Factors associated with peri-neonatal mortality

in Sao Tome & Principe: a prospective cohort study

Alexandra Vasconcelos (A Vasconcelos)[1*], Swasilanne Sousa (S Sousa)[2], Nelson Bandeira (N Bandeira)[2], Marta Alves (M Alves)[3], Ana Luísa Papoila (AL Papoila)[3], Filomena Pereira (F Pereira)[1], Maria Céu Machado (MC Machado)[4]

* Correspondence: alexandravasc@gmail.com (AV)

(AV) ORCID: 0000-0001-8042-0846

Author affiliations

1. Unidade de Clínica Tropical - Global Health and Tropical Medicine (GHTM), Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical (IHMT), Universidade NOVA de Lisboa. Lisboa - Portugal

2. Maternidade, Hospital Dr. Ayres de Menezes, São Tomé, República Democrática de São Tomé e Príncipe

3. CEAUL, NOVA Medical School/Faculdade de Ciências Médicas, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisboa - Portugal

4. Professora Catedrática Jubilada da Faculdade de Medicina de Lisboa, Universidade de Lisboa. Lisboa – Portugal

Abstract

Background

Neonatal mortality reduction is a global goal but its factors in high-burden nations vary and are poorly understood. This study was conducted to identify the factors affecting peri-neonatal mortality in Sao Tome & Principe (STP), one of the smallest African countries.

Methods

Institution-based prospective cohort study conducted at Hospital Dr. Ayres Menezes. Maternal-neonate dyads enrolled were followed up after the 28th day of life (n=194) for identification of neonatal death-outcome (n=22) and alive-outcome groups (n=172). Data were collected from pregnancy cards, hospital records and face-to-face interviews. After the 28th day of birth, a phone call was made to evaluate the newborn's health status. A logistic regression model was used to identify the relevant factors associated with mortality, with a level of significance $\alpha=0.05$.

Results

The mean GA of the death-outcome and alive-outcome groups was 36 (SD=4.8) and 39 (SD=1.4) weeks, respectively. Death-outcome group (n=22) included sixteen stillbirths, four early and two late neonatal deaths. High-risk pregnancy score [cOR 2.91, 95%CI:1.18-7.22], meconium-stained fluid [cOR 4.38, 95%CI:1.74–10.98], prolonged rupture of membranes [cOR 4.84, 95%CI:1.47–15.93], transfer from another unit [cOR 6.08, 95%CI:1.95–18.90], and instrumental vaginal delivery [cOR 8.90, 95%CI:1.68–47.21], were factors significantly associated with mortality. The odds of experiencing death were higher for newborns with infectious risk, IUGR, resuscitation maneuvers, fetal distress at birth, birth asphyxia, and unit care admission. Female newborn [cOR 0.37, 95%CI:0.14-1.00] and birth weight of more than 2500 g [cOR 0.017, 95%CI:0.002-0.162] were found

to be protective factors. In the multivariable model, meconium-stained fluid was significantly

associated with death outcome.

Conclusion

Of the risk factors associated with peri-neonatal mortality in this study, most can be prevented with

continuous monitoring of fetal heart and interventions to reduce perinatal asphyxia. Avoiding

health-worker-related factors associated with delays in prompt intrapartum care is a key strategy for

STP.

Keywords: neonatal mortality, perinatal mortality, stillbirth, neonatal death, Sao Tome & Principe

Introduction

The first 28 days of life—the neonatal period—are the most vulnerable time for a child's survival, and a significant number die before birth never having the chance to take their first breath. Perinatal mortality includes stillbirths and early neonatal deaths (ENND), indicating the death of a live newborn before the age of seven completed days [1]. Late neonatal deaths (LNNDs) are those that occur after 7 days to 28 completed days of birth [2].

Globally, perinatal mortality accounts for three-fourths of deaths during the neonatal period [3,4]. More than half of the cases of stillbirths occur when pregnant women are in labor, and these deaths are directly related to the lack of skilled care at this critical time [5,6]. On the other hand, the largest contributors to neonatal mortality (ENND plus LNND) are complications of preterm birth, birth asphyxia, infection, and congenital malformations although they can differ depending on the country context [7].

Only in the last two decades, mainly after Lawn et al published article titled "4 million neonatal deaths: When? Where? Why?" [8], attention started to be given to the neonatal period in developing countries although stillbirths are still invisible and missing from the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) agenda [5,9,10]. It urges to highlight that stillbirths and newborn deaths account for twice as many deaths as malaria and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection combined but have received much less awareness and funding in these resource-constrained countries [8,9].

Understanding the causes of stillbirths (fetal deaths) is also complex, as there are many promoting and interacting factors [11]. In most low –to medium - income countries (LMICs), it is difficult to determine the exact reason for the stillbirth; therefore, the cause of death is often classified as "unexplained" [5]. Researchers report that different risk factors for fetal death, such as maternal factors (advanced maternal age, high pre-pregnancy body mass index, smoking, low socioeconomic

status), obstetric history (grand multiparity, previous stillbirth), antepartum factors (fewer than four

antenatal visits, fetal growth restriction, maternal anemia, maternal fever and infections,

antepartum hemorrhage, hypertension), and intrapartum factors (preterm birth, extremes of

neonatal birth weight, cesarean delivery, operative vaginal delivery, and assisted breech delivery),

are all factors that have been reported in various studies as causes of stillbirths [6,11-15].

Sao Tome & Principe (STP) is an LMIC with low HIV/AIDS prevalence and a malaria preelimination

phase [16,17]. There is an established antenatal care (ANC) service, with a 98% rate of women seen

at least once by a skilled health provider during pregnancy and a 95.4% rate of deliveries occurring in

health units [17]. In STP, peri-neonatal mortality is considered a public health problem in the

country, given that neonatal deaths accounts for approximately 43% of all under5 deaths [18]. At the

time this study was initiated, there was an annual rate of 22 stillbirths and 22 newborn deaths per

1000 livebirths [18].

We are aware that the concept of knowing what works in terms of reducing perinatal and neonatal

mortality is complicated by a huge diversity of country contexts and of determinants of maternal and

neonatal health [19-22]. However, according to Lawn and other authors, identifying and addressing

avoidable causes of neonatal death is possible even in poorly functioning health systems, justifying

our current study [8,9]. Answering - why, when, and where - newborns die in Sao Tome & Principe

will enable the design of appropriate planning to prevent this major public health problem since, for

appropriate prevention of fetal and newborn mortality, data pertaining to its determinants are

important.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to assess peri-neonatal mortality in STP, and it

was undertaken within the context of a broader project on neonatal adverse birth outcomes (ABOs)

in this LMIC [23-25].

Therefore, we conducted a prospective cohort study to identify the most important factors

associated with mortality among newborns delivered at HAM.

Materials and methods

Study design

An institution-based prospective cohort study was conducted at Hospital Dr. Ayres de Menezes (HAM) for mother-neonate dyads followed up until the 28th day after delivery (neonatal period).

Setting

The archipelago of Sao Tome & Principe is one of the smallest sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries, with approximately 200.000 inhabitants and a total land surface of approximately 1,001 km^2 on two islands (Sao Tome and a smaller island named Principe) [16,17]. The rural districts have ANC services and maternity units with basic obstetric services in Lembá, Lobata, Caué, Me-Zochi, and Principe Island, except for the district of Cantagalo. There is only one hospital in the country, Hospital Dr. Ayres de Menezes (HAM), with the only maternity in the country with Comprehensive Emergency Obstetric and Neonatal Care (EmONC) capable of providing blood transfusions and performing cesarean sections [26]. As a tertiary healthcare facility, HAM receives the most complicated cases from facilities in lower levels of care. There is no health insurance policy in the country or any private maternity units. In STP, there are approximately 3.2 doctors per 10 000 inhabitants and 27 nurses per 10 000 inhabitants, and at HAM, there are three to four obstetricians and one to two general doctors who provide care to the neonates [26]. There are no neonatologists in the country. The midwives in the labor ward are responsible for the initial resuscitation of normal deliveries, and doctors from the pediatric department are called to the labor ward to attend babies in distress.

The HAM maternity unit has a facility-based clinical care unit for ill newborn babies, but there is no neonatal or child intensive care unit in the country. The Neonatal Care Unit (NCU) receives high-risk babies delivered within the institution and referrals from other health facilities or from home with a total capacity to admit six babies. This unit, like others in SSA settings, is basic and able to manage simple neonatal complications such as hypothermia, feeding problems and sepsis suspicion.

Although NCU was rebuilt in 2016, there is still a lack of continuous positive airway pressure therapy,

surfactant therapy and enteric feeding for assisting sick babies.

Study population and follow-up

All mother-neonate dyads admitted to the HAM maternity unit for childbirth constituted the source

population whereas the study populations were selected neonates delivered in the HAM maternity

unit during the study period. Recruitment of participants (mother-newborn dyad) occurred from July

2016 to November 2018. During the study period, 4540 deliveries were recorded, corresponding to

450 cesarean deliveries and 3740 normal vaginal births.

The inclusion criteria for participants were as follows: 1) all neonates delivered at HAM with a

gestational age of 28 weeks or more and 2) newborns who were born outside the hospital but were

later admitted at HAM. A total of 537 newborns were initially enrolled.

The exclusion criteria included the following: 1) all neonates delivered at HAM with a gestational age

of less than 28 weeks, 2) newborns whose mothers had no antenatal pregnancy card, 3) newborns

whose mothers had cognitive impairment, and 4) adolescent or illiterate mothers who had not

obtained permission from their parents or legal guardians to participate in the study. The newborn

was also excluded if his health status was unknown at his twenty-eight days of life. A total of 341

newborns were excluded, nine due to a lack of ANC cards and others due to loss to follow-up.

