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Dear Dr Silveira,

Your manuscript "Reasons for nonuse of contraceptive methods by women with demand for contraception not satisfied: an assessment of low and middle-income countries using Demographic and Health Surveys" (REPH-D-19-00209R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in Reproductive Health, once you have carried out some editorial revisions suggested by Reviewer 1.
If you require support revising your manuscript please consider using AuthorAid, http://www.authoraid.info/en/about/ - AuthorAID is a free international research community supporting researchers publish their work.

Their reports, together with any other comments, are below. Please also take a moment to check our website at https://www.editorialmanager.com/reph/ for any additional comments that were saved as attachments.

Once you have made the necessary corrections, please submit a revised manuscript online at:

https://www.editorialmanager.com/reph/

If you have forgotten your username or password please use the "Send Login Details" link to get your login information. For security reasons, your password will be reset.

When you re-submit your manuscript please attach:

1) One clean copy of your manuscript (submitted as supplementary file)

2) One copy where your changes are highlighted (track changes) (submitted as main manuscript file)

3) A separate, point by point response to the editor and referee comments

Please include a point-by-point response within the 'Response to Reviewers' box in the submission system and highlight (with 'tracked changes'/coloured/underlines/highlighted text) all changes made when revising the manuscript. Please ensure you describe additional experiments that were carried out and include a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style, which can be found in the Submission Guidelines on the journal homepage.

Please note, if your manuscript is accepted you will not be able to make any changes to the authors, or order of authors, of your manuscript once the editor has accepted your manuscript for publication. If you wish to make any changes to authorship before you resubmit your revisions, please reply to this email and ask for a 'Request for change in authorship' form which should be completed by all authors (including those to be removed) and returned to this email address. Please ensure that any changes in authorship fulfil the criteria for authorship as outlined in BioMed Central's editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#authorship).

Once you have completed and returned the form, your request will be considered and you will be advised whether the requested changes will be allowed.
By resubmitting your manuscript you confirm that all author details on the revised version are correct, that all authors have agreed to authorship and order of authorship for this manuscript and that all authors have the appropriate permissions and rights to the reported data.

Please be aware that we may investigate, or ask your institute to investigate, any unauthorised attempts to change authorship or discrepancies in authorship between the submitted and revised versions of your manuscript.

The due date for submitting the revised version of your article is 03 Sep 2019.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript soon and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

Anna E Kågesten, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Reproductive Health
https://reproductive-health-journal.biomedcentral.com/

Dear Editor Anna E Kågesten,

We are pleased to submit our revised manuscript "Reasons for nonuse of contraceptive methods by women with demand for contraception not satisfied: an assessment of low and middle-income countries using Demographic and Health Surveys" (REPH-D-19-00209R1) to the Reproductive Health. We thank you for the opportunity to address the Reviewer 1 relevant concerns and believe these changes have improved the quality of our manuscript.

Best regards,

Mariangela Freitas Silveira, on behalf of all authors
REVIEWERS ASSESSMENT AND RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS:

Reviewer reports:

REVIEWER #1:

The revisions to this paper have really strengthened it, made it much clearer, and improved the reader experience. I appreciate that the authors really took the many suggestions I provided in round 1 (as well as those of the other reviewer) into account. The updated results section is much more concise and easier to follow. It addresses the key findings and leaves more room for the authors to discuss what those findings really mean and how they can be used to inform programs/policies in countries. Overall, I think this paper is nearly ready to be considered complete and once it is, it will be a meaningful contribution to the literature. Well done.

Answer:

Thank you so much for your suggestions. Certainly, your contributions were really important to improve the manuscript quality (as well as those of reviewer #2).

There are several places in the paper (particularly in the results section) where there are long lists of characteristics or reasons in one sentence. I think it would be helpful to use Oxford commas before the "and" in each of these sentences to improve readability. (For example, the lists on lines 289-292 and 292-294). Similarly, it might be easier for the reader if the stratification variables listed on lines 195-201 are presented in a bulleted list instead of all in one sentence.

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for this important suggestion. We revised the text accordingly.

Below, I provide some additional, minor edits to improve clarity and address some issues that likely arose during the revision process.

Lines 95-96: I suggest putting "in LMIC" after "214 million women" to be more specific.

