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Reviewer’s report:

General

It is clear that the authors have placed a significant amount of time and effort into revising the manuscript. This version is much improved and represents an interesting piece of work that contributes significantly to the literature. Gaining a perspective on IPV screening and attitudes about IPV in Turkey is incredibly valuable and deserves to be published.

I am checking unable to accept or reject below, however, as the other options don’t quite fit with my remaining reservation (as below) about the English. I believe that if the English can be carefully proofed and revised and the one remaining major concern below addressed, than the work should be accepted for publication.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

My most significant remaining reservation is that a fluent English speaker and writer MUST read, and edit carefully this manuscript as it cannot be published as it stands. I am not sure if this is something that the journal is equipped to do or if the authors need to take on this responsibility.

Methods/Results:

1. For the knowledge on clinical findings and legal procedures- am still somewhat unclear about the scoring.

For the clinical findings, there are 34 questions and the authors state that the respondents get one point for each "true" answer (though means are in the 6’s??). Were all of the included statements supposed to be true? (which is a little different than the way most are designed?).

Defining above the mean as acceptable is somewhat questionable, b/c if the mean is very low, than above may not be good enough.

I think instead, I would talk about the average % standardized to 100% that people got right (ie Altogether, the mean score was 65%-- meaning that respondents only got 65% of questions right) and then go on to explain as you do that x% answered correctly or incorrectly to specific questions.
For the legal questions, I would take the same approach as above to make it clear to the reader.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract-
1. Would end the last sentence of the background section with "in Turkey."
2. Would include the sample size in the methods.
3. For results, see comments in major revisions re: scoring of clinical and legal knowledge

Introduction-
1. May want to define "honor murders" for readers.
2. Revise (though this may come with English language revisions) the sentence "In order to increase the response capacity of EDs....."

Methods-
1. Move sentences at the end of the survey content and questionnaire section (The paper based survey was handed to physicians.....and the researchers collected them within one day...." to the end of the first paragraph in this section (Content of the questionnaire items....)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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