

Review of: "Substance use disorder and associated factors at an opioid de-addiction clinic in Western Kenya"

Ogochukwu Chioma Ofiaeli

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

1. Give details on the type of questionnaire used - self or interviewer administered.
2. Give some details of the inferential statistics that support your conclusion; a descriptive result is not enough to arrive at your conclusion, for instance with regard to the comment on peer pressure.
3. The key words are a lot. You may limit to 5 or 7 words that are most representative of your work. Except the number you have now is what is required or acceptable by the journal.
4. Remember that your abstract is the 'eye' of your research, project your work well.

Introduction

1. This section is fair. What is the burden of Substance misuse in Kenya? You have not reviewed any literature to this effect. What were the prevailing circumstances before the Methadone program started? Did Kenya have any local response before the international support? Any research on societal changes since this program started?
2. You have not convinced your audience that the substances used by clinic patients and the risk factors for substance use disorders are unknown. How was this verified? The authors need to improve on their justification for this research.

Methods

1. It is unusual to start this section with details of the ethical approval. This ideally should come later because it is only after you have developed a valid research protocol that you seek for approvals.
2. Your study subjects were being weaned off substances of addiction, how did you ensure they had the capacity to give consent to be part of this research? This should be clearly spelt out while giving details of the ethical process. Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria become necessary to help with this. Also clearly stating the stage of recovery at which point consent was obtained or if their caregivers also gave consent will be good.
3. You have not reflected key ethical principles in your ethics section. These are vital especially in a research involving your category of study subjects. Was the consent voluntarily obtained? Were the participants free to withdraw at anytime with no consequence to them and the care they were receiving? Among other points to be clearly spelt out. Please update this section properly and reposition it.
4. In addition, all plans you have for your results, for instance pushing for policy changes, presentation to stake holders will be mentioned in the ethical approval section.

5. Provide details of how the questionnaire was administered - self or interviewer.
6. Data analysis section needs some improvement. You have made inferences from your data; you therefore need to subject the data to the appropriate inferential statistics. As such your research is a Cross sectional one and is not purely descriptive. Engage a Medical statistician to assist you.
7. You have not specified what your dependent and independent variables are as well. This provides a good guide for the Literature review as well.

Results

1. I couldn't find the Table S1 referred to.
2. You only need to summarize your tables in prose and not duplicate the results, especially since your tables are embedded in your results.
3. Data used to generate tables 3 to 5 need further statistical analysis to be relevant.

Discussion

1. You need to build your introduction and justification in order to discuss your results well. The discussion is in your voice. You need to state relevant findings from your research, that support your aim and objectives, compare and contrast your findings with already reported research and offer valid explanation for your own findings.
2. You have not done any inferential data analysis, as such you are unable to make any argument on causality while explaining your findings. The authors need to be wary to work with what they found and have reported and not sentiments. A data re-analysis will most definitely give a louder voice to your discussion.
3. Please rewrite this section after you are done editing your results.
4. Also be alert not to bring in ideas that you hadn't factored in before the discussion and are unable to provide a valid discussion for the results being discussed.

Conclusions

1. Please don't bring in new ideas in this section. This is the end of your work. It is meant to highlight your key findings. You may then wish to have a recommendation section subsequently.
2. For instance, you didn't study Clinic-based intervention measures. It has no place in the conclusion.

Finally

1. You have made a good attempt. Substance abuse is a real problem in today's world. Please rewrite your manuscript and it can be a great literary reference on the subject matter.
2. The authors may wish to go through notable works in the subject matter (and even other well written manuscripts) to get a clearer picture of how to restructure their work.

Regards

