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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
1. What does the paper add to the current literature? There has been extensive literature on the acceptability, usage, and sources of contraceptives in low income countries around the world, as well as from sub-Saharan Africa. It is not clear to me what the current body of literature in Nigeria looks like and the authors should make clear if the paper adds to this literature.

2. Throughout the paper, the authors did not make clear what they meant by acceptability and how it is different from use. A definition of acceptability was particularly confusing as discussed below. What was the question on acceptability in the survey? What does the mean value of acceptability in Table 1 mean?

Minor essential revisions
1. The Introduction section seems fragmented and several paragraphs, including paragraphs 3 and 4, are redundant in my opinion.

2. On the other hand, the authors should provide more background information and literature from Nigeria. For example, what is the current level of unmet need? What is the current contraceptive prevalence?

3. Study Methodology section:
   a. Why and how six regions were selected? Out of how many regions in the country? Related to this point, the authors should later discuss the representative of the sample and the generalizability of results.
   b. What is the total sample of all six states?
   c. A few sentences were not clear. For example, “Data set comparison of urban and rural was used...”, and then later on “The ratio of each of the dependent data sets....”. Did the authors mean that they had separate data sets for urban vs. rural and for each SES group?
   d. Particularly confusing is the sentence “To examine the inequalities in acceptability of modern contraceptive contraceptives variables, the proportion of households that noted their satisfaction sufficient to meet their unmet need or demand on different modern contraceptives was compared...” I do not understand what it means. Even if this is a definition of acceptability, the authors never presented any results in this regard.
4. Findings, Section 1: socio-demographic distribution:

a. Did the response rate vary by state?

b. How about SES? It may be good to include a table to present the socio-demographic distribution.

5. Figures 1 and 2 should be presented in %. In Figure 2, % should be calculated among contraceptive users only.

6. Also why are the % in all the tables so low and why don’t they add up to 100%? I think the authors should present the % by column instead of % for each cell.

7. I do not understand Table 4 at all. In addition, from Figure 2, “others” seemed to be an important source of several methods of contraception. What are “other” sources?

8. The Discussion section is also repetitive, for example paragraph 2 and again the second to last paragraph.

9. In the Discussion, the authors also had several conflicting statements about the role of the private sector. At one point, they said that it was worrisome that the private sector played such an important role. At another point, they stated that public-private sector partnership should be encouraged.

10. I also disagree with the statement that if contraceptives are more available and affordable from the public sector, the level of use will increase. It might only be true with implants and IUDs, while condoms and oral pills seemed to have the highest acceptability and most of them are obtained from the private sector.

11. Several typos and grammatical errors throughout the paper.

Discretionary revisions

1. Figures 1 and 2 were presented twice.

2. What are the additional tables 1-5 for? Why are the % also so low here?
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