

1 **Views and experiences of young people on using mHealth platforms for sexual and**
2 **reproductive health services in rural low- and middle-income countries: a qualitative**
3 **systematic review**

4 Alexander S. Laar¹, Melissa L. Harris¹, Md N Khan¹ and Deborah Loxton¹.

5 ¹ The University of Newcastle, Australia, School of Public Health and Medicine, Centre for
6 Women's Health Research, Faculty of Health and Medicine, Hunter Medical Research
7 Institute, Callaghan, New South Wales 2308, Australia.
8

9 **Abstract**

10 In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), reproductive health programs use mobile health
11 (mHealth) platforms to deliver a broad range of SRH information and services to young people
12 in rural areas. However, young people's experiences of using mobile phone platforms for SRH
13 services in the rural contexts of LMICs remains unexplored. This review qualitatively explored
14 the experiences and perceptions of young people's use of mobile phone platforms for SRH
15 information and services. This qualitative evidence synthesis was conducted through a
16 systematic search of online databases: Medline, Embase, CINAHL, PsycInfo and Scopus. We
17 included peer reviewed articles that were conducted between 2000 and 2020 and used
18 qualitative methods. The methodological quality of papers was assessed by two authors using
19 Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) and
20 Confidence in Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research (CERQual) approach with the
21 identified papers synthesized using a narrative thematic analysis approach. The 26 studies
22 included in the review were conducted in a wide range of LMIC rural settings. The studies used
23 seven different types of mHealth platforms in providing access to SRH information and
24 services on contraception, family planning, sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and human
25 immunodeficiency virus (HIV) education. Participant preferences for use of SRH service
26 platforms centred on convenience, privacy and confidentiality, as well as ease and affordability.

27 High confidence was found in the studies preferencing text messaging, voice messaging, and
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 interactive voice response services while moderate confidence was found in studies focused on
29 phone calls. The overall constraint for platforms services included poor and limited network
30 and electricity connectivity (high confidence in the study findings), limited access to mobile
31 phones and mobile credit due to cost, influence from socio-cultural norms and beliefs and
32 community members (moderate confidence in the study findings), language and literacy skills
33 constraints (high confidence in the study findings). The findings provide valuable information
34 on the preferences of mHealth platforms for accessing SRH services among young people in
35 rural settings in LMICs and the quality of available evidence on the topic. As such, the findings
36 have important implications for health policy makers and implementers and mHealth
37 technology platform developers on improving services for sustainable adoption and integration
38 in LMIC rural health systems.

39 **Keywords:** Healthcare professionals, young people, mHealth platforms, rural settings, LMICs.

40 **Introduction**

41 Sexual and reproductive health (SRH) is essential to young people’s overall health and
42 wellbeing globally (1, 2). While the 1994 Conference on Population and Development
43 recognised the rights of young people to access SRH services, including contraception and
44 family planning [2], in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) most young people aged
45 10–24 years have very limited or no access to SRH information and services. Further, young
46 people from rural settings in LMICs remain the most underserved population by SRH
47 information and services (3-7).

48

49 Studies from rural LMICs have identified multiple challenges which limit young people’s
50 access to and use of SRH information and services (5, 8-10). Some of these barriers include
51 socio-cultural norms (11), stigma attached to sex and sexual health by communities (11), and
52 religious organisations (11). In addition, challenges such as limited health resources and
53 infrastructure, negative or unprofessional attitudes of health providers, long distances to health
54 facilities, inability to afford cost of services (11) and long waiting times for services at health
55 facilities deter or prevent young rural people from accessing services (4-6). Additionally,
56 challenges of conventional SRH intervention services results in limited access to SRH (4, 12,
57 13). These barriers contribute to an unmet need for SRH information among young rural people
58 and result in non-use or incorrect use of contraception and expose young people to
59 vulnerabilities and risks which may lead to unintended pregnancies and STIs including HIV
60 (2, 14, 15).

61

62 Meeting young people’s SRH information and service needs, especially in rural and remote
63 areas, will require innovative modes of delivering youth-friendly services. Digital health
64 programs offer opportunities to improve the provision and access to SRH of young people in

65 LMICs (16). Using mobile phones for the delivery of SRH information and services in a rural
66 context of LMICs could reduce or avert inequalities in the uptake of SRH information and
67 services among young people in rural settings. To address the specific SRH needs of young
68 people in remote rural settings (i.e. in hard-to-reach areas), novel and innovative mobile health
69 (mHealth) platforms are now being used in LMICs to provide access to youth-friendly and
70 youth-centred SRH information and services (17).

71

72 The World Health Organization defines mHealth as ‘the use of mobile and wireless
73 technologies to support the achievement of health objectives’(17). Digital health technologies
74 such as mobile phones can facilitate SRH information exchange and use among young people
75 in rural LMICs to assist with making informed SRH decisions (17). It is suggested that these
76 technologies are effective and affordable in improving coverage and access to SRH information
77 and services among young rural people and are acceptable to young people (6, 17). However,
78 despite the potential of mHealth platforms to improve provision and access to SRH information
79 and services in rural settings in LMICs (17, 18), little evidence and information currently exists.
80 What is available is qualitative in nature, which limits generalisability. A synthesis of this
81 literature, however, can be undertaken to inform policy programs designed to address the SRH
82 needs of young people in rural healthcare systems in LMICs. As such, we synthesised the
83 current evidence to provide a comprehensive understanding of the views and experiences of
84 young people in rural areas using mobile platforms for SRH information and services in rural
85 and remote areas in LMICs.

86

87 **Methods**

88 This systematic review is based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
89 Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (19). The protocol was registered in the PROSPERO
90 database on August 21, 2020 (# CRD42020199221).

91

92 **Data sources and search strategy**

93 A systematic search of five online databases: Medline, Embase, CINAHL, PsycInfo and
94 Scopus for peer-reviewed articles that reported on mHealth intervention studies with young
95 men and women aged between 10-24 years ('adolescents' aged 10-19 years and 'youth' aged
96 15-24 years) (20). These two overlapping age groups were combined to describe 'young
97 people' (21) from rural settings in LMICs. LMICs within this study were determined according
98 to World Bank classifications (22). Studies were limited to those published in English from
99 2000-2020 given the global inception of evidence on mobile telemedicine (23) and increased
100 interest in their use in LMICs over this period. In addition to these sources, reference lists of
101 identified articles and key references of relevant systematic reviews were searched. Searches
102 were also carried out in Google and Google Scholar databases. For database searches, medical
103 subject headings (MeSH) were used to identify relevant articles. Key search terms and
104 keywords that were used are shown in Table 1.

105

106 **Table 1: Search terms and keywords**

Terms	Keywords
Population of interest	men, women, male boys, young men, young males, adolescent young men, adolescent boys, men and women, male boys and female girls, young men and women, young males and females, adolescent young men and women, adolescent boys and girls, aged 10-24 years

Terms	Keywords
Intervention (mHealth)	Mobile health, mHealth, mhealth, m-health, ehealth, e-health, telemedicine, multimedia, cell phone, mobile phone, smart phone, social media
mHealth platforms	short message services, SMS, text message, interactive voice response (IVR), voice calls, voice services, instant messaging, voice messaging, phone calls.
Intervention platform services	reproductive health, sexual health, contraception, family planning methods, family planning services, family planning information, sexually transmitted infections, and HIV
Geographical setting	developing countries, developing economy, less developed countries, underdeveloped countries, LMICs, low-income economy, low-income countries

107

108 The first author (ASL) developed the search strategy which was reviewed by MLH and DL.

109 The search strategy was refined in consultation with the College of Health, Medicine and

110 Wellbeing’s librarian (see Table 1). The Medline search strategy used is shown in Table 2.

111 Search strategies tailored to the other databases are included in the Appendix.

112

113 **Table 2: Medline search strategy**

young* OR youth* OR adolescent* OR young people* OR youth population* OR young women* OR young girl* OR young boy* OR young men* OR young women* OR emerging adult* OR teen* OR adolescent girl* OR adolescent boy* OR adolescen* OR reproductive health* OR sexual health* OR HIV* OR contraception* OR contraceptives* OR modern contraception* OR contracept services* OR contraception counselling* OR family planning* OR family planning services* OR family planning information* OR family education* OR family planning counselling

AND

Healthcare providers* OR Health professionals* OR frontline worker* OR lay worker* OR health provider* OR health counsellor* OR health educator* OR mobile phone health* OR mobile health* OR mHealth* or short message services* OR SMS* OR text message* OR interactive voice response* OR voice calls* OR phone calls*OR voice reminders* OR interactive voice reminders* OR interactive voice calls* OR electronic health* OR phone calls

AND

low-income countries* or low- and-middle-income nation* or low to middle income countries* or middle-income countr* OR developing countries* OR low resource countries* OR Africa* OR sub-Saharan Africa (limit to (english language and full text and humans and yr="2000 - 2020").

