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Reviewer’s report:

Title:

The authors said they changed the title per reviewer feedback, but it does not appear actually changed.

Abstract

Appears fine

Background

Would be OK to use abbreviation of IPV represent Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) after the first usage.

It would be easy to follow if the authors will reorganize the outline of background. For example, firstly, we can start IPV refers to …….. Secondly, in studies in high income countries….. Thirdly, According to WHO in Thailand….. Fourthly, there is lack of studies….. Finally, the aim of study.

Method

Measures description would be consistency if the authors can interpret the level of score in each tool, some tools interpreted, some tools not.

In Data analysis part, authors use 95% confidence interval, but they wrote in abstract and table is 99%.

The justification for using the outdated 15-item DA is not particularly strong, but it will do.

Discussion

Is improved

Table
Table 1, 2, 3, 4, it will make it easy and strong table if the authors can put $P<0.005$ and put * to indicate significant.

Conclusion

It is fine.

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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