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Reviewer's report:

Overall:
* The paper was written in good English and nice to read. But, there are some important points that need clarification.

Abstract:
* Was the objective of the study "to undertake a systematic review" or 'to identify bottleneck in service delivery for …'?

Research Design:
* Under the 'Methods' section, the researchers should clearly describe the research design used. Did they use mixed method? What was the data source? I guess secondary data and focus group (FGD) data. How the FGD (qualitative) was analyzed? What method was used to weave together these different data sources?

Ethical consideration:
* The researchers should inform the reader about the ethical considerations. Was the research project approved by an IRB? Were the study participants consented?

Result section:
* Page 19, second paragraph: What do the researchers mean by May Measurement Month? The needs description.

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Unable to assess

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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