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Reviewer's report:

First of all I would like to congratulate the authors for putting up the case of Myanmar coz of the long going conflicts in this country and poor health indicators.

Following are some minor to major observations which MUST be addressed before considering to publish this anticipated piece of the evidence:

Title: You have put private sector but I do not see any private sector other than PSI/SUN social franchise. So either to delete private sector and the make the case for PSI only or you may need to expand private sector information everywhere.

Intro: Same as above. I would like to see more information about the private sector, its definition, what are the other sources of private sector, share of public and private sector of services, share of govt expenditure on FP and OOP expenditure on health and FP. You need to have some comparison of FP data some similar or neighboring countries in order to make your case stronger. Right now it seems you are just putting up PSI/Sun case. Refer to last DHS of Myanmar and add some important data on FP if available such as fertility preferences; knowledge of FP, FP use by wealth quin-tiles, unmet need etc

Methods: Why have you took 24 out of 95 township, please add detailed rationale? There are total 14 regions/districts and total 63 districts and 324 townships in the country so why not all 324 township or a representative sample of the total township? This piece of very imp info is completely missing. Second, how do you describe quality? Third, What sort of training were given to to SUN SF providers and how were they differ from public sector provider? The rationale seems weak so add a stronger rationale of the intervention
Intervention: Also describe the SUN SF intervention in detail either in the main body or as annex so the reader must know how do you contributed to this change in FP use in such difficult environment.

Results: A comprehensive section.

Discussion and conclusion: Under reported. The results shows that public sector is still the largest provider of FP almost 60% versus the 40% of private sector (although your sample had only PSI/SUN providers so how you can say private sector? Need to improve discussion section by putting concrete discussion coz in discussion you are attributing the increase in FO service to SUN SF providers not to private sector and private sector has multiple different sources of providers.

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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