



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_21474
Title of the Manuscript:	Contraceptive Needs of a Marginalized Group: The Case of Displaced People Living in a Refugee Community. Yaoundé, Cameroon.
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	Lines 42-44, sentence beginning with "The result" is somewhat unclear since the research is already within a refugee setting. It is unclear if there are actual high resource and "low resource" settings within a refugee settlement, as that was not explained. Lines 56-60 – information seem to be conflicting. At one point the authors are indicating that the poor might have higher fertility just because they want more children, then later on it seems like the poor wishes they had family planning to avoid unwanted pregnancies. This needs to be revisited. There is insufficient information on the survey tool or questionnaire used for this study, which weakens the methodology. The procedures for data collection could be better explained. Not much is said about the demographics that were considered until the results section as shown in the tables. There were several shown in table 1 that were not mentioned within the methodology. A couple hypotheses or research questions will help to strengthen the research in general and the methods in particular. I am aware that policies are different in different countries, but it was unclear if minors (15 -17 years	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	old) had a refugee settlement director or manager sign the consent forms on their behalf or if they signed on their own behalf. This needs clarification If the questionnaire was pilot tested, where and among whom was it tested? The data analysis section is also weak and missing pertinent information as to the statistical tests that were conducted to produce the results Line 207 – this sentence needs to be revised. Beginning the sentence with “It also revealed the low use” is extremely difficult to follow. Line 266 – I do not think “exploited” is the best word to use, as refugees may already feel exploited. The authors should think of replacing this word.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some general editing needed throughout the paper. The active voice can be used more in some areas rather than the passive voice. Lines 50-51 – consider changing or revising the sentence beginning with “However, emphasis has not been laid on..” The authors can find one word for “not been laid on” Line 160 - the wording “used condoms at last intercourse with a male predominance” was difficult to understand. I am not sure what was being said. Lines 201-202 – the authors should clarify if the STI information was self-reported or if participants were tested for STI No major ethical issues detected. However, there was a concern of who might of signed the consent for minors, or who might have given them permission. If this is not an issue relative to refugees, then I am okay.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 70 – To make a statement that “no studies have been conducted” one has to make sure this is a fact, and this should be revisited. Is it possible that they found no such studies, but that one could have been conduction? A matter of caution. The limitations were included, but it would have been helpful to find a strength of the study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naomi Modeste
Department, University & Country	Loma Linda University, USA