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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a nice job with the revisions. I just have a few minor points to consider:

1. In the abstract, what do you mean, "Currently induced abortion is a human rights dilemma"? I don't understand this statement. In general, the paper reads as though the authors do not believe that women should have the right to an abortion. Clearly the authors can have this opinion, but I would remove judgment from the paper to keep it scientific/factual. So, for example, I would start the abstract just stating that abortion is common.

2. The description is of how the sample was selected is still confusing. I do not understand the authors explanation of the random selection process. But if it was truly random (that is if each female student had an equal probability of being included in the sample), than the authors should just describe this as "simple random selection".

3. I would report all percentages and ORs to one decimal point, and include the 95% CIs around the prevalence of abortion estimate in the abstract.

4. It would help if you included the age range of preparatory school girls in the abstract, to put the prevalence in perspective. In the US, lifetime prevalence is around 25% for adult women. So 14% does not seem high, although maybe for young adolescents it is high.

5. The grammar needs to be reviewed/updated, line 9 rather than 'practices unsafe abortion' I would say 'experiences unsafe abortion'

6. In the first paragraph, to put these findings in scientific perspective, please include a statement about the VERY low rate of complications when abortions are performed by trained physicians. As previously mentioned, the background section, does not present a balanced view on the safety of abortion procedures. The complication rate for abortions is FAR lower than that of complications from birth/delivery.
7. In lines 29-32 page 3, are these illegal abortions or legal abortions done in a clinical setting? The authors need to accurately present the data which clearly distinguishes between high rates of complications from illegal abortions / those done by non-medically trained providers, and incredibly low complication rates when done by trained providers.

8. On page 4 lines 14-22, what is missing is what the complication rate is for the 100,000 in the facility vs. the 200,000 not done by a trained provider.

9. Page 7, I still do not understand what the authors mean by the knowledge question on 'when life begins'? What do you mean by this? As previously mentioned, whether a zygote is considered a human being (i.e. having begun life) is a religious/ethical question, not a scientific/knowledge question. I would remove this knowledge question from the analysis and table as people who understand biology can answer the question in different ways (there is not a clear right or wrong response).

10. Page 8 lines 3-5, the authors say that the abortion rates were 'disturbingly high' - they should only present the data/facts and not place their own judgment/value on these data facts. Please remove the word 'disturbingly'.

11. The paper would be greatly strengthened if it was reviewed/edited for English grammar and typos.

Nice paper! Hope these comments are helpful.
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