medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Psychometric properties of the Dutch London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy for pregnant people and their partners

First authors: Merel Sprenger[1], & Wieke Y. Beumer[2,3,4,5]

Supporting authors: Dr. Jenneke van Ditzhuijzen[2,3,6] & Prof. Dr. Jessica C. Kiefte-de Jong[1]

Affiliations:

[1]Public Health and Primary Care/Health Campus The Hague, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands;

[2]Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data Science, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands;

[3]Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands;

[4]Amsterdam Reproduction and Development, Amsterdam, the Netherlands;

[5]Amsterdam Public Health, Mental Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands;

[6]Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Social Policy and Public Health, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

Acknowledgements

Studies in this project were funded by ZonMw, project numbers 554002012 and 554002006.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Context. It is often unclear what constitutes an unplanned or unintended pregnancy, and pregnancy intentions may be multidimensional dynamic. The London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) measures pregnancy intentions in a manner close to the actual experience. The aim of this study is to establish a Dutch version of the LMUP (LMUP-NL) and to evaluate the reliability and validity of this version for both people who were pregnant and their partners, whatever the pregnancy outcome.

Methods. A psychometric evaluation of the LMUP using observational data from the BluePrInt study and the RISE UP study was conducted with 1201 people (839 people who were pregnant and 362 partners), aged between 16-55 years. The LMUP-NL was translated based using the Flemish LMUP and the UK 2020 update, resulting in a version for people who were pregnant and one for partners. Next, the acceptability, readability, reliability, construct and convergent validity were analyzed, combining Principal Component analysis, Confirmatory Factor analysis and Mokken scale analyses.

Results. The LMUP-NL demonstrated to be readable and reliable (Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for both versions). Construct validity of both versions was acceptable (CFI>0.93) and Mokken scale analyses indicated a strong scale (H-coefficient:0.68).

Conclusions. The LMUP-NL is reliable and valid for people who were pregnant and their partners, regardless of the pregnancy outcome. It offers researchers and policy makers an instrument suitable to measure pregnancy intention in a multidimensional manner, constituting a closer reflection of the actual experience of pregnancy intentions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

A positive pregnancy test elicits a wide variety of emotional responses. In most research and policy, a pregnancy is defined as either wanted, mistimed (unplanned, but wanted) or unwanted.[1,2] However, previous studies indicated that defining pregnancy intentions in this dichotomous manner leads to oversimplification of a complex construct.[1,3-5] Dichotomous measures of unintended pregnancy assume that pregnancy intentions are the product of a conscious process or choice. According to this view, people experience clear attitudes towards a pregnancy, and their behaviors are often consistent with their intentions. However, previous studies showed a more complex view of pregnancy intentions. People often experience ambivalent attitudes towards (the prospect of) a pregnancy.[6] For instance, some people feel happy at the prospect of a pregnancy, while simultaneously trying to actively prevent conception with their behaviors.[7] Moreover, often people don't have fully formed family building plans (yet).[8]

To address pregnancy intentions in a manner closer to the actual experience of people with an unintended pregnancy in research, calls have been made for using a multidimensional, measurement on a continuous scale.[9] The London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) is an instrument that can be used for this purpose.[10] The LMUP was developed as a short, self-administered measure in the UK, based on lay views. The measure considers three key dimensions when measuring pregnancy intentions: (1) context (timing and partner discussion), (2) attitudes towards the pregnancy (desire for pregnancy/parenthood and expressed intentions) and (3) behavior (contraceptive use and pre-conceptual preparations). The multidimensional conceptualization enables measuring pregnancy intentions in a more comprehensive way compared to dichotomous measures.[10] The LMUP does not assume congruency between the aspects, and it does not rely on people having fully formed family building plans. In 2004, the original version of the LMUP has been assessed as easy to understand, valid and reliable.[10]

The LMUP has been translated and validated in several other languages and cultural contexts across all continents (for example, see Hall et al., 2013; Lang et al., 2019; Morof et al., 2012; Olani et al., 2022; Rocca et al., 2010; Ranatunga & Jayaratne 2020; Roshanaei et al., 2015). [11-17] However, the LMUP is not yet validated in the Netherlands. There is a validated version of the LMUP available in Flemish-Dutch, but Flemish is a clearly different variety of the Dutch language.[18]. Furthermore, norms and perceptions regarding unintended pregnancies can vary due different political and cultural contexts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Therefore, the Flemish LMUP cannot simply be administered in the context of the Netherlands, and validation is needed for use in the Dutch context.

The LMUP has been found valid for measuring pregnancy intentions of anyone who can get pregnant, regardless of their pregnancy circumstances and outcome. For instance, the LMUP is tested in samples with people who were currently pregnant, people who just gave birth and people who had an abortion.[12,13,15,19] In contrast, there is much less research on the validity of the LMUP for pregnant people's partners. We define 'partners' as the people who are involved in the pregnancy either as a romantic partner (regardless of their gender and/or sex), or a non-romantic, but sexually/biologically involved partner. Thus, this might be someone's husband or wife, their (non-)cohabiting partner, a friend-with-benefits or someone they had sex with once. There is growing recognition of the importance of incorporating the partner's perspectives in research on reproductive health.[20] Up to now, the LMUP has been adapted several times for the purpose of measuring pregnancy intentions of pregnant people's partners, and this has been validated in samples from the UK and Malawi.[21,22] Both studies showed promising results with regard to reliability and validity. However, previous studies were done in partners of people who chose to carry the pregnancy to term, mostly with quite intended pregnancies. Research on the pregnancy intentions of partners of people who had an abortion, or a less intended pregnancy, is missing. Further, the LMUP is not yet validated for Dutch speaking partners.

