Author’s response to reviews

Title: Is economic dependence on the husband a risk factor for intimate partner violence against female factory workers in Nepal?

Authors:

Sunita Dhungel (dhungel.sunita100@gmail.com)
Pabita Dhungel (pabitadhungel@yahoo.com)
Shalik Dhital (heductro@gmail.com)
Christiane Stock (cstock@health.sdu.dk)

Version: 2 Date: 19 Apr 2017

Author’s response to reviews:

BMWH-D-16-00334R1

Response to Reviewers

We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments. We have edited the manuscript according to language errors. We have dealt with the reviewers´ comments as follows and all changes are marked in yellow in the revised manuscript:

Reviewer 2

1) Abstract- Conclusions in the abstract are different to the conclusions in the text

Response: This was corrected by adding an additional sentence to the conclusions section (p.17).

2) Page 4, Line 24 - Please cite reference and identify which characteristics of males you are referring to

Response: We have amended this.
3) Page 4, Line 34 - It may be useful to cite the global range of prevalence here rather than later in the paragraph

Response: We have amended this.

4) Page 4, Line 44 - Alcohol is one of the associated factors, not the sole cause of murders (Ref 4 - WHO Fact Sheet 2006).

No evidence in the above paper that ‘murder rate of women is rising’. Or do you mean to say that ‘Alcohol is associated with increased murder rate of women’. There is evidence to support the latter statement

Response: We have deleted the statement on increasing murder in order to avoid confusion.

5) Page 4 Line 56 - Please cite reference to support your statement

Response: We have added a reference to support the statement.

6) Page 5 Line 14 - please cite page number for ref 6

Response: Reference 6 was deleted from the reference list as it was identical with reference 9.
7) Page 7 Line 17 – identify the ‘type of study’

Response: We refer now to the specific study.

8) Page 7 Line 41 - Page number please

Response: We did not add a page number to the reference as this is only required for direct citations.

9) Page 11 Lines 7 and 9 – Is that Nepalese Rupees annually?

Response: We specified that monthly income was meant.

10) Page 11 Line 24 - Four quarters equals 100% - do you mean 75% or 100%

Response: We corrected this to three quarters.

11) Page 11, Line 24 - Women were selected from 4 factories – were they paid workers, if so can you clarify how they were economically dependent.

Response: We explain in introduction (with 2 references) and in the discussion that although the women in the sample were paid workers they are still dependent due to the extremely low wages.
12) Page 11, Line 48 – is it ‘economically depend’ or economically dependent

Response: We have corrected the typo.

13) Page 11, Line 51 – is it “having” or have

Response: We have corrected the typo.

14) Page 14, Line 43 - Women were selected from 4 factories – what happened to their income, why were they economically dependent

Response: We explain in introduction (with 2 references) and in the discussion that although the women in the sample were paid workers they are still dependent due to the extremely low wages.

15) Page 15 Line 24- please comment on differences in your study and the majority of literature that records higher prevalence in younger women

Response: We changed the discussion on age of women accordingly to show that there is mixed evidence regards the age effects.
16) Page 16 Line 29- please also mention cultural factors that limit women’s choices to leave violent marriage

Response: We do not think that this argument fits here, because the sentence only refers to cultural factors related to age of first intercourse. Therefore we did not change the respective sentence. Instead, we included the statement in the introduction (Page 3)

17) Page 16 Line 46- Was knowledge about IPV “one of the protective factors” or the main factor

Response: We changed the formulation from “the protective factor” to “a protective factor” to make clear that it was not the main factor.

18) Page 17 Line 31- Can you make some hypothesis why your study is showing older women more at risk- more marital quarrelling, sometimes that is followed by violence (Jewkes 2002), or older women may be more willing to reveal IPV than younger women or perhaps more capable of challenging their husband with resulting violence

Response: We included these ideas for interpretation into the discussion of the age effect.

19) Page 17, Line 37- “No conclusion regarding casual relationship” - that should be causal

Response: We have corrected the typo
20) Page 18, Line 14- Please match the conclusions to your abstract

Response: We have done this now by adding a sentence on long-term prevention strategies

Reviewer 1

Major comments

1. The heading of the article seems not clear to me. Your whole article reflects that economic dependency on their husband make women more vulnerable to Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) but the title of the article conveys contradictory concept. Please rephrase the title of the article.

