

1 **Stillbirth rates and their determinants in a national maternity hospital in**
2 **Phnom Penh, Cambodia in 2017-2020: a cross-sectional assessment with a**
3 **nested case-control study**

4

5 Aliko Christou^{1*}, Jackline Mbishi², Mitsuaki Matsui^{3,4}, Lenka Beňová¹, Kim Rattana⁵, Ayako

6 Numazawa⁴, Azusa Iwamoto⁶, Sophearith Sokhan⁵, Nary Ieng⁵, Thérèse Delvaux¹

7

8

9 ¹Department of Public Health, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium

10 ²Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium

11 ³Department of Public Health, Kobe University Graduate School of Health Sciences, Japan

12 ⁴Nagasaki University School of Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nagasaki, Japan

13 ⁵National Maternal and Child Health Center, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

14 ⁶Bureau of International Health Cooperation, National Center for Global Health and Medicine, Japan

15

16 *Corresponding author

17 Dr Aliko Christou

18 Department of Public Health

19 Sexual and Reproductive Health Unit

20 Institute of Tropical Medicine

21 Nationalestraat 155

22 Antwerp, Belgium 2000

23 Email: achristou@itg.be

24

25 Twitter handles: @alichristou @lenkabenova

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** In Cambodia, stillbirths and their underlying factors have not been systematically
28 studied. This study aimed to assess the proportion and trends in stillbirths between 2017-2020 in a
29 large maternity referral hospital in the country and identify their key determinants to inform future
30 prevention efforts.

31

32 **Methods:** This was a retrospective cross-sectional analysis with a nested case-control study of
33 women giving birth at the National Maternal and Child Health Centre (NMCHC) in Phnom Penh,
34 2017-2020. We calculated percentages of singleton births at ≥ 22 weeks' gestation resulting in
35 stillbirth and annual stillbirth rates by timing: intrapartum (fresh) or antepartum (macerated).
36 Multivariable logistic regression was used to explore factors associated with stillbirth, where cases
37 were all women who gave birth to a singleton stillborn baby in the four-year period. One singleton
38 live birth immediately following each case served as an unmatched control. Multiple imputation was
39 used to handle missing data for gestational age.

40

41 **Results:** Between 2017 and 2020, 3.2% of singleton births ended in stillbirth (938/29,742). The
42 stillbirth rate increased from 24.8 per 1000 births in 2017 to 38.1 per 1000 births in 2020, largely due
43 to an increase in intrapartum stillbirth rates which rose from 18.8 to 27.4 per 1000 births in the
44 same period. The case-control study included 938 cases (stillbirth) and 938 controls (livebirths).
45 Factors independently associated with stillbirth were maternal age ≥ 35 years compared to < 20 years
46 (aOR:1.82, 95%CI:1.39,2.38), extreme (aOR:3.29, 95%CI:2.37,4.55) or moderate (aOR:2.45,
47 95%CI:1.74,3.46) prematurity compared with full term, and small-for-gestational age
48 (SGA)(aOR:2.32, 1.71,3.14) compared to average size-for-age. Breech/transverse births had nearly
49 four times greater odds of stillbirth (aOR:3.84, 95%CI:2.78,5.29), while caesarean section reduced
50 the odds by half compared with vaginal birth (aOR:0.50, 95%CI:0.39,0.64). A history of abnormal

51 vaginal discharge increased odds of stillbirth (aOR:1.42, 95%CI:1.11,1.81) as did a history of stillbirth
52 (aOR:3.08, 95%CI:1.5,6.5).

53

54 **Conclusions:** Stillbirth prevention in this maternity referral hospital in Cambodia requires
55 strengthening preterm birth detection and management of SGA, intrapartum care, monitoring
56 women with stillbirth history, management of breech births, and further investigation of high-risk
57 referral cases.

58

59 **Key words:** stillbirth, fetal death, risk factors, Cambodia, case-control study, maternal health,
60 perinatal health, routine data, obstetric emergency, hospital, referral

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77 Plain English summary

78 In Cambodia, there is very little information published on stillbirths to know precisely how many
79 there are and to understand the underlying reasons they occur so they can be prevented in the
80 future. Our study aimed to quantify the number of stillborn babies and identify some underlying risk
81 factors from one of the largest maternity referral hospitals in the Phnom Penh, Cambodia. We
82 examined data from almost 30,000 health facility medical files of women who gave birth between
83 2017 and 2020 which included 938 stillbirths. We found that about 3.2% of births ended in a
84 stillbirth and that this percentage increased between 2017 and 2020. Women who had preterm
85 babies, or whose babies were small in weight for their gestational age, and babies that were born
86 breech had a higher chance of being stillborn. Women who had abnormal vaginal discharge which
87 can indicate a possible infection also had a higher odds of having a stillbirth. We also found that
88 women who had a stillbirth previously had almost three times higher chance of having another
89 stillborn baby. Having a caesarean section reduced the likelihood of having a stillborn baby by about
90 half. These findings suggest that efforts are needed to better identify and manage women with
91 preterm births and monitor fetal growth as well as ensure breech births are managed adequately.

92

93

94

95

96

97

98 **Background**

99 Stillbirths comprised 36% of deaths of children under-five years globally in 2021 and their
100 contribution to these deaths has increased from 23% in 2000.[1] Of the estimated 1.9 million
101 stillbirths worldwide every year, almost 90% occurring in low or lower middle-income countries.[2]
102 The 2014 global commitment to The Every Newborn Action Plan set a stillbirth rate target of 12 per
103 1000 births for all countries to reach by 2030.[3] Yet declines in stillbirths globally have been slow
104 and are not on track to reach this target. The highest stillbirth rates are in Sub-Saharan Africa at 21
105 stillbirths per 1000 births followed by South Asia at 17 per 1000 births.[2] The absence of quality
106 data in routine health information systems has limited our understanding of the true burden and
107 precise causes and risk factors for stillbirths at country and sub-national levels, and contributes to
108 the lack of prioritisation of policy and health interventions to reduce stillbirths.[4]

109 The stillbirth rate is defined as the number of babies born without signs of life from either 22 weeks
110 or 28 weeks' gestation per 1000 total births with the latter recommended for international
111 comparisons[4, 5]. The stillbirth rate is an important indicator of the quality of care received during
112 pregnancy and childbirth.[6] Most stillbirths can be prevented if access to high quality of care can be
113 ensured throughout the maternal continuum of care.[7] Factors known to be associated with
114 stillbirth include complications in childbirth, maternal conditions such as hypertension and diabetes,
115 infections including syphilis, HIV and group B streptococcus, haemorrhage, and genetic
116 conditions.[7] The contribution of these causes and risk factors can vary across different contexts
117 and data is needed for each context to prioritise and target preventive strategies.

118 In Cambodia, national stillbirth rates have been estimated from modelling and suggest an impressive
119 decline by nearly half from 24.7 per 1000 births in 2000 to 11.4 per 1000 births in 2021[2], indicating
120 that the country already reached the 2030 target. However, these national rates derived from
121 mathematical estimations can have wide uncertainty intervals and mask within-country variability.

