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Reviewer's report:

This is a clear and concise study, that adds to our understanding of how abortion policy is playing out in Ethiopia. It is well written, makes conclusions appropriate to its scope and has a clear methodological framework.

Before publication, however, the below points should be addressed. Some of these are fairly minor, related to words and phrasing, others require some reframing of the text:

pg 5 - countries with other faith traditions (notably India, predominantly Hindu) also see key controversies around abortion.

pg 5 - 'African leaders agreed', not 'African leaders have agreed'

pg 6 - 'revised guideline' should read 'revised guidelines'

pg 7 - organisation spelt incorrectly

pg 7 - mention is made of a study 'with many similarities to ours' - what are they? This needs more explanation.

pg 8 - 'highlighted experienced dilemmas' - I am unsure what is meant here, I think this needs to be rephrased

Methods - this section doesn't say what the total number of interviewees was? I can infer that it was 30, but these needs to be stated somewhere in this section.

pg 11 - you say that 'more than half of participants hesitated, finding it difficult to answer while others were quite clear on what their views were' - this seems to be giving a motivation to interviewees' hesitation but with no evidence that this was the case? I think this should be removed, or clearer evidence added. What evidence, if any, do you have that they found it 'difficult' to answer?

pg 16 - you say that 'not all the participants have given the issue that much thought' - but the interview data seems to suggest differently?

pg 18 - 'genuine difference' - unclear what you mean by this?

pg 18 - sentence that starts 'It might be..' - this seems to undercut your method as presented above - perhaps say that in future research, the questions should be framed differently?
pg 18 - 'introduced into the reasoning' - I think this could be reworded as it is unclear

limitations section - part of this detail might be added to the methods section to explain the wording of questions etc. I think it would fit more clearly there.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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