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Reviewer's report:

The major flaw in this article is related to the absence of the Intersectionality concept. Intersectionality nature of gender-based violence is clear in this analysis and a key concept that is never mentioned explicitly. (See Sylvia Walby,e.g.)

The authors should reflect on affirmations such as the following: "In the context of EARF, both sexes have a tendency to be victims and/or perpetrators." But a key question must be placed: are women more victims then men? And are men more abusers then abused? The authors themselves have presented evidence that "The majority of perpetrators were male (74.0%) and 69.3% of victims were female (male victims were 28.6%)". This aspect is important. Research shows that men are also victims of several types of violence in the most different contexts and situations, but even in this specific context the authors report, the majority of victims continue to be women. At least some consideration should be made by the authors about this aspect.

Finally, I consider this article of particular importance since it raises a critical and urgent aspect of intervention and prevention of GBV. Like the authors mention: "our results stand for the urgent need for IEC interventions, addressing what is, or what is not an SGBV act." Decision makers and European institutions should be question and should themselves question: how is it possible that professional that deal with men and women in particular vulnerability, such as Asylum Seekers and Refugees, disagree that "abuse, rape and trafficking" is not a form of SGBV?
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