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Reviewer’s report:

Overall Comments

The paper was a pleasure to read. My previous comments and questions have been addressed. Your paper reads with clarity in terminology, rationale, and process. My comments are very minor.

Abstract

In the last sentence, the word improve(ment) is overused. Consider "…knowledge in this area will improve frontline health professionals' practices and responsiveness to women who seek out healthcare in the context of violence."

Aims and Objectives

I would consider (not imperative) changing the header to just read "Objectives".

Study Design

Use consistent formatting around the phases. In the last paragraph of this section, you incorporated Phase 1 and 2 into sentences whereas in later parts, you state the phase as a sentence unto itself. Similarly, You italicized "Phase 1:..." but did not italicise or use a colon with Phase 2. It doesn't really matter how you chose to reference the phases throughout your paper - just make it consistent.

Design

In the first sentence, you reference "this date marks the decade....". I can imagine/speculate that you are referring to the 1970 but I think you should make it explicit. Replace "this" with what you are referring to.
Evaluation

I understand that you are adopting the term evaluation as Cook, Smith and Booth did however, I don't know what constitutes evaluation in this context. How is evaluation defined or used in the context of your study? Just a sentence will do.

Data Extraction

p. 13 Line 8: "…relationship between studies as this will be the likely cause…" What is "this" referring to?

Limitations and Strengths

How does the description of the four components of confidence address the strength or limitations of your study? I suspect there is a link but I think it needs to be made explicit.

NOTE: I noticed that there is inconsistent spacing between sentences.
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