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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?

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

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.

4. Perhaps instead of 'wrong' attitudes, you could call them 'unhelpful' or 'prejudicial'

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.

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.

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.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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