The Sexual and Reproductive Health needs and preferences of youths in sub-Saharan Africa: A meta-synthesis

Authors
Victoria Kalu Uka[1], Helen White[1], Debbie M. Smith[2]

Institutional affiliations

[1]Division of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology Medicine and Heath, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom.

[2]Division of Psychology and Mental Health and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology (MCHP), School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology Medicine and Heath, University of Manchester, United Kingdom.

* Corresponding author

E-mail: victoria.uka@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

Abstract

The sexual and reproductive health (SRH) needs of youths in sub-Saharan Africa are not being fully met, as evidenced by high rates of unintended pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections in this population. Understanding service needs and preferences of sub-Saharan African youths aged 10-24 years is critical for improving access and SRH outcomes and the focus of this systematic review of qualitative research. Four databases were searched with key words to identify relevant studies, supplemented by citation search, with an update in June 2023. The eligibility criteria were clear and developed a priori. Twenty included studies from seven countries underwent quality appraisal using CASP. A meta-ethnographic approach was used to synthesise concepts across studies by the researchers. Four key themes were generated: *information needs; service needs; social needs; and delivery preferences*. Information needs encompassed desires for age-appropriate education on contraception, safer sex, bodily changes, and healthy relationships to fill knowledge gaps. Social needs consisted of life skills training, vocational development, substance use rehabilitation, and support systems to foster healthy behaviours. Service needs included accessible youth-friendly sexual health services, preventative care, sexually transmitted Infections (STI) management, and contraception; and delivery preferences including competent providers who maintain privacy and confidentiality, convenient youth-oriented settings, free or low-cost provisions, and youth involvement in service design. In conclusion, the identified themes emphasise the diverse nature of SRH needs and preferences among sub-Saharan African youths. Insights from their unique priorities and unmet needs inform policy development and intervention strategies. Tailored awareness campaigns, youth-centred training for providers, youth-friendly and confidential SRH models, comprehensive education, and engaging youth in developing relevant solutions may improve acceptability, access, and health outcomes. These efforts could address barriers around stigma, costs, and lack of knowledge, contributing to enhanced SRH and wellbeing. Fulfilling youth SRH needs in sub-Saharan Africa requires commitment across sectors to evidence-based, youth-focused strategies placing their perspectives at the centre

Introduction

According to World Health Organisation (WHO), youth are defined as those aged 10-24 years [1]. Youths make up a large portion of the population in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and are critical to nation-building [2, 3]. However, access to sexual and reproductive health services (SRHS) is restricted, including religious, social, economic, and political barriers [4]. As a result, there are inconsistencies in youth SRHS access across SSA [5–8]. While political leaders in sub-Saharan Africa may embrace international support and funding for youth sexual and reproductive health services (SRHS), actual implementation within these countries often face challenges [9–11]. Each year, over 374 million new cases of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) occur globally, predominantly among youth aged 15-24 years, with a significant proportion in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [12–14]. In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), youth aged 15-24 years account for a considerable portion of these cases, reflecting the high burden of STIs in this region [12]. Approximately 1.5 million HIV-positive youth reside in SSA [15]. Moreover, gender inequality in SSA exacerbates sexual health challenges, with many females experiencing unmet contraception needs due to intimate partner violence, which prevents them from negotiating safer sex [16]. Each year, 21 million pregnancies occur among 15-19-year-olds in LMICs, with half being unplanned [13, 14]. In SSA, unplanned pregnancies among adolescents contribute to increased female school dropout rates, further widening gender disparities in education [17, 18]. With abortion still illegal in some countries in SSA, including Nigeria, unintended pregnancy raises the vulnerability of young females to unsafe options and complications [19]. Such situations strain youths emotionally and psychologically [20], lowering self-esteem and disconnecting them from more empowered peers [21]. Healthy development is hindered [22] and

potentially leads to substance misuse or mental health issues [23]. A lack of access to SRHS exacerbates health problems [4], increasing adverse outcomes like illness and death [24]. When appropriate SRHS are available, including family planning and abortion services, youth vulnerabilities to unintended pregnancy and STIs can be reduced [25–28]. SRHS designed based on youth needs and preferences will promote usage [4]. The WHO, in collaboration with the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) recommend youth participation in healthcare design and delivery, given their awareness of personal needs, to develop relevant solutions [14]. Ignoring youth perspectives risks service refusal and may stall progress towards quality sexual and reproductive health services [5, 14]. The current review explored the needs and preferences of youths of SRHS in SSA, with the aim to increase access.

Methods

This review employed a systematic approach. The revised Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) standards were followed to guide the identification and selection of relevant literature [29]. This review protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022307530).

Ethics statement

As this study is a systematic review of published literature, it did not involve human or animal subjects, and therefore, did not require ethical approval. No primary data collection was conducted, and all data used were from publicly available sources.

Search strategy

The review question and search terms were structured according to the Joanna Briggs Institute's (JBI) suggested framework: PICo, which represents Participants, Phenomena of interest, and Context [30] (Fig 1). An initial scoping search was conducted in Ovid Medline to refine the review question and search terms. During the systematic search, medical subject headings (MeSH) were used in different databases to broaden the search terms [31]. The following four databases were searched: "Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System" (Ovid Medline), "Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature" (CINAHL plus), Psychological Information Database (PsycINFO), and Allied and Complementary Medicine Database (AMED). A citation search to identify additional relevant studies was also conducted. The S2 file presents the full search history on Ovid Medline, CINAHL plus and PsycINFO.



Fig 1: The PICo framework the review question and search terms

Eligibility criteria

Population. Youths aged 10-24 years in SSA were the target population. This is in line with the WHO's definition of youth [1]. Excluded groups were homeless, internally displaced persons, and refugees as their SRHS needs may differ substantially due to their situation [32, 33].

Phenomena of Interest. Studies must have reported at least one of these relevant phenomena regarding SRHS: needs, requirements, preferences, choices, options, wants, or desires. Studies relating to general healthcare needs rather than SRHS specifically were excluded.

Context. All countries in SSA were included in accordance with review aims. Likewise, all SRHS locations were considered, including schools, marketplaces, transport terminals, clubhouses, community centres, health facilities [34]. Both facility-based and community-based SRHS settings were eligible.

Publication types and study design: Inclusion was limited to published, peer-reviewed studies. Grey literature was excluded due to challenges in comprehensively identifying and accessing these sources, which can introduce selection bias if relevant reports are missed. Excluding grey literature can lead to publication bias, as it often includes studies with negative or non-significant results that are less likely to be published in peer-reviewed journals [35]. Despite recognising this potential bias, we opted to exclude grey literature to ensure the quality and reliability of the sources included in our review. The heterogeneous

nature and potential lack of rigorous peer review in grey literature pose challenges in assessing the validity and replicability of findings, particularly in the context of a systematic review. While this exclusion may introduce some bias, we mitigated this by thoroughly searching commercial and open-access databases to ensure a comprehensive collection of relevant studies on the sexual and reproductive health needs and preferences of youths in sub-Saharan Africa. Included papers were written in the English language, with the majority of African studies publish in English [36]. Unpublished studies, theses, conference papers, duplicates, and anecdotal reports were excluded because they lack the peer review process to ensure methodological rigor and may contain preliminary or duplicated data [35, 37]. Qualitative studies and mixed methods studies with distinct qualitative components (example, interviews, focus groups, observations) were included as they provide deeper understanding of youth's needs and preferences related to SRHS [38].

