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Reviewer's report:

General comment: This is a useful manuscript, pointing to the importance of recognizing the increased risk for adverse perinatal outcomes for women with preeclampsia and the added risk imposed with severe features.

Major concerns:

1. Many terms are used in the manuscript without sufficiently precise definition. For example, in the abstract (line 23), how "severe preeclampsia" was defined?

2. Lots of details are missing from the Methods. a) Clarify that low APGARs = <7. b) Provide the number of exclusions (line 23), c) what proportion of results were vs were not validated (line 39), d) define what were your dependent & independent variables (line 45) and e) provide other details such as whether cases of Eclampsia were included. f) Justify use of placental abruption as a criterion for severity. g) Define the other terms noted on the bottom of the Methods page (e.g., was gestational age defined as weeks from the last menstrual period, by Ultrasound, clinical estimate; what criteria were used to judge "abnormal heart rate pattern")

3. Clarify in the Results (& Methods) what AOR and COR mean and how they were determined.

4. I don't find any results for analyses of the influence of the time-interval between when the patient was admitted on perinatal outcomes, or for when MgSO4 (or diazepam) treatment was initiated on perinatal outcomes, yet their manuscript's title implies that they did such analyses. For example, across the time period for this study (2011-2016), was the use of MgSO4 vs diazepam related to the frequency of severe preeclampsia or perinatal death?
5. The results in Figure 2 are striking. Perhaps it's a result of the lack of clarity already referred to (and further noted in my handwritten comments) in Table 2 but needed is clarification as to what specific perinatal outcomes were increased in the severe vs. mild preeclamptic cases and thereby accounted for the marked difference in perinatal survival.

6. Finally, preeclampsia is not only a risk factor for perinatal outcome of the baby but also for the survival and health status of the mother. Was any information collected regarding maternal outcomes?

5. According to Wikipedia, Woldia is a city of approx 180,000 located in northern Ethiopia at an altitude of 2100 m. Please add such information (if indeed correct) to the Methods. Also please add the time period of this study to the Abstract and location of its study site.

Minor concerns: The manuscript is difficult to read or awkwardly written in places. Rather than detail those, I will simply attach my copy with handwritten notes with hopes they will be useful to the authors.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.

Yes
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.
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Quality of written English
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