

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Predictors of Birth Preparedness and Complication Readiness Practice among Pregnant Women in Ethiopia, a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: John Bua

Submitted on: 29 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1607296

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

A systematic review and meta-analysis of birth preparedness and complication readiness practices among pregnant women in Ethiopia, to identify predictors of birth preparedness and complication readiness practices.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations.

The study relied on only published studies done within Ethiopia.

The studies used do not cover the entire Ethiopia.

The studies included used only the cross-sectional method.

Strengths.

The studies included in the study were done at community and institutional level.

The study followed the PRISMA checklist.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

Major comments:

Results and methods section:

1. You started with 126 studies and ended with 21 studies for final review. 76 were excluded for being duplicates. 6 were excluded for being non-compliant. No reason was given for 23 studies excluded?

2. Since you are using a relative static (odds ratio), shouldn't your line of no difference (null effect) have a value of 1 in the forest plot?

3. The heterogeneity test on studies included indicates a high level of inconsistency among the studies. This affects how you interpret the results.

Minor comments:

Background section:

1. 95% and not 99% of maternal deaths occur in only low and lower middle income countries in 2020. That is according to the WHO report 2020 for maternal mortality.

2. Revise the grammar and do proof reading for this section.

Methods, results, discussion and conclusion section:

1. Revise after addressing the major comments.

2. Revise the grammar and do proof reading for those sections.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes, the reference list covers the relevant literature from that area adequately.

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

The review will have international implications in the east African region.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The study didn't identify predictors in a strict sense but it identified factors positively associated with birth preparedness and complication readiness practice among pregnant mothers in Ethiopia. These parameters can be used in the development of prediction tools for birth preparedness and complication readiness.

Predictors in a given context can reliably predict the outcome without being the cause of the outcome.

So the authors might consider changing the title from predictors to factors. Alternatively they could make a study working definition of predictor as a factor associated with birth preparedness and complication readiness practice.

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

The keywords are appropriate.

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

The English can be improved by minor grammar corrections and proof reading.

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13	Quality of generalization and summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 14	Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 15	Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q 16	Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.