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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:-

A) Table 5 under male subjects
Subjects using permanent family planning methods in Model 2 clinic compared from the Baseline to the Endline trends showed and indicated its absolute difference as a declined trend (negative trend i.e -6). However, there are similar cases which sowed negative trends but not mentioned. Refer the same table under the variables of permanent for females which can be -5 rather than 5. The table as a whole should be again looked properly.

B) Reference parts – No consistency in referencing the journals
Example-Most of the journals like reference number 6, 9, 10,11 etc.. are not italicized while journals like reference number 19, 20 are italicized. Therefore, it would be wise to read the authors instruction of this journal.

Minor Essential Revisions

A) On result part- under maternal and reproductive health line 12 spelling error endlin add the letter e.

B) Table 1,2, and 5, presentation of data is not clear and it has some sort of ambiguity for the reader.
Example- in Table 1. Let as consider Model 1 clinic which is indicated by baseline to be (n=203); Endline (n=200) and absolute difference (%). When we see the result for the first case for example currently sick I understand you kept the n=83 under Base line and n=48 under Endline. You kept the difference as 35 which is percentage. I feel 83 and 48 are percents. If that is the case it would be good to write the actual number which is n and % in parentheses.

Model 1
Baseline Endline Absolute
n ( %) n(%) difference (%)
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