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Reviewer's report:

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.

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.

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.

Line 105: I suggest adding "in the study sample" to the end of the sentence (after "sexually active women").

Line 123: The new revised version of the sentence is lacking a verb. Perhaps "might identify"?

Line 154: Add "and" between "sexually active" and "fertile"

Line 183: Add "and" before "8)"

Line 197: Should this say "area OF residence" (not "or")?

Lines 275-279: The reasons should be in quotes.
Line 301: "of" seems to be missing after "In all".

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.

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

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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