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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions:

This manuscript has been revised and is mostly responsive to previous review comments. However there remain some major compulsory revisions all listed below:

There are major difficulties in the English grammar which detract from the manuscript's clarity and readability, and I believe, detract from publishibility.

It is well known that post partum contraception and spacing of pregnancy are crucial to many things, this manuscript's novelty is the area from where the data come- there are little data on sub-saharan Africa on this topic.

For example in the abstract, the last sentence of the results does not make sense- do you mean to say if a woman had a higher education level than her husband?

Also you do not define “extended post partum period” – this needs to be defined in the background/intro.

The first sentence of the background is grammatically incorrect- “…for women is [has been should be used here instead] on the ground since…. And instead of “on the ground” you could use the phrase “has been in place or has been recognized as the standard of care…”

Also in the background, you mention DHS and PPFP but do not define what those acronyms mean. In the beginning you finally define ppfp – but this should be defined up front in the background and then you can use the acronym once it is defined.

An example of the poor organization in this manuscript is : In the background the last paragraph should really just focus on presenting the hypotheses and the reason for the study. Instead only the last sentence of that paragraph has this information. You could also say “this research sought to investigate.”

For the methods, the study was in January 2013 only ? or did it take more than 1 month to interview all of those women who gave birth in 2012?

Why was the survey first created in English? Was it administered in both English
and Amharic? Was the Amharic survey back translated into English to ensure the proper meaning?

For the results- the response rate doesn’t make sense-
There were more than 900 births in 2012 – I know your target was 900- how did you pick those 900? Who didn’t respond? This could enter bias into your data presented.

“above level of husbands education” needs to be rephrased- do you mean women whose education was greater than that of her husband?

Only! 5.7% of your sample sought a postnatal care visit- this sample size could impact your result of those who had a PNC visit were more likely to use contraception.

Discussion-
There are more grammar and spelling problems- for example the word evidences is not plural- just use the word evidence- and then write “evidence shows” (in the second sentence of the discussion.

The second paragraph of the discussion, first sentence, doesn’t make sense- it is highly likely it is the grammar that is creating the confusion. – you also should not introduce new data as you have in this paragraph in the discussion- these data should be in the results.
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