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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this article. It was very interesting. I think the article makes a contribution to the literature, is generally well-written (although there are some grammatical errors which will need cleaning up) and the conclusions seem reasonable from the evidence. I do not have the methodological expertise to know whether there are any problems in the study design, but it seems to me to be a standard interview-based study. I think a more detailed analysis of those interview participants who took the position that supporting abortion was in keeping with their religion but that is probably a better topic for a different paper. So, that is merely a suggestion for future publications rather than a critical comment on this one.

The only minor point I would make is that it would probably be helpful to include a rough currency conversion when discussing the payment (to something like dollars, euros or Great British pounds). It is not required but would probably help an international audience who might not have a good idea the relative amount that was provided to the interview participants.

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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