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**Reviewer's report:**

**Minor essential revisions**

1. You make a series of assumptions about rates of disease, unwanted pregnancies etc. and although you acknowledge this as a weakness it would be helpful to describe where these assumptions come from and vary them in sensitivity analysis to explore their impact on the results.

2. At the end of the results you estimate the cost of running good quality YFHS services at the national level. You just multiply the number of centers by the total cost but previously have acknowledged that rural centers cost less than urban ones. I was wondering if there might be a more accurate way of estimating this. Given these centres are being run anyway you should also mention in the discussion that although this is the cost of running a good quality programme, the programme is already running, though not to the same standards throughout the country so a sponsor would have to provide an additional amount X to bring the programme nationally up to a high standard.


4. The introduction could be argued more clearly, by the end of it I understand what you are going to do in the paper but not why this work is needed.

**Discretionary Revisions**

5. The four centers selected, were they the top 4 or were some others of similar quality and these were selected randomly?

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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