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Reviewer's report:

The authors cover an untouched area —sexual and reproductive health needs of young rural women. They provide a sound background with justifying the need for the study and adequate relatively recent referencing. Objectives are clearly indicated.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. This manuscript seems to have followed a satisfactory and appropriate methodology. However, it lacks sample size calculation and/or basis for such a calculation. Reviewer found no details on justification or basis as to how 690 married and 691 unmarried women were selected for the study.

2. Authors give a good account of study instruments. Data collectors have been given an adequate training. However, the setting and how the questionnaire was administered are not mentioned. Readers wish to know more details on precautions undertaken by data collectors in conducting interviews in this type of research especially covering sensitive reproductive issues.

3. Authors have presented sound data to cover the research question under study. Tables need complying with journal requirements. Some data eg. Age at marriage, in years —may be removed and mentioned in text. Statistics appear to be genuine without indications of manipulation. The manuscript does not adhere to the journal's standards for reporting and data deposition.

4. The discussion covers major findings of the study and possible circumstances for such results. However, it lacks comparing and supporting adequately with already published data ie. inadequate referencing.

5. Conclusions need further expansion. Recommendations include only behavior change communication intervention targeting youths. Reviewer suggests inclusion of SRH issues in school-based education, adult education, and also male participation and education in such issues.

6. The title is comprehensive but abstract needs revision to convey actual methodology.

7. Reviewer found several grammatical errors —be careful in using the tense and using “The” in several places. Overall, the language needs revisiting.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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