1 2	A discrete choice experiment to understand depression intervention treatment preferences of Kenyan pregnant adolescents
3	
4 5 6	Manasi Kumar ^{1,2*} , Albert Tele ^{3,4} , Joseph Kathono ^{1,5} , Vincent Nyongesa ¹ , Obadia Yator ¹ , Shillah Mwaniga ^{3,5} , Keng Yen Huang ⁶ , Mary McKay ⁷ , Joanna Lai ⁸ , Marcy Levy ⁸ , Pim Cuijpers ³ , Matthew Quaife ⁹ , Jurgen Unutzer ¹⁰
7	
8	¹ Department of Psychiatry, University of Nairobi, Kenya
9	² Brain and Mind Institute Aga Khan University (corresponding author)
10	³ Vrije University, Amsterdam, Netherlands
11	⁴ Ikuze Africa, Nairobi, Kenya
12	⁵ Nairobi Metropolitan Services, Kenya
13	⁶ New York University Medical School, USA
14	⁷ Washington University St Louis, USA
15	⁸ UNICEF Headquarters, New York, USA
16	⁹ London School of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, UK
17	¹⁰ University of Washington Seattle, USA
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23 24 25	*Corresponding Author: Dr. Manasi Kumar e-mail: m.kumar@ucl.ac.uk
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract 34

35 **Background**: Understanding mental health treatment preferences of adolescents and youth is

particularly important for interventions to be acceptable and successful. Person-centered care 36

mandates empowering individuals to take charge of their own health rather than being 37

38 passive recipients of services.

Methods: 39

We conducted a discrete choice experiment to quantitatively measure adolescent treatment 40 preferences for different care characteristics and explore tradeoffs between these. A total of 41 153 pregnant adolescents were recruited from two primary healthcare facilities in the informal 42 urban settlement of Nairobi. We selected eight attributes of depression treatment option models 43 drawn from literature review and previous qualitative work. We created a balanced and 44 45 orthogonal design to identify main term effects. A total of ten choice tasks were solicited per respondent. We evaluated mean preferences using mixed logit models to adjust for within 46 subject correlation and account for unobserved heterogeneity. 47

Results: Respondents showed a positive preference that caregivers be provided with 48 information sheets, as opposed to co-participation with caregivers. With regards to treatment 49 options, the respondents showed a positive preference for 8 sessions as compared to 4 sessions. 50 With regards to intervention delivery agents, the respondents had a positive preference for 51 facility nurses as compared to community health volunteers. In terms of support, the 52 respondents showed positive preference for parenting skills as compared to peer support. Our 53 respondents expressed negative preferences of ANC service combined with older mothers as 54 compared to adolescent friendly services and of being offered refreshments alone. A positive 55 preference was revealed for combined refreshments and travel allowance over travel allowance 56 or refreshments alone. 57

Conclusion: This study highlights unique needs of this population. Pregnant adolescents value 58 59 depression care services offered by nurses Participants shared a preference for longer psychotherapy sessions and their preference was to have adolescent centered maternal mental 60 health and child health services within primary care. 61

- 62
- 63

- 65
- 66
- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73

74 Introduction

The prevalence of depression is high among pregnant women, with worldwide estimates of 11-75 18% [1,2] and between 15-28% in Lower-and-Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) (4-8). 76 77 Adolescent mothers usually experience higher rates of prenatal depression as compared adult mothers [5]. Maternal depression negatively impacts the maternal and child health [3,4,6]. In 78 Kenya, pregnant adolescents report mental health problems, difficulty in accessing financial, 79 80 moral and material support from parents or partners, and stigmatization by health workers when 81 seeking health care[7]. Discrete choice experiments (DCE) enable us to estimate relative 82 preference weights and their corresponding trade-offs to measure what is important to people 83 when choosing to engage in care[8], and though this approach has been tested within mental health field[9], it can more actively be used in low resource contexts to prioritize patient 84 centered care[10] 85

DCEs offer rigorous and systematic approaches for eliciting preferences for service or
product attributes from customers and stakeholder[11]. DCEs allow for estimation of the
relative importance of aspects of the service by analyzing trade-offs between attributes made
by stakeholders. This method is increasingly applied to healthcare settings to enable patient
input for patient-centered care [12] and has been successfully applied for patient preference
elicitation in multiple areas of healthcare, including provider-interactions, health service
delivery content and format, and treatment options [12].