Consenting participants in the sample were followed up (mother-newborn dyad) throughout their

stays until hospital discharge. The survival status of neonates after discharge was ascertained by

making a follow-up mobile phone call at the end of the neonatal period. Those who could not be

reached by phone after four attempts in different weeks were taken as nonrespondents, and the

mother-newborn dyad was excluded. A flowchart of participation in the study is shown in Fig 1.

Figure 1 Flowchart of participation in the study

Sampling method

This is a substudy undertaken to estimate adverse birth outcomes (ABOs) and related risk factors in the country.

The sample size initially calculated for the broader project, using Raosoft® (http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html), was based on the formula for sample size and margin of error from the software, reaching the minimum sample size of S⍰=⍰355, with 355 (95%) and 579 (99%) interval confidence. The original study included 537 mother-neonate dyads enrolled based on the following assumptions: two-sided 95% confidence level, power of 80% to detect an odds ratio of at least two for ABO. Since the sample size was not calculated for present outcomes, to assess peri-neonatal mortality, a power analysis was performed, varying from 77% to 87% for outcomes such as gestational age (GA<37) for this study. In this study, 194 mother-neonate dyads were included. Participants were selected through random sampling. Each morning, from the pile of mothers' medical folders, every second interval folder was selected and then carried on requesting contentment for enrollment. To guarantee a sample with few biases and effects by means of confounding variables, the study was conducted in different months (two weeks every two other months), avoiding seasonal interference (rain season and malaria period). Women were interviewed only after the delivery, although the invitation and consent were obtained during her admission to the maternity unit before birth (live birth or stillbirth).

Selection of groups: death and alive neonatal outcome

A total of 194 mother-neonate dyads were included and were divided into two groups according to the newborn status (alive versus dead) at the end of the neonatal period. Newborns who died before the 28th day of life (death-outcome group with stillbirths included; n=22) were compared with newborns alive at the 28th day of life (alive-outcome group; n=172) concerning maternal, antepartum, and intrapartum characteristics.

Study Variables

The dependent variables for the study were death (stillbirth and neonatal - early and late -death)

and live newborns.

The definition of stillbirth used was the WHO/ICD (for international comparison and reporting) as a

baby born without any signs of life at or after 28 weeks of gestation or at least 1000 g in birth

weight. [9,27]. Stillbirths were also described according to whether they were an intrapartum or

antepartum stillbirth. Intrapartum stillbirth was defined as a dead-born fetus where intrauterine

death occurred after the onset of labor and before birth (fresh stillbirth) [9]. Antepartum stillbirth is

a dead born fetus where intrauterine death occurs before the onset of labor (macerated stillbirth)

[9].

Neonatal mortality was defined as deaths in the first 28 days of life among live births. Death within

the first 24 h (<24 h) or first day of life was recorded in units of completed minutes or hours of life

[2]. Deaths occurring ≥24 h of life were recorded in days, from day 1 to 27 completed days [2]. The

neonatal death definition used in this study was the one from the World Health Organization (WHO)

as "deaths among live births during the first 28 completed days of life" [1], which were further

subdivided into early neonatal deaths (ENND) as deaths between 0 and 7 completed days of birth

and late neonatal deaths (LNND) as deaths after 7 days to 28 completed days of birth [2,28].

For neonates who died at home after discharge, probable causes of death were assigned by the

principal investigator (pediatrician) using the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and

Related Health Problems ICD-11 coding. For neonates who died in the HAM, the cause of death was

assigned by physicians, who work in the hospital, and confirmed by the principal investigator.

The independent variables tested in this study included factors grouped into five categories: 1)

newborns' maternal sociodemographic factors (age, educational status, occupation, marital status,

partner's education, and residence); 2) preconception factors (previous contraceptive utilization),

plus current obstetric condition (gravidity, parity, previous abortion and stillbirth, previous cesarean

section and preceding birth interval); 3) ANC service (number of visits, gestational age at first ANC

visit, obstetric ultrasound, number of fetuses in the ultrasound) plus antepartum factors as positive

ANC screenings (high-pregnancy risk score, maternal anemia as hemoglobin concentration <11 g/dl,

bacteriuria, hyperglycemia, Rh incompatibility, intestinal parasitic infection (IPI), malaria, HIV,

syphilis, hepatitis B virus and sickle cell); 4) health facility-related factors (being transferred from

another unit, who assisted the delivery and partograph use) plus intrapartum factors as mode of

delivery and complications (fetal malpresentation [29], umbilical cord complication [30], prolonged

rupture of membranes [31,32], meconium-stained amniotic fluid [33], postpartum hemorrhage as

bleeding >500 mL, preeclampsia defined as hypertension ≥140/90 mmHg and proteinuria in dipsticks

in women who were normotensive at ANC, and obstructed labor [34]); 5) newborns characteristics

as (gestational age, sex, birth weight) and complications (intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR),

congenital anomalies, infectious risk, neonatal resuscitation, fetal distress at birth, birth asphyxia

and admission at NCU) [35-37].

Data collection

Data on antepartum, intrapartum, and postpartum characteristics of participants were gathered and

collected from ANC pregnancy cards, obstetric maternal and newborn clinical records. For

antepartum data, relevant details of the perinatal history and antenatal period were collected

systematically from the ANC pregnancy card. Intrapartum data were collected from labor follow-up

sheets, delivery summaries and maternal medical records. Postpartum data were abstracted from

newborn birth charts and/or newborn medical records if admitted to the NCU.

Maternal sociodemographic characteristics were supplemented with a structured administered

questionnaire through a face-to-face interview of the mothers 12-24 hours after delivery, similar to

other studies from LMICs [38].

Data quality alive-outcome group

The questionnaires were administered in Portuguese, the country national language. The

questionnaire was pretested at HAM one month before data collection in 23 mothers, and

modification was made based on the pretest result, mainly adjusting terminology for more culturally

friendly terms. Women's consent to participate in the study was obtained at the time of admission

at HAM, but the interview was held after a woman was stabilized and ready to be discharged.

Continuous follow-up and supervision of data collection were made by the supervisors. The collected

data were checked daily for completeness. The principal investigator (pediatrician) executed and

was responsible for all main activities as follows: 1) obtaining consent and enrollment of the

participants, 2) data collection from antenatal cards plus maternal clinical and newborns' records, 3)

newborns' clinical observation (for diagnosis confirmation), 4) face-to-face interviews, 5)

administering all phone interviews and 6) data collection entry into the database.

Data management

The anonymity and safety of the participants were ensured. Data were secured in a confidential and

private location. Participants were referred to by identification numbers, and the informed consent

forms were kept separate from the questionnaires. Both could only be linked by a coding sheet

available only to the principal investigator.

Data analysis

Data were entered into the QuickTapSurvey app (©2010-2021 Formstack), and the dataset was

exported to Excel for cleaning and further analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social

Sciences for Windows, version 25.0 (IBM Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows,

Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.). All data were checked for completeness and accuracy by the

principal investigator and a qualified biostatistician.

Descriptive statistics such frequencies and percentages were estimated. A univariable analysis was

also performed. In this study, the neonatal death-outcome group was coded as 1, and the neonatal

alive-outcome group was coded as 0. The proportion of missing data ranged from 0.8 to 10% across

variables, and missing values higher than 10% were described in the analysis.

Univariable logistic regression analysis was used to estimate the unadjusted effect of each

independent variable on the dependent variable. Variables that had a p value less than 0.25 were

considered in the multivariable model. Due to the low number of neonatal death-outcome group

enrolled and wide confidence intervals, the multivariable logistic regression model could only

identify one independent determinant of mortality outcome. A p value < 0.05 was considered

statistically significant in multivariable logistic regression analysis.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The Ministry of Health of Sao Tome & Principe and the main board of the Hospital Dr. Ayres de

Menezes are dedicated ethics oversight bodies, and both approved this study. At the time of the

study protocol was submitted (year 2016), there were no ethics committees in STP. All methods

were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations in practice. Written

informed consent was obtained from all participants (or their parent or legal guardian in the case of

adolescent under 16 or for illiterate pregnant women) after the purpose of the research was

explained orally by the principal investigator. Participants' or their legal representatives' also

consented to have the results of this research work published. Participation in the survey was

voluntary, as participants could decline to participate at any time during the study.

Results

A total of 194 (22 in the neonatal death-outcome group and 172 in the alive-outcome group) newborns were followed up during their first 28 days of life. In this study, the newborn's mean gestational age (GA) was 38.86 weeks with a standard deviation (SD) of 2.26 (minimum 28 - maximum 42 weeks). The death-outcome group had a mean GA and birth weight of 36 (SD=4.83) and 2515 (SD=997) g, respectively, while their counterparts had 39 (SD=1.41) weeks and 3209 (SD=507) g, respectively. The mean maternal age was 27.14 years, with a SD of 6.86 (minimum 15 - maximum 43) years old. The mean maternal age for the death-outcome group and alive-outcome group was 30.73 (SD=7.45) and 26.68 (SD=6.66) years, respectively.

The death-outcome group under-study included 16 stillbirths (72.7%), six (27%) ENND and two (9%) LNND. Stillbirths were 69% intrapartum stillbirths (fresh stillbirths), and 31% were antepartum stillbirths (macerated stillbirths). Stillbirth characteristics are further described in Table 1, and the early and late neonatal deaths (ENND and LNND) are described in Table 2.

