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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for these revisions which have substantially strengthened the article. My two final recommendations are as follows:

1. In order for readers to be able to assess the degree to which findings are statistically significant (i.e., not just above or below p=0.05, but at a more granular level), I feel that it is important to always provide p-values in tables. I strongly recommend the authors add p-values to tables so that readers have a sense of not only whether the finding had a p-value above or below 0.05, but WHAT the p-value was.

2. In the conclusions paragraph of the abstract, it is important to be clear that without a control group concluding that the program caused the increase in use is not founded. I recommend changing "Supply-side interventions have increased the number of new family planning acceptors" to "supply-side interventions are associated with an increase in the number...”

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article.
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