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Reviewer's report:

1) Major Compulsory Revisions: The authors site the WISN Ratio through-out the paper, however the WHO WISN method was not used. The paper cannot call the ratio of the number of actual:required health workers the WISN Ratio without using the actual WISN methodology. They can use a ratio of actual to required workers without calling it the WISN Ratio. The WHO WISN method suggests that a time motion study can be used to complement the WISN method to see how closely the WISN activity standards compare to actual time it takes to deliver these services, but the time motion study is not a WISN method. This time motion study also does not indicate what components of a service were considered standard (e.g. what is included in the standard for an ANC visit -- history, blood pressure, weight, etc. ) and were these services observed. With integration where could the economies of scale be appreciated because of similar activities needed to be performed for both services (e.g. blood pressure only needed to be done once).

2) Major Compulsory Revisions: The methods section does not clearly state how the integration of services is being tested by this study. It is not possible to tell which services were being integrated and how they were going to be measured. Were there different combinations of services integrated that were being tested to see which yields the best results? In the results section it was difficult to follow what the before and end-result differences were for different types of integration. I would suggest making the methods section clear about the starting point and what services were being integrated and how you were going to measure the results of this integration effort.

3) Minor Essential Revisions: Integration means many things in the literature today. The authors need to define how integration in being used in this study.

4) Minor Essential Revisions: It appears that the observations were done at the end of the study and that there was not a before and after observation. If my understanding is correct, the authors should clarify why the observations were only done at the end of the study without a baseline. Additionally, Table 2 on observations needs to be labeled as to when the observations were performed. It appears from these observations in Table 2 that none of the services observed were integrated.

Discretionary Revisions: The text does not clearly indicate the definition of the less integrated and more integrated facilities. I think if the methods section is clarified this section on less and more integrated will be more meaningful.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

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