Reviewer’s report

Title: A population-based surveillance study on severe acute maternal morbidity (near-miss) and adverse perinatal outcomes in Campinas, Brazil: The Vigimoma Project

Version: 1 Date: 30 September 2010

Reviewer: Mattias Rööst

Reviewer’s report:

Minor Compulsory Revisions:

-Abstract: In the objective, the study is described as an intervention. This phrasing is unfortunate as no intervention is actually done within the study. Rather, it suggests measures that could be used in future intervention studies.

-The objective, as described in the introduction section, includes "to evaluate the feasibility of a shared process of confidential enquiry between the municipal, the regional committees, and the researchers as facilitators". How this was done is not described in the methods section and the theme does not appear in the results section. Consequently, it is unclear how this objective was evaluated.

-In the methods section it is not clearly described which information was collected and how this information was collected. Were clinical records used only? Did the research include other sources of data, such as staff discussions or interviews with relatives or women with a near-miss event? This is especially relevant for the results presented in Table 6 about the first and second delay, which are generally difficult to investigate using clinical records.

-The study uses a mix of clinical, management-based, and organ dysfunction based criteria. It would be interesting to know which criteria generated most near-miss cases. That would make it easier for the reader to compare with other studies or settings.

- As I understand the Preventability Score, it should be regarded as an ordinal scale. Consequently, median should be used instead of mean.

-In row 3 paragraph 1 in the Results section it is described that "maternal death comprised 1.9% of cases". However, in Table 1 the figure 2.5% is given for maternal death. As far as I can see, the latter is the correct figure.

-Page 14 second paragraph: It is not clear what the sentence "Although data was not collected, the exercise of thinking about the causal process separately ...." refers to? Which data was not collected?

-The reference list should be checked. For example the title of reference 31 is incorrect. Reference nr 16 is referred to in a sentence about near-miss, which the reference does not discuss.
Table 2 should be checked for consistency.

There are some spelling mistakes and unclear language in the manuscript that should be corrected. For example on page 6..."World Health Organization has.." should be changed to had. The first sentence on the third paragraph page 7 should be rewritten. Further, mixed tenses are used, for example in the result section, which is confusing.

Discretionary Revisions

- Most of all the manuscript focus on quality of care. The title might be improved by including this.

- The objective in the abstract and in the introduction could be more similar.

- Are there any other figures of for example near-miss frequencies in the region that the results of the present study can be compared with?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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