

Review report

BSMMUJ-17.4 – 75623

Knowledge, attitude and practice regarding sexual and reproductive health rights among married adolescents in urban slums of Bangladesh: Cross-sectional survey
Topa AR *et al.* (adity.topa@icddr.org)

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
A. Mechanical review	
Date of submission: 22-Aug-24	
Date sent to author: 22-Aug-24	Date: 24-Aug-24
a. In the BanglaJoL submission platform	
1. Provide affiliation (Department, institute, city, country) of all authors.	Added in the submission platform in the BanglaJol submission platform during submission
b. In the Manuscript	
Abstract page	
2. Prepare an abstract with having Background (including objective without a heading).	Have been added in the manuscript in lines # 27 – 56, Also added objective in the abstract in line number# 31-33
Main body	
3. Provide Statistical analysis in the “METHODS” section.	In the methods section, under the Data Analysis subsection statistical analysis has been added in the manuscript in lines #178 - 182
Footnotes	
4. Mention the memo no. of the funding.	Have been added in the manuscript in line# 384
B. Technical review	
ROUND 1	
Reviewer's name: Fariha Haseen	
ORCID: 0000-0001-5369-573X	
Date assigned: 25-Aug-24	
Date submitted: 9-Sep-24	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? No	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? Yes	
Comments sent to author (Date: 27-Oct-24)	Date: 28-Oct-24
3. Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article? = No 3a. Line Number: 32-33: The abstract mentions that the study explores associated factors related to SRHR knowledge, attitude, and practice, but these factors are not specifically discussed in the results or conclusion. It would be better to briefly mention what these associated factors are or how they were addressed in the study. Line Number: 35-37: Providing more detail on how the sample of married adolescent women was selected and the specific characteristics of the population would give readers a better understanding of the study population. Mentioning whether the questionnaire was structured, semi-structured, or validated and whether it was adapted from existing tools or developed specifically for this study, would be helpful. Including a brief mention of the types of statistical analyses performed, such as	We have updated the abstract's result section and included the findings of factors associated with SRHR knowledge, attitude, and practice in Line#47-50. We also updated abstract methodology Line# 36-38.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, and logistic regression, could provide insight into how the data was interpreted, even if only in very general terms.	
<p>6. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? = No</p> <p>6a. Line Number: 128-152: The methods section does not provide details about the actual survey instrument used, such as the specific questions asked or how the questionnaire was developed and validated.</p> <p>Line Number: 141-142: The random selection of participants is mentioned, but the exact process of how they were randomly selected from the HDSS households is not described in details.</p> <p>Line Number: 156-182: The methods mention that cases with missing data were excluded from the final analysis, but it doesn't explain how missing data were handled or the extent of missing data.</p> <p>Line Number: 154: The section briefly mentions ethical approval but does not provide details on how informed consent was obtained from participants, especially since the study involves adolescents</p>	<p>We have updated questionnaire development details in line#142-144.</p> <p>A new section titled "sample selection" in methodology has been added in line#130-136.</p> <p>Now the extent of missing data has been mentioned in line#192-193</p>
<p>10. Is the discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript? = No</p> <p>10a. Line Number: 302-324: While the discussion is generally critical, it could further explore the underlying reasons for the observed gaps and variations. For example, examining socio-cultural factors influencing attitudes and practices could provide more insight. The discussion could benefit from more specific recommendations for policy or program interventions, such as detailed suggestions for improving government and NGO outreach in specific areas.</p>	<p>We agree that a detailed examination of sociocultural factors would provide insights, but this was beyond the scope of our current study. We have included a recommendation for follow-up qualitative work to understand these influences in more detail (line#362-364).</p> <p>We have added suggestions for the types of approaches that should be explored in government and NGO services in lines #357-359, and lines #364-366.</p>
<p>11. Are the conclusions drawn supported by the results/data? = No</p> <p>11a. Line Number: 351-361: Linking specific findings to each recommendation could enhance clarity. Acknowledging any limitations in the study and how they might impact the recommendations would provide a more balanced conclusion.</p>	<p>Thank you for these helpful suggestions regarding our discussion and conclusion. Our aim is indeed to provide recommendations that are adequately supported by the findings and a balanced conclusion. We have deliberately tried to avoid overreaching our findings.</p> <p>We have included additional sentences in the conclusion to acknowledge limitations.</p>
Reviewer's recommendation: Revisions Required	
Reviewer's name: E	
ORCID: -	
Date assigned: 21-Sep-24	
Date submitted: 30-Sep-24	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? No	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? No	
<p>3. Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article? = No</p> <p>3a. Line 36: please replace adolescent women with adolescent girls (abstract and other sections)</p>	<p>We have replaced adolescent women with adolescent girls in the abstract and other sections (line#78 etc.)</p>

