

## Domestic Violence Advocacy: Facts, Tips, and Resources

Eman. Tadros<sup>1\*</sup>, Ruben. Lopez<sup>2</sup>, Eunice. Gomez<sup>3</sup>


<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Marriage and Family Therapy, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, Illinois, USA

<sup>2</sup> Division of Psychology and Counseling, Governors State University, University Park, IL, USA

<sup>3</sup> College of Education, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, IL, USA

\* Corresponding author email address: Emantadros@gmail.com

### E d i t o r

Donatella Di Corrado  
Associate Professor, Department of  
psychology, Kore University of  
Enna, Enna, Italy  
donatella.dicorrado@unikore.it

### R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Kamdin Parsakia  
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond  
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca  
**Reviewer 2:** Mohsen Golparvar  
Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad  
University, Isfahan, Iran. mgolparvar@khuif.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The distinction between intimate partner violence (IPV) and domestic violence (DV) could be clearer. It's essential to precisely define each term and explain their interrelation early in the document to avoid confusion and enhance the reader's understanding.

The article frequently cites statistics (e.g., the 42% increase in IPV incidents). Including more detailed analyses, such as demographic breakdowns or longitudinal trends, could provide a more nuanced understanding of the problem.

While numerous studies are referenced, a critical analysis of their methodologies, potential biases, and the contexts of their findings could strengthen the article's credibility and offer a more comprehensive understanding of the research landscape.

Highlighting specific evidence-based practices for IPV/DV advocacy and discussing the empirical support for these interventions could make the recommendations more actionable and grounded in research.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.



## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The document could benefit from an explicit section discussing the limitations of current research on IPV/DV, especially regarding the underrepresentation of marginalized communities and how this affects the generalizability of findings.

While the article touches on issues related to gender and sexual minorities, a more detailed exploration of intersectionality—considering race, class, disability, etc.—in the context of IPV/DV could provide deeper insights into the complexities of advocacy and support.

Introducing and critiquing various theoretical frameworks or models related to IPV/DV advocacy (beyond disempowerment theory) could offer a richer academic foundation and suggest avenues for future research and practice.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.