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Reviewers report:

Overall comment

The author have addressed all major comments in the previous revision and there is significant improvement on the article. However there are some minor but essential comments remaining that I have tried to put below. In addition the there are some issues with regard to proofreading specially on the methodology and result part.

Minor but essential Comments

Abstract

1. 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"

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.

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?

Background

1. The background is corrected sufficiently except for some grammatical errors

Methodology

1. 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.

2. 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
3. Page 5 line 57 would you please change "few months" into the number of months for which the exposure was measured

Result

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Your conclusion is not well articulated again. Try to focus on your main findings and summarize. Also summarize your recommendations to key points.

5. 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.
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