114

115 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

116 We included primary studies that used qualitative methods and reported on the views and
117 experiences of young rural female and male's use of mobile phone platforms for accessing
118 SRH information and services in LMICs. For the purposes of this review, 'young' people are
119 defined as (adolescents and youth populations from 10 to 24 years). Conference presentations,
120 student theses, editorials, review articles, letters to the editor, commentaries, symposium
121 proceedings and studies where information on young people could not be disaggregated were
122 excluded.

123

124 **Data extraction**

125 Database searches were completed by ASL. The literature results were first downloaded into
126 Endnote X9 software (Thomson Reuters, Scientific Inc., New York City, New York, USA) and
127 later imported into the Covidence online platform for analysis. Duplicates were removed and
128 screening was then independently conducted by two reviewers (ASL and NK) based on title
129 and abstract according to the inclusion criteria. Full text articles were retrieved and then two
130 reviewers (ASL and NK) independently assessed the relevancy of the papers. Screened articles
131 were read in full. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion.

132

133 **Assessment of methodological quality of studies using GRADE-CERQual approach**

134 The methodological quality of the included studies were appraised using the Grading of
135 Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) and Confidence in
136 Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research (CERQual) approach (24). The methodological
137 quality of included studies were appraised independently by two reviewers (ASL and NK)
138 against four key components: methodological limitations (25), coherence of the review finding

139 (26), data adequacy, (27) and relevance (28) detailed in Table 3(see also Assessment of Quality
140 Table in Appendix). The overall CERQual explanation of quality assessment findings is also
141 detailed in Table 4.

142

143 **Table 3: Definitions of GRADE-CERQual methodological components**

Component	Definition
Methodological limitations of included studies (25)	The extent to which there are problems in the design or conduct of the primary studies that contributed evidence to a review finding.
Coherence of the review finding (26)	An assessment of how clear and cogent the fit is between the data from the primary studies and a review finding that synthesis those data. By cogent in this definition, we mean well supported or compelling.
Adequacy of data contributing to review finding (27)	An overall determination of the degree of richness and quantity of data supporting a review finding.
Relevance of the included studies to the review question (28)	The extent to which the body of evidence from the primary studies supporting a review finding is applicable to the context (i.e perspective or population, the phenomenon of interest, setting) specified in the review question.

144

145 **Determining the level of confidence in the study finding**

146 We further assessed the level of rating of confidence or certainty in the study findings using
147 the GRADE-CERQual approach in Table 4.

148

149 **Table 4: Grading and rating of confidence in the individual review findings**

High confidence	It is highly likely that the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest.
Moderate confidence	It is likely that the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest
Low confidence	It is possible that the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest
Very low confidence	It is not clear whether the review finding is a reasonable representation of the phenomenon of interest

150

151 **Results**

152 **Summary**

153 A total of 3,121 articles were identified through the database search. Among these, 434
154 duplicates were removed. A total of 2,712 studies were assessed based on titles and abstracts.
155 Of these, 2,672 studies were excluded for not meeting inclusion criteria. Forty full-text articles
156 were assessed for eligibility. Of these, 14 articles were excluded. Twenty-six articles met the
157 inclusion criteria for this review (see Figure 1).

Characteristics of studies

All the included studies were conducted in rural areas in LMICs and focused on the use of mobile phone platforms for providing access to SRH information and services to young people, including contraceptive advice and information, family planning and HIV prevention education. The studies were conducted in sixteen different countries, with the majority in Kenya (8 studies) and South Africa (3 studies). Two studies were conducted in Nigeria, with an additional four in Uganda (2 studies) and Tanzania (2 studies). The remaining nine studies were conducted in Burkina-Faso, Bangladesh, Malawi (Rwanda, Malawi, and India), Cambodia, Nepal (Tajikistan, Bolivia and Palestine), Ethiopia, and Peru, respectively. In terms of the study settings, most studies recruited youth participants from communities (17 studies). Others used health care facilities (2), health care facilities and communities (2), communities and schools (3) and schools alone (2). Regarding the methods used for data collection, most involved focus groups (13 studies) and in-depth interviews (9), with four using both (see Table 5).

The 26 studies included in this synthesis used a range of mobile phone platforms for providing access to SRH information and services among young people in rural settings in LMICs. Most of the studies used text-messaging platforms (11) with a combination of voice messaging, (2) interactive voice response, (2) phone calls, Facebook, WhatsApp and Twitter as noted in Table 5. The majority of studies included information about the barriers to mHealth SRH service access, these have also been included in summary form in Table 5.

Table 5: Summary of studies included in the systematic review

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
Vahdat (29)	Kenya Community (Rural/Urban)	Males & females aged 19-29 years	In-depth interviews	Short message service (SMS)/ Text-messaging; Contraception information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of mobile credit - Poor network - Language literacy
Laidlaw (30)	Malawi Community/School (Rural)	Male & female youth aged 15-24 years	Focus group discussions	Text messaging/ Interactive Voice Response (IVR); Contraception/ Family planning/ HIV education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliance on borrowed or shared phones - Cost of mobile phones
Duclos (31)	Burkina-Faso Community (Rural)	Women	Focus group discussions	Voice messaging; SRH information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low technological knowledge on using mobile phones - Restriction of phone use by community members for SRH services - Not able to afford mobile credit & data - Limited mobile network connectivity & stability - Limited electricity supply & stability
Evelia (32)	Kenya Community (Rural/Urban)	Young women &	Focus group discussions	Text messaging/ Facebook/ WhatsApp; SRH information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited network connectivity and stability - Limited power connectivity and stability associated with cost for charging phones

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
		youth aged 10-24 years			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not owning mobile phones due to cost - Participants faced restriction of use of mobile phones by community members such as parents, partners, and school authorities for SRH services - WhatsApp, Facebook, and Twitter platforms services were not commonly used by young people due to lack of technical knowledge - Participants think that Facebook platform services lacked expert moderation - Cost of using Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp platform services due to the requirement for smart phones - Not having technical skills or knowledge for tweeting - Lack of expert moderation of Facebook platforms services
Smith (33)	Cambodia Community/Health facility (Rural/Urban)	Women aged 22 years & above	In-depth interviews	Voice messaging; Family planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intrusiveness of voice messages - Low technological knowledge

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
Dev (34)	Kenya Health facility (Rural/Urban)	Young women 14–24 years	In-depth interviews	Text messaging; Contraception/ Family planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low or lack of technical skills in using text messaging platform services - Low technological literacy - Cost of mobile phones
Blanc (35)	Nigeria Community/ Schools (Rural/Urban)	Young male & female youth aged 10-24 years	In-depth analysis	Text messaging/ Phone call; SRH information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Network connectivity - Low literacy in writing and reading text messages due to low education
Jamison (36)	Uganda Community (Rural)	Young male & female aged 18-35 years	Focus groups & in-depth interviews	Text-messaging; Family planning/ HIV prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using platform information encourages promiscuity
Parajuli & Doneys (37)	Nepal Community (Rural)	Women & girls aged 16-36 years	Focus groups & in-depth interviews	Text messaging; SRH information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not owning mobile phone due to cost - Inability to read and write text messages due to low literacy
Ybarra (38)	Uganda Community (Rural/Urban)	Youth (women &)	Focus groups	Phone call/ Text messaging; HIV prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost for phone credit or airtime - Women faced pressure from partners to share text messages

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
		men) aged 18- to 22 years			
Winskell (39)	Kenya Community (Peri-Urban)	Young females & males aged 11-14 years	Focus groups	Interactive platform; Contraception services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of technological knowledge - Lack of technological literacy skills
Visser (40)	South Africa Community (Urban/Rural)	Young people (12–24 years)	Focus groups	Interactive voice response/ Text messaging; HIV prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of mobile airtime or data - Limited network access and stability
Sabben (41)	Kenya Community (Rural/Urban)	Young males & females aged 11 to 14 years	Focus groups	Interactive voice response; HIV prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not owning phones - Cost of mobile phones
McCharty (42)	Tajikistan, Bolivia & Palestine Community (Rural/Urban)	Young females & males aged 15-30 years	Focus groups	Facebook/ WhatsApp/ Text messaging; Contraception services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost for smart phones - Cost of data and airtime - Limited network connectivity - Limited electricity connectivity

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
Adeagbo (43)	South Africa Community (Rural)	Young females & males aged 18-34 years	Focus groups & In-depth interviews	Text messaging; HIV prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited technological literacy - Cost of data and mobile credit - Cost of phones
Akinfaderin-Agarau (44)	Nigeria Community/ School (Rural/ Urban/Semi-Urban)	Adolescent girls & young women aged 12-30 years	Focus groups	Text messaging/ Interactive voice response; SRH information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language literacy barrier. - Mobile phone cost and credit - Poor network - Limited power supply - Influences from community members. - Misconceptions and myths on receiving calls or messages from unknown people resulting in death or disappearance - Restriction of use of mobile phone by partners and parents
Merrill (45)	South Africa Primary Schools (Rural/Urban)	Adolescent girls aged 11-16 years	Focus groups	Text messaging; HIV & STIs education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of mobile phones - Cost of mobile airtime or credit
Nigatu (46)	Ethiopia Schools (Rural/Urban)	Young women & men	Focus groups &	Text messaging; HIV & STIs education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor mobile network connectivity and stability

