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Reviewer: Samuel C. Dumith

Major Compulsory Revisions: I did not detect any major change to be done in the paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

Title: I suggest removing the term “longitudinal” from the title, once it seems to be much more a “panel” study rather than a “longitudinal” study.

Abstract: In the first paragraph of the Results, it is not clear what is the reference category for the comparison. I know it was the first one, but authors can emphasize this.

Background: When the authors say that “developing countries account for 99% of all the unregistered births”, the most correct term would not be “undeveloped countries”?

Results: It is important to mention in the text what was the distribution for the PSF coverage (% of No PSF, low, intermediate and high coverage).

References: some journal names are in its abbreviated form, while other are with the full name.

Table 2: What is the mean of that population (last line of the table)?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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