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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract

Need to explain why the focus was on the pregnant women and not the rest of the womenfolk?

Conflicting statements on sampling technique- you talk of systematic sampling and random sampling at the same time.

Need to be clear on how the 299 participants were sampled

Main Paper-

Introduction

The introduction does not explain why settled on pregnant women, south east Oromia etc

Not clear on the selection of participants

Background

The background is well articulated with relevant studies. However, besides the studied in Ethiopia being limited, it would be in order to justify the need for the study further

There is also need to justify why focus is on pregnant women and not women in general?

There was also need to be clear on the study objectives for ease of understanding study design in terms of data collection, analysis, conclusions and recommendations

Methodology

How did you arrive at 299 women? How did you calculate the sample size?

Did you consider additional questionnaire to cater for spoilt/non-response?
What about data management and quality control measures?

Address spelling mistakes in the text

Ethical Approval

Clarify what you mean by informants and also the comparison subjects? It is also not ethical to refer to study group as subjects but perhaps use respondents/participants

Results

There is need to highlight at the top or provide a headline on socio-demographic characteristics before providing figures and findings

Generally, a lot of domestic violence cases in Africa are linked to harmful traditional practices or cultural factors and therefore the study seems not to have looked at critical root causes of violence against women instead the researchers settled on a limited number of independent variables as well as limited socio-demographic characteristics

Discussion

When making argument that the study showing high prevalence of DV ensure you give the figures from this study as you compare with the figures in other studies.

Rework the language '…..concerning about..'

In the discussion sections, there seem to be too many possibilities as to why the results from the current study is grossly different from other studies within and without Ethiopia. If the study design or tools had major limitation, then it might be necessary to relook at the study

Conclusion

Looks too summarized. Cleary make conclusion based on prevalence which could also be linked to socio-demographics and also make conclusions based on predictors. Don't loose focus of the study objective

Delink recommendation from conclusion and make recommendation along the two research focus areas (prevalence and predictors)

Limitation of the study
Not provided yet there are issues covered within discussion that demonstrated that there were limitations of the study such as sample size, relying entirely on a hospital-based study.

Remember the results is largely indicting men as the main perpetrators with less mention on the role of women in promoting DV.

Analysis tables

The tables from the analysis should form part of the study and not appendix coming after the Reference. Fit the table appropriately within each finding areas.

What was the reference as you do analysis for association/logistic regression?
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