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Reviewer's report:

General comments: The manuscript describes men's grief following pregnancy loss and neonatal loss. To understand men's grief in this circumstance, the authors conducted a systematic review to address the research questions regarding men's experience and predictors following pregnancy/neonatal loss. Well done to the authors for the analysis of the data and writing the manuscript!

To improve the manuscript, it is better to revise the background and reduce the results and discussion sections. The writing style and editing are intensively required. Punctuation should properly be used. Word consistency such as neonatal, newborn, perinatal, father, men etc. should be considered. Below are the specific comments and questions:

Abstract: The objectives of the abstract should be consistent with the objectives in the background. The design/descriptor of the study should be mentioned in the methods. The conclusion in the abstract seems different from the conclusion of the study. Both should be consistent.

Background: It is a lengthy background. It is better to keep it brief and clear. Relate one paragraph to the next. The ideas should flow from one sentence to the next. Consistency of words/terms should be considered e.g. neonatal versus newborn. To avoid confusion, terminology such as newborn/neonatal and infants should properly be used. Here are some specific examples:
Page 4, Line 31-35. It is a complex sentence. It difficult to follow. It needs to be simplified and divided into two sentences with clarity.
Page 4: Line 40-42: It is better to provide the number of miscarriage per year to be consistent with the following numbers e.g. stillbirth and newborn deaths.
Page 4, Line 43 to 45: Why do the authors compare miscarriage and neonatal mortality in LMIC with infant mortality in high income countries? It is a strange comparison.
Page 5, 50-53: "Psychological outcome" is not related to the topic of the paragraph or previous paragraph. It sounds ambiguous.
Page 5: The "terminology" section can be removed from the manuscript or summarized in the method section.
Page 5: "Previous literature on grief following pregnancy loss and neonatal loss" topic is too long. It's much better summarize it in one or two short paragraphs.
Page 6, line 79-82: It's redundant. It can be removed.
Methods:
Page 7: Describe the time period of the systematic review.
Page 7, line 117: It can be study selection

Results:

Page 9, line 152: It doesn't look pretty to start the results with a reference to the appendix or tables. The results section should start with characteristics of the studies.
Page 9-12: It is recommended to present the study overview/characteristics in an organized and orderly fashion. This part of the result section is very lengthy alongside complex sentences. The overview of the studies unnecessarily presented in details. It is better to revise these paragraphs and make them shorter and easy-to-read.

Page 10: 170 173: The definitions are mixed up specifically perinatal period.

There are unnecessary phrases such as "The authors of studies which focused on miscarriage also noted"

Discussion:

The discussion section is very lengthy along with complex and long sentences. The flow logically from one sentence to the next become a challenge in some parts of the section. Examples provided below. It will be nice to make it shorter focused more on the research questions, the main results (not all the results), surprising findings and comparison.
Page 29, line 633 to 640: Complex and long sentences. The comparison between men and women can simply be presented in one paragraph.
Page 29, line 644 to 647. Complex sentence.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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