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Dear Editor,

We thank you very much for considering our paper ‘The associations between intimate partner violence, childcare practices, and infant health: Findings from Demographic and Health Surveys in Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru’. We have revised the paper again according to the reviewer’s suggestions and hope and believe that the paper is in improved condition. Below you find a detailed description of each point.

**Reviewer 1:**

The authors tried to revise the manuscript based on my previous comments. Still I am not happy with the revision, particularly concerning deletion of many tables. The authors deleted 8 tables from the previous manuscript, which make the manuscript even weaker. Although I suggested authors to delete some tables, this should not be 8. Since the authors used a lot of variables, I can see five or six tables. Briefly, I summarize some mistakes and suggestions below:

**Mistakes/suggestions:**

1. The final samples mentioned in the text (page 6, line 8) do not match with the information given in Table 1. In Table, the numbers are 3590, 11179 and 6260, whereas in text these are 3590, 9955, and 6290. Please correct.
   **Authors’ response:** The correct data were in the text and we have now corrected the tables accordingly.

2. Provide a reference for multicollinearity test (page 8, lines 15-17).
   **Authors’ response:** We have added a reference to the test.

3. Please write Table 1 instead of Table 2 (Page 9, line 11).
   **Authors’ response:** We have corrected this.

4. Violence information (page 9, 15-17) for Columbia is wrong (18.5% instead of 39% and 31.9% instead of 54%).
   **Authors’ response:** The correct data were in the text and we have now corrected the tables accordingly.

5. Put prevalence of severe punishment of child in Table 1 (Page 9, Lines 19-20).
   **Authors’ response:** We have added this information in Table 1.

6. Please keep old Tables (Table 2b and Table 2c either as Table 2 and Table 3) in the manuscript for descriptive information and discuss some of the important findings in result section. You can also make one Table (say Table 2) by combing contextual, resource and child care variables although it would be very long. Deletion of many tables is not a good step because of loss of important information.
   **Authors’ response:** As suggested we have reinserted Tables 2c and 2b as Tables 2 and 3. Some central descriptive findings are discussed, page 14, line 13-16.

7. Prepare one or two further tables for showing the results of bivariable analysis (based on cross table) for three countries taking **illness signs** as dependent variable and all other variables as independent variables. Normally the text is easy to understand if the information is supported by the table.
   **Authors’ response:** One table presenting bivariate results is added, titled Table 4.

8. Please change the number of tables accordingly.
   **Authors’ response:** Numbers of tables are changed according to the new number and order of tables.

9. Please explain “arrow h” mentioned in the conceptual framework.
   **Authors’ response:** An explanation of arrow h is given, page 4, lines 24-25.