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Can community health workers increase modern contraceptive use among young married women? A cross-sectional study in rural Niger.

Introduction

1. What is this paper about?
Comments: The paper addressed clearly the purpose.

2. Why is the paper needed?
Comment: the rationale is not strong. Authors need to build on that section. They could do this by bringing out clearly the problem(s) associated with access and utilization of modern contraceptive in Niger, which the CHWs' visits could provide solution to. And even more importantly how this study will add to the reports of studies and evaluations in this area.

3. What is the question that the study seeks to answer?
Comment: the question was concisely stated.

Methods

1. Are the methods used clearly stated?
Comment: Not clearly stated. Authors need to state clearly how they got to the respondents, which should be a multistage procedure; stating at every stage the specific sampling technique used. E.g.

Need to specify which sampling technique was used (e.g., simple random sampling) rather than simply stating random sampling
48 villages were selected out of how many villages. Need to specify total number of villages in the Dosso region of Niger.

Key variables: May need citation for the definition of LAM as a modern method as it differs. Some authors categorize it as a traditional method (Festin vs. Hubacher).

Data analysis: Why did they control for the CHW visit, which is a main independent variable? Not clearly stated. Why did they use 0.2 as a significance level?

2. Are they appropriate to the study?

Comment: The statistical tools used are appropriate.

Findings

1. Does the paper report on the findings in relation to each of the research questions? Comment: Yes, the findings are reported in relation to the research question. However, we suggest following changes to make it clearer.

Table 1 might require revision, as it includes more than required information that Table 1 should have.

Table 3 has to be the place of Table 2 and Table 2 as Table 3. Analytical report could be reported after all the descriptive reports are reported.

2. Are the answers clear and convincing?

Comment:
Could categorize the parity variable into <+2 and >2, no need to specify % for "No" as it will be self-understood.

Table 3 has to be Table 2 and Table 2 as Table 3

May need to report aORs and p-values for main outcome estimates under the result section. Might cut-down the descriptive results and refer results to the respective tables.

There are no chi-square results stated under the results section, even though authors specify it under the methodology section.

The last para under the results should be before the analytic part.

Place all tables and figures at the end of the manuscript.
Discussion

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

2. Are the interpretations of the findings stated?
Comment: No interpretations of the findings are not stated that made the discussion scanty and results are duplicated.

3. Are the findings compared with the findings from other studies?
Comment: yes

4. Are the strengths and weaknesses stated?
Comment: They stated the weaknesses but strengths were not discussed.

5. Are the implications of the findings for research and action stated?
Comments: The implications were not stated under the discussion.

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?

Comment: Yes

References

1. Do they match the text
Comment: Yes

2. Are they credible
Comment: Yes
3. Are they recent?
Comment: Yes

4. Are they correctly stated?
Comment: Yes, but the in-text citation does not follow the Vancouver style (requirement of the journal as stated in the website).
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