

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Inequalities in the use of maternal health services in Nepal: trend, decomposition and spatial analysis using five waves of the Demographic and Health Survey

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: John Bua

Submitted on: 16 Nov 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605457

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study revealed socioeconomic inequity that has persisted for over 20 years in the use of ANC, ID and PNC services.

Maternal education and time to travel of the health facility were factors identified to be strongly associated with socioeconomic inequity.

Spatial maps also revealed Northern provinces in Nepal had larger time travel to health facilities and lower service utilization compared to other areas in Nepal.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This was a cross-sectional study, therefore, cannot identify causation. But the sample size was large enough to help identify possible contributing factors to causes of socioeconomic inequity in the use utilization of MCH services.

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 comments: The study method was well described and appropriate. The conclusions are supported by the results.

Minor comment: What is the possible explanation for the increase in the female headed-households during the study period in Nepal?

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?

The English is of sufficient quality.

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 covers relevant literature adequately.

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.