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The current study describes prevalence and correlates of intimate partner violence (IPV) IPV among college women in Nigeria. I appreciate that the authors' seek to better understand this important problem within a sample of women who is rarely studied in the research literature. Strengths of the current work include the large sample, the sophisticated sampling methods used, and the assessment mu'l'tiple forms of IPV both within the past 12 months and throughout the participants’ lives.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Despite these strengths, this report seems incomplete. The authors do not provide critical information both about the measure of IPV and about the procedure that was used to collect these data. Specifically, the authors state that the measure of IPV was adapted from the questionnaire used in the WHO Multi-Country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence against Women, but it is unclear what adaptations they made. What types of experiences “counted” as psychological, physical, or sexual abuse, and what did not? Were participants asked about multiple romantic partners, or just the current or more recent one? In terms of lifetime experiences, it is unclear if those incidents were perpetrated by a romantic partner or, in the case of childhood abuse, a caregiver. I’m also uncertain about the method in which these data were collected. The authors state that data were collected via interviews conducted by trained research assistants. Who were these assistants? Why were interviews conducted if the data on IPV was collected via self-administered questionnaire? Much more specific information about the measurement of IPV and the methods used to collect this information is needed.

2. In addition to these methodological issues, the authors seem to misrepresent women’s behaviors such as alcohol use and cigarette smoking as “determinants” of IPV throughout the paper. In truth, these data were collected cross-sectionally, which suggests that these are correlates, not predictors. Furthermore, the authors imply behaviors create IPV risk, when in fact, the direction of effect in
cross-sectional designs is not clear. For example, some research suggests that women who experience IPV are at greater risk for negative health behaviors as a result (e.g., Brener, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999). In such cases, the alcohol or cigarette use might be conceptualized as a consequence of IPV, not a determinant of it.

3. The discussion of women’s perpetration behaviors also seems incomplete. There was no rationale for studying women’s perpetration in the introduction. In addition, without more information about the assessment of IPV, it’s difficult to interpret these data. To what degree are women perpetrating violence against non-violent partners? To what degree does women’s perpetration reflect mutual violence or even self-defense? Are perpetration behaviors occurring within one or multiple relationships?

Minor Essential Revisions
The manuscript would benefit from proofreading
I hope these comments are of use to the authors
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