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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear reviewers,

We thank you for the further careful attention to our manuscript. The reviewer’s comments were very helpful in improving the text of the manuscript. We hope that our responses and the modifications fully integrate the reviewer’s insights and sufficiently respond to their criticisms. Our responses to the reviewer’s comments are detailed below.

Reviewer comments:
Minor Essential
1. Results, paragraph 4 and 5: Please include the coefficients in addition to the p-values so that the reader can get a sense of the magnitude of the results.
Author response:
We added the coefficients.

Reviewer comments:
2. Discussion: The Discussion section currently focuses almost entirely on help-seeking and interventions to address the problem and only includes a cursory discussion of the actual results of the study (association between IPV and physical and mental health). Please add a more in-depth discussion of the results of your analysis.
Author response:
We revised the first part of the Discussion paragraph 2 to make it clearer the connection between the results and the discussion.

Reviewer comments:
Discretionary
1. Abstract, Methods, last sentence: Please rephrase to make this clearer, could be “Analysis is restricted to the married participants who completed the questions on IPV (N =167).”
Author response:
We changed the sentence as suggested.

Reviewer comments:
2. Discussion, paragraph 4: The first part of this paragraph with the description of the studies would be better placed in the Background section since your analysis does not address the question of how the type of IPV impacts health. It would be helpful in the Discussion section to mention that evidence is mixed on this issue, and your study was not able to assess physical and mental health status by type of violence experience due to small sample size and additional research is needed. I see that you have included this in the Limitations section, but you might also want to mention it briefly at the end of Discussion paragraph 3.
Author response:
We moved the part to the second paragraph of the Background section and included the suggested phrase at the end of Discussion paragraph 3.

Reviewer comments:
3. Discussion, paragraph 5: It would be helpful to add a sentence describing the intervention implemented in the Gujarati community in the U.S. since this is one of your major conclusions. This will help the reader understand what you’re recommending.

Author response:
We added the following sentence: “The program in the Gujarat community in the US distributes IPV prevention messages through social marketing and incorporates community engagement for developing campaign strategies and implementations.”

Reviewer comments:
4. Conclusion: Please edit the last sentence to be more descriptive. Do you mean implementing both facility-based and community-based interventions?

Author response:
We changed the sentence to “Implementing both facility-based and community-based interventions would be important to encourage more women with IPV experience to seek help.”

In addition to the responses to the reviewer, we made some language corrections.

We are grateful for the helpful review of our manuscript. We hope our revisions will meet the needs of BMC Women’s Health and look forward to hearing from you regarding the manuscript.