122 Cambodia has almost universal coverage of facility births with 98% of women giving birth in a health
123 facility in 2020[8], thus, examining routine facility data is an important data source which can
124 provide insights into key contributing factors without a high risk of selection bias. Despite this high
125 coverage, there are few published studies investigating risk factors for stillbirth in Cambodia[9] and
126 no analyses of routine health system data to estimate the stillbirth rates. This means a gap in
127 context-specific evidence to feed into policy prioritising interventions or resources towards further
128 preventing stillbirths in the country.

129 This study aimed to assess facility-level stillbirth rates over time and explore factors associated with
130 stillbirths in the largest maternity referral hospital in Cambodia over a four-year period.

131 **Methods**

132 **Study design**

133 This is a retrospective cross-sectional study of singleton births at a national maternity care centre in
134 Phnom Penh, Cambodia between January 2017 and December 2020 with a nested case-control
135 component.

136 **Study setting**

137 The study used data collected from the National Maternal and Child Health Centre (NMCHC) - a
138 government tertiary level hospital under the Ministry of Health located in Phnom Penh, the capital
139 of Cambodia. Phnom Penh has a population of around 2.3 million and constitutes 14% of the total
140 population of Cambodia which in 2019 was estimated to be approximately 16 million people.[10]
141 The NMCHC is one of the largest tertiary maternity referral hospitals in the country with around
142 7,000 births a year and is one of the main referral centres for high-risk cases. The NMCHC was built
143 in 1997 and provides both clinical perinatal care and is a leading training institution in the
144 country.[11] It has 134 in-patient beds, a neonatal care and an intensive care unit.[12]

145 **Study population**

146 The study included all women who had a singleton birth at gestational age ≥ 22 weeks at the NMCHC
147 between January 1, 2017, and December 31, 2020. For the cross-sectional analysis, we included all
148 singleton births registered in the hospital database over the four-year period. For the case-control
149 study, every singleton stillbirth over the four-year period was included and the consecutive singleton
150 live birth after the stillbirth was selected as an unmatched control. Multiple births were excluded
151 from the analysis.

152 **Data sources and data collection**

153 Data on women and their baby were obtained directly from the NMCHC electronic hospital database
154 of patients and additional data was extracted from individual medical records of women. For the
155 case-control analysis, all stillbirths were identified from the hospital database and the consecutive
156 singleton live birth was selected as an unmatched control. Individual medical files from each case
157 and control were located and data extracted into a pre-structured form to cross-check information
158 and provide additional data on variables which were not included in the hospital database.

159 Data on women's obstetric history including parity, history of stillbirth or miscarriages/abortion, age,
160 residence, gestational age, mode of birth, presentation of baby and birthweight of the baby were
161 obtained from the electronic hospital database. Data on women's past maternal medical conditions
162 (hypertension/oedema, vaginal discharge or infections), history of caesarean birth, history of pre-
163 term birth, and resuscitation of the index newborn were extracted from the individual women's
164 medical files.

165 **Study variables**

166 The definition of stillbirth we applied is that outlined in ICD-11 and adopted by the WHO for early
167 fetal deaths as a baby born with no signs of life from 22 weeks of pregnancy onwards.[4, 5] From the

168 hospital database stillbirths were identified and confirmed based on the live status of baby indicated
169 in the patient record sheet (from woman's medical file) as either stillborn (*mort-né*) or alive (*vivant*),
170 or if Apgar score was zero at 1, 5, and 10 minutes after birth in the medical file. Stillbirths were
171 further categorised into intrapartum (fresh) or antepartum (macerated) using data from the
172 electronic hospital database based on assessment the skin appearance recorded by the healthcare
173 provider. In 2.1% of stillbirths, the timing was missing (20/938).

174 For the case-control study, the main outcome of interest was stillbirth (cases) and live births
175 (controls). Independent variables included characteristics with a known relationship with the
176 outcome of stillbirth according to published literature[7] and which were available in the hospital
177 database and/or individual medical files. They included maternal demographic characteristics
178 (maternal age and residence), obstetric history (parity, history of stillbirth/abortion/miscarriage,
179 preterm birth or caesarean birth), fetal factors (gestational age, sex and birthweight, congenital
180 malformation,) and obstetric factors (mode of birth, presentation of fetus, indication for caesarean
181 section, resuscitation attempt) and history of maternal conditions (abnormal vaginal discharge or
182 hypertension/oedema). Not all variables were included in the regression analysis; variables were
183 selected after considering their relationship with the outcome and excluding those with a causal
184 relationship or where timing of when the variable was measured or occurred after the outcome. The
185 birthweight variable was re- categorised according to size for gestational age to create three
186 categories – small for gestational age (SGA), normal for gestational age and large for gestational age.
187 The details of how these were categorised are in the **Supplementary file (Table A1)**.

188 **Statistical analysis**

189 Analyses were performed using STATA/SE v14 and SAS v9.4. For the cross-sectional analysis, we
190 calculated the percentage of stillbirths among all births for each year and overall, and the stillbirth
191 rates for each year as the number of stillbirths per 1000 total births. We also calculated these rates

192 by timing of the stillbirth (intrapartum or antepartum) and the proportion of stillbirths by timing
193 overall. Stillbirths with missing timing (20/938) were included in all calculations as a separate
194 category. In the case-control study, we calculated descriptive statistics to summarise characteristics
195 of women who had a stillbirth compared to those with a live birth. Chi-square tests was used to
196 compare the percentages of cases and controls in terms of selected categorical variables. Bivariate
197 analysis was performed using a binary logistic regression to examine the association between each
198 independent variable and the outcome and to calculate unadjusted odds ratios with 95% confidence
199 intervals. Independent variables which were statistically significant at $p < 0.25$ in the bivariate analysis
200 were retained and included in the multivariable logistic regression model. It was decided *a priori* to
201 retain maternal age and baby's sex in the models as it is established that either very young or older
202 maternal age is an important risk factor for stillbirth and male babies are biologically at a slightly
203 higher risk of stillbirth than females.[7]

204 Multivariable logistic regression was used to identify factors independently associated with the
205 outcome. Two multivariable regression models were fitted – the first model included all cases and
206 controls ($n=1,876$), while the second model included only women with at least one previous birth
207 ($n=1,046$) so we could examine having had a previous pregnancy loss as a risk factor for stillbirth. We
208 fit these models also on the full data set (with imputed values for observations missing gestational
209 age and all variables relying on gestational age) and also on the data set with complete cases only to
210 identify if the imputation affected or changed the overall results (see below) (**Supplementary file,**
211 **Table A3**). In the multivariable models, independent variables that were not significant at 5% level
212 were removed one at a time. To assess multi-collinearity, variance inflation factors were checked.
213 Model fit was checked using the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit test. Due to the known
214 relationship between birthweight and gestational age, we explored whether an interaction existed
215 between these variables. Independent variables that were considered for the first multivariable
216 logistic regression were maternal age, residence, gestational age, sex of the baby,

217 hypertension/oedema, vaginal discharge, presentation of baby and mode of birth. The second
218 multiple logistic regression added obstetric history factors such as history of stillbirth,
219 abortion/miscarriages, and premature birth.