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
		Aged 15-24 years	In-depth interviews		
Ampt (47)	Kenya Community (Rural)	Young women aged 16 years or older.	In-depth interviews	Text messaging; Contraception/ HIV education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor network and stability - Inconvenience for receiving health messages at odd time
FHI 360 USAID (48)	Kenya & Tanzania Community (Rural/Urban)	Young females & males aged 29 years or younger	In-depth telephone interviews	Text messaging; Contraception information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of mobile phone services
Ong (49)	Cambodia Community (Urban/Rural)	Young females aged 15-24 years	Focus groups	Text messaging/ Voice messaging; HIV/STIs prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited network coverage and reliability - Limited electricity coverage and stability
Guerrero (50)	Peru Community (Peri-Urban/Urban)	Adolescents, youth females & males aged 13-24 years	Focus groups	Text messaging; SRH information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Language literacy barrier - Platform not been gender-based for males and females separately

Author(s)	Country & setting	Target population	Data collection method	mHealth delivery platform and services	Key findings on barriers for young people in accessing SRH health
Deliver (51)	India, Malawi & Rwanda Community (Urban/Semi-Urban/Rural)	Adolescent girls & young women aged 15-24 years	In-depth interviews	WhatsApp/ Facebook; SRH information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Influences from community members - Low technological knowledge - Cost of data and airtime - Language literacy barrier - Cost for smart phones to be able to use services - Lack of expert moderation of Facebook services
Memiah (52)	Kenya Community (Rural/Urban)	Youth, boys & girls aged 14-29 years	Focus groups	Text messaging/ Phone call/ Facebook/ Twitter; HIV & STIs prevention education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost of mobile/smart phones - Cost of mobile data and credit
Eckersberger (53)	Bangladesh Facility (Urban/Peri-Urban)	Women aged 18 & above	In-depth interviews	Text messaging /Interactive Voice response; Family planning services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low technological skills and knowledge - Low formal education/literacy
L'engle (54)	Tanzania Health facility/ Community (Rural/Urban)	Young female & male aged 19-29 years	In-depth interviews	Interactive voice response/ Text messaging; Family planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mHealth platforms services devoid of face-to-face interactions but important - Lack of privacy and anonymity

Confidence in the review findings

Confidence in the review findings across studies with explanation of the assessment are detailed in the CERQual evidence profile in Table 6. The study found high confidence in the findings for the text-messaging platforms (29, 30, 32, 34-38, 40, 42-50, 52-54). However, the confidence in the findings for social media platforms including WhatsApp (32, 42, 51) Facebook (32, 42, 51, 52) and Twitter (32, 52) was low. Generally, the study findings for confidence in the challenges and barriers for platform services was high.

Table 6: CERQual evidence profile

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to review findings	CERQual assessment of confidence in the evidence	Explanation of CERQual assessment
<p>General experiences and perceptions for SRH mHealth platforms SRH information and services</p> <p>Participants had a wide range of experiences and views regarding interest, acceptability, and preferences for receiving mobile phone based SRH information and services. These were centred on comfort, convenience, privacy, confidentiality, anonymity, non-judgemental, ability for interaction, affordability and easier for accessing SRH messages compared to face-to-face services where communities are far away from health facilities reported across rural settings in LMICs.</p>	(29-54)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the review finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for using mobile platforms SRH information and services. For the 26 studies, 3 had unclear ethical procedures, 3 had unclear reflexivity, 1 had unclear data analysis procedure and 3 with minor data issues.
Experiences and perceptions for SRH mHealth platform SRH services			
<p>Text messaging</p> <p>Participants reported their preference for text messaging services due to the ability to store text messages for reference and share with friends and peers. Some participants also indicated being able to receive text messages under poor or weak network connectivity conditions as positive experiences for using the service.</p>	(29, 30, 32, 34-38, 40, 42-50, 52-54)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for text messaging. For the 21 studies, 2 had unclear ethical procedures, 1 an unclear data analysis procedure and 3 with minor data issues.
<p>Voice messaging</p> <p>Participant’s ability to store voice messages and re-play and listen at their own convenience was expressed by some participants. Some participants</p>	(30, 31, 33, 49, 53)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for voice messaging. All the 5 studies had no or very minor concerns.

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to review findings	CERQual assessment of confidence in the evidence	Explanation of CERQual assessment
with low-literacy or no formal education expressed their preference for the service as it did not require writing and reading of text messages.			
<p>Interactive voice response</p> <p>Most participants expressed positive views and preferences for interactive voice response due to the ability to interact or engage with health care providers or counsellors to discuss issues that were tailored to their needs. Young people with low education also indicated the ease of using the platform. The requirement for a basic mobile phone to use the services was reported as very advantageous to young poor rural people.</p>	(29, 33, 40, 44, 45, 53, 54)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for interactive voice response platforms. For all the 7 studies, one had minor data issues.
<p>Mobile phone call</p> <p>Participants reported positive experiences due to the ability to interact with health providers and to ask personal questions and get an instant response or feedback tailored to their needs. Low-literate young people liked the services for not requiring composing or reading text messages and not requiring smart or android phones to use the SRH intervention services.</p>	(35, 38, 52)	Moderate confidence	It is possible that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for mobile phone call platform intervention SRH information and services. For all the 3 studies, ethical procedures was not clearly stated in one study.
<p>WhatsApp</p> <p>Participants reported positive experiences in terms of ability to interact with providers and friends and posting or sharing of questions on their</p>	(32, 42, 51)	Low confidence	It is possible that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for WhatsApp platform SRH information and services due to limited data. For all the 3

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to review findings	CERQual assessment of confidence in the evidence	Explanation of CERQual assessment
health issues on the platform for answers or responses. However, some expressed the services not been affordable due to the need for an android or smart phone to be able to use services as a challenge.			studies, ethical procedures in one of the studies were not clearly stated.
<p>Facebook</p> <p>Participants who used the services, a preference was related to the ability to interact with friends and peers and posting questions to receive answers or responses. Some participants reported that the requirement for an android and smart phone to be able to use the services was a barrier. Some had the perception that the services lacked expert moderation of the platform and information posted may not be authentic.</p>	(32, 42, 51, 52)	Very low confidence	It is not clear whether the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for Facebook platform SRH services due to thin data. However, for the 4 studies, the ethics procedures in one were unclear.
<p>Twitter</p> <p>Participants who used twitter platform services reported not being conversant with the platform services They also indicated that it familiar among the youth in their settings. Participants said they encountered some technical difficulties in manipulating the twitter handle. The need for an android or smart phone to be able to use services was also cited as a challenge.</p>	(32, 52)	Very low confidence	It is not clear whether the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for Twitter platform SRH services due to thin data. For the 2 studies, one had unclear ethics procedures.
General barriers for use of mobile platforms SRH information and services by participants			

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to review findings	CERQual assessment of confidence in the evidence	Explanation of CERQual assessment
<p>Cost</p> <p>Participants cited cost for mobile phones and cost for mobile credit or airtime and data as a barrier to use of platforms services. In some instances, some had to depend on shared or borrowed phones to be able to access platforms services. Cost barrier was widely reported across several study settings.</p>	(29-32, 34, 37, 38, 40-45, 48, 51, 52)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences of barriers in using SRH mobile phone platforms services. For all the 16 studies, one study had unclear ethical procedures, two with thin data and one with unclear reflexivity issues.
<p>Technological skills and language literacy</p> <p>Low technological knowledge, skills and language literacy were cited as barriers influencing fully use mobile phone platforms SRH services in across several rural settings</p>	(29, 31-35, 37, 43, 44, 50, 51, 53, 55)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences of barriers in using SRH mobile phone platforms services. For all the 13 studies, two of the studies had unclear ethics procedures and unclear reflexivity.
<p>Electricity connectivity and stability</p> <p>Infrastructural barriers related to limited electricity connectivity and stability was cited a barrier affecting use of SRH mobile phone platforms services across several rural settings. This barrier was commonly reported across several rural settings.</p>	(31, 32, 42, 44, 49)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for mobile phone platforms SRH information and services. For all the 5 studies, one had unclear ethics procedures.
<p>Network connectivity and stability</p> <p>Infrastructural barriers related to limited and weak network connectivity and stability was cited a barrier affecting use of SRH mobile phone platforms services across rural settings. This barrier was commonly reported across several rural settings.</p>	(29, 31, 32, 35, 40, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49)	High confidence	It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for SRH mHealth platforms SRH information and services. For all the 10 studies, 3 had unclear ethics procedure issues, one unclear reflexivity, and 2 with thin data.

