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Reviewer's report:

Finding ways to increase use of reproductive health services is an important area of health promotion for youth. The purpose of the article is clearly directed at looking at studies which have examined the roles of generating demand for service use and creating community support for use, though why the authors chose to review work only from developing countries is not stated. The article is well phrased but not particularly well organized.

Suggestions for major revision:

There is variation in the detail with which individual studies in each section are described in terms of the nature of interventions, outcomes and study limitations, though it is clear that not a lot of detail can be included in a paper of this nature and the supplementary table did provide this in a very nicely laid out format. The size of studies is consistently absent in the text; it would be good to include these where the studies are felt to be particularly informative.

The Discussion summarizes the findings of the review and attempts to draw conclusions, but is disorganized and hard to follow, and there are omissions of detail. For example, where interventions were felt to be particularly effective, such as the reference to the Nigerian study, more detail (such as indicating that this was an RCT) would have been helpful in the summary. Statements such as the one about programs reaching out of school youth beginning with “There is evidence to suggest.....” in the third paragraph of page 15 are not supported by discussion of a particular study or even a reference number. This is also true of the discussion of life skills approaches, media and multi-component strategies on page 16. Reference 43 at the bottom of page 15 which suggests promise for using peer educators is not discussed in the section on Peer Education and Counselling on page 9, where it is stated that no studies of such interventions were found. This failure to link back to the studies reviewed so as to justify conclusions also is seen in the discussion of the role community support on pages 16 and 17. The Discussion is the place to tie the findings together in a coherent way, and this is not accomplished well. Stronger and more clearly stated links to the studies which provide support for the conclusions drawn are called for.

The authors recognize the weakness of the evidence base and call for more and better research. They also state on page 18 that a research agenda has been
outlined, but a clear approach to what needs to be done was not evident in the manuscript.

Minor revision:

The selection criteria for papers to be reviewed are clear, but the MS would be improved by adding some of the major points related to this in the text as descriptors of Table 1.
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