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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewer # 1

Comment 1: 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.

Response: Thank you. We have done as suggested.

Response to reviewer # 2

Comment 1: Make sure to define acronyms at first used.

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We have now defined the acronyms (line 15-16, page 2; line 9-10, page 4; line 4, page7; line 5, page10).
Methods

Comment 1: Thank you for including additional information about the wealth index, is there any other references you could include to indicate that this index has been used in other contexts?

Response: We have now included a reference (line 11, page 7)

Comment 2: Were there any sensitivity analyses conducted to address missing data? The authors should note if there were any non-response in the exposure/outcome as well as the covariates included in the models.

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We however did not observe any non-response in the exposure/outcome.

Results

Comment 1: Thank you for providing additional information about the trend tests for IPV. It would be useful to include the results of these in the results section and not just the figures. Similarly, in explaining the differences between women experiencing and not experiencing IPV in the results, the authors should include the results of the statistical tests used (e.g. p-values).

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We have now included the p-values for the trend analysis of the overall prevalence of IPV (page 8, line 16).

Comment 2: There seems to be no captions for the figures that were included in the manuscript. The authors should provide detailed descriptions of the figures included in the analysis. This should also include a more detailed description of the axes and report any trend tests in the results across cycles.

Response: Thanks. We have now provided the captions for the figures and detailed descriptions of the axes.

Comment 3: There seems to be two line measures. The authors can likely remove these from their version of the draft manuscript

Response: Thank you. We have done as suggested.