Study selection

Identified articles were transferred into EndNote version 20 and then into Rayyan software [40–41] Besides manual removal, both software programs enabled the elimination of duplicates. Rayyan was used as a platform to screen article titles, abstracts, and full texts based on the eligibility criteria stated above to identify included reports ([41]; Fig 2). Ten percent of the identified papers at title and abstract and full text were reviewed by a second reviewer and a kappa score calculated as an internal reliability check.

Data extraction

A modified data extraction tool from the Cochrane Collaboration was used [42]. The tool allowed for information such as author names, publication date, study title, study

question/aims, participant demographics, design, population of interest, analysis methods, and findings to be captured from relevant studies. Data extraction was conducted independently by two researchers (VU and DS) with only qualitative data considered during the process.

Quality appraisal

The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) qualitative checklist from the Cochrane Qualitative and Implementation Group was adopted to judge the quality of the included studies [104]. Two researchers (VU and HW) independently assessed the quality of the included papers [43]. The checklist consists of 10 questions (Q) focused on various aspects of the studies, including study aims, data collection methods, analysis, and results. Questions one to nine are closed-ended with three possible responses: 'yes,' 'can't tell,' and 'no,' while Q10 is an open-ended question. As noted by Long et al. [44], the CASP tool does not provide a standardised method for assessing the clarity and appropriateness of qualitative reporting. Therefore, to enhance transparency and facilitate inter-study comparison, we assigned scores to questions 1-9: 'yes' = 2, 'can't tell' = 1, and 'no' = 0. For Q10, we assigned scores of 2 for papers considered valuable and 1 for less valuable papers, based on our qualitative judgment (See S4 File for quality appraisal summary). The scoring system allowed us to standardise the appraisal process, facilitate comparisons across studies, support overall quality judgments by categorising studies into low, medium, and high quality, and ensure transparency in our judgment. Importantly, no studies were excluded based on their scores. All papers, irrespective of quality scores, were included for their valuable contributions to the meta-ethnographic synthesis.

Data synthesis

A meta-ethnographic approach, developed by Noblit, Hare and Hare [45], was employed to explore the findings of the primary studies. This method allows for comparative integration of data rather than just description and is thus considered appropriate [46, 47]. Taking a meta-ethnography approach systematically transforms findings by drawing comparisons through the process of translation [45, 48]. Consequently, this approach enabled synthesis of youth's SRH needs and preferences across individual papers with greater explanatory power than narrative or thematic approaches [49, 50]. Its analytical nature and widespread use in non-ethnographies underscore its value [51–54].

The included papers were read and re-read to identify codes and examine interrelationships [45]. Studies were then translated into one another through reciprocal translation to determine similarities and refutational synthesis to identify discrepancies between metaphors [45, 46, 55]. Subsequently, lines of argument were developed to reach a holistic interpretation [56]. In meta-ethnography, quality refers not to methods but to metaphor adequacy for rich data [48, 57]. To reduce bias, VU, DS, and HW were independently involved in synthesis of the data.

Results

Study selection

As illustrated in Fig 2, an initial search was conducted in April 2022, and an updated search was performed in June 2023. The June 2023 search narrowed the date range to January

2022 to June 2023, aiming to capture papers published since the initial search conducted between February and April 2022. The combined searches yielded a total of 3,085 papers. After removing duplicates, 2,237 titles and abstracts were screened based on eligibility criteria. Of these, 2,216 papers were excluded for various reasons, including deficiency in more than one exclusion criterion (1,324), an incorrect target population (84), an incorrect phenomenon of interest (402), an unsuitable study design (95), either systematic or scoping reviews (60), grey literature (246), questionnaire development (1), and non-English language (1).

Prior to finalising the selection process, 10% check of titles and abstracts was conducted on the retrieved articles by two independent researchers (VU and LM) to compute an inter-rater reliability [58, 59]. Cohen's kappa (κ) computation was 0.12, indicating slight agreement. This necessitated a review of the inclusion criteria, and more terms (wants and options) were introduced to represent the needs and preferences of youth and expand the phenomenon of interest component. Then, a second check was done since slight agreement may not allow confidence in the review process [60]. Cohen's value for the second 10% check revealed 0.66, indicating substantial agreement, and subsequently disagreements were settled by consensus [58, 61].

Twenty-four articles passed abstract screening, and attempts were made to retrieve full texts. However, one full-text article could not be accessed despite efforts to contact the authors. Consequently, 23 full-text articles were reviewed, of which three were subsequently excluded because one lacked data from youths while the other two used quantitative methods for data analysis. This led to the inclusion of 20 studies in the final review. The findings from the extraction are presented in a summary table reflecting the

extent of available evidence in the accepted studies (see S3 file for data extraction summary).

Quality appraisal

The appraisal of the included papers using the CASP tool revealed generally sound methodological quality across the studies (see S4 File). Most studies described an appropriate methodology suitable for their stated research aims and objectives. However, a notable deficiency in many studies was observed concerning the declaration of potential biases [62–64]. Additionally, based on the quality judgement, one article [65] appeared to be of relatively low quality compared to the others. Nevertheless, no studies were excluded solely based on quality, as the authors were primarily interested in extracting relevant concepts from all included studies that directly mapped to the systematic review question.



Fig 2: PRISMA Flow diagram showing the stages of study selection

Study characteristics

The 20 included studies involved participants ranging in age from 10 to 24 years old. Two papers specifically targeted females [64, 75], while the remaining 18 included both male and female. Eight papers focused on youths living with HIV [62, 63, 66, 72–74]. The studies were conducted in various countries, including Ethiopia, Kenya (3), Malawi (1), Nigeria (2), South Africa (6), Uganda (2), and Zambia (5). Seven studies were community-based, 12 were conducted in healthcare facilities, and one was a school-based study.

Synthesis

The meta-ethnographic synthesis resulted in four key themes encapsulating the breadth of sexual and reproductive health needs and preferences expressed by youths across the included studies; *information needs*, *social needs*, *service needs* and *delivery preferences* (Table 1). These four key themes encompassed multiple nested sub-themes and are represented below with participant quotes.

Table 1: This is the table showing main themes and sub-

Themes	Sub-Themes
Information Needs	▪ Age-appropriate information
	▪ Raising awareness
Service Needs	▪ Health promotion and preventive services
	▪ Treatment services
Delivery Preferences	▪ Provider characteristics
	▪ Logistics of service delivery
Social Needs	▪ Skills acquisition programmes
	▪ Substance use rehabilitation
	▪ Support systems

themes

Theme 1 – Information needs

This theme emerged across all included studies, highlighting youths' desire for information on safe reproductive and sexual health topics like contraception and condom use. As one participant stated: *"people are no longer given deep information about these things [sexual health], they are only given average information"* [64]. No refuting perspectives arose for this theme, although information preferences differed by gender [66, 67]. Males wanted details on proper condom use— *"…the need for condoms, you can go to the health facility and they give them to you but there are some people who do not know how to use them"* [68]. Females preferred information on menstruation, relationships, hygiene, safer sex, and abortion to avoid unsafe procedures and consequences: *"They don't get good counselling or advice on how they can protect and take care of the pregnancies. So they end up aborting"* [68]. This theme had two sub-themes: ***age-appropriate information*** and ***raising awareness***.

Age-Appropriate Information: Youths expressed needing information tailored to their age covering bodily changes, contraceptives, safer sex, and sexual health issues to meet their needs [67, 69–71]. As one noted: *"I have tried to ask them for more information but they did not give me enough. What they told me was not very useful…"* [72]. HIV-positive youths also

wanted productive life information regardless of status [72–74], stating: *"We have a right to having a family and have children"* [72]. Some studies revealed misunderstandings around conception and prevention [63, 67, 74]. Youths faced barriers obtaining age-appropriate information, including provider disconnects on suitability—*"sometimes we go to clinics and then they say 'why do you want to know, you are still too young...'"* [75]—and discussing sexual health with parents due to stigma [75]. Hence information often came from peers and siblings instead: *"yeah, sisters educate about abortion and they even tell you that abortion is no easy matter because you are then between life and death. They actually teach us about many things''* [75]. Mass media was acknowledged a major source SRH information [75].