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
L44-46: 44.4% agree with the statement that both men and women are affected by sexual violence (Table 2). Here, there may be more uncertainty than other statements but this is not a small percentage. So please modify Lines 44-46.	We have deleted the text “and the notion that both men and women are affected by sexual violence” to modify the sentence. Line#46-47 is the modified sentence.
4. Are the study objective(s) clearly stated and logical? = No 4a. Line 120: Please replace the comprehensive picture with a detailed description Line 122: Please delete "that might inform subsequent design or targeting of interventions"	We have replaced the comprehensive picture with a detailed description and deleted "that might inform subsequent design or targeting of interventions". Our updated study objective in lines #104-106.
5. Is the rationale/justification for conducting the study clear? = No 5a. Line 80: Broad and bold statement; please modify Line 108-116: Please see the following article https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2083813	We have updated highlights in lines #63-69. We have added “ https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2083813SS ” as reference#12 in line#96.
6. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? 6a. L135-142: Please clarify the sampling technique whether it was stratified cluster sampling or any other method. Describe it in stages. L137: Was census data available and taken into account before reaching the final sample size?	A detail section of sample selection now has been added in line#130-136. We have taken census data as sampling frame.
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully? = No 8a. L188: Pls explain the drop in sample size from 543 to 500 Lines 205-214: Pls describe all knowledge item results. Line 238 and elsewhere: Pls delete the chi-squared test while describing the <i>P</i> value. Remove 0 before decimal. Line 241 and elsewhere: Replace $P=.000$ with $P<.001$	Sample size 543 was calculated by including 10% non-response rate. Finally, we could successfully interview 500 samples, with 8% non-response rate due to migration and not willing to participate. We have already included the important knowledge items in the results. No necessary changes are required. We have removed the word “chi-squared test” in line#250 and other places and removed 0 before decimal. We have also replaced $P=.000$ with $P<.001$ (line#253).
9. Are the table(s) and figure(s) clear and appropriate to address the objective(s) or research question(s)? = No 9a. Table 1,2,5: Pls denote that the figures are expressed as percentages Table 5: The title is misleading as it also contains knowledge and attitude variables. Separate statistical analysis can be performed to identify the relationship between knowledge, attitude and practice.	Now we have mentioned figures are expressed as percentages in Table 1,2,5. Table 5 titles have been modified. We have already fitted multivariate logistic regression to identify the relationship between knowledge, attitude and practice. Results are mentioned in line#298-310.
10. Is the discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript? 10a. Inadequate and lacks adequate references. No mention of the National Strategy for Adolescent Health. L342-344: Reference to UPHCSDP is not irrelevant but needs more context including its coverage of services and areas.	Thank you for these suggestions regarding our discussion. We have now updated the discussion section
11. Are the conclusions drawn supported by the results/data? = No 11a. Please rewrite based on study findings only.	We have updated conclusions based on our study findings.
12. Are the references appropriate in number and up-to-date? = No 12a. Please see the comment above.	As suggested, we have added new reference#12 (https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2083813). Also

