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Reviewer's report:

This is a clear and well-written paper; and, in particular, the Discussion relating the results to other work and to possible solutions is very good. Also, the information on social indicators is extremely valuable.

Major compulsory revisions
1. More details about the hospital are needed (and if it could be explicitly named, so much the better). Specifically, is it a public hospital (no out of pocket expenses) or a mix of public and private? How were out-of-area transfers identified? How does the hospital fit into the system of hospitals within its jurisdiction?

2. Some discussion of the effect (if any) of defining neonatal deaths as those that occurred before discharge would be helpful to the reader. That is, how many neonatal deaths occur after discharge?

3. Somewhere in the paper (either in text or a table) the number of stillbirths, neonatal deaths and perinatal deaths should be presented.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. DOCS and EPDS should be spelt out (maybe as a footnote) in Table 1.

Discretionary Revisions
1. The Tables would benefit from including “raw” numbers (including number missing) as well as percentages. I can see why the authors have omitted the “raw” numbers from the Tables: different variables were collected in different years & totals are given in footnotes. But, I wonder whether there might not be some way to explicitly include this information without making the Tables too cluttered.
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