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Reviewer's report:

This is across sectional study using the Theory of Planned Behavior to explain birth in health facility intention among expecting couples in Rukwa, Tanzania. Perhaps the findings from this study might be useful. However at present the paper needs major revisions. I highlight some as follows:

1. I am not sure 'Birth in health facility intention or birth intention in health facility'. Please be sure that the wording is correct!

2. Conclusion (Abstract): The authors state that 'Birth in health facility intention among male partners was lower compared to their female spouses. The reason could be that male partners avoid financial implications associated with health facility childbirth.....' I think this is not conclusion and rather part of the results. This should deleted from here and in the text. The rest is O.K.

2. The second part of the questionnaire needs more clarifications. Do authors used scoring or what? and how interpret them ?

3. For logistic regression to be on safe side use association and not 'predictors' all through the manuscript.

4. It is not clear how the authors indicated positive and negative attitude and subjective norms. This should be clearly explained in the Methods.

5. There are strange odds both for male and female participants when performed logistic regression. First of all the authors should check the figures. Secondly I think they should adjust the analyses for socioeconomic variables. At present these are not acceptable.

6. The manuscript should be revised based on the above recommendations.
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