

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Socio-economic factors influencing intimate partner violence among adolescents and young women in sub-Saharan Africa: A scoping review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Ojo Agunbiade

Submitted on: 17 Sep 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1607041

### EVALUATION

#### Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

A summary of the key themes from the article

1. Prevalence of IPV among Adolescents and Young Women in SSA:
  - o IPV is widespread among young women in SSA, with significant regional variations. Socio-economic status, age, and marital status influence the risk, with rural and economically disadvantaged women experiencing higher rates of violence.
2. Socio-economic Factors as Determinants of IPV:
  - o Low socio-economic status, financial dependence, and lack of education increase young women's vulnerability to IPV. Economic deprivation makes it harder for women, especially adolescent mothers, to escape abusive relationships.
3. Impact of IPV on Later Socio-economic Attainments:
  - o IPV negatively affects young women's educational and employment opportunities, reinforcing cycles of poverty and limiting future economic prospects.
4. Geographical and Demographic Disparities in IPV Experiences:
  - o Women in rural areas face higher IPV risks due to fewer support services and lower socio-economic status. Younger and less-educated women are also at greater risk.
5. Psychosocial Outcomes of IPV:
  - o IPV leads to severe psychological distress, including anxiety, depression, and suicidal thoughts, compounding the socio-economic impact of violence.
6. Role of Economic Empowerment in Mitigating IPV:
  - o Economic empowerment through education and vocational training is vital but must be coupled with broader social support systems to reduce IPV effectively.

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

The exclusion of non-English studies and the lack of long-term research on the effects of IPV on socio-economic attainment are acknowledged as limitations. The authors could further explore how these limitations might impact the generalizability of the findings.

#### Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

Title and Abstract

The title effectively captures the essence of the review, and the abstract provides a concise summary of the objectives, methods, results, and conclusion. However, the abstract could benefit from greater specificity in describing the implications of the findings for policy and practice, making it more impactful for readers who may only skim the abstract.

Introduction

The introduction provides a solid background on the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) among adolescents and young women (AYW) in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). It effectively highlights the gaps in existing literature, particularly the lack of focus on socio-economic factors affecting IPV in this demographic. The rationale for the study is well-articulated, but the introduction could be strengthened by a clearer articulation of the research questions or hypotheses guiding the review.

#### Methods

The methods section follows a systematic approach to conducting a scoping review, adhering to established frameworks such as PRISMA and the JBI guidelines. The use of multiple databases and a comprehensive search strategy enhance the rigour of the review. However, there are a few areas for improvement:

1. **Search Strategy:** While the search strategy is described, the specific search terms and combinations used should be provided in more detail, either in the main text or as supplementary material, to enhance replicability.
2. **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:** The criteria are clearly stated, but the rationale for excluding non-English studies could be better justified, especially given the potential for relevant research in French-speaking SSA countries.
3. **Data Extraction and Synthesis:** The data extraction process is described adequately, but the section on data synthesis could be expanded to include a more detailed explanation of how themes were identified and how quantitative data were integrated into the thematic analysis.

#### Results

The results section is well-organized, presenting findings according to the key themes identified in the review. The use of tables and charts to summarize study characteristics and findings is helpful. However, the narrative could be improved by:

1. **Critical Analysis:** While the results are summarized, there is a lack of critical analysis in terms of the quality and strength of evidence from the included studies. Discussing the limitations and potential biases of the studies included in the review would provide a more nuanced understanding of the findings.
2. **Comparative Analysis:** A more explicit comparison of findings across different countries or regions within SSA would enhance the discussion of how socio-economic factors influence IPV in varying contexts.

#### Discussion

The discussion section effectively synthesises and relates the findings to broader public health and policy implications. However, the discussion could benefit from:

1. **Theoretical Integration:** There is an opportunity to integrate more theoretical perspectives on socio-economic status and IPV, which could deepen the analysis and provide a more robust framework for interpreting the findings.
2. **Policy Implications:** While the discussion touches on the importance of socio-economic empowerment as a strategy to combat IPV, it could be expanded to provide more concrete recommendations for policymakers, particularly in the context of achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 3 and 5.

#### Conclusion

The conclusion succinctly summarises the key findings and highlights the importance of addressing socio-economic vulnerabilities to reduce IPV among AYW in SSA. However, it could be strengthened by reiterating the review's unique contributions to the existing literature and offering more specific directions for future research.

#### Strengths and Limitations

The manuscript provides a balanced view of the review's strengths and limitations. A rigorous methodology and including studies from multiple SSA countries are notable strengths. However, the exclusion of non-English studies and the lack of long-term research on the effects of IPV on socio-economic attainment are acknowledged as limitations. The authors could further explore how these limitations might impact the generalizability of the findings.

#### References

The references are comprehensive and up-to-date, reflecting a thorough engagement with the relevant literature. However, a few key references on theoretical frameworks related to IPV and socio-economic status could be added to strengthen the manuscript.

#### Recommendations

1. Provide more detailed information on the search strategy and the rationale for excluding non-English studies.

2. Include a more critical analysis of the quality and biases of the studies reviewed.
3. Expand the discussion to integrate theoretical perspectives and provide specific policy recommendations.
4. Strengthen the conclusion by emphasizing the unique contributions of the review and suggesting directions for future research.

**PLEASE COMMENT**

**Q 4** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

The references are comprehensive and up-to-date, reflecting a thorough engagement with the relevant literature. However, a few key references on theoretical frameworks related to IPV and socio-economic status could be added to strengthen the manuscript.

**Q 5** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

**Q 6** Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

**Q 7** Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

**Q 8** Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes, within the sub-Saharan Africa

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes, I found the title appropriate, concise and attractive

**Q 10** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes, the key words are appropriate.

**Q 11** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, however, the summarised review contains a few grammar and structural issues that I have pointed out.

**Q 12** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** → Quality of generalization and summary

**Q 14** → Significance to the field

**Q 15** → Interest to a general audience

**Q 16** → Quality of the writing

## REVISION LEVEL

**Q 17** → Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.