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Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract

1. Conclusion section line 1 explain ‘Demand for long acting contraceptive methods in this study was low’ it will be more clear if the authors can give explanation or reference that provides information what proportion of women are expected to have demand for LACMs. When you say 36.7% is low, what is your expectation? Do we expect all women to have demand for LACMs?

Background

1. General comment- most of the references use in the background are not specific to HIV positive women. The authors must give reference that indicate the expected level of LACM use among women. We don’t expect all women to shift to LACM. When do we say that the LACM use/demand is good or low?
2. Paragraph 1- The first four lines are not the focus of the research question.
3. Paragraph 1- line 7 change ‘15-49 is 1.9 percent)’ to ‘15-49 is 1.9 percent.’
4. Paragraph 3- line 1 explain ‘Globally unintended pregnancy is very high (accounts 38%...’ 38% of what?
5. Paragraph 3 line 2 ‘among women living with HIV in some settings)…’ better to mention these sites where unintended pregnancy among HIV positive women is as high as 90%.
6. Paragraph 3 – in general is not focused on HIV positive women. Better to use references on HIV positive women.
7. Paragraph 4- ‘In developing countries, the number of women who have an unmet need for modern contraception in 2012 is 222 Million (26%) [9, 10]. It is high in sub-Saharan Africa, surpassing 30% in some countries [11]. About one third of unintended pregnancies occur among women accessing contraception. Many of whom are using short-term methods that require user adherence on a daily or quarterly basis [11].....’ this is also among the general women population. Use references that are specific to HIV positive women.
8. Paragraph 5- ‘Although impressive increases in contraceptive prevalence rate have been achieved in Ethiopia during the past decade (from 8% to 29%), unmet need for family planning (FP) remains high (25%). Long-acting and permanent
methods of contraception (LA/PMs) remain out of reach for large numbers of women and couples who want to space or limit child bearing [12, 13] this is not specific to HIV positive women. In addition it is better to specify what percentage of the women are expected to use LACMs according to the Ethiopian policy. Without this reference we cannot say LACM is high or low

9. Paragraph 5- ‘Therefore LACMs are the best choices for women living with HIV/AIDS’ this conclusion doesn’t go along with what is written in the paragraph

Methods
1. General- How are the myths and misconceptions measured in this study?
2. Study area- it will be good if you can give the prevalence of HIV among women in the study area. How many Women are in Pre-ART or ART program in Bahir Dar?
3. Sample seize- I have noted that you have done analysis to identify associated factors with demand for LACM, was the sample size calculation formula mentioned here appropriate?
4. Sample size- ‘The total number of reproductive age (15-49 years) married women who were served in each service delivery points during one month had been estimated based on a one week preliminary survey. The sample size was proportionally allocated for each service delivery points (Hospital and health centres) and the study participants were selected by systematic random sampling in every seventh interval.’ Tell us how many women in reproductive age group were expected in one month period from the four health facilities.
5. Data process and analysis- ‘backward stepwise logistic regression’ - why did you select this methods?

Results
1. Paragraph 1- line 4- ‘The median monthly family income was 1,000.00 Ethiopian Birr (ETB) (Inter Quartile Range = 1900 ETB)’ better to stat the equivalent USD based on the exchange rate at the time of the data collection. ETB may not be understandable for the international readers.

Paragraph 3- line 2 – ‘About 642 (98.2%) respondents had mentioned at least one LACMs and one source.’ This sentence is no clear

Discussion
1. Insert a first paragraph that shows the strength and limitation of this study
2. Describing findings as positive association and negative association is not sufficient.
3. Paragraph 1- 4 the references used are not appropriate one. In addition the discussion lacks focus at the authors go back and fourth comparing studies from Ethiopia, the middle -east and other African countries among different group of women. Better to use literature done on HIV positive women and structure the discussion systematically
4. Last paragraph- ‘The possible limitations of this study might be risk of social desirability bias and not being triangulated with qualitative study.’ Bring this to the
first paragraph and give more detail about possible limitations. For example where does the social desirability bias might come? What did you do to decease the possible bias?

References

All references should be written strictly following the BMC format. There is lack of consistency on how references are cited.

Tables

1. Table 1- use equivalent USD for income. Make sure that the conversion is based on the average monthly exchange rate during the data collection period. You can get information from online resources.
2. Table 2- please show the results of variables in the multivariable logistic regression even if the findings are not statistically significant

The manuscript need language edition

Minor essential

Abstract

2. In the background section it would be good why long acting contraceptive method is referred among HIV +VE women as a means of contraception before describing that studies are limited in the area
3. Methods section line 5- describe for what purpose descriptive statistics was used
4. Methods section line 6- associated factors wit what?
5. Methods section line 7-8- which one was used mainly to describe association Odds ratio or P-value? You can use odds ratio to describe the strength and magnitude of association and indicate the p-value at the same time. However one is enough to evaluate the presence of association.
6. Result section line 1 change ‘respondents were participated’ to ‘respondents have participated’
7. Result section line 2 change ‘36.7% (95% CI: 33.2, 40.6)’ to ‘36.7% (95% CI: 33.2%, 40.6%)’
8. Result section line 8 -9 change ‘were positively associated with demand for LACMs;’ …. ‘negatively associated with demand for LACMs’ to a more proper description of odds ratio eg. The odds of demand for LACM among those who have myths about LACM was 55% less that HIV +ve women who doesn’t have myths.

Methods

6. Line 1 –‘ reproductive age’ better to mention the age range
7. Data collection- explain more about the pre-test
8. Data collection- clearly describe if the translation has come before or after the
pre-test. When writing the data collection steps make sure that everyone understands easily which steps came first.

9. Data collection- ‘Clients who were volunteered provided the required information’ how many refused? This information is important to implement the same study in the future.

10. Data process and analysis- ‘Fitness of the model was first assessed using Hosmer lomeshow test and 0.05 was used as a cutoff point for its goodness of fit’ ..rephrase to tell how exactly the GOF was used to reject a model

Results

2. Paragraph 1- line 1- response rate of ‘99.09%’ it is 99.1% in the abstract. Be consistent on how you write figures throughout your document.

3.

4. Paragraph 3- line 3- ‘…relatively more popular methods.’ Is that to say ‘relatively more known’?

5. Paragraph 5- ‘In bivariate analysis age, place of residence, educational status of women, the number of alive children they had, ART status, birth intension, past experience for LACMs, and myths heard about LACMs had p-value less than 0.2. However, in multivariable analysis place of residence, educational status of women, the number of alive children they had, birth/reproductive intension, past experience for LACMs, and myths heard about LACMs had statistical significance association with the demand for LACMs.’ You can omit this detail. We can see it from the table and the multivariable details are narrated in the subsequent paragraphs
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