Raising Awareness: Youths emphasised awareness raising for parents, youths and communities regarding youth needs and preferences to ensure access to information and services [70, 76, 77]. Stigma and misconceptions were cited as barriers: *"Stigma, if you are seen going to the hospital, it's like you're engaging in sex. So, society will have a particular perception of you"* [69]; parents disapproved due to stigma [62, 64]. Parent sensitisation was thus needed: *"Parents do not want to give their children time to access this information, maybe because they feel it is not the right time... but generally somebody who is 15 years, that one to me needs lots of counselling and guidance from both home and outside home"* [69]. Community outreach could also raise awareness of available services [68, 70, 76]. If services are perceived as meeting youths' needs, utilisation may increase [14].

Theme 2: Social needs

Social contexts including the acquisition of skills, substance use rehabilitation, and support systems shaped youth SRH needs. Targeted programmes in these areas were acknowledged

to promote healthier sexual and reproductive health behaviours. Three sub-themes encapsulate these social needs: ***Skill acquisition programmes***, ***substance use rehabilitation***, and ***support systems***.

Skill acquisition programmes: Youths required skills for healthy relationships and economic productivity [67, 72, 76,]. Desired skills included negotiation, decision-making, and refusal skills to avoid unsafe sex practices [67, 72, 76]. As one female noted, such skills could empower responses to unwanted sexual advances: *"If a boy is forcing you...what must you do*?" [67]. Vocational skills, such as sewing and catering, were sought to address economic challenges and empower youths, with gender-specific preferences [72]. *"…one thing that I would really like is being taught life skills because as it is, no one teaches us these things. I would like to learn how to cook, and also tailoring*" [72].

Substance use rehabilitation: Rehabilitation was needed to address links between substance use and sexual violence. As youths explained, *"Things that cause rapes are the use of drugs...[which] may also cause raping a child*" [69]. lack of job opportunities and peer pressure were identified as substance use triggers-"*Most of the youths don't have what to do - they resort to taking alcohol, opium, cigarettes and marijuana*" [68].

Support Systems: Family and peer support encouraged SRH service use [74, 76], "*You need support from people who will understand your condition*" [67]. However, negative parental attitudes hindered communication and support-seeking behaviours: "*When we ask our parents they become aggressive, they shout at us not wanting to talk to us, saying, 'why do want to know about such things'*" [75]. Youths living with HIV express varying attitudes toward family support, highlighting the importance of early parental disclosure for timely treatment: "*The fact my family kept this from me made me very sad; [for a time] I hated my*

mother" [74]. Support groups foster positive networks, aiding youths in coping with SRH-related stress, although concerns about disclosure exist among some HIV-positive youths: "*It will hurt if other people know, they will joke about it*" [73].

Theme 3: Service needs

Youths wanted services directly addressing their sexual and reproductive health issues. The need for a wide range of services was reported due to perceived gaps at local health facilities [67, 69, 71, 77-78]. This theme had two sub-themes: ***preventive services*** and ***treatment services***.

Preventive Services: All studies noted youths wanting health promotion and preventive sexual and reproductive services like HIV testing and counselling, antenatal care, counselling, and contraceptives: *"If we use contraceptives we can have a manageable number of children, rather than having so many that we can't raise them"* [79]. Lacking these, risky alternatives emerged [66–68], example, *"make their own condoms – using bread bags – so they won't be seen trying to get condoms in public"* [67]. Services were seen as only for married couples, not youths: "*I have not received such (family planning services), and I don't think it is made for adolescents. It is only for married couples*" [80].

Treatment Services: Youths across all studies wanted STI testing and treatment services for issues like candidiasis, syphilis, and HIV/AIDS [65, 70, 71, 79]: *"...when you get infected with diseases like Candida...we fall sick all of the time, the trenches here spread diseases due to*

poor sanitation" [71]. Reported lack of access may drive this demand: *"She had been to Kasangati health centre and they told her that the drugs are not there..."* [68]. One study mentioned needing timely referrals for serious cases [65]. With unmet treatment needs, youths often relied on peers or unsafe options like herbs or traditional healers [66, 68, 76]: *"When we get problems, sometimes we tell our friends...so that is what she is using"* [68]. Access to such services is critical to reduce youth suffering, morbidity and mortality.

Theme 4- Delivery preferences

The theme indicates youth dissatisfaction with SRHS in healthcare facilities, evident in all included papers, with two subthemes: ***provider characteristics*** and ***logistics of service delivery***.

Provider characteristics: Youths prefer providers offering high-quality SRHS, emphasising welcomeness, trustworthiness, respect, confidentiality, friendliness, same-gender providers, and competency [64, 69, 70, 72, 81]. Negative provider attitudes, lack of privacy, and rudeness deter youths from public health facilities [68, 72, 76]. Youths living with HIV requested autonomy in disclosure and challenge providers to respect their confidentiality — *"Everyone was looking at me in a funny way and whispering, 'This is the one who is sick, she has AIDS.' This was very painful for me because I thought that it was my right to disclose to people about my status. I felt that my rights were violated"* [72]. Negative experiences lead youths to favour competent, non-judgmental providers [68, 70].

In some studies, youths express discomfort with providers of the opposite-sex, while others prefer gender-specific providers — *"Sometimes it is difficult or embarrassing to open up to someone of the opposite sex"* [77]. The need for same-gender preference may be related to

youth's personal values, which tend to shape the life of an individual. Younger SRH providers were seen as being more equipped to understand and address the SRHS of youths and would relate with the youths in an appropriate manner- *"Younger staff can understand challenges facing adolescents and address our issues as adolescents…"* [66]. However, in some other studies youths preferred older SRH providers. Older providers were viewed as experienced and, therefore, competent in the delivery of SRHS - *"… it is better to get information from experienced adults like your mother or health staff"* [66].

Logistics of service delivery: Youths desire dedicated SRHS facilities, adequate staffing, quality medical supplies, free services, short wait times, and youth reward systems [79, 80, 82]. They preferred services tailored to their needs and reported dissatisfaction with existing facilities and claimed they were designed for adults [68, 72, 76]. Youths desired attractive youth-friendly clinics with recreational facilities and enough staff [76] — *"…I can go there to play, to watch movies, I can be guided, I can be tested"* [76]. Cost and long waits in existing facilities hindered access, prompting a preference for free services and rewards [77, 79]. Financial constraints and poverty further challenged youths' SRHS access to SRH services [71, 72]. Thus, youth-oriented services and understanding providers were lacking, leading youths to relying on social media or traditional healers instead [66, 68, 72, 76, 81].

Discussion

This review explored the SRHS needs and preferences of youths aged 10-24 in SSA. The synthesis of evidence highlights the importance of targeted information, alignment of SRH services to diverse youth needs, addressing social needs for holistic SRHS, and tailoring delivery preferences to empower and enhance the SRH experiences of this population.

