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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The justification “No study” is not convincing. There are many small scale studies, published and unpublished and nationwide study (EDHS) on family planning or unmet need. Write your justification again.

2. Ethical considerations should be revised as far as you included minors. How the interview was done in women less than 18 years (2.7% of your sample)?

3. The classification of “Educational status” requires revision and reanalysis. Able to read and write can in include other categories except the first one. See tables

4. The referencing is not according to the journal standard. It should be revised

Minor Essential Revisions

1. It is better to include the EDHS report on unmet need in the introduction part.

2. Reduce detail description of the method part

3. The result can be shortened if you focus on the main findings

4. The classification of residence as urban and rural requires more clarification. How you define rural kebeles under Dangla town? These kebeles are nearby the town (we can say Semi-urban). The residents in these kebeles are generally different from rural residents far from urban settlements.

5. Your discussion contains many results directly copied and pasted. It is not advisable to repeat results during discussion. Please revise it.

6. Line 185/186 (first paragraph of discussion “In this study, the proportion of women with unmet need for FP was 17.4 %, which is lower than the national prevalence (25%)”. Please compare with the urban prevalence of the national report. It is more or less similar with the national urban prevalence (15%).

7. Further analysis of EDHS on FP (including unmet need) and determinants is also published. Please compare your results with such findings during your discussion.

8. Your conclusion says “It is still high compared to national family planning guide plan target of 10% by 2015”. Check the language as well as its relevance as part of your conclusion.

9. Line 160-162 not clear. Check other editorial corrections
Discretionary Revisions

1. Very few variables (only four) are considered as socio-demographic characteristics. Why? It is good to include if data is collected for other relevant variables.
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