



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_37743
Title of the Manuscript:	Contraceptive Practices Among Married Women of Reproductive Age Group in Ogbomoso Metropolis, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 7: Author(s) wrote“Unplanned pregnancy and the resultant illegal abortion” This statement needs to be revised because not all unplanned pregnancies end in abortion as author(s) statement suggests. Line 10: Author(s) wrote “The reduction of these would bring to the barest minimum the upsurge of maternal mortality and infant mortality rates”. Author(s) need to rephrase this statement in the line of the contribution of unplanned pregnancies to maternal and infant mortality because there several other factors that contribute to maternal and infant mortality. Line 15: Author(s) wrote “multi-staged”. It should be written as multi-stage without the “d” at the end of stage. Line 16: Author(s) wrote “Women who were divorced, widows and those who refused to participate were excluded from the study”. Since author(s) decided to list those who were excluded, there is need for the list to be exhaustive. Were single (never married) women included in the sample? If not please state that clearly Line 23: Author(s) wrote “significant relationship between 23 contraceptive practices and religion, likewise occupation.” Author(s) should change relationship to association. Furthermore, since this is the abstract, author(s) need to clearly state the direction of relationship relative to which sub-group. Line 28: Author(s) wrote “as only about one third were currently on a family planning method”. This is different from the 42% early stated in line 21. Author(s) need to decide which is which. Line 41: Author(s) wrote “The current prevalence rate for contraceptive use in Nigeria is approximately 11%–13%”. The reference used by author(s) was a 2010 article. There are more recent literatures in this area, for example, the demographic and health survey published in 2015. Lines 42-44: Author(s) wrote “FP enables couples or family/women to plan when to have children and use birth control to delay (spacing) or number of children FP prevents unwanted pregnancies and reduce the course to abortion.” This statement is difficult to understand because it is not clear. Line 49: Author(s) wrote “among married women of age group [18-49] years”. This is different from 15-49 years as earlier stated in lines 13 and 16 Line 53: Author(s) wrote “reproductive age group (15-49 years)”. Same comment as for line 49 above. Line 57: Author(s) wrote “using Leslie Fischers formular”. Why this was formular used, what was the population size of the study locations, what were the assumptions made and how were the parameters defined. Line 60: Author(s) wrote “Two settlements were selected from the four wards bt” How	The resultant illegal abortion has been removed Line 10 has been changed to Rapid succession of pregnancies has been linked with increase maternal and infant mortality. Therefore, the reduction of unplanned /unwanted pregnancies could bring to the barest minimum the upsurge of maternal mortality Line 15 has been changed to multi-stage Line 16 This “Women who were divorced, widows and those who refused to participate were excluded from the study” has been changed to “Women who were divorced, widowed, single women as well as those who refused to participate were excluded from the study’ Line 23 : Relationship has been changed to association Line 28: One third has been changed to Less than half..... Line 41: a recent prevalence was used Line 42-44 : “FP enables couples or family/women to plan when to have children and use birth control to delay (spacing) or number of children FP prevents unwanted pregnancies and reduce the course to abortion.” changed to FP enables couples to plan when to have children in such a way that couples could either space in between pregnancies or limit the number of children i.e. stop child bearing consciously, and not by chance. Line 49: Has been changed to 15-49 years Line 60: Wards in Ogbomoso already has list of settlements. Line 62-64: changed to Two wards were selected from the two LGAs by simple random sampling making a total of four wards. Two settlements were selected from the four wards by balloting method making a total of eight settlements. A pen was spinned at the imaginary center of the settlements, and sampling started in the direction of the pen. Two houses were omitted in between the houses and sampling continued until the desired number for the settlement was reached. In a house with more than one households (a household for this study included a woman and her children), the interviewed respondents were selected by the use of table of random numbers. Line 67: The questionnaires were interviewer administered. Also, “The questionnaires were interviewer administered after been translated to the local language (Yoruba) and back translated to English Language in order to retain the intended meaning”.