

## **List of corrections effected on MSc research report titled “An Epidemiological Perspective of Unintended Pregnancy among South African Youth”**

I have gone through the comments of the two examiners and believe that they are fair assessment of the study. I have effected changes where due and necessary and I have noted the useful suggestions passed on to me for future use. They will certainly be of immense benefit.

### **Examiner 1 (Dr Prainitha Maharaj) queries:**

#### **Chapter One.**

The reason why the data for Africans were inadequate has now been incorporated into the body of the paragraph.

A summary of the content of the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act and the Sterilization Act and how they empower people to make informed choices have now also been stated in the write-up.

The inadequate literature review is as a result the general guidelines on the content of a research report contained in the Faculty of Health Sciences “Style Guide”. It is stated that the literature review and introduction should be about 25% (10pages) of the whole document. However, I have incorporated the study on “Adolescent Preganancy and reproductive Health in Transkei (rural South Africa) into the literature review. I have been unfortunate not to get the book on African Teenage Pregnancy: Whose Problem? The two other recommended articles were not incorporated because the areas of focus are quite different from that of this study. For example, the article by Rutenberg et al explored whether an association exists between the desire for pregnancy and perceptions of HIV risk among adolescents. Even though some not very related studies were mentioned in the literature review, they were meant to be examples of studies that have been done on youth in South Africa.

#### **Chapter Two**

Japanese Organization for International Cooperation in Family Planning was used as reference for the definition of youth because I could not locate the original source document. The reference is still as it was because I still cannot get the definition from the original source and I feel it is wrong to reference a source that I did not use or see.

The definitions of prevalence and incidence have now been put under section 2.3.

Analysis is restricted to literature-identified factors now re-phrased to read and mean analysis is restricted to literature-identified factors available in the data set and other factors believed to be relevant to the study. These factors/variables have been defined in Table 2.1.

The reason why the observations were incomplete for some of the variables is mainly due to respondents stating that they don't know or missing data. This has been written out in Section 2.8.

Regular and casual partners are also defined in section 2.9.

### **Chapter Three**

Corrections effected on noted areas namely: deleting repetition, dividing a paragraph and referencing a table correctly in the text. Regarding some table in the result section and others in the appendix, the vital tables are the ones that appear in the result section. The ones in the appendix are not very important in the interpretation of the results. They just provide additional information on the results.

### **Chapter Four**

The repetitions were taken care off. Effort was also made to put more comparative narratives into the discussion.

### **Chapter Five**

How unemployment reduces unintended pregnancy is now discussed under recommendation.

### **Examiner 2 (Dr. Jill Williams) queries.**

#### **Theoretical Concerns**

The Epidemiological perspective is to present the distribution and determinants of unintended pregnancy and how these two findings can be applied to control the problem of unintended pregnancy among South African Youth. It was more or less a quantitative analysis and the how and why things are as they are is actually beyond the scope of the study but could only suggest areas to be further looked into which was done. I am happy to note that the examiner did not require a theoretical framework to be added for the study to be meaningful. The comments are however noted and will be considered for future purposes.

#### **Methodological Concerns**

##### **(1) Sampling issues**

On the issue of over sampling, I have limited say on it as it was necessary in achieving the objectives for which the survey was originally carried out and I believe that all necessary statistical considerations must have been observed. This however has no effect

whatsoever on the result of this study as it was based on proportion and not absolute number.

## (2) Analysis Issues

Oversight of not analyzing the missing data acknowledged for this may not allow the comparison of the group of cases (those analyzed and those that were not). It is not however expected to affect the result of the analysis under the assumption that the two groups of women (that had and did not have unintended pregnancy) were likely to be equally affected. This however has been put under limitation of the study to ensure that all loose ends are tied.

Partner's age and education were found not to be associated with unintended pregnancy. They were given consideration in the discussion to drive home the point about the loose relationship (for most of the data were missing because the respondents did not know answers to the questions) between the youth and their partners as well as to the generation gap between the two. This have no effect whatsoever on the result since they are not even associated not to talk of being critical predictors of unintended pregnancy in the study.

Explanation/interpretation of the chi squared statistics and the adjusted odds ratio are now incorporated in sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively.

I hope I have addressed adequately all the issues raised by the examiners.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Latifat D.G. Ibisomi.