Summary of review findings	Studies contributing to review findings	CERQual assessment of confidence in the evidence	Explanation of CERQual assessment
<p>Social norms and beliefs</p> <p>Young people faced barriers as a result of community members influences. Parents and partners referred to women using SRH mHealth platforms services as been promiscuous. Some young people had the belief that receiving phone calls from unknown mobile phone contact numbers or persons could lead to death or the disappearance of the recipient. These restrictive beliefs and myths were reported across Tajikistan, Bolivia, Palestine, and Nigeria.</p>	<p>(31, 32, 36, 38, 44, 51)</p>	<p>Moderate confidence</p>	<p>It is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of participants experiences for use of mobile phone platforms intervention SRH information and services. For all the 6 studies, 2 studies had issues with one was unclear reflexivity and the other on unclear ethical procedures.</p>

1 **Preference and acceptability for using mHealth SRH services**

2 In this review, the studies used seven different mobile phone platforms to deliver a range of
3 SRH information and services on contraception, family planning, prevention of STIs and HIV
4 education across rural areas. Participants' acceptance and preference levels for using mobile
5 platform SRH intervention services were varied. Participants reported preferences for SRH
6 text-messaging (29, 30, 32, 34-38, 40, 42-50, 52-54) services. Some of the reasons were
7 associated with their ability to receive text messages even during poor or weak network
8 connectivity conditions, the opportunity to store text messages for future reference and share
9 the messages with friends and peers. Participants also reported a preference for using voice
10 messaging services (30, 31, 33, 49, 53). Some of the reasons were due to their ability to be able
11 to communicate with HCPs without writing, as well as the ability to store voice messages and
12 re-play and listen to them when they needed. Recipients also reported that their ability to
13 interact with HCPs or counsellors to gain quick responses to their SRH issues that were
14 individually tailored to their needs also saw them favour voice messaging types of services
15 over other methods.

16

17 The findings for the preference of phone call for SRH services (35, 38, 52) related to not
18 requiring literacy and technical skills in terms for composing or reading text messages and the
19 ability to use low cost basic mobile phones for the platform services.

20

21 **Barriers to using mHealth platforms SRH services**

22 Barriers to using mobile platform services in rural settings centred on cost for mobile phones
23 and their maintenance in terms of mobile credit or airtime and data, technological barriers
24 related to lack of technological knowledge or skills needed to use platform services [160, 161,
25 165, 168, 173, 174, 178, 181, 186], limited infrastructure in terms of electricity and network

26 connectivity and stability, and influence of social and cultural norms, influences from
27 community members and beliefs and perceptions [161, 168, 181, 184, 186] as indicated in
28 Table 2.6.

29

30 **Discussion**

31 This review qualitatively explored the experiences and perceptions of young peoples' use of
32 mobile phone platforms for SRH information and services in rural settings in LMICs using the
33 GRADE-CERQual approach. Evidence has shown that mHealth technology platforms have the
34 potential to address numerous SRH information and services access barriers for young people
35 in rural contexts in LMICs (16, 18, 56-59). The study findings reported preferences and barriers
36 for use of mHealth-based platforms for SRH information and services among rural young
37 people across rural LMICs.

38

39 Generally, cost in terms of mobile phone ownership and credit or data for their maintenance
40 was reported as major barrier which influenced use of platforms SRH services among young
41 people (29-32, 34, 37, 38, 40-45, 48, 51, 52). The cost factor led to the reliance on borrowed
42 or shared phones by people who could not afford to be able to access SRH services. The use
43 of borrowed and shared phones resulting in privacy and confidentiality challenges was also
44 reported in this study [72, 105, 119, 120, 157, 162, 163, 168, 173] with high confidence in the
45 study findings noted. Mobile phone sharing is a common phenomenon across rural settings in
46 LMICs among poor young people and creates potential source of privacy and confidentiality
47 breaches (60-63). This is a key challenge when discussing SRH information and services
48 especially when concerning sensitive issues (44, 64). As such, young people are reluctant to
49 use borrowed or shared phone for sensitive SRH issues (44). Ownership of a mobile phone
50 guarantees independence and freedom for use for SRH information and services (44).

51 However, as rural young people are not economically independent, they may not be able to
52 acquire and maintain mobile phones on their own for SRH information and services without
53 financial interventions. Introduction of financial interventions is needed to make mobile
54 platforms SRH services affordable for poor rural young people (64). Introducing financial
55 subsidies for the cost of mobile phones and airtime for maintenance through flexible terms of
56 payment could help overcome the cost barrier and sustain use of services among young people
57 in rural settings in LMICs (65).

58

59 The review finding reported limited and poor network (29, 31, 32, 35, 40, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49)
60 and electricity connectivity and coverage (31, 32, 42, 44, 49) as a barriers to use of mobile
61 platforms SRH information and services among young people across the study settings. This
62 is consistent with other studies which have identified limited coverage and poor network and
63 power connectivity as a challenge in rural LMICs to the access of SRH information and
64 services with young people struggling to identify spots in the communities with network
65 connectivity and stability to be able to use mobile phones (64, 66-69). In addition, charging
66 phones often requires travel to communities with power and sometimes paying a fee to charge
67 mobile phones batteries. Given that the use of mHealth applications in rural settings requires a
68 reliable, effective, and sustained network and electricity connectivity (17, 70), exploring
69 alternative power sources such as solar panels and power banks have been recommended for
70 rural poor-resourced settings in LMICs with limited technological infrastructure (17, 65).

71

72 High confidence was found in studies reporting on limited technological skills and language
73 literacy (29, 31-35, 37, 43, 44, 50, 51, 53, 55) as barriers to mHealth for SRH particularly in
74 terms of limited knowledge regarding the use of these platforms. Despite the perceived benefits
75 and opportunities of mobile phone technology for SRH information services among rural

76 populations (especially young people in rural communities in LMICs), these services are less
77 utilisable by low literate and illiterate young people in rural contexts that would otherwise have
78 benefited most from mHealth technologies SRH initiatives (71).

79

80 Moderate confidence was shown in the findings that identified the restriction of young people’s
81 mobile phone use for SRH services by community members such as partners and parents (31,
82 32, 36, 38, 44, 51) as a barrier to use. This finding is consistent with other studies in rural
83 LMICs where young women reported that their sexual partners associated phone use for SRH
84 information with infidelity (62, 63, 66). Despite the untapped potential of mobile phones as
85 tools for improving access to SRH information and services among young people in rural
86 LMICs, the use of mobile phones frequently raise a topic of conflict between sexual
87 partners(66) and could influence the decision of young people to use innovative mHealth
88 technology for SRH information and services. Other perceived factors which influenced young
89 people’s phone use for SRH services emanated from social beliefs and myths related to phone
90 calls received from unknown people that could result in death or disappearance of the recipient.
91 This was most often reported across rural settings in Tajikistan, Bolivia Palestine, and Nigeria.
92 Other studies have also linked social beliefs and myths for receiving calls from anonymous
93 people resulting in death caused by “evil spirits” (62, 63). These social beliefs need to be
94 addressed to avoid misinforming young people for using the mobile phone technology for SRH
95 information and services in rural context of LMICs. Public education is critical to educate rural
96 populations about mHealth SRH initiatives to address knowledge gaps in relation to myths and
97 perceptions that affect use of mobile phone platforms for SRH information and services among
98 young people in rural contexts in LMICs (72, 73).

99

100 The study also reported positive findings regarding the acceptance and preferences of mHealth
101 platforms SRH information and services in relation to youth-friendly platforms services (58,
102 74, 75) associated with comfort, convenience, privacy and confidentiality, compared to in-
103 person services (29-54). The ability to engage young people with wide range of SRH
104 information and services across wide geographical rural areas were reported as some of the
105 benefits of mHealth platforms for SRH services (29-54). Several studies have come out with
106 similar findings among young people in rural contexts in LMICs (6, 76-79). With regard to
107 platforms such as text messaging, voice messaging, integrated voice recognition (IVR) and
108 phone calls, some of the positive findings in terms of their preference for SRH information and
109 services was due to their familiarity and the ability to use low cost non android phones for the
110 services, compared to WhatsApp, Facebook, and Twitter platforms. The preference for text-
111 messaging services was associated with the ability to receive and read text messages under
112 poor or weak network conditions and the opportunity to store messages for reference and share
113 with friends and peers (29, 30, 32, 34-38, 40, 42-50, 52-54). These findings are also confirmed
114 by studies in rural settings in LMICs among young people (6, 50, 64, 80-83). Text-messaging
115 platforms continue to be the most frequently used and preferred mobile phone communication
116 platform among populations in rural settings in LMICs (44). However, text messaging requires
117 basic literacy for writing and reading to be able to use services, hence young people's
118 preference for phone calls (35, 38, 52) and voice messaging (30, 31, 33, 49, 53) and IVR (29,
119 33, 40, 44, 45, 53, 54) services. Preference for voice messaging, phone call, and IVR platforms
120 was also due to illiterate and low literate young people to use the platform services since they
121 did not require writing and reading of messages (30, 31, 33, 49, 53) and the to the ability to
122 interact or engage with HCPs or counsellors to discuss their SRH issues by receiving quick
123 response tailored to their needs (29, 33, 40, 44, 45, 53, 54). The findings indicated that
124 platforms such as WhatsApp (32, 42, 51), Facebook (32, 42, 51, 52) and Twitter (32, 52) were

125 less preferred and used by young people for SRH information and services due to their
126 unfamiliarity and the requirement for a smartphone and its associated high cost as well as low
127 knowledge and skills (29-32, 34, 37, 38, 40-45, 48, 51, 52).