220 **Handling of missing values**

221 Gestational age had the highest missingness with approximately 40% of observations among the
222 controls (live births) and 48% of cases (stillbirths) missing gestational age in the case-control study
223 dataset (n=1876). As we created a new variable of baby size at birth taking into account gestational
224 age, this variable also had the same level of missingness. For the gestational age variable and size at
225 birth, imputation was used with a total of 10 imputations to fill in missing values. These variables
226 were first recoded into categories using available continuous values and this was followed by
227 imputation of missing values as categorical variables. This approach was chosen over imputing
228 gestational age as a continuous variable prior to categorising the variable, as it minimised variation
229 in the estimates.

230 Missing data for other explanatory variables was <25% and these were almost all from observations
231 from the control group (live births). Variables with missing data included hypertension/oedema
232 (n=155/1876), history of vaginal discharge (n=110/1876), and history of premature birth
233 (n=144/1876). As the number of observations with missing data in these variables was small, we
234 recoded those observations with missing values to the category “No”.

235 **Results**

236 **Levels and trends in stillbirth mortality at NMCHC**


237 Of 29,742 singleton births in the 4-year period there were 938 stillbirths, giving an overall stillbirth
238 rate of 32 per 1000 births or 3.2% of births (Table 1). Two-thirds (66%) of stillbirths were
239 intrapartum while one-third occurred in the antepartum period. The stillbirth rate increased from 25

240 per 1000 births in 2017 to 38 per 1000 births in 2020 (Figure 1). When disaggregated by type of
 241 stillbirth, we found that the increase was due predominantly to an increase in intrapartum stillbirth
 242 rate in 2019 and particularly in 2020, whereas there was almost no change in the antepartum
 243 stillbirth rate.

244 **Table 1.** Proportion of stillbirths and stillbirth timing among singleton births, 2017-2020 at NMCHC,
 245 Cambodia

	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Total number of births (singleton)	7066	7333	8095	7248	29742
Total number of stillbirths (singleton)	175	212	275	276	938
Intrapartum (fresh)	133	127	171	196	627
Antepartum (macerated)	41	78	99	73	291
Undefined (missing timing)	1	7	5	7	20
Stillbirth rate (per 1000 births)	24.8	28.9	34.0	38.1	31.5
Intrapartum stillbirth rate	18.8	17.3	21.1	27.4	21.1
Antepartum stillbirth rate	5.8	10.6	12.2	10.1	9.8
Proportion of stillbirths among all births (%)	2.5	2.9	3.4	3.8	3.2
Among stillbirths, by type (%)					
Intrapartum (fresh)	76	60	62	71	67
Antepartum (macerated)	23	37	36	26	31
Undefined (missing timing)	<1	3	2	3	2

246



247

248 **Figure 1.** Proportion of stillbirths and timing of stillbirth between 2017-2020 among women with
249 singleton births at NMCHC, Cambodia

250

251 **Case control study**

252 *Characteristics of cases and controls*

253 There were 938 cases (stillbirths) and 938 controls (live births) included in the case-control analysis.
254 Table 2 summarises the maternal, fetal and obstetric factors in the sample by outcome. Around 20%
255 of women were over 35 years with only a small percentage <20 years. For just under half of the
256 sample (44%) this was their first child, while about a quarter (25.3%) had two or more children. A
257 history of at least one previous stillbirth was found in 2.5% of women; however, this was over
258 double among women whose current birth ended in a stillborn (3.6%) compared to women who had

259 a live birth (1.3%). A substantially higher percentage of live births were born at term or higher (37 or
260 more weeks) while a higher percentage of stillborn babies were born extremely, very preterm, or
261 moderate to late preterm. Overall, there were very few women giving birth after 41 weeks (5.6%).
262 Among live births, over half were of normal weight for the gestational age but for stillborn babies
263 almost 18% were small for gestational age. The rate of congenital malformations was more common
264 among stillborn (6.0%) babies compared to liveborn (0.3%). Overall, 17% of babies were breech,
265 transverse or face but the percentage was substantially higher among stillbirths (26%). The overall
266 caesarean section (CS) rate was 27% but was lower among stillborn babies (21.4%) compared with
267 live born (33.1%). Of note was that when we examined the indication for the CS in nearly 13% had
268 fetal death given as the reason. Resuscitation was attempted on almost half of live born babies but
269 only among 7% of stillborn babies. Among intrapartum stillbirths' resuscitation was attempted on
270 9.1% (57/628) (results not shown). Around one-fifth of women had a history of abnormal vaginal
271 discharge indicative of an infection, and this was slightly higher among women with a stillbirth
272 (24.6%) compared to those whose baby was alive (19.4%). Only 2% of women had a recorded history
273 of hypertension and this did not differ by the outcome.

274 The characteristics of cases and controls included in the sub-group analysis of women that had at
275 least one previous birth is provided in the Supplementary material (Table A2).

276

277

278

279

280

281 **Table 2.** Characteristics of cases (stillbirths) and controls (live births), 2017-2020 NMCHC, Cambodia
 282 (n=1,876)

Independent variable	Live birth		Stillbirth		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<i>Maternal characteristics</i>						
Maternal age (years)						
<20	60	6.4	82	8.7	142	7.6
20-34	733	78.1	644	68.7	1,377	73.4
35+	145	15.5	212	22.6	357	19.0
Residence						
Urban	690	73.6	637	67.9	1,327	70.7
Semi-rural	197	21.0	240	25.6	437	23.3
Rural	51	5.4	61	6.5	112	6.0
Parity						
Nulliparity	421	44.9	409	43.6	830	44.2
1	304	32.4	268	28.6	572	30.5
2+	213	22.7	261	27.8	474	25.3
History of stillbirth						
No	926	98.7	904	96.4	1,830	97.6
Yes (1 or more)	12	1.3	34	3.6	46	2.5
History of miscarriage/abortion						
No	601	64.1	591	63.0	1,192	63.5
Yes	337	35.9	347	37.0	684	36.5
History of premature birth						
No	930	99.2	927	98.8	1,857	99.0
Yes	8	0.9	11	1.2	19	1.0
History of caesarean birth						
No	840	89.6	880	93.8	1,720	91.7
Yes	98	10.5	58	6.2	156	8.3
<i>Fetal factors</i>						
Gestational age						
extremely preterm <28 weeks	4	0.43	69	7.36	73	3.89
very preterm 28-31 weeks	22	2.35	134	14.29	156	8.32
moderate to late preterm 32-36 weeks	68	7.25	150	15.99	218	11.62
term 37-40 weeks	407	43.39	125	13.33	532	28.36
41+ weeks	76	8.1	30	3.2	106	5.65
missing	361	38.49	430	45.84	791	42.16
Gestational age						
extremely or very preterm <32 weeks	26	2.77	203	21.64	229	12.21
moderate to late preterm 32-36 weeks	68	7.25	150	15.99	218	11.62
term >37 weeks	483	51.49	155	16.52	638	34.01
missing	361	38.49	430	45.84	791	42.16

