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Title: Effect of a postpartum family planning intervention on postpartum intrauterine device counseling and choice: evidence from a cluster randomized trial in Tanzania

This is a well designed and relevant study but has one major limitation as the authors correctly pointed out. There is a potential for better findings with wider generalisability, had it been implemented in lower facilities.

I have the following comments:

1. Under background, line 53, authors mentions that "the analysis focuses on the effect of the intervention on this newly added service, including effects on PPIUD counseling and women's choice of PPIUD (i.e having a PPIUD inserted) before being discharged from hospital after delivery. Under outcomes of interest authors mentioned that (line 39) "Choice of PPIUD was measured as a dichotomous variable based on both woman's report and the provider's report…..(line42) If either the woman or the provider reported PPIUD insertion, the woman was considered to have chosen the PPIUD" . It appears that the phrase "PPIUD choice" and "PPIUD insertion" are being used interchangeably and bring confusion . A woman can choose PPIUD but not go for insertion. In addition, regarding line 42, was there a procedure to verify a woman's report of PPIUD insertion in the provider's report/documents? If such procedure was not in place it would rather be better to strictly use "PPIUD choice" and do away with "PPIUD insertion" as it was used under your conclusions.

2. The implementers of the intervention have been mentioned as FIGO/AGOTA and their roles widely described. It would enlighten the reader to highlight whether data collection was also coordinated by FIGO/AGOTA or if there were any work related links with FIGO/AGOTA.

3. Figure 1 Study Flow chart. The flow of numbers in group 2 is not correct and might need your attention, (particularly for those who did not consent, n=648).

4. Under results, in page 7, line 29: authors refer to the trends in PPIUD choice…approximately 18% in Mbeya and 6% in Muhimbili, but when you turn to the figure it is less than 15% for Mbeya and less than 5% for Muhimbili. Again, as mentioned earlier, authors have used PPIUD choice in the text and PPIUD insertion as the title of the figure which is confusing.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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