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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me for reviewing this manuscript.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

In general the manuscript is difficult to read and to follow. The manuscript structure must be improved to help the reader to better follow the flow of ideas. For example, adding subtitles might help.

In addition, the text clarity could be improved if reviewed by a language specialist.

Background

It is not clear what is the main focus of the article. The introduction addressed several topics related to violence against women but it not clear whether the manuscript is about IPV, domestic violence or violence against children. Sometimes domestic violence and IPV seem to be used as synonymous when they have different meanings. The differences between these term should be clarified.

Page one, third paragraph: Talks about the prevalence of violence in Europe; however, it is not clear what type of violence the author is talking about.

Page two, first paragraph: A subtitle named setting should be included here to describe what is known about VAW in Rumania. I suggest to start with prevalence figures and them move to legislation. Also, when describing the studies previously conducted in this setting it is important to clarify what are they reporting. Currently, it is not clear whether the studies report physical violence, sexual violence, emotional violence or all. Also, it is not clear who is the perpetrator (a partner, a stranger) or the time frame (ever, in the last twelve months, etc.)

Page three: The aims should be after the rationale.

Aims: The study has a cross-sectional design thus risk factors are difficult to assess. What can be assessed are associated factors. The aims are two broad and not quite represented in the results section of the manuscript.

Page three, four paragraph must be included and integrated in the aims as well. The rationale also need improving. It does not satisfactorily answer why this manuscript is important and what does it adds to what is already known about
this subject in this area. The objectives does not seem to differ much from what other studies conducted in this setting (and described in the introduction) have studied.

The author mentions that the methodology used could be a reference for other authors; however, it is not clear why should be considered as such.

The author also mentions that based on her findings she can determine whether there has been a decline in IPV levels when comparing with other surveys. However one wonders in these surveys are indeed comparable between themselves or even if the use the same methodology.

Methods
I suggest starting by adding subtitles string with the study design, and later the setting. In the setting it is mentioned that the settings were chosen because they have certain characteristics but it is not clear whether this are in common or else.

What criterion was used to calculate sample size? Also describe how randomization was achieved. Did you have a list of subjects or used public records to select the individuals?.

Questionnaires
The measurement described here are not clear. For example, was the same scale used to measure IPV on men and women? If so, were this scale came from (WHO, conflict tactic scale, etc). What questions are asked ? Some examples might do.

Ethical considerations
The WHO recommends interviewing one woman per household and not to interview the woman’s partner because it might put the women in danger. However you have do so. What was the purpose of this?

Please describe how the women who were found exposed to violence were handled and how was the interview environment set during the interview.

Analysis
Describe what LCA means the first time the term is used.

It is not clear what analyses did you do to asses risk factors since latent class analysis is Latent Class Analysis (LCA) is “a statistical method for identifying unmeasured class membership among subjects using categorical and/or continuous observed variables” rather than looking for adjusted associations between variables.

Results
I suggest to describe first the prevalence and then the associated factors. The prevalence should be described by gender, by type of intimate partner violence and by time frame (last year, ever).

Reference to proper tables are missing through the whole section.

It is mentioned that the prevalence does not vary by birth cohorts; However, this analysis is not described in the methodology. The table addressing this
information is not referred here as well.
Page eight last paragraph is difficult to understand.
The reference to the table addressing the association between exposure to violence at the family of origin and the current violence is missing.
I suggest that the profiles regarding violent behavior are described separately by gender and compared between them.

Discussion and conclusion
Difficult to assess before previous comments have been addressed.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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