**Responses to Reviewers:**

***A Scoping Review of 37 Years of Family Violence Research in China* (#TVA-19-027)**

The authors of this manuscript wish to thank the three reviewers for their second round of excellent comments regarding our work. As with the first round of comments, the review feedback has been extremely valuable for improving our manuscript, and we appreciate the opportunity to strengthen our manuscript further. Based on this feedback, we have made appropriate edits and alterations to enhance the manuscript. These changes are detailed below.

**Reviewer #1 Comments:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** | **Response** | **Revised Text** |
| R1.1 | “Some of the sentences in the tables can be further refined to improve their meanings. For example, "The overall state of Chinese IPV research is still lacking, with too little attention to empirical methods and great heterogeneity of methods, approaches, and findings." sounds a little odd. What do you mean by "overall state..." is still lacking?” | We appreciate the reviewer’s comment and the opportunity to further refine the key messaging in the tables. We have now considerably revised and refined the statements in both the tables. | See the text in both Table 1 and Table 2. |
| R1.2 | “The authors should also recheck references to ensure that they are correctly cited in text.” | This was helpful feedback from the reviewer. We did have some errors in our in text citations that we had not caught earlier. Now we have gone through both our in text citations and our reference list carefully to address all the prior errors and oversights. | Changes and corrections have been made throughout the manuscript and the reference list. |

**Reviewer #2 Comments:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** | **Response** | **Revised Text** |
| R2.1 | “The results of this paper are presented clearly but it was all quite specific and I was left wanting a broader discussion of the significance of the author's findings. The main issue that needs to be improved is to link the data and arguments substantially in the Discussion or it needs to be better framed for readers to appreciate its broader significance.” | We appreciated the reviewer’s recommendation to rework the manuscript to make the broader implications of the study’s finding clear. We have now revised the Discussion section of the manuscript considerably, both by adding text to that section’s introduction, as well as reworking the text throughout this entire section, as well as reworking the Conclusion section of the manuscript. Please also see our response in R1.1 above. | See the revised Discussion section, pages 19-27, in particular pages 20, 24-25, 26-27. |

