Reviewer’s report

Title: Effect of a Postpartum Family Planning Intervention on Postpartum Intrauterine Device Counseling and Choice: Evidence from a Cluster-Randomized Trial in Tanzania

Version: 0 Date: 02 Dec 2019

Reviewer: Rebecca Callahan

Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written manuscript describing an important intervention and evaluation. My main question for the authors relates to the description of the primary analysis as a difference in difference analysis when it appears that it is simply a comparison of pre vs post intervention or control vs. intervention. The paper could also be strengthened with a bit more context about the intervention in the introduction.

Abstract
The second sentence is very long and somewhat hard to follow. The results presented appear to be a difference between pre and post intervention rather than difference in difference between two groups receiving an intervention.

Introduction
Page 3 Line 28: Are you referring to LMICs only or globally? It would help to provide more context for the intervention. Why was this implemented in Tanzania? What was the origin?

Methods
Page 4 Line 21: More description is needed of the Groups: why the early intervention implementation and late intervention implementation? Why were the two Groups defined as they were, i.e., 3 months and 9 months of baseline data collection? What was the rationale? What was the original goal in comparing these two Groups? Since the intervention data for Group 2 are not presented, why include them in this analysis? Why not just compare pre and post intervention in Group 1? Should add mention of IRB approval(s) Page 4 Line 45: How is the analysis difference in difference? Seems like it is just difference between pre and post intervention; treatment vs. control. How this is a difference in difference analysis needs to explained more clearly.

Page 5 Line 23: Who were the RAs? Were they trained?
Page 5 Line 50: Main reasons for ineligibility?
Page 5 Line 54: Main reasons for missing outcomes/covariates?
Page 6 Line 7: As above, how is it difference in difference if you are just comparing intervention exposed to not exposed?
Page 6 Line 35: What are the "measured aspects of quality in counseling"?

Results
Why not just show percentages in Tables 1 & 2? Table 3: Are these percentages or do they need to be multiplied by 100? I would suggest showing percentages in all tables.
What is the difference between Other Christian and Protestant?

Page 7 Line 53: Again, how is this difference in difference? Seems it is just the effect of the intervention compared to no intervention. Please clarify.

Discussion

Page 9 Line 41: Why argue against post-admission counseling when your results show that this increased uptake significantly. The literature is murky on how effective antenatal FP counseling is on PPFP uptake. This may be of interest: https://www.fphighimpactpractices.org/briefs/immediate-postpartum-family-planning/

Page 9 Line 46: Need to define quality of counseling earlier.

Page 9 Line 52: Why is provision of a leaflet "emblematic of a provider who has a strong commitment to high quality counseling"?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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