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Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering our manuscript titled, “A Retrospective Cohort Study Investigating Individual and Community Determinants of Facility Delivery in Rufiji, Tanzania”.

We have taken your comments into consideration and attach our responses:

#1 "The outcome variable is measured as a dichotomous indicator taking a value of 1 if the mother delivered in a facility and 0 if she delivered at home." I don't think it matters when the indicator takes the value 1 or 0, as long as the resulting odds ratio is interpreted appropriately. Please consider rewording, e.g.: "The dichotomous outcome variable compares delivery in a facility with delivery at home." - Amended

*2 Methods: Please provide more detail on the statistics you have produced. As far as I can see you have computed proportions, expressed the strength of association between variables as odds ratios, have chosen a 95% confidence level when computing confidence intervals. All this should be mentioned, and whatever other statistics you have produced. Amended

#3 Section "Model specification". "Multilevel logistic regression was estimated to quantify the influence of hypothesized social network and community factors". I believe regression produces estimates, but is not estimated itself. Consider using the following formulation: "Multilevel logistic regression was used to estimate the influence of hypothesized social network and community factors" - Amended

*4 Section "Model specification". Please explain the different levels of the "multilevel logistic regression" strategy you followed. Amended

*5 Section "Model specification". "adjusting for known confounders identified in the literature". Please list the confounders. If they are too many, give examples. Amended

*6 Section "Model specification", tables. Please specify in the methods section which statistical test you have used to produce the p-values reported in the tables. Amended

*7 Results "...however this relationship is barely significant (95% CI: 0-52%)". What is this a confidence level for? – Amended. This confidence interval is for the community’s average years of schooling amongst females

*8 Tables: the tables must be understandable without obliging the reader to look for explanations in the text. Therefore characterise the various models either in the captions or in footnotes.-Amended

*9 Tables: in footnotes specify the statistical test that has been used to produce the p-values (e.g. likelihood ratio test, Wald test)-We used Wald test to generate p-values. But we have decided to report only confidence intervals instead of confidence interval and p-value.

We have also changed the corresponding author to first author.

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript.

Sincerely,
Asta Ramaiya