

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Medium and longterm adherence to postabortion contraception among women having experienced unsafe induced abortion in Dar es Salaam

**Version: 2 Date:** 17 May 2008

**Reviewer:** Amy Tsui

### **Reviewer's report:**

I have read the authors response to the 3 reviewers and paid more attention to their response to my comments. The revised manuscript is tighter.

They have, for the most part, responded in a responsible manner. For me, the main issues were selectivity bias given the high loss to follow-up of young PAC clients (in a context where abortion is not legal except to save the mother's life) and the ethical procedures followed to protect the identity of PAC clients when seen at the home.

I am impressed that each client was seen exactly in the 12th month of follow up. This is a logistical feat for fieldwork. I also think they could have applied survival analysis to their data and do not accept the statistical sophistication of the method as being inappropriate. However, I leave this up to the editors' final decision.

Where they have not responded explicitly is the adequacy of statistical power for their hypothesis testing. But it would appear that, with the exception of condom use, the significance levels in Tables 2 and 3 imply adequate statistical power.

There are grammatical errors now in the revision, in the newly added narrative. Somehow one has the impression this revision (and the original manuscript) was done hastily. Hopefully BMC will edit for typographical errors and syntax.

The balance of the changes against the reviewer comments weigh in favor of a much improved manuscript.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

No competing interests.