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Reviewer’s report:

The paper addresses an interesting topic. However, major changes are needed. The results section is hard to follow. There is a disconnection between the tables and the paragraphs. The authors also need to review the interpretation of the results especially the odds ratio.

Please find below the specific comments and suggestions.

Abstract:

1. Lines 14-15: I suggest rewriting the aim. It is not clear.

2. Line 16: it would be better to specify that the study was conducted in Ethiopia.

3. Lines 32-36: this sentence is not clear. I suggest reviewing the interpretation of the results.

Plain Summary

4. Lines 7-12: these reasons were not mentioned in the abstract.

Introduction

Background

5. Line 12: Could explain this impact?

6. Lines 14-19: I suggest including a right-based approach to family planning not only reducing poverty and hunger.

7. Line 22: Where were these programs implemented? (globally, Africa, Ethiopia?)

8. Line 35: you should define the abbreviation before using it.
9. Line 46: could you describe the findings of this evaluation?

10. I suggest using the term low- and middle-income countries instead of developing countries.

Statement of the problem

11. Lines 15-17: I suggest rewriting this sentence.

12. Lines 56-58: I suggest rewriting the aim of the study. You did not include that you are investigating factors associated with husbands' involvement.

Methods

Study setting

13. I suggest adding more information about the population (religion…)

14. Line 50: You need to define the abbreviation HEWs

Data collection

15. Line 31: You need to add citations.

16. Line 33: There is an incomplete sentence.

17. I suggest merging the operational definitions and the study variables.

Data processing and data analysis

18. Line 41: you need to add citation for the software used.

Results

19. Table 1 includes a description of the study population and the proportion of husbands' involvement. The husbands' involvement was not described in this section. The description of the table should correspond to the table content. You need also to report p values.

20. Lines 28-31: this sentence is not clear.
Knowledge and attitude about family planning of study participants

21. The results reported in the paragraph are not found in Table 2, while the table’s content was not described.

22. You need to report p-values in Table 2.

Practice of family planning of study participants

23. Lines 5-11: those results are not reported in Table 3.

24. You need to report p-values in Table 3.

Husbands’ involvement in family planning

25. You need to review this section to make sure that the results are also reported in Table 4. For example, the side effects are not found in Table 4, also there are discrepancies between the percentages reported in the paragraph and those reported in the table.

26. You need to report p-values.

Bivariate and multivariate analysis of study participants

27. Lines 4-10: I suggesting reviewing the interpretation of the results.

28. Lines 10-15: The interpretation is not clear.


Discussion

30. Lines 33-37: Could you explain more the reasons for the discrepancies in the results?

31. Lines 49-51: This sentence is not clear.

32. "This might be due to there was myth and misconception among religious leaders that they believe the religion prohibited the use family planning and leads to negative effect": you need to add citations.

Recommendations
33. I suggest rewriting the recommendations. They are not clear.
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