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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript is an interesting scoping review of the literature by Anna M. Leddy on Gender-based violence (GBV) and HIV prevention and care continuum. The main objective of the review is to find the link between GBV and HIV care continuum in key population.

While the findings and results are good and important, I would like to suggest that the author:

* polish the structure of the review by organizing the section to have a better narrative of the story (the author could refer to other published scoping review)
* narrow down the number of references focusing more on those relevant to the manuscript.
* should highlight the key findings, recommendation and limitation of the review.

Please see my comments below.

Major comments:

1. Gender Based Violence (GBV) should include all gender identity and dynamic including heterosexual men and women, transgender women, men who have sex with men (MSM), women who have sex with women. Please refer to "HIV and gender-based violence: welcome policies and programmes, but is the research keeping up?" Sofia Gruskin et al., 2014, Reproductive Health Matters ". The author should elaborate more on why the focus is on women only in this study. A potential hint could be the global effect of the epidemic on women.

2. This is a global study since data were collected from 15 different countries; therefore the term "key population" should be clarified and contextualized (e.g. African Caribbean and Black (ACB) is key population in Canada).

3. The author refers to a 2015 study by Hatcher and colleagues (page 3, line 13) on HIV and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and should clearly elaborate on the difference and/or intersection between GBV and IPV conceptual framework.
4. The author should clearly define the hypothesis of the study and specific aims or objectives. Furthermore the significance of the study should be highlighted in the final paragraph of the introduction.

5. In the paragraph "selecting the literature", the author states: "This is a hallmark of the scoping review methodology, as researchers are unlikely to identify relevant criteria before familiarizing themselves with the literature (26)". This statement is misleading and probably could be removed; therefore the author should have a paragraph under the "Method section" on inclusion and exclusion criteria that helped designed the search algorithm, search strategy and risk of bias assessment section.

6. The author should include a paragraph on the outcomes (primary and secondary) of the studies as well as on how the data were extracted (data extraction).

7. The author should also indicate if gray literature was used.

8. The author should elaborate more on the PrEP findings (Page 12, line 20). One reason could be that PrEP is not available in under-developing countries or some of the key population studied in this study might not have access. However the fact that there is no study highlighting the link between PrEP and GBV could be presented as potential gaps.

9. In the conclusion the author could be more specific on highlighting the recommendation and limitation of the study.

Minor comments:

Abstract, conclusion: "This is scoping review".

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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