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Reviewer's report:

The best part of this effort is that data are coming from a non-academic rural hospital with limited resources makes this study important. Some general comments are as follows; English language needs some strengthening, at some places rephrasing or correction of concepts is required. For example in the introduction section in the very first line the definition of perinatal death is wrongly given; for lines 77 to 78 more information is needed why facility levels are not responding; line 81 to 83 need rephrasing for clarity; lines 87 to 88 need language correction. Also recommendations do not match the data. recommendation are addressing more of the additional analyses rather than the primary

Some more specific comments are as follows;

Abstract: t- test should be written correctly

Results: it is mentioned that "rate of perinatal death prior to discharge was 35.5/1000 deliveries" this needs clarity in the write-up to show what authors are trying to present-- Prior to discharge and denominator is not clear, similarly the sentence-- fresh stillbirth and neonatal deaths were more associated with nulliparity ---- needs rephrasing

Conclusion: needs complete revision

Introduction:

correct lines 65 to 68 and rephrase some as mentioned above

Methods: have the authors reviewed all the records or a sample size was calculated? How was stillbirth defined? what was the cutoff taken for the gestational age--give this upfront, as this comes late

Controls should be defined properly-- infants with normal delivery outcomes does not say much -- if authors mean live birth? normal vaginal delivery? APGAR? etc this should be mentioned clearly
line 108 Fresh stillbirths were those with findings suggestive of death within hours of delivery??
this can be rephrased as "Fresh stillbirths were those where fetal death had occurred in the uterus
less than 12 hours of birth and fetus had no signs of skin changes. etc.

Was collinearity checked before modeling?

Results:

Age should be described appropriately either as a continuous variable or in groups with
percentage.

Table 1 should give just a comparison of cases and controls with percentages only

Table 1 given is too busy and too many things are presented in one table, Suggest to combine
variables with small numbers don't see the reason for including fresh and macerated still birth
analysis with such a scant data. a neat clean paper on perinatal death could suffice, if authors
choose they may include a descriptive paragraph on this. same holds true for analysis on
singleton and twin cases

Discussion: should emphasize on limited recourses, booked /unbooked cases/ rural facility--
quality of care to address fresh stillbirth, should be added. neonatal deaths should be written as
early neonatal deaths conclusions should be revised completely

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

No

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

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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