

Reviewer's report

Title: A process evaluation of user fees abolition for pregnant women and children under five years in two districts in Niger (West Africa)

Version: 3 **Date:** 30 April 2009

Reviewer: Juliet Nabyonga Orem

Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is much improved and ready for publication. I however insist that more clarity be provided in a few areas which am sure authors can address:

Minor essential revisions:

- Please explain the reimbursement for avacuation/referral clearly. authors should clearly state the evacuation/referral that HELP provided for. On page 8 in the second para., authors say that services are free in regional and national referral hospitals for referred children and pregnant women, are services free as government policy or free because they are reimbursed by the NGO?
- The last sentence of the same para 8. says that the NGO reimbursed costs for referrals of children and pregnant women carried out by the district ambulance. Did the NGO only reimburse transport costs for referral? since the sentence before says services are free for referred children and pregnant women?
- First para on page 19 says that if children and women are evacuated or go on their own to higher levels in teh pyramid, they have to pay.

Authours should reconcile these issues please.

Page 24, the citation above in bracket is retained but I can't see where this citation is, is it the quote? I think it can be deleted without losing the message.

Page 28: Perhaps the Nigerien context in particular? why do you put a question mark at the end?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare I have no competing interests