Peer Review Report

Review Report on Creating reproductive health behavioral profiles for women of reproductive age in Niger using cross-sectional survey data: a latent class analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: John Bua
Submitted on: 20 Oct 2022
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605247

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

1. The majority of the respondents (>90%) agreed the health facility is the best place to deliver a baby.
2. The majority of the respondents (>74%) agreed it was acceptable to use family planning.
3. High levels of knowledge about and positive attitudes towards the three services were observed.
4. The study revealed a strong association between class membership and the use of reproductive and maternal services.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

1. The study can't establish causation between class membership and health behaviour cause it was a cross-section in nature.
2. Social desirability bias among respondents could have affected observed behaviour determinants.
3. The views of the men were not included in the study.

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.**

Major comment
The initial calculated sample size was 34 respondents per enumeration area to cater for a non-response of 10%. Therefore the sample size would have been (34 x 40) x 2 = 2720.
But you mentioned you interviewed 30 respondents per enumeration area. Therefore the sample size interviewed would have been (30 x 40) x 2 = 2400.
So how and why did you arrive at the final sample size of 2,709?

Minor comment
Proofreading and correcting grammar in the write-up.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

The title is appropriate.

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

The keywords are appropriate.

Q 6 **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

Needs minor grammar corrections.

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?)**

The reference list is adequate and unbiased.

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:**

Minor revisions.