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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

In response to your email d.d. December 13th, 2016, we revised the manuscript and incorporated the suggestions made by the reviewers. To facilitate the re-review of the manuscript, all changes were highlighted in yellow.

Underneath, we provide an overview of all adjustments made:

• Reviewer 2, first major revision: adaptations were made to the ‘Perceived helpfulness of the intervention’ section in the discussion chapter.

• Reviewer 2, second major revision: we experienced a substantial lost-to-follow-up at the second time point (N= 199 at interview 1 and N=152 at interview 2). Since we already faced statistical analysis challenges associated with the small sample size at the first time point, it is highly likely to have more difficulties with an even smaller sample. We estimated that it would be more logical to split our results over two papers based on the first and second interview since we were able to report primary and secondary outcomes for the same time period. Moreover, the techniques for longitudinal analysis are very different from the non-
longitudinal analysis and therefore we grouped our results based on the timing of the interviews.

• Reviewer 2, first minor revision: in an attempt to assess the impact of the missing data on our outcome variables, we explored three different scenario’s (worse case: all missing data are IPV cases, best case: all missing data are no IPV cases and Last Observation Carried Forward). We performed this single imputation analysis to get an idea where our results would be situated between the extremes (results see line 378-386). Based on this analysis, we had little reason to believe that the missing data would have biased our results. Hence, we did not invest in other modern missing data techniques.

• Reviewer 2, second minor revision: In the first phase of the research, our participants filled in a written questionnaire in Dutch, English or French, which could be done in with limited language skills. However, it is very difficult to judge to what extent the women understood what they were filling out in a questionnaire with multiple choice answering options. This situation was very different from a telephone interview setting. Here, the researcher was able to test and judge if the respondent is proficient in a certain language and actually understands what she was being asked for. That is the reason why a woman was lost or excluded for language reasons in the second phase, since there were some women that did not understand the instructions of the interviewer although they filled in the baseline questionnaire.

We hope these adaptations will facilitate the swift publication of our manuscript.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. An-Sofie Van Parys,
Ghent University, Belgium