Independent variable	Live birth		Stillbirth		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Birthweight						
<1500g	27	2.88	334	35.81	361	19.24
1500-2499g	136	14.5	323	34.43	459	24.5
2500-3999g	748	79.7	251	26.76	999	53.3
+4000g	27	2.9	30	3.2	57	3.0
Size at birth						
Small for gestational age	60	6.4	268	28.6	328	17.48
Normal for gestational age	487	51.92	203	21.6	690	36.78
Large for gestational age	30	3.2	37	3.9	67	3.57
missing	361	38.49	430	45.8	567	42.16
Sex of baby						
Female	441	47.0	450	48.0	891	47.5
Male	497	53.0	488	52.0	985	52.5
Congenital malformation						
Yes	3	0.3	110	11.7	113	6.0
No	935	99.7	828	88.3	1,763	94.0
<i>Obstetric factors</i>						
Presentation of baby						
Vertex	867	92.4	694	74.0	1,561	83.2
Breech, transverse or face	71	7.6	244	26.0	315	16.8
Mode of birth						
Vaginal	608	64.8	718	76.6	1,326	70.7
Caesarean	310	33.1	201	21.4	511	27.2
<i>Indication for CS was fetal death</i>	0	0.0	26	12.9	26	5.1
Vacuum assisted	20	2.1	19	2.0	39	2.1
Resuscitation attempted						
Yes	395	42.1	64	6.8	459	24.5
No	543	57.9	874	93.2	1,417	75.5
<i>Maternal history of medical conditions</i>						
Abnormal vaginal discharge						
Yes	182	19.4	231	24.6	413	22.0
No	756	80.6	707	75.4	1463	78.0
Hypertension/oedema						
Yes	18	1.9	20	2.1	38	2.0
No	920	98.1	918	97.9	1,838	98.0

283

CS- caesarean section; GA- gestational age

284

285

Bivariate and multivariable logistic regression analysis

286 Maternal age group, residence, parity, gestational age, birthweight, presentation, mode of birth, and
287 vaginal discharge were significantly associated with stillbirth in bivariate analysis (**Table 3**, column 1).
288 **Table 3** shows the first multivariable model fitted with gestational age, birthweight, and size at birth
289 each separately (Model 1A-1C), a model with an interaction term between gestational age and birth
290 size (Model 1D) and a model with gestational age and birth size included together as separate
291 variables (Model 1E) The multivariable models fit on the complete cases only are presented in the
292 Supplementary file (**Table A3**).

293 In the first multivariable model, maternal age was significantly associated with stillbirth; women
294 aged >35 years had almost twice the odds of stillbirth (aOR 1.82, 95% CI 1.39-2.38) compared to
295 women aged 20-34 years. Babies that were extremely premature (<32 weeks) had over three times
296 increased odds of stillbirth and those moderately preterm had 2.5 times increase odds compared
297 with babies born at term or higher. Babies that were small for gestational age or larger for
298 gestational had 2.3- and 1.8-times greater odds of stillbirth, respectively. Babies that were born
299 breech, transverse or face had almost 4 times increased odds of stillbirth compared to vertex
300 presentation (aOR: 3.84, 95% CI: 2.78, 5.29). Babies born by caesarean section had half the odds of
301 stillbirth compared to those born by vaginal birth (aOR 0.50, 95% CI: 0.39, 0.64). Baby's sex and
302 mother's place of residence were not significantly associated with stillbirth after adjusting for other
303 covariates (**Table 3**). There was no significant interaction between gestational age and birth size
304 when the interaction was fit on the dataset with imputed values, however, in the complete case
305 analysis the interaction was showing as significant (LR test $p=0.03$)(**Table A3**)

306 Model 2 (**Table 4**) shows the multivariable logistic regression results on the sub-group of women
307 with at least one previous pregnancy. We found that a history of stillbirth increased the odds of
308 stillbirth three-fold (aOR: 3.08, 95% CI: 1.48 6.43) compared to multipara without a history of
309 stillbirth, after adjusting for other factors.

Table 3. Bivariate and multivariable logistic regression of factors associated with stillbirth among all women (N=1876, Imputed values for women missing gestational age)

N=1876	N=1876				N=1876				N=1876 (IMPUTED)				N=1876 (IMPUTED)				N=1876 (IMPUTED)				N=1876 (IMPUTED)			
	Bivariate				Model 1A (+Birthweight only)				Model 1B (+Birth size only)				Model 1C (+Gestational age only)				Model 1D (interaction) (Birth size* Gestational age)				Model 1E (Gestational age + Birth size)			
	uOR	95% CI	p-value		aOR	95% CI	p-value		aOR	95% CI	p-value		aOR	95% CI	p-value		aOR	95% CI	p-value		aOR	95% CI	p-value	
Maternal age (years)																								
<20	1.56	1.10	2.21	0.000	0.94	0.61	1.48	0.0001	1.40	0.96	2.05	0.000	1.28	0.87	1.88	0.0002	1.30	0.87	1.93	0.0001	1.30	0.88	1.93	0.0001
20-34	1				1				1				1				1				1			
35+	1.66	1.31	2.11		1.85	1.39	2.23		1.76	1.35	2.29		1.86	1.43	2.42		1.82	1.39	2.38		1.82	1.39	2.38	
Residence																								
Urban	1			0.027																				
Semi-rural	1.32	1.06	1.64						NS				NS				NS				NS			
Rural	1.30	0.88	1.91																					
Parity																								
Nulliparity	1.10	0.89	1.36	0.026					NS				NS				NS				NS			
1	1																							
2+	1.39	1.09	1.77																					
Sex of baby																								
Female	1				1			0.326	1			0.885	1			0.8668	1			0.7057	1			0.6845
Male	0.96	0.80	1.15	0.677	1.12	0.90	1.40		1.01	0.82	1.23		1.02	0.84	1.25		1.04	0.85	1.28		1.05	0.85	1.29	
Gestational age (IMPUTED)																								
<32 weeks	4.81	3.49	6.64	<0.0001									4.13	2.83	6.04	<0.0001	3.38	2.04	5.61	<0.0001	3.29	2.37	4.55	<0.0001
32-36 weeks	3.00	2.20	4.10										2.63	1.95	3.56		2.78	1.79	4.31		2.45	1.74	3.46	
term 37+ weeks	1												1				1				1			
Birthweight																								
Extremely low to very low (<1500g)	34.12	22.52	51.68	0.000	28.36	18.51	44.4	0.000																
Low (1500-2499g)	6.55	5.14	8.35		6.26	4.86	8.06																	
Appropriate-high (+2500g)	1				1																			
Size at birth (IMPUTED)																								
Small for gestational age	3.46	2.60	4.60	<0.001					3.06	2.28	4.11	<0.0001					2.51	1.58	4.00	0.0004	2.32	1.71	3.14	<0.0001
Appropriate for gestational age	1								1								1				1			
Large for gestational age	1.91	1.09	3.35						2.26	1.27	4.01						2.16	0.99	4.70		1.83	0.97	3.43	
Presentation of baby																								

