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Reviewer's report:

The article touches upon an important topic, and a highlighted need to strengthen the evidence around MHM impacts as well as key elements. The use of 'hardware' and 'software' are a bit jarring as terms given we are talking about girls' bodies in terms of MHM supplies, and you may want to reconsider this use.

In general, I found the article a description of the Nia Project to set up an evaluation that has yet to come. Without the evaluation results, it is unclear how the article will advance the field. It would be recommended to restructure the article to be a review of current evidence and practices, highlighting the Nia project, exploring if the Govt of Kenya's alternate programme was evaluated or has yielded results - than to title this as the results of evaluation when even the methodology section is set in the future "the analysis will do XX, it will highlight XX".

The topic is so important, and the paper very well written - it is just difficult to understand what we are to get out of a paragraph long discussion that sets up a planned evaluation, and no conclusions. For this reason, I have put it as 'minor revisions'.
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