

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 52805

Title: Retrospective analysis and countermeasures of failed trial of labor

Reviewer's code: 03115435

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Research Fellow, Research Scientist, Senior Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-07 10:19

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-13 11:58

Review time: 6 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This retrospective study of the factors related to failed trial of labor and the clinical indications of cesarean section conversion is very interesting. In recent years, with the attention of the state and the Ministry of Health, the cesarean section rate has decreased. Caesarean section is an invasive procedure, and the potential risk is much higher than that of natural delivery. The risk delivering newborns who need to enter the neonatal intensive care units, and having children with overweight, obesity, type 1 diabetes, asthma is also increased. It is necessary to strictly control the indications of cesarean section in the vaginal delivery process, rationally apply cesarean section, improve the quality of obstetric work, and ensure the safety of mother and child in the perinatal period. This study is aimed to analyse the clinical data of pregnant women with vaginal trials of labor in our hospital in recent years and explored the reasons for the conversion to cesarean section in the failed trial of labor and the corresponding solutions. Generally, this study is designed well, the methods are described in detail. Results are reasonable, and well discussed. Are there any follow up data? And how about the limit of the study. Please make a short discussion. Thank you.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 52805

Title: Retrospective analysis and countermeasures of failed trial of labor

Reviewer's code: 03035546

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BPhy, MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-14 11:14

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-20 04:14

Review time: 5 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting study. Only a minor editing is required. I have no specific comments.