Youth empowerment through targeted information

Sexual and reproductive health information has demonstrated benefits in preparing youths against risks of unsafe behaviours [83, 84]. However, youths lack access to age-appropriate information, relying on uncertain social or peer sources instead [4]. Guided, professionally informed education tailored to maturity levels could aid healthy development [85, 86]. The current review supports this finding that SRH education is most effective when it is professionally informed and guided based on the maturity levels and needs of youths. This is because, most youths were ill-prepared on reproductive changes, desiring parental and provider discussions to facilitate access and dispel stigma [68]. Empowering youths with desired knowledge also promote healthy sexuality attitudes [84]. In line with this, our review suggests that guided education may be associated with the development of healthy sexuality perspectives and potentially protective against risky sexual and reproductive behaviours among youths. As youths understand their needs, ensuring youths can access age-appropriate sexual health information is critical to empowering them to understand their bodies and make healthy SRH choices.

Aligning SRH services to diverse youth needs

In the current review, papers identified various youth SRH needs ranging from promotion and preventive to treatment services. Findings demonstrated gaps in aligning care and environments to youth realities. As a result, there is an increased prevalence of unsafe self-help alternatives [68, 87]. This situation, predominant in low- and middle-income countries, where systemic shortcomings, such as social stigma, taboos, and restrictive policies, often hinder the effective positioning of SRH services in relation to youth realities [88–90]. However, in high-income countries, initiatives have aimed at tailoring SRH services to better suit youths, promoting better coordination, and addressing diverse needs [91]. These

disparities contribute to adverse sexual and reproductive health outcomes [34, 92]. Thus, emphasising the imperative for increased attention and tailored strategies in these regions to bridge the gap and improve the provision of youth-friendly SRH services [93, 94]. Comprehensive SRH services are embodied rights for youth development [92]. Yet findings showed youths do not seek facility-based SRH services, due to perceived unavailability of services and stigma. Addressing negative social norms through community dialogue and sensitisation could dispel misconceptions and promote access to quality SRH services [95, 96]. Additionally, most youths want quality clinical services from competent providers. Ensuring available, accessible, non-judgmental youth-focused SRH services should be a priority.

Addressing social needs for holistic SRHS

Acknowledging the intertwined social and economic factors influencing youth SRHS outcomes, skills development programmes that consider gender preferences may facilitate healthy decision-making capacities [5, 72,]. Integrated substance abuse and mental health services have also been identified as critical for reducing risky behaviours [97, 98, 99]. High-income countries like the UK and US have adopted a more holistic approach, shifting certain centres towards a one-stop model that integrates clinical, social, and educational support [39, 98, 99]. Meanwhile, initiatives in countries such as Mexico, India, and South Africa have incorporated life skills building, education, vocational training, and livelihood support alongside clinical SRH services [100–102]. Such comprehensive models agree with the multifaceted youth needs and preferences, showing promise for improving access and health outcomes. However, youth-centred comprehensive SRHS remains less uniformly implemented in sub-Saharan Africa [103]. As Hujo and Carter [105] argue, more holistic

community-based approaches may be better suited to address the multidimensional youth realities in this region, yet require greater resource mobilisation and political backing for realisation. Additional implementation research could catalyse suitable integrated services for marginalised African youth [103, 105]. In conducting such research, recognising familial and peer support as identified facilitators for SRHS access further emphasises the potential value of social network integration into youth SRHS programmes [106, 107]. Such comprehensive models align with youth preferences and show promise for improving access and health outcomes.

Tailoring delivery preferences for youths

The review illuminates the significance of provider characteristics (welcomeness, trustworthiness, respect, confidentiality) and logistics of delivery (adequate staffing, quality supplies, free services) in shaping youths' experiences with SRHS [4, 70]. Unfavourable provider attitudes contribute to barriers in accessing SRHS, necessitating training guided by WHO's quality standards [13, 14]. Specifically, WHO's recommendation for youth-friendly health services include accessible locations and hours, lower cost, respectful and confidential care, peer counselling, comprehensive services, provider competencies, youth and community involvement [13, 14]. Preferences for same-sex providers, youth-only centres, and incentives accentuate the importance of recognising and respecting youths' choices for effective SRHS [1, 62, 107]. Recognising and integrating youths' preferences is critical for uptake and sustained engagement with SRHS. The COM-B model identifies capability, opportunity, and motivation as key components that need to be targeted for successful interventions aimed at changing behaviour [108, 109]. Addressing these areas in

youth-friendly services can directly enable youths to access and engage with sexual and reproductive health services.

Implications for practice

There is a clear need for more comprehensive, youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health services tailored to meet the informational and service needs of youth. This includes age-appropriate education, access to contraception, STI testing and treatment and counselling. Also, awareness campaigns are needed to reduce stigma around youth sexual health topics in communities and facilitate more open communication with both health providers and parents/families. This can pave the way for better support systems. Providers require additional training on delivering youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health services fostering trust, ensuring privacy/confidentiality, communicating respectfully without judgment, allowing autonomy, and understanding preferences around provider characteristics like age and gender. Dedicated youth health facilities are needed rather than expecting youth to utilise the same services designed for adults. These centres should be appealing, have adequate staffing/supplies, provide comprehensive and free/low-cost services, involve minimal wait times, and consider incentive programmes. Programmes to equip youth with life skills including healthy relationship building, decision making around sexual behaviours and economic empowerment skills are helpful. This can reduce risky sexual behaviours. Links between risky sexual behaviours and issues like substance use stress the need for accessible counselling and rehabilitation services tailored to youth.

Strength and limitations

This review boasts several strengths in its systematic approach. We conducted comprehensive searches across multiple databases to identify relevant studies on youth

SRHS in SSA. Screening and quality appraisal were meticulously carried out by two independent reviewers, and the utilisation of meta-ethnography methodology adheres to guidance on robust qualitative evidence synthesis. By synthesising insights across primary studies, this review offers qualitative evidence on the delivery situation of youth SRHS in SSA, potentially informing strategic planning to develop safer, more youth-friendly services in this region. However, it is worth noting that as only qualitative research was included, we refrained from making definitive judgments on cause-and-effect relationships. Future mixed-methods reviews could explore provider attitudes and quantitatively assess youth SRHS needs and preferences. Furthermore, while this review specifically represents perspectives within sub-Saharan Africa, broader reviews would facilitate a global comparison of youth needs. Notably, we acknowledge the limitation of not citing grey literature data, which could have provided valuable insights into government and institutional responses to issues such as drug abuse, violence, and HIV, thereby impacting the management of these significant public health challenges.

Conclusion

This review explored the needs and preferences of youths concerning SRHS. Twenty primary studies met the eligibility criteria, and the findings of the review indicate that sexual and reproductive healthcare in SSA is currently not tailored to align with the needs and preferences of youths. This departure from the WHO-recommended delivery gold standard highlights a pressing need to rectify existing gaps in the provision of sexual and reproductive health services. While globally generalisable solutions are unrealistic, a multifaceted approach is required to meet the needs and preferences of youths across information, service, social and delivery realms to ensure access to and well-being of youth sexual and

reproductive health. Key youth preferences centre on desiring guided education matched to maturity levels, tailoring of available SRH services to their diverse needs, integration of social dimensions like skills training, and youth-friendly delivery considerations around provider characteristics and atmospheres. Further research is warranted to develop youth-centred models of SRHS delivery that integrate these preferences in order to improve access and outcomes. Understanding and incorporating youths' needs and preferences in the planning of sexual and reproductive health services will be imperative to enhancing their overall welfare.

Author contributions

Victoria Uka conceived, designed, and conducted the review, performed data synthesis, and drafted the manuscript. Debbie M. Smith and Helen White provided critical guidance and supervision throughout the review design and conduction, actively participated in data synthesis, and critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgement

The authors express their gratitude for the support provided during this review. Special thanks to Leah Millard of the University of Manchester, United Kingdom for her dedicated screening of a percentage of titles and abstracts, enhancing the rigour of this review. The authors also extend their appreciation to the participants and researchers whose work contributed to the primary studies included in this review. Their invaluable contributions have enriched the synthesis of evidence presented in this manuscript.

