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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Title should be adapted. The title is confusing as you expect high unmet need for contraception if FP (family planning) use (contraception prevalence rate) is low. The title is also not reflecting the topic studies, being; determinants for high unmet need and low FP use (contraception prevalence rate) in Butajira district.

2. Background:
4th paragraph: ‘policy environment’; is ‘health policy environment’ meant?

Background is confusing. It should clearer and more systematically specify if info on FP use given is information regarding the situation in Ethiopia or general available knowledge on use of FP and unmet need.

The Background chapter should clearly state the research question and the need for this research. What is known already about the FP use in Ethiopia and its determinants in Ethiopia and globally and what is the additional information this research wants to collect; why this research is important? Need to have more information on the study area (Butajira district)

3. Results: paragraph 10: This paragraph on determinants of unmet need should be formulated different. E.g. the sentence ‘Married women are asked whether they have problem to use contraception whenever they wanted’ is the definition for unmet need. This sentence is followed without introduction with sentences with statements about the reasons (determinants) for unmet need, which is confusing.

‘Rejections by religious leaders’ is not a determinant of unmet need but a social/cultural/religious determinant hampering FP use.

4. Results: the author stated ‘Besides, married women who are members of food self-deficient households is about 1.58 (95% CI: 1.39, 1.81) times more likely to use family planning compared to their counterparts in food self-sufficient households though the association turned statistically not significant when other variables are included.’, which other variables? Also the author states ‘Furthermore civil servant, handicraft and merchant women are 6.2 (95% CI: 4.81, 7.99), 3.46 (95% CI: 2.78, 4.30) and 3.21 (95% CI: 2.73, 3.76) respectively more likely to use family planning compared to those whose livelihood are farming although the statistical significant association disappeared when factors
are added in the model’, which factors do you mean?

5. Discussion: 2nd paragraph: In the article the author states that the total current contraception use in Butajira district is 25.4% and total unmet need 52.4%; this totals 77.8% this is almost the 80% demand which is the objective of the Ethiopian government. So the statement in your discussion (last lines 2nd paragraph) is not correct.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Use ‘married women’ instead of ‘currently married women’

2. Background: 3rd paragraph last line: the author stated ‘rural areas and uneducated and primary level completes’; what means ‘completes’?

3. Methodology chapter 1st line: What is a ‘dejure’? Please clarify.

4. Table 1: Number of ‘women who supporter use of contraception’ is not in this table however the text in the result chapter 2nd paragraph refers to this; ‘furthermore, about 87% of them told that they supported the use of contraception while only 68% of their partners supported its use’

5. Results, 6th paragraph: ‘Ever use of family planning methods among currently married women is more than 77% followed by about 45% and 40% of lowlanders and highlanders, respectively.’, specify the 77% refers to the urban population.

6. Table 3: specify you are given a 95% CI in brackets. Why no CI for ‘limiting’ column?

7. Results: 8th paragraph: ‘The unmet need of contraception is estimated to be 52.4% as shown in Table 4.’ Should be Table 3.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Table 2: last row: change ‘among all women’ to ‘total’

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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