The aim of the current study is threefold: (1) to establish acceptable Dutch versions for people who were pregnant and partners of the LMUP for use in the Netherlands, (2) to test the reliability and validity of the LMUP-NL in a population-based sample of people who were pregnant with a variety of pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands, and (3) to also validate the LMUP-NL for pregnant people's partners. Results of the current study may provide future researchers and policy makers with an instrument that is suitable to cover the complexity of pregnancy intentions, thereby providing a more realistic understanding than existing measures. Furthermore, it will offer more accurate understanding of pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methodology

Adaptation of the questionnaire

To create a Dutch LMUP that is suitable for use in the Netherlands and acceptable for anyone who can get pregnant and their partners, we based the Dutch versions on the Flemish LMUP and the UK 2020 update.[19,23]

According to the translational guidelines of Sousa and Rojjanasrirat,[24] we firstly created a draft version with linguistic changes from Flemish to Dutch. Second, this version was evaluated in discussions with five other researchers, professionals from the field (e.g., an abortion doctor, sexologist, and midwife) and with linguists. After adaptation based on expert input, a blind back-translation into English was performed by two independent translators with English as their native language. This version was then compared to the LMUP in English. No adjustments had to be made. In our third step, the surveys were evaluated in individual think-aloud interviews with seven people who experienced an unintended pregnancy: five women and two men. Think-aloud interviewing is a cognitive interviewing technique in which participants are asked to think aloud as they perform a task, e.g., completing a survey.[25,26] Participants took the interviewer through the cognitive process of completing the survey and expressed any thoughts or feelings that came up. Based on the think-aloud interviews, we slightly adjusted the questionnaire (see Table 1). This adjusted version was discussed with the other researchers, linguists and professionals again and consensus was reached, resulting in the final version. Complete versions of the Dutch questionnaire (LMUP-NL) for people who were pregnant and partners are available on request or via OSF.

Data collection for validation

The current study combines data from two prospective population-based cohort studies: the BluePrInt study in the Netherlands by Amsterdam University Medical Center (ZonMw project number 554002012) and the RISE UP study in The Hague (ZonMw project number 554002006), the Netherlands by the Leiden University Medical Center. The two studies are both part of a consortium funded by ZonMw around unintended pregnancy and the researchers decided to join forces in the adaptation and validation of the Dutch LMUP, as the RISE UP study collected data about all pregnancies and the BluePrInt study collected data about unintended pregnancies, including terminated pregnancies. Both studies were reviewed by the ethical committee and received a waiver from the Medical Research

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Involved Human subjects Act (WMO): for the RISE UP study by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of Leiden Den Haag Delft under reference number N21.127, and for the BluePrInt study by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam Medical Center under reference number W21_407.

The BluePrInt study included people who carried an unintended pregnancy to term or terminated an unintended pregnancy, and their partners. Participants were informed about the study at first consultation with their midwife, in the abortion clinic or via an online mailing directed at pregnant people. Because we did not want to interfere within the decision process, people could take part in the study after the abortion or when they decided to carry the pregnancy to term.

The RISE UP study did not explicitly target unintended pregnancy, but people could take part if they were or their partner was pregnant (gestational age ≤ 28 weeks), or terminated their pregnancy less than three months ago, and if they lived in The Hague. Potential participants were informed about the study at their midwife, at Youth and Family Centers, via direct emails from an online pregnancy platform, and through social media advertisements.

For both studies, interested people could scan a QR code that directed them to the information letter, video, and consent form. After receiving their consent, we sent them the survey. Participants were required to answer all survey items, with the option to answer 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say' to any item. Upon completing the survey (about 20 minutes), they received a gift card worth €10. In both studies, other sections in the survey asked questions on psychosocial health, social support, adverse life events, experience with abuse, worries, wellbeing, and resilience.

Analysis of psychometric properties

In the development of the original LMUP and in later validation studies, classical test theory was used.[10,21] For the current validation, we applied this theory as well, and additionally, we used elements from modern test theory like several other validation studies have done.[11,13,19,27,28] As we have data from both people who were pregnant and partners, and as we have two slightly different versions for both groups (Table 1), we carried out the following analyses for these versions separately. Data were cleaned and prepared for merge by researchers (MS & WB). All analyses were performed using R version 4.2.1. In the analyses, 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say' were coded as missing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

- *Acceptability*

To assess acceptability, we examined missing data rates with rates lower than 5% indicating higher acceptability, in line with Lang et al.[12] Item discrimination was assessed by looking at item category endorsement values and checking if there were no item categories with greater endorsement (selection) than 80%. We also looked at targeting by investigating if the distribution of our data covered the full range of the LMUP, from 0 to 12.

- *Readability*

We investigated the readability with the Flesch Reading Ease Score (FRES) and the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (FKGL), like Goossens et al. did for the Flemish version of the LMUP.[29]

- *Reliability*

To assess reliability, we used the Cronbach's alpha statistic with a score higher than 0.7 indicating acceptable reliability.[30] We also looked at corrected item-total correlations (with a score lower than 0.2 indicating that the item contributed little to the homogeneity of the scale) and inter-item correlations were examined to check that all items had a positive direction.

