Author’s response to reviews

Title: Modern contraceptive use among sexually active men in Uganda: Does discussion with a health worker matter?

Authors:

Allen Kabagenyi Ms. (allenka79@yahoo.com)
Patricia Ndugga Ms. (patnduggab@yahoo.com)
Stephen Ojiambo Wandera Mr. (swandera@gmail.com)
Betty Kwagala Dr. (kkwagala@gmail.com)

Version: 5  Date: 27 February 2014

Author’s response to reviews: see over
February 27, 2014

Public Health
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Dear Review Board:

We are grateful for your continued support of our enclosed manuscript. This study is one for the few to examine men’s role in reproductive health decision making which is important in understanding fertility control in low developing countries. This manuscript is based on secondary data analysis of a large and rigorously conducted survey.

With regard to the additional requests we have made the changes and a point-by-point response to the Editors comments follows on the next page. In addition, Ednaz edited the manuscript for professional copyedit.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Allen Kabagenyi
(Corresponding Author)

Co-Authors:
Patria Ndugga
Stephen Ojiambo Wandera
Betty Kwagala
Dear authors,

Thank you for your revised submission, which is a good attempt to respond to the reviewers' concerns. However, there are a number of key issues outstanding.

1. Both reviewers outlined their concerns with the ambiguity of your outcome/dependent variable: modern contraceptive use. This remains unclear. For example, under Variables page 7 you say the question wording was 'any method other than condom'. However the coding frame you report directly below includes condoms. Please clarify what MCU constitutes in this study.

We apologies for leaving modern contraceptive use (MCU) the dependent variable unclear. MCU was derived from MV312 as defined in the survey dataset. MV312 records any methods including condom although information on condom use is collected through separate questions as indicated in the attachment.

We have deleted condom use and it remains as; “respondents were asked if they or their partner’s had used any method to avoid or prevent a pregnancy the last time they had sex, and the method used (see Annex1)”.

2. There is still a great deal of inconsistency in the way that you describe the outcome variable more generally, i.e. ‘men’s contraceptive use’. What the reviewers pointed out is that your dependent variable data is not just men’s contraceptive use but also that of their partners as reported by men. This is acknowledged in the abstract but not elsewhere in the manuscript – see also results section of abstract where you state ‘modern contraceptive use among men’. See conclusion where it is described as male contraceptive use. Could you consider consistently using ‘men’s reported use of contraception and men’s reportage of their partner’s use of contraception’?

We have thoroughly edited the document and ensured consistency in the write up of the depended variable to reflect men’s reported use of contraception and men’s reportage of their partners’ use of contraception.

3. Direction and causality

Under limitations please add more explicitly: The authors assumed that discussing family planning with a health worker prompted contraceptive use but the reverse could also have been true, that using contraception may have prompted discussion of contraception with a health worker.
Also the conclusion should only refer to the strength of the association rather than causation.

These have been refined as suggested and included the association with discussion of health workers.

4. Page 6 Please change 'we also examined a series of men's factors' to 'we also examined a series of individual level factors'

This has been changed as suggested.

5. Please note also that the entire document should also be professionally copyedited.

We submitted the manuscript for copyedit to Edanz as per your recommendation.