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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Not clearly

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   No.
   It is not clear how data was collected, which is the main problem with this paper.

3. Are the data sound?
   No.
   On page 5, last paragraph, the author write that the facilities from which subjects have been collected perform about 2400 abortions annually. The number of facilities is not declared.
   Women were recruited Between January 2008 and December 2010, ie for two years, which should account for 4800 eligible women.
   Under Participants 37,5 % of “eligible” women are said to agreed, which should result in 1880 included. However only 956 women were called, which is 20%.
   With such a low representation alls further calculations seem without meaning.
   Complicated multivariate analyses make no sense.
   This should strongly be stressed by the authors.
   If there is any possibility for the authors to compare their study population with drop outs or at least any other study with similar populations it could help a little bit.
   To me the Participant characteristics seems very uneven which strengthens the impression of lack of representativity.
   However the data are interesting and should be published, but with a high degree of caution as regards conclusions regarding any general abortion seeking population.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   No. the Method for data collection is described in Introduction, (p4 , last paragraph an so forth) and Results were reported under Methods: Participants.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   NO, See above

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   No, not at all

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes, as far as I can see, but my mother tongue is not English.

Recommendation:
- Major Compulsory Revisions

Best Regards
Lotti Helström
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**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.