- *Construct validity*

We assessed construct validity through a principal component analysis (PCA) to examine if all items were related to one construct, i.e., loading onto one component with an Eigenvalue of >1. With this PCA we compared the current psychometric properties with those of the original LMUP scale.[3] In line with recent validations,[21,28,31,32] we performed a Confirmatory Factor Analysis to investigate model fit, assessed by the comparative fit index (CFI) (acceptable if > 0.95) and the standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR) (acceptable if <0.08) and root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) (acceptable if <0.06).[33] Additionally, we tested the following hypotheses for construct validity: 1) people who are in a relationship have higher LMUP scores than people who are not in a relationship, with even higher scores for people who are cohabiting and/or married, 2) people younger than 20 years old and people older than 39 years old have lower LMUP scores than those in between (age limits are chosen based on recent reports of Statistics Netherlands on the average age of mothers),[34] 3) people who decide to carry the pregnancy to term have higher scores than people who choose to terminate the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

pregnancy, 4) people who were pregnant for the first time have lower LMUP scores than people who have been pregnant before, and 5) people with a higher gestational age at survey/abortion have higher LMUP scores than those who have a lower gestational age at survey/abortion.[14,19,27] We looked at the distribution of the scores in a histogram and performed a Shapiro-Wilk test to test for normality which provided no evidence for normality ($p<0.001$ for both survey versions). Hence, we carried out non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests to test our hypotheses. For age, we performed a Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by a Dunn's post-hoc test with a Bonferroni adjustment of the *p* values.

Furthermore, we assessed convergent validity by analyzing linked LMUP difference scores of couples. Data from couples were linked during recruitment, thus scores could be compared. First, we tested normal distribution of the difference scores by visually inspecting a histogram representing difference scores. As this was the case, a paired samples t-test was performed. Further, the correlation between couple's scores was assessed. Although we expected a significant correlation between the scores, we did not expect perfect agreement, as a partner may have different pregnancy intentions compared to the pregnant person.[21]

- *Mokken scale analysis*

Then, in line with other validations of the LMUP, we have performed analysis as established by modern test theory.[13,19,27,28,32] Thus, we carried out a Mokken scale analysis which tells us whether the separate items have different levels of difficulty. Participants should show as much agreement with items as is in line with the true extent of their pregnancy intention. The scalability of the Mokken scale was assessed by the Loevinger H coefficient, with only items of >0.3 eligible for scaling, and with $H<0.4$ indicating a weak scale, $0.4<H<0.49$ a medium scale, and ≥ 0.5 a strong scale. If this analysis suggests that the LMUP is a strong scale, it means that the full score may be used.[35]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results

Sample

1201 people completed the questionnaires. Of the 1201 participants, 1172 people (97.6%) answered 3 or more LMUP items, and were therefore eligible for the analyses.[10] Out of these 1172 people, 910 were participants of the BluePrInt study and 262 were participants of the RISE UP study. 597 (49.7%) in the total sample were pregnant people intending to carry the pregnancy to term, and 242 (20.1%) were people who recently had an abortion. Further, we included 238 (19.8%) partners of people intending to carry the pregnancy to term and 124 (10.3%) partners of people who recently had an abortion. Participants were between 16 and 55 years old (people who were pregnant: median = 29, IQR = 25-33, range = 16-44 years; partners: median = 30, IQR = 25-33, range: 16-55 years). As shown in Table 2, most participants were born in the Netherlands, were not religious, and were cohabiting with a partner. The BluePrInt study and RISE UP study included quite similar populations, with the RISE UP study participants consisting of a somewhat bigger proportion of religious people, a smaller proportion of people born in the Netherlands, and people that were not in a relationship. Most pregnancies occurred within a relationship and had a gestational age between 13-16 weeks when filling out the questionnaire. 53.2% of the pregnancies were first pregnancies (Table 2).

Acceptability

The number of missing responses per item ranged from 1.3% (item 1; contraception) to 16.7% (item 5; partner discussion) for people who were pregnant (Table 3). Further, missings per item ranged from 1,2% (item 2; timing) to 23,5% (item 3; intention) for partners (Table 3). In both respondent groups, the missing data rates of items 1, 2 and 6 are acceptable. However, the missing data rates of items 3, 4 and 5 are >5%, because of a high number of participants choosing the '*I don't know*' option for these items (Table 3). Partners had more missings than people who were pregnant for item 1 and 3. Participants did not have any missings on item 6. Missing data was relatively more common in the BluePrInt study compared to the RISE UP study.

For the total sample, as well as for subsamples of people who were pregnant and partners, total LMUP scores ranged from 0 to 12 with a median of 5 and IQR from 2 to 8 (Figure 1), indicating a distribution of scores along the total LMUP scale. No question response had more than 80% endorsement on either version (Table 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Readability

The Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease Score was 80, both for people who were pregnant and partners, translating to 4th grade level (4.3 for both versions).

Reliability

The Cronbach's alpha for the six LMUP items of both versions of the LMUP (for people who were pregnant and for partners) indicated good internal consistency (Table 4).[30] Further, results indicated that in the total sample, the item-rest correlations were above 0.2 for all items, and all inter-item correlations were positive.

Construct validity

PCA showed that all items loaded onto one dimension with an Eigenvalue of 3.76 both for people who were pregnant and partners. CFA assessing model fit largely supported a single factor model for people who were pregnant with regards to CFI (0.930), SRMR (0.041), and RMSEA (0.160 (0.139-0.183)). A better fit was found for partners when looking at CFI (0.976), SRMR (0.035), and RMSEA (0.098 (0.059-0.139)). PCA component loadings and CFA factor loadings can be found in Table 4 for both the people who were pregnant and partner survey.