128

129 While basic or simple low cost mobile phone ownership levels are common among rural young
130 people in LMICs and could be used for mHealth SRH initiatives, the same is not true for
131 smartphones (84, 85). While mobile phone-based platforms are becoming increasingly
132 popular among young people for SRH services in rural contexts in LMICs, platforms such as
133 WhatsApp, Facebook and Twitter are less used and preferred by young people (42, 51, 52).
134 Few young people had used these platforms due to the requirement for smart phones and their
135 associated high cost and lack of technological skills (16, 86, 87). Some participants also felt
136 that these platforms were not familiar among them in their settings and hence their low usage.
137 Evidence has shown that there is a dearth of qualitative evidence on the effect of innovative
138 social media platforms such WhatsApp, Facebook, and Twitter for SRH information and
139 services among young people in rural LMICs (42, 51, 52). This warrants further research on
140 these social media platforms to help maximise their impact for use for SRH information and
141 services among young people in rural LMICs settings.

142

143 We acknowledge that this review has some limitations. Firstly, we restricted our search to those
144 studies published in the English language between 2000-2020. This could have limited the
145 numbers of articles restricted from the search. We could have missed relevant articles outside
146 of our study period and languages other than English. Hence, we could have missed studies
147 relevant to mHealth platforms for SRH services for young people. A strength of this study is
148 that it was conducted using a comprehensive search strategy and a robust quality appraisal
149 process and rigorous systematic review methodology (25-28).

150

151 **Conclusion**

152 The findings of this synthesis have demonstrated the perceived potential of mHealth platforms
153 for improving access to conventional SRH information and services among young people in
154 rural settings in LMICs. While mHealth platforms have the potential to address access
155 limitations to SRH information and services among rural young people, the barriers need to be
156 addressed. These findings provide relevant recommendations for policy makers and
157 implementers of SRH programs to improve services for integration and scale-up in the rural
158 health system contexts in LMICs.

159

160 **Authors' contributions**

161 ASL, DL and MLH conceived and designed the study. ASL, DL and MLH conducted the data
162 search. ASL and NK conducted the title and abstract screening, full text screening and data
163 extraction. ASL and NK analysed the data and conducted the quality assessments. Data
164 screening was independently conducted by two reviewers (ASL and NK) based on title and
165 abstract according to the inclusion criteria. Full text articles were retrieved, and the two
166 reviewers (ASL and NK) independently assessed the relevancy of the papers. Screened articles
167 were read in full. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion. ASL wrote the first draft of the
168 manuscript. ASL, NK, MLH and DL assessed the confidence of the review findings. MLH, DL
169 and NK contributed to the interpretation of the data and review of the manuscript for
170 intellectual content. All the authors have read and approved the manuscript for submission.

171

172

173

174 **Acknowledgements**

175 This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP)
176 Scholarship for my PhD program. We would like to acknowledge Jessica Birchall, senior
177 librarian at the University of Newcastle for her guidance in developing the search terms for
178 this review. Dr. Melissa Harris is supported by an ARC Discovery Early Career Researcher
179 Award ((DE190101134).

180 **Funding**

181 This study was not funded.

182

183 **Availability of data and materials**

184 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from
185 the corresponding author on reasonable request.

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206 **References**

- 207 1. Starrs AM, Ezeh AC, Barker G, Basu A, Bertrand JT, Blum R, et al. Accelerate
208 progress—sexual and reproductive health and rights for all: report of the Guttmacher–Lancet
209 Commission. *The Lancet*. 2018;391(10140):2642-92.
- 210 2. Popple K, Florescu A, Wong A, Golaz A, Singh N, Blanchet K, et al. Innovation for
211 Sexual and Reproductive Health in Humanitarian Crises. Elrha: London. his work is licensed
212 under a Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercialNoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC
213 BY-NC-ND 4.0). 2021.
- 214 3. Ajayi A, Akpan W, Goon D, Nwokocha E, Adeniyi O. Tough love: Socio-cultural
215 explanations for deadly abortion choices among Nigerian undergraduate students. *African
216 Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences (AJPHEs)*. 2016;22(31):711-24.
- 217 4. Desrosiers A, Betancourt T, Kergoat Y, Servilli C, Say L, Kobeissi L. A systematic
218 review of sexual and reproductive health interventions for young people in humanitarian and
219 lower-and-middle-income country settings. *BMC public health*. 2020;20:1-21.
- 220 5. Fatusi AO. Young people's sexual and reproductive health interventions in developing
221 countries: Making the investments count. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2016;59(3):S1-S3.
- 222 6. Feroz AS, Ali NA, Khoja A, Asad A, Saleem S. Using mobile phones to improve young
223 people sexual and reproductive health in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review
224 to identify barriers, facilitators, and range of mHealth solutions. *Reproductive Health*.
225 2021;18(1):1-13.
- 226 7. Pachauri S, Santhya K. Reproductive choices for Asian adolescents: A focus on
227 contraceptive behavior. *International Family Planning Perspectives*. 2002:186-95.
- 228 8. Morris JL, Rushwan H. Adolescent sexual and reproductive health: The global
229 challenges. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*. 2015;131:S40-S2.
- 230 9. Santhya K, Jejeebhoy SJ. Sexual and reproductive health and rights of adolescent girls:
231 Evidence from low-and middle-income countries. *Global public health*. 2015;10(2):189-221.
- 232 10. Cortez R, Quinlan-Davidson M, Saadat S. Challenges for Adolescent's Sexual and
233 Reproductive Health within the Context of Universal Health Coverage. 2014.
- 234 11. Ezenwaka U, Mbachu C, Ezumah N, Eze I, Agu C, Agu I, et al. Exploring factors
235 constraining utilization of contraceptive services among adolescents in Southeast Nigeria: an
236 application of the socio-ecological model. *BMC public health*. 2020;20(1):1-11.
- 237 12. Chandra-Mouli V, McCarragher DR, Phillips SJ, Williamson NE, Hainsworth G.
238 Contraception for adolescents in low and middle income countries: needs, barriers, and access.
239 *Reproductive health*. 2014;11(1):1-8.
- 240 13. Salam RA, Faqqah A, Sajjad N, Lassi ZS, Das JK, Kaufman M, et al. Improving
241 adolescent sexual and reproductive health: A systematic review of potential interventions.
242 *Journal of adolescent health*. 2016;59(4):S11-S28.
- 243 14. Prata N, Weidert K. Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health. *Oxford Research
244 Encyclopedia of Global Public Health*2020.
- 245 15. Rizvi F, Williams J, Hoban E. Factors influencing unintended pregnancies amongst
246 adolescent girls and young women in Cambodia. *International journal of environmental
247 research and public health*. 2019;16(20):4006.
- 248 16. Ochieng BM, Smith L, Orton B, Hayter M, Kaseje M, Wafula CO, et al. Perspectives
249 of Adolescents, Parents, Service Providers, and Teachers on Mobile Phone Use for Sexual
250 Reproductive Health Education. *Social Sciences*. 2022;11(5):196.
- 251 17. Organization WH. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for
252 health system strengthening: web supplement 2: summary of findings and GRADE tables.
253 World Health Organization; 2019.

