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Title

Based on your result here what makes this study to be specific to socio-economic determinants? How could you determine the effect of socio-economic determinants without controlling for other relevant (core) variables that are known to affect unmet need? I think you missed some very important variables

Abstract

I prefer to rewrite this statement "……unmet need for family planning still exist in the country." It is better to explain about level of existence. Simply, existence of the unmet need may not have public health significance.

The way you expressed fear of side effect under abstract was as ordinal data (….more fear of side effect for using contraceptive methods) but on methodology part it was analyzed as dichotomous.

This result is not clear for me "….uneducated younger women who belong to poorer household….." the way you analyzed on the result par not looks just like your expression here.

The conclusion is lacks focus. Your title was mainly about socio-economic determinants but I don't think that the conclusion shows the implication of your finding from this factors. Particularly fear of side effect is not socio-economic factor.

Background

Some of the references are very old while there are a new update about the information they convey.

There are many grammatical error and there are also vague sentences. For instance, this statement is unclear "The growing level of UMNFP is an important issue in under developed countries (Westoff and Bankole, 1995)" and the reference is also too old while it is about rapidly changing information.
The flow of write up is not well organized. You have tried to mention many literatures under the background section but you again added another section as literature. I don't think this also inline with the journal protocol. This also increased the volume of the manuscript

In general the background needs extensive rewrite with up-to date information.

Methodology

The way you operationalized the EMM is not clear. "EMM = Exposure of Mass Media has been classified into two categories i.e. heard a family planning message and no heard a family planning message." Is it ever hear of FP information? or … what is the timing?

Please give title for section under "METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCE" where you expressed about the model and variables.

While analyzing wealth index how do you treated urban and rural residents? Have you used the same tool for urban and rural? Are the assets for urban and rural residents the same in Pakistan or ….?

Result

What is the need of these statements together "Description of different socio-economic characteristics of married women who are respondent in our study and perception about fear of side effect for contraceptive use is presented in Table 1. Table 1 shows the description of different socio-economic characteristics of our respondent women and their perceptions about fear of side effects."

The way you wrote the statements in the result section is not to the standard and understandable. For instance "We see in table 1 most of the women are in age-group 20-39, with 15.0% in 20-24, 20.0% in 25-29, 17.9% in 30-34 and 16.9% in 35-39 age-groups." Not written with standard English and "According to region of residence, 52.8% rural women whereas only 46.6% urban women." Is not understandable.

I haven't seen the way you measured the knowledge of family planning methods and but you reported as knowledge is equal to simple Exposure of Mass Media (hearing of information about FP) which couldn't be the case.

The way you reported the result of FP information and consequently FP use is not in harmony. The expression "….. 73.7% have knowledge but the use of family planning methods is only limited to 78.7%." for me it is not limited but above expectation

Don't you think that this study has no important limitation to be considered while using the result? For instance exclusion of some key c.
Your conclusion is direct copy of your result and too many. The conclusion should be the implication of the result.

Why you gave more focus to fear of side effect as a determinant including in conclusion?

Your recommendations are not targeted and some of its part seems another discussion/result section.

On your tables how could we know the significance of the ORs since there is no confidence interval or P-value? Also you haven't showed for which variables you have controlled for while assessing the determinants.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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