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Reviewer's report:

This is a well researched paper whose quality can improve with a few corrections. My specific comments are as follows:

Background
- The background section is well written can can be improved with a few corrections on the grammar, particularly the objectives which do not currently read so well
- What is WWDs?

Methodology
- What informed the choice of Addis Ababa for the study?
- Usually people who live in cities are self selecting, most of the time with higher levels of education among other characteristics as they move to the city to look for employment. This therefore leads to my question, was Addis Ababa then the best location for this study?
- It’s not clear if PWDs were interviewed from all the 10 sub cities
- Under data analysis the authors report that corrections for missing data was made. How does this alter the quality of data given that data collection had ended?
- While the authors report that face to face interviews was used, it is not clear as to who collected the data
- Was consent obtained from PWD before data collection?
- Given that the study was done among participants who are under 18, how was consenting handled for them
- It is not clear whether the study received ethical approval
- The authors should describe how the outcome variable is measured under methodology
- Marriage before age 18 is better described child marriage as opposed to early marriage
- Why is the study limited to women? don't men also need SRH services?

Results
- The authors define illiterate as not having attended school, this is not always true
- Table 1 - what do the asterisk mean?
- Line 253 and 254: how was comprehensive knowledge measured?
- Line 222 reports awareness to be 97.2%, later on, line 283 reports lack of awareness 23.5% being the main reason for non use of modern methods. It will be useful for the authors to add the numbers in addition to the percentage to avoid any confusion
- How was good self perception measured?
Discussion
-Line 302-305: The statement sounds a bit discriminatory and should be reworded, unless the authors were expecting otherwise
-Line 306: I don't necessary support the comparison with Zimbabwe whose methodology is not reported. How about make comparisons with the rest of the population to enable us understand if PWD are disadvantaged
-It is not clear while the qualitative findings are not reported in the results section

Conclusion
-The authors report low use of modern contraceptive methods among PWD while no comparison is made with the general population in Addis Ababa or Ethiopia in general.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.