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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper provides an interesting descriptive perspective of unintended pregnancy in three districts of Tanzania. The authors demonstrate some of the relevant factors associated with having an unintended pregnancy for future program planning in the region.

**Major compulsory revisions:**

1) The final multivariate model included in the paper does not feel complete. In particular, place of residence (urban/rural) which was significant in the bivariate results is not in the model; it is, however discussed in the discussion.

2) I expect that the variables gravidity and number of children under 5 in the household are somewhat correlated. The authors explain their reasons for including this variable but the level of correlation should be presented and if it is high, perhaps just gravidity should be included in the model.

3) The approach to creating the wealth variable should be described in more detail.

4) Writing issues: The authors need to review the paper closely for grammatical errors. The order of the presentation and the tables should follow one another to help the reader follow. Tighten the discussion and avoid too much repetition to what is discussed in the results section.

**Minor essential revisions:**

1) Abstract – the conclusions of the abstract do not relate to the results of the paper. These could be written without the analyses presented.

2) Page 4, end of first paragraph – the authors state “Further documentation of serious consequences of unintended pregnancy exist in other settings.” It is not clear what the authors are referring to, other as compared to what? The paragraph is about low- and middle income countries, I think.

3) Data – the survey was among women aged 15 and above – does that mean that ALL women in the household were surveyed or was there some age cut-off? Also, “and children aged less than five years” infers that the children were surveyed but in fact, I expect that women were asked about their children under 5. Make this presentation clearer (and note mis-spelling of “patterns” and MDG written out is capitalized).

4) The authors drop education and wealth (because they were not significant in
the bivariate analysis), however, these are important control variables that should be included in the final model.

5) In the first paragraph of the description of the multivariate results, you might want to tell the reader that the model controls for marital status. Given the important distinctions by age group, it is good to know that these are controlling for whether a woman is single, ever married, or currently married.

6) The effect of religion paragraph needs to be checked as it seems that Muslim was significant for unwanted pregnancies.

7) In the model results, the authors put stars on values that have a p-value of less than 0.10 but then they do not discuss these in the text. I suggest not marking these in the table if they do not intend to discuss. In addition, in the write-up the authors mention effects that were not statistically significant which may be misleading.

8) Conclusions – the conclusions provided are somewhat disconnected. Yes, the findings point to the need for inter-spousal communication but the authors say “point to the need for programs to enhance availability of, access to, and inter-spousal communication about FP services.” I am not even sure what this means and specific examples need to be given on how you would promote inter-spousal communication. Moreover, the authors should blend the last paragraph about the Connect Project to better fit the study findings and the recommendations. Otherwise, it feels like it is just tagged onto the end of the paper.

9) Tables: Table 1 is missing number of children under 5 in the household, interspousal communication, and contraceptive use. As mentioned above, Table 3 at least needs place of residence but should also include education and wealth.

Discretionary revisions

1) At the end of data paragraph, it would be good to include the number of women who meet the study criteria.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

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