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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

The paper looks great at this point

Just a few technical issues which need attention

1. Title: Should you say care is the question or is it poor access due to rurality? think about this again and see

2. The explanation you give on severe anomalies should be included in the paper on page 8 where you talk about them.

3. On page 5 where you describe study population, you talk about excluding births less than 500 gm, if you did not know GA, what if they were above 500 grams, how did you estimate GA

4. On page 10 results about Table 5, otherwise it's not clear why you picked that region as reference. You may need to write that you are comparing perinatal risk to Western region upfront, and state the reason, why

5. Finally, the cities, are not appearing on Figure 1 yet.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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