

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	A decade of research into the acceptability of interventions aimed at improving adolescent and youth health and social outcomes in Africa: a systematic review and evidence map
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Somefun, Oluwaseyi; Casale, Marisa; Hauptronn, Genevieve; Desmond, Chris; Cluver, Lucie; Sherr, Lorraine

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Pike, C University of Cape Town, Desmond Tutu Health Foundation
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	26-Jul-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a well-constructed and timely systematic review of acceptability studies amongst African adolescents. It summarises common factors that drive and limit acceptability in adolescent interventions, which will provide a useful and relevant resource to resources and programme implementors. The point raised around the lack of a standardised acceptability definition and measure is salient, although few solutions or recommendations for improvement are provided.</p> <p>It is unclear at points whether acceptability outcomes are reported only from the perspective of adolescents or other stakeholders (e.g. page 12, lines 11-13), with the discussion mentioning that 25 studies assessed acceptability amongst other stakeholders. If outcomes from other stakeholders are reported then this should be explicitly stated.</p> <p>The discussion is detailed and the section on gaps and future research areas particularly insightful. The discussion of acceptability findings could be strengthened by reference to studies (within or outside of Africa) that have successfully used the research approaches suggested. Contrasting the state of acceptability studies in Africa to other regions may further provide a helpful point of comparison.</p> <p>Overall, this review is pertinent and I can recommend it for publication, with minor revision.</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Gregorio, Jr., Ernesto R. University of the Philippines System
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	08-Sep-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The paper is relatively well written but a review by an English Language expert will not harm, there are some sentences that are quite long that sometimes become confusing.
-------------------------	--

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. C Pike, University of Cape Town

Comments to the Author:

This is a well-constructed and timely systematic review of acceptability studies amongst African adolescents. It summarises common factors that drive and limit acceptability in adolescent interventions, which will provide a useful and relevant resource to resources and programme implementors. The point raised around the lack of a standardised acceptability definition and measure is salient, although few solutions or recommendations for improvement are provided.

Firstly, we thank the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments which are well noted. We agree that the diversity of acceptability definitions and measures used is challenging, as indicated by various other authors (including Sekhon and colleagues) and that there is much scope, as we note in the discussion, to further theorize the construct of acceptability and move towards developing better measurement tools and indicators. However, this objective is beyond the scope of this mapping review, and we believe we could not have started to do it justice in this paper. This mapping review aimed to provide a broad overview of study characteristics and findings, and identify gaps for future, more focused review and empirical work. We are currently working on a separate paper, which findings of this review will feed into, with the aim of developing a theoretical framework for adolescent and youth acceptability. We believe this is important work and are hoping it will be written up and in the public domain in 2022.

It is unclear at points whether acceptability outcomes are reported only from the perspective of adolescents or other stakeholders (e.g. page 12, lines 11-13), with the discussion mentioning that 25 studies assessed acceptability amongst other stakeholders. If outcomes from other stakeholders are reported then this should be explicitly stated.

We have now clearly stated that this review focuses on adolescent acceptability alone (Pg. 10, Ln 3-5) but that, while beyond the scope of this paper, we believe the perspectives of stakeholders are important. As indicated in the discussion, we believe that broader stakeholder acceptability should be considered in future research and more focused review work. We state, on page 18, Ln 1-3 “Future review analyses and acceptability studies could further focus on acceptability among these groups of individuals, and its implications for adolescent acceptability and intervention success.”

The discussion is detailed and the section on gaps and future research areas particularly insightful. The discussion of acceptability findings could be strengthened by reference to studies (within or outside of Africa) that have successfully used the research approaches suggested. Contrasting the state of acceptability studies in Africa to other regions may further provide a helpful point of comparison.

Once again, we thank the reviewer for the positive comments. We have now included references to several studies in the discussion section of the manuscript, to relate our results to the existing literature beyond Africa.

Overall, this review is pertinent and I can recommend it for publication, with minor revision. We thank the reviewer for this encouraging comment.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Ernesto R. Gregorio, Jr., University of the Philippines System

Comments to the Author:

The paper is relatively well written but a review by an English Language expert will not harm, there are some sentences that are quite long that sometimes become confusing.

We thank the reviewer for the positive comment and useful suggestion. We have carefully read through the entire manuscript and simplified long sentences where appropriate

**VERSION 2 – REVIEW**

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Pike, C University of Cape Town, Desmond Tutu Health Foundation
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	04-Nov-2021
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Thank you for your thoughtful responses. With the updates that have been made, I can recommend this manuscript for publication.