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Reviewer’s report:

Although the authors have addressed some of the issues that were raised by reviewers, the paper still needs extensive revision before it can be considered for publication in Reproductive Health.

A. MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

1) Introduction

a) As noted in the previous comments, the rationale for the research is still not outlined in a manner that clearly brings out the paper’s contribution to the literature. For instance, the authors note in the last paragraph that examining how concordance and discordance affect contraceptive use could add value but they do not state exactly what value we stand to gain from such research. In addition, the authors note at the beginning of the second last paragraph that the literature they have reviewed suggest the need to consider the attitudes of both husbands and wives towards family planning. However, the preceding paragraph simply outlines the family planning situation in Ethiopia and does not provide any rationale for considering the attitudes of both husbands and wives towards family planning.

b) Several statements in the introduction need to be supported with citations. For instance: (i) the first sentence of the second paragraph; and (ii) the second, third and fourth sentences of the fourth paragraph.

2) Methods

a) The authors state in the second paragraph that “Sample size calculation indicated that a minimum of 854 couples were required for this analysis.” What was the basis for the sample size calculation i.e. to detect what at what level of significance? Were any power calculations also considered?

3) Results

a) I still feel that the manner in which the results are presented is difficult to comprehend. The write-up is still crowded with numbers—some of which are already provided in the tables—that are difficult to understand. For instance, it is very hard for the reader to discern what is what in something like (#2(6, N=806)=33.103, p<0.001) as stated in the third paragraph under ‘Fertility preferences’. The authors should minimize on repeating in the text numbers that
are already provided in tables. They should instead focus on providing interpretations of what the numbers mean.

b) Under ‘Factors associated with current use of contraception’, the authors make reference to results from ANOVA in the second paragraph, yet such analytical approach was not mentioned in the ‘Methods’ section.

4) Discussion

a) In the last two paragraphs of the ‘Results’ section, the authors refer to groups with high CPR. It is, however, not clear how this applies in the context of the study given that CPR is defined as the percentage of currently married women using any method of contraception. Thus, the fact that the authors found some sub-groups to have high or low levels of contraceptive use does not mean that such sub-groups had high or low CPR.

b) Although this was mentioned in the previous comments, the authors still present some of the results in the discussion section (for example, in the second and third paragraphs). The authors should note that the discussion should focus on summarizing what the major findings are (without repeating the results) and discussing the implications of the findings for practice (i.e. policies, programs and research).

c) The authors still simply list the limitations of the study without discussing how they are likely to influence the findings. It is not just enough to list the limitations; the authors need to point out how they may influence the findings.

5) General comment

Overall, the paper still needs extensive editing for language in order to enhance clarity of arguments and flow of thought. In its current form, I would suggest that almost every statement in the paper needs editing for brevity or clarity. That is why it was not possible to list all of them as this would be tantamount to writing another paper instead of providing comments.
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