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**Reviewer's report:**

All comments are minor but essential.

1. I think the title is a bit misleading. The fact that the paper is a description of the study design should be indicated.

**Background:**

2. The authors say that the nurses were given a self-efficacy test and 45% of nurses disagreed with the statement that they did not feel prepared. In English, there is very little use of double negatives. My interpretation of this is that 45% of nurses were prepared. Perhaps it should be changed to say only 45% of nurses were prepared… the quoting of the actual statement is unnecessary.

**Study Setting:**

3. What is the difference between Type I and II clinics?
4. Saying “I and II” is better than “II and I”.
5. There is a sentence (2nd paragraph) that begins …These clinics, chiefly located in low and middle income areas… It isn’t clear if the authors in using the word “These” are referring to Type III clinics or Type I and II clinics.
6. The last sentence in the paragraph referred to above, says “Approximately, 2,336,564 residents use the services…” Usually if there is a number that precise, you don’t see the word approximately with it. Perhaps try saying that “More than 2,336,000 residents use the services….annually.

**Randomization, Sample Size and Power Analysis:**

7. The authors need to explain how that got from 57 to 42 clinics. Why didn’t they randomize all 57? This paragraph could and should be re-written for clarity. Why is the sample size 900? Is that what they need to have 80% power? It doesn’t say that. What metric are the authors using to estimate change?

**Study Population, Recruitment and Retention**

8. Information in Table 1 should be incorporated into the text and the table eliminated.
9. When I read that the study is using the abuse assessment screen, I thought they meant “The Abuse Assessment Screen.” http://www.dbhds.virginia.gov/documents/scrn-pw-aas-eng.pdf. But apparently they don’t since the AAS has only 5 questions and they are talking about 11
questions. So then, I don’t know what instrument they are talking about. They say it is validated. For what group of individuals? The screening instrument should be included in the manuscript.

10. The authors refer to “Box 1.” I presume they mean figure 1. This should be clarified.

11. Do they ask the women if it is okay to phone them? I worry about anything that may trigger the partner to violence.

Intervention description:

12. I liked the point that women were more likely to be comfortable asking for services if there is a specific name.

13. The reasoning behind training only nurses who work the morning shift is unclear. It may be obvious if you know the system, but it isn’t to this reviewer.

Quantitative Assessments & Analytic Pan:

14. Information in Table 3 should be incorporated into the text and the table eliminated.

Quantitative Assessments & Analytic Pan:

15. This paragraph needs to be re-written for more depth.

Process Evaluation:

16. If they are testing nurses every three months, are they considering test-retest bias?

17. Are the mock clients anonymous? I presume so, but if yes, it should be stated explicitly.

Cost Analysis:

18. In doing the cost analysis, is the cost to the system for taking care of abused women considered? Is the cost to the women for pain, suffering, humiliation considered in this?

Discussion:

19. As data collection has already started, it is likely too late to implement this suggestion. Having something that requires a bit more of the women initially helps weed out people who may eventually drop out. (No response to this comment is needed.)

20. The word impact is a noun not a verb.
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