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Reviewer’s report:

An interesting study on an important topic, however I have some concerns about the methodology for the statistical analysis. Please find my comments by section below.

Background:

Last sentence of paragraph 1 requires a reference.

Methods - Quantitative data analysis:

There is clustering in the data, i.e. clients are clustered within clinics. There are a number of clinic-level factors that are likely to influence client-level responses and outcomes. The hierarchical nature of the data should be taken into account in the logistic regression analysis to produce valid estimates of standard error and confidence intervals.

Results:

Please provide the total number of clients who completed the interview pre-intervention and post-intervention. Similarly, the total n pre- and post-intervention who completed the follow-up telephone interview would also be useful. Either in text or table 2.

What % of clients had a medical, < 12 weeks surgical, > 12 week surgical abortions? Would this effect the uptake/provision of PAFP from a client or practitioner perspective? For example, if a follow up appointment is required after medical CAC, does this provide an extra opportunity to counsel on PAFP?

"Uptake of PAFP" section - results at lines 201-204 (second and third sentences) do not match up with results provided in tables 3 and 4

Table 3 - 3rd column labelled "aOR and 95% CI" should be labelled cOR for crude results.
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