References

1. World Health Organization. J Adolesc Health. [Cited 02 December 2023]. Available from: https://www.who.int/southeastasia/health-topics/adolescent-health. 2023.

2. Singh JA, Siddiqi M, Parameshwar P, Chandra-Mouli V. World Health Organization guidance on ethical considerations in planning and reviewing research studies on sexual and reproductive health in adolescents. J Adolesc Health. 2019 Apr;64: 427-429.
doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.01.008 • PubMed: 30904091 • PubMed Central: PMC6496912.
Google Scholar.

3. van Sluijs EMF, Ekelund U, Crochemore-Silva I, Guthold R, Ha A, Lubans D et al. Physical activity behaviours in adolescence: current evidence and opportunities for intervention. Lancet. 2021;398: 429-442.
doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01259-9 • Google Scholar.

4. Ninsiima LR, Chiumia IK, Ndejjo R. Factors influencing access to and utilisation of youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health services in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. Reprod Health. 2021;18: 135.
doi: 10.1186/s12978-021-01183-y • Google Scholar.

5. George AS, Amin A, de Abreu Lopes CM, Ravindran TKS. Structural determinants of gender inequality: why they matter for adolescent girls' sexual and reproductive health. BMJ. 2020;368 : l6985.
doi: 10.1136/bmj.l6985 • Google Scholar.

6. Ibitoye M, Choi C, Tai H, Lee G, Sommer M. Early menarche: A systematic review of its effect on sexual and reproductive health in low- and middle-income countries. PLOS ONE. 2017;12: e0178884.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0178884 • Google Scholar.

7. Liang M, Simelane S, Fortuny Fillo G, Chalasani S, Weny K, Salazar Canelos P et al. The state of adolescent sexual and reproductive health. J Adolesc Health. 2019;65: S3-S15.
doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.09.015 • Google Scholar.

8. Uka VK, Ekpoanwan EE, Nsemo AD, Etowa JB. Sexual and reproductive health services awareness and utilisation among young people in a semi-Urban community in Cross River State, Nigeria. Afr J Reprod Health. 2023;27: 58-70.
doi: 10.29063/ajrh2023/v27i5s.8 • Google Scholar.

9. Namoro SD. Youth reproductive health in sub-Saharan Africa. Is governance part of the problem? [Cited 7 July 2022] Available from: https://ideas.repec.org/p/pit/wpaper/347.html (No. 347); 2009.

10. Omo-Aghoja LO, Aisien OA, Akuse JT, Bergstrom S, Okonofua FE. Maternal mortality and emergency obstetric care in Benin City, South-south Nigeria. J Clin Med Res. 2010;2: 55-61 • Google Scholar.

11. Wado YD, Bangha M, Kabiru CW, Feyissa GT. Nature of, and responses to key sexual and reproductive health challenges for adolescents in urban slums in sub-Saharan Africa: A scoping review. Reprod Health. 2020;17: 149.
doi: 10.1186/s12978-020-00998-5 • Google Scholar.

12. Stewart J, Bukusi E, Celum C, Delany-Moretlwe S, Baeten JM. Sexually transmitted infections among African women: an opportunity for combination sexually transmitted infection/HIV prevention. AIDS. 2020;34: 651-658.doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000002472 • PubMed: 32167988 • PubMed Central: PMC7290066. Google Scholar.

13. World Health Organisation. Sexually transmitted infections (STIs). [Cited 23 January, 2024]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sexually-transmitted-infections-(stis); 2023.

14. World Health Organisation. Global standards for quality health care services for adolescents. Geneva. [cited 28 October 2021). Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/06-10-2015-who-unaids-launch-new-standards-to-improve-adolescent-care; 2015.

15. United Nations Children Emergency Fund. (2023). Adolescent HIV prevention. Available at: https://data.unicef.org/topic/hivaids/adolescents-young-people/ [cited 05 September 2023].

16. Santhya KG, Acharya R, Pandey N, Singh SK, Rampal S, Zavier AJ et al. Understanding the lives of adolescents and young adults (UDAYA) in Bihar, India. Available from: https://www.projectudaya.in/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/UP-Report-pdf.pdf; 2017.

17. Glynn JR, Sunny BS, DeStavola B, Dube A, Chihana M, Price AJ et al. Early school failure predicts teenage pregnancy and marriage: A large population-based cohort study in northern Malawi. PLOS ONE. 2018;13: e0196041.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0196041 • Google Scholar.

18. Goossens G, Kadji C, Delvenne V. Teenage pregnancy: a psychopathological risk for mothers and babies? Psychiatr Danub. 2015 Sep;27 Suppl 1: S499-S503.
PubMed: 26417827 • Google Scholar.

19. Aderibigbe SA, Araoye MO, Akande TM, Monehin JO, Musa OI, Babatunde OA. Teenage pregnancy and prevalence of abortion among in-school adolescents in North Central, Nigeria. Asian Soc Sci. 2011;7: 122.
doi: 10.5539/ass.v7n1p122 • Google Scholar.

20. Bhandari SD, Joshi S. Perception and perceived experiences about prevention and consequences of teenage pregnancy and childbirth among teenage mothers: A qualitative study. J Adv Acad Res. 2016;3: 164-172.
doi: 10.3126/jaar.v3i1.16625 • Google Scholar.

21. Irvine H, Bradley T, Cupples M, Boohan M. The implications of teenage pregnancy and motherhood for primary health care: unresolved issues'. Br J Gen Pract. 1997;47: 323-326.
Google Scholar.

22. Hegde A, Chandran S, Pattnaik JI. Understanding adolescent sexuality: A developmental perspective. J Psychosexual Health. 2022;4: 237-242.
doi: 10.1177/26318318221107598 • Google Scholar.

23. Baumrind D, Moselle KA. A developmental perspective on adolescent drug abuse. InAlcohol and substance abuse in adolescence 2014 May 22 (pp. 41-68). Routledge.
doi: https://doi.org/10.1300/J251v04n03_03

24. Nair MK, Paul MK, John R. Prevalence of depression among adolescents'. Indian J Pediatr. 2004;71: 523-524.
doi: 10.1007/BF02724294 • Google Scholar.

25. Bearinger LH, Sieving RE, Ferguson J, Sharma V. 'Global perspectives on the sexual and reproductive health of adolescents: Patterns, prevention, and potential' *The f*. Lancet. 2007;369: 1220-1231.
doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60367-5 • Google Scholar.

26. Igras SM, Macieira M, Murphy E, Lundgren R. Investing in very young adolescents' sexual and reproductive health. Glob Public Health. 2014;9: 555-569.
doi: 10.1080/17441692.2014.908230. [Epub 2014 May 13].
PubMed: 24824757 • PubMed Central: PMC4066908.
Google Scholar.

27. Ojong IN, Chiotu CN, Duke EU, Uka VK. School-based survey of adolescents' opinion on premarital sex in selected secondary schools in yakurr local government area, Cross River State, Nigeria. Glob J Pure Appl Sci. 2015;21: 191-195.
doi: 10.4314/gjpas.v21i2.11 • Google Scholar.

28. Biddlecom AE, Munthali A, Singh S, Woog V. Adolescents' views of and preferences for sexual and reproductive health services in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Malawi and Uganda. Afr J Reprod Health. 2007 Dec;11: 99-110.
doi: 10.2307/25549734 • PubMed: 18458737 • PubMed Central: PMC2367115.
Google Scholar.

29. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Int J Surg. 2021;88: 105906. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2021.105906 • Google Scholar.

30. Joanna Briggs institute. JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis: 2.6.2 Review question. [Cited 13 October 2023]. Available from: https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/ MANUAL/4688141/ 2.6.2+ Review+question; 2022.

31. Booth A. Searching for qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: a structured methodological review. Syst Rev. 2016;5: 74. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0249-x • Google Scholar.

30. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Int J Surg. 2021;88: 105906. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2021.105906 • Google Scholar.

31. Booth A. Searching for qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: a structured methodological review. Syst Rev. 2016;5: 74. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0249-x • Google Scholar.

32. Hindin MJ, Fatusi AO. Adolescent sexual and reproductive health in developing countries: an overview of trends and interventions. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2009;35: 58-62. doi: 10.1363/ipsrh.35.058.09 • Google Scholar.

33. Akinsulure-Smith AM, Dachos N, Jones WL. Nah we yone's de fambul camp: facilitating resilience in displaced african children. J Immigr Refugee Stud. AL. 2013;11: 221-240. doi: 10.1080/15562948.2013.801721 • Google Scholar.

34. Denno DM, Hoopes AJ, Chandra-Mouli V. Effective strategies to provide adolescent sexual and reproductive health services and to increase demand and community support. J Adolesc Health. 2015;56 (1) Suppl: S22-S41. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.09.012 • Google Scholar.

35. Paez A. Gray literature: an important resource in systematic reviews'. J Evid Based Med. 2017;10: 233-240. doi: 10.1111/jebm.12266 • Google Scholar.

36. Page MJ, Higgins JP, Sterne JA. Chapter 13. Available from: https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-13. Assessing risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis; 2019. pp. 349-374.

37. McKibbon KA, Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Developing optimal search strategies for retrieving qualitative studies in PsycINFO. Eval Health Prof. 2006;29: 440-454.
doi: 10.1177/0163278706293400 • Google Scholar.

38. Yates J, Leggett T. Qualitative research: an introduction. Radiol Technol. 2016;88: 225-231.
Google Scholar.

39. Hetrick SE, Bailey AP, Smith KE, Malla A, Mathias S, Singh SP et al. Integrated (one-stop shop) youth health care: best available evidence and future directions. Med J Aust. 2017 Nov 20;207: S5-S18.
doi: 10.5694/mja17.00694 • PubMed: 29129182 • Google Scholar.

40. Harrison H, Griffin SJ, Kuhn I, Usher-Smith JA. Software tools to support title and abstract screening for systematic reviews in healthcare: an evaluation. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2020;20: 7.
doi: 10.1186/s12874-020-0897-3 • Google Scholar.

41. Valizadeh A, Moassefi M, Nakhostin-Ansari A, Hosseini Asl SH, Saghab Torbati M, Aghajani R et al. Abstract screening using the automated tool Rayyan: results of effectiveness in three diagnostic test accuracy systematic reviews. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022;22: 160.
doi: 10.1186/s12874-022-01631-8 • Google Scholar.

42. Noyes J, Lewin S; 2011. Chapter 5. Extracting qualitative evidence. In: Noyes J, Booth A, Hannes K, Harden A, Harris J et al., editors. Supplementary guidance for inclusion of qualitative research in cochrane systematic reviews of interventions. version 1 [Updated August 2011]. Cochrane: Collaboration Qualitative Methods Group. [Cited 02 July 2022]. Available from: http://cqrmg.cochrane.org/supplemental-handbook-guidance.

43. Porritt K, Gomersall J, Lockwood C. JBI's systematic reviews: study selection and critical appraisal. Am J Nurs. 2014;114: 47-52.
doi: 10.1097/01.NAJ.0000450430.97383.64 • Google Scholar.

44. Long HA, French DP, Brooks JM. Optimising the value of the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme, tool for quality appraisal in qualitative evidence synthesis. Res Methods Med. Health Sci. 2020;1: 31-42.
doi: 10.1177/2632084320947559 • Google Scholar.

45. Noblit GW, Hare RD. Meta-Ethnogr Synthesizing Qual Stud. 1988. Available from: https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/meta-ethnography/book2416;11. sage.

46. Campbell R, Pound P, Morgan M, Daker-White G, Britten N, Pill R et al. Evaluating meta-ethnography: systematic analysis and synthesis of qualitative research. Health Technol Assess. 2011 Dec;15: 1-164.
doi: 10.3310/hta15430 • PubMed: 22176717 • Google Scholar.

47. Sandelowski M, Barroso J. Creating metasummaries of qualitative findings. Nurs Res. 2003;52: 226-233.
doi: 10.1097/00006199-200307000-00004 • Google Scholar.

48. France EF, Cunningham M, Ring N, Uny I, Duncan EAS, Jepson RG, Maxwell M, Roberts RJ, Turley RL, Booth A, Britten N, Flemming K, Gallagher I, Garside R, Hannes K, Lewin S, Noblit GW, Pope C, Thomas J, Vanstone M, Higginbottom GMA, Noyes J. Improving reporting of meta-ethnography: the eMERGe reporting guidance. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2019 Jan 31;19(1):25. doi: 10.1186/s12874-018-0600-0. PMID: 30709371; PMCID: PMC6359764.

49. Britten N, Campbell R, Pope C, Donovan J, Morgan M, Pill R. Using meta ethnography to synthesise qualitative research: a worked example. J Health Serv Res Policy. 2002;7: 209-215.
doi: 10.1258/135581902320432732 • Google Scholar.

50. Cahill M, Robinson K, Pettigrew J, Galvin R, Stanley M. Qualitative synthesis: a guide to conducting a meta-ethnography. Br J Occup Ther. 2018;81: 129-137.
doi: 10.1177/0308022617745016 • Google Scholar.

51. Alcántara Porcuna V, Rodríguez-Martín B. Parents' and teachers' perceptions of physical activity in schools: A meta-ethnography. J Sch Nurs. 2022;38: 98-109.
doi: 10.1177/1059840520972005 • Google Scholar.

52. Bell Z, Scott S, Visram S, Rankin J, Bambra C, Heslehurst N. Experiences and perceptions of nutritional health and wellbeing amongst food insecure women in Europe: A qualitative meta-ethnography. Soc Sci Med. 2022;311: 115313.
doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115313 • Google Scholar.

53. Elmir R, Schmied V, Wilkes L, Jackson D. Women's perceptions and experiences of a traumatic birth: A meta-ethnography. J Adv Nurs. 2010;66: 2142-2153.
doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2010.05391.x • Google Scholar.

54. Lyons S, Currie S, Peters S, Lavender T, Smith DM. The perceptions and experiences of women with a body mass index ≥ 30 kg m^2 who breastfeed: A meta-synthesis. Matern Child Nutr. 2019 Jul;15: e12813. doi: 10.1111/mcn.12813. [Epub 2019 Apr 26].PubMed: 30901509 • PubMed Central: PMC6618145. Google Scholar.

55. Toye F, Seers K, Allcock N, Briggs M, Carr E, Barker K. Meta-ethnography 25 years on: challenges and insights for synthesising a large number of qualitative studies. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014;14: 80.
doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-14-80 • Google Scholar.

56. Atkins S, Lewin S, Smith H, Engel M, Fretheim A, Volmink J. Conducting a meta-ethnography of qualitative literature: lessons learnt. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2008;8: 21.
doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-8-21 • Google Scholar.

57. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample size in qualitative interview studies: guided by information power. Qual Health Res. 2016;26: 1753-1760.
doi: 10.1177/1049732315617444 • Google Scholar.

59. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. Biochem Med. 2012;22: 276-282.
doi: 10.11613/BM.2012.031 • Google Scholar.

58. Cohen J. Weighted kappa: nominal scale agreement with provision for scaled disagreement or partial credit. Psychol Bull. 1968 Oct;70: 213-220.
doi: 10.1037/h0026256 • PubMed: 19673146 • Google Scholar.

60. Park CU, Kim HJ. Measurement of inter-rater reliability in systematic review. Hanyang Med Rev. 2015;35: 44-49.
doi: 10.7599/hmr.2015.35.1.44 • Google Scholar.

61. Devillé WL, Buntinx F, Bouter LM, Montori VM, De Vet HC, Van der Windt DA et al. Conducting systematic reviews of diagnostic studies: didactic guidelines. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2002;2: 9.
doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-2-9 • Google Scholar.

62. Adhiambo HF, Ngayo M, Kwena Z. Preferences for accessing sexual and reproductive health services among adolescents and young adults living with HIV/AIDS in Western Kenya: A qualitative study. PLOS ONE. 2022;17: e0277467.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0277467 • Google Scholar.

63. McCarraher DR, Packer C, Mercer S, Dennis A, Banda H, Nyambe N et al. Adolescents living with HIV in the Copperbelt Province of Zambia: their reproductive health needs and experiences. PLOS ONE. 2018;13: e0197853.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0197853 • Google Scholar.

64. Twitty TD, Hitch AE, Marais L, Sales JM, Sharp C, Cloete J et al. Pregnancy and STI/HIV prevention intervention preferences of South African adolescent girls: findings from a cultural consensus modelling qualitative study. Cult Health Sex. 2024 Feb;26: 191-207.
doi: 10.1080/13691058.2023.2194357. [Epub 2023 Apr 6].
PubMed: 37022107 • Google Scholar.

65. Olukoya AA. Provision of reproductive health services for adolescents--report of a study in two Local Government areas (LGAs) of Nigeria. Early Child Dev Care. 1996;120: 95-117.
doi: 10.1080/0300443961200108 • Google Scholar.

66. Smith P, Marcus R, Bennie T, Nkala B, Nchabeleng M, Latka MH et al. What do South African adolescents want in a sexual health service? Evidence from the South African Studies on HIV in Adolescents (SASHA) project. S Afr Med J. 2018;108: 677-681.
doi: 10.7196/SAMJ.2018.v108i8.13013 • Google Scholar.

67. Vujovic M, Struthers H, Meyersfeld S, Dlamini K, Mabizela N. Addressing the sexual and reproductive health needs of young adolescents living with HIV in South Africa. Child Youth Serv

Rev. 2014;45: 122-128.
doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.028 • Google Scholar.

68. Atuyambe LM, Kibira SP, Bukenya J, Muhumuza C, Apolot RR, Mulogo E. Understanding sexual and reproductive health needs of adolescents: evidence from a formative evaluation in Wakiso District, Uganda. Reprod Health. 2015;12: 35.
doi: 10.1186/s12978-015-0026-7 • Google Scholar.

69. Mutea L, Ontiri S, Kadiri F, Michielesen K, Gichangi P. Access to information and use of adolescent sexual reproductive health services: qualitative exploration of barriers and facilitators in Kisumu and Kakamega, Kenya. PLOS ONE. 2020;15: e0241985.
doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0241985 • Google Scholar.

70. Schriver B, Meagley K, Norris S, Geary R, Stein AD. Young people's perceptions of youth-oriented health services in urban Soweto, South Africa: a qualitative investigation. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;14: 625.
doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0625-y • Google Scholar.

71. Tuhebwe D, Babirye S, Ssendagire S, Ssengooba F. The extent to which the design of available reproductive health interventions fit the reproductive health needs of adolescents living in urban poor settings of Kisenyi, Kampala, Uganda. BMC Public Health. 2021;21: 933.
doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10933-3 • Google Scholar.

72. Mburu G, Hodgson I, Teltschik A, Ram M, Haamujompa C, Bajpai D et al. Rights-based services for adolescents living with HIV: adolescent self-efficacy and implications for health systems in Zambia. Reprod Health Matters. 2013;21: 176-185.
doi: 10.1016/S0968-8080(13)41701-9 • Google Scholar.

73. Adams L, Crowley T. Adolescent human immunodeficiency virus self-management: needs of adolescents in the Eastern Cape. Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med. 2021;13: e1-e9.
doi: 10.4102/phcfm.v13i1.2756 • Google Scholar.

74. Hodgson I, Ross J, Haamujompa C, Gitau-Mburu D. Living as an adolescent with HIV in Zambia–lived experiences, sexual health and reproductive needs. AIDS Care. 2012;24: 1204-1210.
doi: 10.1080/09540121.2012.658755 • Google Scholar.

75. Lince-Deroche N, Hargey A, Holt K, Shochet T. Accessing sexual and reproductive health information and services: A mixed methods study of young women's needs and experiences in Soweto, South Africa. Afr J Reprod Health. 2015;19: 73-81.
Google Scholar.

76. Godia PM, Olenja JM, Hofman JJ, Van Den Broek N. Young people's perception of sexual and reproductive health services in Kenya. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;14: 172.
doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-14-172 • Google Scholar.

77. Simuyaba M, Hensen B, Phiri M, Mwansa C, Mwenge L, Kabumbu M et al. Engaging young people in the design of a sexual reproductive health intervention: lessons learnt from the Yathu Yathu ("For us, by us") formative study in Zambia. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021 Jul 29;21: 753.
doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06696-7 • PubMed: 34325696 • PubMed Central: PMC8320161.
Google Scholar.

78. Olukoya AA. Provision of Reproductive Health Services for Adolescents--Report of a Study in Two Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Nigeria. Early Child Development and Care. 1996 Jan 1;120(1):95-117.

79. Self A, Chipokosa S, Misomali A, Aung T, Harvey SA, Chimchere M et al. Youth accessing reproductive health services in Malawi: drivers, barriers, and suggestions from the perspectives of youth and parents. Reprod Health. 2018 Jun 19;15: 108.
doi: 10.1186/s12978-018-0549-9 • PubMed: 29921282 • PubMed Central: PMC6008927.
Google Scholar.

80. Odo AN, Samuel ES, Nwagu EN, Nnamani PO, Atama CS. Sexual and reproductive health services (SRHS) for adolescents in Enugu state, Nigeria: a mixed methods approach. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018;18: 92.
doi: 10.1186/s12913-017-2779-x • Google Scholar.

81. Mmari KN, Magnani RJ. Does making clinic-based reproductive health services more youth-friendly increase service use by adolescents? Evidence from Lusaka, Zambia. J Adolesc Health. 2003;33: 259-270.
doi: 10.1016/s1054-139x(03)00062-4 • Google Scholar.

82. Kimo K, Makuria K. 'Adolescents' reproductive health problems, service preferences, and accessibility. Pak J Psychol Res. 2017;32: 407-427.

83. Mosavi SA, Babazadeh R, Najmabadi KM, Shariati M. Assessing Iranian adolescent girls' needs for sexual and reproductive health information. J Adolesc Health. 2014;55: 107-113.
doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.11.029 • Google Scholar.

84. Starrs AM, Ezeh AC, Barker G, Basu A, Bertrand JT, Blum R et al. Accelerate progress-sexual and reproductive health and rights for all: report of the Guttmacher-Lancet Commission. Lancet. 2018 Jun 30;391: 2642-2692.
doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30293-9. [Epub 2018 May 9].
PubMed: 29753597 • Google Scholar.

