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Dear Authors,

All of the suggestions are to be considered minor, essential revisions. The authors are expected to make these changes, and trusted enough to do so without further review prior to publication:

1. Overall manuscript needs to carefully review document and pay attention to passive voice and tenses

2. Last sentence of the introduction should introduce the methods section with a sentence something like: We conducted a cross-sectional household survey of married women of reproductive age as well as a series of exit interview with women seeking a facility based care to address the question of etc etc” or something like that, in order to transition to the methods section.

3. Methods section:
   • Overall disorganized – please re-read carefully and tighten the whole section – too wordy and loose.
   • No need to include description of coding strategy – please remove wherever that is included
   • There needs to be a clear description of eligibility criteria for both the household survey and the exit interviews
   • Pg 7, middle of the first paragraph that starts with “the same procedure” does not make sense. Both it and the sentence before should be rewritten for clarity.
   • For both household survey and exit interviews – please describe how many women were eligible, how many were approached, and how many were surveyed and interviewed respectively.
   • Pg 9, the first half of the paragraph that gives the initial description of the Health
Belief model should actually be in the introduction. A description of the theory and how it applies should be in intro, a description of how it was used in this study should be in methods – please adjust

4. Results:
   • please be careful throughout the results to just report results – there are several instances in which “discussion” type content shows up in results, for example, pg 11, last sentence of the first paragraph belongs in discussion, as well as pg 12, last sentence of the first paragraph.
   • In the prose description of results – it is not necessary to describe each table – if tables are labeled properly, they will be clear. Please take all of the wording out like “Table 1 is a description of so and so” – we know this from reading Table 1 – it is redundant and burdens the paper unnecessarily. This happens throughout the results section – please carefully re-read this section and again, tighten it up to include only pertinent results that you want to highlight from the tables.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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