

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

Nastaran Heydarikhayat¹

1 Iranshahr University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

	First of all, thank you for the opportunity to review this article. I must mention that it is an interesting and useful topic, but there are some points that need to be corrected. I wish the authors success.
Title	The title of the study should be changed. The purpose of a qualitative study is not to determine incidence. The focus of the study is on the management of intimate partner violence against women, and the title should be changed accordingly. The title should be aligned with the goal and results of the study.
Abstract	-Thematic analysis is mentioned in the method, while content analysis is mentioned in the methods of the article. - The authors mentioned categories in the abstract and themes in the text. Please correct it. -In the results, the number of the main theme, category, and subcategory should be mentioned.
Introduction	-The introduction needs revision. - The definition of intimate partner violence and types of violence should be mentioned in the introduction. - The importance of this issue is very weak in the introduction. - In the introduction, there is no mention of the negative consequences of intimate partner violence against pregnant women. Statistics in Cyprus should also be reported. - At the end of the introduction, there is talk about the management of violence, which does not match the title of the article. - The use of future verbs at the end of the introduction should be changed.
Methods	-At the beginning of the methods, the type of study and design is not clear, which should be corrected. What is the approach of this qualitative analysis? In the method, the label of <i>study design</i> should be written, and in this section, the type of study and the reason for choosing this type of study should be mentioned with a valid reference. -Also, study setting, description of setting, participant, sampling method, reason for using this sampling method, length of sampling, and exclusion criteria should be mentioned. - Rigor of the study should be mentioned too. - Is there a religious difference among midwives? A factor that can be considered important in this matter. -Mention the work experience and degree, age in the inclusion criteria in the text. What measures have you taken to maintain diversity? - Abbreviations in the text should be reported in full for the first time, and the abbreviation should be mentioned in parentheses. - The number of samples in qualitative studies is not determined based on other studies. The same explanation of data saturation is more correct.



	This part should be corrected.
	- In content analysis studies, categories and subcategories are relevant.
Results	 At the beginning of the results, a short explanation should be given regarding the number of initial codes and the number of final codes. In this part, the main theme should be mentioned and a brief explanation should be given about it. Results should be expressed according to theme, category, and subcategory. The main theme is not written in the study; it seems that the written themes of classes and sub-themes are sub-categories that need to be modified. Subcategories in "Ambiguous procedures for subcategories management" do not express ambiguity. It should be rewritten. There is no consistency between the floor and sub-floors, and it needs to be corrected. It is better to write "and" instead of "slash" in the results.
Discussion	- Category and subcategory in the discussion should be interpreted, and similar and contrasting studies should be mentioned.
limitations	The limited number of samples is a characteristic of qualitative studies and is not considered one of the limitations. The authors should state the limitations of the working method. - Limitations and strengths of the study need correction.
conclusions	- Conclusions should be based on the results, and discussion and interpretation should be removed.