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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript examines intimate partner violence (IPV) among pregnant Black and Latina adolescents in New York and compares mental health outcomes by three profiles of IPV involvement (unilateral victimization, unilateral perpetration, bilateral violence). This important topic is addressed in a succinct and well written manuscript. The results that focused on mental health outcomes by profile were especially powerful. The following suggestions are offered.

Introduction

1. Given that the study sample is entirely Black and Latina adolescents, I would like to see the introduction section structured to inform the reader about the knowledge base for this specific population. This section may need to be longer for that to happen. Consider modifying the title to match.

2. The authors include a nice justification in the discussion section (lines 37-60 on page 10, lines 1-33 on page 11) about the need to examine perpetration within this population. Given the critiques in the literature about examining women's IPV perpetration, a couple of sentences in the introduction that also support the need to examine perpetration in the population are needed.

Methods

3. Further information is needed about the context of the original study within this manuscript. What were the demographics of the original study? Were any participants in the original study excluded from this sample? Were data from all sites used?

4. More information is needed about the participants in the current sample. Were all adolescents in this sample in a relationship with a partner? Was violence only assessed for partners? For example, if adolescents were experiencing child maltreatment or living in a home where a parent was experiencing IPV, was this measured? What was the socioeconomic status of the adolescents and how was this measured? The abstract indicates that participants were low-income but it was not clear if this was based on community level factors or measured at the household level. Was any data collected about the medical payment method?
5. Additional information about data collection procedures are needed. When was data collected in the original study? How many interviews were conducted with participants? How long were the interviews?

6. The manuscript acknowledges in the limitations section that the measurement of IPV "focused on discrete acts of violence and did not capture severity, forms of abuse . . ., or other contextual elements." Do you have data on the full Revised Conflict Tactics Scale or is the data that you used only available now as it is presented in the paper? The variation in types of IPV and severity, especially as it applies to comparing perpetration and victimization, is important to this manuscript. Based on the current reading of the manuscript, it appears that one incident of verbally insulting a partner during the course of the pregnancy would be equivalent to ongoing physical or sexual abuse. This becomes particularly important given that the paper measures perpetration and victimization. Can you provide descriptive statistics about the severity and type of IPV for each of the three categories (unilateral victimization, unilateral perpetration, bilateral violence)?

7. For the prenatal distress scale, can you compare the median split for this population to other populations where this scale is used?

8. For the relationship status categories, single and never married were compared to an "other" category. Was "other" just married, divorced, or widowed? If a participant did not respond to this question or this information was unknown, was this coded as "other"?

9. There is a typing error on page 8, line 18 which makes the sentence content unclear. The sentence states, "Variables with significance of $\alpha = 0.05$ or which are were kept in multivariate models."

Results

10. For line 35 on page 10, please modify the sentence "Of these, 13% were victims, 35% were perpetrators and 52% were engaged in bilateral violence as both victim and perpetrator" to make it clear that these are mutually exclusive categories. Please add "only" after the words "victims" and "perpetrators."

Discussion

11. In the discussion section on lines 8-11 on page 10, the manuscript discusses how fear of injury from IPV may be increasing prenatal distress. However, it is not clear what the prevalence of physical IPV is within the sample of women experiencing some form of victimization. With the measurement of IPV in the paper, it is possible that the majority of women are experiencing emotional IPV and this may or may not include threats of bodily harm. Can this statement be further supported with descriptive evidence of the type of IPV?
12. It appears that IPV was measured during the third trimester and that participants were asked to reflect back on the earlier trimesters of pregnancy. If this is accurate, please add retrospective report to the limitations section.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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