All our hypothesis tests were confirmed (Table 5). They showed that single people have on average a lower total LMUP score (i.e., lower pregnancy intent) compared to people who are in a relationship. The difference was even larger for people who were cohabiting with a partner compared to single people and people who were in a relationship, but not cohabiting. We also found lower total LMUP scores for pregnancies that were terminated compared to pregnancies that were carried to term. As for age, for partners the total LMUP score increases as they get older. People who were pregnant, however, have lower LMUP scores for both the younger age group (<20) and the older age group (≥40). The final two hypotheses were tested for people who were pregnant only, showing that people who were pregnant for the first time (primigravida) had on average lower total LMUP scores than people who had been pregnant before (multigravida). And people who filled out the survey at a lower gestational age (in the first 12 weeks) had a lower total LMUP score on average compared to people who had a higher gestational age while filling out the survey. This hypothesis also held when looking only at people who carried their pregnancy to term.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Convergent validity

LMUP scores for both people who were pregnant and their partners were available for 257 couples. LMUP scores of people who were pregnant were highly correlated to their partners scores *(r* = 0.800). The paired t-test indicated that on average, people who were pregnant reported a lower LMUP score compared to their linked partners ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant}}$ = 4.48, M_{partners} = 4.94, t_{256} = -3.36, p <.001). When comparing LMUP scores based on pregnancy outcome, results indicated that couple's scores did not significantly differ in the abortion group ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant, abortion}}$ = 1.70, $M_{\text{partners, abortion}}$ = 1.94, t_{95} = -1.39, p = .167). LMUP scores did however significantly differ in couples who decided to carry the pregnancy to term ($M_{\text{pregnant people, carry to term}}$ = 6.41, $M_{\text{partners, carry to term}}$ = 6.73, t_{256} = -3.08, p = 0.002).

Besides, to test whether the LMUP scores of the participants who had a linked partner in the data set differed from participants without a linked partner in the data set, another t-test was performed. Participants who did not have a linked partner in the data set either did not have a partner or had a partner who did not participate in one of our studies. Results indicated that participants with a linked partner in the data set (M_{linked} = 4.74) had a significantly lower LMUP score compared to participants without a linked partner ($M_{\text{not linked}}$ = 6.10, t_{1169} = -6.38, p <.001).

Scaling

Results from the Mokken Scale Analysis showed that items correspond to a basic Guttman structure with Loevinger H coefficients greater than 0.45 for all items, both in the survey for people who were pregnant and for partners (Table 4). Hence, all items were eligible for scaling. For people who were pregnant, item 3 was easiest to endorse, followed by item 4, 2, 5, 6, and 1. For partners, item 4 was easiest to endorse, followed by 5, 3, 2, 6, and 1. For the entire scale with all six items, the Loevinger's H coefficient was 0.68 for both versions, indicating a strong scale.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion

Pregnancy intention is a complex concept that asks for a multidimensional and continuous measurement to capture the actual experiences of people's pregnancy intentions in research.[9] In this study, we established acceptable Dutch versions for people who were pregnant and partners of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP-NL) for use in the Netherlands. The LMUP-NL was found both reliable and valid in a population-based sample of people who were pregnant with a variety of pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands. Lastly, the version for pregnant people's partners was also valid. The current study therefore contributes to a more realistic measurement of pregnancy intentions in the Dutch context.

Overall, the LMUP-NL performed well according to various criteria for the performance of psychometric measures, both for people who were pregnant and their partners. The LMUP-NL appeared to be reliable and more readable than the original version of the LMUP (4.3 compared to 6.7).[10] Further, construct validity analyses demonstrated that all items loaded onto one dimension and largely supported a single factor model. All hypotheses were confirmed related to relationship status, age, pregnancy decision, gravidity, gestational age, in line with previous studies.[11-13,19,27,36] Additionally, results of the current study confirmed the hypothesis that people who were pregnant filling out the LMUP later in their pregnancy (gestational age > 12 weeks) reported more retrospective pregnancy planning compared to people filling out the LMUP earlier in their pregnancy (gestational age 0-12 weeks), also when looking only at the group that chose to carry to term. This result suggests that the reflection on pregnancy intention may change to become more intended as the pregnancy continues.[14] Lastly, our Mokken Scale analyses indicated a strong scale and showed that items correspond to a basic Guttman structure.[21,31] In line with previous validations, we found that item 1 (contraception) and item 6 (preparation) have the lowest contributions to the scale.

With regard to the comparison of the LMUP-NL versions for people who were pregnant and their partners, we found a high correlation of LMUP scores between couple's scores. However, we also found a small, but significant difference in linked LMUP scores in couples who chose to carry to term, with slightly higher scores for partners. This is contrary to what was found in other validations of the LMUP for partners.[21] We expect that this difference was found as a consequence of selection bias, as we expect that partners with more positive feelings towards the pregnancy may be more likely to participate in our studies. This idea is supported by the fact that there was a significant difference in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

pregnancy intention for people that were linked to their partner in our dataset compared to people that did not have a linked partner. There was no significant difference for couples in the abortion group. This is in line with previous studies on abortion and partners, showing that couple's pregnancy intentions are highly associated.[37,38]

Strengths and limitations

This study has several strengths. First, a thorough translation of the LMUP from both English and Flemish to Dutch took place, consulting diverse experience experts and colleagues in the field. Second, the current study is the first to validate the Dutch LMUP for both people who were pregnant and their partners and applied methods in line with previous validations. We had a relatively large and diverse sample with a broad range of pregnancy intentions pregnancy outcomes, in comparison to previous studies validating the LMUP.[12,16,19,28,36]

