

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Disparities in Obstetric, Neonatal, and Birth Outcomes among Syrian Women Refugees and Jordanian Women

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Ankit Anand

Submitted on: 10 Jan 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605645

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Author compared the multiple obstetrics and neonatal outcomes (such as neonatal/post neonatal deaths, Low birth rate, preterm births) between refugee Syrian women and native Jordanian women. Study provides an interesting MNCH outcomes among refugee population which is interesting

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The strength is the large hospital data used to provide the maternal and child health related estimated for refugee women which is usually not available

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

I would thank the Author for presenting these useful information for the refugee women. However, I have some observations:

Please provide name and details of the editorial board. Different hospital and universities may have their own review board, bring clarity on those as well

Also provide and compare mean/median for age parity and income for the two groups.

Please provide more details on the surveillance system and data quality. are there any step to check data quality or issue with any of the information. does the data quality varies between hospital and if yes, then why? How did you arrive at the 26139 and 3453 women? were there any cases removed? how they handled missing information ?

A paragraph on above will be helpful for the readers to understand the data

I can see the significant difference in the background of these women. foe example: age education, parity etc. after controlling for these factors the difference between the two group of women seems to become insignificant. it is a interesting finding that the difference can be attributed to the background variables.

The stillbirth rate the neonatal death rate and perinatal death were significant and kind of expected. if author can explore sub-population analysis of only the refugee women it may become more interesting although it was not the objective but may bring a more layer to the understanding.

I appreciate authors for a very clean analysis and simple presentation of the results. a slightly more details on context, data and surveillance system is needed. for example authors mentioned that "analysis was conducted in five leading referral hospitals in Jordan, the findings might not generalise to women refugees receiving care in possibly more-equipped clinical institutions than those included in this study" why a more context is needed here.

### PLEASE COMMENT

#### **Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

**Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

**Q 7** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 9** Originality



**Q 10** Rigor



**Q 11** Significance to the field



**Q 12** Interest to a general audience



**Q 13** Quality of the writing



**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study



#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.