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Reviewer’s report:

Although the article is improved, it still gives too much useless information. A few examples:

- tables 1, 3 and 4 give the differences between the two groups; almost nowhere there is a significant p-value (because there are many variables some p-value are significant just by chance); the authors should revise their tables into smaller versions

- in all tables (still) decimal percentages are given for the N=64

- the tables are described in the text of the results and again in the discussion; for a descriptive study, the information in the abstract is almost enough next to the tables; a discussion of 5 pages, which is twice as long as the result, is not informative nor necessary

Some other remarks:

- I do not understand the sample size calculation (except that it turns out to be right the number that was actually used); what is a 95% CI of 3%?

- The sampling method is still not clear to me: how was the sample of 60% chosen (why 60% anyway) and how were the 100 clinics chosen from each city.

The authors should really take the reviewers comments into account; the text and tables should be revised accordingly.
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