	Table 1 Death-outcome group (n=22): characteristics of the stillbirths (n=16)

Stillbirth number	Intrapartum stillbirths	Gestational age range	sex	Birth weight	Major malformation	Pregnant Transferred	Reason for transferred	PROM	Meconium	Eclampsia	Atonic uterus	Birth attendant	Dystocia
1	no	4	male	3100	yes*	yes[1]	no fetus heartbeat	-	yes	-	-	midwife	no
2	no	1	male	1200	-	yes[1]	no fetus heartbeat	-	-	-	-	midwife	no
3	no	4	male	2000	-	yes[2]	eclampsia	-	yes	yes	-	midwife	no
4	yes	4	male	1900	-	-	-	-	yes	-	-	midwife	no
5	yes	4	male	2900	-	-		-	-	-	yes	obstetrician	yes
6	no	2	female	980	-	yes[3]	no fetus heartbeat	-	-	-	-	midwife	no
7	yes	3	female	1750	-	-	-	-	-	-	yes	obstetrician	yes
8	yes	4	male	3300	-	-	-	-	yes	-	-	midwife	no
9	yes	3	male	1600	-	-	-	yes	-	-	-	midwife	no
10	yes	4	male	3000	-	-	-	yes	-	-	-	obstetrician	yes
11	yes	4	female	1900	-	-	-	-	-	yes	-	midwife	no
12	no	4	male	3100	yes*	yes[1]	no fetus heartbeat	yes	yes	-	-	midwife	no
13	yes	4	male	2000	-	-	-	-	yes	-		midwife	no
14	yes	4	male	3500	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	midwife	yes
15	yes	1	male	1200	-	-	-	yes	yes	-	-	midwife	yes
16	yes	4	female	3990	-	-	-	-	yes	-	-	midwife	N0

307	This is the Table 1 legend.

308	*Malformation in two stillbirths: Multiple malformations in the rib cage, spina bifida, clubfoot and hydrocephalus

309	[1] Caue district, [2] Cantagalo, [3] Lobata

310	sub-categories of preterm birth, based on gestational age: 1=extremely preterm (less than 28 weeks); 2=very preterm (28
311	to 31 weeks); 3=moderate to late preterm (32 to 36 weeks); 4=term newborns (37 to 41) and 5= posterm newborn (>42)

Table 2 Death-outcome group (n=22): characteristics of the six live births with a neonatal death (n=6)

Neonatal death	Time of death (range)	Main cause of death	Sex	Birth weight	Prematurity	Major malformation	Birth asphyxia	NCU admission	PROM	Meconium	Eclampsia	Birth attendant	Dystocia
[◻]ENND 1	< 24h	Prematurity-related death	male	1230	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	home delivery	no
ENND 2	< 24 h	Major malformation + Birth asphyxia	male	3000	no	yes*	yes	no	no	no	no	obstetrician	yes
ENND 3	Day 1-7	Sepsis + Birth asphyxia	male	2200	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	midwife	no
ENND 4	Day 1-7	Major malformation + Birth asphyxia	female	3450	no	yes*	yes	yes	no	yes	no	midwife	no
LNND 5	Day 8-10	Sepsis + Birth asphyxia + Brachial plexus lesion	male	4250	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	no	midwife	no
LNND 6	Day 10-15	Probably late sepsis	female	3800	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	obstetrician	yes

This is the Table 2 legend.

Abbreviations: ANC – antenatal care; NCU – Neonate Care Unit; PROM – prolonged rupture of membranes; yo – years old; ENND – early
neonatal death.

*Major malformations identified ENND 2: hydrocephaly and ENND 4: thoracic malformation

[◻]Maternal characteristics: ENND 1 (mother age range 35-40 years old, G7 P6, 1 ANC visit); ENND 2 (mother age range 15-19
years old, G0 P0, 6 ANC visits); ENND 3 (mother age range 20-24 years old, G1 P0, 4 ANC visits); ENND 4 (mother age range
35-40 years old, G6 P5, 4 ANC visits); LNND 1 (mother age range 35-40 years old, G5 P3, 8 ANC visits); LNND 2 (mother age
range 35-40 years old, G2 P1, 6 ANC visits).

The maternal characteristics as well as antepartum, intrapartum, and postpartum factors for the

total of the participants and for the death-outcome group versus the alive-outcome group are

described in Tables 3 and 4.

There were no maternal deaths in this study, with a total of 2 maternal near-misses occurring in the

stillbirths' mothers' death-outcome group numbers 5 and 11 that needed hysterectomy intervention

due to atonic uterus with major obstetric hemorrhage.

Table 3 Univariable logistic regression analysis of peri-neonatal mortality among newborns admitted
at HAM, Sao Tome & Principe (n= 194; death-outcome group :22 and alive-outcome group: 172)

Variables	Categories	Total n=194	Death-outcome group n=22 n (%)	Alive-outcome group n=172 n (%)	cOR	(95%) CI	p value
Sociodemographic characteristics							
Mother´s age	14-16	5 (2.6)	0	5 (2.9)	1		
	17-19	23 (11.9)	3 (13.6)	20 (11.6)	-		-
	20-34	131 (67.5)	11 (50)	120 (69.8)	-		-
	≥35	35 (18)	8 (36.4)	27 (15.7)	-		-
Maternal education	none	5 (2.6)	0	5 (2.9)	1		
	primary	101 (52.1)	19 (86.4)	82 (47.7)	-		-
	secondary	77 (39.7)	2 (9.1)	75 (43.6)	-		-
	higher	11 (5.7)	1 (4.5)	10 (5.8)	-		-
Maternal occupation	housewife	131 (67.9)	16 (72.7)	115 (67.3)	1		
	student	8 (4.1)	0	8 (4.7)	-		0.999
	employed	54 (28)	6 (27.3)	48 (28.1)	-		0.833
Marital status	union/married	124 (63.9)	14 (63.6)	110 (64)	0.986	0.392-2.482	0.977
	single	70 (36.1)	8 (36.4)	62 (36)	1		
Baby´s father education	none	5 (3.3)	3 (27.3)	2 (1.4)	1		
	primary	58 (38.4)	6 (54.5)	52 (37.1)	0.077	0.011-0.556	**0.011**
	secondary	49 (32.5)	0	49 (35)	-	-	-
	higher	39 (25.8)	2 (18.2)	37 (26.4)	0.036	0.004-0.354	**0.004**
Residence[1]	urban	92 (48.2)	9 (45)	83 (48.5)	0.867	0.342-2.200	0.765
	rural	99 (51.8)	11 (55)	88 (51.5)	1		
Preconceptional							
Contraception previous use	yes	38 (24.8)	3 (20)	35 (25.4)	0.736	0.196-2.760	0.649
	no	115 (75.2)	12 (80)	103 (74.6)	1		

Obstetric history							
Gravidity	1	42 (21.6)	4 (18.2)	38 (22.1)	1		
	2-5	100 (51.5)	8 (36.4)	92 (53.5)	0.826	0.235-2.907	0.766
	≥5	52 (26.8)	10 (45.5)	42 (24.4)	2.262	0.655-7.815	0.197
Parity	0	53 (27.3)	5 (22.7)	48 (27.9)	1		
	1-4	121 (62.4)	12 (54.5)	109 (63.4)	1.057	0.353-3.166	0.921
	≥5	20 (10.3)	5 (22.7)	15 (8.7)	3.200	0.814-12.574	0.096
Previous abortion	yes	59 (30.4)	6 (27.3)	53 (30.8)	0.842	0.312-2.272	0.734
	no	135 (69.6)	16 (72.7)	119 (69.2)	1		
Previous stillbirth	yes	17 (8.8)	4 (18.2)	13 (7.6)	2.718	0.801-9.225	0.109
	no	177 (91.2)	18 (81.8)	159 (92.4)	1		
Poor birth spacing2	yes	39 (20.1)	6 (27.3)	33 (19.2)	1.580	0.574-4.346	0.376
	no	155 (79.9)	16 (72.7)	139 (80.8)	1		
Antenatal care							
GA at first ANC visit	≤12	98 (60.5)	6 (27.3)	92 (53.5)	1		
	>12	58 (35.8)	9 (40.9)	55 (32)	2.509	0.847-7.430	0.097
Number of ANC visits	1-4	19 (10.1)	2 (10)	17 (10.1)	1		

	5-7	84 (44.4)	16 (80)	68 (40.2)	2.000	0.419-9.547	0.385
	≥ 8	86 (45.5)	2 (10)	84 (49.7)	0.202	0.027-1.538	0.123
Obstetric ultrasound	0	73 (38.4)	7 (35)	66 (38.8)	1		
	1	87 (45.8)	12 (60)	75 (44.1)	1.509	0.561-4.056	0.415
	2	30 (15.8)	1 (5)	29 (17.1)	0.349	0.041-2.976	0.336
Twin pregnancy	yes	14 (7.2)	0	14 (8.1)	-	-	-
	no	180 (92.8)	22 (100)	158 (91.9)	1		

