

Review of: "Contraceptive utilization and associated factors among youths in Hossana town administrative, Hadiya zone, Southern Ethiopia"

Getachew Ossabo Babore¹

¹ Wachemo University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear editor-in-chief and authors of this manuscript.

I am happy to review this manuscript, which was done in the area of health inequalities and innovation, and it is an interesting one.

Here are my major and minor comments that need special attention and should be revised aggressively to consider a manuscript for publication; otherwise, an article will not be considered for publication.

Therefore, before proceeding to the next step, all these major comments should be justified appropriately. Looking for the result part without getting enough justification on these pages is wasting time and energy. So I need strong justification before reviewing the results and the remaining part of the article.

Major comments

Introduction

However, the introduction part is clear and easily understandable, but it may lack some basic elements.

1. Major gaps in the subject matter were not presented appropriately; that is why there is no gap or problem conducting research is not necessary. In addition, the identified problem/gap should be researchable. Please describe the identified problems if you have any.
2. Your outcomes are UHEP package utilization and HSB, but you focus on only UHEP package utilization; there is no detailed explanation about HSB. If unable to describe it a lot, it could not be an outcome.

Method part

- What is the importance of defining model HHs head age? Do you think individuals whose age is below 18 years can be model HHs heads/non-model heads? Please justify the reason.
- Assessment of model HHs head's knowledge is not your objective, but you used P-value 80.7% from a previously done study on knowledge while calculating sample size. Please justify it; otherwise, it may lead to sampling error.
- Your study subject is HHs or HHs heads. In the entire document, there are mixed descriptions. Please look again and

decide on one (either HHs/HHs heads); otherwise, your entry point is unknown.

- Do you think a 1:1 ratio of model & non-model HHs is acceptable to compare the outcomes obtained from those samples? What is your basis for using it rather than considering 1:2 or more?.
- Logistic regression analysis (bivariate) is conducted not to identify factors associated with utilization of UHE_Ps package. Purposes of logistic regression analysis (bivariate & multivariate) are quite varied. Please modify it. Describe how candidate variables for the multivariate analysis were selected and explain the parameters/cutoff point used to select those variables.
- How have you managed the confounding factor of UHEP package utilization vs. health seeking behavior? Might be one is confounding the other, I mean: if HHs had experienced high utilization of UHEP packages, they simultaneously may have good/favorable health seeking behavior. I do have doubt regarding this finding: UHEP package utilization level among non-model HHs was 64.2%, whereas their health seeking behavior is 65.2%, which is higher than utilization; how could it be?
- I do have doubts regarding factors identified as predictors of UHEP package utilization and HSB. How can those variables (having information on UHEP packages, knowledge level....) be simultaneously associated with both outcome variables? Could you give me justification?
- How did you assess/decide whether model HHs utilized UHEP packages or not? Under the study variables and measurement parts, you categorized UHEP utilization into three, but your findings seem to indicate you categorized the outcome variable dichotomous. In addition, there is no operational definition for it, and in the results part, I couldn't get the prevalence of UHEP package utilization (78% & 64.2% for both groups); no sub-title describes your first specific objective (prevalence of UHEP package utilization).
- Data quality assurance methods and collinearity tests were not explained adequately, and the validity of tools was also not described. Thus, without these measurements and fitness tests, it is difficult to measure the outcome variables.

Minor comments

1. Abstract

- Please address the confidence interval for your main findings (prevalence), which is essential to compare against other studies and to support your conclusion.
- Look at the conclusion part again; your conclusion should be based on the major findings and have recommendations. Your conclusion is not based on the findings, and there are no recommendations for your conclusion.

Method & Materials

- Grammatical and technical error: Under the sampling procedure,..... four districts were selected by using the lottery "method"; method and techniques are quite different. Look for this because the lottery approach is not a method. Again, this part or use the appropriate word.
- The first model, HH..... "were" selected; look for subject-verb agreement again.
- Under the independent variable, the UHEP package ----- it is incomplete.

