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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the manuscript would benefit from minor revisions to improve the clarity of the manuscript's findings. Below are suggested revisions to address minor weaknesses to the article.

Tables and Figures:

Table 3: Suggestion to revise the table title to state: "Demand for family planning satisfied with modern contraceptive methods (mDFPS) below 20% by country and subgroup."

Table 3: "Animist" should be written as "Animism", which is the religion's name.

Figure 2 Note: The note for Figure 2 should be split into 2 sentences. Suggested revision: "The darker colored countries have an overall mDFPS below 20%. The lighter colored countries have an overall mDFPS above 20%, yet these countries have at least one subgroup with mDFPS below 20%.”

Table S1: Suggestion to revise the table title to state: "Countries without information on reproductive health among unmarried, sexually active women, excluded from the analyses."

Table S2: Suggestion to revise the table title to state: "Demand for family planning satisfied with modern contraceptive methods (mDFPS) below 20% by country and subgroup."

Table S2: "Animist" should be written as "Animism", which is the religion's name.

Table S2: Is there any reason why "Central African Republic" is in bold font? If no, please remove bold font to match the other countries.

Abstract:

Lines 20-22: Suggested rewrite to remove "women's": "Subgroups with low coverage (mDFPS below 20%) were identified according to marital status, wealth, age, education, literacy, area of residence (urban or rural), geographic region, and religion."
Lines 28-31: Suggested rewrite: "West & Central Africa showed the lowest coverage (mean mDFPS = 33%); whereas, South Asia had the highest coverage (mean mDFPS = 71%)."

Line 38: Low mDFPS coverage should be defined by revising to state "low mDFPS coverage (<20%)."

Line 40: Add "countries". Suggested revision: "country-level, yet in many of these countries, mDFPS coverage…"

Line 52: Please remove "As often is the case" and add "illiterate" and "living in rural areas". Suggested revision: "Subgroups requiring special attention include women who are poor, uneducated/illiterate, young, and living in rural areas."

Plain English Summary:

Line 28: Please correct the font for "in the" before "youngest age groups" to match the manuscript text font.

Introduction section:

Line 21, page 4: "Improve" should be written as "improved". Suggested rewrite: "…will directly contribute to improved maternal and child health outcomes."

Methods section:

Line 2, page 7: Please remove "very". For consistency throughout the manuscript, it is suggested to state only "low coverage" defined as mDFPS below 20%, instead of as "very low" or "extremely low".

Lines 2-5, page 7: Since the authors are stratifying on categories of age ranges not used previously in the literature, the authors should explain why these specific categories of age ranges are being used for the analyses.

Results section:

Line 46, page 7: "CEEE" should be "CEE". Suggested rewrite to add (<50% modern): "Diverse countries from CEE & CIS have low reliance on modern contraception (<50% modern)."
Lines 49-51, page 7: Suggestion to remove "Armenia" and "Bosnia and Herzegovina" add "Kosovo" to the countries relying on traditional contraception. These countries have a % modern <30%. You need to define a cut-off for % modern.

Lines 51-54, page 7: Suggestion to remove the sentence "Cambodia, Philippines,....modern methods." In Table 1, these countries have a % modern >30%. You need to define a cut-off for % modern.

Lines 56-59, page 7: There are 11 countries listed here. Suggestion to remove Belarus, which has 52.5% modern, short term contraception. The other countries are >53%.

Lines 1-3, page 8: This sentence should be removed as it does not add to the Results section since these countries have a high % modern.

Lines 7-10, page 8: Suggestion to remove "highly prevalent" and replace with "common".

Lines 36-37, page 8: "CEEE" should be "CEE".

Lines 44-45, page 8: Please remove "extremely". For consistency throughout the manuscript, it is suggested to state only "low coverage" defined as mDFPS below 20%, instead of as "very low" or "extremely low".

Lines 49-52, page 8: Suggested rewrite to be consistent with the Abstract: "As shown in Table 3, these subgroups tended to include women who are poor, uneducated/illiterate, young, and living in rural areas."

Lines 53-54, page 8: "Animist" should be written as "Animism", which is the religion's name.

Lines 58-59, page 8: Guinea-Bissau should be added to the list of countries with other religions.

Discussion section:

Lines 22-23, page 9: Please remove "extremely". For consistency throughout the manuscript, it is suggested to state only "low coverage" defined as mDFPS below 20%, instead of as "very low" or "extremely low".

Lines 27-28, page 9: Please correct the font for "in the" before "youngest age groups" to match the manuscript text font.

Lines 19-20, page 10: Please remove "extremely". For consistency throughout the manuscript, it is suggested to state only "low coverage" defined as mDFPS below 20%, instead of as "very low" or "extremely low".
Lines 23-25, page 10: Suggested rewrite "With such low coverage at the national level, …"

Lines 26-30, page 10: Suggested rewrite: "The subgroups highlighted in Table 3 are not surprising as they tend to include women who are poor, uneducated/illiterate, young, and living in rural areas."

Lines 37-39, page 10: Suggested rewrite: "Lack of access to contraception is not one of the most common barriers for use."

Lines 48-49, page 10: Please replace "Christianity" with "Animism" as Christianity is not included in the Results section or Table 3, yet Animism is mentioned.

Lines 26-27, page 11: Please replace "effectivity" with "effectiveness".

Conclusion section:

Line 25, page 12: Please remove "extremely". For consistency throughout the manuscript, it is suggested to state only "low" defined as mDFPS below 20%, instead of as "very low" or "extremely low".

Lines 36-47, page 12: These sentences would fit better in the Strengths paragraph in the Discussion section. Please add them to the end of this paragraph after Line 7, page 12.
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