

Review of: "Factors Associated with Contraceptive Use Among Migrant Female Head Porters in the Kumasi Metropolis"

David Jean Simon¹

¹ Université Panthéon-Sorbonne (Paris I)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article deals with a very interesting topic. However, before its publication, the authors must make some corrections to the manuscript.

You will find my comments below.

Introduction

1. Contraceptive prevalence in Ghana according to the Demographic Housing Survey (2014) is 22% (Aviisah et al., 2007).

Reviser: There's a problem with this reference. The survey dates from 2014 whereas the reference is 2007.

1. This may be due to a lot of factors including socio-economic barriers, beliefs and norms, and side effects of contraception, among others.

Reviser: I suggest that the authors add at least 2 references at the end of this sentence.

1. Older women portray sexual inactivity as menopause sets in and perhaps because they have achieved their desired family size. Middle-aged women, however, exhibit a growing interest in space childbearing and the desire to excel in their careers.

Reviser: Same comment as before. Add references

1. The introduction is not yet complete. The authors have not added the purpose of the article.

Reviser: I suggest that the authors add a paragraph explaining the purpose of the article and the reasons for such a study.

Results

Reviser: I suggest that the authors analyse the variable age and education level. For age, give the mean and the standard Deviation.

Discussion

Reviser: Discussion of the ethnic variable is not enough. The authors need to explain why Bimobas are more likely to use contraceptive methods compared with Frafras. Is there anything specific about Bimobas that could explain this? Same question for Frafras, what could explain their lower use of contraceptive methods compared to Bimobas? The discussion should focus on these ethnic groups.

1. Head porters who did not have valid national health insurance cards were 0.395 times more likely to utilize contraceptive services compared to those who did have valid NHIS cards. Also, authors must add references because it is a scientific paper.

Reviser: The way this Odd ratio is analyzed needs to be corrected. When the OR is less than 1, it must be analyzed as a percentage (see this paper : <https://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-023-02295-2#Sec1>). Furthermore, the authors should compare their results with those of other authors.

1. Knowledge of HIV status correlated strongly with contraceptive use.

Reviser: 'associated' is better than correlated.

Why authors discuss the variables 'HIV status' and Multiple sexual partners. Looking at the logistic regression results, these two variables are not significant because '1' belongs to the confidence interval. When variables are not significant, they should not be discussed unless they are very important.