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Reviewer's report:

The topic of knowledge, attitude and peer influences among adolescents using maternal health services is important. The topic is nicely introduced. However, result presentation is unstructured and not connected to the discussion. Result presentation via Tables is very poor. Please work with a more stringent and ordered presentation in result and discussion. Discussion contains everything, no main important messages are clarified.

Abstract:
Background chapter is far too long. I suggest deleting the text from "In the context of… (line47) until …should be introduced. (Line 52). This information is important but not important enough to be mentioned during the abstract.

Method: The sentence: "The data form Mobenyi server were cleaned and exported into R software for statistical analysis." (line 63/64) can also be deleted. It is important but not part as of the abstract.

However, Study design and Response rate is missing in the abstract. This needs to be added.

Introduction:
The introduction is nicely written, relevant literature is cited. However, the final chapter should explain the research aim or research question. At the moment the last chapter looks more like a short summary. Please delete this and introduce your research question.

The sentences: Age of consent to sex often conflicts with age to consent for medical intervention (Line 101/102) I do not get what you like to say, please rewrite.

The sentence: "In China marriage is precondition for access to SRH programmes at public facilities that are free of charge (10)". Is not important for your context. Please delete.

Method:
Please add response rate (for more information please check response rate in Wikipedia). Unfortunately, you used this word wrong in your tables.

Please delete sample size calculation. Such a calculation should be done for the main research question. However, the sample size calculation was based on the prevalence of adolescent repeat
pregnancy. Well, this is not the main aim of the paper and no relevant result was presented during the result presentation and discussion. The power calculation is senseless.

You added not having permission from parents as exclusion criteria; that is, unfortunately, wrong. By this procedure you get a biased sample (as some people, particular the youngest ones are not part in your sample. Do you have some information, how often that happens? That would help a lot to understand something about the participation rate of you survey.

Wording: "Informed voluntary consent" does not make sense, you need to write: Participation was voluntary and informed consent was assessed. (line 222)

Result:
Result presentation needs still a lot clarification. Please omit the word response rate or senseless wording like "respondent´s response" Please try to omit empty spaces and double information in your tables.

Here some suggestion:

* Table 1 and table 10 need to be put together, as they contain the same information.
* It would be nice to put some tables together (e.g. tables 6 and 7) to reduce the number of tables with very scarce information.
* Table 12 and 13 can be presented together. You can present logistic regression estimated from the crude and adjusted models in one table. Please check some scientific articles how these results are presented.
* Restructure table title. Table title should contain what is presented and in which population
* Delete the word response rate (as it is wrong)
* Change the word expected response to correct answer. (It is possible to expect a wrong answer; therefor the words "expected response" is wrong).

Delete figure 1 as you present the same result as in table 13.

I like to suggest another table structure:
1st column: question
2nd column: answer*
3 collumn: n
4 collumn: %
work with Stars(*) and describe below the table: *the correct answer is marked bold (formerly: expected response)

Discussion
The discussion is very broad and unstructured. Please start with naming the main and or most important results from your cross-sectional study. And discuss them carefully given existing literature.
Please omit chapters that starts not connected to your research question like "Prenatal exposure to pesticide … (line 515). It is tricky to follow your argumentation if you start a chapter with such a sentence that is far away from that what you are presenting.
Under limitation you should also name what does a cross sectional study limit (line 590). Additionally, you should mention that you might have an under-represented number of children below 18 (due to your exclusion criteria).
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