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	did author(s) define settlement? I assume author(s) mean “by” where “bt” was written Lines 62-64: Author(s) wrote “Two houses were omitted in between the houses and sampling continued until the desired number for the settlement was reached.” What does “houses” mean? Does it mean buildings/structures or households? This sampling strategy means that some people were systematically prevented from participating in the survey. Meaning they had a zero chance of being selected since this sampling process did not take into account the population size. In places where there were more than one eligible women i.e two married women between 15-49 or 18-49 as the case may be, were both of them interviewed? If not how was the respondent selected. How was difference in population size between the selected settlements accounted for? Line 67: Author(s) wrote “Administered questionnaires were checked for errors”. How the questionnaires were administered (self or interviewer). In what language was the questionnaire, how did you manage respondents who did not understand the language in which the questionnaire was prepared? Line 77: Author(s) wrote “some of the respondents were initially inappropriately predisposed to participate in the study.” What does inappropriately disposed mean exactly? Author(s) should change “are” in line 82 to were Line 85: Author(s) wrote “and IUCD (64.6) is the most known form”. This number is different from what was shown in table 2. Author(s) may wish to reconcile. Lines 92-93: Author(s) wrote “husbands of 198 (49.5%) respondents were 92 aware that their wives are using one form of contraceptives or the other” This statement creates the impression that men were also interviewed, which was not the case. Please rephrase this sentence. Secondly, is there a reason this was not part of any table? Lines 96-97: Author(s) wrote “Table 4 shows that IUCD is the commonest used form of contraceptives among current users 71(42.0%) followed by injectables 46(27.2%), then pills, 29(17.2%).” This statement is in conflict with lines 22-23. Please reconcile. Lines 98: Author(s) wrote “was jointly made in 69, 40.8% respondents”. This needs to be rephrased and numbers presented properly Line 104: Author(s) wrote” each”. Please change to respectively Lines 109-110: Author(s) wrote” it was revealed that religion and occupation of respondents were statistically significant” What does this statement mean exactly? Please verify your numbers in table 7. Line 138: Author(s) wrote “majority of them claimed to know where to obtain.” This statement in addition to being incomplete, has not been previously presented in the result section and as such is new information which cannot be introduced for the first time in the discussion section.	This wrote “some of the respondents were initially inappropriately predisposed to participate in the study changed to The issue of family planning could be very sensitive and confidential, making some of the respondents reluctant to participate in the study initially. Line 82: are changed to were Line The value for IUCD corrected Line 92-93: rephrased from “husbands of 198 (49.5%) respondents were 92 aware that their wives are using one form of contraceptives or the other” to 198 (49.5%) of respondents claimed their husbands were aware about their use of contraceptives, 106 (26.5%) did not inform their husband’s while 96 (24.0%) were not sure if their husbands are aware about their use of contraception or not. The table also added. Line 96-97- The values reconciled Line 104: Each changed to respectively Line 109-110- Rephrased Line 138 : Rephrased and table Added . Line 139-140- Table added to result section Line 145-151- Statement supported by tables in the result section. Line 156- Citation provided Line 157-159- Statement removed Line 1710171- Statement confirmed and removed Lie 178-179- statement on the study from Jimna removed Line 181-184 Sentences removed as they did not go in the flow os the discussion. Line 186-187- Citation referenced. Minute changed to almost half Line 192-193- “In this study in which just about half of the participants’ spouses knew whether their wives were using or not using any form of contraceptive” changed to In this study, just about half of the participants’ spouses knew whether their wives were using or not using any form of contraceptive. Line 196 : Statement confirmed and adjusted Line 199-200: Statement confirmed and adjusted. Line 205-208: “In this study, it was observed that two third of Islamic respondents were not on any form of contraceptive, which was statistically significant. This is comparable with another study done in another study where there was no significant difference in the practice of different religious groups to family planning.” changed to This is quite different from the outcome from another study done in another study where there was no significant difference in the practice of different religious groups to family planning. Thank you for this thorough constructive review.