Antenatal care screenings							
High-pregnancy risk[3]	yes	70 (36.1)	13 (59.1)	57 (33.1)	2.914	1.176-7.220	**0.021**
	no	124 (63.9)	9 (40.9)	115 (66.9)	1		
Maternal disease during pregnancy[4]	yes	123 (63.4)	11 (50)	112 (65.1)	0.622	0.244-1.587	0.321
	no	66 (34)	9 (40.9)	57 (33.1)	1		
	missing	5 (2.6)	2 (9.1)	3 (1.7)	4.222	0.618-28.867	0.142
Maternal anaemia[5]	yes	59 (30.4)	6 (27.3)	53 (30.8)	1.736	0.533-5.655	0.360
	no	98 (50.5)	6 (27.3)	92 (53.5)	1		
	not tested	37 (19.1)	10 (45.5)	27 (15.7)	5.679	1.892-17.048	0.002
Bacteriuria	yes	62 (32)	5 (22.7)	57 (33.1)	0.593	0.208-1.690	0.328
	no	132 (68)	17 (77.3)	115 (66.9)	1		
Hyperglycaemia[6]	yes	8 (4.1)	1 (4.5)	7 (4.1)	1.122	0.132-9.578	0.916
	no	186 (95.9)	21 (95.5)	165 (95.9)	1		
Rh incompatibility	yes	7 (3.6)	0	7 (4.1)	-	-	-
	no	187 (96.4)	22 (100)	165 (95.9)			
IPIs	yes	98 (50.5)	8 (36.4)	90 (52.3)	0.521	0.208-1.305	0.164
	no	96 (49.5)	14 (63.6)	82 (47.7)			
Malaria	yes	1 (0.5)	0	1 (0.6)	-	-	-
	no	193 (99.5)	22 (100)	171 (99.4)			
HIV	yes	2 (1.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (0.6)	1		
	no	192 (99)	19 (95)	163 (99.4)	0.123	0.007-2.037	0.143
HsAg positive	yes	6 (3.1)	2 (9.1)	4 (2.3)	1		
	no	113 (58.2)	10 (45.5)	103 (59.9)	0.194	0.032-1.195	0.077
Sickle cell positivity[7]	yes	13 (6.8)	1 (4.5)	12 (7.0)	0.631	0.078-5.102	0.666
	no	181 (93.2)	21 (95.5)	160 (93)	1		

Health facility-related factors							
Baby delivered at HAM	yes	188 (96.9)	21 (95.5)	167 (97.1)	1.590	0.177-14.275	0.679
	no	6 (3.1)	1 (4.5)	5 (2.9)	1		
Transferred from another unit*	yes	16 (8.2)	6 (27.3)	10 (5.8)	6.075	1.953-18.900	**0.002**
	no	178 (91.8)	16 (72.7)	162 (94.2)	1		
Delivery assisted by	obstetrician	36 (18.6)	5 (22.7)	31 (18)	1		
	midwife	153 (78.9)	16 (72.7)	137 (79.7)	0.724	0.247-2.126	0.557
	home labor	5 (2.6)	1 (4.5)	4 (2.3)	1.550	0.143-16.852	0.719
Partograph use	yes	76 (39.2)	9 (40.9)	67 (39)	1.085	0.440-2.678	0.860
	no	118 (60.8)	13 (59.1)	105 (61)	1		
Fetal malpresentation[8]	yes	2 (1)	0	2 (1.2)	-	-	-
	no	192 (99)	22 (100)	170 (98.8)			
PROM[9]	yes	15 (8.1)	5 (23.8)	10 (6.1)	4.844	1.473-15.930	**0.009**
	no	171 (91.9)	16 (76.2)	155 (93.9)	1		

Pre/Eclampsia[10]	yes	17 (8.8)	2 (9.1)	15 (8.7)	1.047	0.223-4.917	0.954
	no	177 (91.2)	20 (90.9)	157 (91.3)	1		
Obstructed labour[11]	yes	22 (11.3)	4 (18.2)	18 (10.5)	1.901	0.579-6.239	0.289
	no	172 (88.7)	18 (81.8)	154 (89.5)	1		
Postpartum haemorrhage[12]	yes	2 (1)	0	2 (1.2)	-	-	-
	no	192 (99)	22 (100)	170 (98.8)			
Normal Vaginal delivery	yes	155 (79.9)	15 (68.2)	140 (81.4)	0.490	0.185-1.300	0.152
	no	39 (20.1)	7 (31.8)	32 (18.6)			
Caesarean section	yes	33 (17)	4 (18.2)	29 (16.9)	1.096	0.345-3.477	0.877
	no	161 (83)	18 (81.8)	143 (83.1)			
Previous caesarean	yes	10 (5.2)	2 (9.1)	8 (4.7)	2.050	0.407-10.333	0.384
	no	184 (94.8)	20 (90.9)	164 (95.3)			
Instrumental vaginal delivery[13]	yes	6 (3.1)	3 (13.6)	3 (1.7)	8.895	1.676-47.208	**0.010**
	no	188 (96.9)	19 (86.4)	169 (98.3)			
Meconium-stained amniotic fluid	yes	43 (22.2)	11 (50)	32 (18.6)	4.375	1.744-10.975	**0.002**
	no	151 (77.8)	11 (50)	140 (81.4)			
Umbilical cord complication	yes	8 (4.1)	1 (4.5)	7 (4.1)	1.122	0.132-9.578	0.916
	no	186 (95.9)	21 (95.5)	165 (95.9)			

Newborn's characteristics							
Gestational Age[14]	28 - 31	3 (1.5)	3 (13.6)	0	1		
	32 - 36	8 (4.1)	4 (18.2)	4 (2.3)	-	-	-
	37 - 41	176 (90.7)	15 (68.2)	161 (93.6)	-	-	-
	≥42	7 (3.6)	0	7 (4.1)	-	-	-
Sex	feminine	92 (47.4)	6 (27.3)	86 (50)	0.375	0.140-1.004	**0.051**
	masculine	102 (52.6)	16 (72.7)	86 (50)			
Birth weight[15]	<1500 g	5 (2.6)	4 (18.2)	1 (0.6)	1		
	1500-2499 g	18 (9.3)	7 (31.8)	11 (6.4)	0.159	0.015-1.732	0.131
	2500g-3999 g	161 (83)	10 (45.5)	151 (87.8)	0.017	0.002-0.162	**<0.001**
	≥ 4000 g	10 (5.2)	1 (4.5)	9 (5.2)	0.028	0.001-0.564	**0.020**
IUGR[16]	yes	9 (4.6)	6 (27.3)	3 (1.7)	21.125	4.82-92.586	**<0.001**
	no	185 (95.4)	16 (72.7)	169 (98.3)	1		
Infectious risk[17]	yes	50 (25.8)	14 (63.6)	36 (20.9)	6.611	2.574-16.978	**<0.001**
	no	144 (74.2)	8 (36.4)	136 (79.1)			
Congenital malformation	yes	4 (2.1)	4 (18.2)	0	-	-	-
	no	190 (97.9)	18 (81.8)	172 (100)			

This is the Table 3 legend.

Abbreviations: ANC – antenatal care; CI – confidence interval; cOR: crude odds ratio; GA – gestational age; HAM: Hospital

Dr. Ayres de Menezes; IPI – intestinal parasitic infection; IUGR – intrauterine growth restriction; PROM – prolonged rupture

of membranes.

[1]Urban residence for women living in the capital city (Água Grande) and rural areas in all other districts (Mé-Zochi,

Cantagalo, Lobata, Lembá, Caué and Principe Island).

[2]Poor birth spacing birth intervals of less than 2 years [39]

[3]High-pregnancy risk is registered in the ANC pregnancy card if the current pregnancy is defined as one or more of the

following: 1) pregnant women age less than 15 years old or greater than 35, 2) grand multipara for women with six or more

labors, 3) previous history of a stillbirth or early neonatal death, 6) previous caesarean section, and 7) previous hemorrhagic

complication.

[4]Maternal disease was operationally defined as one or more of the following conditions during the current pregnancy:

pre/eclampsia, gestational diabetes, malaria, bacteriuria, anemia, and intestinal parasitic infection.

[5]anaemia during pregnancy as a hemoglobin concentration <11 g/dl

[6]glycaemia >105 mg/dL,

[7]Through a sickle cell solubility test, which involves treating a thin blood film with sodium dithionate under hypoxic conditions

and observing for sickling under a light microscope, that is the screening technique available in STP and performed to

pregnant women with anemia or clinical suspicion. A positive result can suggest either sickle cell anemia or the sickle cell

trait [40].

[8]Foetal malpresentation was determined if the presenting fetal part was noncephalic (e.g. breech, transverse, oblique) [29].

[9]Prolonged rupture of membrane (PROM) was defined as a rupture of membrane lasting longer than 18 hours before labor

began [31,32].

[10]Preeclampsia (hypertension ≥140/90 mmHg and proteinuria in dipsticks in women who were normotensive at ANC).

[11]Obstructed labor was operationally defined as the sum of all cesarean sections due to mechanical problems or fetal

distress and all instrumental delivery [34].

[12]Postpartum hemorrhage was defined as >500 mL bleeding.

[13] IVD in STP is only performed by vacuum.

[14]Gestational age was estimated from the date of onset of the last normal menstrual period or through ultrasound dating of

pregnancy. Prematurity was defined as a delivery before 37 complete weeks of gestation from the date of onset of the last

normal menstrual period and subcategorized as very preterm (28 to 31 weeks) and moderate to late preterm (32 to 37

weeks).

[15]Low birth weight was defined as a newborn weight less than 2500 grams (up to and including 2499 g) at birth regardless

of gestational age. Low birth weight was further categorized into very low birth weight (VLBW, <1500 g) [41]. Low birth

weight is a result of preterm birth, intrauterine growth restriction or both [41].

Large birth weight when ≥4000 g (macrosomia) irrespective of gestational age.

[16]There is still no consensual definition for intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR) or fetal growth restriction in Africa [42]. In

this study, it was defined as the term LBW (i.e., birthweight <2500 g and gestational age ≥37 weeks of gestation) due to low

in utero measurements through obstetric ultrasounds in the country [42].

