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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This is a well-developed paper. The research provides some interesting discussion, and while it is confirming previous research is important and relevant. It would be useful for the authors to discuss the implications of the results of this study. For example, how can these results be used to help develop interventions to address issues of relationship violence. Given the sample was a population based sample these results provide an opportunities to discuss population level in addition to more targeted strategies.

There are a few points which need clarifying:

The abstract states: "Conclusions: Psychological aggression plays a more relevant role in women’s relationship satisfaction than physical aggression".

Identify in what direction this is - is psychological aggression more concerning, related to greater dissatisfaction etc for women than men?

How did the RAs ensure both partners completed the survey? There is no discussion as to whether questionnaires were rejected if both partners did not complete the survey. Given the data were matched I assume this is the case however this should be discussed along with the partner attrition (one partner returning and the other not)

RAs recruited "1/3 of whom could be acquaintances and the rest unknown" - how did the RA's find the unknown participants? How did they assure partners both completed the survey? Was there any bias with recruiting the acquaintances?
The authors state: "to confirm the veracity of the data, a random control of 10 percent of the participants of the study was performed. Please explain how this was achieved.

Limitations page 24, line 10

The second limitation states:

Second, given that the study consisted of couples and not individuals, the answers to the questions about the relationship satisfaction and the use of aggressive behaviours may be influenced by the partner's answer or by what the partner expects to hear due to factors such as social desirability, which is an important response bias.

In this section the authors suggest partners were given and the surveys independently. How did the RA's match the partners and provide both with the surveys? What was done to reduce social desirability (for example, discussing the importance of honesty etc)

Page 22, line 19

The association with Cognitive Dissonance in this context is good, however it would be useful to describe in a little more detail - are the women who are happy using dissonance to justify and possibly ignore the behaviours? Describe and also show the associations for those who are dissatisfied

Edits:

The following sentences are confusing (consider editing):

Page 6, line 6
"such that high relationship satisfaction will be related to reporting less aggression than that reported by the partner, whereas low relationship satisfaction will be related to reporting more aggression than the partner reported."

Page 3, Line 7: interjudge agreement (what does this mean)

Page 19 Line 2 and Page 19, Line 17
"Neither men's relationship satisfaction was significantly associated with couples' mean or differential reports of male and female -perpetrated psychological aggression."
Neither men's relationship satisfaction was significantly associated with couples' mean or differential reports of male and female-perpetrated psychological aggression.

What is meant by 'neither men's'

Page 20, line 10
Comma should be moved to: of the couples, and

Page 21, line 3
Should this read more male than female …?

"In addition, this report identified more male and female physical aggressive behaviors, and these results are consistent with the observations made in previous research on the dyadic or bidirectional nature of physical aggression [6, 42] and psychological aggression [43]."

Page 22, line 17
Satisfied - should read satisfied

Page 22, line 18
Should read act (not acts) (or these types of acts)
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