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**Background**

lines 75-77 - please provide a reference for the statement

In the background "quality management" has not been defined, nor is there any discussion of the literature on the use of this approach in the post-abortion care setting to provide the rationale for this study. This should be discussed briefly.

The term "end-line" is potentially confusing. Consider changing to "post-intervention" or "after the intervention" throughout the paper.

**Methods & analysis**

Please include references to back up the figures (e.g. baseline) used in the sample size calculation

Why were condoms excluded from the outcome? Are they a popular form of contraception in this setting?

How were the nine providers recruited for the interview? What are their characteristics?

The data should be re-analysed to account for potential clustering within health services.

What confounding factors were considered?

Were data for the three services that dropped out completely removed from the paper?

There is no information presented about the characteristics of clinics or their clients? Were they similar across the nine sites?

**Discussion**

Please comment on the finding that women were less likely to obtain a method within 14 days of the abortion after the intervention - why might this be so?
The discussion is fairly superficial. There is no discussion of the recommendations for practice and for research arising from this study. There is also limited discussion of how this study relates to other quality management interventions in sexual health. Perhaps the intervention strategies were not comprehensive enough?

The biggest limitation is the study design - namely the lack of randomisation of clinics to the intervention. Please discuss this including the implications of this in terms of bias and confounding. The big loss to follow up at the 2 week interview is also a major concern - this should be discussed further, including what steps were taken to try and improve rates of follow up.

Tables

Table 1 - while reporting on differences in those lost to follow up, Table 1 should describe the characteristics of two comparison groups, namely, those in the baseline and end line groups, to provide the reader with data on how similar these groups were.

I couldn't see how Table 4 is relevant as it seems to combine the baseline and endline groups and simply make comparisons between the different strata within each characteristic.
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