[17]Infectious risk was operationally defined as the sum of all the following risk factors: 1) maternal fever (axillary temperature

>37.9 C) at the time of delivery, 2) prolonged rupture of membrane (≥18 hours), and/or 3) foul-smelling amniotic fluid [43].

Table 4 Univariable logistic regression analysis of neonatal mortality among newborns who were live

births (n= 178; death-outcome group: 6 and alive-outcome group: 172)

Variables	Categories	Total n=178[†]	Death-outcome group n=6[⊥] n (%)	Alive-outcome group n=172 n (%)	cOR	(95%) CI	p value
Neonatal resuscitation	yes	7 (3.9)	2 (33.3)	5 (2.9)	16.700	2.457-113.495	**0.004**
	no	171 (96.1)	4 (66.7)	167 (97.1)	1		
Fetal distress at birth*	yes	26 (14.6)	5 (83.3)	21 (12.2)	35.952	4.004-322.859	**0.001**
	no	152 (85.4)	1 (16.7)	151 (87.8)	1		
Birth asphyxia**	yes	10 (5.6)	4 (66.7)	6 (3.5)	55.333	8.421-363.600	**<0.001**
	no	168 (94.4)	2 (33.3)	166 (96.5)	1		
Admission at NCU	yes	15 (8.4)	3 (50)	12 (7)	13.333	2.425-73.310	**0.003**
	no	163 (91.6)	3 (50)	160 (93)	1		

This is the Table 4 legend.

Abbreviations: CI – confidence interval; cOR: crude odds ratio; NCU – neonatal care unit.

[†]stillbirths excluded

*Fetal distress was defined as a low Apgar score <7 at the first minute of life (score from 0 to <7) [24,44].

**Birth asphyxia was defined as a low Apgar score <7 at the fifth minute of life (score from 0 to <7) [24,44].

Factors associated with perinatal and neonatal mortality

Binary logistic regression analysis was performed to assess the association of peri-neonatal mortality

with several characteristics (Table 3 and Table 4). Crude analysis showed that meconium-stained

amniotic fluid, prolonged rupture of membranes, transfer from another unit, and instrumental

vaginal delivery were significantly associated with peri-neonatal mortality.

Antepartum factors

The odds of peri-neonatal mortality were three times higher among mothers classified as having a

high-pregnancy risk (cOR 2.91, 95% CI 1.18–7.22, p=0.021). Mothers without hemoglobin test during

the ANC follow-up had a higher risk of having a peri-neonatal death (cOR 5.68, 95% CI 1.89–17.05,

p=0.002) than those without anemia.

Health facility-related factors

The odds of peri-neonatal mortality were six times higher among mothers transferred from another

unit compared to those directly admitted at HAM maternity (cOR 6.08, 95% CI 1.95–18.90, p=0.002).

Intrapartum factors

PROM as well as meconium-stained amniotic fluid were other intrapartum factors, with the odds of

mortality being almost five times higher for newborns whose mothers had a PROM (cOR 4.84, 95%

CI 1.47–15.93, p=0.009), and four times higher for those with a meconium-stained amniotic fluid

(cOR 4.38, 95% CI 1.74–10.98, p=0.002).

For the mode of delivery, having an instrumental assisted delivery was associated with an eightfold

higher risk of perinatal and neonatal mortality (cOR 8.90, 95% CI 1.68–47.21, p=0.010).

Newborns' factors

Newborns with intrauterine growth restriction had a twenty-one-fold higher risk of mortality (cOR

21.13, 95% CI 4.82-92.59, p<0.001), and newborns with an infectious risk had almost sevenfold

higher odds of dying (cOR 6.61, 95% CI 2.57-16.98, p<0.001). Regarding newborn characteristics,

female neonates (cOR 0.38, 95% CI 0.14-1.00, p=0.051) and birth weight greater than 2500 g and

lower than 3999 g (cOR 0.017, 95% CI 0.002–0.162, p<0.001), and greater than 4000 g (cOR 0.028,

95% CI 0.001-0.564, p=0.020) were protective factors against peri-neonatal mortality.

Postpartum characteristics were only assessed for a total of six death-outcome group since sixteen

stillbirths were not further included for analysis. Performance of neonatal resuscitation, fetal

distress at birth (APGAR score at first-minute inferior to seven), birth asphyxia, and admission to the

neonatal care unit were all related to an increased risk for neonatal mortality (Table 4).

Multivariable model

Considering the reduced size of the outcome group (n=22), only one significant variable remained in

the multivariable model. Newborns whose mothers had meconium-stained amniotic fluid were at a

higher risk of peri-neonatal death.

Discussion

In this prospective cohort study, the main aim was to define risk factors, the most vulnerable period for neonatal death - partum, early or late neonatal period - and to identify where they die - in the maternity, at home or in the pediatric ward - as we were able to follow them up until their 28th day of life. In this study, we found that 90% died in HAM maternity before the 7th day of life, that is, during the perinatal period, with mainly being stillborn (73%). The magnitude of stillbirths observed in this study (3%) is in line with the studies conducted in Nigeria (4.8%) [45] and Tanzania (3.5%) [46] and lower compared with studies from Ethiopia (6.7%) [47]. Most stillbirths occurred during intrapartum, as also identified in LMICs similar to STP, and most could have been prevented [48,49].

In this study, intrapartum characteristics, such as pregnant women with meconium-stained amniotic fluid, prolonged rupture of membranes, and instrumental vaginal delivery, were the main factors significantly associated with peri-neonatal death. Health facility-related factors, as pregnant women transferred from another unit were also at a significant risk.

High-pregnancy risk score notification was the only antepartum factor significantly associated with peri-neonatal mortality. For newborns, experiencing fetal distress at birth, needing resuscitation maneuvers, having birth asphyxia and admission to the neonatal unit were identified as high-risk factors for death. Being a female newborn and having a birth weight greater than 2500 grams were found to be protective factors.

Odds of experiencing death were identified as four times higher among newborns from mothers with meconium-stained amniotic fluid. This finding is consistent with studies from Ethiopia [6,50] and Yemen [12] that also reported higher rates of fetal death due to intrauterine passage of meconium into amniotic fluid and a fivefold increase in perinatal mortality compared with low-risk patients with clear amniotic fluid [51]. Meconium-stained amniotic fluid is associated with fetal

distress since the fetus, in response, inhales the meconium, which in turn leads to airway

obstruction, surfactant dysfunction and pneumonitis, which leads to loss of the fetus [6].

PROM was also a significant factor associated with neonatal mortality in this study, showing fivefold

higher odds for the death-outcome group. This association was also identified in other studies from

low-resource constrained countries reporting one-third of stillbirths occurring during labor as a

result of prolonged labor or obstructed labor not attended to promptly [35,36,38,52,53]. The reason

for this might be because PROM is a risk factor for early-onset neonatal sepsis as well as a high risk

of fetal distress, respiratory distress syndrome, intraventricular hemorrhage, and death [31,32,54].

In this study we found an overall prevalence of PROM of 8.1%, which is in accordance with the global

incidence that ranges from approximately 5% to 10% of all deliveries in the world [54,55].

Lack of emergency obstetric care (EmOC) is well-known to increase the risk of neonatal mortality, as

laboring mothers with complications cannot immediately receive appropriate health services, such

as access to a cesarean section [36]. In this study, mothers who needed to be transferred from

another health unit for delivery at HAM had a sixfold higher risk of having a neonatal death outcome

than mothers directly admitted at HAM. Half the mothers who were transferred from the death-

outcome group had to do a 60 -kilometer journey that took approximately two to three hours until

reaching HAM maternity in the capital city. Distance from a health facility with EmOC and the

considerable travel times are well-known barriers and influential factors of birth adverse outcomes

also found in other studies in sub-Saharan Africa [56,57].

In this study, the overall rate of 3.1% of instrumental assisted vaginal birth deliveries was found to

be lower compared to 17% of births by cesarean section and 79.9% of normal vaginal deliveries.

Instrumental-assisted deliveries are an effective intervention for deliveries complicated by

prolonged labor or fetal distress but are also related to adverse outcomes since fetal distress or

cephalopelvic disproportion are more frequently the motive to use this technique. Therefore, the

ninefold higher risk of death outcome found in this study, similar to other researchers reporting

[13,58,59], relates to late appropriate intrapartum care intervention with subsequently higher rates

of fetal distress and risk of an intrapartum stillbirth.

Antenatal care health services in STP follow a high-risk stratification for each pregnancy and, in this

study, this notification of a high-risk pregnancy in the pregnant women antenatal pregnancy card

was significantly associated with a threefold higher risk for fetal and neonatal death than alive-

outcome group. High-pregnancy risk was operationally defined as one or more of the following

according to STP national practice, namely, age as inferior to 15 years old or superior to 35, grand

multipara, previous history of a stillbirth or early neonatal death, previous cesarean section, and

previous hemorrhagic complication. This is consistent with other studies that reported higher rates

of perinatal and neonatal mortality with extreme maternal ages and previous adverse obstetric

history (grand multipara, previous stillbirth, or early neonatal death) [1,12]. However, in this study,

we could not find a statistically significant difference between groups when each of these variables

were independently analyzed.

Regarding the newborns' characteristics, the overall sex ratio at birth was 52.6% for males and

47.4% for females. The death rate was higher in male neonates (72%) than in the female death-

outcome group (27.3%), with female sex being a protective factor. Sex variations are frequently

reported, with a highly consistent pattern of excess male mortality across different populations and

income groups [60]. Male infants are more vulnerable to fetal and early neonatal death, with most

studies reporting no gender difference in mortality after 7 days of age [60]. This sex difference may

be explained by a sex-specific difference in the growth and function of male and female placentae,

making boys more vulnerable to different adverse outcomes [60,62].

