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Editor Comments:

Thank you for your revised submission. Together with the reviewer's comments, please address the following editorial points:

2. We have noticed there is a significant amount of text overlap between your manuscript and previously published papers. Please edit the text throughout to reduce the similarity with these papers. We realize that some overlap is unavoidable, especially in the Methods and descriptions of the standard instrument, but please ensure that the manuscript is written in your own words as much as is possible, even when citing.

Reviewer reports:

Angela Taft (Reviewer 1):

1. In future responses to papers, it is kinder to your reviewers to include your changes in the text, not just 'it is amended. They do not then have to hunt in the text to find what the amended text is - although I am grateful for the highlights. Your explanation of the WHO Ethiopian study is important to include in the introduction as you mention the prevalence, but not the critical proviso of the province/s studied. I have used the comment how to replay reviewers comment. But I could not understand the issue regarding to WHO Ethiopian study even if I have deleted the comparison done by WHO MCS from the discussion.

2. I do understand that the impact of combined violence is significant, but as I understand it, the WHO MCS did not do this although emotional violence was measured it was not included in the prevalence figures therefore cannot be compared unless you recalculate and explain. The comparison with WHO MCS is removed and only the prevalence is kept within the manuscript.

3. It is very important to know what specific behaviors are asked in the different categories of IPV, not to say that 'series of independent questions were asked…on physical, sexual and emotional violence. What does this mean? It is amended as follows: page 5
The response variable was IPV where it combined all physical, sexual, and emotional violence. Series
of independent questions were asked for each woman on physical, sexual and emotional violence. To identify physical violence, women were asked to confirm that whether their husband push, shake, or throw something; slap; twist arm or pull hair; punch with fist or with something else; kick, drag, or beat up; tried to choke or burn; threaten or attack with any material at them to deliberately hurt them at one point in lives. For identification of sexual violence women were asked whether their husband ever physically forced them to have sex or make other sexual acts when they do not want. Similarly, to derive emotional violence in the survey, women were asked whether their husband ever said or did something to disgrace them in the presence of others; threaten to hurt or harm them or someone close to them; or insulted or make them sense immoral about themselves [16]. In this study, indicators of specific type of spousal violence were combined to form two categories, namely women who had never experienced the specific violence, and women who had ever experienced at least one type of the specific violence. The three types of spousal violence were combined into a single spousal violence variable with binary outcomes of ever or never experienced at least one type of spousal violence.

4. Please add the references for the literature that you used for your choice of explanatory variables.
Page 6:
- The following reference is added for the choice of explanatory variables [12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 31-33].

5. Discussion - I suggest that you amend the expression to say that 'most research conducted in Ethiopia so far etc…the contribution of the current study is that we have used national random population data for ever-married women aged 15-49. However, you need to be careful NOT to say one in three Ethiopian women, but consider what the inclusion ONLY of ever-married women might be for the prevalence estimate. What about single/ unmarried partnered women?
Page 11, 12
- One in three women changed to ------ one in three ever-married women
- In this study only ever married women were considered. This is stated in the inclusion and exclusion criteria (newly added).
- In the paragraph-2 of introduction I have stated that: Research conducted by WHO on domestic violence revealed that intimate partner violence (IPV) is the most common form of violence in women’s lives and showed that women were at higher risk of violence at homes than in the streets and this has serious impacts on women's health [5]. Due to this reason, the scope of research focused on ever-married women

6. You cannot compare prevalence of studies that use different populations (e.g pregnant women) or those that use measurement different from the DHS methods and then say that the prevalence is lower. I have deleted the comparison made with research conducted on pregnant women (discussion, from page 10)

7. You do need to discuss your limitations which are still missing. No evidence of poor fit is not good fit which should be higher. Are there any other limitations? I think there are.
The following correction had been made.
Inclusion exclusion criteria (page 7)
Only ever-married women in reproductive age who reported their experience of IPV were considered. Thus single/unmarried women and women who did not report their IPV experience were excluded.

Limitation of Study (Page 7)
This research was not conducted without limitation. Some factors which have significant contribution to IPV were not included.

Page 10: No evidence of poor fit it is not the limitation of the research but implied that the model fits the data well. But it is rewritten as:
“Hosmer and Lemeshow test (Table 5) revealed that P-value = 0.596 indicating the model fits the data very well. This is good and implied that the model is indeed correctly specified.”