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Reviewer’s report:

Major comments

None.

Minor comments

1. Could the authors offer more background information on URHI program and intervention? It is not clear from the Methods section how URHI programs are different in public and private facilities. Are they offered in both public and private sector? If the URHI programs are separate from public and private sectors, did the authors control for them?

2. I wouldn't call the facility sample "matched sample". They sounded like panel sample.

3. It would be good to compare facilities included and excluded from the analysis and discuss how the roughly 40% missing data may affect the results.

4. I am not sure if dividing the number of new or total FP clients by the number of RH staff would control for facility size. What changes in the number of clients were faster or slower, and it was dependent on facility size?

5. It was not clear whether the authors only included facilities that had data at both points, and the number of such facilities was not included in Table 1 as stated. Table 1 only presented the number of facilities at baseline and at endline.

6. I did not find Table 3 particularly helpful.

7. Could the authors show the distribution and the range of the program scores, and explain what a 1-point increase mean?

8. Related to the previous comment, could the authors expand on the program implications? They suggested a combination of supply-side approaches. Could they be more specific? What would be the most effective combination, as shown from the results?
9. In the discussion, the authors were a bit vague when suggesting that "future surveys might reduce this problem by investing in interviewer training for these types of questions." What are these types of questions and what kind of training may it be?

10. Table 1: the distribution of provider received training with the Systematic Identification of Client Needs tool at baseline should be 0% instead of 100%.
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