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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have done an impressive job and the article is of good quality. The authors have been able to reach a large number of health providers with their study, making the findings somewhat generalizable across the country. It is also a very important study regarding the recent policy changes with regards to abortion care. I believe however the authors have emphasized on some of the findings which are not the most relevant. In the abstract, and focus on the discussion the authors mention that providers have insufficient knowledge of the complications of unsafe abortion, while I think the figures show the majority of the respondents adequately identify the main complications that can have major consequences. However, when you look at the table I think emphasize of the conclusion should be the lack of knowledge on what to do if complications are identified, or basic physical examination. For example only half of the providers identify the need for assessing vital signs, or performing a vaginal examination, which is probably basic care provision. Additionally, the lack of knowledge on the need to perform an MVA as main treatment option in case of unsafe/incomplete abortion is pertinent and deserves more attention. There are several studies on the lack of MVA use in low resource settings. So perhaps the authors can give some more emphasis on these findings of the study. The way the article is written now, these aspects get less attention. Furthermore there are some minor spelling and writing errors which should be edited. Page 14 line 35 'provide' should be 'providers'. Page 6 line 57 needs rephrasing. For example ' Respondents who attended most deliveries prior to the interviews were midwives...'.

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.

Yes
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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