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Reviewer's report:

Regarding the posed questions, specifics regarding my answers are given below in my review:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Room for improvement
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Room for improvement
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Room for improvement
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  1. ABSTRACT: In the methods portion would state "married" as well as age, rather than only mentioning it in the conclusion.
  2. METHODS: Should be "provided" rather than "received" informed consent.

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

  1. INTRO: The first two paragraphs don't appear to be consistent for Korea. 81.9% is not 40.3%; it must be related to the type of study, but this should be described for the reader.
  2. METHODS: Initially it is stated that persons over age 19 were included in data gathering. Later it is stated that the final study population included only married people age 30 and over. It is quite unclear why only this population was considered. Why this age? Why not persons cohabiting? This also will limit the applicability of the results.
  3. MEASURES: The authors give definitions of minor and severe intimate partner violence used in their study. However, it is unclear how these definitions were
The definition for minor appears to include emotional/psychological rather than physical violence and I am unsure of the term "catty". Sexual violence does not appear to be considered. It is also stated that it had to occur during a disagreement, and occur more than once, and it is not clear why. This is a major concern: what other studies have used these definitions? How were they decided upon? Also, in measures, I am not sure how usual the household income calculation described is.

4. RESULTS: It is not clear whether there is overlap of being victimized and perpetrating in paragraph 3. In the last sentence of paragraph 3, do you mean for women as well? In paragraph 4, do you mean women were "significantly" more likely? In paragraph 5, first sentence, do you mean perpetration or victimization? The sentence at the bottom of page 7 is not clear. (OR for what?) Again, in the last paragraph of page 8, it is unclear whether you are referring to perpetration or victimization. The writing in that paragraph similarly needs further clarity.

5. DISCUSSION: The discussion would benefit from further discussion of what is novel, which includes information re: perpetration by women, and victimization of men.

6. Please explain why table 3 and 4 are represented in this way, and what information they give that is not in the text. This is unclear to me.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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