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General comment
The research topic is interesting and relevant to the field, and on the right place where VAW is very common with entrenched by different traditional norms. I have read a lot cross-sectional studies finding in India and I am so happy getting this opportunity to read and forward comments on a pilot interventional study at a place in India.

My concerns are the following
1. The design is not well reflected and justified. Why chose a single arm for piloting the work. A single arm design is relatively weaker than other two or more arm designs. How can readers understand the changes are due to something related with time and or some policy changes in the country or a mass media exposure? It would be nice if a control group was there.
2. Eligibility criteria has to be briefly and exhaustively listed out. Not clearly presented
3. There is also a confusion on the intimate partner violence and other family violence. How do you manage some sort of mix ups? Were they counted twice or what?
4. Ethical approval: the approval number and agency name should be clearly indicated. Local committee is some house doubtful for readers.
5. Method of analysis: logistic regression models with random effects, to do what? What is the effect size did you computed? Was that Odds ratio, risk ratio, prevalence ratio, prevalence odds ratio, incidence ratio? Please kindly be specific and to the point. As far as the outcome variable prevalence greater than 10%, adjusted prevalence ratio is recommended using the generalized linear model (GLM). Otherwise, you will reach a wrong conclusion.
6. Method of analysis: is it per protocol or intention to treat analysis? Not clear?
7. Results: Tables: UNADJUSTED or ADJUSTED 95%CI: unadjusted of what? Effect size measure is not specified?
8. Tables: should be designed a scientific format. Lines should be hidden and smartly designed to attract readers and illustrate the findings clearly.
9. Which guide is followed to write this manuscript? CONSORT or STaRI?

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

No

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

No

**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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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