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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper reflecting new information on external cephalic version. This is a well-written manuscript which addresses correctly most methodological aspects of a cost-effectiveness study. The paper overall is clearly written and easy to follow. There are however some comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. An emergency CS can also occur after a successful ECV, therefore this should be incorporated in the decision tree model.

2. In the discussion, Table 6 is mentioned, this table is not incorporated in the manuscript and therefore not evaluated.

3. The time horizon is confusing. On page 6 the horizon is set 6 weeks for vaginal delivery and 8 weeks for CS (why not both 6 or 8 weeks?), and on page 8 it is 12 weeks after delivery. This should be made more clear.

4. On page 10, third paragraph, it is stated that cost estimates were derived from literature, there are however no references. References should be added in the text or data sources in the table.

5. Page 11 line 6: what are the references for the estimated costs?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The text in figure 1 is difficult to read.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Table 1. Concerning ECV emergency CS rate I would suggest to also refer to the most recent review on ECV complications of Grootscholten et al. Obs Gyn Nov 2008

2. I’m not an expert on health utilities, but I noticed that on page 8 line 13 it is stated that maternal health state was independent form neonatal health state. I doubt this is true. For example, long term NICU admission also affects the mother in a certain way (daily visits, longer in hospital stay because of the admission of the neonate etc.). If I’m right this should be mentioned in the
discussion.

3. Discussion
I would tone down the remark “vaginal breech delivery is not being undertaken in common obstetric practice” in something like “and the resulting low vaginal breech delivery rate”
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