

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Are Kenyans Likely to Use COVID-19 Self-Testing Kits? Results from a Cross-Sectional Survey

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Bijit Biswas

Submitted on: 15 Apr 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604918

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

There were 419 participants (mean age 35.7 years). A minority (10.5%) had ever tested for SARS-CoV-2. If SARS-CoV-2 self-testing were available, 39.9% and 41.5% would be likely and very likely, respectively, to use it. If unavailable free-of-charge, 63.01% would pay for it. Multivariate analyses suggested that people in rural areas (Coefficient 0.30, 95%CI: 0.11-0.48, $p < 0.002$), aged 36- (Coefficient 0.21, 95%CI: 0.03-0.40, $p < 0.023$), and employed full time (Coefficient 0.32, 95%CI: 0.06-0.58, $p < 0.016$) would have more odds to adhere to recommended hygiene and prevention actions

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

A major limitation of our study was that we asked questions about the potential value and acceptability of a putative SARS-CoV-2 self-test, instead of actually distributing a self-test kit that respondents could try. As a result, the study could be subject to social desirability bias, with respondents giving responses that they thought are most socially acceptable, but which may or may not reflect what they would do if the test were indeed available.

Random sampling, use of multivariable analysis,

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The manuscript aimed to understand the public's perceptions around rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen self-testing in Kenya, including the drivers of acceptability, willingness to pay, and adherence to hygiene and prevention recommendations following a positive self-test.

It was very nicely formulated, administered and written.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Accept.