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Reviewer's report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS according with the suggested questions:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   No. To me, the objective is clearer stated on page 7: "to understand what happens when things do not go well when couples are fighting, and particularly what happens when couples use aggression", than in the objectives paragraph of the introduction; there, there is not a general objective and 4 specific objectives. Besides, these "objectives" coincide with the structure of the results, which is not properly qualitative (maybe a deductive approach, not inductive, so clarify it at the methodology section).

I totally disagree with the use of the term Intimate Partner violence for these cases. I agree with the terms disagreements between them or even psychological aggressions, but labeling it as IPV is a strong affirmation, since it is a serious phenomena including severe physical violence with serious consequences, even death for mainly women according to statistics. I suggest using psychological violence instead. I agree with hitting and pushing are physical violence and authors should reflect it, of course, but it is not the focus of the all study. Authors should be aware of the danger of minimizing the risk of violence with their statements, only be careful with that :). Besides, on page 16, authors state that "excluded those who had experienced IPV resulting in physical injury", which should be explained at the methodology section -recruitment-.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   No, because authors first describe the study design and then the method of recruitment, and would be better to describe first de description of the sample (now, 3rd paragraph). It is necessary to make clearer that the therapist collaborated in the recruitment of participants, with an active role. I think it is not necessary the mean age of the children, maybe would be more useful to see this data in a small table: how many children have each couple? ages of the children? to be able to see the differences between them. And what about the ages and sociodemographic data of the couples? Years of marriage? Are all marriages or cohabitant couples? Years of relation? Other important thing is to identify couples with codes or something similar.

The key topics of the interview coincide with the specific objectives and with the structure of results; that sounds at deductive approach, looking for specific topics at the interviews instead of exploring what emerges of them, please clarify it.
That is why using "grounded, content analysis approach" does not seem proper to me. I think this kind of analysis is totally a thematic content analysis, following a deductive pattern. The steps followed by authors are correct if they state they are following a deductive approach. To me is not clear, neither, why authors read the transcriptions and listen the audio recordings at the same time, since listening precede to transcribe and then it is not necessary to listen again, only in case they have any doubt (if so, they could specify it). Who performed the interviews, who transcribed and who analyzed them?

3. Are the data sound?
Yes but identification of participants are needed, to the reader be able to know which quote corresponds with which couple.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Well, the discussion should begin with the main result, and now is not answering to the general objective. More contrast of the results and references are needed.
Sometimes authors mention "implications for intervention development" but not explain them, for example page 14. On this page also mention "vulnerable women", what are the characteristics of these women and why are vulnerable? a explanation is required.
Page 15, "the impact of violence on well-being may be very different for men and women": please explain it deeply.
The fist sentence of the conclusions is pertinent and could be also the main result (explaining it more). But to me the conclusions seems implications to practice. Page 16, "innovative programs are providing support for parents", what kind of programs?

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes, but in the abstract’s conclusions something is missing, more information concluded by the study and not only implications. More keywords are needed.

10. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes
Other comments:

About the introduction, the first paragraph of introduction about interventions pertains to the justification of the study and maybe could be moved to other part of the introduction, preceding the objective, because is telling us why is important to perform such kind of study.

I think it is not scientific including only one reference for one big paragraph, explaining in each paragraph one study each; authors should do a further effort to summarize and contrast the information (page 4, pages 5).

Last paragraph of the introduction (page 5) before the objective would be more appropriate for discussing the results.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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