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Reviewer's report:

Post-partum trend in blood pressure levels, renal function and proteinuria in women with severe preeclampsia and eclampsia in Sub-Saharan Africa: A 6-months cohort study:

BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth: REVIEW

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes. There is a robust description of the course and destination of all women in the study.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes and see below
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes see below
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? See below
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? See below
9. Is the writing acceptable? Minor grammatical corrections required.

Review

The strength of this study is the pre pregnancy data collected on these women. The paper is very well written apart from some minor grammatical errors which need to be corrected.

It is not usual elsewhere for women to present to a hospital for pre pregnancy testing: why were these women seen in a hospital environment pre-pregnancy? Or was this data collected for other sources (clinics etc). how reliable is that data?

Minor corrections
Abstract:
Line 2 involvements should read involvement
Results: line 8 remove “the”
Conclusion: line 2 Cameroonians should read Cameroonian
Key Words: Renal impairment is used in the key words and Renal failure in the abstract : this should be consistent
Main Document:
Page 6 line 1: Please remove the abbreviation sPECL - this is not used anywhere else in the preeclampsia literature and implies a different disease. Use severe preeclampsia throughout
Methods line 1 remove SPECI and replace with severe preeclampsia
Grammatical errors: Methods: line 2 at the central maternity should read at the central maternity Unit
Line three carry should read carried
Line 5 foro the maternity conditions should read for maternity related conditions
Line 8 and performs an average of 3000 deliveries, should read performs an average of 300 deliveries per ?? month
Page 7 last line : Definition: it is standardized to present the threshold for proteinuria as mg per 24 hours or mg/mmolCr : therefore should read 5000 mg per day (As estimated from a protein to creatinine ratio).
Page 8 line 2 change sPECL to severe preeclampsia
Page 8 line 5 change to mg/mmol Cr
Define serum creatinine as mg/mmol (S.I units)
Page 8 Line 7Why was 95 ml/min chosen when <90 ml/min/1.73m2 is the CKD definition cut off?
Statistical analysis line 10 change sPECL to severe preeclampsia
Results: The methods state that all women received their antenatal care at hospital so why are there more deliveries (5765) than women who attended antenatal care (5610) in the study?
The significant results in table 2 need to be highlighted. Why are the 6 months significant results (especially BMI, not highlighted in the abstract, especially given that this is a reversible variable?
Discussion line 7 (page 11) “higher” implies that there was a graded responses examined in terms of the level of proteinuria. It appears that this was studied as a discrete variable? Can the authors please clarify or adjust the wording accordingly?
Paragraph 2: in general Acute renal failures has been replaced by the term Acute
Kidney injury (although I agree that this is not widely used in obstetric circles). For ease of search terms can I suggest that both terms are used in the discussion, one in parentheses.

Page 12 line 8, it might be helpful for the authors to postulate the role of increased BMI in the 6 month risk profile, and to comment on potential mechanisms.

List of abbreviations : Caesarian section should be spelt caesarean

Please remove sPECL

References: there are some additional references relating Low birth weight to subsequent renal disease which might be worth including?


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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