To appreciate the results, some limitations need to be acknowledged. First, people who were born outside the Netherlands, or with a parent born outside the Netherlands, and people with a religious background, were underrepresented in our sample.[39,40] Second, some questions had a relatively high missing value rate, explained by participants choosing ‘I don't know’ or ‘I'd rather not say’ as their answer. Nonetheless, these answers might be informative on their own. For example, some people may feel uncomfortable sharing their thoughts about the pregnancy, and for others the ‘I don’t know’-option is the best reflection of their actual experiences. Although we do not expect that this will influence the underlying factor structure of LMUP-NL, it may influence the overall LMUP score. It was outside the scope of the current study, but future research could investigate these missing values more closely. Finally, some statistics (CFI for people who were pregnant and RMSEA for both versions) were inadequate in the construct validity analyses. The CFI for people who were pregnant was just below the threshold. As for the RMSEA, there are only few other versions that report on RMSEA analyses, hence we cannot properly compare our psychometric evaluation with validations of other translations of the LMUP.

Conclusion

The current study supports the reliability and validity of the LMUP-NL, for both people who were pregnant and their partners, regardless of the pregnancy outcome. We believe more qualitative work

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

could shed light on the dimensionality and the dynamics of pregnancy intentions, to truly understand the complexity of this concept. Especially, future studies are advised to study this complexity in groups that are underrepresented in studies into pregnancy intentions, such as pregnant people's partners.[41,42] Nevertheless, future research into Dutch speaking populations is advised to use the LMUP-NL to measure pregnancy intentions in a way that reflects actual experiences more closely. At the same time, it also provides policy makers with a framework that encompasses the broad array of experiences surrounding unintended pregnancy.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Santelli JS, Lindberg LD, Orr MG, Finer LB, Speizer I. Toward a multidimensional measure of pregnancy intentions: Evidence from the United States. *Stud Fam Plann*. 2009;40(2):87-100. doi:10.1111/j.1728-4465.2009.00192.x
2. UNFPA. *Seeing the unseen: The case for action in the neglected crisis of unintended pregnancy*. 2022. https://esaro.unfpa.org/en/publications/seeing-unseen
3. Barrett G, Wellings K. What is a 'planned' pregnancy? Empirical data from a British study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2002;55(4):545-557. doi:10.1016/s0277-9536(01)00187-3
4. Klerman LV. The intendedness of pregnancy: A concept in transition. *Matern Child Health J*. 2000;4(3):155-162. doi:10.1023/a:1009534612388
5. Auerbach SL, Coleman-Minahan K, Alspaugh A, Aztlan EA, Stern L, Simmonds K. Critiquing the unintended pregnancy framework. *J Midwifery Wom Health*. 2023;68(2):170-178. doi:10.1111/jmwh.13457
6. Schwarz EB, Lohr PA, Gold MA, Gerbert B. Prevalence and correlates of ambivalence towards pregnancy among nonpregnant women. *Contraception*. 2007;75(4):305-310. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2006.12.002
7. Aiken AR, Dillaway C, Mevs-Korff N. A blessing I can't afford: Factors underlying the paradox of happiness about unintended pregnancy. *Soc Sci Med*. 2015;132:149-155. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.038
8. Borrero S, Nikolajski C, Steinberg JR, Freedman L, Akers AY, Ibrahim S, et al. "It just happens": A qualitative study exploring low-income women's perspectives on pregnancy intention and planning. *Contraception*. 2015;91(2):150-156. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2014.09.014
9. Hill B, Kothe EJ, Currie S, Danby M, Lang AY, Bailey C, et al. A systematic mapping review of the associations between pregnancy intentions and health-related lifestyle behaviours or psychological wellbeing. *Prev Med Rep*. 2019;14:100869. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.100869
10. Barrett G, Smith SC, Wellings K. Conceptualisation, development, and evaluation of a measure of unplanned pregnancy. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2004;58(5):426-433. doi:10.1136/jech.2003.014787
11. Hall J, Barrett G, Mbwana N, Copas A, Malata A, Stephenson J. Understanding pregnancy planning in a low-income country setting: Validation of the London Measure of Unplanned

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Pregnancy in Malawi. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2013;13(1):200. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-13-200

12. Lang AY, Hall JA, Boyle JA, Harrison CL, Teede H, Moran LJ, et al. Validation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy among pregnant Australian women. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(8):e0220774. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0220774

13. Morof D, Steinauer J, Haider S, Liu S, Darney P, Barrett G. Evaluation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in a United States population of women. *PLoS ONE*. 2012;7(4):e35381. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035381

14. Rocca CH, Wilson MR, Jeon M, Foster DG. Stability of retrospective pregnancy intention reporting among women with unwanted pregnancies in the United States. *Matern Child Health J*. 2019;23(11):1547-1555. doi:10.1007/s10995-019-02782-9

15. Ranatunga IDJC, Jayaratne K. Proportion of unplanned pregnancies, their determinants and health outcomes of women delivering at a teaching hospital in Sri Lanka. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20:667. doi:10.1186/s12884-020-03259-2

16. Roshanaei S, Shaghaghi A, Jafarabadi MA, Kousha A. Measuring unintended pregnancies in postpartum Iranian women: Validation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy. *East Mediterr Health J*. 2015;21(8):572-578. doi:10.26719/2015.21.8.572

17. Olani AB, Bekelcho T, Woldemeskel A, Tefera K, Eyob D. Evaluation of the Amharic version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Ethiopia. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(6):e0269781. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0269781

