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Dear sir/madam

It is to be recalled that we have sent a paper entitled ‘Demand for long acting and permanent contraceptive methods and associated factors among married women of reproductive age group in Debre Markos Town, North West Ethiopia’ to be published on your journal. Thus, as per the reviewers comments we have modified the document and also we tried to address each comment one by one in the following table independently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses to comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The choice of an appropriate size is a crucial aspect of study design. The authors stated in their &quot;Response to Reviewers&quot; that there is no previous study on LAMPs to depend upon for estimation of the sample size for their trial. This is not true. There is a similar study conducted by Alemayehu M et al. , with more or less similar socio-cultural, geographical and similar study settings, entitled &quot;Factors associated with utilization of long acting and permanent contraceptive methods among married women of reproductive age in Mekelle town, Tigray region, north Ethiopia&quot; and published recently (BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2012).</td>
<td>Yes, it is true that the sample size is important part of research to make generalization as well as for perfect representation of the general population. However, in our case there is no problem, confidently we can say our inquiry is not similar with what the reviewers have mentioned. “Alemayehu M’s et al. inquiry was on utilization of LAMP.” But ours is on “demand of LAMP (i.e. women who were using LAPMs and had unmet need for reversible long acting and permanent methods).” This was clearly stated in the methodology part of the document. When we come to the sample size calculation, using 50% yields larger sample size (523≈) than using the percentage (12.3%) stated in the mentioned article which yields (≈ 226). So, ours is more powerful than what recommended. This is because of using sample size greater than the minimum requirement has no problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We think that the author(s) fail to support their formal power analysis. However, we encourage the author(s) to indicate in their revised manuscript with appropriate corrections that they were aiming for a random sample. A list of all individuals from the population was drawn-up (the sampling frame), and individuals were selected randomly from this list.</td>
<td>Regarding the sampling frame we have incorporated in the document and attached it as new file.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>