85. Reid Chassiakos YL, Radesky J, Christakis D, Moreno MA, Cross C, COUNCIL ON COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA. Children and adolescents and digital media. Pediatrics. 2016 Nov;138: e20162593.
doi: 10.1542/peds.2016-2593 • PubMed: 27940795 • Google Scholar.

86. Pringle J, Mills KL, McAteer J, Jepson R, Hogg E, Anand N et al. The physiology of adolescent sexual behaviour: A systematic review. Cogent Soc Sci. 2017;3: 1368858.
doi: 10.1080/23311886.2017.1368858 • Google Scholar.

88. Denno DM, Hoopes AJ, Chandra-Mouli V. Providing adolescent-friendly reproductive health services through public health facilities in resource-constrained settings: a review of the evidence from low- and middle-income countries. J Adolesc Health. 2020;66: S7-S17.

87. Gbadamosi IT. Ethnobotanical survey of plants used for the treatment and management of sexually transmitted infections in Ibadan, Nigeria. Ethnobot Res Appl. 2014;12: 659-669. Available from: https://ethnobotanyjournal.org/index.php/era/article/view/945.
doi: 10.17348/era.12.0.659-669 • Google Scholar.

89. Mmari K, Lantos H, Brahmbhatt H, Delany-Moretlwe S, Lou C, Acharya R et al. How adolescents perceive their communities: a qualitative study that explores the relationship between health and the physical environment. BMC Public Health. 2014;14: 349.
doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-349 • Google Scholar.

90. Zenebe GA, Ewunie TM, Belay MM, Abose AM. Quality of adolescent and youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health services and associated factors in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Public Health. 2023 Jul 12;11:1191676. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1191676. PMID: 37501947; PMCID: PMC10369062

91. Chandra-Mouli V, Plesons M, Hadi S, Baig Q, Lang I. Building support for adolescent sexuality and reproductive health education and responding to resistance in conservative contexts: cases from Pakistan. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2018 Mar 30;6: 128-136.
doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-17-00285 • PubMed: 29444802 • PubMed Central: PMC5878066.
Google Scholar.

92. United Nations Population Fund. The power of 1.8 billion: adolescents, youth and the transformation of the future. [Cited 15 January 2024]. Available from: https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/EN-SWOP14-Report_FINAL-web.pdf; 2014.

93. Chandra-Mouli V, Lane C, Wong S. What does not work in adolescent sexual and reproductive health: a review of evidence on interventions commonly accepted as best practices. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2015 Aug 31;3: 333-340.
doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-15-00126 • PubMed: 26374795 • PubMed Central: PMC4570008.
Google Scholar.

94. Denno DM, Chandra-Mouli V, Osman M. Reaching youth with out-of-facility HIV and reproductive health services: a systematic review. J Adolesc Health. 2012;51: 106-121.
doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.01.004 • Google Scholar.

95. Akinwale, Oladayo Damilola, Bello, Cecilia Bukola, Akpor, Oluwaseyi Abiodun, Elemile, Mayowa Grace. Evaluation of adolescent/youth.friendly sexual and reproductive health services: A 7-year systematic review from January 2016 to April 2022. J Integr Nurs. Oct-Dec 2022;4: 177-192.
doi: 10.4103/jin.jin_79_22 • Google Scholar.

96. Envuladu EA, Massar K, de Wit J. Adolescent sexual and reproductive health care service availability and delivery in public health facilities of plateau state Nigeria. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18: 1369.
doi: 10.3390/ijerph18041369 • Google Scholar.

97. Khadr SN, Jones KG, Mann S, Hale DR, Johnson AM, Viner RM et al. Investigating the relationship between substance use and sexual behaviour in young people in Britain: findings from a national probability survey. BMJ Open. 2016;6: e011961.
doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011961 • Google Scholar.

98. Manlove J, Fish H, Moore KA. Programs to improve adolescent sexual and reproductive health in the US: a review of the evidence. Adolesc Health Med Ther. 2015 Apr 7;6: 47-79.
doi: 10.2147/AHMT.S48054 • PubMed: 25897271 • PubMed Central: PMC4396579.
Google Scholar.

99. Department of Health and Social Care. 'You're Welcome': establishing youth-friendly health and care services [online]. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/establishing-youth-friendly-health-and-care-services/youre-welcome-establishing-youth-friendly-health-and-care-services; 2023.

100. García-Bello LA, Heredia-Pi IB, Zavala-Arciniega L, Paz-Ballesteros W, Velázquez-Viamonte A, Serván-Mori E. E. Care friendliness in adolescent sexual and reproductive health services in Mexico and a characterisation of their clients. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2022 Dec;37 Suppl 1: 204-219.
doi: 10.1002/hpm.3512. [Epub 2022 Jun 6]. PubMed: 35661412 • Google Scholar.

101. Ranjan S, Nair AR. Approaches and strategies for effective implementation of Life Skills Education. Int J Life Skills Educ. 2015;1: 89-110.

102. Ubisi L. Analysing the hegemonic discourses on comprehensive sexuality education in South African schools. J Educ. University of KwaZulu-Natal. 2020;(81): 118-135.
doi: 10.17159/2520-9868/i81a07 • Google Scholar.

103. Mbeba RM, Mkuye MS, Magembe GE, Yotham WL, Mellah AO, Mkuwa SB. Barriers to sexual reproductive health services and rights among young people in Mtwara District, Tanzania: a qualitative study. Pan Afr Med J. 2012;13 Suppl 1 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):13. [Epub 2012 Dec 26]: 13.
PubMed: 23467684 • PubMed Central: PMC3589247.
Google Scholar.

104. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP qualitative studies checklist [online]. [Cited 07 July 2022]. Available from: https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/; 2018.

105. Hujo K, Carter M. Transformative change for children and youth in the context of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Available from: https://cdn.unrisd.org/assets/library/papers/pdf-files/wp-2019-2-hujo-carter%20.pdf; 2019.

106. Markham CM, Lormand D, Gloppen KM, Peskin MF, Flores B, Low B et al. Connectedness as a predictor of sexual and reproductive health outcomes for youth. J Adolesc Health. 2010;46(3) Suppl: S23-S41.
doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.11.214 • Google Scholar.

107. Awuah V, Apiung G, Konlaan B. Utilization of youth friendly health services and associated factors: A community-based analytical cross-sectional study among young people in the tamale. [Cited 08 September 2023]. Available from: https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-1609739/v1/2f0d9237-c305-41d7-b6f3-d471fb7cb5dc.pdf?c=1658835871; 2022. Metropolis.

108. West, Robert, Michie, Susan. A brief introduction to the COM-B Model of behaviour and the PRIME Theory of motivation. Qeios. 2020.
doi: 10.32388/WW04E6 • Google Scholar.

109 McDonagh LK, Saunders JM, Cassell J, Curtis T, Bastaki H, Hartney T, Rait G. Application of the COM-B model to barriers and facilitators to chlamydia testing in general practice for young people and primary care practitioners: a systematic review. Implementation Science. 2018 Dec;13(1):1-9. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0821-y

110. James G. Education and sexuality: towards addressing adolescents' reproductive health needs in Nigeria. Curr Res J Soc Sci. 2012;4: 285-293.

Supporting documentation

S1 File. This is the S1 File List of countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

S2 File. This is the S1 File Search histories.

S3 Table. This is the S3 Table Data extraction summary on youth's needs and preferences regarding SRHS in sub-Saharan Africa.

S4 Table. This is the S4 Table CASP appraisal of included papers on the needs and preferences of youths regarding sexual and reproductive health services in sub-Saharan Africa.