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Characteristics of adults involved in alcohol-related intimate partner violence: Results from a nationally representative sample (MS: 1364504683120837)

Dr. Pafitis:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. We discuss each of your comments below. Referees’ comments are summarized in **Bold italics**, and our responses and amendments to the manuscript are denoted below. All changes to the manuscript are highlighted with track changes.

**Referee 1**

1. The referee stated positive excerpts throughout their review of our manuscript: “The author(s) question is well defined and grounded in the literature. The methods are sound. The authors are clear about their published and unpublished work, and the writing is great. Exceptional article.”
   The authors appreciate these comments and thank the referee for the positive feedback on our work.

2. The referee notes that the authors should provide more detail about their measures. For instance, an alpha coefficient should be presented for the mental health measure and other scales where appropriate.
   We agree that we did not thoroughly describe our measures and provide enough internal consistency information. Throughout the measurement section, we added alpha coefficients, intraclass correlation coefficients, and citations to other studies that have validated and demonstrated reliability for these tools (see pages 6-8).

3. The referee notes that the data are especially sound and appropriate to address our research question, the authors thoroughly address the limitations of their study, and do not generalize beyond their conclusions.
   We agree with the referee and we appreciate their positive feedback.

**Referee 2**

4. The referee notes, “The study is interesting and adds to the body of knowledge on the risk factors of exposure to violence.”
   We thank the referee for their positive commentary regarding our research.

5. The referee suggested that we delete the reference from the abstract.
   This is an excellent point raised by the referee, and the reference has been removed from the abstract.

6. The referee stated that, “The use of alcohol at the time of the event needs to [be] clarified. The time frame at the use needs to be explained. Does it include use before the violent act?”. Relatedly, the referee suggested that, “event level alcohol use referred to drinking at the time violence happened. Violence could also have been a result of alcohol use before [the] event happened. This should be captured as a limitation of the study.”
   We agree that the measure of alcohol consumption in its temporal proximity to the IPV event is a limitation of the study. The item that measures alcohol use during IPV is now highlighted in italics on page 8.
Further, on page 12, we note that, “the quantity of alcohol consumed by each partner during an IPV event is unknown, and quantity of alcohol consumed could be associated with aggressive behavior. Unfortunately, the data did not capture the length of time each partner spent drinking, or how temporally proximal their alcohol consumption was to the IPV event.” This is certainly a direction for future research, which is noted on page 13: “This finding lays the foundation for future research that will investigate the relationship between event-level alcohol use and victimization and perpetration of IPV, ideally quantity and frequency reported by both partners. Future research should refine the measurement of alcohol-related IPV to evaluate event-specific instances of partner violence, and the perceived role in which alcohol use directly impacts IPV event severity.”

7. The referee suggested that we provide more information about the number of participants in Wave I of the NESARC and the attrition rate between waves. We agree with this suggestion. At the request of the referee, we added the following passage on page 5: “Participants were eligible if they participated in Wave I (2001-2002) of NESARC (N=43,093) and did not becoming ineligible (e.g., institutionalized, or no longer alive), resulting in an 81% response rate [25].”

8. The referee suggested that mention which software package we used for data analysis. To clarify which statistical package we used for analysis, we revised the following sentence on page 9: “All statistical analyses were conducted using the STATA 12 analytical package (StatCorp, College Station, TX).”

9. The referee mentioned that there were inconsistencies in the number of decimal points reported in the manuscript, and we should revise for consistency. We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript and it appears that we report two decimal places (after the decimal point) throughout the manuscript. If there is a specific table the referee is referring to, we will be more than happy to make the changes.

10. The referee noted a spelling error on page 9, where we use the word “us” rather than “use”. This is a “good catch” by the referee. This change was made on page 9.

11. The referee suggested that we “delete” mention of the objectives in the discussion section, as these have been stated earlier (in the introduction).” We agree that we were repetitious in reiterating our objectives. Instead, we briefly noted the findings of the present study, and why these results are important for research and prevention.

Thank you again for providing for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript.