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**Editor's comment:**

The article has been improved, but it still requires some improvements before it can be accepted. I recommend that a native speaker would revise the language.

**Response:** we have given it for the native speaker and language editing has been done.

There are several sentences which remain unclear:
- ...also the guide-line help more to probe ideas, page 5.
  **Response:** Thank you we rephrased the sentence to make it clear

- ...the service from public institution GO 6(11.1%) and private organization 3 5.6%), page 8.
  **Response:** We used it to mean governmental organizations so that we wrote it fully.

- ...large number of married women who had negative attitudes towards it..., page 11.
  **Response:** We have described accordingly “This might be related to a large number (61%) of the married women have an interest for more children. In addition to that having negative attitude towards permanent methods of contraception in the study community contributes to low use.”

  **Response:** Yes it was not correct we have modified it.

In addition, the following stylistic changes should be done
- Systematise the use of LAPM, now even LAMP, e.g. pages 4, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 13.
  **Response:** We have gone through the document and made it consistent. Thank you!

- Close the gap between percentage unit and percentage (30% instead of 30 %), e.g. pages 3 and 6.
  **Response:** We accepted it.
- The accurate numbers could be rounded, e.g. 12,782 in page 3 and the population figures in page 4.

Response: We have tried to make it to round to one decimal only but 12,782 is not decimal it is a solid number to refer to maternal deaths.

- Is the expected prevalence of modern contraceptive use 16% (now 0.16), page 4?

Response: Yes it is 16% but when we put as p = probability of using contraception it is as 0.16. Anyways to make it clear we wrote it accordingly.

- the study participants, not participant, page 5.

Response: We corrected it.

- Capitalise the name of towns, universities and areas, e.g. Wukro, pages 6, 7.
- 1-1.5 instead of 1 to 1 and a half, page 6.

Response: We have done it accordingly.

- Pages 6 and 7 have some text on grouping of answers which is given twice.

Response: We have removed and corrected it.

- Add a space between numbers and parenthesis, e.g. page 7.

Response: We included space.

- Include the number of respondents in page 7 (440 out of 460 married women).

Response: We have put the number.

- The means could be given with one decimal, as SDs are given.

Response: We have tried to put in one decimal only.

- Define, if an abortion is an induced or a spontaneous abortion (or both), page 8, Table 2 (currently the second Table 1).

Response: We specified it; it was to mean induced abortion.
- Systematise the presentation of percentage units, e.g. page 9: 48% and 62.2%.

**Response:** We appreciate the comment and we tried to be consistent.

- Three fourth is not 23.8%, page 9.

**Response:** Thank you we put the exact number 67 instead.


**Response:** We have corrected it.

- Page 11: Split the first long sentence of the second paragraph to two sentences.

**Response:** We have modified it.

- Correct: El Salvador instead of Elsalvadore.
- Systematize the presentation of references, now [10], but also (10).

**Response:** We wrote correctly both El Salvador and reference presentation.

- Correct: have negative instead of don't have positive, page 11.

**Response:** We put negative instead.

- Tables: Systematize the presentation of decimals in percentages.

**Response:** ok, we have done it.

- Table 1: The numbers in occupational status does not add to 440.

**Response:** Yes, first we exclude women who had no work but now included as housewife.

- Correct the second Table 1 to Table 2. Does the age at delivery refer to first delivery? The number of pregnancies instead of pregnancy.

**Response:** We corrected the number of tables, specified as the first delivery and replaced pregnancies rather than pregnancy.
Response to the Reviewer:

Reviewer's report
Reviewer: Sia Msuya

General Comments:
If possible the authors should request a native speaker to help with the language. There are few grammatical mistakes.

Response: we have given it for the native speaker and language editing has been done.

Minor essential revisions:
- Table 2 is labeled as Table 1, please change
Response: Thank you we have corrected it

-In the conclusion section the sentence "Few of married women used female sterilization and none used female sterilization and vasectomy". It is conflicting and not clear. Either removes the first part about few used sterilization because nobody was using the method. Or did the authors meant few women were using long term contraceptive methods and none used female sterilization or vasectomy?

Response: Yes we accept it and have modified it.