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Reviewer's report:

This qualitative study explores reasons for premature or early removal of implanon implants by some method acceptors in Arba Minch in south Ethiopia. The manuscript is generally well written. However, a few concerns require some attention.

Methodology
1. Please, within what time period is being referred as "recently had implanon removal"?
2. How were the women identified and contacted?
3. Please, for clarity, a brief description of what is done (process) will be cherished by readers. Normally, purposive sampling is based on some reasoning; what made the researchers select two particular kebeles out of eleven? Similarly, how were the households and women selected?
4. Some reconciliation of the two the descriptions of the total number of women interviewed is required; "selected 2 kebeles and five women from each" and "sample size was determined based on the concept of saturation"

Results:
5. It is more informative when range is stated with median or the minimum and maximum is just stated
6. Were there further explorations on what respondents meant by "heavy menses" and "sick looking"?

Syntax:
7. Page 3, lines 48/49 : "use of long-acting" instead of "long-acting reversible"
"HEWs" used several times without writing it in full, the first time it was used in main text on Page 5 lines 48/49;
8. Conclusion could more concise by avoiding some repetition

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

No

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

Yes

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

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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