Reviewer’s report

Title: Sexuality, fertility and family planning characteristics of married women aged 15 to 19 years in Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania: a comparative analysis of cross-sectional data

Version: 0 Date: 11 Oct 2018

Reviewer: Venkatraman Chandra-Mouli

Reviewer’s report:

Overall good job. However, there are some concerns that we suggest gets addressed before the publication.

* The rationale of the study is not strong. It's not clear why the cross-county comparison and/or evaluation was done, beside that the A360 program was rolled out across those 3 countries (Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania).

* The question that the study seeks to answer is not well stated.

* Reference is required for the modern contraception definition.

* It will be good to specify the factors that were used to assess sexuality, fertility and family planning characteristics of married women under the method section.

* Table 1

  - Include age as a continuous variable and present mean (SD)
  - For the categorical variables, it will be good to present median (IQR) for each category in addition to the overall.
  - Specify the numbers in the parentheses as n (%) in a heading column to make it clearer.
  - Table requires formatting to meet the journal requirement.

* Table 2

  - Mean (SD) for continuous variables (age at first sexual intercourse, age at first birth
  - There is a little confusion over the unmet need for modern contraception. In the method section, authors have mentioned that they used DHS definition (mainly retrospective) for unmet need. However, in the results (Table 2, footnote) it seems that both prospective and retrospective definitions were used to assess the unmet need. Please keep it consistent.
In the first paragraph of the discussion, authors have stated injectables as long-acting reversible contraceptive method. Generally, implants and IUDs are only included under this category. Also, do not introduce new findings in the discussion (e.g., % of women using long-acting methods among women who used modern contraceptive methods), and avoid duplicating the results.

Need to compare findings with the other studies. It's compared but it is not sufficient.

Introduction

1. What is this paper about?

→ The paper clearly addressed the purpose of the study.

2. Why is the paper needed?

→ The rationale of the study is not strong. It's not clear why the cross-county comparison and/or evaluation was done, beside that the A360 program was rolled out across those 3 countries (Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania).

3. What is the question that the study seeks to answer?

→ The question that the study seeks to answer is not well stated.

Methods

1. Are the methods used clearly stated?

→ Yes, but at multiple instances, authors have referred to the other study to assess detailed methodology (e.g., sampling strategy, sample size calculation)

→ Reference required for the modern contraception definition.

→ It will be good to specify the factors that were used to assess sexuality, fertility and family planning characteristics of married women under the method section.

2. Are they appropriate to the study?

→ The statistical tools used are appropriate for the descriptive study.
Findings

1. Does the paper report on the findings in relation to each of the research questions?

→ Yes, the findings are reported in relation to the research question. However, we suggest following changes:

Table 1

* Include age as a continuous variable and present mean (SD)
* For the categorical variables, it will be good to present median (IQR) for each category in addition to the overall.
* Specify the numbers in the parentheses as n (%) in a heading column to make it clearer.
* Table requires formatting to meet the journal requirement.

Table 2

* Mean (SD) for continuous variables (age at first sexual intercourse, age at first birth

2. Are the answers clear and convincing?

→ Not completely

Table 2

* There is a little confusion over the unmet need for modern contraception. In the method section, authors have mentioned that they used DHS definition (mainly retrospective) for unmet need. However, in the results (Table 2, footnote) it seems that both prospective and retrospective definitions were used to assess the unmet need.

Discussion

1. Are the key findings in relation into each research question stated?

→ Yes. However, in the first paragraph of the discussion, authors have stated injectables as long-acting reversible contraceptive method. Generally, implants and IUDs are only included under
this category. Also, do not introduce new findings in the discussion (e.g., % of women using long-acting methods among women who used modern contraceptive methods), and avoid duplicating the results.

2. Are the interpretations of the findings stated?

→ Interpretations of the findings are stated.

3. Are the findings compared with the findings from other studies?

→ Yes, but not sufficient.

4. Are the strengths and weaknesses stated?

→ Strengths and limitations of the study are well stated.

5. Are the implications of the findings for research and action stated?

→ The implications of the findings were stated.

Conclusion

Does this section clearly and concisely state the conclusions of the study in relation to the key question it sought to answer and the contribution that the paper would make?

→ Yes

References

1. Do they match the text

→ Yes

2. Are they credible

→ Yes
3. Are they recent?
   → Yes

4. Are they correctly stated?
   → Yes
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