Reviewer’s report

**Title:** Risk factors and outcome of patients with eclampsia at a tertiary hospital in Egypt

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 28 Aug 2017

**Reviewer:** Thomas Easterling

**Reviewer’s report:**

"Risk factors and outcome of patients with eclampsia at a tertiary hospital in Egypt," by Mahran et al is a revised manuscript examining eclampsia in a tertiary hospital in Egypt.

* The statement "poor ante-natal attendance" suggest to me that care was available and that the woman did not take advantage of it. "Attending" is something that a woman would choose to do or not. Is this what the authors intend to say? On the other hand, was prenatal are not readily available?

* The authors attribute high c-section rates to high complication rates in this study. Furthermore, they suggest that a higher rate of vaginal delivery should be encouraged in cases of eclampsia. Data regarding complications among women with c-section vs. vaginal delivery are not presented to support these conclusions.

* The authors suggest that treatment with parenteral anti-hypertensives might improve outcomes. Again data to support this conclusion is not presented.

* Only 178 of 250 women received oral anti-hypertensive therapy before delivery. Should women be treated more aggressively with oral agents? This seems more likely to be accomplished than establishing a reliable supply of parenteral agents.

* MgSO4 was clearly available - all patients received MgSO4. The hospital guidelines suggest use to prevent "further fits." Do hospital guidelines suggest use to prevent eclampsia? If not, should the guidelines be changed?

* Are presenting BP's available?

* "The different presentation of cases on admission is shown in table 2." Should this be Table 3?

* What percent of women had seizures prior to admission. The pathway to decreasing the rates of seizures among women prior to admission is different from interventions available once admitted.

* Of the 100 with seizures after delivery, how many were admitted to this facility after the seizure, (they were delivered elsewhere)? If the seizures were in this facility, then aggressive interventions to improve care PP are warranted (eg. BP control, MgSO4).
"Seizure" is probably a better choice of language than "fits. (Previously recommended).
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