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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for allowing me to review the above titled manuscript. Please find below my comments.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. The authors' hypothesis that the financial crisis period in Spain, which probably led to the massive destruction of employment to both men and women, could favour or promote a change in homicides of women due to intimate partner violence (IPV) is well defined. The authors, however, did not obtain data of the incidence of IPV during the periods studied to show any link between the IPV and intimate partner related femicide (IPF).

2. The limitations of the ecological cohort study were mentioned by the authors. Given that studies used to compare the results of this present study were obtained and analysed at individual levels, the only reason one could guess for the authors for adopting the ecologic method is convenience. And, this to me is at the expense of reliability of the results.

3. The soundness of the sources of data used could not be ascertained from the extent of information given. A detailed description of how the data from the different sources were obtained will be required. For instance, it would be interesting to know how the IPF was defined from the data source and how the data were collected.

4. I have no evidence to doubt the figure. However, related to the method and for effective comparison, I would have expected the authors to consider analysing data for an equal number of years; pre-crisis and during the crisis, instead of the current three-year pre-crisis and six years during the crisis comparison.

5. The authors' adherence to the standard of reporting is commendable.

6. The discussion could be reinforced with some of the issues raised in this revision.

7. The limitations could be more detailed.

8. The authors clearly acknowledged all the published work upon which they were building.

9. The title does not convey what was found, however, the abstract does.
10. The writing is acceptable.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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