N=1876	N=1876				N=1876				N=1876 (IMPUTED)				N=1876 (IMPUTED)				N=1876 (IMPUTED)				N=1876 (IMPUTED)			
	Bivariate				Model 1A (+Birthweight only)				Model 1B (+Birth size only)				Model 1C (+Gestational age only)				Model 1D (interaction) (Birth size* Gestational age)				Model 1E (Gestational age + Birth size)			
Vertex	1				1 0.000				1 <0,0001				1 <0,0001				1 <0,0001				1 <0,0001			
Breech, transverse or face	4.29	3.24	5.69	<0.001	2.32	1.64	3.28		4.36	3.21	5.91		4.08	2.99	5.57		3.83	2.77	5.29		3.84	2.78	5.29	
Mode of birth																								
Vaginal	1 <0.001				1 0.0001				1 <0,0001				1 0.0001				1 <0,0001							
Caesarean	0.63	0.48	0.81		0.63	0.49	0.82		0.46	0.36	0.59		0.47	0.37	0.60		0.50	0.39	0.64	<0,0001	0.50	0.39	0.64	
Vacuum assisted	2.21	1.13	4.33		2.19	1.12	4.28		1.14	0.58	2.23		1.27	0.65	2.48		1.45	0.72	2.94		1.43	0.71	2.88	
Abnormal vaginal discharge																								
Yes	1.36	1.09	1.69	0.006	1.40	1.07	1.82	0.014	1.42	1.12	1.80	<0.001	1.44	1.13	1.83	0.0032	1.46	1.14	1.87	0.003	1.46	1.14	1.87	0.0028
No	1				1				1				1				1							
Hypertension/oedema																								
Yes	1.11	0.59	2.12	0.743																				
No	1																							
BW*GA interaction term																	0.566							
SGA and <32 weeks																	0.90 0.38 2.13							
LGA and <32 weeks																	1.05 0.25 4.48							
SGA and 32-36 weeks																	0.79 0.36 1.69							
LGA and 32-36 weeks																	0.48 0.15 1.61							
AGA and +37 weeks																	1							
HL Goodness of fit					0.3669				0.6944				0.5622				0.7865				0.8927			

Abbreviations: uOR – unadjusted odds ratio; aOR – adjusted odds ratio; CI- confidence interval; GA- Gestational Age; AGA – appropriate for gestational age; SGA – Small for gestational age; LGA- large for gestational age; HL- Hosmer-Lemeshow

Grey shading – variable not included in the first step of multivariable model; NS – variable initially included but was not significant (p<=0.05) so was dropped from the model

Table 4. Multivariable logistic regression on sub-group of women with at least one previous birth (N=1046, Imputed values for women with missing gestational age)

N=1046					N=1046 (IMPUTED)			N=1046 (IMPUTED)				N=1046 (IMPUTED)			N=1046 (IMPUTED)					
	Bivariate				Model 2B (+birth size)			Model 2C (+gestational age)				Model 2D (+birth size*gestational age interaction)			Model 2E (+gestational age + birth size)					
	uOR	95% CI		p-value	aOR	95% CI		p-value	aOR	95% CI		p-value	aOR	95% CI		p-value	aOR	95% CI		p-value
Maternal age (years)																				
<20	0.80	0.25	2.54	0.003	0.43	0.12	1.59	0.002	0.40	0.11	1.44	0.00	0.39	0.11	1.44	0.0007	0.39	0.11	1.45	0.0005
20-34	1				1				1				1				1.74	1.27	2.37	
35+	1.58	1.21	2.06		1.67	1.23	2.27		1.76	1.30	2.38		1.74	1.27	2.37		1			
Residence																				
Urban	1			0.184																
Semi-rural	1.26	0.94	1.69		NS				NS				NS				NS			
Rural	1.36	0.83	2.24																	
Parity																				
1	1			0.0082	NS				NS				NS				NS			
2+	1.39	1.09	1.77																	
History of stillbirth																				
Yes (1 or more)	2.89	1.48	5.65	0.001	3.24	1.58	6.64	0.0013	3.22	1.55	6.66	0.0016	3.13	1.50	6.57	0.00	3.08	1.48	6.43	0.002
No	1				1				1				1				1			
History of miscarriage/abortion																				
Yes	1.11	0.87	1.41	0.406																
No	1																			
History of premature birth																				
Yes	1.23	0.48	3.13	0.669																
No	1																			
History of caesarean birth																				
Yes	0.55	0.39	0.79	0.001																
No	1																			
Gestational age																				
Extreme or very preterm <32 weeks	4.08	2.64	6.29	<0,0001					3.77	2.34	6.07	<0,0001	2.82	1.30	6.10	0.0051	2.87	1.77	4.66	0.0001

N=1046	Bivariate			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2B (+birth size)				N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2C (+gestational age)			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2D (+birth size*gestational age interaction)			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2E (+gestational age + birth size)		
	uOR	95% CI	P-value	aOR	95% CI	P-value	aOR	95% CI	P-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	
Moderate-late preterm 32-36 weeks Term \geq 37 weeks	3.02 1	2.07 4.40					2.94 1	1.97 4.39		2.92 1	1.59 5.36		2.54 1	1.65 3.89		
Sex of baby																
Female	1		0.636	1		0.3103	1		0.4298	1		0.289	1		0.286	
Male	1.06	0.83 1.35		1.15	0.88 1.52		1.12	0.85 1.47		1.16	0.88 1.54		1.16	0.88 1.54		
Size at birth																
Small for Gestational age	4.08	2.64 6.29	<0,0001	3.13	2.15 4.58	<0,0001				2.56	1.47 4.44	0.001	2.36	1.58 3.52	0.000	
Appropriate for Gestational age	1			1						1			1			
Large for Gestational age	3.02	2.07 4.40		2.24	1.09 4.59					2.17	0.90 5.23		1.91	0.89 4.10		
Presentation of baby																
Vertex	1		0.000	1			1			1			1		<0,0001	
Breech, transverse or face	3.42	2.42 4.83		3.91	2.66 5.75	<0,0001	3.66	2.47 5.44	0.000	3.51	2.33 5.28	<0,0001	3.54	2.36 5.31		
Mode of birth																
Vaginal	1		0.000	1			1			1		0.000	1		<0,000	
Caesarean	0.59	0.45 0.77		0.48	0.35 0.66	<0,0001	0.51	0.37 0.69	<0,0001	0.52	0.38 0.71		0.51	0.38 0.70		
Vacuum assisted vaginal	1.67	0.50 5.59		2.13	0.59 7.60		2.27	0.62 8.28		2.44	0.64 9.22		2.39	0.64 9.00		
Abnormal vaginal discharge																
Yes	1.65	1.22 2.22	0.001	1.78	1.29 2.47	0.0005	1.88	1.34 2.63	0.0001	1.90	1.35 2.66	0.000	1.88	1.34 2.64	0.0002	
No	1			1			1			1			1			
Hypertension or oe dema																
Yes	1.42	0.61 3.27	0.410													
No	1															
Birthweight*GA interaction												0.884				
SGA and <32 weeks										0.90	0.38 2.13					
LGA and <32 weeks										1.05	0.25 4.48					
SGA and 32-36 weeks										0.79	0.36 1.69					