Patients' preferences are particularly salient in depression treatment, because multiple efficacious treatments (for example, combination of antidepressants and psychotherapies) and modalities (for example, group and individual) as well as different types of psychotherapies (cognitive-behavioral or relational like IPT) exist. Incorporating individual patients' preferences into treatment decisions could lead to improved adherence to treatments for depressive disorders in this highly vulnerable group.

99 The objective of conducting this DCE was to quantitatively measure adolescent depression

100 treatment preferences for different care characteristics and explore tradeoffs between these.

101 Methods

102 Design

A DCE is a survey design that asks respondents for their utilities [13]. The method is based on random utility theory [14] and Lancaster's economic theory of value [15]. It is built on the assumptions that health care interventions, services, or policies can be described by their characteristics (called attributes), and that a person's valuation depends on the levels of these characteristics [16,17].

DCEs ask people to complete a series of hypothetical choice activities to extract this information. Individuals are asked to choose their favorite option among two or more alternatives (e.g., psychological therapies) with varying intervention characteristics in each choice task. Patient preferences can thus be measured as the extent to which each intervention feature influences an individual's intervention choice.

This survey was created in accordance with the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics recommendations and the Outcomes Research (ISPOR) Conjoint Analysis Task Force checklist for appropriate research techniques for stated-preference studies[18]. The task force's experimental design guidelines [19] were used in this investigation (see supplementary table 1).

To investigate depression treatment preferences among pregnant teenagers, we employed a DCE, which consists of four stages: identifying and defining attributes and levels, generating choice sets and constructing questionnaires, collecting survey data, and analyzing and explaining the results [15,20]. Figure 1 depicts the DCE's development process.

Figure 1: The Development Process of DCE

123

124 Attributes and Levels

A preliminary list of attributes was made by extracting all relevant attributes and levels from 125 health-related DCEs [9,21] and through comprehensive literature review in consultation of with 126 psychologists with experience in adolescent mental health. We supplemented this by 127 conducting semi-structured qualitative interviews with experts in the field of adolescent mental 128 health and health economics (primary health clinicians, nurses and mental health practitioners 129 (n=36), researchers in the field of mental health (n=10), and a health economist) [22,23]. 130 131 Subsequently, we conducted qualitative semi-structured interviews with 10 purposefully sampled respondents with a history of depression diagnosis. Following a grounded theory 132 approach in the phases of both data collection and analysis^[24], we derived lists of actors and 133 factors that may play a part in the search for and selection of depression treatment. The authors 134 reduced the set of potential candidate attributes to a more manageable set of attributes by 135 filtering out double or overlapping attributes. The final list included eight attributes that 136 consisted of; (i) Information delivery, (ii) Participants, (iii) Treatment option, (iv) Intervention 137 delivery, (v) Training, (vi) Support, (vii) Services and (viii) Incentives. 138

The design was pilot-tested with a selection of the pregnant adolescents who had been 139 participated in the qualitative interviews to refine the survey and to assess the salience of the 140 attributes to the treatment decision. Participants completed DCE questionnaires and 141 participated in a personal cognitive interview as part of the pilot testing. To determine the 142 burden on participants, the number of completed items and the time it took to complete them 143 were recorded. Personal cognitive interviews were utilized to assess participants' knowledge 144 of the questionnaire's levels and face validity. The final set of attributes and levels are presented 145 in Table 1. 146

147 **Table 1:** Attributes and levels

Attributes		Level
1.	Information delivery	Health Facility
		Individualized
2.	Participants	Co-participate with Caregivers
		Provide information sheets for care-givers
3.	Treatment option	4 sessions for 1.5 hours
		8 sessions for 1.5 hours
4.	Intervention delivery	CHV
		Facility Nurses
5.	Training	Vocational
		Formal (Back to school)
6.	Support	Peer support
		Parenting skills
7.	Services	Adolescent friendly services
		Combined with older mothers
8.	Incentives	Transport KSh. 500
		Food
		Both

148

We tested multiple-choice elicitation formats and chose to use full-profile tasks between two treatment profiles in which participants indicated which treatment they would prefer to take. This setup allowed for the elicitation of acceptable tradeoffs people were willing to make between different treatment attributes. If the number of attributes is low enough that participants can reasonably complete a full-profile task, this maximizes information about trade-offs [25]. We allowed the participants to select an opt-out option. An example choice task with decision scenario is shown in Figure 2.

- 156 **Figure 2:** Sample choice card using orthogonal design*
- 157 *Note: In an orthogonal design all attributes are independent of one another

158 Experimental Design

We piloted using a fractional factorial design, then analyzed data in a multinomial logistic regression model to generate a Bayesian D-optimal design [26]. D-optimal designs maximize the precision of the estimated parameters given a set number of choice tasks and information

on expectations of respondent preferences [27]. We designed ten choice tasks. A repeat task
was added to test choice consistency. In addition to discrete choice tasks, participants were
asked to directly rank the attributes in order of importance from 1-8.

165 **Recruitment and Data Collection**

Purposive sampling was used to recruit pregnant adolescents aged 14-18 years who were 166 seeking antenatal services at two primary health care centers located in two informal 167 settlements with Nairobi County were recruited from March to June 202. In addition, 168 respondents who had participated in the preliminary study were approached (qualitative 169 interviews and pilot study). The recruitment was carried out by two research assistants and 170 seven CHVs. In Addition, 11 choice scenarios, we administered PHQ-9 to measure self-171 172 reported depressive symptoms and also collected information on their socio-demographic profiles. Confirmed pregnancy status, adolescent age 14-18 years, willingness to share their 173 feedback on the DCE, familiarity with Kiswahili and English languages, stable mental health, 174 being in the neighborhood for last one year, willingness to give consent were the exact inclusion 175 criteria. 176

177 The sample size estimate in our study is based on Johnson and Orme's rule of thumb (R Johnson & Orme, 2010; Rich Johnson & Orme, 2003). The calculation formula for the minimal sample 178 size N, according to Johnson and Orme, is provided in the following equation: $N \ge (500 \text{ x c})/(a \text{ s})$ 179 x t) - where N is the number of participants, t is the number of choice tasks (questions), a is the 180 number of alternative scenarios and c is the largest number of attribute levels for any one 181 attribute, and when considering two-way interactions, 'c' is equal to the largest product of 182 183 levels for any two attributes - $(500 \times 6/3 \times 8)$. To account for 10% non-response at least 139 participants is recommended. A tablet-based DCE interview using Dooblo software program 184 [28] was used to capture participant responses. 185

Ethical approval: Ethical approval was obtained from the Kenyatta National Hospital and
University of Nairobi Ethics and Research Committee (Approval No. P694/09/2018). All data
collection, such as de-identifying data and allowing participants to stop the survey at any time,
was done in accordance with ethical standards.

190 Statistical Analysis

We analyzed choice data using mixed multinomial logit models [29] to adjust for within-191 subject correlation [30,31] and account for unobserved preference heterogeneity [29]. The 192 193 model was estimated using the mlogit command with 500 random Halton draws in R version 4.1.2. No interaction terms were included and we did not perform sub-group analysis. In the 194 mixed logit model, all the attributes were included as effects-coded categorical variables that 195 196 we assumed to be normally distributed. This assumption was based on convenience because 197 appropriate assumptions for these distributions remain ambiguous [15,25,29]. We chose to use effects coding to account for nonlinearities [25]. The level of each attribute that we expected 198 199 to be most neutral was used as the omitted or reference attribute parameter. The negative preference (represented by negative coefficient) represents disutility or disliking of that option 200 and positive preference represents liked or beneficial choice/utility (positive coefficient) on 201 mixed logit model. 202

203 **Results**

204 *Response rate*

A total of 192 participants who were registered in ANC clinics at Nairobi Metropolitan Service's Kariobangi and Kangemi health centers were contacted and screened for eligibility. Of these, 21 participants did not meet the eligibility criteria, where eight participants gave birth before the study commenced and 13 were aged more than 18 years. Out of 171 eligible participants, 18 refused to consent leaving a total sample size of 153 (Response rate of 89.5%).

210

211 Figure 3: Recruitment Flow Chart

212 Participant sociodemographic characteristics

Table 2 presents the socio-demographic and other characteristics of the respondents. A total of 153 pregnant adolescent girls participated in the survey The mean age was 17.2 and ranged from 14–18 years. More than three-quarters of participants (79.7%) were single, while the rest were either married or living with a partner. In terms of education, the majority (72.5%) had secondary school level of education. Most respondents (64.1%) were students and the rest were staying at home doing family chores. Participants who were classified as having probable depression (PHQ-9>10) were 43.1% (95% C.I. 35.3% -51.6%, mean (SD): 8.9 (9.0).

