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Reviewer's report:

I read your manuscript with much interest, however, as I continued to read I got disappointed at the lack of strong argument for this potentially significant paper and many other aspects presented in the paper. detailed comments are below:

Knowledge, attitudes and peer influences related to pregnancy, sexual and reproductive health among adolescents using maternal health services in Ugu, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.

Abstract
You abstract is lacking what is already known about your research…
Line 68: you use sexual and reproductive health, then in the next sentence you use sexual and reproductive healthcare services… I suggest you use "healthcare"
Line 70: I don't really see how/where the SDG fit in your abstract- that sentence feels like its just slumped there with no coherence with the rest of the abstract… Don't get me wrong SGDs are important but the sentence need to add value to your content not just be there!
Line 78: I think this sentence will read better if you say "…. Adolescent attending maternal health services…" rather than "using" as that maybe be confused with the research tool used.
Line 79: Is this a well-known survey? I have never heard of it… I feel it needs to be a explained a little bit or at least state what the survey questions asks about…?
Line 81-83: these 2 sentences have different fonts
Line 87: knowledge questions about/of what?? This goes back to the point above about the survey used which needs some more description…?
Line 89: that sentence sounds more like a conclusion and therefore not fitting in the results paragraph.
Line 95-97: where is that conclusion drawn from? Results indicative of that conclusion are not presented and therefore hard to understand the conclusion!

Introduction
Line 118: I wouldn't say "…often neglected" but rather "not prioritized"
Line 120: "restrictive laws"... such as???
Line 134: why is this [:] here???
Line 135-137: I'm not sure what that sentence/ what is the point the author trying to put across by adding this sentence…?
Line 135-140: that's is what is needed for the brief description of the survey used…

Methods
General comment: The authors make assumptions that the reader knows about the HPKS as they have not described it sufficiently, nor have they described the components of their adapted version! Check your grammar and sentence completeness. A copy of the questionnaire used would be helpful...

Line 192: the sentence does not sound right...
Line 194: which larger study?? This is the first time you make mention of a larger study- how does that fit into your own study??
Line 193-194: this could potentially cause confusion… you had mentioned a piloting in the paragraph above and now you are mentioning another piloting- its best you focus on things and measures/methods used in your specific study otherwise you are losing me as the reader.

Results
Line 265: "of" is missing between half and the participants
Very poorly presented tables, consider revising them. Also, too many frequency tables- with this kind of sample, how can you not take the opportunity of good test statistics and present those in more details, scientifically… I would suggest the authors to try and collapse some tables together and present them in better way, scientifically! A demographic table showing characteristics of the participants is missing or presented in a way that is not helpful to the reader. Tables need to have enough information so that they can be self-explanatory, at the moment for example in table 10, one has to figure out what is in brackets- CI, or …???

No explanation of the results whatsoever!

Discussion
This section does not even come close to discussing the results presented here…nor are the results being compared with current or previous research, except for few instances! This section reads like a plain lit review chapter… where the results are attempted to be discussed, it's a repetition of what was presented in the results section. What are implications of your findings? What are they telling us? What should be done/ recommendations? What are the limitations of a cross-sectional survey, convenience sampling???
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