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Reviewer’s report:

The URHI is a significant family planning initiative and the finding that program effort (dose) made a difference to outcomes across three countries that participated in it is important. With that said, this paper leaves me wanting more explanation about implementation of URHI and also guidance on how to interpret the findings. There must be more to say than do a bunch of things and the number of new users will go up. Also, it would be important to say why control sites were not included in the MLE design.

Page 1: The authors cite Bruce 1990 for what is needed to increase contraceptive use. Bruce is about quality of care and was written 27 years ago. I was surprised not to see any reference to rights in the paper - FP2020 talks about women's and girls' rights to family planning and work on rights-based approaches to family planning have progressed since 2012. Quality and access are part of rights but are not synonymous with rights. I realize it has come out since this paper was written but the authors might want to check out Anrudh Jain's update of the Bruce Framework (http://www.popcouncil.org/uploads/pdfs/2017RH_QoCRightsBasedFP.pdf). It would be good to say that while there increasing attention to rights-based family planning, URHI was designed to improve access to quality family planning services. The discussion (page 9) also says that improving access and quality - linked with demand is what is needed in FP2020 countries. What about other components of rights-based family planning?

On page 2 there needs to be a better transition between the introductory material on the evidence for access and quality of care and the URHI project. What about saying that the purpose of the paper is to use evidence on access and quality from three countries that participated in the URHI and then describe the initiative.

The authors seem to use access and availability interchangeably - please clarify.

Page 5: The authors note that the interventions in the three countries varied - but just seeing the list of the components for each country on page 5 seems like apples and oranges and does not give the reader any sense of what the components entailed - and if they can be compared across the countries. Could the authors give any additional information about the components and the comparability across countries.

For example, training of providers - was the content similar across the countries? How does whole site training differ from 'any interviewed provider received training from URHI at any time.' The components of contraceptive supply management also differed - in Kenya it was
redistribution of methods between facilities, in Nigeria it was no stock-outs in the last month (which is an outcome rather than an intervention) and in Senegal it was the push model - can those be compared? With these differences across countries, it is not clear how to interpret the findings across countries. Was it the combination of components that made the difference? Was URHI better implemented in certain countries? The starting point for family planning programming was different in the three countries - Kenya is far ahead of Nigeria and Senegal - how did that affect the results, if at all?

Page 6: the loss of observations was high - around 40 percent in each country. Did the authors do any analysis of the facilities that were lost compared to those included in the analysis?

Page 6: The sentence: "We used a matched sample of facilities for which data were available for independent and dependent variables for both time periods" is not clear. Does that just mean that facilities for which data were available for both baseline and endline were included?

Page 6: I don't understand the use of the term "Participation in non-URHI program components…” Why non-URHI?
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