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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory revions needed.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes, although in the methods section the aim has been changed into: ...‘to assess the nurses ability to identify women exposed to IPV’. At the end of the background they mentioned: ‘nurses preparedness to provide nursing care’. This is not the same, identification is only one aspect of preparedness. The authors should adhere to their first aim.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Partially. How many questions remained after the first testing round with 6 nurses? 20 of the 27?Ddid the questionnaire changed after the 39 nurses tested it? Explain what is meant by: ‘being sufficiently prepared’ in the methods and not only in the results section. (page 11)

3. Are the data sound? There are different numbers of questionnaires returned, fully answered and valid. How many had to be excluded? The flowchart does not correspond with the numbers in the results paragraph. (194 – 193 – 190?) Why did they select 20 -20 cards? In the analysis they did not discern between both groups? Is this study part of an intervention study? Please provide information in short.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Partly, now the first paragraph of the results section needs rewriting. Too mixed up with response rate and invalid questionnaires because of missing values. A pity, because it is rich material.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? This section has improved. Check for unnecessary double information and again in the limitations 35 nurses were mentioned for not having provided a reason for not answering. Not same as in the flowchart. Further some explanation on missing values should be provided.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Much better now, although more clearness is needed on missing values and response rate, which is very high, making this study valid.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

More recent references are provided but still reference 5, 6 cannot be checked while for 6 a substitute from Sweden is possible. Stenson, Heimer,e.a. WHI
2008, Prevalence of experiences...

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? The title is shorter but still not accurately. How about: Nurses preparedness to take care of abused women: a quantitative study in primary health care. (in Sweden: not really needed. This could have been done everywhere)

9. Is the writing acceptable?

The writing still needs improvement, sometimes the meaning of a sentence is not clear because of wrong wording.

Other numbered comments:

1. Language editing needed to understand what the authors mean to say.
2. Page 3: .. in the Swedish legislation (not legal)
3. Page 3: include reference: Ramsay BMJ 2002 a systematic review of quantitative studies, reports low recognition of healthcare staff (0-3%)
5. Page 8: first part has changed however still presented too messy and not corresponding with flowchart.
6. Page 9: as the authors present a large number of tables with outcomes, they can easily shorten the text e.g. Table 2: the majority of the respondents did not discuss how to react at the workplace. Etc etc.
7. Page 10: the last paragraph on children: shorten to avoid double text.
8. Page 11: ‘being sufficiently prepared’ comes forward for the first time in the manuscript. The authors should explain in the methods what they mean by ...
9. Page 11: Moreover it seems that elderly nurses are better prepared. Is this correct? The tables are not clear contain too many figures and do not correspond clear enough with the text. Also statistical test is missing beneath table 7-8.
11. combine tables on questionnaire.
12. A very nice study but not yet reported sound enough. Major revision needed.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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