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Reviewer's report:

The authors studied about family planning among undergraduate university students in Ghana.

Below you will find out some important suggestions for the manuscript:

1. There are some grammar mistakes which cause difficulties to understand the real points of the study. The authors should go through the manuscript by the help of English professional.

2. On page 4, line 31-39: "Although past and current national surveys on family planning in Ghana (GDHS 2014) have extensively looked at contraceptive uptake in the country, there is limited focus on contraceptive uptake among students in various Universities hence the focus of this study to examine acceptance of family planning among students of University of Education, Winneba.". The sentence is too long and disturbs the meaning. Instead of long sentence, the authors could separate the sentence before "hence".

3. On page 5, the 1st paragraph should be shortened to one sentence to describe the study area. There are so many details about University.

4. Faculty names could be given on page 5, line 46 in the sentence of "…………All the five (5) faculties were………………".

5. The authors can just emphasize two faculties were selected among five faculties. Selection method based on "……… written on paper, folded and put in a round bowl and a friend was asked to pick from the bowl with eyes closed." does not seem so nice in an academic paper.

6. What version of SPSS was used in data analysis?

7. On page 6, line 49-51: "The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the data. Multivariable tables were generated. The SPSS programme software was used for data entry.". There is no need to repeat the information that authors use SPSS in data analysis twice.

8. The authors give so much findings in Results although they're shown in tables. For instances:
   - "Most of the respondents (n=67 or 67.0%) knew that one could get pregnant by relying on the withdrawal method, while 25 respondents (n=25 or 25.0%) were of the opinion that it is impossible to get pregnant if the withdrawal method is used." The authors can give only main result (67.0%) and readers could find out others (25.0%) in the related table.
9. Inserting the results (numbers) in the discussion is not convenient according to writing style. The authors should discuss the findings comparing the other study results and comment on the difference or same conclusion of the study.

10. In the tables, assuming "F" is frequency, "n" could be better choice instead. "Gender" would be better instead of "sex".

11. I have doubt that so many tables cause negative effect while reading the manuscript.
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