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
	added a few more references (e.g. references #17 and 18).
13. Are statements of the manuscript supported by appropriate reference(s)? = No 13a. Please see the comment above.	As suggested, we have added new reference#12 (https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2083813)
14. Is the storytelling straightforward, clear (i.e., does not impede scientific meaning or cause confusion), and logical? = No 14a. Falls short in areas described above.	We have revised the entire manuscript in line with the reviewers' suggestions by addressing all the comments point by point.
Reviewer's recommendation: Revisions Required	
Editor's comments	
Editor's name: M Mostafa Zaman	
ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342	
1. Abstract: Method is inadequate. This should be elaborated in exchange of other sub-sections.	We have updated the abstract. Now we have elaborated the methods and result section in line with the reviewers' suggestions.
2. Highlights: Please link the bullet points to your study; these are very generic.	We have updated the highlights section based on our study findings.
3. Objective: Express the objective in a single sentence.	We have updated and modified the study objective in line with the reviewers have suggested. Now the objective is in single sentence. Please see line#104-106.
4. Methods: a. Ethical concerns/issues should be described here under a separate heading. b. Data collection instrument description is missing. This should include the "Key variables ascertainment" information.	We have added new sections under methodology titled "Sample selection" (lines #130-136), "Data collection" (lines #139-150) and "Ethical consideration" (line#152-157).
5. Results: The text description of the results section could be summarized around the main findings; The rest should be referred to the respective tables.	In the manuscript, we tried to summarize the result section according to study findings. We feel no necessary action is required for the result section.
6. Discussion: The first paragraph should briefly reiterate the key findings rather than repeating the objective. The conclusion should be supported by the findings of this study. Please do not conclude or recommend beyond what is supported by the data. It is not clear where the school curriculum's recommendation evolved!	We agree that conclusions should not overstretch the findings and that is why we have indicated potential strategies for exploration and evaluation, and deliberately not made firm recommendations. We have removed the reference to school curriculum and highlighted the need for educational opportunities beyond the school/college setting (since many girls drop out of school and marry early).
Editor's decision: Revisions Required	
ROUND 2	
Editor's name: M Mostafa Zaman	
ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342	
Comments sent to author (Date: 12-Oct-24)	Date: 28-Oct-24
1. Abstract: The Methods in the Abstract should be expanded in exchange for the Results and Conclusion to keep the word count within 250.	We have updated the abstract methodology.
2. Highlights should provide full sentences.	We have updated the highlights.
3. Introduction: The objective could be given in a single sentence.	We have updated the study objective in one sentence.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
4. Methods: Tables have results for the wealth quintiles. How were these created? Please elaborate on this section.	We have added wealth quintiles calculation in lines #181-187.
5. Conclusion: Please summarize and align it to the objective of the study.	We have updated the conclusions.
6. Ethical approval: Some of the texts should be moved to the ethics in the Methods section.	We have moved some Ethical section texts to lines #152-157.
Editor's decision: Revisions Required	
ROUND 3	
Editor's name: M Mostafa Zaman	
ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342	
Comments sent to author (Date: 27-Oct-24)	Date: 28-Oct-24
1. Lines 183-185: Please indicate how many household items were on the list.	Household items included 18 items. Now mentioned in line#183.
2. Analysis: The PCA must include the TV because it is a household item, too. However, you have presented data for the TV separately as an item in addition to the wealth indices. I suppose this violates the definition of household items or is a double count. Therefore, I suggest removing TV from all concerned tables (1-3 and 5).	Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have removed TV from all concerned tables (1-3 and 5). We also updated the multivariate results accordingly.
3. The Editor's comment on the redundancy between text and tables of the Result section has been refuted. However, I see this section occupies almost half of the manuscript. The text description has touched almost all cells presented in the tables. This is unnecessary, even if you remain within the permissible word count of the manuscript's main text. The choice of text description depends on the main message of the manuscript. I suggest reducing the word count by about 50% or removing all tables because you have a full description of the results in the text. Having said this, I would like to say that the tables are the heart of the manuscript and deserve priority over the texts.	We appreciate your suggestion. We have reduced the result section by 50%.
4. The results given in Table 4 should have two decimal points max. Present the result as OR (95% CI); p values here are redundant because confidence intervals are sufficient to understand this. Please use star marks if you are still interested in highlighting this significance.	We have updated the Table 4.
5. P values in all tables and texts should have up to two decimal points except the very small values., e.g., <0.001.	We have modified the P-values accordingly in tables and text.
Editor's decision: Revisions Required	

C. Editorial decision	Date: 28-Oct-24
Final decision: Accepted subject to editorial clarifications.	