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Reviewer’s report:

This is potentially interesting article but the key points are lost because the message is not consistent. I think it requires greater clarity about what the central research questions and findings are. In the abstract for example the stated aims are to "better understand women's experiences and accurately measure the incidence and characteristics of informal sector abortions" The results in the abstract focus on the types of informal abortion and the sources of information. The conclusion is about the sampling method.

The results are too lengthy and some of the data should be only in tables and not described as well. I am not sure current contraceptive use is relevant.

In the discussion the factors motivating women to seek informal abortion are not well discussed and there is generally a lack of depth to the section. for example is the mistrust and fear of stigmatization of formal abortion services possibly related to the fact that many of the women were sex workers? The conclusion in the body of the manuscript is more aligned with what I believe are the important findings but this is very different to the abstract.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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