

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Associations of sustainable development goals accelerators with adolescents' well-being according to head-of-household's disability status

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Kirubel Mussie

Submitted on: 14 Dec 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1604341

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study presented the association between SDG accelerators/interventions and wellbeing indicators among adolescents in Zambia, with a particular focus on adolescents living in disabled household heads. SDG indicators such as social cash transfer, life-long learning and mobile phone access significantly associated with wellbeing indicators such as no poverty, informal cash transfers, good health, no suicidal ideation, school enrolment and no health access restrictions related to disabilities.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This study addresses a very important topic in its field and beyond. The entire manuscript is well written, and the research question is adequately address by the chosen methods. Moreover, the findings are discussed very well and in relation to up-to-date literature. However, a few limitations can be addressed to improve its quality. The research question can be discussed slightly better and a few aspects of the methods can be elaborated better. Moreover, as the study addresses an interesting and very relevant topic in public health, giving more insights into its public health policy implications would benefit the topic much.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Major:

Introduction

1. You start referring to individuals aged 15 to 24 years, which appears confusing to the reader. It gives an impression that that is the age range of adolescents. So please provide a clear definition of adolescent age referring to a standard/universal reference like WHO, etc and then operationalise the concept of adolescence if necessary.

2. Line 72 – “Disability is a serious threat to achieving the SDGs” This is a strong conclusion for such a sensitive issue and seems to communicate bias instead of fact. It looks like you are saying disability threatens efforts to achieve SDGs. If this is the argument, further explanation is required on how. But if not, then restructure/rewrite the sentence.

Methods

1. Ethical consideration, specifically participant consent condition is not adequately explained. Such large-scale studies are highly criticised by the research ethics community for (1) not ‘properly’ applying research ethics principles, and/or (2) not adequately reporting ethical considerations. Thus, in this study, are the participants’ decisions informed? In answering this, please indicate if the participants were well informed. You may address this gap by simply inserting the word “informed” before the term “consent” on line 116. However, better description would also be more helpful. Also, are all informed consents written or verbal or both? If both, please specify how many for each type of consent.

2. Please indicate if participation was fully voluntary and if participants were given the right to withdraw from the study. If there were any participants who withdrew or refused, please report that as well.

#### Conclusion

1. As this is a very interesting and important study, it would be interesting to add a few lines highlighting its implications for policy.
2. The topic for further research in the last sentence seems to be the same or very similar research area as the current one. Please clarify if you are referring to any other gap that the current study identified.

#### Minor:

##### Introduction

1. Lines 48, 49 – I am not sure if mentioning a 10 year old child as an example appears necessary when the focus is on those between 15 and 24. A better example would be someone within that age range. But this would also be not a problem if my first major comment is addressed.

##### Methods

1. It would be nice to see the name of the local language mentioned

### PLEASE COMMENT

**Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

n/a

**Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

**Q 7** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes

### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 9** Originality



**Q 10** Rigor



**Q 11** Significance to the field



**Q 12** Interest to a general audience



**Q 13** Quality of the writing



**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study



### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.