

Review comment -2

This article adds important nuance (context!) to scientific conversations about reporting IPV and how professionals can better meet the needs within the community. The particular focus on college-age students also responds to an important gap in the literature about transition-age young adults who are at risk for many other concerning health outcomes and behaviors.

I appreciate the inclusion of the goals of the study, the primary results, and specific recommendations for providers going forward.

Lit Review: is overwhelming and confusing. While it seems clear that the literature is mixed, the authors need to find ways to interpret/summarize the findings more clearly. The current overview seems to make a claim and then to dispute it—it is difficult to follow. Stats are confusing in the overview of college samples. Some stats show males having higher rates while the narrative states that females have higher rates. (p. 5) Your summary that states that women are more negatively impacted than men by IPV is an important overall take-away and can be useful in strengthening your overall argument/framing. Your analysis of the context of reporting and how the scales impact the numbers is really important! (p.8). I would like to see this emphasized more/earlier. The Current Study (this should be included under Method): Consider if the questions can be included in a table or figure. Results are interesting and important.

The sources cited in the introduction are very old—I would be interested to see these updated (or referenced if they are understood to be seminal in the field). p. 4 has an incomplete citation (CITE).

There is a lack of inclusion of the LGBTQ+ community (though there is focus on this community in the literature overview)—clearer information about the decision would be important to include.

In the intro you seem to report that the research about IPV across gender has been inconsistent at best, but you end with data about the LGBTQ+ community that sounds definitive. Consider if the T and + communities need to be differentiated from these statistics and/or if you can find research examining some of the other within-group differences that may exist. You bring in a great deal of research about this community (pg.7), but it needs to be included/reflected more earlier/throughout.

Overall, you have inconsistently included data and stats about the LGBTQ+ community. The victimization rates (p.4), for example, are only presented in the gender binary (male/female). Ultimately your study relies on a gender binary, so consider addressing this as a clear limitation and/or explaining how/why the decisions were made. It might be important to

remove some of the literature focusing on the LGBTQ+ community if your study excludes the community from participation (and/or doesn't explicitly include the community).

The primary focus for revisions should be to update and clarify the literature review, better aligning it with the directions that the manuscript takes.