Response: We have rephrased the title to show better that a positive association between these two factors exist

2. In the introduction in Pg. 3 line 56 says "In Nepal, IPV against women is encouraged due to ......." What evidence do you have for this claim? Please provide evidence based reference before claiming such statements. There are other statements which would add validity to your article if you give references. For e.g. line 34 in Pg. 3 when you were claiming there different prevalence rate of IPV around the globe. In Pg. 4 line 4 when you were stating that women have less ownership and poorer background.

Response: We have added references to all these statements now.
3. In the introduction you should also clearly state that why this research is necessary to focus on these carpet worker women, the rational you have provided in Pg. 5 should come before in Pg. 4 last paragraph which gives more clear message why you are conducting this research.

Response: We have restructured the introduction according to your suggestions, so that the argument why the study focuses on factory workers comes earlier.

4. The sample size calculation should be explained more in detail. How did you selected the 3 carpet factories, was it also convenience sampling? It is not explained. In Pg. 6 line 46 you have said your questionnaire is based on "different other studies" which studies? Is it based in Nepal or in other countries?

Response: We describe that the sample size calculation was based on a sufficient number of respondents for a valid IPV prevalence estimation. We describe now that the 3 carpet factories are selected on convenience basis. We deleted the sentence containing “different other studies” to avoid confusion. Questionnaire items taken from NDHS were indicated as such.

5. Your questionnaire explanation is too long, can you minimize it differentiating in 4 broader sections. Most of your questions has been categorized into binary, yes or no answers can you specify explanation only those questions, which has multiple category?

Response: We have reduced the questionnaire description substantially to avoid too lengthy descriptions.
6. Results pg. 9 line 22 what do you mean by "no availability of sampling frame" It would be helpful if you could explain them

Response: We have deleted the sentence, because it is less relevant and causes confusion. Instead we explain now that we used purposive sampling.

7. In the result section in factors associated with physical IPV you have mentioned all 4 significant factors, is there any reason why you did not follow the same pattern for other factors in sexual IPV where only 2 factors were mentioned where as in the Table 3 decision making was also significant and in factors associated with psychological IPV you have mentioned all significant association except for educational factor; where as your table 4 shows the significant association. Why did you omit these factors?

Response: We did mention all significant factors. For Table 3 decision making was mentioned as significant factor, but the order of variables mentioned in the text did not follow the order in the table. We changed that. For Table 4 lower education was mentioned as significant factor.

8. The last paragraph of result section is not clear

Response: We reformulated the last paragraph to make it clearer.

9. The Discussion needs some revision to be clearer and stronger. Discussion should summarize only the major findings interpreting what the findings mean. It should also explain the implications for policies and programs from these findings. For e.g. in Pg. 14 line 46 if you could also discuss how/ why education act as a protective factor? In Pg. 15 line 7 if you could also discuss why this discrepancy in your findings occurred.
Response:

We re-structured the discussion to put more focus on significant main factors.

We also included a statement why education can be a protective factors and an argument why education of the women did not remain significant after adjustment for education of the husband.

10. Please give reference to your statement in Pg. 15 line 24 comparing IPV in western and Nepali context in Pg. 15 line 31, the whole paragraph "several other factors showed ..... factors to some extent " is not clear. Please explain. In Pg. 16 line 27 "however due to..................intercourse into account" can you please clarify what does this mean?

Response: We explain the protective factor of arranged marriage on page 15 better now. We have deleted the other unclear paragraph on age of women at first intercourse in order to streamline the discussion towards important factors (comment 9).

Minor comments

1. The result reported in the abstract in the significant factors is somewhat selective, economic dependency as well as age of women should also be mentioned.

Response: We revised the abstract accordingly.

2. There are some typos

Pg. 3 line 51 "into" should be rephrased DONE

Pg. 5 line 19 "weakening " did you mean "influencing"? WE CHANGED THE WORDING

Pg. 5 line 33 mention the specific age group 15-49 years DONE

Pg. 13 line 38 " our study......." whole paragraph is a repetition
Response: We avoided the repetition by deleting the second study aim in the beginning of the discussion and left it only here.

Pg. 15 line 19 "economically" repetition DONE

3. Conclusion should be rewritten to make it more succinct
Response: The conclusion part has been revised

4. The authors need to mention about the further research
Response: We mention future research in the conclusion now