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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Background
   1a. Context: Readers need to understand the IPV/nursing context. Is there legislation allowing prosecution of perpetrators, protection for victims and children and community-based IPV services to which nurses can refer? Can women who leave partners receive priority housing, welfare payments – in other words, please provide a brief outlines of the context so we understand whether these are additional barriers for health care providers (HCPs). Can nurses receive supervision or support for dealing with stressful issues such as IPV?

2. Preparedness to provide nursing care to women exposed to IPV
   This section should include current Swedish context, eg as you refer later to nurses referring to doctors. Are they more likely to be better trained and supported? Does the Swedish Nursing Association have an IPV policy? Also explain what the ‘volunteer organisations’ are to which you later refer?

3. Methods
   Please tell us on what assumptions and how you powered the study.
   Did you use clinic as a (cluster) variable, as nurses would be clustered in clinics?

4. Setting and data collection
   How were the 40 clinics randomised? What happened to one as you then refer to 39.
   Are the clinics urban/rural?
   What was the average nurse employee rate and what the SD.
   How many nurses overall were eligible to be in the study? That is, what was your original denominator?
   Please tell us which questions attracted the higher missing rate (eg was it income –this is common).

5. Results
   Please move the description of your response rates and demographic descriptions of nurses to this section and note the proportion that had experienced IPV themselves (12%).
Tables 7 and 8.
Please correct the titles of these (which have slipped) as it took me a while to understand your CIs and p values.

Discussion
Under limitations, mention your wide CIs and the sample size limits.

Minor Essential Revisions
Please remove all references to ‘these’ women. You do not intend it, but it sounds oddly negative in English. I recommend either victimised or abused women or women experiencing IPV.

I suggest ‘profound’ rather than ‘deep’ in the abstract and p3.

p.3 Health problems – ‘can present very differently’ - I think you mean in diverse ways.

Preparedness paragraph p.4
Line 2: Suggest ‘such organisational conditions ‘include….

Line 4. Education is known (although not explored in PHC etc (two examples below) suggest you remove this statement)


Page 5. First para, last few lines> since IPV often occurs in isolation. This is ambiguous- do you mean women often live in isolation or that IPV occurs in isolation from other problems? Last sentence – when children ‘are involved’, a report to social services is needed. Please clarify. In Australia, nurses are mandated to report to child protection if the child is ‘in danger’ or actually abused. If they are witnessing, the nurse can seek to help the mother keep her and children safer without reporting necessarily. Our nurses find this a clinically difficult judgment.

Second para: Line 4 ‘under-explored in PHC – I suggest, only recently being better explored? It does not detract from your contribution.

Bottom of page 5. ‘personal experience of IPV is repeated.

Results:
Table 3 – please organise from highest% to lowest% as this would be quicker to scan.

P.8 Middle para. Final line: lack of cooperation.. (from whom?)

Table 7. Reduce the ORs to two decimal places and add 0 before those below 1. (eg 0.57) . Please line up around the ‘.’ so that they are easier to read.
Discretionary
Did you think to use this to see whether the factor of 12% nurses who had experienced IPV was a barrier or facilitator to willingness to ask? Overall this could be a significant factor.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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