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Author’s response to reviews:

The comments are responded in brackets.

Technical Comments

1: Declaration (Done)
2: Ethics and consent (Done)
3: List of abbreviations (Done)

Editor Comment

1: Please have your manuscript edited for grammar and punctuation by professional editor who is fluent in English

and submit proof when you submit your revised manuscript. (We have sort the assistance of some of over

colleagues to improve the expression and language. We have sort the assistance of some of over

colleagues to improve the expression and language.)

Comments of 1st Reviewer

1: TITLE:

Which determinants? i.e social and demographic “SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DETERMINANTS”.
(Initially, the title of our article was “Socio-economic Determinants of Unmet Need for Family
Planning among Married Women in Pakistan”. However, during first revision, the title was suggested as “Determinants of Unmet Need for Family Planning among Married Women in Pakistan”. We have no objection if the article is entitled as “Socio-economic Determinants of Unmet Need for Family Planning among Married Women in Pakistan” OR “Socio-demographic Determinants of Unmet Need for Family Planning among Married Women in Pakistan”)

2: In this version, the authors decided to omit some parts of the previous version rather than properly addressing the issues pointed in the first review. (In the light of the comments on our first draft, we omitted some part of the paper to make our “background” more succinct. However, in the light of your suggestion, we have included the omitted contents in new version. (please see page 4-5)

3: The regressions need to be re-run again, so be it including the region variable. Include in the methods the level of development of each region. (The level of development can be possibly included as an independent variable to explain the differences of UMNFP among regions. However, un-luckily we don’t have the region specific data of some variables (e.g. income per capita) to depict the level of development.)

4: NEED TO BE PROOF READ by a native speaker again. (Language of the article has been improved in the light of your comment.)

Specific Comments

1: Page 2

31: The word planning is missing (The missing word has been inserted)

2: Revise key words “limiting” “spacing” of what? (Revised)

3: Line 55: “The” need to be removed. (Done )

4: Page 3

“Reduction in fertility decreases dependency ratio in the economy because as a result of such decline a large cohort of working-age adults enters the population, outnumbering children and the elderly.” WAS THIS TAKEN FROM AN AUTHEOR? If so, make reference to it as the argument at it currently stands seems contradictory. Did not get the line of thought here. Develop more. (The comment has been incorporated (please see page line 15-21))
5: 45% of all European women had unmet need for contraception? In the best of my understanding, Westoff’s study uses 5 Eastern European countries (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Ukraine). (The correction has been done)

6: 56: The literature (Done)

7: 56: CAUSES? Or factors associated? Strong to say causes, unless studies use longitudinal data to know the timing of things (Incorporated (please see page 4 line 9))

8: Page 4: Rich FAMILIES: the results are about household wealth. Be consistent with the variables used. CHANGE NOT INCORPORATED IN REVISED VERSION (Incorporated (please see page 4 line 12))

9: In THE South Asian region (Incorporated (please see page 4 line 20))

10: 40: the survey consists of the married women aged 15-49.

Use comas in 4+ digit numbers (i.e 14000)

was reported in THE survey

Thus a comprehensive data of all variables (Incorporated (please see “Data source section” page 5))

11: Page 9:

31: In THE bottom quintile…. Whereas THE top quintile consists

is A categorical variable with 5 different categories (The comment has been incorporated)

12: “Binary Logistic regression is considered suitable when dependent variable is categorical variable with two possible outcomes. On the other hand, Multinomial Logistic Regression is considered appropriate when dependent variable is categorical variable with more than two possible outcomes.” Revise the English (We have try to improve (please see page 6 line 23-26))
“Description of different characteristics of married women who are respondent in our study is presented in Table 1.”

15: TABLE 1. Mean/Median age 30.87/30.00. Include S.D.

16: Among total of the respondent women REVISE ENGLISH

17: You are using age groups not cohorts. If you want to use the word “cohort”, you need to covert to cohorts

18: “The odds ratios have decreasing trend starting from first age cohort to seventh age cohort which implies that with an increase in age, the likelihood of UMNFP goes on to decrease.”

19: However, the relationship of age with UMNL is non-linear as it goes on to increase with increase in age up to fifth age cohort and then starts to decrease with an increase in age till seventh cohort.

