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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The question is relevant but I think authors should explain it better.

Background should be reviewed in order to address the following information:

The Ethiopia law on abortion; when a woman can ask for abortion?

How abortion is performed in this case? Medical abortion is a new method but what about MVA? And also improve background by adding information about acceptability and how important it is.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

I suggest the authors improve the description of data collection and also the procedures - not clinical, but as field work - for each abortion method. If I understood, women who opted for medical abortion had 3 visits: first when they had mifepristone, 48 hours later when they had vaginal misoprostol, and a follow up visit after 14 days. If this is true, women who had medical abortion had only one more visit than women from MVA group. Was it enough to influence in choosing one or other abortion method?

What kind of question had the questionnaires? Closed-ended, open-ended or both?

I also think that authors should make clear that they are considering as acceptability of medical and MVA abortion when women indicates it to a friend or when they say that would choose the method again.

It is not clear for me if the article presents data from the first interview or if they present data from the first and second together.

In my opinion authors should present a sample size as they are using logistic regression and che square and if possible a list of the variables analyzed.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

In my opinion data are sound and well, but authors should improve the method section
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Authors show that women from both groups are similar. Are they similar because they search for abortion at the same place (do they live at the same neighborhood?)

I did not understand how women who opted for MVA had as place of abortion home. Authors should discuss this result.

Even education level was not significant I think authors should present it and discuss it.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Authors repeat a lot of the results in this section. I think they should discuss their data according to other studies findings.

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

In my opinion the title is not adequate so I suggest something like: Client preferences and acceptability for medical abortion and MVA as early pregnancy termination method in Northwest Ethiopia or

Client preferences and acceptability for medical abortion and MVA in Northwest Ethiopia

7. Is the writing acceptable?

I am not an expert in English so I am not able to judge the writing grammar. But I think authors should improve background section providing readers with more information on the local context. I think this is important for the reader to know better what the results means.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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