

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJTDH_127585 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Accessibility on utilization of contraceptive methods among youths: an analytical cross-sectional study in Westlands Sub County, Nairobi County. |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>The study addresses a critical issue in public health by focusing on contraceptive utilization among youths in a developing nation. It aligns with Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 3 (Good Health and Well-being) and contributes to addressing global health inequities. And its findings can inform youth-friendly healthcare policies and advocate for enhanced accessibility to contraceptives, but it has some drawbacks; -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Although utilization is essential, the study could have <u>explored barriers to access more comprehensively, such as cultural stigma or provider bias.</u> ⇒ Methodological weaknesses (Major concerns);- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Your abstract shows that the design has both qualitative and quantitative data, but no section of your result presents the qualitative part??? ○ You used regression analysis but, no mentioned in abstract section or elsewhere ○ What contents were there in your data collection tool ? ○ Why you used Sloven's formula, is your population appropriate for this sample size formula? ○ Sampling: pparticipants were sampled from those already seeking services at health facilities, introducing a selection bias as it excludes youths not accessing healthcare services, who might face greater barriers to contraceptive utilization ○ The methods do not mention whether the questionnaire was pre-tested or validated before use, which could affect the reliability and validity of the data collected. ⇒ The methods do not provide a clear breakdown of the demographic characteristics of the sample population (e.g., gender distribution or education levels), which could inform sample representativeness. ⇒ It is unclear if the study differentiated between contraceptive users and non-users when collecting data, which could affect the granularity of the analysis ⇒ the methods mention only descriptive statistics and the chi-square test; there is no mention of multivariate analyses. Without controlling for confounders, the study may oversimplify relationships between variables | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>Yes, its suitable</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> | <p><i>Dear author, your abstract provides a clear and concise summary of the study but lacks some depth in context and interpretation of findings. Addressing these issues would enhance its impact and provide a more compelling snapshot of the research;</i> <i>The background lacks depth:- better to provide a brief context on why contraceptive utilization among youths is particularly low in the study area and why it is significant for public health</i></p> <p><i>Add more context to the results, such as: A brief explanation of why quality of services was significant and why accessibility was not. A summary of key demographic trends (e.g., higher usage among females and educated youths).</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion : should be more specific about how demographic factors and service quality influence utilization, and suggest how the findings could inform practical interventions.</i></p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p><i>Good but better misses some subsection like Sociodemographic characteristics at result section</i></p> | |
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p><i>With some modifiable drawbacks,(especially in methods section) this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it employs a well-designed cross-sectional study to address an important public health issue—contraceptive utilization among youths in an urban Kenyan setting. The use of systematic and simple random sampling ensures representativeness, while the large sample size (398 participants) provides adequate statistical power for reliable findings. Appropriate statistical methods, including chi-square tests and logistic regression, are used to analyze relationships between variables, enhancing the validity of the results. Furthermore, the study adheres to ethical guidelines and provides actionable insights, making it a valuable contribution to the field of reproductive health.</i></p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p><i>there are areas where improvements could enhance its comprehensiveness and relevance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Overrepresentation of Certain Regions like Ethiopia (e.g., references 1, 7, 8, 11); - Underrepresentation of Male Perspectives; - Limited Focus on Youth-Friendly Services: while the manuscript discusses youth-friendly services as a crucial aspect, the references do not adequately reflect recent research on strategies to improve service delivery for young people | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Hailu Chare Koyra</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia</p> |