

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Benefits of family planning: an assessment of women's knowledge in rural Western Kenya
AUTHORS	Mutombo, Namuunda; Bakibinga, Pauline; Mukiira, Carol; Kamande, Eva

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Suzanne Bell UC Berkeley Bixby Center for Population, Health and Sustainability, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Jan-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Revisions:</p> <p>The phrasing of the objective in the abstract and introduction should be changed; it is not well-written. Sounds like "knowledge levels" are separate from the "associated factors regarding the benefits of family planning". The authors use "and", which makes it seem like these are two things being assessed. Needs to be clearer, and perhaps explicitly indicate you are investigating knowledge of FP benefits for the child and the mother.</p> <p>Page 2 line 10: "individuals", not "individuals"</p> <p>Page 2 line 39: "low levels", not "low level"</p> <p>Page 4 line 19: remove "over the years", could put "in the last two decades"</p> <p>Page 4 line 21/23: "a reduction", not "reduction"; "and" should be "or"</p> <p>Page 4 lines 30-40: are these statistics all from citation 1?</p> <p>Page 5 line 8: "unmet need for", not "unmet needs of"</p> <p>Page 5 lines 35-42: use citations for both these sentences; they important statements that should reference a source.</p> <p>Page 7, methods: Add details about the informed consent process and sampling design - was it multi-stage random sample? Multi-stage cluster random sample?</p> <p>Page 7, methods: would be helpful if the authors included some examples of the types of questions asked, which make up the dependent variables.</p> <p>Page 7 line 26: spell out KNBS when reference for the first time.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Page 7 line 40: "Table 3", not "Table 5"</p> <p>Page 8 line 36: if the sample was representative, why were there less than 20 married women? This leads me to question the sampling/representativeness.</p> <p>Did the authors try using dichotomous low/high (around the mean) dependent variables? Division into 3 categories seems arbitrary and am not sure how much nuance it provides.</p> <p>Page 8 line 54-10: Poorly worded, "lower log-odds of having higher than lower knowledge...". Consider rephrasing.</p> <p>Page 10 line 13: What were the inclusion criteria?</p> <p>Page 10 line 18: "newspapers/magazines", not singular</p> <p>Page 10 line 20/line 42/line 47, Page 11 line 6: "the majority", not "majority"</p> <p>Page 10 line 22: "confirmed" not "confirm"</p> <p>Page 10 line 33: "the minority"</p> <p>Page 10 line 35 and 37: use "%", don't spell out "percent" (be consistent)</p> <p>Page 11 line 8: "high knowledge level"</p> <p>Page 11 line 8-16: Poorly worded: "Concerning the level of knowledge about impacts of using family planning on the mother, data indicated some relatively higher knowledge for impacts on the mother than on the child as approximately 95% of women exhibited some knowledge about the impacts on the mother compared with 83% for the impacts on the child." Confusing.</p> <p>Page 11 line 44: "Age and level of knowledge regarding the impact of family planning on the child have a positive linear correlation."</p> <p>Page 12 line 48: May be better to phrase it as, "Results on the factors associated with increased knowledge about the impacts of using family planning on the child are presented..."</p> <p>Page 13 line 29: "are significantly associated with a women's level of knowledge..."</p> <p>Page 14 line 18-23: I would not put this conclusion in terms of "high" knowledge since "high" was arbitrarily assigned and is not actually "high" in the truest sense. Perhaps include the percentage of women with no knowledge (0), or very low (1). More informative.</p> <p>Page 14 line 33: do the authors mean no study in Western Kenya have documented this? Many studies have documented this relationship.</p> <p>Page 14 line 49: cite this last sentence.</p> <p>Page 14 line 53: "Age was the only additional factor associated</p>
--	---

	<p>with..."; it was not the only significant factor, I believe. Rephrase this sentence, it is not well-worded.</p> <p>Page 15 line 6: do the authors have a reference for this statement? Should be cited.</p> <p>Page 15 line 9-14: these concluding remarks should be expanded upon. And if the authors are going to make a statement about men's involvement, this particularly should be expanded upon, including references to other studies that have/have not had success in raising contraceptive knowledge via male involvement.</p> <p>Page 14/15: there is no real discussion of limitations.</p> <p>This paper is fairly well-written but there are several grammatical/phrasing issues, many of which I highlighted in my comments. It also lacks flow in many places. In addition, the methods and discussion/conclusion must be expanded upon and the limitations must be addressed.</p> <p>The paper does not contribute much to the literature, but it could be interesting to program planners and government officials in Western Kenya with a focus in family planning.</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Edith Weisberg FPNSW Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Jan-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>There needs to be some explanation about why 54% of respondents to the PWKP survey were excluded from this study.</p> <p>There needs to be further explanation about collection of the data. Was it face to face questioning and if so were multiple interviewers used,</p> <p>it would be useful to have the questions detailed and have a breakdown of the percentage of correct answers to each question to enable an understanding about the extent of knowledge on child and women's health</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

We have reviewed the comments and have since made the necessary revisions as advised by the reviewers. Concerning the decision to use ordinal regression as opposed to the binary logistic regression; the ordered logit is the most ideal for cases where the dependent variable has the property of magnitude and can be ranked, hence our application of this method to measure knowledge levels.

It should also be noted that the manuscript is based on a rural sample and drawn from one of the least developed parts of Kenya. The characteristics of this sample does not represent rural Kenya per se but rather rural Western Kenya. In the earlier version, for example, we ironically reported that less than 20 women were married. After reviewing the data sets, we have realized that it is actually the other way round: less than 20 women were NOT married. This reflects the traditional or conservative nature of this region as marriage is almost universal.

We, therefore, feel that we have addressed all the pertinent issues on this paper. Find attached the revised version of our manuscript.