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Reviewer's report:

General
I do not consider the manuscript ready for publication yet.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Minor changes were made in the discussion whereas my suggestion was a major rewrite. The discussion is still too much of an introduction with an overview of different contraceptive methods. Results are very briefly mentioned. A discussion could start with a short paragraph summarizing the main findings. Thereafter the results are discussed in the same order as they are presented in the result section, put in relation to other studies and in this case data from DHS. The authors should ask themselves the question: What does this mean?, pointing out if their findings are in line with other studies or contradict them and what clinical and practical implications the findings may have. Move most of the overview of contraceptive methods to the introduction and shorten it.

2. The method still needs to be better explained. How did the researchers get in touch with the women and how were they selected? This is important information in order to judge if the findings are representative for Turkish women. Did some women decline participation? If so, how many and why and what implications could it have on the results?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. The analysis ... using descriptive statistics. No tests were done??
2. Abstract: Do not start a sentence with "because". The two first sentences can be combined. The software can be removed from the abstract.
3. Check the language in the abstract, delete "barring in mind"

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)