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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed most of the issues but other problems remain.

•The use of grammar is still poor, confusing and misleading at times. This unfortunately is the as with some of the new information provided in the revised version of the manuscript. There is a need for the authors to consult someone proficient in the use of the English language and who is familiar with social science and/or health research to help improve the quality of grammar in this article.

•In the methods section: Authors need to have a separate heading for Study area and setting, sample, procedures, analysis

•It is still not clear whether or not males were included in the FGDs. While the authors state that they used female field workers to conduct FGDs in order to get better data because female participants might be more comfortable with them, in the next sentence they indicate that the FGDs help ‘get ideas from the male partners’. This is confusing. The authors need to state explicitly, the characteristics of the participants of the focus groups. How many FGDs were conducted and where did they take place?

•Provide references for the use of thematic analysis for FGD data.

•The explanation about the coding of the questionnaire is not clear. The authors should consult other publications in BMC or other high quality journals to see how this and other forms of analyses are reported.

•Please avoid the use of the word ‘illiterate’ rather use ‘no formal education’

•It is not clear whether the 0.82 alpha reported for the instrument was for the whole instrument or one of the constructs. It is also important to report alphas for each of the constructs e.g knowledge, attitude and practice of modern contraceptives, domestic decision making power, contraceptive decision making and factors affecting modern contraceptive decision making power.

•Provide reference for the literature where the instruments were drawn and also report on the context in which they were used to derive the reliabilities (alphas) reported. i.e in what study was the 0.82 reliabilities obtained? Distinguish between the reliabilities of instruments drawn from the literature and the reliabilities you obtained in your study. In the methods section only report the
reliabilities of the instruments from where it was drawn.

• There is an incomplete sentence on p.4 3rd paragraph. Sentence beginning with Study in Ethiopia....... 

• Discussion: P.10. Authors state that ‘rural women and men report they are not comfortable with......’ which data are you referring to here qualitative or quantitative. This is especially worrying because of the next sentence that suggests that ‘qualitative study..showed similar findings’ this statement seems to suggest that males participated in the quantitative study.

• P.10 last line but one. The statement ‘There was no also reported use of male contraceptive.....’ is unclear and confusing? What is meant by this sentence?

• The discussion and conclusions are poorly done and adds little to the literature or knowledge. Not much data comes out from the study.