Birth weights of more than 2500 g and more than 4000 g were protective factors for death outcome

in this study. This finding is comparable with different research on other African countries that

associates a birth weight of less than 2500 g (LBW) with higher rates of stillbirth and neonatal death

[1]. Additionally, the odds of experiencing death were 21 times higher for babies with IUGR or fetal

growth restriction defined, in this study, as a term LBW (birthweight <2500 g and gestational age ≥37

weeks) [42]. Low birth weight is a worldwide recognized important multifaceted public health

problem since LBW infants are 20 times more likely to develop complications and die than normal

weight infants [6,63].

We found that the odds of death were six times higher for newborns with maternal infectious risk.

This finding is in agreement with previous studies conducted in SSA, as neonatal infectious risk is

linked to amniotic fluid contamination that can cause intrapartum fetal infection or early

postpartum neonatal infection with sepsis complicated with septic shock and multiple organ

dysfunction, in which both are the most common causes of death in the perinatal period [35,43].

Infection is an important cause of stillbirth and neonatal death in LMICs, although there is a lack of

overall information regarding the organisms involved, the types of transmission, and the

mechanisms of death in these constrained countries [64]. In Sao Tome & Principe, malaria and

syphilis are no longer an infection-burden and cause of stillbirth or neonatal death; therefore, other

bacterial and viral maternal infections should be linked to stillbirth and ENND [64]. In STP, there are

no means to establish a neonatal infection through blood cultures; that is, neonatal infection is

based only on clinical signs with no bacteriological documentation. Additionally, nothing is known

about the rate of vertical transmission of Streptococcus Group B (GBS) from colonized mothers at

birth in the country. Therefore, there is a current gap in the knowledge, capability of making

diagnosis and prevention and treatment of neonatal infections in STP. For instance, a study from

Ethiopia [64] detected that the rate of vertical transmission of GBS from colonized mothers at birth

was as high as 45.02% due to term PROM, PROM ≥18 hours before delivery and mothers having

fever during labor. Detecting the risk for vertical transmission of GBS and implementing prevention

methods such as adequate intrapartum administration of antibiotics are recognized as easy and

affordable practices for reducing mortality due to infectious causes and should be implemented in

the country along with culture techniques [43].

All four congenital major malformations detected in this study resulted in perinatal mortality,

although due to the low number of newborns enrolled it was not possible to establish a statistically

significant difference. Congenital malformations are known to be associated with poor outcomes for

newborns, and 10–20% of stillbirths are attributed to intrinsic fetal anomalies [53]. Studies from

Zimbabwe [65], Ethiopia [1] and Yemen [12] found that congenital anomalies among stillbirths were

associated with a 5-fold [65], 34-fold [1] and 40- fold [12] higher risk than those among live births.

Another important consideration regarding congenital anomalies is the type of malformation, since

some, such as neural tube defects, are preventable and can be reduced by 30 to 50% by folic acid

supplementation in pregnant women and have been estimated to cause 29% of deaths related to

congenital anomalies in LMICs [4]. In this study, three out of the four major anomalies were neural

tube defects, highlighting the need to enhance proper supplementation to preconceptional women

in the country.

In this study, we were not able to find a higher risk associated with newborn gestational age. The

high rate of stillbirths found in our study as well as the low number of preterm babies enrolled

(5.6%) explain the lack of association. Stillbirths are among the most common pregnancy-related

adverse outcomes worldwide, but they differ between low- and high-income countries. In high-

income countries, most stillbirths occur early in the preterm period, whereas in low resource

constrained countries, most occur in term or in late preterm births, as found in our study [66].

Additionally, the neonatal mortality timeframe is higher in babies born between 37 and 38 weeks of

gestation than in those born between 39 and weeks [4].

From stillbirths in this study, 69% occurred during the intrapartum period, in accordance with other

studies from LMICs [5]. These intrapartum stillbirths mean that intrauterine death occurred after the

onset of labor and before birth (fresh stillbirth). We can also guess that some of them could be early

neonatal deaths, as there are known barriers and difficulties in these contexts to establish whether a

fetus or motionless newborn is living or dead after its delivery. For instance, information on some

Apgar scores in these death-outcome group was not recorded, perhaps because of lack of time,

especially when the neonates had to be rushed to receive resuscitation maneuvers. Studies from SSA

highlight that it is very frequent that some depressed but living fetuses with a possible heartbeat do

not receive resuscitation maneuvers and are prompt classified as stillbirths [1,66]. This is supported

by a systematic review of sixteen hospitals and community-based perinatal mortality studies [67,68].

In this study, newborns who needed resuscitation maneuvers were at a 16-fold higher risk of dying

than the alive-outcome group, representing the risks of the intrapartum period. Additionally, the

odds of neonatal death from fontal distress at birth and birth asphyxia were 36 and 55 times higher,

respectively, among the death-outcome group than the alive-outcome group. These results are in

line with studies conducted in Cameroon [69] and Ethiopia [36] as well as published literature that

suggests that lower APGAR scores are associated with severe multiorgan damage resulting in brain

damage, lung dysfunction, cardiomyopathy, renal failure, hepatic failure, necrotizing enterocolitis

and consequently death [70]. Previous studies [23,24] that compared outcomes between adolescent

pregnant girls and older counterparts identified that adverse outcomes imputable to adolescent

births were fetal distress (OR 1.94, 95% CI 1.18-3.18) and performance of neonatal resuscitation

maneuvers (OR 2.4, 95% CI1.07-5.38), highlighting the risks surrounding this period among deliveries

at HAM maternity unit.

Perinatal asphyxia can be caused by factors grouped according to whether they are before birth

(antepartum risk actors), during birth (intrapartum risk factors), or after birth (postpartum or fetal

risk factors) [44,70]. Nonetheless, the single most important predictor is, undoubtedly, the quality of

intrapartum care during labor and delivery.

The most important aspect of this study for public health is that it identifies potential characteristics

that predispose newborns to life-threatening conditions, which is critical to address the underlying

causes and provide prompt interventions by various stakeholders in the healthcare system [71].

This study allows us to perceive how to answer our question "when, where and why do newborns

die in STP?" as "when": mostly during labor, "where": *in utero* and "why": mainly due to fetal

distress and intrapartum-related deaths probably due to low quality and constraints of care during

labor and delivery. Ending preventable stillbirths and neonatal deaths does not necessarily require

new or innovative interventions. Most modifiable risk factors identified in this study can be

addressed and prevented with timely, quality care during childbirth, including ongoing intrapartum

monitoring and opportune intervention in case of complications [72]. Some interventions, such as

computerized cardiotocography to monitor a baby's well-being in the womb by measuring

contractions, are estimated to reduce the rate of infant deaths around the time of birth by 80%

when compared with traditional cardiotocography [73].

In summary, the findings of this study will be useful to health policymakers and program developers

in implementing appropriate interventions to achieve the newborn health post-2015 Sustainable

Development Goals of no more than 12 neonatal deaths per 1000 live births in Sao Tome & Principe

by 2030 [74].

Strengths and Limitations

In this study, the researcher retrieved maternal and neonatal data directly from ANC cards and

maternity registers to limit recall bias. The selection of the death-outcome group and alive-outcome

group was based on the records of maternal and neonatal registers; therefore, it is less likely that

this study has misclassification biases both in the exposure and death-outcome group ⬚alive-

outcome group categories [75].

Regarding the limitations, newborns lost to follow-up due to mothers who provided the wrong

mobile number or who did not answer the phone call were at a significantly high rate; hence, the

real number of early and late neonatal deaths can be much higher than the rate we have found.

Current knowledge gaps, including those associated with local burden, bacterial etiology, and

eventual difficulty of nurses and mothers in perceiving subtle clinical signs associated with neonatal

infections prevented us from having a clear picture of the situation in this study [43]. Data on

maternal weight gain during pregnancy, nutritional status, BMI, maternal intrapartum antibiotic

prophylaxis, antenatal corticosteroid administration, and total time of labor were not available.

Another limitation is that some of the variables mentioned in the univariable model had wide

confidence intervals and high odds ratios due to the low number of death-outcome group enrolled

in this study. This was a barrier to conducting a multivariable model, a limitation also reported in

other studies [37].

Conclusions

Complications such as a high-risk pregnancy score, meconium-stained amniotic fluid, prolonged rupture of membranes, being transferred from another unit, and an instrumental-assisted vaginal delivery increased the risk of stillbirth and neonatal death between 4– and 9–fold, and 90% of all these deaths occurred in the perinatal period.

Newborns with an infectious risk, intrauterine growth restriction, fetal distress at birth, who needed resuscitation maneuvers, birth asphyxia, and those admitted to the neonatal unit had a 3- to 55-fold higher risk for dying than the alive-outcome group. Female newborn and birth weight of more than 2500 g were found to be protective factors.

Implementing an efficient referral system that directs high-risk pregnancies to the EmOC facility, equipment (continuous fetal heart monitoring capability in all district maternity wards) and personnel technical skills will improve peri-neonatal outcomes and survival in Sao Tome & Principe.

