

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)
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.	This manuscript addresses an important public health issue by exploring the accessibility and utilization of contraceptive methods among youths. The study provides significant insights into the factors influencing contraceptive use and offers data that can guide policy and program development. The methodology is clear and scientifically robust, and the results contribute meaningfully to the existing body of knowledge. Importance of the manuscript for the scientific community: This study is crucial for understanding the barriers to contraceptive use among young people and highlights the role of service quality in addressing these barriers. The findings are particularly relevant for designing interventions in similar contexts globally.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is appropriate and reflects the content of the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract is clear and summarizes the key aspects of the study effectively. However, including specific statistical findings in the abstract would enhance its comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unstructured introduction: The <i>Introduction</i> section lacks clarity and logical flow. The importance of the study and its objectives should be clearly presented at the end of the <i>Introduction</i> to guide readers on the research focus. - Data presentation: Table 1 in the <i>Results</i> section needs detailed captions. For example, "Access Score" is mentioned in the table but not explained in the <i>Methodology</i>. Add captions that define terms such as "Access Score" and explain how these metrics were derived. 	
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>1. Methodology issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The definitions of key research variables are insufficient and lack clarity. Specifically, the variables <i>Health Facility Accessibility</i>, <i>Quality of Service</i>, <i>Academic Level</i>, and <i>Marital Status</i> require detailed explanations in the <i>Methodology</i> section. - The sampling strategy should specify whether the selected youths are representative of the population in terms of demographics or socio-economic background. Clarify how participants were chosen. - The survey period and scope should be clarified to ensure representativeness. For example, "Survey was conducted in 398 youths" lacks specifics about the time frame and seasonality considerations. <p>2. Statistical analysis (Page 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some conclusions, such as "quality of services significantly affects contraceptive utilization," are unsupported by specific p-values, confidence intervals, or odds ratios. Include these metrics to improve the scientific rigor. - The manuscript currently lacks robust multivariable analysis to account for the combined effect of variables. This is critical to identify independent predictors of contraceptive use while controlling for confounding factors. <p>3. Results section:</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>- Add a table summarizing the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the study participants. This will provide a clear overview of the sample population and ensure transparency.</p> <p>- Table 1 does not include p-values, which are crucial for determining the statistical significance of the differences between groups. Without these values, it is challenging to assess the relationships between the variables and contraceptive use. It is recommended to add p-values for each variable to enhance the interpretability of the findings.</p> <p>- Currently, Tables 2, 3, and 4 appear to be direct copies of SPSS outputs, which lack scientific rigor in presentation. To enhance readability and professionalism, consider the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the beta coefficients (β) for logistic regression analyses. • Report the Odds Ratio (OR) with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) for each variable. • Include exact p-values instead of relying on general significance levels <p>- The all tables lack detailed captions or footnotes explaining the variables and statistical metrics presented. This makes it difficult for readers to fully understand the results. For example, Table 1 should include explanations for all abbreviations, statistical tests used, and the criteria for significance. Clear and comprehensive captions will improve the readability and scientific rigor of the manuscript.</p> <p>- Some results lack appropriate statistical verification. For example: The claim that "quality of services significantly affects contraceptive utilization" should be supported by specific p-values or logistic regression models.</p> <p>- Findings related to gender differences need deeper analysis to explain why females are 3.47 times more likely to use contraceptives.</p> <p>4. Discussion section:</p> <p>- The <i>Discussion</i> does not adequately compare the findings with similar studies. For instance, while the role of service quality is highlighted, it lacks references to studies in similar socio-economic contexts to validate these claims.</p> <p>- Certain points in the <i>Discussion</i> repeat results without offering deeper insights. For instance: <i>"Service quality is a critical determinant of contraceptive utilization among youths"</i> should be expanded with examples of how poor service quality impacts outcomes in similar settings.</p> <p>- Weak Limitations section (Page 10): The <i>Limitations</i> section should address potential biases in self-reported data and explain whether the study design accounted for these biases. For example, participants' perceptions of affordability may not align with actual financial constraints.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Additional references should support key arguments, such as the discussion on "quality of service."</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical adjustments are recommended for better readability.</p> <p>- For example: <i>"Proximity to facilities does not influence utilization rates"</i> can be rewritten as: <i>"The study found no statistically significant relationship between proximity to facilities and contraceptive utilization rates ($p > 0.05$)."</i></p> <p>- Some sentences are lengthy and challenging to comprehend, such as: <i>"The accessibility to contraceptive services was evaluated using a composite score developed from various parameters including proximity, availability, and affordability."</i> This sentence should be split, with clear definitions for "parameters."</p> <p>- The use of terminology is inconsistent. For example, "family planning services" and "contraceptive methods" are used interchangeably without clear definitions.</p> <p>- Typographical errors: For instance, "utilization" is misspelled as "utilization" in the <i>Results</i>.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into a critical area of public health. Including practical recommendations based on the findings would strengthen its impact.</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>Nguyen Thi Hong Hanh</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Hanoi National University of Education, Vietnam</p>