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Reviewer's report:

Despite the lack of a control group, the large sample and extensive sampling method of the study enable several conclusions to be drawn about contraceptive use and social franchise programs.

Overall, the text is wordy and should be reviewed again for proper grammar and syntax.

Abstract - The grammar for the Results section is incomplete. The conclusions are overstated based on your results (see comments that follow).

Background - This section is too long. Delete the 5th paragraph as it is repeated in the methods. Move some explanatory information to the discussion.

For the sentence that starts on line 53, provide a reference.

Methods - Further explain how the proportion to population size method dictates choosing 25 townships and 95 women in each township. Give a similar explanation for the second stage sampling.

Please explain why only married women were surveyed.

Page 7, lines 49-53. Delete these sentences as the information is explained previously in this section.

Table 2 - It is not necessary to repeat all the results in the text and the table. Consider cutting the text that repeats this information. Reorder the methods by order of frequency (most used to least used, followed by no method) to be most explanatory to the reader. Include the p values. It is not clear there is a difference between less than 10 and 10 or greater year programs.
The confidence intervals for model 4 cross 1 and therefore there is no association between number of RH providers and use of a modern method.

Table 4 - simplify this table by removing the single asterisk as p = 0.1 is not a typical level of significance.

Discussion - Although the results of the study show a positive association between the social franchise program and modern method use, this does not necessarily explain the contraceptive use increase from 2009. The first sentence of the discussion should not overstate this.

Page 10, lines 30-35 - the data did not explore increased acceptance and knowledge as reasons for the increased contraceptive uptake and so this conclusion cannot be drawn. These sentences should be deleted and only a hypothesis for such be stated.

Page 11, line 8 - This sentence is overstated. Model 2 did not have robust effect size and model 4 was not significant.

Lines 21-31 - delete this paragraph as it is not clear that private vs franchise is as important as private vs public clinic.

Lines 38-41 - delete this sentence.

Conclusions - again, the first sentence is overstated given your results and needs to be adjusted. The map can be omitted.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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