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General comments

The manuscript needs substantial work before being published.

English needs to be proof read. The manuscript has plenty of grammar and edit errors that make it difficult to read, starting from the abstract. In its current form, the manuscript cannot be accepted for publication without correcting the grammar and have it proofread first.

The use of informal language, such as "don't" rather than "do not".

Background: needs revision.

Data: should be mentioned before the methods.

Methods: Adequate.

Discussion: should be a separate section. It needs to be properly developed. There are a few points mentioned but they need to be fully developed.

The conclusion, as it stands, seems inadequate, as it only repeats the findings already shown.

Recommendations should be policy recommendation and should probably be part of the discussion/conclusion and not a separate section.

Authors need to familiarize themselves with other papers on the journal to see the style and the sections.
Specific comments

Page 3

Line 9 "It can help to reduce fertility rate, as a result of fertility decline, a large working-age people exist in the population (Allen, 2007)". Unclear.

Line 20: "For instance, for each dollar spent in family planning services, Egypt and Thailand saved $31 and $16 respectively". Unclear. Do you mean per woman? Save on what? Millions? It is unclear.

Line 29. The word "Unmet" needs to be lower case. Need to be consistent with the use of upper cases in the middle of a sentence.

Line 33. Need to specify which parts of Europe, as it reads contradictory to what it is stated at the beginning of that paragraph. You mean all of Europe? Or East Europe?

Page 4

Line 12-14 "The government sector is the main provider of information and facilities regarding family planning to the poor and this sector also provide female sterilization services". Only information, facilities and sterilization? What about the rest of the services e.g. LARC and short-term contraceptives?

Line 18. Amounts in Rupees need to be also in USD.

Line 29. The regions of Pakistan are mentioned in the introduction but then they go missing in the analysis. "… different regions of the country." Explain the level of development in each region, which would make it clear when presenting the figures from richest (Islamabad) to poorest? For someone who is not familiar with the regions in Pakistan is unclear to see if %s of contraception correspond to the level of development in the region.

Line 39 "The non-use of contraceptive in rural women is 69% and in urban women is 55% (PDHS, 2013)" Redundant. Those should be figures for unmet need for contraception instead.

Line 49 "This high maternal mortality rate in the country may be a result of insufficient health facilities and prevalence of unmet need for family planning. This study is an attempt to investigate the socio-economic determinants of UMNFP among married women in Pakistan"

Based on this, it seems the paper tries to examine unmet need as a cause of maternal mortality. The actual objective is fine, but the sentence before the objective is misleading what the paper is about, particularly as no further mentioned is made about maternal mortality. That is a good
point that needs further development either in the Discussion section, or Background/Introduction section or both depends on what exactly are you trying to argue.

Page 5

Line 4 Do not see how age is a socio-economic factor? Then, you are investigating social, economic and demographic factors.

From line 15 onwards: is it "probable" or likely? Probably has a connotation to probabilities

Page 6.

Is it informative or informed women?

Results

On page 4 it says that only 35% of women are users of contraception but in the results section it says that 78.7% are (?). I think all the figures are from 2013, so why are these numbers so different? Not sure where that 78.7% is coming from.

Page 8.

Line 44 "but are not receiving" Why should they receive them? Using rather than receiving? Unclear

Line 46 "Results of previous studies found that unmet need decreases by increasing age" It is written in an unclear way.

Line 56 "In this study, the UMNFP is higher in rural areas as compared to urban areas" needs to go before presenting results by area of residence. Results should focused on the odd ratio presented on the tables i.e. urban are less likely than …

Page 9

Line 37 "Unmet need is lesser after the fourth child because those women may not want to have family planning methods before they have 3-4 children but after that they want no more children and want to adopt for family planning methods." Rephrase to make it clearer.
Line 47: "rich people" the results are about hh wealth. Be consistent with the variables used.

Line 12: mass media. Creates awareness: develop more in the discussion section.
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