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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your amends, which address my concerns, with the following two exceptions:

Response to Q2: This point needs to be mentioned in the manuscript, preferably in the methods, but should at least be alluded to in the discussion, as a limitation.

Response to Q on limitations: you are still misrepresenting the true limitations of this work. They are not limited to the fact that the inspectorate had not yet published their report. They also include: a small group of professionals, of mixed professional background were approached for interview, and the implementation of screening was variable across the hospitals involved. These points must come across, and be satisfactorily dealt with in the discussion.

Some minor corrections relating to grammar are still required, as follows:

Methods
1. ‘The hospitals included one University (urban) children’s hospital, four urban teaching hospitals, and two rural periphery hospitals’
   This should read ‘two rural peripheral hospitals’
2. ‘a child abuse hospital attendant, a forensic nurse specialized in the child abuse detection, and a senior child abuse researcher specialized in child abuse prevention’
   This should read ‘forensic nurse specialist in child abuse detection, and a senior child abuse researcher specialist in child abuse prevention’.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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