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Thank you for your valuable comments that have helped us to improve this manuscript; *Nurses’ preparedness to care for women exposed to Intimate Partner Violence: a quantitative study in primary health care.*

A point-by-point description of the revisions can be found below.

Please note that our extracts from the manuscript are in italics.

**Revisions**

**Comments on the report of reviewer dr. Angela Taft**

**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Nurses’ preparedness to care for women exposed to Intimate partner violence: a quantitative study in primary health care.

**Version:** 4  **Date:** 4 November 2011

**Reviewer:** Angela Taft

**Reviewer's report:**

Generally speaking the authors have improved the clarity and expression in the manuscript.

**Minor essential revisions**

1. Clarity of sample size: Your sample size estimation was based on what difference (%) between those who identify and those who didn't?

   Answer: The sample size has now been clarified and reads as follow: “Estimation of sample size was done to reach a 21 % difference between those who could identify women exposed to IPV and those who could not”. Please refer to page 6.

2. The response rate is 69.3% by my calculations and not 70%.

   Answer: The response rate was calculated on 193 respondents which lead to a response rate of 70% (0.696). Unfortunately we forgot to recalculate when the response rate was detected to be 192. This had now been corrected in the revised manuscript. Please refer to page 8.

3. I suggest you express your results more clearly and comment that nurses were six times more likely to ask about abuse if they felt prepared, rather than just give the odds ratio and refer to the exposure variable. Just into age, nurses were nine times more likely to ask if it obtains information about violence by themselves.

   Answer: As suggested by the reviewer the result now has been clarified and reads as follow: “Being sufficiently prepared was found to be the only significant independent variable in the first step of multivariate logistic regression analysis (p = 0.002). Nurses were six times more likely to ask about IPV if they felt sufficiently prepared. Several models were tested and only the age-adjusted
model was statistically significant. Age adjustments resulted in grouping the participants in three age categories. The eldest were > 60 years old. The age-adjusted odds ratio (OR) was 6.30 (95% CI 2.02–19.67) and referred to whether nurses identified women exposed to IPV and whether they felt sufficiently prepared.

In the second step, being sufficiently prepared was used as a dependent variable to find predictive factors. Only ‘having obtained knowledge by themselves’ was a significant independent variable (p< 0.001). Variables ‘being sufficiently prepared’ and ‘having obtained knowledge by themselves’ were shown to be closely associated reflected by an OR of 7.53 (95% CI 2.46–29.03). Nurses were nine times more likely to ask about violence if they had obtained information about violence by own initiative. The age-adjusted odds ratio for the association was 9.07 (95% CI 2.83–29.13).”

4. Perhaps instead of 'wrong' attitudes, you could call them 'unhelpful' or 'prejudicial'
Answer: The word “wrong” has now been changed and reads as follow: “Training programmes must deal with this problem, since having the ‘prejudicial’ attitudes is known to negatively impact the nurses’ interaction with abused women as well as their ability to identify them and properly care for them [36].” Please refer to page 14.

5. At the bottom of page 14 you say 'In previous studies, women exposed to IPV preferred to be asked directly about IPV' please give the references.
Answer: References are now inserted in the revised manuscript.

The confidence intervals in the regression models were rather wide, which could indicate a rather low statistical power, 'but according to our power calculation the power was judged sufficient. 'I think the authors should acknowledge the CIs are wide and not follow this with a defensive comment that the power calculations say it is OK. It is more likely to mean that the numbers in some cells are small. Answer: The sentence “but according to our power calculation...” has been removed as suggested by the reviewer. Please refer page 16.

6. It would be helpful for you to make a comment about the number of nurses who have personally experienced abuse, and the one in three of your nurses had a relative who was affected by it. This has implications for nursing management of IPV.
Answer: The number of nurses having experienced IPV themselves are now commented in the revised manuscript; “A total of 191 nurses answered the question about whether they had themselves experienced IPV, 23 of whom (13%) reported that they had. Additionally, 58 (30%) of the 191 nurses had either a relative or close friend who had been exposed to IPV”. Please refer to page 10.

“This study showed that 13 % of the nurses had personal experiences with IPV and one out of three had a relative who had been exposed to IPV. Even though there was no indication of an association between having experienced IPV and higher odds of successfully identifying IPV victims, the personal experience may influence the quality of nursing care given to IPV victims [48]. Refer to page 15.
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