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Reviewer’s report:

The revisions made is not satisfactory and indicate the lack of epidemiologist/biostatistician in the research group.

Major compulsory revisions

Methods

Study setting
The last sentence in the paragraph regarding ethical permission should be moved to the end of the Methods and constitute a separate section

Care of eclamptic mothers at MNH
The first paragraph "Eclampsia patients who are admitted..." is a not care but data collection.

Data sources
Relabel this section to Data collection!

Were data collected prospectively or retrospectively?
Try to make a logical presentation of the data generation process to make it clear the source for each variable.

How was the optimal patient stay in ICU established?

Statistical analysis
bivariate analysis should be bivariate logistic regression analysis etc
Introduce the abbreviations OR and CI for odds ratio and 95% confidence interval

Results
With respect to the size of the study I recommend 2 digits precision in the estimates, thus in the first paragraph
4.9% should be 4.9% but
68.6% should be 69%
55.2% should be 55%
versus is usually abbreviated vs.

"A typical candidate for extra care in ICU was a parous women older than 24 years..."

I do not agree!!!

Delete the sentence: "Variables that were not associated for extra care included."

Not needed!

The presentation of the results from the logistic regression analysis is poor. Present the variables by impact i.e start by Time to delivery.

The risk or need of extra care increased by increasing time to delivery and was doubled... (OR=2.0; 95% CI:1.1-3.7) and tenfold elevated... (OR=10; 95% CI:4.3-23) as compared to when time to delivery was less than 12 hours. Altered state of consciousness and abdominal mode of delivery doubled the risk for extra care (OR=2.3 and 2.5 respectively)

Table 1
Age group
>=30

Number of fits
>=3

Gestational age (weeks)
<=8.5
>8.5

Time taken to delivery
>=24.01

Use same label of the variables
Table 1: Time taken to delivery, Type of referral
Table 3: Time to delivery, Patient received from

Table 3
OR for reference group should be 1, not 1.0
The reference group should come first

Isn't it logical that gestational age >=37 should be the reference group
Similar for MNH?

References
Still needs to be checked!
Be consistent in the use of abbreviation of journals

Try to write short and concise

Get a new language check
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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