20: Results of third regression REVISE

21: Existing studies conducted in different countries and regions of the world have also suggest that THE likelihood of unmet need for family planning has been found to higher in rural areas as compared to urban areas REVISE … is higher a verb?

22: After which, it has an increasing trend. UMNFP, UMNS and UMNL REVISE

23: This is an indication of ineffectiveness of media campaign launched by government to create awareness among people regarding the usefulness of family planning services REVISE ENGLISH explain more about this campaign in the discussion.

24: Employment of women against some paid job increase their opportunity cost of bearing and rearing of a child. UNCLEAR, REPHRASE

25: UMNFP, UMNS and UMNL = Use only UMNFP as it implies both or say UMNFP either for limiting of spacing
26: Media can provide them information regarding the availability and usefulness of different family planning methods to limit their family size according to their desire. REVISE ENGLISH (Revised)

27: DISCUSSION: Results need further discussion. Explain more. Do not assume that your reader knows all about the mass media campaign in Pakistan. Include limitations of the study. (We have try to incorporate the comment.)

28: Conclusion: should be the implication of the results. What are the policy implications of the findings? (Incorporated (please see page 10-11))

29: Because of enormous implications of size and growth rate of population for economic development, Government of Pakistan has been continuously struggling to bring down population growth in the country. REVISE (Revised)

Comments of 2nd Reviewer

1: Abstract

On Abstract background section starting from line 3 would you put as “However, like many other developing countries of the world, unmet need for family planning is still high with the magnitude of 21% according to Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey 2012-13” (Incorporated)

2: In result section of the abstract line 33 the phrase “negatively associated” made the statement vague. In addition, it is difficult to understand the direction of association particularly for number of living children. Better if you explain it another way (We have rephrased the statement to make it clearer.)

3: Page 2 line 44, the conclusion is not well explained again. Please put the implication of the findings in short. What makes fear of side effect to be the major cause of unmet need based on your finding? (Comment incorporated (please see page 2))

4: Background

The background is corrected sufficiently except for some grammatical errors (The corrections have been done.)

5: Methodology

On page 5 line 43 you have categorized FSE as 1 if they have fear of side effect and 0 otherwise. What do literally mean by the phrase “” have fear of side effect or have no fear of side effect”? It
is better to explain it more in the methodology to make it clear. (The comment has been incorporated (please see page 6 line 17-20))

6: Page 4 Line 52 I recommend to change the section named as “methodology” to “Measurement” and put section named as “Analysis method” on page 6 line 3 (Incorporated)

7: Page 5 line 57 would you please change “few months” into the number of months for which the exposure was measured (We have phrase it as “few month” because that’s how it has been reported in PDHS.)

8: Result

You have put some information about the magnitude of unmet need for family planning including the measurement method on your background and I thought that this variable is one of your main findings. But you simply started from the determinants in the result and discussion part by missing the magnitude with all its aspects (unmet need for spacing, for limiting and overall). Why don’t you put and explain about the level of unmet need for family planning? You missed this also in the abstract result. (It has been mentioned in result’s section (please see line 19))

9: I haven’t seen the way you measured the knowledge of family planning methods though you reported as knowledge is similar with simple Exposure to Mass Media (hearing of information about FP) which couldn’t be the case. This is the comment on the first round review and it was not addressed. Particularly, I recommended to put the way you measured the knowledge of FP method on the methodology/measurement section. (The variable used in our study is exposure to mass media. We understand that knowledge of FP methods however, it can the main source of such knowledge. Instead of knowledge of FP methods we have preferred to use exposure of mass media because it can possibly public policy intervention through mass media campaign. In order to avoid any sort of confusion, we have changed the term of “knowledge of FP methods” as “exposure to mass media”)

10: Don’t you think that this study has important limitation to be considered while using the result? For instance exclusion of some key variables. Not addressed on initial revision comment (A section of the limitation has been added (please see page 11))

11: Your conclusion is not well articulated again. Try to focus on your main findings and summarize. Also summarize your recommendations to key points. (We have try to improve in the light of your comments)

12: Page 8 line 37-39, The statement which read as “Wealth status of the women’s household shows a negative relationship with unmet need for family planning” is vague for the readers of this article including me. From this statement, I couldn’t understand that as wealth status
increases the level of unmet need for FP increases or decreases. Try to rewrite as it could be understood by any reader.  (We have try to make it clear (please see page 9 line 24))