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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript.

This article examined the prevalence and preference of modern contraceptive use and the intention for their use among rural reproductive married women in the Upper East Region of Ghana.

General Comments
This manuscript is unsuitable for publication in its present form due to the following reasons:

The manuscript is ambiguous to comprehend. It appears that the authors are unclear about what the objective of the study should be. As it is, the manuscript is attempting to do many things of which, all its many objectives received inadequate attention.

Specific Comments
Should the authors wish to resubmit this article, here are some suggestions on how to improve the article:

This introduction is too lengthy. One way to improve the introduction is to remove the theoretical background which has no relevance to the objective of this study. Also the Ghanian context should be significantly shortened. The details provided about the GEHIP programme is too much and has little or no relevant to this study. I suppose previously published evaluation studies on the programme would have provided this details elsewhere.

The style of reporting the results is inappropriate. Authors should state what their results are without embellishing them with unnecessary additional information.

Lastly, authors should decide what main objective they want to address in this paper. Is the study about fertility? Is the study about unmet need for contraceptive? Is it about reasons for contraceptive use? Is it about prevalence of contraceptive use? When the authors speak of intention to use contraceptive, what do they mean? I believe it is different from reasons why they are using contraceptive. Reproductive intention was used elsewhere to replace contraceptive intention. Do these phrases mean the same thing?
Having a clear objective should enable the authors to considerably focus on important things, especially when rewriting the introduction and discussion of findings.
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