

Review of: ""There Are Challenging Cases for Us": A Qualitative Study of Cypriot Midwives' Experiences Investigating Incidents of Intimate Partner Violence During Pregnancy"

Juliet Nyasulu¹

¹ University of Stellenbosch

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review comments

Title: The title is appropriate, clear, and informative

Abstract:

The abstract is concise, outlines the aims of the study, methodology, findings, and conclusions. However, make sure the first conclusion statement highlights that the study established the existence of IPV among pregnant women.

Introduction:

- The background is sufficient and relevant; however, there is too much content not referenced. Even if the sources are unpublished, they have to be properly referenced as shown below;

The General Health System (GESY) in Cyprus provides every pregnant woman with free access to 15 visits to a gynecologist/obstetrician and 6 visits to a community midwife (reference). However, it is not commonly practiced to inquire about violence during these visits because many professionals involved in maternity care believe it is not something they should ask about (reference). There are no protocols or clinical guidelines specifying the questions that should be asked of pregnant women or referring the pregnant woman to other social services. The official documents of public hospitals for the initial prenatal examination do not include a question related to the issue (reference). As a result, each obstetrician or midwife decides individually whether to inquire about or investigate issues related to intimate violence. For this reason, there are no statistical data on the cases of pregnant women seeking support or assistance in maternity hospitals (reference).

- Remove the *Antenatal Care in Cyprus and IPV screenings* subsection and let the content flow.
- The authors did not state the aim of the publication at the end of the introduction section, soon before the methodology.

Research methods: Lacks details for clarity. Some results content is in the methods section.

- What is the study design? Study site? And how was data collected? Data sources are not described in the methods, though highlighted in the abstract.
- Demographics and Table 2 must move to the results section.
- Data analysis was appropriate and relevant to the study aim.

Results:

- **Adequate and relevant qualitative data was collected.** Data collected (adequate and relevant)
- Data was well presented as per themes and sub-themes in summary tables.

Discussions:

- **The discussion section is very weak and must be redone, not** Critical, comprehensive, logically integrated, linked to literature. The discussion needs to be redone, presented logically with critical evidence-based and well-referenced arguments.
- Firstly, highlight the existence of IPV among these pregnant women established in the study. Using literature, define the problem, what are the consequences, recommendations, and policy implications.
- From each theme, be concise in a sentence defining your key findings. Is the finding consistent with existing literature? Using literature, what are the consequences, recommendations, and policy implications?

Conclusion and recommendations: Be clear, concise, and supported by data. Findings must relate/respond to the objectives/hypotheses/research questions. Recommendations must be linked to the findings

