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Revision note

Knowledge, experience, and potential risks of dating violence among Japanese university students: a cross-sectional study

The authors thank the reviewers for their comments. We have revised the manuscript in accordance with the reviewers’ comments as indicated below. In addition, the article has been checked by a native English speaker.

**Responses to Reviewers**

Minor essential revisions

1. Reviewer’s comment
   
   I would move the following sentence to the limitation section: “The WHO multi-country study in Japan was performed in Yokohama city, which is one of most urbanized cities in Japan, and the results may not be representative of the situation in different areas of Japan, such as small towns, rural areas, etc., or of the country as a whole.

   Response
   
   The sentence has been removed from the revised manuscript.

2. Reviewer’s comment
   
   Regarding Cronbach’s alphas, I would recommend presenting alphas for perpetration, victimization and recognition of abuse, but point out their relative strengths in the limitations section.

   Response
   
   Cronbach’s alphas for perpetration, and victimization have been added to the Results section in the revised manuscript (p9, l12-13, and p10, l5-6), and a sentence has been added in the Discussion section (p19, l1-4).

3. Reviewer’s comment
   
   Table 4 is not helpful to summarize the results you present in the text. I would remover the current Table 4, and create a table with the numbers you present in the text. I would also remover Table 5. This information can be summarized in the text.
just fine.

Response

Tables 4 and 5 have been removed from the revised manuscript in accordance with the reviewer’s suggestion. The summary of help-seeking after receiving harassment was described in the text rather than creating a new table because the present study does not focus mainly on evaluating help-seeking behavior following harassment (p12, l2-3).

Discretionary revision

1. Reviewer’s comment

I am hesitant to put weight on the item measuring “neglect” of dating partner. I am unclear on what neglect in this case entails. I would remove the item from the first part of your discussion section.

Response

The “neglect” item has been omitted from the Discussion section in accordance with the reviewer’s comment. In questions about “neglect,” including Tables 2 and 3, the word “neglect(ed)” has been changed to “ignore(d)/ignoring their partner” in the revised manuscript.

2. Reviewer’s comment

You present quite a few results. I think the results section would be more organized if you provide section headings for the results. This is because the response options are the same for all sections and it is easy to misunderstand one paragraph is the perpetration of behaviors while the next section is the experience of victimization.

Response

Section headings have been added in the Results section in accordance with the reviewer’s comment.

3. Reviewer’s comment

Discussion: the mention of the Safe Dates program does not make sense here. You could reward the sentence starting with “Foshee, et al” to read (for example): “The Safe Dates program implemented among adolescents in [insert country here]
addressed sexual health in dating relationships however evaluations to date have not demonstrated long term effectiveness to reduce threats to adolescent sexual health.”

Response
The sentence has been reworded in accordance with the reviewer’s comment.