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Reviewer’s report:

General
This paper has really come a long way and the authors are to be commended for all of their hard work.

A few discretionary comments are listed below. Additionally, there are some minor grammatical errors that can be corrected easily by an editor.

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

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

None.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. The authors may want to change the title to "The Training Needs of Turkish ED Personnel Regarding IPV" to alert the reader to the important focus on Turkey.

2. In the results section, under "knowledge on definition of IPV" might be helpful to add in one sentence (it is in the Table but would make it easier for the reader to also have here) about the Likert scale (1= not violent through 5=severe violence).

3. In this same section, also may add a section that the types of violence were sub-categorized as physical, sexual, emotional and economic.

4. The statement on page 8 "When asked about current screening practices, 63.9% of the study group declared that they included questions about IPV when they worked with an injured patient, but only 1/4 of the study group stated that they screened each case of injury from this point of view," is still confusing to me—are n’t those statistics saying the same thing? Please explain the differences between the first stat of 63.9% versus the 25% (screened injured patients versus what?)
5. The Tables should stand alone, so would put the Likert scale range on Table 2 as well.

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**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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