N=1046	Bivariate			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2B (+birth size)			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2C (+gestational age)			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2D (+birth size*gestational age interaction)			N=1046 (IMPUTED) Model 2E (+gestational age + birth size)		
	uOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value
LGA and 32-36 weeks										0.48	0.15	1.61			
AGA and +37 weeks										1					
HL Goodness of fit (p-value)				0.35			0.9279			0.735			0.5912		

Abbreviations: uOR – unadjusted odds ratio; aOR – adjusted odds ratio; CI- confidence interval; GA- Gestational Age; AGA- appropriate for gestational age; SGA – Small for gestational age; LGA- large for gestational age, HL- Hosmer-Lemeshow

Grey shading – variable not included in the first step of multivariable model; NS – variable initially included initially but was not significant so was dropped from the model.

Discussion

This study is one of the first analyses using multi-year routine facility data on stillbirths in Cambodia from a high-volume public tertiary referral maternity hospital. We assessed the stillbirth burden and identified potential risk factors that can be targeted for prevention. Our study found an overall stillbirth rate at 32 per 1000 births among almost 30,000 births between 2017-2020. We found that the stillbirth rate in this hospital increased annually between 2017 and 2020 to a high of 38 per 1000 births in 2020 (60% higher than in 2017). Key factors that increased the odds of having a stillbirth included being aged over 35 years, having a baby that was born preterm or small for gestational age or with breech or transverse presentation, reporting abnormal vaginal discharge during pregnancy and a history of stillbirth. Giving birth by caesarean section was protective and reduced the odds of stillbirth.

The overall stillbirth rate at NMCHC was high compared to the national stillbirth (population) rates estimated for Cambodia which suggest a rate of 11 per 1000 births[13]. However, this is not unexpected given our analysis was from a tertiary referral maternity hospital and that this is not a population-based study representative of all births in Cambodia. A recent community-based study in Cambodia reported a stillbirth rate of 11 per 1000 births which aligns with levels in the national survey[9]. Facility-based stillbirth rates are commonly higher than population-based levels due to high risk or complicated births in (referral) maternities and case-mix. There are no other facility based studies within Cambodia to compare with, but in neighbouring Vietnam, facility-based stillbirth rates range from 25 per 1000 births in one tertiary facility in Ho Chi Minh city [14] to 9 per 1000 live births in Da Nang city where stillbirths from seven facilities were examined.[15].

The increase in the stillbirth rate over the four years could be the result of increased or better referral of high-risk cases as NMCHC is known to receive such cases from surrounding facilities and provinces. The peak in the intrapartum stillbirth in 2020 also coincides with the beginning of the

COVID-19 pandemic. Although there were few COVID-19 cases in Cambodia until 2021, there were strict travel restrictions and school closures in place from early 2020[16], which could have led to delays for women to reach a health facility or less staff available, affecting both timely access to and ability to provide quality antenatal and emergency obstetric care. Of concern is that the increase in stillbirth rate over this four-year period was attributed to an increase in fresh or intrapartum stillbirth rate which indicates the baby is alive on arrival to the facility. Therefore, some of these deaths could potentially be saved if timely and quality obstetric care could be ensured. The share of intrapartum stillbirths in NMCHC accounted for 71% of all stillbirths in 2020, which is relatively high when the average estimated for low- and lower- middle-income countries is around 50% and for the East and South-East Asia region it is even lower at 30%. However, we acknowledge our measure of establishing the timing of stillbirth using skin appearance has its limitations.[17]

Our analysis identified several factors that were significantly associated with a higher odds of stillbirth in Cambodian mothers giving birth at NMCHC. The increased risk for women over 35 years and below 16 years of age is a known factor in the literature[7]. Our sample of women was too small to create an age group below 16 years, and we did not observe an increased risk of stillbirth in the youngest age group in our analysis (<20 years).

We found a significantly higher odds of stillbirth among babies who were extremely (<32 weeks) or moderately preterm (32-36 weeks), compared with term babies. There are limitations in interpreting this without additional knowledge on whether the baby was growing normally, as being born preterm could be the result of detection of FGR and therefore early induction or CS. When taking into account the baby's birthweight for their gestational age, we found a significantly increased odds of stillbirth when the baby was either small for GA or large for GA. Several similar case-control studies that include a measure of GA also found high risk of stillbirth in preterm babies [18-20], and Recent modelling estimates suggest that 74% of stillbirths globally are among preterm babies, while a quarter of stillborn babies born at term were SGA[21]. Both preterm and SGA increase a babies'

vulnerability predisposing them to risk of both stillbirth and newborn death and longer-term consequences including stunting, disability, and non-communicable diseases.

Almost half of all babies in the case-control study were below 2500 grams – whether this is due to FGR or other factors is important to investigate for future stillbirth and neonatal mortality prevention in Cambodia, but also to improve longer term outcomes. Moreover, preterm, small for GA and stillbirth outcomes can also increase the risk of similar adverse outcomes in the next pregnancy so identifying and managing these risks will be critical to prevent future poor birth outcomes.[22]

Around a quarter of the stillborn babies in our study had a non-vertex presentation – the majority being breech. This led to almost four times greater risk of stillbirth compared with vertex presentation. Around two-thirds of breech babies were delivered vaginally in this facility, which warrants further examination on their management to understand why so many are leading to poor outcomes. Breech vaginal births can increase the risk of stillbirth and the current recommendation is to conduct CS for term breech presentation [23]. However, for pre-term breech births this remains contested, although CS appears to lower the risk of perinatal mortality in high income settings.[24] Nevertheless, consideration needs to be taken before recommending planned CS for breech presentations in low resource settings to avoid placing women or their baby at risk of additional complications due to the surgery and where there may be insufficient skills for CS.[25]

A history of stillbirth is a well-known risk factor for subsequent stillbirth which can increase the chance of stillbirth by four-fold or more[26]. It is therefore important to identify such women during their subsequent pregnancies to ensure closer monitoring and management to prevent recurrent stillbirths. Our study also showed an over three-fold increase in stillbirth among women who had a previous loss when we limited our analysis to women with a previous pregnancy. Many similar case-control analyses to ours do not exclude first time mothers from the sample used in the regression

analysis which makes interpretation less reliable as these women have not had a previous pregnancy [20, 27, 28].

The overall CS rate in the case control sample was 27% and among stillbirths it was 21% and we found that having a CS was protective and reduced the chance of stillbirth by almost half. Among similar studies in the literature there is variation in terms of whether CS shows a protective effect[29] or increases stillbirth risk[18]. An increased risk could be attributable to a range of factors including delayed access to obstetric care or insufficient skills or resources to manage complications, as it is well established that CS reduces perinatal mortality when conducted appropriately in settings that are adequately resourced and skilled providers available[30].

