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Reviewer report

Solomon Weldemariam: Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled: Women's contraceptive discontinuation and switching behavior in urban Senegal, 2010-2015. This is a first revision to me for this manuscript.

General: The punctuation, spelling, capitalization, abbreviations and overall grammar are well written however there is wrong use of tenses in the abstract, introduction and methodology part.

Title: the tile is informative and attractive to readers to read the manuscript in-depth.

Abstract: The abstract is acceptable other than tense error

Introduction:

1. Page 4, lines 74-75, 75-76, 76-77, 89-90 should be referenced.

2. Wrong uses of tenses in page 4, line 83-84,

3. Page 5, lines 105-111 taken from one literature (chunk of ideas from the same literature) which is not recommended.

4. Page 5 line 115 clarify the word Contractive, is it to mean contraceptive?
Methods:

1. In this part I am not clear with the design? Is it a cohort study or a follow up cross sectional or an evaluation after intervention? From the topic it seems a follow up study starting from 2010-2015 (for 5 years) however page 6, line 136 indicate that data were collected in 2015 and line 137 indicates there was baseline data in 2011. Overall make it clear about the design, the data collection technique (whether it was record review or face to face interview).

2. In the classification of contraceptive methods page 7, line 153, the category of other modern includes Standard Days Method, emergency pill and "other modern" and in line 154 also there is classification as traditional methods. Therefore, how it could be standard day method classified under other modern classification? why you did not included under traditional methods? Moreover, it is not clear that "other modern" under other modern category. Other concern, how did you consider emergency contraceptive to include in discontinuation rate since it is not a routine contraceptive method? Even the other modern classification under quotation is not defined what are the others.

3. Page 7, lines 165-166 indicate that the analysis calculated all-reason and method-specific discontinuation rates at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months however the topic indicates 5 years study. Do you mean that women followed only for 24 months only after they start a contraceptive method?

4. Tens error in page 8, lines 177-178.

Result:

1. The result section should focus on the result of the study only and avoid discussion on the result which seen in Page 10, line 217-218.

2. Page 10, line 230 indicates that all LAM users have discontinued by 12 months, do you mean that LAM method extends beyond 6 months as contraceptive method? Make clear the definition used for LAM.

3. What "other" stands for, in page 11, line 247?

Discussion:

1. Sentences in Page 14, lines 308-311 should be referenced.
2. Page 14, line 313-317 should be discussed and supported with previous studies and in the same page lines 318-330 are not discussed and supported with previous findings.

3. In the limitation part page 15, lines 338-340 the sentences is not clear it needs recast or clarification. Did you exclude pregnant women as a result of method failure?

Overall the discussion part is not well discussed in detail and it should be supported with findings from previous studies.

Conclusion:

Statements in Page 16-17, lines 362-367 should move up to discussion section. It is not recommended to site references in conclusion part rather the conclusion of the study should draw inferences in the light of the result/findings.
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