

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High

Novelty: Moderated

Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors:

Title and Abstract:

1. Title: I would suggest: prevalence of domestic violence among users of a healthcare facility: a retrospective longitudinal analysis.
2. Abstract: The abstract provides a clear description of the objectives and results. However, an explicit methodology section is missing. The abstract should be structured into Background, Objective, Methods, Results, and Conclusion. The prevalence of domestic violence should be stated as a proportion (e.g., 8%, 6.2%).

Introduction

1. The variable of domestic violence should be studied in greater depth. Thus, its differences with violence against women should be indicated, since in this case, victims of both sexes are involved.
2. In addition, it should be clarified whether the statistics presented pertain only to violence against women or are of both sexes.
3. Also, the consequences of this type of violence should be discussed.

Method:

1. Participants: The authors state, "It is important to note that these data were collected during our Internship 1 as part of the requirements to complete our professional education in the School of Psychology at the Peruvian Union University." I believe this section should be omitted as it is not part of the participant description.
2. Instruments: I suggest renaming the section to "Measurements" instead of "Instruments." It would be advisable to add an evaluation of the reliability of the instrument reported in this study, either in this section or in the results. Additionally, it would be helpful to include more information on the administration process of the instrument and the conditions under which it was applied. It is also necessary to add information about the covariates used, such as gender, age, etc.
3. Data analysis: The description of the analysis is vague. Although the use of statistical techniques in R is mentioned, it is unclear if specific tests of statistical significance were performed or what criteria were used to interpret the results. Additionally, the methodology for survival analysis is not detailed. It would be useful to explain the specific approach to survival analysis and how cumulative risks were interpreted. Furthermore, it is important to clarify how the longitudinal data were processed to assess changes in the prevalence of violence. It would also be helpful to consider whether a trend analysis over time is relevant to evaluate if prevalence increases linearly over time.
4. A section on ethical aspects should be added. It must be clearly stated that this is a secondary database and that the authors did not directly assess the participants. Therefore, an ethical review is not required since it involves secondary data. If the authors have ethical approval from a committee, it should be included.

Results:

1. The authors mention that they evaluated cumulative risk, but it is unclear what analysis was performed in the methods section. Additionally, it is not clear whether this risk is statistically significant. I suggest adding the statistical tests used. Moreover, Figures 1 and 2 are not in English.
2. It is unclear what the overall prevalence of violence was, not as a number but as a rate (%).
3. Tables 1 to 5 could be merged into a single table. I am concerned that there is a lot of potential analysis within the results, but the analysis by age group seems redundant when compared to the

information presented in the table and text. It is suggested to merge the specified tables and present a single paragraph for the analysis by age group. Is there a quantitative difference in the reported prevalence by age groups?

4. I would suggest adding a trend analysis or a survival analysis using Cox regression (only if the data allows for it). The results section, in its current state, has a lot of room for improvement.

Discussion:

1. Strengths: It is unclear what the main strengths of the study are.
2. Implications for practice: Although general recommendations are mentioned, it would be helpful to propose more specific interventions based on the findings, such as community programs or local policies aimed at reducing domestic violence.

General Recommendations:

1. Clarify methodology: It is recommended to explain in detail the data analysis process, including the justification for using survival analysis and the statistical tests applied.
2. Improve results structure: Include clear subheadings and graphs that summarize the main findings. Reduce the number of tables.

This manuscript has the potential to contribute to the field of research on domestic violence, but it requires significant improvements in its methodological structure and presentation of results.

RESPONSE LETTER

Translation into English: Presentation and Writing

Moderate

Comments for Authors: Please be as precise as possible in your comments. Enumerate each recommendation so authors can respond appropriately to each. Indicate clearly where changes should be made (e.g., paragraph 2 of the Methods section).