One concerning finding regarding CS from our study was among the indications for CS for stillbirth we found that for almost 13% of stillbirths delivered by CS the indication documented was fetal death. Fetal death should not be a reason for CS unless there are other life-threatening complications to the mother. It is particularly the case if the stillbirth occurs in the antepartum period, as this places the woman at unnecessary risk of morbidity and further complications.[31] Additional inquiry into whether these CS were warranted may be required to ensure women are not placed at unnecessary risk.

We also found that among all stillbirths (intrapartum and antepartum) in this study, resuscitation attempts were very low compared with live births. Resuscitation has been shown to reduce the risk of both perinatal and neonatal mortality and current recommendations suggest that resuscitation should be attempted on every intrapartum stillborn baby.[4, 32] It is possible that resuscitation may have been attempted but was not recorded; however, this requires further exploration to ensure that no opportunity to save a baby is missed.

Study strengths and limitations

Our study has several strengths – it presents one of the first published data on stillbirth in Cambodia, adding to the dearth of literature on this for the country. Moreover, we used routine data in a setting where over 90% of births occur in health facilities. We have a very large sample size over a four-year period from a large national maternity hospital which provides greater confidence in the findings and reducing the chance of errors. Our analysis also demonstrates the use of multiple imputation methods to address missing data on gestational age which can be applied to other similar routine data in LMIC. Missing data for gestational age is currently a major challenge in routine facility data in low resource settings[33] yet has important implications for stillbirth - for defining stillbirth and its use as a proxy for measuring FGR and preterm births.

Our study has several limitations in relation to the study design, variables available and the quality of routine data. This is single facility-based study and is therefore not representative at any geographic level. Being a referral facility, it is also likely to receive all high-risk cases which can bias the findings. We were unable to control for several important factors including socio-demographic determinants such as mother's education and socio-economic status both of which are known risk factors for stillbirth. Our measure of mother's residence as either urban or rural was also imprecise given the information available and be why we did not find any association as rural residence is commonly associated with increased stillbirth risk.

We had a large amount of missing data for some variables especially gestational age and although we addressed this using multiple imputation, this also has its limitations. Also because of this, we could not report on late gestation stillbirths from 28 weeks or more which is recommended for international comparisons.

Several other important factors were also not considered due to lack of or incomplete data or because the timing of the variable was unknown (e.g. for maternal conditions) including women's antenatal care visits or content, referral status and use of obstetric interventions (e.g partograph) as

well as clinical factors including maternal or fetal complications. We could not report directly on infections and used vaginal discharge as a proxy of possible infection although interpretation of this is limited and we have no knowledge on whether women received treatment for these or not. Syphilis and HIV testing are done routinely in Cambodia but there is no documentation of syphilis and HIV status at NMCHC [34] – these infections are important causes of stillbirth [7] and so need to be quantified and women treated as early as possible.

The distinction of stillbirth timing as fresh and macerated using assessment of skin condition can be inaccurate and so limits the interpretation of the proportions of antepartum and intrapartum stillbirths. Ideally, vital signs and fetal heart sounds on admission should be used to differentiate between these [4], however we found that this data was of very low quality and inconsistent in routine records at NMCHC. There are various issues that can affect this data including available equipment to assess fetal heart sounds accurately and health provider skills in using these, as well as intentional misclassification to avoid blame.

Conclusions and recommendations

Our study has quantified and identified factors associated with stillbirth in Cambodia using routine health facility data for the first time. Improved management of preterm births, and detection and management of SGA earlier in pregnancy as well as closer monitoring of women with history of stillbirth and aged over 35 years will be imperative for future stillbirth prevention in Cambodia. Further research is needed to understand the increase in stillbirths at this tertiary maternity hospital during 2017-20 and beyond and whether this is attributed to referrals of high-risk pregnancies, related to quality of care, or other reasons. A recent study in three provinces in Cambodia measuring knowledge of intrapartum care among skilled birth attendants found low levels of knowledge [35]. Review of the management of breech births in this facility is also needed. Future studies in Cambodia with a prospective design to capture all key factors and particularly infections such as HIV

and syphilis and including a qualitative component can provide further data in the short-term.

Strengthening the quality of facility data overall and gestational age should be emphasised to better inform future stillbirth prevention.

Declarations

Ethics approval

The study has received ethical approval from the National Ethics Committee for Health Research in Cambodia (# 153/19; amendment # 294/20) and the Institutional Review Board at the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Belgium (#1317/19).

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available as they are part of a hospital patient record database of the National Maternal and Child Health Centre in Cambodia. The authors do not have permission or approval to share this database beyond the investigators involved in the study.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Funding

This study received funding from the Belgian Directorate-General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian aid (DGD). Aliko Christou is funded by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) for a postdoctoral fellowship (number 1294322N). The funders were not involved in the study design; in the collection, analysis, interpretation of data; in the writing of the article; or in the decision to submit for publication.

Author contributions

TD, MM, AI and KR conceptualised the study and secured funding. AC led the writing of the manuscript with critical comments provided by TD, LB, and MM. MM, TD, AN, SS, and NI oversaw data collection and data cleaning. AC and JM conducted the analysis with guidance from TD and LB. All authors have reviewed and approved the final version.

List of Abbreviations

AGA – appropriate for gestational age, aOR – adjusted odds ratio, CI – confidence interval, CS – Caesarean section, FGR – fetal growth restriction, GA – Gestational age, HL – Hosmer Lemeshow, LGA – large for gestational age, LMIC- Low- and middle-income country, NMCHC – National Maternal and Child Health Centre, SGA – small for gestational age, uOR – unadjusted odds ratio, WHO – World Health Organisation

References

1. Hug L, You D, Blencowe H, Mishra A, Wang Z, Fix MJ, Wakefield J, Moran AC, Gaigbe-Togbe V, Suzuki E *et al*: **Global, regional, and national estimates and trends in stillbirths from 2000 to 2019: a systematic assessment.** *The Lancet* 2021, **398**(10302):772-785.