- 254 18. Watkins JOTA, Goudge J, Gómez-Olivé FX, Griffiths F. Mobile phone use among
255 patients and health workers to enhance primary healthcare: A qualitative study in rural South
256 Africa. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2018;198:139-47.
- 257 19. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for
258 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*.
259 2009;6(7):e1000097.
- 260 20. Organization WH. Atlas of African Health Statistics 2016: health situation analysis of
261 the African Region. 2016.
- 262 21. Organization WH. Regional atlas on adolescent and youth 2017: monitor the health
263 status and trend of adolescent and youth in Africa. 2018.
- 264 22. Serajuddin U, Hamadeh N. New World Bank country classifications by income level:
265 2020-2021. *World Bank Blogs*. 2020.
- 266 23. Istepanian RS. Guest editorial special issue on mobile telemedicine and telehealth
267 systems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine*. 2000;4(3):194-.
- 268 24. Lewin S, Bohren M, Rashidian A, Munthe-Kaas H, Glenton C, Colvin CJ, et al.
269 Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 2: how to make
270 an overall CERQual assessment of confidence and create a Summary of Qualitative Findings
271 table. *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):11-23.
- 272 25. Munthe-Kaas H, Bohren MA, Glenton C, Lewin S, Noyes J, Tunçalp Ö, et al. Applying
273 GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 3: how to assess
274 methodological limitations. *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):25-32.
- 275 26. Colvin CJ, Garside R, Wainwright M, Munthe-Kaas H, Glenton C, Bohren MA, et al.
276 Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 4: how to
277 assess coherence. *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):33-41.
- 278 27. Glenton C, Carlsen B, Lewin S, Munthe-Kaas H, Colvin CJ, Tunçalp Ö, et al. Applying
279 GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 5: how to assess
280 adequacy of data. *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):43-50.
- 281 28. Noyes J, Booth A, Lewin S, Carlsen B, Glenton C, Colvin CJ, et al. Applying GRADE-
282 CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 6: how to assess relevance of the
283 data. *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):51-61.
- 284 29. Vahdat HL, L'Engle KL, Plourde KF, Magaria L, Olawo A. There are some questions
285 you may not ask in a clinic: providing contraception information to young people in Kenya
286 using SMS. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*. 2013;123:e2-e6.
- 287 30. Laidlaw R, Dixon D, Morse T, Beattie TK, Kumwenda S, Mpmemberera G. Using
288 participatory methods to design an mHealth intervention for a low income country, a case study
289 in Chikwawa, Malawi. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*. 2017;17(1):1-12.
- 290 31. Duclos V, Yé M, Moubassira K, Sanou H, Sawadogo NH, Bibeau G, et al. Situating
291 mobile health: a qualitative study of mHealth expectations in the rural health district of Nouna,
292 Burkina Faso. *Health research policy and systems*. 2017;15(1):47.
- 293 32. Evelia H., Shilabukha k., M. W, J. W. “Reaching young people through digital
294 platforms: findings of a study of NAYA’s field programme”,. Rutgers & NAYA. 2015.
- 295 33. Smith C, Ly S, Uk V, Warnock R, Free C. Women’s views and experiences of a mobile
296 phone-based intervention to support post-abortion contraception in Cambodia. *Reproductive*
297 *health*. 2017;14(1):1-10.
- 298 34. Dev R, Woods NF, Unger JA, Kinuthia J, Matemo D, Farid S, et al. Acceptability,
299 feasibility and utility of a Mobile health family planning decision aid for postpartum women
300 in Kenya. *Reproductive health*. 2019;16(1):1-11.
- 301 35. Blanc AK, Glazer K, Ofomata-Aderemi U, Akinfaderin-Agarau F. Myths and
302 misinformation: An analysis of text messages sent to a sexual and reproductive health Q&A
303 service in Nigeria. *Studies in family planning*. 2016;47(1):39-53.

- 304 36. Jamison JC, Karlan D, Raffler P. Mixed method evaluation of a passive mHealth sexual
305 information texting service in Uganda. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2013.
- 306 37. Parajuli R, Doneys P. Exploring the role of telemedicine in improving access to
307 healthcare services by women and girls in rural Nepal. *Telematics and Informatics*.
308 2017;34(7):1166-76.
- 309 38. Ybarra ML, Agaba E, Chen E, Nyemara N. Iterative Development of In This toGether,
310 the First mHealth HIV Prevention Program for Older Adolescents in Uganda. *AIDS and*
311 *Behavior*. 2020:1-14.
- 312 39. Winskell K, Sabben G, Akelo V, Ondeng'e K, Obong'o C, Stephenson R, et al. A
313 smartphone game-based intervention (Tumaini) to prevent HIV among young Africans: pilot
314 randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2018;6(8):e10482.
- 315 40. Visser M, Kotze M, van Rensburg MJ. An mHealth HIV prevention programme for
316 youth: lessons learned from the iloveLife. mobi programme in South Africa. *AIDS care*.
317 2020;32(sup2):148-54.
- 318 41. Sabben G, Mudhune V, Ondeng'e K, Odero I, Ndivo R, Akelo V, et al. A smartphone
319 game to prevent HIV among young africans (Tumaini): assessing intervention and study
320 acceptability among adolescents and their parents in a randomized controlled trial. *JMIR*
321 *mHealth and uHealth*. 2019;7(5):e13049.
- 322 42. McCarthy OL, Wazwaz O, Calderon VO, Jado I, Saibov S, Stavridis A, et al.
323 Development of an intervention delivered by mobile phone aimed at decreasing unintended
324 pregnancy among young people in three lower middle income countries. *BMC public health*.
325 2018;18(1):1-15.
- 326 43. Adeagbo O, Herbst C, Blandford A, McKendry R, Estcourt C, Seeley J, et al. Exploring
327 people's candidacy for mobile health-supported HIV testing and care services in rural
328 KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa: Qualitative study. *Journal of medical Internet research*.
329 2019;21(11):e15681.
- 330 44. Akinfaderin-Agarau F, Chirtau M, Ekponimo S, Power S. Opportunities and limitations
331 for using new media and mobile phones to expand access to sexual and reproductive health
332 information and services for adolescent girls and young women in six Nigerian states. *African*
333 *journal of reproductive health*. 2012;16(2):219-30.
- 334 45. Merrill KG, Merrill JC, Hershow RB, Barkley C, Rakosa B, DeCelles J, et al. Linking
335 at-risk South African girls to sexual violence and reproductive health services: A mixed-
336 methods assessment of a soccer-based HIV prevention program and pilot SMS campaign.
337 *Evaluation and program planning*. 2018;70:12-24.
- 338 46. Nigatu T. Mobile for Youth (m4Youth): IFHP's experience providing SRH Information
339 through Short Message Services (SMS). DOI: 1013140/RG223339983369. 2017.
- 340 47. Ampt FH, Lim MS, Agius PA, L'Engle K, Manguro G, Gichuki C, et al. Effect of a
341 mobile phone intervention for female sex workers on unintended pregnancy in Kenya
342 (WHISPER or SHOUT): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global Health*.
343 2020;8(12):e1534-e45.
- 344 48. FHI 360, USAID, MARRIE STOPES INTERNATIONAL. Assessing the Feasibility
345 of Providing Family Planning Information via Mobile Phones in Kenya and Tanzania.
346 RESEARCH BRIEF, PROGRESS IN FAMILY PLANNING. 2013.
- 347 49. Ong KKX, Ng JS, Om C, Chhoun P, Tuot S, Yi S. Perceived barriers and facilitators in
348 using text and voice messaging for improving HIV and sexual and reproductive health of
349 female entertainment workers in Cambodia: a qualitative study. *Mhealth*. 2020;6.
- 350 50. Guerrero F, Lucar N, Claux MG, Chiappe M, Perez-Lu J, Hindin MJ, et al. Developing
351 an SMS text message intervention on sexual and reproductive health with adolescents and
352 youth in Peru. *Reproductive health*. 2020;17(1):1-14.
- 353 51. Deliver GEaW. GOING ONLINE FOR SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

