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Reviewer's report:

1. The authors had answered my point on inconsistent terminology by clarifying the definitions of routing and case-based inquiry for intimate partner abuse and using the same terms through the manuscript.
2. The authors had expanded and clarified interpretation of the results by discussing routine and case-based inquiry for intimate partner abuse in parallel.
3. Pre specified hypothesis had been added to the Introduction.
4. Women’s responses in Table 1 had been renamed according to the terminology used in the manuscript.
5. The results had been linked to the tables. Prevalence of women’s responses had been reported as percentage with 95% confidence intervals in main text.
6. The new information gained from the study had been added to the Conclusion.
7. The Conclusion section had been rewritten.
8. Study limitations had been described in more details to explain generalizability and practical implementation issues.
9. The authors clarified the findings of the open-ended questions in the Abstract.

Discretionary Revisions: I would suggest adding a sentence to the discussion that your hypothesis has been proved by your findings.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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