Peer Review Report

Review Report on Gender differences in intimate partner violence victimization and its relationships with anxiety, depression symptoms and suicide behaviours in China

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Tamer Edirne
Submitted on: 27 Oct 2024
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1607953

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

females had a higher294 lifetime prevalence of being a victim of total IPV than males in China but no significant gender difference in prevalence of sexual IPV victimization?
Male participants with psychological or sexual IPV victimization presented greater odds of possible anxiety than females; males with physical IPV victimization showed greater likelihood of with suicide ideation than females.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

No answer given.

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.**

My suggestions are
Abstract
1. pls. add % of sexual lifetime prevalence into the results or remove all numbers in paranteses
2. conclusion is not appropriate, this study is not about interventions or reducing IPV, its only about prevalence...
Methods
3. is there a validated Chinese version of the PHQ-9? make comment
Discussion
4. lines 367-380 are not part of discussion because this study is not aiming to investigate interventions, pls. remove to intro or delete...
5. Line394, conclusion suggestion: our findings reveal a higher prevalence of IPV victimization compared to males as hypothised but no difference in sexual IPV victimization in females and males requires further investigation.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

yes

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

no, a proofreading may be necessary

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9	Originality	■ ■ ■ □ □
Q 10	Rigor	■ ■ ■ □ □
Q 11	Significance to the field	■ ■ ■ □ □
Q 12	Interest to a general audience	■ ■ ■ □ □
Q 13	Quality of the writing	■ ■ □ □ □
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	■ ■ ■ □ □

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.