Title and Abstract:

1. **Title:** I suggest: *Prevalence of Domestic Violence Among Health Center Users: A Retrospective Longitudinal Analysis*.
The title and content have been updated accordingly.
 2. **Abstract:** The abstract provides a clear description of the objectives and results. However, it lacks an explicit methodology section. The abstract should be structured into background, objective, methods, results, and conclusion. The prevalence of domestic violence should be expressed as a proportion (e.g., 8%, 6.2%).
It has been updated as requested.
-

Introduction:

1. The variable of domestic violence should be studied in greater depth. Differences with violence against women should be indicated, as this study involves victims of both genders.
Clarifications have been made.
 2. It should also be clarified whether the statistics presented refer exclusively to violence against women or both genders.
This has been addressed.
 3. Additionally, the consequences of this type of violence should be discussed.
This has been added.
-

Methods:

1. **Participants:** The authors state: *"It is important to note that these data were collected during our Internship 1 as part of the requirements to complete our professional education at the School of Psychology, Universidad Peruana Unión."* I believe this section should be omitted as it does not pertain to the description of participants.
The specified paragraph has been omitted, and further details about the participants have been provided.
2. **Instruments:** I suggest renaming this section to "Measures" instead of "Instruments." It would be advisable to include a reliability assessment of the instrument reported in this study, either in this section or in the Results. Additionally, more details about the instrument's administration process and conditions under which it was applied should be included. Information about covariates, such as gender and age, should also be added.
This section has been updated with the title "Measures." Reliability of the instrument has been reported, and covariates have been described within this section.
3. **Data Analysis:** The description of the analysis is vague. While statistical techniques using R are mentioned, it is unclear if specific statistical tests were performed or what criteria were used to interpret results. Additionally, the methodology for survival analysis is not detailed. It would be useful to explain the specific approach to survival analysis and how cumulative risks were interpreted. It should also clarify how longitudinal data were processed to evaluate changes in prevalence. Consider whether a trend analysis over time is relevant to assess if prevalence increases linearly with time.
The writing has been improved. It is specified that statistical significance tests were not performed, but 95% confidence intervals were estimated to determine relevant results.
4. **Ethical Considerations:** A section on ethical considerations should be added. It should be stated clearly that this is a secondary database and that the authors did not directly evaluate participants. Therefore, ethical review is not required as it involves secondary data. If ethical approval from a committee exists, it should be included.

An "Ethical Considerations" subsection has been added, indicating that the data are secondary, and ethical committee approval has been noted.

Results:

1. The authors mention that cumulative risk was evaluated, but it is unclear what analysis was performed in the Methods section. It is also not clear if this risk is statistically significant. I suggest adding the statistical tests used. Additionally, Figures 1 and 2 are not in English.
Relevant updates have been made.
 2. The overall prevalence of violence is unclear; it should be reported as a rate (%).
 3. Tables 1 to 5 could be merged into a single table. I am concerned there is excessive potential analysis within the Results section, but the age group analysis seems redundant compared to the information presented in the table and text. Merging the specified tables and summarizing the age group analysis into a single paragraph is suggested. Is there a quantitative difference in prevalence by age group?
The recommended updates have been made.
 4. I would suggest adding a trend analysis or a survival analysis using Cox regression (if the data permit). The Results section currently has significant room for improvement.
Unfortunately, the data did not meet the assumptions required.
-

Discussion:

1. **Strengths:** The primary strengths of the study are unclear.
Strengths have been added in the "Limitations and Strengths" section.
 2. **Practical Implications:** While general recommendations are mentioned, proposing more specific interventions based on findings, such as community programs or local policies aimed at reducing domestic violence, would be beneficial.
A subsection and a paragraph on the implications of the study have been added before the Limitations and Strengths section.
-

General Recommendations:

1. **Clarify Methodology:** It is recommended to explain in detail the data analysis process, including the justification for using survival analysis and the statistical tests applied.
The methodology has been updated.
2. **Improve Results Structure:** Include clear subtitles and graphics summarizing the main findings. Reduce the number of tables.
Improvements have been made as suggested.

This manuscript has the potential to contribute to the field of domestic violence research but requires significant improvements in its methodological structure and presentation of results.

Both the methodology and results sections have been updated.