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Reviewer's report:

1. In the section “Data Collection”, it would be helpful if some descriptive data or table was provided on the focus groups and interviewees—number of groups, size of those groups, composition of participants—community and health workers, and breakdown of the policy makers and donors, etc. for the reader to have a better understanding of the number, breadth and composition of the different informants that participated.

2. Under “Discussion”, the section on “BPHS and state-building” was not convincing. It is out of place in this paper and does not appear to me to be central to this paper and the basis for this qualitative assessment. Would recommend consideration of removing this section and all discussion of implications of state building as there is only minimal, tangential evidence which is more implied than demonstrated. Would spend more time in discussion of “Improvements and weaknesses of SRH in BPHS” since you were examining only that portion of the BPHS. A deeper discussion on improvements of BPHS and SRH elements is the comparative advantage of this article--talking about the improvements and weaknesses of the health system. So this section on strengths and weaknesses should be expanded and deepened in its analysis of the findings.

3. Conclusions (in body of paper and abstract): Very weak. Statement “deepens insight into SRH services delivery in Bamyan, adding to broader debates on health service contracting in conflict-affected areas.”—this is not self-evident so authors must provide basis for such a conclusion. This needs expansion and must clearly show how authors arrive at such a concluding statements--the dots need to be connected.
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