220 **Table 2:** Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency (N=153)	Percentage (%)
Age	Mean; SD; Range	17.2; 1.	0; 14-18
Marital status	Single	122	79.7
	Married/ co-habiting with a partner	31	20.3
Highest level of education	Primary school	42	27.5
	Secondary school	111	72.5
Monthly Family Income	<4,999 KES/ under 500 USD	82	53.6
	5,000-9,999 KES/500- 100 USD	34	22.2
	>10,000 KES/1000 USD	37	24.2
Person Living With	Parents	103	67.3
	Spouse	32	20.9
	Others	18	11.8
Week of gestation of first ANC visit	< 12 weeks	25	16.3
	12-28 weeks	108	70.6
	>28weeks	20	13.1
Unplanned Pregnancy	Yes	96	62.7
	No	57	37.3
Attitude of adolescent's partner towards	Positive	92	60.1
the pregnancy	Negative	40	26.1
	Ambivalent	21	13.7
Presence of social support	Yes	120	78.4
	No	33	21.6

Parity	0	14	9.2
	1	113	73.9
	2+	26	17.0
Age at Sex Debut	14-16 Years	79	52.0
	17-18 Years	73	48.0
	Non-Response	1	

221

222 **Preference Results**

The results from the mixed logit model are presented in Table 3. Given the significant estimates for all but one attribute level information delivery and the alignment of coefficients with a priori expectations, we conclude the DCE was well understood by participants and the modelling method appropriate. The attributes are ranked from the most preferred to the least preferred in terms of the strength of their coefficients.

With regards to services delivery, the respondents had a negative preference of being offered services along with adult mothers at the ANC (63.7%, β =-37.92, *p*<0.001) as compared to separate adolescent friendly services. The respondents expressed positive preference for training in parenting skills (56.7%, β =19.6, *p*<0.001) as compared to peer-support based skills. In terms of further training needs, there was a negative preference for return to school (77.3%, β =-19.3, *p*<0.001) as opposed to livelihood training.

In terms of added incentives to make improve access to IPT sessions, a negative preference for refreshments was expressed (51.6%, β =-4.69, *p*<0.001) as compared to provision of combined transport funds and refreshments. Interestingly, our respondents had a positive preference for receiving transport allowance (99.9%, β =18.39, *p*<0.001) in comparison of both refreshments and travel allowance.

In terms of joint participation group sessions, the respondents showed a positive preference that the caregivers be provided with information sheets (64.4%, β =6.05, *p*<0.001), as opposed to co-participation with caregivers or partners.

- 242 When asked who is preferred for running intervention delivery sessions, the respondents had a
- positive preference for facility nurses (52.8%, β =6.04, *p*<0.001) as compared to CHVs.
- In terms of intervention delivery, our respondents showed a positive preference of 8 sessions
- 245 (52.0%, β =5.52, *p*<0.001) as compared to 4 sessions.
- 246 Participants did not show significant differences in preference for information delivery.
- 247 Respondents were less likely to opt out of the choices with 99.9% of them opting to choose
- 248 one of the two options provided.
- Table 3: Results of mixed multinomial logit model with calculated proportions of positive and
- 250 negative effects for treatment options

Table 3: Results of mixed multinomial logit model with calculated proportions of positiveand negative effects for treatment options

Variable	Category	β	S. D	% Preference	S. E	Sig.
Information	SRHR information	Ref.				
delivery	Individualized dietary information	-0.66	26.83	-50.8	0.76	0.3864
Joint	Co-participate with	Ref.				
Participation	Caregivers/partners Provide information sheets for care-givers	6.05	16.38	64.4	0.82	<0.001
Treatment	4 sessions for 1.5 hours	Ref.				
duration	8 sessions for 1.5 hours	5.52	122.11	52.0	1.33	<0.001
Intervention	CHV	Ref.				
delivery agents	Facility Nurses	6.04	87.78	52.8	1.27	<0.001
Further	Vocational	Ref.				
Training Needs	Formal (Back to school)	-19.29	25.77	-77.3	1.13	<0.001
Support type	Peer support	Ref.				
	Parenting skills	19.57	113.50	56.7	1.51	<0.001
МСН	Adolescent friendly services	Ref.				
Services	Combined with adult/older women	-37.92	107.82	-63.7	1.64	<0.001
Incentives	Food	-4.69	118.83	-51.6	1.74	0.0071
	Transport	18.39	5.53	99.9	0.81	<0.001
	Both	Ref.				
Opt Out		-118.10	32.58	-99.9	-118.10	<0.001

253 Note: Ref-Reference category; MCH-Maternal and child health care

254 Ranking of attributes

Our respondents ranked Information delivery as the first, treatment duration option second, Support type third, Joint Participation fourth, MCH Services fifth, Incentives sixth, and Intervention Delivery Agents seventh and Further training needs as eighth.

