Dear Reviewers,

Thank you very much considering our manuscript for possible publication in your HRH Journal. We would like to inform you that we have rephrased the title "Impact of an inbuilt monitoring system on family planning performance in rural Bangladesh". We have revised the manuscript according to your comments. Attached herewith the responses of your comments.

Revisions as per First Reviewer's comments:

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

The methods section in this article needs a lot of work and clarifications.
A) It is mentioned that both qualitative and quantitative methods were used, however the precise methods are not outlined and their choice not explained
Modification done on this section: Please see Page # 6.
B) How were the observations undertaken?
Modification: Please see Second Para of Page # 6 & 7.
C) It would be good to have a better understanding the reasoning behind the interviewing guidelines that underlay the surveys despite the fact that the authors mention that information on awareness of, accessibility to and use of, health and family planning services was collected from the MWRAs, there is no mention of the basis and background of the interviewing guidelines.
Modification: Please see Page # 7.
D) Mention is made of the meetings, however not on the logistical set up or the precise content
Modification: Please see Second Para of Page # 7
E) Very little information is given on the research staff and the field interviewers their backgrounds, training and incentives
Modification: Please see Second Para of Page # 6
F) Reasons behind choice of using female interviewers are not given (linked to my point on lack of context).
Modification: Please see Second Para of Page # 6
G) There is no information on the family welfare assistants or the villages
Modification: Please see Second Para of Page # 4 & footnote of Page # 6.

The discussion and conclusion need to move away from a merely descriptive summary of the results and really critically deal with the matter at hand. How does this study contribute to the overall debate on monitoring systems in family planning? How did the dynamics between frontline workers and managerial staff pan out and ultimately lead to improvements of the programme; this issue is mentioned but not explored fully, which leaves the reader with a slightly unsatisfied feeling by the end of the conclusion.
Modification: Please see Page # 10 -12.

Revisions as per second Reviewer's comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The rationale of the study should be stated at least by a single sentence.
   Please see last three lines of Page # 5.
2. The literature review is inadequate to compare findings of the study. Therefore the authors are to provide sufficient references.
   Modification: Please see Page # 3-5
3. Page-4: The authors must specify what exact data collection techniques were used and what are the
indicators.
Modification: Please see Page # 6 & 7.
4. Page-5: "The study employed 30 cluster survey method and 600 MWRAs were the sample"
a. Did the authors consider cluster effects in calculating sample size? If not, the reasons should be stated clearly.
Modification: Please see first Para of Page # 7.
b. The authors should clearly mention how the MWRAs were selected from the clusters for interview.
Modification: Please see last seven lines of Page # 6 & 7.
5. Context issues; in which contexts were questionnaires completed, qualitative data collected?
Modification: Please see second Para of Page # 7.
6. Sources of data were not mentioned in the methodology of the study.
Modification: Please see Page # 6 & 7.
7. Page-6-data analysis: Not a single word is written about analysis of qualitative data. The paper should contain the details of how qualitative data were analyzed.
Modification: Please see second Para of Page # 7.
8. The findings of the study contain very limited information about qualitative issues. Excerpts from qualitative data were not provided.
Modification: Please see second Para of Page # 7.
9. Page-7 and table3: The study was conducted in one sub-district and thus the findings are not representative of national level data. Therefore, the authors are suggested to compare the study findings with concerned Division instead of national level data.
Modification: Please see limitation of Page # 8.
10. The authors should have indicated the limitations of the study.
Modification: Please see limitation of Page # 8.
We have also revised few minor and discretionary revisions in this manuscript according to your comments.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Thanks with best regards.

Humayun Kabir