1. `The authors wanted to examine the association between C-section and childhood diseases. The temporal sequence suggests that childhood diseases should be the outcome variable and the authors also pointed that out. But in the analysis the descriptive and bivariate analysis was conducted and presented in relation to characteristics affecting C-section and normal delivery. I would suggest the author to present the occurrence of childhood diseases in relation to different maternal and child characteristics in Table 1.
2. In discussion (line 243-245), the authors mentioned “We found that the risk of childhood diseases for children born in C-section was substantially higher than children in normal delivery. This finding over the databases is consistent.” However, in the findings, the crude RR and adjusted RR are not significant for c-section for childhood diseases across the years.
3. Moreover, the authors did not justify the inclusion of three survey data from two different surveys in the study. If capturing time trend is the objective, please also justify why the study did not include BDHS 2011 data? Since MICS was conducted in 2012, any similar results would have been a stronger proof of the time trend.