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Reviewer’s report:

General Comments:
Overall the manuscript is fairly written and well structured. I have made several comments which require minor revisions. I recommend that the manuscript should be published after the editor is satisfied with the revisions.

Abstract:
The background and methods section should explicitly mention what is a woman focused development. In the result section, the P values should come at the end sentences. The conclusion should focus on the women focus development and the achievements it made.

Background:
This is well written. On page 5 the paragraph on BRAC Manoshi Programme, one would like to now whether the DCs started as part of BRAC?

Methods:
Under the section, study population, the first sentence, ”the study targeted……the word on should be deleted. In the last sentence of that paragraph indicates a comparison group. In what sense is this phrase used? The last sentence on sample size and sample selection mentions selection, how was the selection done? On the section on statistical analyses, one hour was used as a cut off point for first, second and third delays. What was the justification for this? It is indicated that Mann-Whitney’s test was used for skewed data. Which data was skewed?

Results:
The first paragraph under sample characteristics, mentions the intervention group. So what was the intervention group? This should have been described in the methods section. The results section should be written in the past tense. Under the section “three delays and time taken for events, the sentence on “median time required to make decisions…… is a major finding and should appear in the abstract. Under the section”factors associated with delays…….” the first sentence is an important finding and should be put in the abstract.

Discussion:
This is well done, except on page 16, the last sentence is not clear

Conclusion:
It is very difficult to attribute the results entirely to the project as the conclusion portrays. The conclusion should be revisited.

References:
This is well written.

Tables:
These are fairly presented.