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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written paper on a very important topic to those in the fields of IPV and medical education.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. There are a number of areas that need to be addressed in a little more detail. The most important of these stems from the finding that there is no statistically significant improvement in actual knowledge for the GPs over the study period. This is alarming – and deserves a much more detailed examination. It is particularly concerning since all of the other measures are self-reported, and we have no information on how accurate these are. If training results in a change in perceived knowledge and preparedness and in self-reported detection, but NOT an increase in actual knowledge, how can we be sure that the doctor's practice has actually improved? Does this not suggest that the training requires some modification – and thus the conclusion section requires some revision to reflect this? The one reference that the discussion uses for a relationship between confidence in ability to practice differently and likelihood of doing so is drawn from the field of physicians counselling smokers, and this does not seem very similar to the IPV field; no argument is made in the paper as to why this should be relevant or reassuring.

Minor Essential Revisions
There are a few further additions that would be helpful:
2. It would be helpful to include the specific items from the PREMIS scales that were used (in and Appendix if necessary), this may be very necessary to aid the discussion necessary to address 1 above
3. The paper should include a brief discussion of how different the physicians who accepted the invitation were from those who didn’t?
4. I found it rather confusing that the paper sometimes referred to the training program as training sometimes as an intervention and sometimes as ‘training intervention’. I suggest it would be clearer to refer to it as training program throughout, and reserve intervention for use in ‘intervention group’ only.

Small changes suggested to improve clarity

5. Abstract, Results
• Third line – ‘change control group in’ to ‘control group on’
• Second to last line – insert ‘self-reported’ before ‘detection

6. Main paper: Methods
• under ethical approval – change ‘within August’ to ‘in August’
• under training content: change start of sentence beginning with ‘Participants’ to read ‘Besides learning about the dynamics of IPV, participants developed….’
• Under data analysis – add reference for Chi-square test with a Monte Carlo simulation

7. Main paper: Methods Third para – ‘shouldn’t’ should be ‘should not’

8. Main paper: Conclusion
Third line suggest replacing ‘an early intervention stage for IPV training’ by ‘a suitable opportunity for IPV training’

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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