18. Louw Rd. Is Dutch a pluricentric language with two centres of standardization? An overview of the differences between Netherlandic and Belgian Dutch from a Flemish perspective. *Werkwinkel*. 2016;11(1):113-135. doi:10.1515/werk-2016-0006

19. Goossens J, Verhaeghe S, Van Hecke A, Barrett G, Delbaere I, Beeckman D. Psychometric properties of the Dutch version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in women with pregnancies ending in birth. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(4):e0194033. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0194033

20. Roudsari RL, sharifi F, Goudarzi F. Barriers to the participation of men in reproductive health care: A systematic review and meta-synthesis. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):818. doi:10.1186/s12889-023-15692-x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

21. Barrett G, Hall JA, Howden B, Patel D, Shawe J, Stephenson J. Evaluation of the psychometric properties of a version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy for women's partners. *Int J Men's Soc Community Health*. 2020;3(1):e65-e77. doi:10.22374/ijmsch.v3i1.20

22. Yeatman S, Smith-Greenaway E. Birth planning and women's and men's health in Malawi. *Stud Fam Plann*. 2018;49(3):213-235. doi:10.1111/sifp.12060

23. Barrett G, Nolan EM, Gürtin ZB, Stephenson J, Hall JA. London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy and newer family forms: An update. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020:765. doi:10.1136/jech-2020-214419

24. Sousa VD, Rojjanasrirat W. Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user-friendly guideline. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2011;17(2):268-274. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x

25. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. *Qual Life Res*. 2003;12(3):229-238. doi:10.1023/a:1023254226592

26. Drennan J. Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires. *J Adv Nurs*. 2003;42(1):57-63. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02579.x

27. Borges ALV, Barrett G, Dos Santos OA, Nascimento NDC, Cavalhieri FB, Fujimori E. Evaluation of the psychometric properties of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Brazilian Portuguese. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2016;16. doi:10.1186/s12884-016-1037-2

28. Muleva BR, Borges ALV, Hall JA, Barret G. Evaluation of the Portuguese version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Mozambique: A psychometric measurement study. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2022;26(2):47-57. doi:10.29063/ajrh2022/v26i2.5

29. Kincaid JP, Fishburne Jr RP, Rogers RL, Chissom BS. *Derivation of new readability formulas (Automated Readability Index, Fog Count and Flesch Reading Ease Formula) for navy enlisted personnel*. Institute for Simulation and Training; 1975. https://stars.library.ucf.edu/istlibrary/56/

30. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*. 1951;16:297-334.

31. Drevin J, Kristiansson P, Stern J, Rosenblad A. Measuring pregnancy planning: A psychometric evaluation and comparison of two scales. *J Adv Nurs*. 2017;73(11):2765-2775. doi:10.1111/jan.13364

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

32. Hall JA, Stephenson J, Barrett G. Evaluating the Chichewa version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Malawi: a validation update. *BMC Res Notes*. 2021;14:231. doi:10.1186/s13104-021-05645-1

33. Hu L-t, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 1999;6(1):1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

34. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Kinderen krijgen. https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/visualisaties/dashboard-bevolking/levensloop/kinderen-krijgen.

35. Mokken RJ. *A Theory and Procedure of Scale Analysis: With Applications in Political Research*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton; 1971.

36. Bukenya JN, Nalwadda CK, Neema S, Kyambadde P, Wanyenze RK, Barrett G. Pregnancy Planning among Female Sex Workers in Uganda: Evaluation of the Psychometric Properties of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2019;23(3):79-95. doi:10.29063/ajrh2019/v23i3.8

37. Waller MR, Bitler MP. The link between couples' pregnancy intentions and behavior: Does it matter who is asked. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2008;40(4):194-201. doi:10.1363/4019408

38. Cha S, Chapman DA, Wan W, Burton CW, Woolf SH, Masho SW. Couple pregnancy intentions and induced abortions in the United States. *Int J Women's Health Reprod Sci*. 2016;4(4):157-163. doi:10.15296/ijwhr.2016.36

39. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. CBS introduceert nieuwe indeling bevolking naar herkomst. 2022 Feb 16. https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-bevolking-naar-herkomst#:~:text=Op%201%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Nederland%20geboren%20ouder.

40. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Bijna 6 op de 10 Nederlanders behoren niet tot religieuze groep. 2022 Dec 22. https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/51/bijna-6-op-de-10-nederlanders-behoren-niet-tot-religieuze-groep.

41. Guadagno M, Mackert M, Rochlen A. Improving prenatal health: Setting the agenda for increased male involvement. *Am J Mens Health*. 2013;7(6):523-526. doi:10.1177/1557988313490785

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

42. Bond MJ. The missing link in MCH: Paternal involvement in pregnancy outcomes. *Am J Mens Health*. 2010;4(4):285-286. doi:10.1177/1557988310384842

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Adjustments made compared to the Flemish and UK 2020 version. Note: for question numbers followed by a 'P', changes were made in the version for partners only.

