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Reviewer’s report:

Overall this is an important area of research that is relevant to BMC Women's Health. However, the extremely low prevalence rate identified amongst participants compared to rates identified in other studies challenge the validity of study results.

Most of the peer review comments have been addressed, however, a few were not addressed. There are still inconsistencies in the language used for sexual violence and intimate partner violence. I strongly suggest that the authors use consistent terminology throughout the manuscript for clarity. Additionally, there are still numerous spelling and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. The authors may wish to consider enlisting the services of a copy editor or academic writer to review the manuscript for spelling and grammar, as well as scientific writing style.

Additional Comments:

Abstract - The background section of the abstract does not include background information and only includes the objective of the study. This is also a run on sentence that should be made into multiple sentences for clarity.

Background - What are the separate rates of physical and sexual IPV reported in references 9 and 10?

Methods - How were participants systematically screened? Was every potentially eligible participant screened? The authors should address these questions in the manuscript. Willingness to provide informed consent should be listed as a separate 4th inclusion criterion. Was the pilot study that you mentioned to assess the face validity of questionnaires used published? If so this should be referenced, or if not please state that this is unpublished data. Please specify what item was deleted from the DAS scale and why.

Results - The authors state that 212 women out of 14288 screened positive for IPV and list a prevalence rate of 0.02%. The percentage from these numbers should be 1.5%. In the multivariate logistic regression section the authors state that high physical violence and suicidal behaviours are "marginally significant", however, the p-values are greater than 0.05 and therefore findings are not statistically significant. This should be deleted or revised to say "approached statistical significance". This should be corrected throughout the paper.
Discussion - Is it ethical to conduct IPV screening in settings that aren't private?

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

No

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

Yes

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

No

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.