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Reviewer's report:

This study is of value to the scientific community and is of benefit in improving services for women. Authors need to continue work to improve the work to a publishable standard.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR

English grammar requires substantial improvement as many sentences are somewhat ambiguous and/or unclear. Examples include:

The current title is somewhat ambiguous ….. 'Improving knowledge and counseling coverage of post-partum family planning among female community health volunteers in Nepal: a mixed method study' Is the improvement of knowledge among the FCHV's or among the women they serve? A better title may be 'Improving post-partum family planning services provided by community health volunteers in Nepal: A mixed methods study'

A sentence within the abstract states that 'Female Community Health Volunteers (FCHVs) have improved community health needs in Nepal.' I don't think that FCHV's can improve health needs or that this is the correct terminology for what is intended. Rather FCHV's may 'address' health needs.

Another example is the overly brief sentence in line 606 which currently states 'However, role of CHWs specifically for PPFP remains scant'. This requires further explanation.

Many more grammatical issues exist within the manuscript to the extent that the reader is required to read sentences and statements several times in an attempt to decipher meaning. The manuscript would benefit from professional English editing.

KEY WORDS

It is recommended that these be drawn from the MESH Browser to better locate the work within library data bases. Authors are encouraged to search the MESH Browser for appropriate words https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search
RESEARCH METHODS and REPORTING GUIDELINES

The authors have addressed many of the issues from previous reviewers but gaps remain. To address these gaps it would be useful for the authors to access the relevant guidelines from the Equator Network http://www.equator-network.org/ complete the relevant reporting checklists for example the COREQ checklist for qualitative research http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/coreq/ and attach them with any future submission. A systematic approach of this nature would certainly help the authors ensure they have included what is required in reporting their research processes and outcomes.

On page 9 commencing line 147, authors state that 'The study comprised of three quantitative results which include FCHV's knowledge in the same group before and after the intervention, their counseling coverage in the communities of mothers in different stages of pregnancy, and their counseling coverage reflected in the hospitals among mothers who have given birth. The qualitative results include focus group discussions of FCHVs who had participated in the intervention.' The current use of English makes confuses the reader as to whether this statement relates to methods or results. If this is intended for the methods section, the authors could start the statement by indicating that 'the study utilized three quantitative and one qualitative technique.'

OVERALL COMMENT

This is a multi-intervention mixed method study with a significant degree of complexity. The intent of the various methods is to bring academic rigor to the inquiry, however, the authors are then challenged with the task of reporting the research in a coherent and streamlined manner. The study is an important one reporting useful information to influence practice. However, the current script is difficult to follow. Improvements could be made by systematically following relevant reporting guidelines and securing professional English editing services.

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.

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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