



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_36007
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL VARIATIONS OF MATERNAL MORTALITY IN BORNO STATE OF NIGERIA: A POPULATION BASED STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- I consider that the study is "institutional based" not "population based", because is working with institutional records and not with population samples or groups. - There are statistical figures that must to be checked (please see attached document) - Some statistical analysis could be performed with the data, but if the authors are not in condition to perform it, the study should be considered to publication because it reveals a dramatic situation in an area were data collection and processing seems to be a complicated task. - Results and discussion must to be in separate chapters. - Comparing institutional MMR in Borno State provided by the present study (average for the period 1100) with MMR calculated by Nigeria DHS (576) many conclusions could be drawn. Authors might be interested in explain why their figures (institutional) are double than population estimates from DHS, especially considering that the area faces security problems I consider that the paper contains relevant information collected in an area were security issues are a major concern for health personnel. Because of that the figures reported in the paper should be known by the public health community around the world, even if the accuracy of data cannot be guaranteed.	
Minor REVISION comments	- The study should be considered as "ecological study", because it tries to relate "risk-modifying factors on health or other outcomes based on populations defined either geographically or temporally" - The aim to relate antenatal visits with MMR is plausible, instead the relationship is not necessarily causal. There is a major constraint with the definition of the amount of antenatal visits, surely it aggregates all consultations without making a difference between first or subsequent consultations. Then, the figures show the effective demand of consultations within the health system but nor its coverage among the population. In the text, authors should state it clear.	
Optional/General comments	I am attaching a revised version of the paper	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marco-Antonio Pino
Department, University & Country	School Of Medicine, Pontifical Catholic University Of Ecuador, Ecuador