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Reviewer’s report:

Overall good effort. Please consider addressing the given below comments under each section of the manuscript.

Introduction

1. What is this paper about?
   í The paper addressed the purpose of the study.

2. Why is the paper needed?
   í The rationale of the study is not discussed.

3. What is the question that the study seeks to answer?
   í The question that the study seeks to answer is well stated; however, there is no clear discussion on why is this needed. The question asked seems to be very common and many earlier studies might have already answered it.

Methods

1. Are the methods used clearly stated?
   í Yes, but there is no clear definition of the variables used in this study.

í Terms (e.g., IPV, domestic violence) are used so interchangeably and are not clear. It's hard to follow what the authors are trying to discuss. Either use the term intimate partner violence or domestic violence.

í Page 5, Line 29: Is that March 2016?
í Page 6, Line 14-27: Too difficult to read and understand.

í Page 6, Line 30: Availability of materials can be discussed under the disclaimer section.

2. Are they appropriate to the study?

í The statistical tools used are appropriate for the study.

Findings

1. Does the paper report on the findings in relation to each of the research questions?

í Yes, the findings are reported in relation to the research question. However, findings are not too clear. Some of the findings are non-differentiable between cases and controls. Also, be consistent in reporting numbers and percentages, else it's hard to follow the numbers.

í Consider presenting only the important findings of the study rather than presenting all in the text. You could refer to the tables for the remaining findings of the study.

í 5 variables reported in the findings are not discussed anywhere above that creates confusion. It should have been well stated under the method section.

í Page 8, Line 56-58: What do you mean by enter method regression?

í Page 9, Line 22-23: Again, description on subcategories of the variables should have been explained above under the methods.

í What are the findings for the other two variables (sexual and psychological)?

Table 1

" Unit for monthly income?

Table 2

" Consider including footnote for the definition of unintended pregnancy. Also, add abbreviations.

2. Are the answers clear and convincing?
í Not completely

Table 5
"There is a confusion over the multivariable findings. What outcome are you looking for? Is that for pre-term birth or low-birth weight or both?

Discussion

1. Are the key findings in relation into each research question stated?
í Yes. However, there is a repetition of most of the findings rather than interpretation of the findings.

2. Are the interpretations of the findings stated?
í Interpretations of the findings are stated but is not satisfactory.

3. Are the findings compared with the findings from other studies?
í Yes, but not sufficient.

4. Are the strengths and weaknesses stated?
í Strengths and limitations of the study not stated.

5. Are the implications of the findings for research and action stated?
í The implications of the findings not stated.

Conclusion

Does this section clearly and concisely state the conclusions of the study in relation to the key question it sought to answer and the contribution that the paper would make?

í No. This is just a mere repetition of the findings. What are the implications of this study? What would be your future recommendations?
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