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Reviewer's report:

1- The title: the concept of acceptability do not reflect exactly the content of this manuscript.

2- The abstract: Remove reference from the abstract (second line in methods paragraph of the abstract)

3- The background: The subject is contextually relevant, and this paper can make important contribution to policy against unsafe abortion in the specified context and beyond.

4- Methods:

4-1) This manuscript needs a conceptual framework and operational definition of acceptability in the methods. Researchers address briefly this issue in the discussion, and they did well to acknowledge the complexity of this concept of acceptability and the psychological dimension related to it. In the current state of this manuscript, this limitation is insufficiently addressed. Researchers can describe in the methods, conceptual clarification and choices they made to guide the understanding of the whole manuscript.

4_2) Researchers used the concept of acceptability interchangeably with the one of satisfaction.

The MeSH provides the following definition for patient Satisfaction: The degree to which the individual regards the health care service or product or the manner in which it is delivered by the provider as useful, effective, or beneficial.

Is this concept identical to acceptability?

4-2) can the research team describe the tool used to measure "acceptability"? Is it a single question on acceptability or a composite score that takes into account the acceptability of different dimensions of the service provision in both groups? Moreover, health providers have administrated the acceptability form to patient within the facility. How do researchers appraise the effect this arrangement can have on the capacity of patient to express dissatisfaction or negative feedbacks?
4-2) Researchers reported in the manuscript that they established separate waiting areas for the two groups to ensure independency: is this enough to ensure independency?

Indeed, patients are aware that the procedure has been performed within a research project that is supervised overall by medical experts. How do this affect the independency of the two groups? Can we reject the possibility that women in the ANM group felt in a safe condition within this research and globally supervised setting and thus reported a high proportion of satisfaction?

4-3) what are the mean ages of providers in both groups?

4-4) Why do some patients were not considered for the acceptability form?
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