- 258 Figure 4: Ranking of attributes
- 259 **Discussion**

This study assessed depression treatment preferences among pregnant adolescent girls in 260 informal urban setting. Consistent with prior expectations, information delivery and treatment 261 options were the most important attributes. Our respondents showed a positive preference 262 that caregivers be provided with information sheets, as opposed to co-participation in therapy 263 sessions. With regards to treatment options, the respondents showed a positive preference for 264 8 sessions as compared to 4 sessions. With regards to intervention delivery agents, the 265 respondents had a positive preference for facility nurses as compared to community health 266 267 volunteers (CHVs). In terms of support, the respondents showed positive preference for parenting skills as compared to peer support. Respondents expressed negative preferences of 268 ANC service combined with older mothers as compared to adolescent friendly services and 269 270 of being offered refreshments alone. However, a positive preference was revealed for combined refreshments and travel allowance over travel allowance or refreshments alone. 271 272 These findings do suggest that young peripartum adolescents would prefer more tailored support that engages them directly but also provides guidance and engagement with their 273 caregivers and partners. There is a strong emphasis on youth friendly maternal and child 274

275 health care services than being lumped with routine MCH clinics with adult women.

Despite the enormous significance of these findings, these are outputs of a DCE experimentfrom two Nairobi primary health care sites. This could be tested further in other sites and

settings for external validity. In general, DCEs have been shown as effective method for
eliciting preferences for mental health services within diverse settings, illustrating a

280 promising approach to increasing patient-centered mental health care.

These directly elicited preferences are consistent with our experience of depression associated 281 challenges that pregnant adolescents experience. We learnt that our respondents preferred 282 longer group psychotherapy and that they did not rank educational needs above vocational 283 training. Pregnancy and impending motherhood may have shaped these preferences which 284 might evolve and it appears that they did see infant care and parenting as their key difficulties. 285 Our respondents would prefer informational support for caregivers and partners above direct 286 involvement of the caregivers and partners in group sessions. It appears that peer support, 287 privacy and a safe space to share their experiences is considered important. Given that a large 288 number of them experience interpersonal disputes with family members and are in conflicted 289 relationship with their partners or partners, something other studies have noted too (45). . It 290 291 was also clear that they preferred to interact and be serviced in Antenatal clinics that are youth friendly/responsive by nurses but not with older adult women. Pregnant and parenting 292 adolescents differentiate themselves from regular adolescents and adult women [32-34]. 293

A preference of IPT delivery by ANC nurses over CHVs is also telling. While we will now 294 use these revealed preferences as guidance in our efforts to further modify group IPT, we also 295 296 know that as these young women give birth, their preferences may evolve and change. Keeping a conversation around other aspects of health such as robust SRHR choices- including family 297 planning, use of PrEP, HIV testing, use of contraceptives etc. will also be critical and nurses 298 and CHVs can both play a part there. Working out their livelihood options if return to school 299 is difficult will need to be a priority and for those who will opt for continuation of school, 300 offering brief IPT (4 sessions, even as a booster or remission treatment) might help in the long 301 run. It appears that young pregnant or parenting girls would like to be taken seriously like adult 302

women and would like to access services that are responsive to their needs and offer protection
 from multidimensional stigma associated with unintended early pregnancy and mental illness.

Depressive disorders are among the top three causes of years lived with disability globally, 305 accounting for 40% of all mental illness, and affecting 350 million people comprising 4% of 306 the population. Mental health services are scarce in low-and-middle-income countries like 307 308 Kenva. Even when services exist, these do not map on to patient and provider preferences. Innovations are needed to provide accessible, affordable, and acceptable prevention, care, and 309 treatment services to the diverse populations faced with poor mental health. Information and 310 messages about mental health, preventative services, care and treatment characteristics, 311 provider approaches, and care provision modalities must continue to evolve based on 312 stakeholder preferences to ensure relevance and desirability [35]. 313

Historically, patient involvement especially of vulnerable adolescents in shaping health practice has been minimal, especially in low-resource settings (10-13). There is good evidence that services that engage patients from the beginning – around conceptualizing the service itself, can be highly successful and effective. Similarly, adolescent-centered care has been associated with improved symptom burden, satisfaction, and enablement [36].

The current focus on patient-centered care within healthcare systems aims to ensure highquality interactions between patients and the health system through achievement of the eight principles: *respect for patients' preferences, coordination and integration of care, information and education, physical comfort, emotional support, involvement of family and friends, continuity and transition, and access to care* [37,38]. It appears that many of these principles were articulated by our respondents in the DCE experiment on depression care.