Acknowledgments

A special remark for the late Professor João Luís Baptista PhD MD - AV research cosupervisor - a great man who was a thinker and a fighter for Africa's improvement of public health. We are indebted to all the women who participated in the study. The authors would like to thank Elizabeth Carvalho and the 1) medical team and nurses of Hospital Dr. Ayres de Menezes Maternity for their support, especially to the chief-nurse Paulina Oliveira, and 2) Ana Sequeira, Rita Coelho, Ana Margalha, Ana Castro, Alexandra Coelho, and Inês Gomes for field support. We would like to acknowledge Instituto Camões, I.P. for the logistic support in Sao Tome & Principe.

References

1. Getiye Y, Fantahun M. Factors associated with perinatal mortality among public health deliveries
in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, an unmatched case control study. BMC pregnancy and childbirth.
2017;17(1):1-7.

2. Pathirana J, Muñoz FM, Abbing-Karahagopian V, Bhat N, Harris T, Kapoor A, Keene DL, Mangili A,
Padula MA, Pande SL, Pool V. Neonatal death: Case definition & guidelines for data collection,
analysis, and presentation of immunization safety data. Vaccine. 2016;34(49):6027-37.

3. WHO. Every new born: an action plan to end preventable deaths. February 2014. Available at:
https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/mca-documents/advisory-groups/quality-of-
care/every-new-born-action-plan-(enap).pdf?sfvrsn=4d7b389_2

4. Lehtonen L, Gimeno A, Parra-Llorca A, Vento M. Early neonatal death: A challenge worldwide.
Semin Fetal Neonatal Med. 2017;22(3):153-160. doi: 10.1016/j.siny.2017.02.006. Epub 2017 Feb 24.
PMID: 28238633.

5. Hug L, You D, Blencowe H, Mishra A, Wang Z, Fix MJ, Wakefield J, Moran AC, Gaigbe-Togbe V,
Suzuki E, Blau DM. Global, regional, and national estimates and trends in stillbirths from 2000 to
2019: a systematic assessment. The Lancet. 2021 Aug 28;398(10302):772-85.
https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01112-0

6. Dagne HM, Melku AT, Abdi AA. Determinants of stillbirth among deliveries attended in Bale Zone
Hospitals, Oromia Regional State, Southeast Ethiopia: a case–control study. International Journal of
Women's Health. 2021;13:51.

7. Lawn JE, Kerber K, Enweronu-Laryea C, Massee Bateman O. Newborn survival in low resource
settings—are we delivering?. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology.
2009;116:49-59.

8. Lawn JE, Cousens S, Zupan J, Lancet Neonatal Survival Steering Team. 4 million neonatal deaths:
when? Where? Why?. The lancet. 2005 Mar 5;365(9462):891-900.

9. Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Pattinson R, Cousens S, Kumar R, Ibiebele I, et al. Stillbirths: Where? When?
Why? How to make the data count? Lancet. 2011;377(9775):1448–63.

10. Blencowe H, Cousens S. Addressing the challenge of neonatal mortality. Tropical Medicine &
International Health. 2013;18(3):303-12.

11. Lavin T, Allanson ER, Nedkoff L, Preen DB, Pattinson RC. Applying the international classification
of diseases to perinatal mortality data, South Africa. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2018
Dec 1;96(12):806.

12. Obad MA, Taher R, Qayad M, Khader YS. Risk factors of stillbirth in Yemen. J Neonatal Perinatal
Med. 2018;11(2):131–136. doi:10.3233/ NPM-18174618.

13. Adane, et al. Adverse birth outcomes among deliveries in Gonder university hospital, Northwest
Ethiopia. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2014;14:90 http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2393/14/90

14. Chi BH, Wang L, Read JS, Taha TE, Sinkala M, Brown ER, Valentine M, Martinson F, Goldenberg
RL: Predictors of stillbirth in sub-saharan Africa. Obstet Gynecol. 2007, 110 (5): 989-997.
10.1097/01.AOG.0000281667.35113.a5.

15. Stringer EM, Vwalika B, Killam WP, Giganti MJ, Mbewe R, Chi BH, Chintu N, Rouse D, Goldenberg
RL, Stringer JS: Determinants of stillbirth in Zambia. Obstet Gynecol. 2011, 117 (5): 1151-1159.
10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182167627.

16. Sao Tome and Principe WHO statistical profile. WHO Libr. 2015. https://www. who. int/ gho/
countries/stp. pdf.

17. INE e UNICEF. 2020. Inquérito de Indicadores Múltiplos 2019, Relatório final. São Tomé, São
Tomé e Príncipe: Instituto Nacional de Estatística e Fundo das Nações Unidas para a Infância.
Available at: https://mics-surveys-
prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/West%20and%20Central%20Africa/Sao%20Tome%20and%20Princi
pe/2019/Survey%20findings/Sao%20Tome%20e%20Principe%202019%20MICS%20Survey%20Findin
gs%20Report_Portuguese.pdf

18. UNICEF IN de E (INE) e. Inquérito de Indicadores Múltiplos, São Tome e Principe, MICS-STP, 2014,
Principais resultados. SaoTome, SaoTome e Principe, INE e UNICEF. 2015; Instituto Nacional de
Estatística, 2016. Inquérito aos Indicadores Múltiplos 2014 de São Tomé e Príncipe, Relatório Final.
São Tomé, São Tomé e Príncipe.

http:// ms. gov. st/ wp- conte nt/ uploads/ 2019/ 01/ MICS- Final- Report- STP_ Portu gu% C3% AAs.
Pdf

19. Bhutta Z, Das JK, Bahl R, Lawn JE, Salam R, Paul VK, et al. Can available interventions end
preventable deaths in mothers, newborn babies, and stillbirths, and at what cost? Lancet.
2014;384(9940):347–70.

20. Beyond2015, Gcap, Ifp. Civil Society Demands for the Post-2015 Agenda from 39 Countries. 2013;

21. Dickson KE, Simen-Kapeu A, Kinney M V., Huicho L, Vesel L, Lackritz E, et al. Every Newborn:
Health-systems bottlenecks and strategies to accelerate scale-up in countries. Lancet.
2014;384(9941):438–54.

22. Nair N, Tripathy P, Prost A, Costello A, Osrin D. Improving newborn survival in low-income
countries: Community-based approaches and lessons from South Asia. PLoS Med. 2010;7(4).

23. Vasconcelos A, Bandeira N, Sousa S, Pereira F, Machado MD. Adolescent pregnancy in Sao Tome
and Principe: a cross-sectional hospital-based study. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2022
Dec;22(1):1-5.

24. Vasconcelos A, Bandeira N, Sousa S, Machado MC, Pereira F. Adolescent pregnancy in Sao Tome
and Principe: are there different obstetric and perinatal outcomes?. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.
2022 Dec;22(1):1-1.

25. Vasconcelos A, Sousa S, Bandeira N, Baptista JL, Machado MD, Pereira F. PO 8592 Why, when
and where do newborns not only get sick but also die in são tomé and príncipe? A case-control
study.

26. Ministério da Saúde_ República Democrática de Sao Tome e Principe_Plano Nacional do
Desenvolvimento da Saúde 2017-2021

27. Tavares Da Silva F, Gonik B, McMillan M, Keech C, Dellicour S, Bhange S, Tila M, Harper DM,
Woods C, Kawai AT, Kochhar S, Munoz FM; Brighton Collaboration Stillbirth Working Group.
Stillbirth: Case definition and guidelines for data collection, analysis, and presentation of maternal

immunization safety data. Vaccine. 2016;34(49):6057-6068. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.044.
Epub 2016 Jul 16. PMID: 27431422; PMCID: PMC5139804.

28. Kikuchi K, Ansah EK, Okawa S, Enuameh Y, Yasuoka J, Nanishi K, et al. Effective linkages of
continuum of care for improving neonatal, perinatal, and maternal mortality: a systematic review
and metaanalysis. PloS one. 2015; 10(9):e0139288. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0139288 PMID:
26422685

29. Mulowooza J, Santos N, Isabirye N et al. Midwife-performed checklist and ultrasound to identify
obstetric conditions at labour triage in Uganda: A quasi-experimental study. Midwifery.
2021;96:102949.

30. Weissmann-Brenner A, Meyer R, Domniz N, Levin G, Hendin N, Yoeli-Ullman R, Mazaki-Tovi S,
Weissbach T, Kassif E. The perils of true knot of the umbilical cord: Antepartum, intrapartum and
postpartum complications and clinical implications. Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics.
2022;305(3):573-9.

31. Chiabi A, Takou V, Mah E, Nguefack S, Siyou H, Takou V, et al. Risk factors for neonatal mortality
at the Yaounde Gynaeco-Obstetric and Pediatric Hospital. Cameroon. Iranian Journal of Pediatrics.
2014;24(4):393–400.

32. Tewabe T, Mohammed S, Tilahun Y et al. Clinical outcome and risk factors of neonatal sepsis
among neonates in Felege Hiwot referral Hospital, Bahir Dar, Amhara Regional State, North West
Ethiopia 2016: a retrospective chart review. BMC Res Notes. 2017;10, 265.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-017-2573-1

33. Avagliano L, Massa V, Bulfamante G. Meconium-stained amniotic fluid and histologic signs of
fetal distress in stillbirths. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology.
2021;266:55-62.

34. Shaikh S, Shaikh AH, Shaikh SA, Isran B. Frequency of obstructed labor in teenage pregnancy.
Nepal Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 2012;7(1):37-40.

35. Alemu AY, Belay GM, Berhanu M, Minuye B. Determinants of neonatal mortality at neonatal
intensive care unit in Northeast Ethiopia: unmatched case-control study. Tropical Medicine and
Health. 2020 Dec;48(1):1-0.

