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Reviewer's report:

The author came a long way and improved the manuscript, this version can be read, looks much better but still needs more work.

1. The title needs to be changed to reflect the content of the article
2. Criteria would be good to be separated (Q61 should have been more complex
   a. Subject witnessed violence between parents only
   b. Subject was only abused by parents (or other member) as a child, but didn’t witnessed any violence between parents:
      Yes or No: If yes what kind of abuse the subject suffered?
      -emotional
      - physical
      - sexual
      - All of the above or in any combination
   c. Subject witnessed violence between parents and was also abused as a child
      The above separation of criteria would give clarity to analysis regarding the range of impact severity on the subject adult life considering the exposure to one form or many forms of violence and which variant had the worse impact.
      In the study are always lumped together, as a result the informational value is lost.
3. Define the quantitative measurements in terms of frequency: what means “often” and “occasionally” : Often can be once per day, or once per week. When asked in questionnaires, if not strictly defined, a bias is introduced as people have different perceptions of everything: “often” can be perceived by some individuals as occurrence every day, for others “often” means once per week and for others can be three times per day.
4. Clusters: When discussing them please follow the same criteria to compare:
   (e.g. cluster 1, the non violent one, the criteria-“is not acceptable to hit a woman” is used and a number is given 0.99 (what the number means?), but this is not mentioned for cluster 2 where the property threatening is mentioned as a criteria instead, oh, but the women criteria comes back in cluster 3, and we have another
kind of value 49%. When expressing values the consistency is missing, once is 0.99 (decimal) and once is 49% (in percentage), so what is the scale, what the numbers are actually measuring and representing, what they tell us, should I assume that 0.99 is actually 99% or 9.9%. Conclusion: when comparing clusters consistency of criteria compared and discussed as well as the numbers scale is missing in both cases.

5. Is confusing to identify the different IPV forms measured. Is important to describe the type of IPV as the 4 ones: emotional, physical, sexual, controlling behavior as we find them in the international literature and widely accepted.

At one point is mentioned that are seven types of IPV and numbers are assigned inside the same category (page 8 last paragraph), lumping 3 types in parenthesis (e.g. under physical is 3. Slapping, kicking, 4. hitting with a stick, ... and 5. threatening with a firearm,...)

6. Clarity in statements.
   a. It is stated “Two items (7, and 10) where eliminated from the analysis.....” Please name those items 7 and 10, write them down for me, the reader, to know at what you are referring too.
   b. It is stated: “being at the receiving end of violence increases the risk of further violence” violence leads to violence. What that means? Being the subject of violence the individuals are at risk to suffer more violence because they are used to, or they are the ones that are violent and submit others wicker than them to violence, or both.
   c. It is not clear what exactly the two essential modifications are in the domestic law regarding violence. The way it is stated in the manuscript, I see only one.
   d. What did you mean by “respondents were not clients of any domestic violence services” at the time of the questionnaire (better said when the questionnaire was employed”)

What I understand from this statement is that in Romania are some companies that provide services of domestic violence. By omitting the word “counseling or behavioral services” something else is conveyed to the reader.
   e. The representative sample is of 1,206 individuals and a sample of 600 women? What is the reason of choosing these samples like this? When it says individuals, I understand that are men and women, so why to double the women sample, it is any difference between them? What is the importance or gain for the study? What is the relevance of this fact for the study?

7. The limitations of the study should be discussed separate under specific title, not shoveled in the conclusions sections

8. Every section has to have a structure.
   a. This section wants to communicate this idea.
b. These are the facts that support or not, the idea to be discussed

c. The studies mentioned in support have to be named and mentioned if are domestic or international

d. Conclusion

9. The violence prevalence is one, it cannot be 76 prevalences. The word prevalence doesn’t have plural in English vocabulary. I think that at one point the incidence and prevalence terms are misused and their definitions confused.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field if gets the structure, clarity and corrections that it needs to be at international standards. The manuscript needs more work and has to be resubmitted

Quality of written English:
1. Needs more language corrections before: (e.g. page 14 second paragraph, lays vs. lie “force or strength lays in violence”

2. Choosing better words to express the idea “feelings towards the family of origin vs. feelings relating to the family

3. Use fewer acronyms and state what they are standing for (e.g. what LCA stands for? No explanation, and it is not listed at the end in the list of abbreviations)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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