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Reviewer’s report:

Once again, I appreciate the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled "Longitudinal inconsistency in responses to survey items that ask women about intimate partner violence."

I was quite critical of the manuscript initially, because, in my opinion, it lacked a focus on methodology to align it with journal scope. The authors have made an effort to include a narrative that makes it more relevant to investigators who are interested in undertaking longitudinal studies exploring sensitive issues. The authors have also changed their conclusion. I appreciate the mention of false positives and false negatives, as it adds clarity to the report and highlights much better the insights that it provides.

The authors have also included a more in-depth analysis of generalizability and limitations.

The discussion section was the weakest in the second revised version. The authors have now made specific changes to their third version that significantly improve the manuscript.

In my opinion, the manuscript flows consistently (to use this paper's terminology) from start to finish, without losing sight of the methodological implications (strengths and shortcomings) of this type of survey.

I recommend publication.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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