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Reviewer's report:

General
This is an interesting paper and addresses a topic that could be developed further. My main concern with the paper is the way that it is written up – whilst interesting, the methods section is confusing as it not only gives the methods of the evaluation of the project re the outcomes, but gives the results of different activities on the way i.e. the process. It would work better if the methods section was rewritten and it was really clear how you did the evaluation. If this were done, then I think that it would be a useful contribution to the literature.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. The title needs to be changed to reflect the fact that the area of study is reproductive health
2. You need to rewrite the methods section so that it is clearer – reduce the section on the districts and also on the intervention making it more concise as to what was actually done, and not mixing method and results. You also need to clarify exactly what was done for the outcome evaluation – was a semi-structured interview guide or a semi-structured self-administered survey? You also did some interviews – did you have semi-structured interview guides for these – how were the participants selected etc etc. I.e. Make the method section clearer and more robust. If there is an appropriate reporting tool to use such as the COREQ guidelines that would be helpful depending on the actual method used.
3. You need to utilise the data more in the results section and make it clearer including some of the quotes from the interviews.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
4. You need to look at the referencing – usually the numbers are the references as they appear in order but you jump from reference 1 to reference 5 in the text – so you need to renumber these.
5. There are several typing/grammatical errors throughout the text that need to be corrected.
6. Please discuss re ethical approval.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which
the author can choose to ignore)
None

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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