- 354 MEANINGFULLY ENGAGING ADOLESCENT GIRLS AND YOUNG WOMEN FOR
355 SMARTER DIGITAL INTERVENTIONS. 2020.
- 356 52. Memiah P, G M, Ikua W, Kemboi S, Oyugi G. Assessment of Adolescents' and Youth
357 HIV/SRH Programming through Digital Technology, Service provision & Policy Advocacy
358 in Kenya. The Digital Platform. 2014.
- 359 53. Eckersberger E, Pearson E, Andersen K, Hossain A, Footman K, Biswas KK, et al.
360 Developing mHealth messages to promote postmenstrual regulation contraceptive use in
361 Bangladesh: participatory interview study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2017;5(12):e174.
- 362 54. L'Engle KL, Vahdat HL, Ndakidemi E, Lasway C, Zan T. Evaluating feasibility, reach
363 and potential impact of a text message family planning information service in Tanzania.
364 *Contraception*. 2013;87(2):251-6.
- 365 55. Woog V, Kågesten A. The sexual and reproductive health needs of very young
366 adolescents aged 10–14 in developing countries: what does the evidence show? 2017.
- 367 56. Huang K-Y, Kumar M, Cheng S, Urcuyo AE, Macharia P. Applying technology to
368 promote sexual and reproductive health and prevent gender based violence for adolescents in
369 low and middle-income countries: digital health strategies synthesis from an umbrella review.
370 *BMC health services research*. 2022;22(1):1-27.
- 371 57. Gonsalves L, L'Engle KL, Tamrat T, Plourde KF, Mangone ER, Agarwal S, et al.
372 Adolescent/youth reproductive mobile access and delivery initiative for love and life outcomes
373 (ARMADILLO) study: formative protocol for mHealth platform development and piloting.
374 *Reproductive Health*. 2015;12:1-10.
- 375 58. Ippoliti NB, L'Engle K. Meet us on the phone: mobile phone programs for adolescent
376 sexual and reproductive health in low-to-middle income countries. *Reproductive health*.
377 2017;14(1):1-8.
- 378 59. L'Engle KL, Mangone ER, Parcesepe AM, Agarwal S, Ippoliti NB. Mobile phone
379 interventions for adolescent sexual and reproductive health: a systematic review. *Pediatrics*.
380 2016;138(3).
- 381 60. Gurman TA, Rubin SE, Roess AA. Effectiveness of mHealth behavior change
382 communication interventions in developing countries: a systematic review of the literature.
383 *Journal of health communication*. 2012;17(sup1):82-104.
- 384 61. Sekandi JN, Murray K, Berryman C, Davis-Olwell P, Hurst C, Kakaire R, et al. Ethical,
385 Legal, and Sociocultural Issues in the Use of Mobile Technologies and Call Detail Records
386 Data for Public Health in the East African Region: Scoping Review. *Interactive Journal of*
387 *Medical Research*. 2022;11(1):e35062.
- 388 62. Thobias J, Kiwanuka A. Design and implementation of an m-health data model for
389 improving health information access for reproductive and child health services in low resource
390 settings using a participatory action research approach. *BMC medical informatics and decision*
391 *making*. 2018;18(1):1-10.
- 392 63. Hackett KM, Kazemi M, Sellen DW. Keeping secrets in the cloud: Mobile phones, data
393 security and privacy within the context of pregnancy and childbirth in Tanzania. *Social Science*
394 *& Medicine*. 2018;211:190-7.
- 395 64. Ames HM, Glenton C, Lewin S, Tamrat T, Akama E, Leon N. Clients' perceptions and
396 experiences of targeted digital communication accessible via mobile devices for reproductive,
397 maternal, newborn, child, and adolescent health: a qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane*
398 *Database Syst Rev*. 2019(10).
- 399 65. Greve M, Brendel AB, van Osten N, Kolbe LM. Overcoming the barriers of mobile
400 health that hamper sustainability in low-resource environments. *Journal of Public Health*.
401 2022;30(1):49-62.

- 402 66. Kreniske P, Basmajian A, Nakyanjo N, Ddaaki W, Isabirye D, Ssekyewa C, et al. The
403 promise and peril of mobile phones for youth in rural Uganda: multimethod study of
404 implications for health and HIV. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2021;23(2):e17837.
- 405 67. Laar AS, Harris ML, Shifti DM, Loxton D. Perspectives of Health Care Professionals'
406 on delivering mHealth Sexual and Reproductive Health services in rural settings in Low-and-
407 Middle-Income countries: a qualitative systematic review. 2022.
- 408 68. Feroz A, Jabeen R, Saleem S. Using mobile phones to improve community health
409 workers performance in low-and-middle-income countries. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1-
410 6.
- 411 69. Malila B, Mutsvangwa T, Douglas T, editors. Architecture of a village small cell
412 network for mobile health. 2018 3rd Biennial South African Biomedical Engineering
413 Conference (SAIBMEC); 2018: IEEE.
- 414 70. Olu O, Muneene D, Bataringaya JE, Nahimana M-R, Ba H, Turgeon Y, et al. How can
415 digital health technologies contribute to sustainable attainment of universal health coverage in
416 Africa? A perspective. *Frontiers in public health*. 2019;7:341.
- 417 71. Katusiime J. Designing A Multimedia Intervention for Illiterate And Semi-Illiterate
418 Pregnant Women in Developing Countries: A Case of Uganda: Humboldt Universitaet zu
419 Berlin (Germany); 2021.
- 420 72. Watara AS, Mumuni A, Zuwera Y, Edward AA, Iddrisu MG, Margret BD. Young
421 people's experiences in accessing sexual and reproductive health services in sub-Saharan
422 Africa from 1994 to 2019-A content analysis. *International Journal of Sexual and Reproductive*
423 *Health Care*. 2020;3(1):017-26.
- 424 73. Rivera M, Miller K, Gomanie NN, Mehta K, editors. A Narrative Review of Demand
425 Generation Strategies For Family Planning in Low-and Middle-Income Countries. 2022 IEEE
426 Global Humanitarian Technology Conference (GHTC); 2022: IEEE.
- 427 74. Nuwamanya E, Nuwasiima A, Babigumira JU, Asimwe FT, Lubinga SJ, Babigumira
428 JB. Study protocol: using a mobile phone-based application to increase awareness and uptake
429 of sexual and reproductive health services among the youth in Uganda. A randomized
430 controlled trial. *Reproductive Health*. 2018;15(1):1-12.
- 431 75. Nwaozuru U, Obiezu-Umeh C, Shato T, Mason S, Carter V, Manu S, et al. Mobile
432 health interventions for HIV/STI prevention among youth in low-and middle-income countries
433 (LMICs): a systematic review of studies reporting implementation outcomes. *Implementation*
434 *science communications*. 2021;2(1):1-16.
- 435 76. Organization WH. Youth-centred digital health interventions: a framework for
436 planning, developing and implementing solutions with and for young people. 2020.
- 437 77. Livingstone S, Nandi A, Banaji S, Stoilova M. Young adolescents and digital media:
438 uses, risks and opportunities in low-and middle-income countries: a rapid evidence review.
439 2017.
- 440 78. Logie C, Okumu M, Abela H, Wilson D, Narasimhan M. Sexual and reproductive
441 health mobile apps: results from a cross-sectional values and preferences survey to inform
442 World Health Organization normative guidance on self-care interventions. *Global Health*
443 *Action*. 2020;13(1):1796346.
- 444 79. Feroz A, Abrejo F, Ali SA, Nuruddin R, Saleem S. Using mobile phones to improve
445 young people's sexual and reproductive health in low-and middle-income countries: a
446 systematic review protocol to identify barriers, facilitators and reported interventions.
447 *Systematic reviews*. 2019;8(1):1-7.
- 448 80. Mwaisaka J, Gonsalves L, Thiongo M, Waithaka M, Sidha H, Alfred O, et al. Young
449 people's experiences using an on-demand mobile health sexual and reproductive health text
450 message intervention in Kenya: qualitative study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*.
451 2021;9(1):e19109.

- 452 81. Tweheyo R, Selig H, Gibson DG, Pariyo GW, Rutebemberwa E. User Perceptions and
453 Experiences of an Interactive Voice Response Mobile Phone Survey Pilot in Uganda:
454 Qualitative Study. *JMIR Formative Research*. 2020;4(12):e21671.
- 455 82. Chukwu E, Gilroy S, Addaquay K, Jones NN, Karimu VG, Garg L, et al. Formative
456 Study of Mobile Phone Use for Family Planning Among Young People in Sierra Leone: Global
457 Systematic Survey. *JMIR Formative Research*. 2021;5(11):e23874.
- 458 83. Guerrero F, Lucar N, Garvich Claux M, Chiappe M, Perez-Lu J, Hindin MJ, et al.
459 Developing an SMS text message intervention on sexual and reproductive health with
460 adolescents and youth in Peru. *Reproductive health*. 2020;17(1):1-14.
- 461 84. Doyle AM, Bandason T, Dauya E, McHugh G, Grundy C, Dringus S, et al. Mobile
462 phone access and implications for digital health interventions among adolescents and young
463 adults in Zimbabwe: cross-sectional survey. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2021;9(1):e21244.
- 464 85. Castle S, Silva M. Family planning and youth in West Africa: mass media, digital
465 media, and social and behavior change communication strategies. 2019.
- 466 86. Hagg E, Dahinten VS, Currie LM. The emerging use of social media for health-related
467 purposes in low and middle-income countries: A scoping review. *International journal of*
468 *medical informatics*. 2018;115:92-105.
- 469 87. Alhassan RK, Abdul-Fatawu A, Adzimah-Yeboah B, Nyaledzigbor W, Agana S,
470 Mwini-Nyaledzigbor PP. Determinants of use of mobile phones for sexually transmitted
471 infections (STIs) education and prevention among adolescents and young adult population in
472 Ghana: implications of public health policy and interventions design. *Reproductive health*.
473 2019;16(1):1-11.

