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Title: Utilization of dual method contraception among reproductive age women on anti-retroviral therapy in public hospitals of northern Ethiopia

General observation

The manuscript is good but will require some language editing and should be spell checked. The title should indicate clearly that study was conducted in "selected public hospitals". The manuscript contributes to knowledge and increase evidence on contraception utilization in an African setting. The results will be useful to public health policy makers and practitioners.

Abstract

The manuscript's abstract does provide the reader a quick clear idea about the rational for the study and the results before reading the rest of the manuscript. However, the conclusion, does not draw inferences from the results and has been presented as key summary of the study.

Background

The background of the manuscript is good but the aim/purpose of the manuscript needs to be clearly stated.

Methods

The methods section of the manuscript should clarify the following issues:

1. What is the reasoning for selecting two public health facilities?

2. More details and justification of the sampling methods is required. Need to specify how the systematic random sampling was undertaken.
3. Explain the reason for the choice to use of the single proportion formula in calculation of the sample size. Remember, the choice of the formula to use is based on the outcome of interest, hence you need to clearly provide the reason(s) for your choice.

4. The sample size, sampling frame, and sampled clients lacks clarity i.e., the total sample size estimated for the study was 331 (line 104/105), the study was conducted among 324 clients (line 29/30) and interviewed client were 331 (line 58/59).

5. The response rate was 97.9%. In total, how many clients were sampled from the two facilities (by proportion to size)?

6. Dual contraception method definition lacks further details and justification (line 107/108). Explain the basis for the choice of 'condom plus other contraceptive methods' as dual contraception method. Give examples of the other contraceptives. Why was condom a constant factor? For instance how were HIV clients using other dual contraceptives exclusive of the study?

7. Sentence in line 99/100 not clear

This section is important to provide the reader sufficient detail of the method used and the procedure followed to arrive at the results, to allow the work to be replicated by others.

Results

It is not clear from the results what the dual contraceptive rate is. What was it? Secondly the results should be presented in a logical sequence in the text, tables, figures, charts etc to respond to the purpose of the manuscript. The results section should focus on the results of the study and avoid any discussion of the results.

Discussion

The key summary of the results should be provide to start the discussion. The limitations of the study should be discussed in the light of the results.

Conclusion

Clarify sentence in line 220/221- message of massage?

Decision

This manuscript is fit for publication but the above comments should be taken into consideration in its revision.
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