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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? - No
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? - Yes
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? -Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - No
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? abstract need to be modified. In the study the follow up rate is 59%, this should be included in the abstract. Only 79% and 84% of these were using contraception at the end of 12 months, while if you read abstract it appears that contraception use is very high even at the end of 12 months.
7. Is the writing acceptable? - needs modification

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
  - Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) - recommended
  - Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

- Minor Essential Revisions - 1. revision in abstract as suggested above
2. The first papagraph in background is pertaining to maternal mortality and is redundant and irrelevant in this study and can be deleted.
3. Conclusion drawn are those of authors and have not been evaluated ibn the study.

- Level of interest - moderate

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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