

# Review of: "The Impact of Dietary Intake and Nutritional Status on Birth Outcomes Among Pregnant Adolescents: A Systematic Review"

Hanifa Bachou<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> FHI 360

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Review Report

**Reviewer: Dr Hanifa Bachou**

**Title: The Impact of Dietary Intake and Birth Outcomes Among Pregnant Adolescents: A Systematic Review**

**Author: Linda Gyimah**

## General Observation

The study is novel, uses a literature review to document the association of dietary intake during adolescent pregnancy with pregnancy outcomes. The research question is fairly well formulated.

Although the situation is more common in LMICs, the search used provided mostly studies from HICs. Authors may need to widen search terms, period, and search databases. However, the study does not meet the stringent criteria for a systematic review aimed at minimizing bias.

## Detail

**Title:** Informative. The author may consider rephrasing as 'The Impact of Dietary Intake Among Pregnant Adolescents and Birth Outcomes' (At the author's discretion)

**Authorship:** Single author; for a systematic review, multiple authorship is recommended.

**Source:** The author used a strong main database, Cochrane, and other literature reviews. For a systematic review, consider using more than one location for studies (SCOPUS, MEDLINE, Web of Science, Embrace, LILACs, SC iSearch, etc.). The other sources used, like PubMed, are for literature review, not specific, nor robust enough, hence potential for bias.

**Selection of articles:** Inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied to selection and are well displayed in a flow chart.

**Data Collection:** Describes each study's methodological approach, including variables, samples, measures, data analysis. The author made a fair attempt; however, for a systematic review, a comparison between and among selected

studies is important.

**Data analysis and reporting:** The author provided a table of selected studies and some details. However, there was an absence of grouping of studies according to methodological similarities, and numerical and graphical presentation of results to address statistical analysis and synthesis.

**Interpretation of findings:** This is based on the strength of evidence derived from findings and was not well covered here.

In summary,

**Evaluation:** Critical evaluation of the selected studies is required to determine validity. In this study, this was suboptimal. There was inadequacy in a rigorous critical evaluation.

**Synthesis:** A rigorous methodology is needed for a Systematic Review to prevent shortcuts and minimize bias. This should include a statistical analysis required to integrate the results of selected studies included in this systematic review. The study used more qualitative data, with an absence of quantitative synthesis that should include a statistical method.

**Inference:** The study demonstrated a fair evidence base.

**Conclusion:** The study does not meet the critical criteria for a Systematic Review.

**Recommendation:** Suggest the author considers a review of the study methodology from a Systematic Review to a Narrative/Literature Review.