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Reviewer's report:

Behaviour change techniques and contraceptive use in low and middle income countries: a review

This paper aims to identify effective behavior change techniques to increase modern contraceptive use in low and middle income countries.

General comments

The subject is of great importance and timely. Though the intention of the authors to add a piece of evidence on the issue there are few important points need to be clarified and amended.

The reasoning and approach is weak as I felt that a great miss is there is we are to title a paper on Behaviour change techniques (BCTs) while this was not used as a key term in the search. The attempts of the authors to dig in the RCTs are well respected but need to be reconsidered. Thus the overall conclusion might be correct, but it is hard to be reached based on the work done for the following reasons:

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. None of the study aimed to test specifically the BCTs
2. The criteria used though valid but the addition of the seventh criterion need to be justified enough (though important)
3. More details on the search strategy is needed
4. The effectiveness are not shown in the tables though it is the basis of the comparison between studies
5. The discussion need to improved
6. The limitations needs to be detailed as well
7. The focus on the CHWs in the last paragraph is not well justified
8. Recommendations for future practice are not well justified
9. It was not clear how the two reviewers reviewed the full texts. It seems that the review done by one author only while two reviewed abstracts.
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. In the summary, the issue with regards to CHWs is abrupt and not justified
2. Change the paragraph on the authors’ role to fit the text.

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

One of my publication and cited, but I declare no competing interests