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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a wonderful job addressing the reviewers' comments. I have two additional comments (one withstanding from previous review) that I believe will benefit this paper:

- The data analysis section, while improved from the last reading, could still be improved with additional information about the authors' process. Not much was added about data analysis itself. However, I do appreciate the additional information about the participant feedback sessions. If the authors choose to add more here, they could look to "Chen, C. X., Draucker, C. B., & Carpenter, J. S. (2018). What women say about their dysmenorrhea: a qualitative thematic analysis" for an example of a previously published thematic analysis also citing Braun and Clarke in BMC Women's Health. While the authors do not necessarily have to present data analysis in this way, it could be a good guideline for what information to include in this section. It may also help to state who conducted interviews and focus groups, as this could help explain familiarity with the data.

- The added information about victim terminology at the beginning of the introduction is a great addition that adds more nuance to the paper. However, I do think the text could be edited to be more succinct.
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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?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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