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Reviewer’s report:

Overall the rationale for the study is clearly explained and the decisions in the methods section carefully considered.

This is a simple analysis but nonetheless interesting. Therefore it is worth publishing once revisions have been made.

Much of the context section seems redundant where it is but might work in the discussion section. I think the material on p 6 should only be focused on the main research question.

Some more detailed comments follow:

The first sentences up to the words 'In Africa' belong in the methods, nonetheless a briefer version of the definition is needed for line 82.

throughout there are multiple small errors in English - often singular when it should be plural
l 85-6 you need to specify the actual frequency, ie to go into the same detail as the preceding sentence.

1 89 define 'early marriage'

l 95-97 the definition of IPV is not complete and misses out the reference to coercion

Regarding the data it took me a while to understand whether or not the source data was national, so you need to make it much more explicit early on that this is not national data but rather nationally representative.

By pooling the data from two years it is not clear whether or not this leads to oversampling (ie the same woman might fill it in on two different dates) and you need to deal with this either way.

1 198 tell us more about the data source - were the IPV questions validated for the population because some studies have found a difference in response to these same questions depending on ethnicity.
l212-217 could be slightly better worded- I would place l212-215 a little later after you have talked about the aggregation method, to make it clearer.

You should report actual p values in line with recent convention rather than a p<9.05 level of significance (l267)

l277 the % of childless is very small, you should discuss this in relation to the quality of your analysis.

l319 and on, why not report the p values?

l326-328 needs to be discussed

l410 say they may be unhappy or distressed ie add may, and the sentence as it stands is judgmental in assuming all couples would be unhappy

l462 it would be good to have more on implications.

l477 briefly state what the earlier results were regarding the references on pregnancy and IPV the conclusions may be too categorical. You might mention Bacchus' work too (http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1471-0528.2004.00108.x/full), but also very recent work

l118-119 you should clarify why the studies conflict

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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