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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed most of my points, as well as points raised by reviewer 2. I have the following minor essential revisions:

1) Use of the term “technology-related abuse” in abstract and the main text. I wonder if this term is sufficiently clear? I would prefer the phrase “including technology-related abuse” in the abstract to be changed to “including via text and email”, to give a more accurate reflection of the questions used. Similar changes could be made elsewhere in the main text.

For example, p.10 There weren’t specific questions on “stalking through social media”, so to avoid being misleading the sentence containing this phrase might be better as “Additionally, our questions included asking about dating violence/abuse received via texts and emails”.

2) Methods p.8 Delete “five” after “unhealthy/disordered eating behaviours were assessed using..”, since only three items now used.

Last paragraph on this page: the wording here on how the cut points for sexual partners was chosen (“based on ... frequency distributions”) is not clear. It seems that the cut point for oral and vaginal sex of five or more partners was essentially arbitrary, but differed for anal sex simply because any anal sex was comparatively rare. Please therefore state something like “The cut point for risky oral and vaginal sex was defined as having five or more partners. Anal sex was less common, so the definition of risk was any anal sex. While these measures are likely to indicate sexual health risk from STIs and unwanted pregnancy, they may not constitute equivalent risk.”

3) Other abuse exposures. P11 and elsewhere (eg Results, Tables). To avoid confusion (particularly since the “other abuse” exposures include sexual abuse) please refer to other abuse exposures as “other (non-dating) abuse exposures”. This will necessitate making changes throughout the paper.
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