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Reviewer's report:

First, I would like to thank the authors for giving me the opportunity to read their work. This is an interesting study of topic of importance to practicing physicians. The study is well executed and rigorous and adds to the knowledge base on the quality of family planning services. It is well written up, concise, yet descriptive enough to be replicated.

Below are my comments in more detail. The comments are intended to help the authors take the paper to the next level of improvement.

The research question is very clear. The title and the abstract are well-written, clear and concise. The English writing is detailed and comprehensive. The article benefits from a logical structure. The introduction is covers the literature related to quality of care research concerning family planning services.

The methods are appropriate. My biggest concern, however, relates to the way the methods are presented. It is difficult to relate the different measures and instruments to the attributes and indicators. To me it is not clear which of the indicators were exactly measured in the different methods executed in the study, e.g.: facility inventory questionnaire, provider interview, observations on family planning and the exit interview. After reading the article, I was wondering what was exactly asked in the provider interview and which indicators were investigated in the observations on family planning? Was this done by one researcher? The facility inventory questionnaire is mentioned only in the methods section. Which questions were being asked in the facility inventory questionnaire? Is this questionnaire developed by the researchers or is it a validated questionnaire from previous research? Possibly the facility inventory questionnaire are the measures of client satisfaction in Table 4, but that is not clear to me. As a minor point of concern, for those not familiar with polychoricpca principal components command, the calculation of the outcome measure client satisfaction is difficult to understand.

The authors should also explain the abbreviation STI in the article. I suppose the abbreviation stands for Sexually Transmitted Infections.

The discussion and conclusion are definity well-balanced and supported by the data in the results section. Nonetheless, I would have liked to see more implications for research and practice in a separate section. The authors mention the most important limitations of the study.
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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