Question	Change	Reason
1	Move of 'I/we were using' from beginning of answer option to end of question	To improve readability
1	Clarification of answer option on always using contraception, but knowing method had failed	To improve readability, based on think aloud interviews
2	Addition of 'parent' next to 'mother'	To improve acceptability
2P	Use of 'father/parent' instead of 'mother/parent'	To improve acceptability
3P	Use of 'having a child' instead of 'becoming pregnant'	To improve acceptability and to better suit Dutch language, based on think aloud interviews
3P, 4P, 5P	Use of 'before the pregnancy' instead of 'before I got pregnant'	To improve acceptability and to better suit Dutch language, based on think aloud interviews
4	Use of word 'child' instead of 'baby'	To better suit Dutch language
5	Abbreviation of introductory text	To improve readability and acceptability
5	Addition of answer option in which participants agreed with their partner that they did not want any (more) children	To accommodate this group, based on think aloud interviews
6	Addition of answer option in which participants report exercising more	To prompt participants to think of this health behaviour
6P	Remove option of folic acid	To improve acceptability

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1 **Table 2. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants (n = 1172).**

2

	People who were pregnant			Partner		
	Total (n = 832)	**RISE UP (n = 219)**	**BluePrint (n = 613)**	**Total (n = 340)**	**RISE UP (n = 43)**	**BluePrint (n = 297)**
Characteristic	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**
Age groups						
<20	37 (4.5)	2 (0.9)	35 (5.7)	12 (3.5)	-	12 (4.0)
20-39	764 (91.8)	209 (95.4)	555 (90.5)	308 (90.6)	37 (86.0)	271 (91.2)
>39	31 (3.7)	8 (3.7)	23 (3.8)	20 (5.9)	6 (14.0)	14 (4.7)
Ethnicity						
Born in the Netherlands	657 (79.0)	142 (64.8)	515 (84.0)	296 (87.1)	28 (65.1)	268 (90.2)
One or both parents born outside the Netherlands	98 (11.8)	41 (18.7)	57 (9.3)	29 (8.5)	10 (23.3)	19 (6.4)
Born outside the Netherlands	73 (8.8)	36 (16.4)	37 (6.0)	15 (4.4)	5 (11.6)	10 (3.4)
Missing	4 (0.5)	-	4 (0.7)		-	-
Religion						
No religion	608 (73.1)	144 (65.7)	464 (75.7)	282 (82.9)	26 (60.5)	256 (86.2)
Buddhism	4 (0.5)	2 (0.9)	2 (0.3)	-	-	-
Christianity	120 (14.4)	31 (14.2)	89 (14.5)	31 (9.1)	6 (14.0)	25 (8.4)
Hinduism	11 (1.3)	7 (3.2)	4 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	1 (2.3)	-
Islam	47 (13.2)	24 (11.0)	23 (3.8)	11 (3.2)	5 (11.6)	6 (2.0)
Jewish	-	-	-	1 (0.3)	-	1 (0.3)
Other	18 (2.2)	3 (1.4)	15 (2.4)	5 (1.5)	2 (4.7)	3 (1.0)
Missing	24 (2.9)	8 (3.6)	16 (2.6)	9 (2.7)	3 (7.0)	6 (2.0)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Partnership status						
No relationship	72 (8.7)	9 (4.2)	63 (10.3)	17 (5.0)	-	17 (5.7)
Not cohabiting with partner	139 (16.7)	5 (2.3)	134 (21.9)	65 (19.1)	-	65 (21.9)
Cohabiting with partner	611 (73.4)	204 (93.2)	407 (66.4)	250 (73.5)	43 (100.0)	207 (69.7)
Missing	10 (1.3)	1 (0.5)	9 (1.5)	8 (2.2)	-	8 (2.6)
Pregnancy within relationship						
No	86 (10.3)	11 (5.0)	75 (12.2)	29 (8.5)	3 (7.0)	26 (8.8)
Yes	741 (89.1)	208 (95.0)	533 (86.9)	311 (91.5)	40 (93.0)	271 (91.2)
Missing	5 (0.6)	-	5 (0.8)	-	-	-
Gestational age at survey						
<4 weeks	13 (1.6)	-	13 (2.1)			
4-8 weeks	185 (22.1)	15 (6.8)	170 (27.8)			
9-12 weeks	190 (23.3)	19 (8.7)	171 (27.9)			
13-16 weeks	242 (29.0)	40 (18.3)	202 (33.0)			
17-24 weeks	102 (12.3)	70 (32.0)	32 (5.2)			
>24 weeks	92 (11.0)	75 (34.2)	17 (2.8)			
Missing	7 (0.8)	-	7 (1.1)			
Gravida						
First pregnancy	441 (53.1)	93 (42.5)	348 (56.9)			
Second or subsequent pregnancy	380 (45.7)	126 (57.5)	254 (41.5)			
Missing	10 (1.2)	-	10 (1.7)			

1 **Table 3. Endorsement frequencies of LMUP items and response options.**

	People who were pregnant			Partners		
	All	Decision: Carry to term	Decision: abortion	All partners	Decision: Carry to term	Decision: abortion
Item	**N (%)**	**N (%)**	**N (%)**	**N (%)**	**N (%)**	**N (%)**
1 – Contraception						
Always using contraception	161 (19.4)	77 (13.1)	84 (34.7)	90 (26.5)	31 (14.4)	59 (47.6)
Using sometimes or failed at least once	281 (33.8)	184 (31.2)	97 (40.1)	124 (36.5)	77 (35.7)	47 (37.9)
Not using contraception	379 (45.6)	318 (53.9)	61 (25.2)	114 (33.5)	96 (44.4)	18 (14.5)
Missing: Don't know	4 (0.5)	4 (0.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (5.6)	0 (0)
Missing: Rather not say	7 (0.8)	7 (1.2)	0 (0)	12 (3.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
2 – Timing						
Wrong time	257 (30.9)	68 (11.5)	189 (78.1)	97 (28.5)	15 (6.9)	82 (66.1)
OK time	314 (37.7)	274 (46.4)	40 (16.5)	142 (41.8)	109 (50.5)	33 (26.6)
Right time	246 (29.6)	241 (40.8)	5 (2.1)	97 (28.5)	91 (42.1)	6 (4.8)
Missing: Don't know	11 (1.3)	5 (0.9)	6 (2.5)	4 (1.2)	1 (0.5)	3 (2.4)
Missing: Rather not say	4 (0.5)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
3 – Intention						