2. UN IGME, UNICEF, WHO, World Bank, United Nations: **Never Forgotten The situation of stillbirth around the globe. Report of the United Nations Interagency Group for Child Mortality Estimation, 2022**. In. New York: UNICEF; 2023.
3. WHO: **Every Newborn: an Action Plan to End Preventable Deaths**. In. Geneva: WHO; 2014.
4. IGME, UNICEF, LSHTM: **Stillbirth Definition and Data Quality Assessment for Health Management Information Systems (HMIS): A guideline**. In. New York: UNICEF; 2022.
5. WHO: **ICD-11 for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics**. In.: WHO; 2023.
6. Pattinson R, Kerber K, Buchmann E, Friberg IK, Belizan M, Lansky S, Weissman E, Mathai M, Rudan I, Walker N *et al*: **Stillbirths: how can health systems deliver for mothers and babies?** *Lancet* 2011, **377**(9777):1610-1623.
7. Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Waiswa P, Amouzou A, Mathers C, Hogan D, Flenady V, Froen JF, Qureshi ZU, Calderwood C *et al*: **Stillbirths: rates, risk factors, and acceleration towards 2030**. *Lancet* 2016, **387**(10018):587-603.
8. National Institute of Statistics (NIS) Ministry of Health (MoH) Cambodia, ICF: **Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey 2021–22 Key Indicators Report**. In. Phnom Penh, Cambodia and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NIS, MoH, and ICF.; 2022.
9. Rambliere L, de Lauzanne A, Diouf J-B, Zo AZ, Landau M, Herindrainy P, Hivernaud D, Sarr FD, Sok T, Vray M: **Stillbirths and neonatal mortality in LMICs: A community-based mother-infant cohort study**. *Journal of global health* 2023, **13**.
10. National Institute of Statistics MoP, Cambodia;: **Report of Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey 2019/20**. In. Phnom Penh: National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning; 2020.
11. Koum K, Hy S, Tiv S, Sieng T, Obara H, Matsui M, Fujita N: **Characteristics of antepartum and intrapartum eclampsia in the National Maternal and Child Health Center in Cambodia**. *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Research* 2004, **30**(2):74-79.
12. **National Maternal and Child Health Center (NMCHC) Cambodia** [<https://nmchc.gov.kh/en/>]

13. DHS program: **Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey 2014**. In.: National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning and Ministry of Health; 2015.
14. Hirst JE, Arbuckle SM, Do TM, Ha LT, Jeffery HE: **Epidemiology of stillbirth and strategies for its prevention in Vietnam**. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2010, **110**(2):109-113.
15. Giang HTN, Bechtold-Dalla Pozza S, Tran HT, Ulrich S: **Stillbirth and preterm birth and associated factors in one of the largest cities in central Vietnam**. *Acta paediatrica* 2019, **108**(4):630-636.
16. Chhim S, Ku G, Mao S, Put WVD, Damme WV, Ir P, Chhea C, Or V: **Descriptive assessment of COVID-19 responses and lessons learnt in Cambodia, January 2020 to June 2022**. *BMJ Global Health* 2023, **8**(5):e011885.
17. Gold KJ, Abdul-Mumin AR, Boggs ME, Opare-Addo HS, Lieberman RW: **Assessment of "fresh" versus "macerated" as accurate markers of time since intrauterine fetal demise in low-income countries**. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2014, **125**(3):223-227.
18. Abebe H, Shitu S, Workye H, Mose A: **Predictors of stillbirth among women who had given birth in Southern Ethiopia, 2020: A case-control study**. *PLOS ONE* 2021, **16**(5):e0249865.
19. Egbe TO, Ewane EN, Tendongfor N: **Stillbirth rates and associated risk factors at the Buea and Limbe regional hospitals, Cameroon: a case-control study**. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2020, **20**(1):75.
20. Okonofua FE, Ntoimo LFC, Ogu R, Galadanci H, Mohammed G, Adetoye D, Abe E, Okike O, Agholor K, Abdus-salam R *et al*: **Prevalence and determinants of stillbirth in Nigerian referral hospitals: a multicentre study**. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2019, **19**(1):533.
21. Lawn JE, Ohuma EO, Bradley E, Idueta LS, Hazel E, Okwaraji YB, Erchick DJ, Yargawa J, Katz J, Lee ACC *et al*: **Small babies, big risks: global estimates of prevalence and mortality for vulnerable newborns to accelerate change and improve counting**. *The Lancet* 2023, **401**(10389):1707-1719.

22. Bane S, Simard JF, Wall-Wieler E, Butwick Alexander J, Carmichael SL: **Subsequent risk of stillbirth, preterm birth, and small for gestational age: A cross-outcome analysis of adverse birth outcomes.** *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2022, **36**(6):815-823.
23. Hannah ME, Hannah WJ, Hewson SA, Hodnett ED, Saigal S, Willan AR: **Planned caesarean section versus planned vaginal birth for breech presentation at term: a randomised multicentre trial. Term Breech Trial Collaborative Group.** *Lancet* 2000, **356**(9239):1375-1383.
24. Bergenhenegouwen L, Vlemmix F, Ensing S, Schaaf J, van der Post J, Abu-Hanna A, Ravelli ACJ, Mol BW, Kok M: **Preterm Breech Presentation: A Comparison of Intended Vaginal and Intended Cesarean Delivery.** *Obstetrics and gynecology* 2015, **126**(6):1223-1230.
25. Sandall J, Tribe RM, Avery L, Mola G, Visser GHA, Homer CSE, Gibbons D, Kelly NM, Kennedy HP, Kidanto H *et al*: **Short-term and long-term effects of caesarean section on the health of women and children.** *The Lancet* 2018, **392**(10155):1349-1357.
26. Lamont K, Scott NW, Jones GT, Bhattacharya S: **Risk of recurrent stillbirth: systematic review and meta-analysis.** *Bmj* 2015, **350**:h3080.
27. Lema G, Mremi A, Amsi P, Pyuza JJ, Alloyce JP, McHome B, Mlay P: **Placental pathology and maternal factors associated with stillbirth: An institutional based case-control study in Northern Tanzania.** *PLOS ONE* 2021, **15**(12):e0243455.
28. Tolefac PN, Tamambang RF, Yeika E, Mbwagbaw LT, Egbe TO: **Ten years analysis of stillbirth in a tertiary hospital in sub-Sahara Africa: a case control study.** *BMC research notes* 2017, **10**:1-6.
29. 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.
30. Darmstadt GL, Yakoob MY, Haws RA, Menezes EV, Soomro T, Bhutta ZA: **Reducing stillbirths: interventions during labour.** *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2009, **9 Suppl 1**(1):S6.

31. Zethof S, Christou A, Benova L, van Roosmalen J, van den Akker T: **"Too much, too late": data on stillbirths to improve interpretation of caesarean section rates.** *Bull World Health Organ* 2022, **100**(4):289-291.
32. Patel A, Khatib MN, Kurhe K, Bhargava S, Bang A: **Impact of neonatal resuscitation trainings on neonatal and perinatal mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis.** *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2017, **1**(1):e000183.
33. Miller L, Wanduru P, Santos N, Butrick E, Waiswa P, Otieno P, Walker D: **Working with what you have: How the East Africa Preterm Birth Initiative used gestational age data from facility maternity registers.** *PLOS ONE* 2020, **15**(8):e0237656.
34. Delvaux T, Ouk V, Samreth S, Yos S, Tep R, Pall C, Keo V, Deng S, Khin Cho WH, Hul S *et al*: **Challenges and outcomes of implementing a national syphilis follow-up system for the elimination of congenital syphilis in Cambodia: a mixed-methods study.** *BMJ Open* 2023, **13**(1):e063261.
35. Matsui M, Saito Y, Po R, Taing B, Nhek C, Tung R, Masaki Y, Iwamoto A: **Knowledge on intrapartum care practices among skilled birth attendants in Cambodia—a cross-sectional study.** *Reproductive Health* 2021, **18**(1):115.