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 139-140: Author(s) wrote “The highest source of information about family planning as found in this study was through the health workers, followed by radio, television and friends.” This again is new detail as source of FP information had not been previously presented in the results section. Furthermore, author(s) concluded in lines 141 and 142 that this is due to ante-natal or immunization interactions. This may not be the case since there a several other avenues for respondents to have made contacts with health providers. Line 142: Author(s) wrote “If enhanced, attitudinal change could be effected.” This statement is incomplete and as such not clear. Lines 145-147: Author(s) wrote “Majority of the respondents knew Government hospitals as a place where contraceptives could be obtained.....,” This again, is new information that is not supported by the data presented by author(s). Author(s) should either remove this statement or present it in the results section as well Lines 150-151: Author(s) wrote “Most of the respondents had the understanding that family planning could help prevent an unwanted pregnancy” Another statement not supported by the data presented by author(s) Line 156: Author(s) wrote “This is similar to the finding in a similar study in Saudi Arabia where the understanding of how to use oral contraceptive pills was very low” Author(s) did not provide a citation for this reference. Lines 161-162: Author(s) wrote “In this study, there was a difference in the knowledge of contraceptives among the respondents as regards various religious bodies.” The only test performed by author(s) was a chi-squared test and it only examined current contraceptive use. How did author(s) come about this conclusion? Lines 167-169: Author(s) wrote “If a reorientation of this particular religious caste is not done, contraceptives use by them will perpetually be null and this will undoubtedly lead to increase birth rate and mortality rates in the country.” This statement is completely at variance with the results presented by author(s) in table 7. Lines 170-171: Author(s) wrote “It was observed that the educational status of respondents also significantly determine their knowledge about contraceptives” Again, this statement is not supported by the data presented. Secondly, the only test performed as presented in table 7 did not show any association between education and contraceptive use. This is also followed by faulty deductions in lines 172 to 176. Furthermore, education has not been associated with intelligence as insinuated by author(s). People who do not have formal education could be counselled about contraceptives in their local language. Lines 178-179: Author(s) wrote “This is similar to another study done in Jinma where almost all the participants wished they had the opportunity to be more enlightened about contraceptives.” Author(s) did not provide a citation for this study referenced. Lines 181-182: Author(s) wrote “This might be due to the unpalatable experiences they or someone close to them have witnessed with contraceptives” This statement appears to be discussing another study different from author(s) current study. Lines 183-184: Author(s) wrote “Spouse (husband) involvement is seen to play a pivotal role in deciding on the use of a birth control method and it is also equally vital	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with regards to the number of children a couple desire to have.” While this may be true, it is not supported by the data presented by author(s). Secondly, the statement appeared to be orphaned as it is not immediately addressing any point. Lines 186-187: Author(s) wrote “This is in consonance with another study where very minute number of participants have ever discussed family planning or its use with their husbands” Author(s) did not provide a citation for this study referenced. Secondly, the word “minute” should be replaced with a better adjective. Lines 192-193: Author(s) wrote “In this study in which just about half of the participants’ spouses knew whether their wives were using or not using any form of contraceptive” This statement is completely unclear. What is the intended message of author(s)? Line 196: Author(s) wrote “In this study, about one third of respondents were presently on a form of contraceptives” This again is different from what was presented on table 4. Lines 199-200: Author(s) wrote “Injectables happened to be the most used contraceptives among respondents currently on contraceptives” This is different from the data on table 4. Lines 205-208: Author(s) wrote “In this study, it was observed that two third of Islamic respondents were not on any form of contraceptive, which was statistically significant. This is comparable with another study done in another study where there was no significant difference in the practice of different religious groups to family planning.” How can author(s) say that a significant finding in their current study is similar to another study where there was no statistically significant finding.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		