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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

Authors improved the manuscript in terms of gender sensitivity. However, I suggest to make it even more emphasized throughout the manuscript. Instead of “female and male participants”, it is better to stay “women and men”.

Abstract

Results

You stated: “Exposure to psychological violence was more prevalent than exposure to physical violence”. Please specify for whom, for women or men, or both? Please add gender for every reporting every figure (also in the first sentence of this section in the abstract).

Regression modeling also: please avoid regression modeling where gender is one of the variables. Do it separately foe women and men whenever possible.

Conclusion

Please consider replacement of the word “valid guidance” in this context, with something like “factors which raise physicians’ attention to patient’s experience with violence”

***

Introduction

Please add a few sentences about the characteristics of domestic violence exposure among men, to justify why they were included in the study as well (apart from Slovenian’s studies). Currently, that aspect is missing. Also, when you are stating “patients in primary health care” it is not clear whether women and/or men are concerned, or just one gender.

Please consider replacing “individuals” with particular gender, or both. In majority of the text it is already improved, but it remained at some places. (minor, technical point: please provide a space between the number and the percentage in the brackets).

Method

Participants

You mentioned the age as the eligibility criterion. Could you explain how, it is
unclear now. Make sure that it is clear that both women and men were included in the study sample.

Please add if relevant ethical committee approved the study protocol (from the next subheading).

Procedure

The first 1,5 sentences, as a justification of the procedure, should not be placed in the Method, but rather somewhere in the Introduction (especially since it is not clear whether patients were asked about violence because of the data collection, or an intervention, or both).

Measures

Minor comment: I would hesitate to cite the reference [25] as a basis for constructing the questionnaire. That reference is literature review, the state-of-art one, related to violence against women, but not the one where the questionnaire designs are discussed.

Data Analysis

The criterion for determining variables to be used in multivariate regression modeling is currently missing.

Results

The first paragraph: the majority (702, 84.7%) referred to women or men? Please segregate data.

Table 1. Please provide a strong rationale why physical violence as a category to-stands-alone is missing, and is always joined with psychological violence. Is co-occurrence the case for both women and men, please?

Table 2. It is not clear what the figures 0.057, 0.456 and 0.002 are meaning? (I suppose they are statistical significance, but please somehow like this)

Factors Associated with exposure (…)

Please explain how did you come up with the “correctly identified cases of physical violence”?

Table 3. Please state in the title of the table that it is the model built for women, and avoid writing statistical results in the title.

The factors Strongly Associated with Exposure (…)

What is the gender of 14 people with a history of an employment, please?

Discussion

Points mentioned above (gender sensitivity) have to be emphasized in the Discussion, as well.
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