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for this comment and have made the changes accordingly. (Line 84)

Line 105: I suggest adding "in the study sample" to the end of the sentence (after "sexually active women").
Answer:
We have added the suggested information. (Line 93)

Line 123: The new revised version of the sentence is lacking a verb. Perhaps "might identify"?
Answer:
We thank the reviewer for the attention to this point and have added the verb as suggested. (Line 108)

Line 154: Add "and" between "sexually active" and "fertile"
Answer:
We have made modifications as suggested. (Line 133)

Line 183: Add "and" before "8)"
Answer:
We have added this word as suggested. (Line 153)

Line 197: Should this say "area OF residence" (not "or")?
Answer:
We thank the reviewer for attention to this point. (Line 165)

Lines 275-279: The reasons should be in quotes.
Answer:
We thank the reviewer for highlight this and have made the changes as suggested.

Line 301: "of" seems to be missing after "In all".
Answer:

We thank the reviewer for highlighting this point. However, we think that the respective sentence is correct in the current form, so we believe that in this context, the word “of” is not necessary.

Lines 321-322: Are the parentheses around "those with lower education levels and those who lived in rural areas" correct? It makes it look as though that's how "poorer" was defined, but looking back at the analysis section, I think you had more specific wealth data. So, if that's not how "poor" was defined, I think the parentheses should be removed.

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion and have removed the parentheses. (Lines 234-235)

Line 354: Suggest using modifications "poorest women" instead of "poorest ones."

Answer:

We have replaced the word “ones” with the word “women”. (Line 249)

Line 362: Suggest adding "all of which are located in West or Central Africa" after "Five countries" and putting the country names in parentheses, then removing the phrase that starts with "the last four…” I also suggest switching this sentence with the next sentence (i.e., talking about the reasons first, then delving into the top 5 countries); this will segue nicely into talking about those Western/Central African countries.

Answer:

Angola is located in Eastern and Southern Africa, and Chad, Gambia, Guinea, and Mali are located in West and Central Africa. So, we wrote the new sentence as follows:

“Regarding the reasons for nonuse by women with demand for contraception not satisfied, it is noteworthy that “health concerns” and “infrequent sex” were the most prevalent reasons in many countries. Five countries all of which are located in Africa (Angola, Chad, Gambia, Guinea, and Mali) presented prevalence of demand not satisfied of >70.0%.” (Lines 254-257)

I suggest making the sentences on 378-380 and 383-385 into one sentence, since the second one really completes the thought brought up by the first. In fact, I think this thought would be really
great if it were moved to the end of this paragraph to sum up that while the numbers might look good and progress is being made, countries still need to strive for the goal of zero unmet need.

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for highlighting this point. We have made the changes as suggested. We also have changed the sentence order as highlighted by the reviewer. (Lines 279-282)

Line 423: This verb should be "are" not "is."

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for the attention to this point and we have made this change accordingly. (Line 293)

Line 479: Suggest adding "their own" before "reproductive decisions."

Answer:

We have added this information as suggested. (Line 324)

Lines 489-491: I think the original edit (in light blue) makes more sense here than ending the sentence in "this question" because really, cultural and personal factors affect ALL of the reasons listed, not just the one mentioned in the paragraph above.

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for this comment and have made the changes as suggested. (Lines 328-329)

Line 510: Consider replacing "choice" with "method" to avoid writing "choose the choice."

Answer:

We agree with the reviewer that this sentence needed to be improved. So, we have made changes accordingly (Line 339). We thank so much for the reviewer contributions.
REVIEWER #2:

All my previous comments have now been addressed.

Answer:

Thank you so much for your contributions. Certainly, your suggestions were really important to improve the manuscript quality (as well as those of reviewer #1).

--

Please also take a moment to check our website at https://www.editorialmanager.com/reph/l.asp?i=89195&l=KX2IAAZW for any additional comments that were saved as attachments. Please note that as Reproductive Health has a policy of open peer review, you will be able to see the names of the reviewers.

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES-HS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE-HS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

Recipients of this email are registered users within the Editorial Manager database for this journal. We will keep your information on file to use in the process of submitting, evaluating and publishing a manuscript. For more information on how we use your personal details please see our privacy policy at https://www.springernature.com/production-privacy-policy. If you no longer wish to receive messages from this journal or you have questions regarding database management, please contact the Publication Office at the link below.

______________________________
In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: https://www.editorialmanager.com/reph/login.asp?a=r). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.