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Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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This paper has the potential as it deals with the one of the recent models of CCT - two stage payment. The paper in the current form is not publishable - it reads like a report. I suggest the following.

1. Background.. current form fine. But some of the biggest CCT programmes such as Indian JSY is not mentioned in the background.

2. After background - describe the SURE P Programme in FULL including the desk review. This will give the reader how the programme works. This must be very comprehensive review.

3. Then... Methods (without desk review)

Methods section is very weak.. needs to strengthen substantially. SWOT analysis is not discussed adequately - what it is, why is being done? etc. It is not clear how 30-33 women are selected?

4. Results - most the graphs could be presented in a table.

I am happy to read it after a major version.
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