

Review comment -2

This study is highly relevant to the scientific community, particularly in the Eswatini context where gender-based violence (GBV) is prevalent. It sought to strengthen the capacity of frontline professionals and influential community leaders in Eswatini to prevent and respond to GBV through a culturally grounded training intervention.

The abstract demonstrates several notable strengths while also revealing important gaps. It clearly frames gender-based violence in Eswatini as a pressing social welfare and public health issue, rooted in patriarchal structures and socio-economic dependence, which provides strong contextual grounding. The intervention itself is well described, emphasizing culturally responsive training and diverse stakeholder involvement. However, the study's scope is limited by its very small sample size of only seven participants, which raises questions about representativeness. Methodological details are sparse, with no mention of how qualitative data were collected or analyzed, making it difficult to assess rigor. Most critically, the abstract does not present findings or outcomes, leaving readers uncertain about the effectiveness of the intervention or its impact on professional and community capacity. Finally, the lack of implications for practice or policy weakens the abstract's contribution to broader GBV discourse. A further gap is the absence of a theoretical framework, which would typically provide the conceptual lens through which the intervention is designed, implemented, and interpreted. Including even a brief reference to such a framework would strengthen the abstract by situating the study within established scholarship. Taken together, these strengths and weaknesses suggest that while the study is contextually relevant and thoughtfully designed, the abstract would benefit from greater methodological transparency, inclusion of results, articulation of its significance, and acknowledgment of the theoretical foundation guiding the work.

The article demonstrates a level of English proficiency that is suitable for scholarly communication, ensuring clarity and accessibility for an academic readership.

The thematic evidence presented in the study is consistent and provides answers to the guiding research questions, though the small sample size means the findings are exploratory rather than generalizable. While these results are promising, the limited number of participants constrains the extent to which conclusions can be applied more broadly. Future research should therefore expand the intervention to larger groups, incorporate longitudinal follow-up, and compare outcomes across different community contexts to strengthen validity. Nonetheless, the study underscores the policy relevance of culturally responsive training models and highlights the importance of engaging traditional and religious leaders as agents of change. The discussion is already strong, but it could be made even more compelling by explicitly mapping findings to the research questions, adding comparative context from similar interventions, and weaving in

participant voices to illustrate the shifts in understanding and practice. Together, these refinements would enhance the clarity, depth, and impact of the study's contribution to the discourse on GBV prevention and response.

The references cited in the article are appropriate, recent, and sufficient for scholarly work. However, it is important to note that Nyawo et al. (2020) is missing from the reference list and should be included to ensure completeness and accuracy. The study would benefit from a stronger integration of the literature review and theoretical framework with the findings and discussion. While the literature review establishes the context and the theoretical framework provides the conceptual lens, these elements should be explicitly connected to the empirical results. Doing so would demonstrate how the findings confirm, extend, or challenge existing scholarship, and clarify the theoretical contributions of the study. In particular, weaving references to prior studies and theoretical perspectives into the discussion would enhance coherence, situate the results within broader academic debates, and strengthen the overall impact of the research.