

Review of: "Using a Health and Demographic Surveillance System to Assess Stillbirths Trends and Risk Factors in Siaya County, Kenya between 2008 and 2019"

Yewbmirt Sharew

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Yewbmirt Sharew Bayile

Injibara univeristy, Injibara, Ethiopia

Review: Using a Health and Demographic Surveillance System to Assess Stillbirths Trends and Risk Factors in Siaya County, Kenya between 2008 and 2019.

General Comments

First, I need to say thank you for selecting me to review this notable paper. This paper addresses an overlooked issue, so the title is remarkable. Hence, I tried to put my comments here below:

Title

Better to avoid unnecessary wording in the title, and it is good to write it in the following way:

Stillbirths Trends and its Risk Factors Using a Health and Demographic Surveillance System in Siaya County, Kenya, 2008 - 2019.

Abstract

Introduction: Try to make gleam the aim/objective of your study to engage the audience to read.

Methods: It is better to list your data management and analysis tools in this section.

Result: Only **educational level**, **sub-county**, **wealth index**, and **year of pregnancy outcome** are determinants of stillbirth. See my view well in the specific comments below?

It is better to report trends of stillbirth in relation to its decomposition/women's Characteristics, well?

Conclusion: Your conclusion has to be in line with your results. In my view, your conclusion is not based on this paper's scientific results. Again, the recommendation has to be specified towards the source population. So for me, your conclusion is not fit???

In general, there are some grammatical, wording, and coherence errors across the document. Also, the paper lacks focus.

The quality of writing contributes to having numerous readers? So it is better to correct it accordingly?

Specific comments

Introduction

“To assess the trend and factors associated with stillbirth in the communities in light of ANC visits and address this gap of knowledge.”

This aim/objective lacks consistency with your title. And also, it shows your biased view towards ANC. So better to be consistent?

Materials and methods

Your Source and Study population are not clearly stated, so better to state them clearly?

Again, your study design needs to be stated clearly?

Result

Trends of stillbirth

In general, the analysis showed a decreasing trend of stillbirths from a high of 36 in 2008 to 17 per 1000 live births in 2019.

To ensure clarity for all types of readers across the document, it is important to put forth what metrics of measure you used for the trends of stillbirth. These metrics need to be communicated clearly starting from the title, objectives, and methods. Rate/ratio....?

Then it is better to report the trends of stillbirth per pre-selected metrics of measure rather than narrate the measurements here?

Determinants of Stillbirth

To say variables are determinants, adjusted odds ratios have to be significant after the adjustment of confounding factors. Based on this, as I observe the regression table, only **educational level, sub-county, wealth index, and year of pregnancy outcome** are determinants of stillbirth. Age and ANC are not significant determinants. So you have to report only those four variables. Avoid reporting the non-significant variables of age and ANC visit, which causes confusion and displays researchers' bias; moreover, the real scientific reports.

Discussion

You are expected to discuss only your significant results related to findings within or others. So I recommend your discussion to be focused?

References

Some references are outdated, so it's better to see them again?

Overall, stillbirth is the image of the basic health intervention status for the community. Again, it is a key pointer of one's country's economic development. So this paper will have a marvelous contribution to the field.

Thank you in advance!