

Peer Review File

Article Information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-20-438>

Reviewer A

1. Can authors describe the methods of data collection more in details? I understand that you used Mortality Information System and Live birth Information System, which is nation-wide, I guess, but who is actually inserting the data? which variables are collected? Is it everyday basis system or monthly collected? I tried to use the link but it did not work (maybe its my fault). Just to give a bit more detailed information about data collection.

Answer: The recommendation suggested by the reviewer was made and we added more detailed information about the data collection procedure. In addition, we added a topic about the study variables in the Method section. Line: 142-184

2. The paper is about early neonatal mortality and I understand it is not vital to provide data on stillbirth, but for having a clearer picture, can you provide 2-3 sentences about stillbirth rate in the region/country, and late spontaneous abortions, since those are very interlinked. And to say something about stillbirth rate among teenage mothers.

Answer: The reviewer's recommendation was made and we added in the Discussion section two paragraphs on the burden of the stillbirth rate in the state of São Paulo. Line: 339-348

3. When talking about regions in discussion, it might be useful to see the map showing the regional differences. As it is said that the reduction was mostly accelerated in the Northern region.

Answer: We appreciate the suggestion, however, in the discussion section we brought comparative studies from different regions of Brazil and the world. However, the object of this study is restricted to the State of São Paulo, one of the four states in the Southeast region of Brazil. In this case, it would not be appropriate to insert a map of the regions of Brazil, as this is not the objective of the study.

4. On line 202, you said 'relatively large proportion of missing data', I would add here what is this proportion.

Answer: the reviewer's recommendation was carried out and we entered the value of the proportion of missing data for the race / color variable. Missing data = 20.3%.

“With a relatively large proportion of data missing¹⁹”. “With 20.3% of data missing” Line 498-499.

5. Table 1: The number in each categories are not adding up to the total number of births, I guess, its due to the missing data. Can you add the category 'missing' for each variable and provide absolute numbers and proportions as for other categories?

Answer: the recommendation suggested by the reviewer was made and we added the category “missing” for all variables in table 1 and we presented the absolute and relative values.

6. In the same table, for gestational age variable: 8% here are missing, can you have an idea is it randomly assigned in the GA categories or there is any other explanation?

Answer: In fact, the percentage of ignored and / or blank information about gestational age can partially affect the interpretation of the result of this variable in an uncontrolled way.

7. In the same table, for birth weight variable: Much lower proportion of missing here, compared to GA group. Only 0.8% missing. Any explanation? Is it more common to weight baby instead of calculation GA?

Answer: In fact, the percentage of ignored and / or blank information can partially affect the interpretation of the result of this variable in an uncontrolled way. In live birth protocols, all measurements of variables must be made, however, for some reason this data was not filled in the database.

8. Line 297: There should be decreased and not 'increased', right?

Answer: Correct. In fact, it showed a reduction. Line 311

9. It would be more interesting, if you add information (small paragraph) about global numbers of teenage pregnancy, which makes your data more comparable for reader.

Answer: The recommendation suggested by the reviewer was made. Line: 83-96

Reviewer B

1.) The whole manuscript should receive English proofreading.

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer

2.) Methods in Abstract, 1.000 should be 1,000? Other numerical values should also be corrected. Conversely, there are some parts where “;” should be replaced with “.” (for example, line 288).

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer

3.) Line number 126, 10.7%0 is an odd expression. Although “%0” appears in many parts of the manuscript, you should explain what “%0” means. “%0” and “%” are different?

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer Line: 130

4.) Line number 152, “were” should be correctly “where”?

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer. Line 174.

5.) Line number 161, What is “respective probability”? Is it p-value?

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer. Line 192.

6.) Lines 197-208, Although you wrote “2.8 limitations” in the Materials and Methods section, it should be located in the Discussion.

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer. Included in the discussion section

Line: 493-501

7.) You should mention about Table 2 and 3 and Figure 2 and 3 in the Results section. Not present the results newly in Discussion.

Answer: a recommendation suggested by the reviewer

8.) Why is the abbreviation of early neonatal mortality rate TMNP? Isn't it ENMR?

Answer: In fact, the acronyms were wrong, the recommendation suggested by the reviewer was made

9.) Although you wrote “early neonatal mortality rate decreased until the year 2000” in the Abstract, ENMR decreased until 2005 or 2006 as shown in Table 2 and Figure 1. Although “the trend~ remained stable in the period evaluated” is written as the conclusion, I think “Although early neonatal mortality rate showed a significant decreasing trend until approximately 2005, it remained stables thereafter.” is a more accurate description. What do you think?

Answer: We appreciate the suggestion the recommendation suggested by the reviewer was made

10.) Line 288, what is NPT?

Answer: There was a typo, following correction for ENMR Early Neonatal Mortality Rate. Line 354.

11.) Line 297, is increased a mistake of decreased?

Answer: In fact, it showed a decreased Line 311.

12.) Lines 294-296, where are the results that support this sentence?

Answer: In the Figure 3

13.) In Discussion, you should briefly discuss the results obtained in this study. It seems that a number of sentences which are not directly related to the results obtained in this study are written in Discussion.

Answer: There is no beginning of the discussion, a brief discussion of the results and we remove what is not directly related to the study.

14.) You should discuss why TMNP decreased from 1996 to 2016 in Discussion.

Answer: We appreciate the suggestion the recommendation suggested by the reviewer was made
Line 328-331