325 Limitations

This study had some limitations. It was conducted in two healthcare facilities in an informal 326 urban setting that are part of Nairobi metropolitan services health facility and results may not 327 be entirely generalizable to other settings and practice models. Therefore, the applications of 328 our findings remain limited to urban informal settlements. These settlements tend to be 329 socioeconomically and ethnically diverse in their own right so the current study can inform 330 more contextual study designs. We studied a convenience sample of respondents who may 331 have been more frequent visitors to the facilities and their views may not represent all patients. 332 Our results and conclusions are based on the attributes and levels included in the DCE we 333 334 designed. While we followed a robust process to determine which attributes are important and relevant in our context using focus groups of key informants with expert knowledge of the 335 clinical setting as well as previous literature in similar settings, we cannot be sure we captured 336 all important attributes. 337

338

339 Conclusion

Our participants revealed a complex set of preferences – prioritizing longer psychotherapy duration, parenting support, disseminating relevant depression care information to caregivers and partners as opposed to inviting them into groups, vocational training over return to school and combined refreshments with travel allowance as added incentives for psychotherapy. Negative preferences were revealed for combined ANC services with adult women, and provision of refreshments alone. These directly elicited preferences provide a unique opportunity to develop 'patient-centered' mental health services in a primary care context.

347

348 **Declarations**

Ethics approval and consent to participate: the study was approved by the Kenyatta National 349 Hospital/University of Nairobi ethical review committee (approval no. P694/09/2018). The 350 study received approval from the Nairobi County health directorate (approval no. 351 CMO/NRB/OPR/VOL1/2019/04) and approval from National Commission for Science, 352 Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI/P/19/77705/28063). All study participants' informed 353 consent to participate would be sought, including stakeholders and advisory committee 354 355 members from whom data would be collected. The research was carried out per the KNH/UoN ethical review committee guidelines as well as the standard guidelines and principles of the 356 357 Declarations of the Helsinki.

358 Consent for publication: All study participants gave their consent to publish this work's359 findings.

Availability of data and material: The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests: The authors do declare that they do not have any competing interests

Funding: Research reported in this publication was supported by the Fogarty International Center of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number K43TW010716. The content is solely the authors' responsibility and does not necessarily represent the National Institutes of Health's official views. The first author was funded by the Fogarty Foundation K43 grant (2018-2023), and the co-authors are her mentors and collaborators in this study.

Authors' contributions: MK developed this paper, data collection was overseen by JK, VN,
and AT and MQ conducted quantitative data analysis, while OY, SM, KYH, MM, JL, ML, PC
and JU.All authors read and approved the work.

- 372 Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank all the participants, Nairobi County health
- directorate, Director of Mental health, Ministry of Health, Kariobangi, and Kangemi health
- 374 facility staff.

376 **References**

377	1.	Neal SE, Chandra-Mouli V, Chou D. Adolescent first births in East Africa:
378		disaggregating characteristics, trends and determinants. Reprod Health. 2015;12: 13.
379		doi:10.1186/1742-4755-12-13
380	2.	Campbell B, Martinelli-heckadon S, Wong S. UNPFA State of the World's
381		Population. Motherhood in Childhood. 2013; ii-116.
382	3.	Ayele TA, Azale T, Alemu K, Abdissa Z, Mulat H, Fekadu A. Prevalence and
383		Associated Factors of Antenatal Depression among Women Attending Antenatal Care
384		Service at Gondar University Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. Ebmeier K, editor. PLoS
385		One. 2016;11: e0155125. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0155125
386	4.	Gust DA, Gvetadze R, Furtado M, Makanga M, Akelo V, Ondenge K, et al. Factors
387		associated with psychological distress among young women in Kisumu, Kenya. Int J
388		Womens Health. 2017;9: 255–264. doi:10.2147/IJWH.S125133
389	5.	Anderson CA, Connolly JP. Predicting posttraumatic stress and depression symptoms
390		among adolescents in the extended postpartum period. Heliyon. 2018;4: e00965.
391	6.	Cox JL. Psychiatric Morbidity and Pregnancy: a Controlled Study of 263 Semi-Rural
392		Ugandan Women. Br J Psychiatry. 1979;134: 401-405. doi:10.1192/bjp.134.4.401
393	7.	Kumar M, Huang K-Y, Othieno C, Wamalwa D, Madeghe B, Osok J, et al. Adolescent
394		Pregnancy and Challenges in Kenyan Context: Perspectives from Multiple Community
395		Stakeholders. Glob Soc Welf. 2018;5: 11-27. doi:10.1007/s40609-017-0102-8
396	8.	Soekhai V, de Bekker-Grob EW, Ellis AR, Vass CM. Discrete Choice Experiments in
397		Health Economics: Past, Present and Future. Pharmacoeconomics. 2019;37: 201–226.
398		doi:10.1007/s40273-018-0734-2

