Dear respected editor, thank you very much for the invitation to review this manuscript. The manuscript is well written. The labor pain management is neglected issue and it is important to be investigated. So, this can be an input for policy making. Even though, the manuscript is well written it have some shortcoming in abstract, introduction, methods and discussion sections.

Here below I provided specific comments.

1. Regarding the writing style, the use of font size is irregular. E.g., line number 18 and 19.
2. In the abstract, what makes your study different from other published paper. SO, the gap of the study should be explicitly stated.
3. On line number 19, rather than saying the end of May, please state the date explicitly.
4. On line number 24 and 25, the confidence of uncertainty should be reported.
5. On line number 28 and 29, each factors level of significance and effect size should be reported.
6. I found that your recommendation is not specific and strong. You should give specific and strong recommendations to the concerned bodies.
7. On the introduction section, paragraph one and two have different type of writing style and font use. Please be consistent.
8. Intext citations are also different. Some are colored, some are bolded, some have high font size. E.g., line number 39, 53, 54, 60……
9. The introduction should be supported with numbers. Such as the number of women get non-pharmacological labor pain management, proportion of OCP practiced NPLPM, proportion of OCPs who had favorable attitude, …
10. I found that the need to conduct this study is not well explored. If the case is barriers. It should be well discovered in the result section. It is crystal clear that qualitative approaches are better to address such kind of variables.
11. I found that the method section is well written. However, the writing style and grammar errors are a major challenge throughout the manuscript. Please be consistent thorough the paper and proof read the whole section.
12. It is better if you clearly show how, you measured the variable and how you maintain the quality of the data.

13. On the statistical analysis section, please clearly show how the model is fitted? How the assumptions are tested? How multicollinearity is checked? If you have done all those things, you need to report all findings.

14. On line number 203, the confidence interval contains 1, so it had no significant association b/n Master's degree qualification and knowledge. Ho you explain this?

15. The discussion section is well written. The major gap is it lacks interpretations of the some findings and implication of all findings.