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Reviewer’s report:

This study is relevant for several reasons. Most importantly it reported on two phenomena that are particularly prevalent in Uganda namely physical intimate partner violence (PIPV) and problem drinking. Information from Africa is indeed scarce which fosters the valuable information that is provided in this manuscript. Moreover, the data was generated through a population survey and with a sample that is representative of the population. Thus, I would like to reiterate the special contribution of this research to advancing knowledge on the association between problem drinking and PIPV.

The authors have provided satisfactory responses to the reviewers’ comments. The paper has improved significantly. However, the revised version still has some shortcomings that need to be further addressed. The text needs a major linguistic revision and the authors are invited to do a thorough review given the all too many typos. The abstract is unclear when reporting the results. The justification of the study on p.7 is still scattered and requires more conciseness and clarity.

In the method section, the levels of stratification in the survey design are ambiguous. This section should be revised to better describe the nature of the clusters. Moreover, the information on the weighted and unweighted samples is not necessary. They add confusion with information that is more peripheral to the main objectives of the study. The information on age subdivisions is also unclear.

The analysis strategy is presented as a recipe-type list. The information on descriptive statistics is unimportant whereas the reports on the types of analysis should be more concise.

The authors still refer to the partner of the respondent, a type of formulation that makes the text heavier to read. Given that the sample is sufficiently described as well as the measures of partner’s drinking, it is less important to remind the reader that some reports refer to the partner of the respondent.

I am not sure that Figure 1 should be kept in the results section. Besides the fact that covariates are not considered in the results reported in Figure 1, this information duplicates the first result reported in Table 2. Thus, I consider that the information will remain complete without reporting Figure 1.

The authors should also be careful in using the right wording for some of the
concepts. In the method section, multivariable and bivariable should be replaced by the words multivariate and bivariate. It is also suggested to use the word deprived instead of poor throughout the text. Finally, in the recommendation section, it is unclear why heavy drinking consumption was limited to drinking to get drunk, a notion that was not measured in this study.

Overall, this paper has a definite relevance for the field of alcohol research. However, the manuscript requires further revisions before its consideration for publication.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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