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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors seem to have addressed a few comments. I will have to reiterate the point that the IUD is a provider-dependent method which a user can discontinue at will. Perhaps this is why in Table 4, we do not see the effect of a greater supply of methods affecting continuation (see Supply of contraceptive component)—both in terms of significance and in the non-monotonicity of the effect (i.e., the effects of the high, medium and low are also in order). In other words, this could mean that choice per se is irrelevant, as clients are more likely to be offered the IUD than any other method, which could be an implicit program emphasis. However, a greater supply of methods does seem to have a monotonic effect on the use of other methods, albeit without statistical significance.

The second point is that quality is measured more by infrastructural readiness than the actual care that a client received. This is an important theoretical distinction to make because what a client was told or was treated can have an effect on whether the client returns to the facility and/or continues with the method; on the other hand, whether a facility has all the necessary supplies, trained staff, and buildings to provide the service just refers to the ability of the facility to provide services and not necessarily to what was delivered.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Page 4--Jain, not Jane.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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