399	9.	Ride J, Lancsar E. Women's Preferences for Treatment of Perinatal Depression and
400		Anxiety: A Discrete Choice Experiment. PLoS One. 2016;11: e0156629.
401		doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156629
402	10.	Larsen A, Tele A, Kumar M. Mental health service preferences of patients and
403		providers: a scoping review of conjoint analysis and discrete choice experiments from
404		global public health literature over the last 20 years (1999–2019). BMC Health Serv
405		Res. 2021;21: 1–13.
406	11.	Green PE, Krieger AM, Wind Y. Thirty years of conjoint analysis: Reflections and
407		prospects. Marketing research and modeling: Progress and prospects. Springer; 2004.
408		рр. 117–139.
409	12.	Ryan M, Farrar S. Using conjoint analysis to elicit preferences for health care. Bmj.
410		2000;320: 1530–1533.
411	13.	Lancaster KJ. A New Approach to Consumer Theory Journal of Political Economy, 74
412		(2). S; 1966. pp. 132–157. doi:10.1086/259131
413	14.	McFadden D. Conditional Logit Analysis of Qualitative Choice Behaviour". In
414		Frontiers in Econometrics, ed. P. Zarembka.(New York: Academic Press). 1974.
415	15.	Lancsar E, Louviere J. Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare
416		decision making: a user's guide. Pharmacoeconomics. 2008;26: 661-677.
417		doi:10.2165/00019053-200826080-00004
418	16.	Ryan M. Discrete choice experiments in health care. Bmj. British Medical Journal
419		Publishing Group; 2004. pp. 360–361.
420	17.	Ryan M, Gerard K, Amaya-Amaya M. Using discrete choice experiments to value
421		health and health care. Springer Science & Business Media; 2007.

422	18.	Bridges JFP, Hauber AB, Marshall D, Lloyd A, Prosser LA, Regier DA, et al. Conjoint
423		analysis applications in health-a checklist: a report of the ISPOR Good Research
424		Practices for Conjoint Analysis Task Force. Value Heal. 2011;14: 403-413.
425	19.	Reed Johnson F, Lancsar E, Marshall D, Kilambi V, Mühlbacher A, Regier DA, et al.
426		Constructing experimental designs for discrete-choice experiments: report of the
427		ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Experimental Design Good Research Practices Task Force.
428		Value Heal J Int Soc Pharmacoeconomics Outcomes Res. 2013;16: 3–13.
429		doi:10.1016/j.jval.2012.08.2223
430	20.	Johnson FR, Lancsar E, Marshall D, Kilambi V, Mühlbacher A, Regier DA, et al.
431		Constructing experimental designs for discrete-choice experiments: report of the
432		ISPOR conjoint analysis experimental design good research practices task force. Value
433		Heal. 2013;16: 3–13.
434	21.	Clark MD, Determann D, Petrou S, Moro D, de Bekker-Grob EW. Discrete choice
435		experiments in health economics: a review of the literature. Pharmacoeconomics.
436		2014;32: 883–902. doi:10.1007/s40273-014-0170-x
437	22.	Kumar M, Nyongesa V, Kagoya M, Mutamba BB, Amugune B, Krishnam NS, et al.
438		Mapping services at two Nairobi County primary health facilities: identifying
439		challenges and opportunities in integrated mental health care as a Universal Health
440		Coverage (UHC) priority. Ann Gen Psychiatry. 2021;20: 1–13.
441	23.	Kumar M, Huang K-Y, Othieno C, Wamalwa D, Madeghe B, Osok J, et al. Adolescent
442		Pregnancy and Challenges in Kenyan Context: Perspectives from Multiple Community
443		Stakeholders. Glob Soc Welf. 2018;5: 11-27. doi:10.1007/s40609-017-0102-8
444	24.	Patton MQ. Qualitative research and evaluation methods. Thousand Oaks. Cal Sage
		Publ 2002-4

