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Reviewer's report:

We congratulate the effort made in this second revision, there has been many improve making the article more shape, however we still have some points to be revise, specially in relation to research question, the rest I consider minor revision.

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   · The research question is not related with the study design; it is a cross sectional with the main aim to estimate the prevalence of IPV, however you can consider as a secondary analysis the relation between IPV and infant morbidity. (Major compulsory revision)
   · The research question says: “Is it that intimate partner violence is associated with common childhood illnesses that eventually lead to death?”, however you do not study death, but morbidity (please check the title of the article) (Major compulsory revision)
   · In the background, second paragraph, line 21, it says: “We therefore conducted a community-based study of rural and urban populations in eastern Uganda in order to determine any association between intimate partner violence and common childhood illnesses namely fever, cough with fast breathing and diarrhea”, it is better to replace the world “determine” by “explore”, because the type of study design is a crossectional one. (Major compulsory revision)

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   2.1 Consider to move the paragraph on “Sample size estimation” before “Variables and instrument (Discretionary revision)
   2.2 In the paragraph of the sample size, replace the degree of precision 0.5 by 0.05, it must be 5% and not 50% (Minor Essential Revisions)

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Data sound good and well controlled

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data
deposition?

The manuscript has relevant standards for reporting and data position

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Well balance in the discussion

You have not conclusions (Discretionary revision)

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Here, comments are related to the first question above, title responds mainly to an analytical question and not for a study to estimate prevalence (Major compulsory revision)

7. Is the writing acceptable?

No comments