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493
494
495
496
497
498

499

Appendix

500 **Table1: Search strategies tailored to the other databases**

Cochrane Library	
1	Trials matching young adult* OR youth* OR adolescent* OR young people* OR youth population* OR young wom?n* OR young girl* OR young boy* OR young m?n* OR young women* emerging adult* OR adolescent girl* OR adolescent boy* OR adolescen
2	In 'Title Abstract Keyword' AND reproductive health* OR sexual health* OR HIV* OR contraception* OR contraceptives* OR modern contraception* OR contracept service* OR contracept educat* OR contracept counsell
3	In 'Title Abstract Keyword' OR Healthcare providers* OR Healthcare professionals* OR health provider* OR health counsellor* OR health educator
4	In 'Title Abstract Keyword' AND mobile health* OR mHealth* OR mobile phone health technology* OR mobile phone health* OR digital mobile health* OR digital mobile phone health
5	In 'Title Abstract Keyword' AND low-income countries* OR low-and-middle-income nation* OR low to middle income countries* OR middle-income countr* OR low resource countries
6	In 'Title Abstract Keyword' - with Cochrane Library publication date Between Jan 2000 and Dec 2020, in Trials with 'Public Health' in Cochrane Groups (word variations have been searched)
Scopus	
1	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (low-income AND countries* OR low-and-middle income AND nation* OR low AND toAND middle AND income AND countries* OR middle-income AND countr* OR low AND resource AND countries)
2	TITLE-ABS KEY (mobile AND health* OR mhealth* OR mobile AND phone AND health AND technology* OR mobile AND phone AND health* OR digital AND mobile AND health* OR digital AND mobile AND phone AND health) OR
3	TITLE-ABS-KEY (healthcare AND providers* OR healthcare AND professionals* OR health AND provider* OR health AND counsellor* OR health AND educator) OR

4	TITLE-ABS-KEY (young AND adult* OR youth* OR adolescent* OR young AND people* OR youth AND population* OR young AND wom?n* OR young AND girl* OR young AND boy* OR young AND m?n* OR young AND women* AND emerging AND adult* OR adolescent AND girl* OR adolescent AND boy* OR adolescen)
5	TITLE-ABS-KEY (reproductive AND health* OR sexual AND health* OR HIV* OR contraception* OR contraceptives* OR modern AND contraception* OR contracept AND service* OR contracept AND educat* OR contracept AND counsell)
6	AND PUBYEAR > 1999 AND PUBYEAR < 2021.
CINAHL	
S4	(reproductive health* AND sexual health* AND HIV* AND contraception* AND contraceptives* AND modern contraception* AND contracept service* AND contracept educat* AND contracept counsell* AND young adult* AND youth* AND adolescent* AND young people* AND youth population* AND young wom?n* AND young girl* AND young boy* AND young m?n* AND young women* AND adolescent girl* AND adolescent boy* AND adolescen) OR (healthcare providers* AND healthcare professionals* AND health provider* AND health professional
S3	(reproductive health* OR sexual health* OR HIV* OR contraception* OR contraceptives* OR modern contraception* OR contracept service* OR contracept educat* OR contracept counsel* OR young adult* OR youth* OR adolescent* OR young people* OR youth population* OR young wom?n* OR young girl* OR young boy* OR young m?n* OR young women* emerging adult* OR adolescent girl* OR adolescent boy* OR adolescen
S2	(reproductive health* OR sexual health* OR HIV* OR contraception* OR contraceptives* OR modern contraception* OR contracept service* OR contracept educat* OR contracept counsel* OR young adult* OR youth* OR adolescent* OR young people* OR youth population* OR young wom?n* OR young girl* OR young boy* OR young m?n* OR young women* emerging adult* OR adolescent girl* OR adolescent boy* OR adolescen) AND (mobile health* OR mHealth* OR mobile phone health technology* OR mobile phone health
S1	(reproductive health* OR sexual health* OR HIV* OR contraception* OR contraceptives* OR modern contraception* OR contracept service* OR contracept educat* OR contracept counsel* OR young adult* OR youth* OR adolescent* OR young people* OR youth population* OR young wom?n* OR young girl* OR young boy* OR young m?n* OR young women* emerging adult* OR adolescent girl* OR adolescent boy* OR adolescen) AND (mobile health* OR mHealth* OR mobile phone health technology* OR mobile phone health*
	limiters - full text; references available; published date: 20000101-20201231; peer reviewed; clinical queries: qualitative - best balance; human; journal subset: public health; geographic subset: Africa; language: English; special interest: men's health, public health, women's health
PsychoINFO	

1	(young adult* or youth* or adolescent* or young people* or youth population* or young wom?n* or young girl* or young boy* or young m?n* or young women* emerging adult* or adolescent girl* or adolescent boy* or adolescen).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, table of contents, key concepts, original title, tests & measures, mesh]
2	(reproductive health* or sexual health* or HIV* or contraception* or contraceptives* or modern contraception* or contracept service* or contracept educat* or contracept counsell).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, table o'f contents, key concepts, original title, tests & measures, mesh]
3	(healthcare providers* or healthcare professionals* or health provider* or health counsellor* or health educator).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, table of contents, key concepts, original title, tests & measures, mesh]
4	(mobile health* or mHealth* or mobile phone health technology* or mobile phone health* or digital mobile health* or digital mobile phone health).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, table of contents, key concepts, original title, tests & measures, mesh]
5	(low-income countries* or low-and-middle-income nation* or low to middle income countries* or middle-income countr* or low resource countries).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, table of contents, key concepts, original title, tests & measures, mesh]
6	limit to (full text and human and english language and yr="2000 - 2020")

501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515

516 **Table 2: Overall summary of CERQual assessment of quality**

Components	Studies contributing to the assessment findings and ratings	Assessment quality ratings	Overall CERQual assessment quality ratings of evidence	Explanation of overall CERQual assessment of quality findings
Methodological limitations	<p>All 26 studies [157-182] included in this review were rated as no or very minor concerns overall, with 7 having minor issues as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unclear of ethical procedures, 3 studies [160, 163, 174]. 2. Unclear reflexivity issues, 3 studies [163, 164, 169]. 3. Unclear data analysis procedure, 1 study [174]. 	Minor concerns	High Quality	<p>Overall, the finding was graded as high confidence as it is highly likely that the finding is a reasonable representation of young people’s experiences after using mobile phone-based platform interventions regarding SRH information and services.</p> <p>All 26 studies [157-182] included in this review were rated as no or very minor concerns overall with 7 having minor issues as detailed below:</p>
Coherence	All 26 studies [157-182] included in this review were rated as no or very minor concerns overall.	Minor concerns		<p>For methodological limitations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unclear of ethical procedures, 3 studies [160, 163, 174]. 2. Unclear reflexivity issues, 3 studies [163, 164, 169].
Adequacy	All 26 studies [157-182] included in this review were rated as no or very minor concerns overall with 3 studies [168, 175, 176] having minor data issues.	Minor-moderate concerns		

Relevance	All 26 studies [157-182] included in this review were rated as no or very minor concerns overall.	Minor concerns		<p>3. Unclear data analysis procedure, 1 study [174] 1 study.</p> <p>For data adequacy, 3 studies [168, 175, 176] had minor data issues.</p> <p>For coherence and relevance, both were rated no or very minor concerns.</p>
------------------	---	----------------	--	---

517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539

540 **Table 3: Assessment of studies under each CERQual component**

Studies	Assessment of methodological limitations	Assessment of relevance	Assessment of data adequacy	Assessment of coherence	CERQual Assessment of quality
Evelia et al 2015	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Reflexivity not clear from reading paper. Ethical issues not clearly described.</i>				
Smith et al 2017	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Dev et al 2019	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Reflexivity not clear from reading paper.</i>				
Blanc et al 2016	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Reflexivity not clear from reading paper. Ethical issues not clearly described.</i>				
Jamison et al 2013	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Ethical issues not clearly described.</i>				
Parajuli & Doneys 2017	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Ybarra et al 2020	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Winskell et al 2018	No or very minor concerns	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Visser et al 2020	No or very minor concerns	Moderately rich data	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Sabben et al 2019	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High

<i>Notes</i>	<i>Reflexivity not clear from reading paper.</i>				
McCharly et al 2018	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Adeagbo et al 2019	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Akinfaderin-Agarau et al 2012	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Merrill et al 2018	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Nigatu et al 2017	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	Moderate
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Data analysis procedure not clear from reading the paper. Ethical issues not clearly described in detail.</i>				
FHI 360 et al 2013	Minor concerns	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	Moderate
<i>Notes</i>	<i>Reflexivity does not clear from reading paper. Ethical issues not clearly described.</i>	<i>Moderately rich data</i>			
Ong et al 2020	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Guerrero et al 2020	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Girl Effect and Women Deliver 2020	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Memiah et al 2014	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High

Laidlaw et al 2017	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
L'Engle et al 2013	No or very minor concerns	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
<i>Notes</i>		<i>Moderately rich data</i>			
Ampt et al 2020	No or very minor concerns	Minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
<i>Notes</i>		<i>Moderately rich data</i>			
Duclos et al 2017	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Eckersberger et al 2017	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High
Vahdat et al 2013	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	No or very minor concerns	High

541

542




Figure 1: PRISMA flow chart showing study selection procedure