

Review of: "Prevalence and Associated Factors of Hemorrhoids and Other Perianal Complications During the Puerperium Among Mothers Who Gave Birth at Debre Tabor Referral Hospital, Debre Tabor, Ethiopia, 2022"

Mohammed Ahmed Aliyi¹

¹ Haramaya University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments/suggestions

The paper presents informative and pertinent data on Prevalence and Associated Factors of Hemorrhoids and Other Perianal Complications During the Puerperium Among Mothers Who Gave Birth at Hospitals in Ethiopia. The authors have produced a good paper, and the data is important to publish to show that Hemorrhoids and Other Perianal Complications during the puerperium are still a public health problem in Ethiopia. The paper should be improved with the addition of more detail and correction of some mistakes. Authors need to check grammar throughout the document.

Under the abstract, specifically the results part, I suggest summarizing all statistically significant factors, then explaining them one by one, as it is an abstract.

However, authors reported a positive family history has a relation with Perianal Complications During the Puerperium Among Mothers. Do the authors have a sense to explain how a positive family history is related to mothers' complications during the puerperium periods? And it should be specified which factors are related to family history.

I'm somehow curious about the source populations. Is it not possible to take these mothers in their third trimesters? If your source population is all pregnant women, how will you generalize the findings with your study subjects? This may affect the validity of the study.

The authors have reported that variables having p-value < 0.025 from the bivariable analysis were chosen as candidates for the final multivariable logistic regression model. Is this by error or intentionally? What are your justifications?

There is a disagreement between your source population and what is presented in the results. Your source population was all pregnant women in Debre Tabor town; however, around 89 were rural residents. It needs revision.

How did you get the participants, since most of the mothers preferred to stay at home for at least two months after giving birth according to the traditions of the society?

It is best to add the ethical approval reference number if applicable.

How about the privacy and confidentiality of the patients during examination and data accession? Needs to be added.

The authors did not explain what to do for those with preanal complications. Please include what you did for those with preanal problems.

Also, under sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of study participants, authors made a mistake saying more than half (53.4%) of mothers live in a rural setting, which opposes what is written in table 1. In table one, 46.6% of participants were rural residents. Nothing was said about the differential diagnosis for a perianal disease.

Discussion and Conclusions parts are well stated, linked to the original research question & limited to supporting results.