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Reviewer's report:

All these comments are Minor Essential Revisions

Introduction

Overall – the intro covers the necessary issues but is not well structured into a coherent flow. Some reworking is needed here.

Second para: The sentences referring to Kaida, Hladik, Myer. These references are important, but how they relate back to the point that the authors is trying to make is a bit unclear.

Third para of introduction – this is strangely situated – a 1 sentence para that is not clearly linked to what comes before or after - and should be folded in elsewhere

“complex web” is overused in the manuscript.

Methods

The 1-sentence para, “A quantitative analysis....” Really belongs in the introduction, not the methods

The methods are suitably clear, and importantly, state what sexuality/contraceptive counselling was provided to participants

The end of the introduction suggests that this is a partner study – but only some women had partners enrolled. This should be clarified in the intro, and the sampling of male partners needs clarification. Was there an attempt to identify all women’s partners, and these were the ones who agreed to participate?

The data analysis and ethical issues appear sound.
Results

The analysis contains several inappropriate quantifications – calculating percentage participants who said different things should be avoided in this kind of method.

the subheadings need work. “Emotional/personal” needs rephrasing eg, “emotional and personal reasons”. Is “Lack of family planning” a subheading under “Practical/structural” or was text accidentally deleted?

Figures 1 and 2 look like powerpoint slides and need to be reworked into black and white line drawings prior to publication

The use of boldface font should be avoided.

Discussion

Generally the discussion is balanced and well written. The “Limitations” heading should be removed or formatted in keeping with the other subheadings.

The first sentence of the limitations sections does not make sense. This is a qualitative study (cross sectional is a term generally for quantitative studies) – and this study could assess, in a qualitative way, the strength of different motivations.

The reference to table 2 in the final para needs to be deleted, its not necessary.
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