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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions

P1 Abstract/Methods: “to observe” may be replaced by a better term such as “to describe”.

P2 Abstract/Conclusion and elsewhere: it is not surprising that “no single factor accounts for this high fertility” (or is it?). I suggest deleting this passage here and elsewhere.

P3 Background: explain CBR and TFR acronyms.

P5 Data and Methods / Sampling frame: was data stratification taken into account for analysis? This should be important to maintain the representativeness of the NHDS sample.

P7 Methods of analysis – I do not understand the passage “the dependent variable (CEB) is in ratio scale”. Are you referring to the outcome variable(s) of ANOVA/multiple regression? They should be considered continuous (and normally distributed, see below).

P7 Methods of analysis – looking at mean value of CEB in the two age groups, I suspect that CEB is not normally distributed. This may not be a problem with a large sample size like this but I suggest to report that tests of deviations from normality were performed and their results.

P7 Methods of analysis – although looking at correlation coefficients # 0.6 is a useful way to screen for collinearity, I suppose that more indicative tests such as calculation of variance inflation factors were performed.

P9 Multivariate analysis – in the first phrase of PARA 2 delete “were found” (repetition)

P21 Table 2 – explain the * heading. Why not using ** instead of *** as there are apparently no **?

P22 Table 3 – please make clear that this is a “multivariate” analysis
Discretionary Revisions

P1 Abstract/Results: consider reporting the regression coefficients in the abstract as they are much more informative than the associated p-values.

P9 Multivariate analysis – it is interesting that one model explains 23% less variance than the other (59-33). Any biologically plausible explanation for this?
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