36. Yego F, D'Este C, Byles J, Nyongesa P, Williams JS. A case-control study of risk factors for fetal and
early neonatal deaths in a tertiary hospital in Kenya. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2014
Dec;14(1):1-9.

37. Demisse AG, Alemu F, Gizaw MA, Tigabu Z. Patterns of admission and factors associated with
neonatal mortality among neonates admitted to the neonatal intensive care unit of University of
Gondar Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. Pediatric health, medicine and therapeutics. 2017;8:57.

38. Abadiga M, Mosisa G, Tsegaye R, et al. Determinants of adverse birth outcomes among women
delivered in public hospitals of Ethiopia, 2020. Archives of Public Health. 2022;80(1):1-7.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s13690-021-00776-0

39. Pimentel J, Ansari U, Omer K, et al. Factors associated with short birth interval in low- and
middle-income countries: a systematic review. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2020;20,156.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-2852-z

40. Esoh K, Wonkam-Tingang E, Wonkam A. Sickle cell disease in sub-Saharan Africa: transferable
strategies for prevention and care. The Lancet Haematology. 2021

41. Cutland CL, Lackritz EM, Mallett-Moore T, Bardají A, Chandrasekaran R, Lahariya C, Nisar MI,
Tapia MD, Pathirana J, Kochhar S, Muñoz FM. Low birth weight: Case definition & guidelines for data
collection, analysis, and presentation of maternal immunization safety data. Vaccine. 2017;35(48Part
A):6492.

42. Accrombessi M, Zeitlin J, Massougbodji A, Cot M, Briand V. What do we know about risk factors
for fetal growth restriction in Africa at the time of sustainable development goals? A scoping review.
Paediatric and perinatal epidemiology. 2018;32(2):184-96.

43. Huynh B, Kermorvant-Duchemin E, Herindrainy P et al. Bacterial Infections in Neonates,
Madagascar, 2012–2014. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2018; 24(4), 710-717.
https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2404.161977

44. Wosenu L, Worku AG, Teshome DF, Gelagay AA. Determinants of birth asphyxia among live birth
newborns in University of Gondar referral hospital, northwest Ethiopia: A case-control study. PLoS
ONE. 2018;13(9): e0203763.

45. Mbachu, I, Achigbu, K, Odinaka, K, et al. Tracking stillbirths by referral pattern and causes in a
rural tertiary hospital in Southern Nigeria. Niger Postgrad Med J 2018; 25(2): 87–93.

46. Chuwa, FS, Mwanamsangu, AH, Brown, BG, et al. Maternal and fetal risk factors for stillbirth in
Northern Tanzania: a registry-based retrospective cohort study. PLoS ONE 2017; 12(8): e0182250.

47. Mulatu T, Debella A, Feto T, Dessie Y. Determinants of stillbirth among women who gave birth at
Hiwot Fana Specialized University Hospital, Eastern Ethiopia: A facility-based cross-sectional study.
SAGE Open Medicine. 2022 Feb;10:20503121221076370.

48. Chaibva, et al. Adverse pregnancy outcomes, 'stillbirths and early neonatal deaths' in Mutare
district, Zimbabwe. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2019;19:86. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-019-
2229-3

49. Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Waiswa P, et al, for The Lancet Ending Preventable Stillbirths Series study
group with The Lancet Stillbirth Epidemiology investigator group. Stillbirths: rates, risk factors, and
acceleration towards 2030. Lancet 2016; https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00837-5

50. Mamo SA, Teshome GS, Tesfaye T, Goshu AT. Perinatal asphyxia and associated factors among
neonates admitted to a specialized public hospital in South Central Ethiopia: A retrospective cross-
sectional study. PloS one. 2022;17(1):e0262619.

51. Desai D, Maitra N, Patel P. Fetal heart rate patterns in patients with thick meconium staining of
amniotic fluid and its association with perinatal outcome. Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol.
2017;6(3):1030–5

52. Asiki, et al. Adverse pregnancy outcomes in rural Uganda (1996–2013): trends and associated
factors from serial cross-sectional surveys. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2015;15:279.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-015-0708-8

53. Lawn J, Shibuya K, Stein C. No cry at birth: global estimates of intrapartum stillbirths and
intrapartum-related neonatal deaths. Bull World Health Organ. 2005;83:409–17

54. Assefa, N., Berhe, H., Girma, F. et al. Risk factors of premature rupture of membranes in public
hospitals at Mekele city, Tigray, a case control study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2018; 18, 386
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-018-2016-6

55. Alam MM, Saleem AF, Shaikh AS, Munir O, Qadir M. Neonatal sepsis following prolonged rupture
of membranes in a tertiary care hospital in Karachi, Pakistan. The Journal of Infection in Developing
Countries. 2014;8(01):067-73.

56. Geleto, A., Chojenta, C., Musa, A. et al. Barriers to access and utilization of emergency obstetric
care at health facilities in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review of literature. Syst Rev. 2018; 7,
183. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-018-0842-2

57. Habte A, Wondimu M. Determinants of maternal near miss among women admitted to
maternity wards of tertiary hospitals in Southern Ethiopia, 2020: A hospital-based case-control
study. PloS one, 2021. 16(5): p. e0251826. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251826

58. Thakur N, Sunny AK, Gurung R, Basnet O, Litorp H, Ashish KC. Rate and Neonatal Outcomes
Among Instrument Assisted Vaginal Birth in 12 Public Hospitals in Nepal. Preprint. DOI:
https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-36775/v1

59. Hailemichael HT, Debelew GT, Alema HB, Weldu MG, Misgina KH. Determinants of adverse birth
outcome in Tigrai region, North Ethiopia: Hospital-based case-control study. BMC pediatrics.
2020;20(1):1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-019-1835-6

60. Mondal D, Galloway TS, Bailey TC, Mathews F. Elevated risk of stillbirth in males: systematic
review and meta-analysis of more than 30 million births. BMC medicine. 2014;12(1):1-1.

61. Aghai ZH, Goudar SS, Patel A, Saleem S, Dhaded SM, Kavi A, Lalakia P, Naqvi F, Hibberd PL,
McClure EM, Nolen TL. Gender variations in neonatal and early infant mortality in India and Pakistan:
a secondary analysis from the Global Network Maternal Newborn Health Registry. Reproductive
Health. 2020;17(3):1-1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-020-01028-0

62. Pongou R. Why is infant mortality higher in boys than in girls? A new hypothesis based on
preconception environment and evidence from a large sample of twins. Demography.
2013;50(2):421-44.

63. KC A, Basel PL, Singh S. Low birth weight and its associated risk factors: Health facility-based
case-control study. PloS one. 2020;15(6):e0234907.

64. Yadeta TA, Worku A, Egata G, Seyoum B, Marami D, Berhane Y. Vertical transmission of group B
Streptococcus and associated factors among pregnant women: a cross-sectional study, Eastern
Ethiopia. Infection and drug resistance. 2018;11:397.

65. El T, Gombe N, Shambira G, Chadambuka A, Mufuta T, Zizhou S. Determinants of perinatal
mortality in Marondera district, Mashonal and East Province of Zimbabwe.2009. Pan AFr Med J.
2011;8(7).

66. Goldenberg RL, Harrison MS, McClure EM. Stillbirths: the hidden birth asphyxia—US and Global
perspectives. Clinics in perinatology. 2016;43(3):439-53.

67. Gutman A, Harty T, O'Donoghue K, Greene R, Leitao S. Perinatal mortality audits and reporting of
perinatal deaths: systematic review of outcomes and barriers. Journal of Perinatal Medicine.
2022;26. https://doi.org/10.1515/jpm-2021-0363

68. Berhan Y, Berhan A. Perinatal mortality trends in Ethiopia. Ethiopian journal of health sciences.
2014;24:29-40.

69. Chiabi A, Takou V, Mah E, Nguefack S, Siyou H, Takou V, et al. Risk factors for neonatal mortality
at the Yaounde Gynaeco-Obstetric and Pediatric Hospital. Cameroon. Iranian Journal of Pediatrics.
2014;24(4):393–400.

70. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. The Apgar score (Committee Opinion No.
644). Obstet Gynecol. 2015;126(4):52–5.

71. Habte A, Lukas K, Melis T, Tamene A,Sahle T, Hailu M, et al. (2022) Determinants of neonatal
near miss among neonates admitted to public hospitals in Southern Ethiopia, 2021: A case-control
study. PLoS ONE 17(5): e0268041. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268041

72. Hug L, You D, Blencowe H, Mishra A, Wang Z, Fix MJ, Wakefield J, Moran AC, Gaigbe-Togbe V,
Suzuki E, Blau DM. Global, regional, and national estimates and trends in stillbirths from 2000 to
2019: a systematic assessment. The Lancet. 2021 Aug 28;398(10302):772-85.
https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01112-0

73. Ota, E, da Silva Lopes, K, Middleton, P, Flenady, V, Wariki, WM, Rahman, MO, et al.. Antenatal
interventions for preventing stillbirth, fetal loss and perinatal death: an overview of Cochrane
systematic reviews. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2020;12:CD009599.
https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009599.pub2.

74. Paulson KR, Kamath AM, Alam T, Bienhoff K, Abady GG, Abbas J, Abbasi-Kangevari M, Abbastabar
H, Abd-Allah F, Abd-Elsalam SM, Abdoli A. Global, regional, and national progress towards
Sustainable Development Goal 3.2 for neonatal and child health: all-cause and cause-specific
mortality findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet. 2021;398(10303):870-
905. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01207-1

75. KC A, Basel PL, Singh S. Low birth weight and its associated risk factors: Health facility-based
case-control study. PloS one. 2020;15(6):e0234907. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234907