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Thank you very much for the reviewers’ responses to our manuscript titled, ‘Prevalence and correlates of intimate partner violence towards female students of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria’. It has helped to improve the quality of the work. Below are our responses to the reviewers’ comments.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr J. Umana

Response to the reviewers comments

Response to Jennifer Katz:

Major Compulsory Revisions.

1. Information about the measures of IPV and the procedure used to collect data has been clarified. See page 5, Paragraphs 3-4.

   Types of experiences that counted as psychological, physical, or sexual abuse are depicted in a new table. See page 5, paragraph 5 and table 4 on page 17.

2. Our study was a cross sectional study and as such ‘correlates’ replaces ‘determinants’, ‘predictors’ and ‘causes’ in the edited manuscript. See the title and abstract on page 1, table 5 on page 17, and in the body of manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions

The manuscript has been proofread by the authors and peers.
Response to Katie Edwards

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Please see major compulsory revisions No. 1 under response to Jennifer Katz.
2. A survey/questionnaire was used for data collection and has been clarified. See page 5, paragraph 5.
3. The questionnaire used is attached.
4. Figure 1 on page 15 has been included to show the rates of IPV.
5. The reference group of the odd ratio is represented by 1.000. See table 5 on pages 17 and 18.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The manuscript had been proofread and grammatical and typographical errors corrected. For example, see paragraph 2, and line 4 of the abstract on page 1.
2. Comparison groups have been included. Please see the results section of the abstract on page 1, and paragraph 3.
3. An example of adverse effects on academic performance has been given in the abstract section. See page 1, paragraph 3, and lines 11 and 12.
4. Rates of IPV in Nigeria have been provided in the introduction. Please see page 3, paragraph 4.

The authors have stated what this study adds to the literature on IPV. In addition, specific objectives and conceptual framework for our study have been included in the introduction. See page 3, paragraph 4, and page 4, paragraphs 1 to 4.

Similarly, a section on attitudes towards IPV has been included in the edited manuscript. See page 7, paragraph 2 and table 4 on page 17.

5. We used the female respondents. However, we have recommended the use of male and females participants in future studies to further explore IPV.
6. Peers were not listed as an option for informal support disclosure, because in the literature of IPV in Nigeria, peers are not the usual confidants.
7. Limitations of our study and future research are included in the edited manuscript. See page 10, paragraph 2.

Discretionary Revisions

1. We have used transitions between paragraphs in the introduction and discussion sections of the edited manuscript.
2. We have also used percentages rather than vague terminologies. For example, see page 2, paragraph 3, and line 2.
3. The statement ‘it is likely that students who were resident off campus may have had different experiences’ has been expunged, because our research is not to support the statement.