25. Mühlbacher A, Johnson FR. Choice Experiments to Quantify Preferences for Health 446 and Healthcare: State of the Practice. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2016;14: 253-447 266. doi:10.1007/s40258-016-0232-7 448 26. Street DJ, Burgess L, Louviere JJ. Quick and easy choice sets: constructing optimal 449 and nearly optimal stated choice experiments. Int J Res Mark. 2005;22: 459-470. 450 Hall J, Kenny P, King M, Louviere J, Viney R, Yeoh A. Using stated preference 451 27. discrete choice modelling to evaluate the introduction of varicella vaccination. Health 452 453 Econ. 2002;11: 457-465. doi:10.1002/hec.694 28. Dooblo. Data Collection Software for Mobile Surveys | Dooblo. 2021. 454 Hauber AB, González JM, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM, Prior T, Marshall DA, 455 29. 456 Cunningham C, et al. Statistical Methods for the Analysis of Discrete Choice Experiments: A Report of the ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Good Research Practices 457 458 Task Force. Value Heal J Int Soc Pharmacoeconomics Outcomes Res. 2016;19: 300-315. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2016.04.004 459 30. de Bekker-Grob EW, Ryan M, Gerard K. Discrete choice experiments in health 460 economics: a review of the literature. Health Econ. 2012;21: 145–172. 461 doi:10.1002/hec.1697 462 31. McFadden D, Train K. Mixed MNL models for discrete response. J Appl Econom. 463 2000;15: 447-470. 464 465 32. Osok J, Kigamwa P, Huang K-Y, Grote N, Kumar M. Adversities and mental health needs of pregnant adolescents in Kenya: identifying interpersonal, practical, and 466 cultural barriers to care. BMC Womens Health. 2018;18: 1-18. 467 468 33. Duby Z, McClinton Appollis T, Jonas K, Maruping K, Dietrich J, LoVette A, et al.

469		"As a Young Pregnant Girl The Challenges You Face": Exploring the Intersection
470		Between Mental Health and Sexual and Reproductive Health Amongst Adolescent
471		Girls and Young Women in South Africa. AIDS Behav. 2021;25: 344–353.
472		doi:10.1007/s10461-020-02974-3
473	34.	Berhane Y, Canavan CR, Darling AM, Sudfeld CR, Vuai S, Adanu R, et al. The age of
474		opportunity: prevalence of key risk factors among adolescents 10-19 years of age in
475		nine communities in sub-Saharan Africa. Trop Med Int Heal. 2020;25: 15–32.
476	35.	Murray CJL, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi-Kangevari M, et
477		al. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a
478		systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet. 2020;396:
479		1223-1249. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2
480	36.	Webb MJ, Wadley G, Sanci LA. Improving Patient-Centered Care for Young People
481		in General Practice With a Codesigned Screening App: Mixed Methods Study. JMIR
482		mHealth uHealth. 2017;5: e118. doi:10.2196/mhealth.7816
483	37.	Fisher J, Mello MC de, Patel V, Rahman A, Tran T, Holton S, et al. Prevalence and
484		determinants of common perinatal mental disorders in women in low-and lower-
485		middle-income countries: a systematic review. Bull World Health Organ. 2012;90:
486		139–149.
487	38.	Senturk V, Hanlon C, Medhin G, Dewey M, Araya M, Alem A, et al. Impact of
488		perinatal somatic and common mental disorder symptoms on functioning in Ethiopian
489		women: The P-MaMiE population-based cohort study. J Affect Disord. 2012;136:
490		340-349. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2011.11.028
491	S1- S	upplementary Table 1

492 **S2-** Supplementary Literature on Attributes and Levels

493 **S3**-Supplimentary Mixed Logit Models



Figure 1: The Development Process of DCE

	Choice card 2			
	Attributes	Option A	Option B	Opt out
	1) Information delivery	Individualized dietary information mother and baby	Sexual reproductive health knowledge	None
medRxiv pre	2) Caregiver & male partner eprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.07.222 participation fied by peer review) is the au It is made available unde	In-person participation of 278515: this version posted August 9, 2022. The thouffurger Who has granted president a lidense perpetuity. Proceeding 4.0 International license.	Provide written reading materials on convrient helder for this to display the preprint in caregivers & male partners	None
	3) Treatment option	8 sessions for 1 hour, 30 minutes	4 sessions for 1 hour, 30 minutes	None
	4) Intervention delivery	Facility nurses	CHV (Community health volunteers)	None
	5) Support	Peer support	Mentorship/ support from older people	None
	6) Education & training	Return back to school (Formal training & certification)	Vocational training (Practice life skills for income generating schools)	None
	7) Services	Adolescent friendly services	Combined with older mothers	None
	8) Incentives	Transport	Food	None
	Your choice? (Please tick one box)			

Figure 2: Sample choice card using orthogonal design*

*Note: In an orthogonal design all attributes are independent of one another



Figure 3: Recruitment Flow Chart



Figure 3: Ranking of attributes