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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting, clear and well written article. It was an enjoyable and informative read.

Major compulsory revisions

1. In the methods section more information is needed on the selection of respondents – were respondents with certain characteristics selected or were that a pure convenience sample?

2. In the abstract the conclusions seem a little strong. The data presented do not show that the use of the booklet resulted in behavior change or describe coverage levels– thus perhaps better to say ‘acceptable’ rather than ‘appropriate’. Similarly on page 13 paragraph 2 the authors describe the intervention as effective - no conclusions about effectiveness of the intervention can be drawn without coverage or behavior change data.

3. Data discussed in paragraphs 2-3 of the discussion were not presented in the results – there is a disconnect between the results and these sections of the discussion that should be resolved.

4. The paper does not include a limitation section – this is essential to add.

Minor essential revisions

1. A paragraph detailing the FCHV’s who work in the intervention area would have been beneficial – how many were there, how many visits do they make to pregnant and delivered women? How much training and supervision do they get? Is there any background data on their coverage levels? This information would be useful to put some of the findings in context, for example the quote on page 11 shows a desire to reduce the number of FCHV visits, but from what number?

2. It was in clear what the officials in phase 1 of data collection were rating and why there view was important. Were they rating their own perception of the importance of the card (e.g do they think that birth preparedness is more important that wrapping and drying) , or were they rating their perception of usefulness having seen how they are used by the FCHW? I did not find this data very useful or interesting without understanding what was being rated.

3. In places some numerical data would be useful e.g paragraph 3 page 8 the number who responded in the affirmative to having changed their behavior as a result of the visits.
4. Description of the data collected could be a little more detailed e.g in the 3rd paragraph of the methods it is not clear what was really covered with the FCHV – how were performance factors examined?

5. Is there a way to summarize the findings in a table? If this is not possible it would be useful to add a few more subheadings – many different topics are covered in the results and it is easy to get a little lost.

Discretionary revisions
1. It would have been nice to have a little more contextual information in paragraph 1 of the methods such as the level of ANC use.

2. In the discussions the authors talk about reducing repetition in the cards- is there any data from the behavior change theory that shows reinforcing messages through repetition is an important strategy? If so the impact of removing repetition for key messages should be discussed.
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