

The summary does not mention that the adolescents with whom the research is conducted are studying.

The theoretical reference model on "dating violence" is not specified, there is no problematization in this regard, the information placed is more related to background.

Throughout the document, the term "type of violence" is used to indiscriminately refer to a classification of violence and the role of victim, perpetrator, and reciprocal, what appears to be a consequence of the lack of clarity in the theoretical model on violence.

It is suggested to include more research on school adolescents.

The information developed in the procedure section of the method is more ethical.

Information on mental health professionals who raised field information in ethical considerations is more procedural.

In the phrase "All participants had to sign an informed consent" the use of "had" is coercive.

If the information was collected with minors aged 12 to 16 why were they given an informed consent and not an informed assent? And why were minors asked to sign a document?

In the results it would be worth giving more information about the participants that allow us to understand the data of the first item, named "Dating violence".

In table 1, it is not clear why the "n" of "have been victims" equals 4.801 if the total number of participants is 870.

The results on the most frequent types of violence only describe in the text the results for men and not women, without providing a justification for why this omission.

In the phrase "Being a victim of dating violence is the experience most often associated with using alcohol and illegal drugs." Table 5 is used as a reference, and it only presents frequencies; this analysis is not conclusive for asserting an association between variables.

To deepen the analysis of the conclusions and the group of school adolescents with whom the research was conducted.