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Author’s response to reviews:

I have attached the revised files--a clean version where I have accepted the changes and another version with the track changes on. I have also attached a letter with point-by-point responses to the reviewers comments. PLEASE Use the CLEAN VERSION as the revised version.

Dear Editor

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS
Re: REPH-D-18-00129R1” Contraceptive use intentions and unmet need for family planning among reproductive-aged women in northern Ghana”

Dear Editor,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our paper referenced above based on the comments submitted by the two reviewers. We have now been able to address the comments and are resubmitting our responses for your review and decision. Below are the point-by-point responses to each of the comments.
Reviewer #1:

1. Manuscript is ambiguous, authors unclear about objectives and attempting to do too many things.
   Response: Comment is quite helpful and we have accordingly revised the introduction and objectives to draw the reader’s attention to what we are seeking to do. We have reduced the introduction so that only the most salient and relevant information is presented. However, while the paper may seem ambitious we believe the issues we have attempted to address are interrelated and taken together give a better and clearer picture of the related issues of contraception use intentions and unmet need which are often not addressed in a way that gives a better picture and understanding of these important issues and their relation to fertility regulation and reproduction. The revised manuscript makes these issues much clearer.

2. Introduction too lengthy.
   Response: We have revised the introduction and made it much more shorter and sharper in focus. We agree that the Ghanaian context may not have been too relevant in this case and have removed that part of the introduction accordingly. However, we strongly believe the theoretical underpinnings provides a strong basis for the concepts of unmet need which have remain extremely relevant for understanding unmet need for family planning and how programmes might be designed to respond to such issues. We have however, reduced and sharpened the focus to lay the theoretical basis for understanding the issues being addressed.

3. Authors should decide on the focus of the paper.
   Response: Address in point 1 above

Reviewer #2

1. Article well-written, but “Northern Ghana” in title should be changed to “Upper East Region.”
   Response: Thank you for the compliment. Regarding the title we have substituted “Northern Ghana” with “Upper East Region”

2. Provide more details on sample selection
   Response: We have provided a more detailed description of the sampling procedure, describing the two-stage sampling procedure that was used.

3. Show figures from the result summarized in the tables in the text.
   Response: We have rewritten the results section reporting the figures summarized in the tables in the text and shifted part of the interpretations in the results section to the discussion section of the paper. All significant numerical values are reported and highlighted in the text.

Finally, we like to state that the reviews have helped us to rethink some of the argument and drift of the paper so its focus is much more sharper and clearer. Again, we want to thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript.