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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The authors have responded to most of the issues raised. However, this manuscript still requires the services of a copy editor.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

2. Methods - Although the authors defined their variables in the response to the authors, some of these variables were not included in the body of the text. For instance, how was "discontinuation of MCM" defined?

3. Variable selection - Did the authors have an analytic framework to guide their analysis? In the final multivariate model presented, wealth index was omitted. Source of income (both, husband, wife) appears to be the only measure of income/assets in the model. Even if the association of wealth index with the outcome was not significant at the set cut-point, a measure of household wealth is an important variable to adjust for in this analysis. The authors should include this variable in their final model, or justify its exclusion.

4. Table 3: The value of "n" for ever use of MCM was 387. This means that data were missing for 264/651=40.6% of participants. The authors did not address how they handled missing data in their analysis. Additionally, at least 7% of data used for multivariate logistic regression appears to be missing. How did the authors handle this in their analysis?

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

5. Page 8; 5th paragraph: It would be helpful if the authors can reorder the contraceptive methods they listed by effectiveness or prevalence of use, or some other well understood order.

6. In the conclusion, the authors wrote, "...food security is a significant barrier..." Did they mean, "...food insecurity is a significant barrier..."?

7. The authors should review their references carefully. Apart from errors with punctuation and spelling, a few are incomplete, for example references 14, 15
and 18.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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