



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1308
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CONTRACEPTION AS PROXIMATE DETERMINANT OF FERTILITY AMONG WOMEN IN RURAL AND URBAN AREAS OF OSUN STATE SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	

PART B:

	FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments (if any)	Authors' response
For comments of Reviewer 1 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 2 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 3 and author's feed back	I re-read this manuscript and I'm very satisfied with the changes made. The paper is much clearer – thank you for making the changes. However, I'm still concern because authors have not used appropriate statistical method. The multistage sampling method was used to collect the data but it has been ignored in the phase of analysis. Unfortunately, the results may be biased because authors have still used orthodox method instead of survey commands. If ignoring the sampling design, e.g., assuming simple random sampling when another type of sampling design was used, the standard errors will likely be underestimated, possibly leading to results that seem to be statistically significant, when in fact, they are not. Before I can approve of this article I would like to see a sentence or two in the chapter of data management why the authors did not use the appropriate method. I know, this cannot be taken into account with SPSS Statistics, but authors can be used another software. R is free to download and has a widely range of different svy commands (http://faculty.washington.edu/tlumley/survey/).	Authors have adequately used the SPSS software in data analysis and its versatility in data management (to the best of their knowledge and ability), even in analysis of data collected by multistage random sampling technique. . However, inability to use R analysis statistical software/method could be regarded as a limitation to this study as stated in the corrected manuscript.
For comments of Reviewer 4 and author's feed back		