

Reviewer's report

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

Version: 1 **Date:** 7 January 2008

Reviewer: Johanne Sundby

Reviewer's report:

The paper deals with a very important topic, namely the content and application of post abortion care, especially family planning. It is a bit too long. I feel that the general introduction around maternal mortality and unsafe abortion may be shortened considerably, these are now generally known policy facts. Go directly to the topic of this paper, namely the third paragraph, which is very good and focused. But do - maybe - add a few references to empirical work on postabortion care, that is: where are we now...?

The methodology part is ok. This paper focuses a lot on the qualitative responses. Thus, I feel that too much space has been devoted to the quantitative methodology.

Don't use "on safari" (page 4). It is swahili and means "were travelling".....

One essential thing to discuss is that the setting for assessing follow up here is not a real clinical one, but a research setting. It is very problematic for a real situation to follow women as closely as every 3 months, and not even advisable for a hospital to counsel on this approach to family planning access. The real life problem of access to family planning services of good quality at the primary care level is important. Do discuss this dilemma, as it is not clear to me why women who have had an abortion should or need to come back so often.

The methodology, especially analytic methodology, for the qualitative part seems underdeveloped compared to the quantitative part. It should not only be quotes, but a method for sorting out themes/topics etc. Grounded theory? or other theory?

The qualitative results section is long, and could benefit from either a shortening/focusing/ or more sub-headings identifying important themes.

The discussion is the weakest part of the paper. It should pick up major challenges to family planning/Contraceptive use after abortion, and point to service delivery and social constraints, first. Then the study limitations, methods a discussion, that may have to be short. I would strengthen this paper with an attempt to recommendations (from the findings) instead of conclusions, as I find this paper very policy and program relevant. I also feel that some of the results/findings (page 10) are repeated in the discussion rather than analyzed in the context of other papers and other research findings. Is post abortion

contraceptive use different from general contraceptive use, or similar? if different, why?

and: page 9, bottom: you mean "high migration rate" ? not "imigration" rate (people are moving inside the country for the most???) ?

The tables seem adrquate.

Other than this, I feel the paper is interesting and relevant.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.