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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the authors’ must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Throughout the manuscript, the term ANC is used, although not defined. This needs to be addressed.

The authors’ note that they surveyed pregnant women who reported disrespect or abuse. My questions are: How were disrespect and/or abuse defined? How were these terms objectively assessed and measured?

In the methods, it is essential that a description of the specific criteria used to choose study facilities be provided.

What are the specific definitions for: a hospital, a health center, and a dispensary in Tanzania?

Please describe the level and expected quality of care that can be received at each type of facility (in other words how do these qualities differentiate the different types of facilities)?

Moreover, how many patients are seen at each type of facility (either average daily or weekly rates)?

Also please describe the staff who are employed at each of these facilities by the following: how many staff are there, what training do the staff have, what levels of experience do the obstetric staff have?

There should also be a description/discussion of the type and extent of training of the obstetric care staff and the potential impact that has on pregnant women’s perceptions of the quality of care received.

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.
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