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Reviewer's report:

In general, the authors have done a reasonable job of addressing reviewers’ concerns. Several suggestions remain:

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. On p. 9 the authors report that “Women who experienced sexual abuse had a higher prevalence of hypertension (17% vs. 14%) compared to those who did not.” I assume that this was a significant difference, although no p value is reported. Also, in the notes to Figure 1 it is stated that “No statistically significant differences were noted between type of child maltreatment and hypertension”, which would appear to conflict with the text on p.9.

2. The authors state on p. 11 that the effect size for the relationship between sexual abuse and hypertension did not change after controlling for obesity, physical activity, smoking and alcohol consumption. Is this literally true that there was no change - I would think that the effect size would have decreased slightly given that the PR dropped from 1.43 to 1.35.

3. On p. 12 the authors refer to the limitation of using a yes/no characterization of “violence exposure”, apparently referring to their child maltreatment assessments. Given that neglect does not typically involve “violence exposure”, using the term “child maltreatment” would be more appropriate here.

4. The authors sometimes refer to “sex differences”, other times to “gender differences”. Given the distinction between the terms, it would be helpful for the authors to select the most appropriate term for their study (presumably gender differences if sexual identity was self-reported) and to use it consistently throughout the manuscript.

5. On a minor note, the authors begin a sentence “Lastly” in the first paragraph of p. 12, followed by another sentence with “Finally” later in the same paragraph. Also, adding asterisks to denote significant findings in Table 2 would more readily allow readers to identify significant findings.
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