Reviewer’s report

Title: Successful Programmatic Approaches to Facilitating IUD Uptake: CARE's Experience in DRC

Version: 0 Date: 30 Oct 2018

Reviewer: Gretchen S Stuart

Reviewer's report:

MANUSCRIPT NUMBER: 18-00467
TITLE: Successful Programmatic Approaches to Facilitating IUD Uptake: CARE's Experience in DRC

Overall: This is an original research report summary reviewing this history, the unmet need and the qualitative data of uptaking IUDs in DRC. The paper is very long with some sections misplaced. The objectives of the paper should be more clearly articulated and the methods and results should then clearly match the objectives.

A statement in the introduction and in the discussion should be made about how specifically THIS manuscript will fit into the literature. There are lots of published manuscripts that address and find the same findings as this paper.

1. Lines 89 - 112: The background information of the DRC is too long and should be shortened by about 50%. Some examples of where things can be shortened are provided below.
2. Lines 101-105: This belongs in the methods.
3. Lines 105-112 seem to be part of the conclusion. The introduction should focus on the problem, the gaps in the literature, and the goals/hypothesis of the research conducted as planned a priori.
4. Lines 130-136: This section should also be in the discussion.

Lines 140-176 are informative but do not fit in the methods. They may be more valuable in the discussion when discussing or comparing the results of your study with existing practices and existing literature.

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.

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

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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