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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions:
1. Line 101: it would improve the readability of the paper when the objective of the article is put in a new paragraph
2. Line 124: the WHO definition of intimate partner violence indeed focuses on women, but research has clearly demonstrated that it does not only affect women, so I would suggest to leave out ‘to women’ and use men and women or to persons
3. Line 133: it is very positive that you specify the use of the meaning of the words abuse and violence, this contributes substantially to the clarity of your message throughout the manuscript
4. Line 164: I suggest you use the commonly used term ‘search strategy’ instead of search architecture
5. Line 165: what do you mean when you refer to subject headings, MeSH terms?
6. Line 229-231: it would improve the structure of this section when you group the information on the selected studies per study design and study population
7. Line 308: they gave birth in which country?
8. Line 385: do people experiencing physical violence access services more quickly or was it also for people experiencing emotional abuse?
9. Line 629: women-centered makes it more clear

Major compulsory revisions
1. The article is quite extensive and long to read. I think the manuscript could benefit from reducing the amount of pages and making it more concise for the readers, especially in the results and discussion sections
2. Line 157: what is the reason for using a time limit of 67 years (from 1946 to 2013). Literature older than 10 years is generally considered to be dated…
3. Line 174: you reviewed a huge amount of abstract (6169) with 8 persons, how were the tasks devised? More information on that process is required
4. Figure 1: indicates that out of 6169 abstracts, 49 full text articles were selected for further review. It would be helpful if you included additional information on the process, reasons for inclusion or exclusion here too
5. Line 252: people with mental health problems are not necessarily seen or perceived as ‘disabled’. The manuscript could benefit from additional explanation on this matter.

6. Line 272 and other: recommendations or suggestions should not be included in the results section and are more at place in the discussion or in a separate recommendations section. This is repeatedly (e.g. line 367, 426, 494) being done at the end of each subsection throughout the results and this should be avoided.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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