Did not intend pregnancy	481 (57.8)	261 (44.2)	220 (90.9)	143 (42.1)	45 (20.8)	98 (79.0)
Intentions kept changing	98 (11.8)	84 (14.2)	14 (5.8)	46 (13.5)	30 (13.9)	16 (12.9)
Intended pregnancy	199 (23.9)	196 (33.2)	3 (1.2)	71 (20.9)	68 (31.5)	3 (2.4)
Missing: Don't know	42 (5)	38 (6.4)	4 (1.7)	64 (18.8)	57 (26.4)	7 (5.6)
Missing: Rather not say	12 (1.4)	11 (1.9)	1 (0.4)	16 (4.7)	16 (7.4)	0 (0)
4 – Desire						
Did not want a baby	242 (29.1)	62 (10.5)	180 (74.4)	99 (29.1)	14 (6.5)	85 (68.6)
Mixed feelings about having a baby	168 (20.2)	131 (22.2)	37 (15.3)	94 (27.7)	66 (30.6)	28 (22.6)
Wanted baby	199 (23.9)	291 (49.3)	20 (8.3)	97 (28.5)	89 (41.2)	8 (6.4)
Missing: Don't know	89 (10.7)	84 (14.3)	5 (2.1)	40 (11.8)	37 (17.1)	3 (2.4)
Missing: Rather not say	22 (2.6)	22 (3.7)	0 (0)	10 (2.9)	10 (4.6)	0 (0)
5 – Partner discussion						
Never discussed getting pregnant with partner, or agreed to not get pregnant	242 (29.1)	80 (13.6)	162 (66.9)	109 (32.1)	25 (11.6)	84 (67.7)
Discussed, but did not agree about getting pregnant	78 (9.4)	47 (8.0)	31 (12.8)	36 (10.6)	15 (6.9)	21 (16.9)
Agreed to get pregnant	372 (44.8)	342 (58.1)	30 (12.4)	103 (30.3)	90 (41.7)	13 (10.5)
Missing: Don't know	105 (12.6)	89 (15.1)	16 (6.6)	65 (19.1)	59 (27.3)	6 (4.8)

Missing: Rather not say	34 (4.1)	31 (5.3)	3 (1.2)	27 (7.9)	27 (12.5)	0 (0)
6 – Preparation						
No preparatory lifestyle changes	532 (63.9)	314 (53.2)	218 (90.1)	266 (78.2)	150 (69.4)	116 (93.6)
Did 1 preparatory lifestyle change	144 (17.3)	129 (21.9)	15 (6.2)	43 (12.7)	38 (17.6)	5 (4.0)
Did 2 or more preparatory lifestyle changes	156 (18.8)	147 (24.9)	9 (3.7)	31 (9.1)	28 (13.0)	3 (2.4)
Missing: Don't know	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Missing: Rather not say	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. Distribution of the total LMUP scores of people who were pregnant and their partners.



1 **Table 4. Results of reliability, construct validity, and Mokken scale analyses for LMUP survey for people who were pregnant and partners.**

Item	N	Item-rest correlation coefficient	PCA component loading	CFA factor loadings	Loevinger H coefficient
People who were pregnant					
Entire scale	645	Cronbach's alpha = 0.88	Eigenvalue = 3.76	CFI 0.930. SRMR 0.041. RMSEA 0.160 (0.139-0.183)	0.68
1 – Contraception	821	0.57	0.28	0.45	0.46
2 – Timing	817	0.78	0.44	0.82	0.69
3 – Intention	778	0.86	0.45	0.84	0.78
4 – Desire	721	0.85	0.45	0.86	0.72
5 – Partner discussion	692	0.81	0.43	0.80	0.71
6 – Preparation	832	0.67	0.38	0.65	0.68
Partners					
Entire scale	226	Cronbach's alpha = 0.87	Eigenvalue = 3.76	CFI 0.976. SRMR 0.035. RMSEA 0.098 (0.059-0.139)	0.68
1 – Contraception	328	0.64	0.34	0.56	0.54
2 – Timing	336	0.75	0.44	0.77	0.70

3 – Intention	260	0.86	0.45	0.83	0.73
4 – Desire	290	0.87	0.57	0.93	0.75
5 – Partner discussion	248	0.87	0.46	0.90	0.75
6 – Preparation	340	0.43	0.25	0.37	0.58

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.13.23298453; this version posted December 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 5. Results from hypothesis testing. W values are presented for all tests except for age, there the values are a Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared statistic.

	People who were pregnant		**Partners**	
Hypothesis	**Test statistic**	**p-value**	**Test statistic**	**p-value**
Single vs Relationship	17,953.0	<0.001	1,670.0	0.009
Non-cohabiting/single vs cohabiting	32,328.0	<0.001	4,302.5	<0.001
Age				
20 to 39 vs >39	**2,540.0**	0.021	**-2,320.0**	0.030
20 to 39 vs <20	**6,220.0**	<0.001	**4,300.0**	<0.001
>39 vs <20	**2,450.0**	0.021	**4,930.0**	<0.001
Abortion vs carry to term	14,526.0	<0.001	2,947.5	<0.001
Primigravida vs multigravida	72,507.0	<0.001		
0-12 weeks vs >12 weeks	35,050.0	<0.001		
Carry to term group	24,636.0	<0.001		