Review of "History of Dating Violence and the Association with Late Adolescent Health"

Thank you to the authors for carefully considering initial reviewer requests; all issues previously identified were addressed satisfactorily. Based on the first-round revisions, several additional minor essential revisions and discretionary revisions are listed below. I am most concerned about the issues discussed in Minor Revision #3.

Minor Essential Revisions:

(1) Please provide a citation supporting the claim in the second last sentence of the Introduction (i.e., that “hooking up” is a primary pathway to relationship formation among today’s adolescents).

(2) It seems there was some confusion around the Jouriles et al. citation I provided, apologies for not being more clear. My concern (and the reason I included this citation) was because of retrospective recall issues. While the authors used memory prompts to improve this recall, as they acknowledge on page 18, memory is fallible, and it is possible that some non-exposed subjects were actually exposed. The Jouriles citation is an example of issues in retrospective reporting of dating violence (see the “Recency of Reports of Relationship Aggression” section in this paper). Thus, instead of discussing the cumulative vs. one-time prevalence rate differences presented in Jouriles et al., it would be preferable if the authors discussed the retrospective recall findings in the Jouriles et al. article, and the potential implications for their data.

(3) Thanks to the authors for including discussion that the small male sample size may have reduced power, and for providing sample sizes in Table 5. However, now looking at the male cell sizes in Table 5, the impact of this small sample size on inferences is concerning, and at a minimum, the authors should dedicate a bit more discussion to this in the Discussion section, to make clear to
readers these issues. If there is space, it would also be helpful if the authors mentioned this specific limitation in the Abstract. The authors may also want to consider whether including results from the current male sub-samples is reasonable; although it would make comparisons with the female sub-sample difficult, one solution might be report all associations for the “Any TDV” group for males, in order to make cell sizes more adequate and to increase confidence in the estimates.

Discretionary Revisions:
(1) Introduction, paragraph 1, last sentence: This says “additional studies” but only one citation is given.

(2) In the Introduction literature review, the authors may also want to consider discussing Ackard et al., 2007, Journal of Pediatrics, 151(5) (listed as Reference Number 5 in the current version).

(3) Spelling error of author last name in second paragraph of Introduction, fourth sentence. Extra comma in third paragraph of Introduction, first sentence. And, in Table 1, should be slapped, not “slap,” I think.

(4) Fourth paragraph, sentences two and three: For sentence two, there is also literature that demonstrates that non-physical violence is as strongly, or more strongly, related to adverse health than physical violence (e.g., Baldry, 2003, International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 2(1); Yoon et al., 2009, Violence and Victims, 24(1)), so perhaps could say “Some studies” instead of “These studies,” as the latter makes it sound like an unequivocal finding. For sentence three, this assertion would be stronger with additional citations.

(5) Were participants given any specific definition of what qualified as a dating, romantic or sexual relationship? If so, would be helpful if these definitions were given.

(6) I think the quotes around “more mild” (in description of dating violence measures) are because it is in response to a reviewer comment, but without this context, is not clear why this would be in quotes. Would suggest their removal.

(7) Thank you for including a consideration of potential pathways from victimization to adverse outcomes (which I think was in response to a reviewer request). It seems that you could expand on this theoretical argument, even though you don’t have data to actually investigate it (e.g., stress and coping pathways, potential role of HPA axis). This would strengthen the discussion. Related to theory, I think discussion of some theory would also strengthen main findings. In Table 3, the authors report that a majority of participants (male and female) experienced non-physical dating violence. Thus, arguments could be made that many of these experiences of psychological aggression were developmentally normative, and not capable of long-term harm (for a discussion of this in adults, see Jordan, Campbell & Follingstad, 2010, Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 6 or Follingstad & Rogers, in press, Sex Roles). While I appreciate that the authors could not qualitatively assess the nature of dating
violence, it seems that a theoretical discussion around why an experience that occurred to a majority of participants is potentially damaging would strengthen their findings.

(8) I appreciate the authors’ response to my prior comment about potential confounders. However, a theoretical consideration can still demonstrate that a number of potential confounders exist between dating violence and measured outcomes. Thus, the potential for unmeasured confounders deserves mention in the Limitations.

(9) In the Limitations paragraph (Discussion), please clarify what wide confidence intervals are indicative of (i.e., less precise estimates).
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