



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_4985
Title of the Manuscript:	PATTERN OF NEONATAL MORTALITY IN A TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN UMUAHIA, SOUTH EAST, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors use the term “neonatal mortality rate” frequently in the manuscript but made no effort explicitly distinguishing between the two definitions: 1) number of deaths per 1,000 live births; 2) number of deaths per 100 neonatal patients (expressed as a percentage); Both are very important and relevant for the current study yet they have very different epidemiological and clinical meanings and shouldn't be used interchangeably. The authors need to make a clear distinction between the two in the “Introduction” section and state that the current study is focused on the latter. The “Introduction” section is too long. The authors tried to be too comprehensive in setting up the background but lost focus. It seems that the last paragraph (lines 102 – 107) is essential in establishing the aim of the study. I would suggest follow the flow of thought as: 1) Neonatal mortality is high in Nigeria; 2) Linkage between neonatal mortality and MDG4 and insufficient progress; 3) Causes of neonatal mortality and its linkage with interventions for reduction; 4) Aims of the current study (“It is pertinent therefore that ...”) In the current manuscript, the elaboration of global situations can be greatly reduced. The final compulsory change is the formatting of “References”. The authors could benefit from some	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	editorial service or using reference management software (such as Reference Manager or EndNote). There are just too many inconsistencies and typos in the current version.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Line 26 "... in the current study is quiet high with ..." Please replace "quiet" with "quite". Lines 61 – 63 Please cite reference No.4 here. The citation number (as a superscript) is missing. Line 76 "It is amazing that most of these deaths..." Please replace "amazing" with "unfortunate" as the word amazing gives a positive flavour while this statement is actually about a negative phenomenon. Lines 145 – 146 I would love to see age at death be further stratified by three categories: XX% died with 24 hours of birth; XX% died after 24 hours but within 72 hours of births; XX% died after 72 hours but within 28 days; this can be presented in a table. Lines 153 – 154 "More than half of the babies (294) were delivered through..." Please add phrase "who died" so it reads "More than half of the babies (294) who died were delivered through..." Lines 158 – 160 I would love to see cause of death further cross-tabulated against age of death in three groups as specified in an earlier comment (or against time of hospitalization in three groups as first 24 hours, between 24 and 72 hours, after 72 hours). This can be presented in a table where rows are headed by causes of death and columns headed by time category. Figure 1. Y axis title should be "Average number of admissions". Figure title should read "Average monthly admissions, 2000 – 2010" Figure 2. Figure title should read "Gender distribution of neonatal mortalities, 2000 – 2010" Table I. Last row of method should read "Other method or unknown", instead of "? Method".	
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is generally well written with clear aims and methods. Results are presented with clarity and discussed with breadth and depth. Please shorten introduction and add a couple of more tables as commented above and the manuscript would be great to be published.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xiaodong Cai
Department, University & Country	ICPD beyond 2014 Secretariat, United Nations Population Fund, United States of America