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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Pafitis,

Re: Response to the Reviewer of the manuscript "Magnitude and factors associated with Intimate Partner Violence in Mainland Tanzania" (PUBH-D-15-00286R1).

Thank you very much for facilitating in reviewing the above mentioned manuscript. We are very grateful to the Reviewer for the very constructive comments and suggestions all of which we consider have improved this version. We have addressed all comments raised by the Reviewer and all suggestions have been incorporated in the revised version. Also, we have taken note of the editorial requests as follows:

Major comments:

* Expand discussion of the ecological model in the introduction
We have expanded the background, specifically, on the ecological model by clarifying the risk factors for each of four (4) levels in the model and that these levels interact with each other (Background, Page 4-5)

* Discuss other studies about the association of IPV with age, education and size of household

We have discussed more about this association and added three (3) more references including that of Abramsky, et al. (Refer. 15)

* Page 4, line 26: cite WHO study when referring to studies with only limited regions (however it should be noted that while the current study does have more regions, it's still not national representative and in fact the current study has a much smaller sample size than the WHO Tanzania study).

This comment is valid and we have edited the argument on Page 5.

We have also replaced "larger sample" with "more geographically diverse sample". (Page 5)

* Measures, Page 7, line 7: list out background measures collected

Under the Measures (Page 8), we have included a list of background key variables that we collected

* Page 8, lines 14-19: "on the one hand" and "on the other hand" is confusing

Under the Data analysis sub-section (Page 9), we have clearly explained statistical procedures (Chi-square test) and logistic regression and threw away the confusing expressions of “on one hand” and “on the other hand”
* Totals of women experiencing IPV is not presented in any of the tables

We have included the total number of respondents and number (%) of the sample reporting different types of IPV (Table 2). They appear in the caption the Table 2.

* Results section: Expand results about Table 3

On page 12, we have expanded the results about Table 3 (Prevalence of women’s perpetration to physical violence by their exposure to types of IPV)

* Discussion:
  
  o Compare existing findings of associations with IPV experience to the Abramsky paper

  In the Discussion section (Page 16, 5th paragraph), we have discussed findings about the associations with IPV and included Abramsky paper.

  o Need to add a line in limitations about small sample size and power

  Under the limitation of the study (Page 17, first paragraph), we have included the possibility of inability to detect the associations probably because of lack of power (small sample size).

  o The interpretations of some of the existing literature

  We have corrected all removed all misinterpretations of the Tanzania DHS (2010) about GBV and IPV; everywhere in the manuscript.
Minor comments

* Page 3, lines 9-11, remove "even nuisance behavior".

The term has been removed (Page 4)

* Page 3, lines 14-16, change "as long as these acts come from" to "perpetrated by"

The change has been effected (Page 4, First paragraph, 4th line)

* Page 3, line 51: change "suggested and recommended" to "developed"

The change has been made (Page 4, last paragraph, second sentence)

* Page 5: remove "larger" from line 17

The word larger has been removed (Page 5, last paragraph, last sentence)

* Page 8, line 14: odds ratios are not a test; remove "the odds ratio" and just keep chi-squared and logistic regression

It is true. We have removed “Odds ratios” in the last paragraph of Page 9

* Page 10, lines 22-28: this discussion of what asked and how should be moved to methods, not results.

We have moved a discussion on what was asked and how to the methods section (Page 8 under Measures)
* Page 13, line 14: change "retard" to "hinder"

We have changed “retard” to “hinder” (Page 15, first paragraph, 4th line)

* Page 13, line 48: add range of IPV rates from Tanzania from WHO study (physical IPV is 33-47% and sexual is 23-31%)

We have edited and followed the Reviewer’s advice (Page 15, forth sentence of the third paragraph)

* Page 14, line 47: if authors found no statistically significant relationships, how is this "similar" to the ecological model?

This mismatch of reasoning has been removed and the sentence has been re-written (Page 16, last paragraph)

----------------------

Editorial Requests
----------------------

We have revised the manuscript as per editorial requirements and policies.

Ethics:

We interviewed people. Therefore in the manuscript we have included the name of the committee that approved your study (Page 8, under Ethical consideration, first paragraph).
Consent:

There is a statement dealing consent for participation (Page 8, first paragraph, last sentence)

Authors Contributions:

In the 'Authors Contributions' section we have included details of the individual’s contributions as listed in the manuscript.