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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to third round review (Manuscript ID: BMWH-D-20-00189R2)

Dear editor and reviewers,

We would like to thank you for the third round reviews of our manuscript entitled “Intimate partner violence against women and its association with pregnancy loss in Ethiopia: Evidence from a national survey” and for providing us with advice to improve the quality of the manuscript. The responses to the comments have been provided as follows.

Sincerely,

Assistant Editor Comments

Suggestion: Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship). Currently, the contributions of authors [CC, MLH, EH and DL] do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below.

Response: the aforementioned authors have made substantial contributions to the article and meet authorship criteria. We have now revised the authors contributions and it has now reads “TYT carried out conceptualization of the study, performed the statistical analysis, and wrote the original draft. CC, MLH, EH and DL have made substantial contributions to the conception of the study, the analysis and interpretation of data. CC, MLH, EH and DL provided critical feedback and helped shape the research, analysis and manuscript. All authors contributed to reviewing and editing the original draft and the final manuscript. The authors have read and approved the final manuscript and each author agrees with its submission.”

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer 2: I served as one of the reviewers for the initial submission and the revised submissions for this manuscript. The revisions made are satisfactory and addressed the issues raised. However, the authors failed to provide point-by-point rebuttal to the queries made, making it difficult to easily identify what changes were made until I read the entire manuscript to identify the tracked changes and to fish out those relating to my queries. The authors must be encouraged to do the point-by-point rebuttal to help speed-up the review process in the future.

Response: The responses to the reviewers’ comments were prepared in a summary table and attached as ‘supplementary material’. We are sorry for the inconvenience caused if the reviewer/s could not access it. We will prepare the response in text and include it in the box instead of uploading it as an attachment.

Reviewer 3: Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Response: We have now prepared the review response in text and it is included in the box.

Reviewer 4: After the review the text, methods and statistical analysis improved.
Reviewer 5: The authors have adequately amended the manuscript.
Reviewer 6: This in an interesting article and I have no comments. It should be published.
Reviewer 7: the authors have made substantial changes