

Review of McNair thesis, "Prevalence and Use of Guns in Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence" authored by Caroline Cummings.

The title is an accurate and succinct representation of the scope of the work. Nice job!

#### Abstract

The abstract provides a succinct and comprehensive review of the paper. There are a few minor edits to suggest: 1. The wording here is a little confusing: "whether there is any difference in the prevalence of IPV perpetration between people using and not using a firearm". Should this say a difference in the prevalence of IPV perpetration between people who possess a firearm and those who do not? 2. "The review yielded mixed findings for each question." Would this better read: "both questions"? 3. "Implications for social policy and future research on use of guns in perpetrating IPV are discussed." I think this would be clearer to say: "Implications of both studies for social policy..."

#### Introduction

Here you have written a clear definition of the purpose and scope of the paper and of the constructs to be investigated.

Recommended edits: j1. Line 3: "For the purposes of this study". Consider "research" of "studies" instead of "study" because your paper has two studies specifically. 2. 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph 7<sup>th</sup> line: Should "argued" by "found"? 3. Same paragraph, next sentence: "Another issue addressed was the use of weapons in the perpetration of physical assault." Here you could explain more specifically what about weapon use will be addressed and for what purpose.

#### Study 1

Here you explain well the specific goals of this study.

Recommended edits: 1. "85.4% of women and 55% of men." Use the same number of decimal points for all percentages. I suggest 84% be used. 2. In regard to your research questions, one is: "Do more male than female college students commit physical assault against their intimate partners?" Asking this research question makes me wonder why you did not also examine gender differences in psychological aggression, as you did for the first research question? Some explanation or justification of the specific question you asked would be helpful to the reader.

#### Methods

Very clear and appropriately detailed description of the study methods. The word "all" could be deleted from the first sentence of the participants section.

Suggested edits: 1. In the measures section you state that "The reliability and validity of the instrument are well-documented by other scholars." Here, you should include a citation to support your assertion about the instrument: Straus et al., 1996.

#### Results:

The data are presented and analyzed clearly and correctly.

Suggested edits: 1. "When comparing prevalence rates of psychological aggression to prevalence rates of physical assault, in...". A comma is not needed here. 2. In Table 1, please make sure to leave a space after the number of participants in each cell and the following parenthesis. Also, make sure that the cell numbers are lined up evenly (justified) so that all three digit numbers are in alignment vertically in the table. 3. The title of tables could be more descriptive of the numbers presented in them. For table 1: "Number of Students Reporting Psychological Aggression and Physical Assault Perpetration"; For table 2: "Number of Students Reporting Physical Assault Perpetration by Gender". 4. There should be a comma rather than a period after the chi square statistics and before the p values reported in the tables. See the APA format handbook.

#### Discussion

You have summarized and interpreted the findings from study 1 very well and reviewed the limitations to the methods of your study appropriately. You have a particularly effective and succinct organization and transition between points in this section.

Suggested edits: 1. “as there are few reported rates of homicidal and non-homicidal IPV with the use of a weapon.” Here you should say “relatively few reported incidents of homicidal and non-homicidal...” You are speaking of reported events not reported rates.

#### Study 2 Introduction

Very nice job establishing the rationale and purpose of your analysis.

1. The quote of the legislation is quite long and takes away the narrative voice you have established. Is this long quote needed? Could you summarize the main points? The next paragraph after the quote does a good job summarizing what is most important about the legislation. I think this may be all that is needed.

2. Page 6, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: “the topic of” could be deleted from this sentence.

3. Page 7, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. This seems tangentially related to the purpose of this study on gun violence laws. Could you simply delete it?

4. Please provide a citation and reference for this resources, so that the reader too can access it: “One major database these studies relied on was compiled by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, which just recently released a report about intimate partner homicides in the United States.”

#### Study 2 literature review

This is a very effective and well written summary of the findings and qualifications in those findings of your review.

#### Discussion and Conclusion

The discussion interprets and summarizes the findings of the review nicely. You equip the reader to evaluate further research on their own.

In the conclusion you state: “Past research studies addressing the concern report conflicting findings and have not necessarily proven the laws to be effective in all realms.” This statement seems vague and tepid relative to your findings. Is it the most accurate and comprehensive summary of your findings from study 2? It seems too conservative, relative to your findings. Consider how you summarized the work in your abstract. Your writing there reflects your actual findings more accurately.