**Reviewer #3 Comments:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** | **Response** | **Revised Text** |
| R3.1 | “In terms of publication, The author concluded that “the past decades have seen an increase in public awareness and a growing political consensus regarding necessary action.”(line 24-26, p21). The different stages can be separated as 1982-1993(line 38, p2), 1990s(line 12, p3), 2000s and after(line 29, p3). If the results can be presented in different periods, the article will be highly readable and clear. For example, the number of publications in 1982-1993 was 12(line 38, p2), how many publications were reviewed during the next two generations? Similarly, researchers’ organizations, funding sources, geographic setting et. al, can also be presented in different periods and be compared. The readers will easily find why the next generations see a much better development of IPV research in China as the authors want to summarize.” | We understand the reviewer’s recommendation and appreciate the reviewer’s ideas to help us present our study. Nonetheless, we respectfully disagree that by restructuring the manuscript in the ways that the reviewer suggests that we will improve the study. We aimed to conduct a scoping review, with the goal of mapping this broad research topic meaningfully and efficiently, as well as providing an overall description of the evidence. In our opinion, the current structure of the manuscript meets these aims and goals well. Moreover, we would also like to point out that the study’s result section and Figure 1 currently provide much of the information being requested here.  In addition, we noted on page 8 that “Among the 68 articles, only one was published in the 1990s (i.e., 1997); 37 were published between 2000 and 2009 and the rest (30) were published in or after 2010.” | No changes were made to the manuscript. |
| R3.2 | “Smaller size, diverse family patterns, and a shift in lifestyle have been shaping the Chinese family structure, resulting in an increase in family violence, specifically IPV” (line 10-11, p3)The following content in the same paragraph was the prevalence rates of women victims between rural and urban areas. I wonder how to get this conclusion. If this was referred, please give the reference. If this was your own conclusion, please give a strong proof on the relations between family structure and prevalence of IPV.” | We have revised the statement and added a citation. The revised sentence now reads: Smaller size, diversifying family patterns, as well as shifts in family relationships and roles are shaping Chinese family structures, which in turn, may relate to both an increase in family violence itself, as well as increasing awareness to the issues of family violence, including IPV (Zhang, 2018). | See the revised sentence on page 3. |
| R3.3 | “In the Inputs section (p8-9), how to define the study was conducted by a certain organization? Maybe the studies were supported by the same funder. Maybe the studies were conducted by the same organization. And similarly, how to define a series of articles belong to a same study. As we all know an organization can conduct some studies on a similar topic and then publish articles.” | We appreciate the reviewer’s point that sometimes groups of researchers can publish multiple articles based on the same study, which was conducted by the same team and funded by the same funder. In responding to this point, we would like to acknowledge that the practice of multiple publications from the same study is often a good one, especially when the study was large and/or collected considerable data. Nonetheless, we also want to assure the reviewer that we were careful when conducting our research to scrutinize articles and report information carefully. We also rigorously tracked articles, research teams, organization, and funders throughout our review. Accordingly, our manuscript presents a thorough effort to summarize the state of the research to-date including information about all the research teams, organization, and funders. | No changes were made to the manuscript. |
| R3.4 | “In the Settings section (p11), the authors just talked about samples distribution in the current articles.” | We would like to point out that in the discussion concerning “Settings” that though we do begin with a statement about the settings in which study samples were located, we go on to present findings concerning the areas of China in which the studies were conducted and provide an analysis of where the studies were conducted, including rural v. urban settings. In addition, we have added detailed text and information to this section to address the reviewer’s recommendation. | Please see the revised “Settings” on page 10. |
| R3.5 | “In the Topics section (Line 20, p11), the authors presented the types of samples mainly, only last three lines showed the topics of the contents. What I understand is that the paragraph should show the topics or contents of current research mainly.” | With respect, we would like to point out that topically there is overlap between the topics of the study and the samples/population investigated. Accordingly, we believe that these study results are important to discuss in the way that we have presented the study’s findings. | No changes were made to the manuscript. |
| R3.6 | “Based on the contents, [the Settings, Topics, and Samples sections] can be merged in to one section “Samples”.” | With respect, we disagree with the reviewer’s suggestion. Please see our responses R3.4 and R3.5. | No changes were made to the manuscript. |
| R3.7 | “In the “Rates vary by location” part, the first sentence was “other studies found different characteristics of violence types depending on the setting.” (line 20, p 17). The title and the content was inconsistent. Should the tile be “Violence types vary by setting”? And the following part in this paragraph was about the three types of violence of the same location was different. The whole paragraph was inconsistent with the title.” | We appreciate the reviewer’s point and think that some of the wording in the front part of the paragraph has led to confusion. Accordingly, we revised the first part of the paragraph to read: “Overall, the studies showed widely varying violence estimates both by violence type and by location, even within the same geographical area.” | See the revised statement on page 16. |
| R3.8 | “I highly recommend the author organize the different parts carefully and keep titles and contents consistent and clear.” | We appreciate the reviewer’s point and have carefully revised all aspects of the manuscript to enhance the clarity of the presentation and writing. | Changes made throughout the entire manuscript |
| R3.9 | Error: ““family violence in China from 1982 to 2017” (line33, p 21), the scoping review is from 1982 to 2018, isn’t it?” | We appreciate the reviewer pointing out this typo to us. We have made a correction from 2017 to 2018. | See the corrected text on page 21. |
| R3.10 | Repetitive: ““Specially, the study aims to systematically characteristics and understand....” (line 8-17, p6). The authors listed all the inputs, outputs and outcomes factors which were specified again (line 24-38, p8). Please condense contents of the article like this.” | While we understand the reviewer’s point, we would like to point out that though there are similarities between the two sets of the text, the first setoff text introduces our research approach, while the second set of text provides important details about our approach. Moreover, we believe this style of writing will be helpful for readers’ comprehension of our study’s approach and methods. | No changes were made to the manuscript. |
| R3.11 | Repetitive: “China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) can be spelled completely for the first time and then “CNKI” in the following paragraphs (i.e., line 31, p5).” | We appreciate and agree with this point and have made the suggested change. | See the change made on page 4. |