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Reviewer's report:

Study protocol for a RCT on effects of distribution of disposable sanitary pads, and reproductive health education, separately and/or combined.

In relation to the quality of the RCT design a statistician should provide comments on the quality and potential shortcomings of the RCT design. The instrument used to collect data seems to collect a lot of additional interesting information that is not mentioned in the article.

Cost-effectiveness analysis is mentioned in the paper but no methodology for it is described.

Rigorous evaluation of programmes is very important in order to improve programming and avert unintended effects and it is good to see efforts to that effect. It would maybe be useful to present the findings together with more qualitative data looking at programme implementation and acceptability to the beneficiaries?

The results of the study are going to inform further programming and health policy. Will this mean that in case no statistically significant effects can be found, girls no longer are entitled to receive comprehensive reproductive health education and/or denied access to affordable sanitary pads?
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