

Reviewer's report

Title: Predictors of tobacco counseling among Hispanic physicians: a cross-sectional survey study

Version: 1 **Date:** 10 August 2007

Reviewer: Elaine Puleo

Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Although results from this survey have been published elsewhere, it should not be the duty of the reader to hunt for pertinent information.

A. Information concerning the research design needs to be more specific

B. Information about your primary outcome variable, tobacco-related practices needs to be provided- this would be distributional assumptions and some characteristics of the distribution itself (mean, median, sd, range etc.).

2. Table 1 is a result and should be moved to that section and discussed as such.

3. Because you have such a small sample population and your response rate is low,

was there any testing of whether your sample was

a) representative of the full population wrt demographics of Hispanic physicians in New Mexico and

b) if there were significant differences between respondents and non-respondents and/or initial respondents and later incentivized respondents?

4. Table 3 is not necessary although the discussion of the explained variance can be left in the text.

5. A new Table 3 should present the characteristics of the respondents with respect to the independent variables of interest. Also, please label gender so one does not have to wait till the final sentence of the Discussion to determine how gender is being modeled.

5. Bivariate models including each of the predictors and potential confounders and effect modifiers (were any other variables from table 2 considered?) should be presented in table form along with the final multivariable model. Models 1 and 2 in table 4 can be removed from the table and just presented as is in the text.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

- 1 page 4 Introduction paragraph 2 change 28.000 to 28,000
2. same paragraph Replace "Not only it is" with "Not only is it"
3. Results - paragraph 3 you have it ending with a comma - should be a period

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Please explain how an IRB actually approved sending incentives to only those who hadn't responded in a timely fashion.
2. For Instrument section - it would be helpful to give more information on each of the 4 major variables - what were the ranges, means medians etc. Was any thought given to normality and/or transformation? - this is discretionary for the Instrument section but compulsory (see item 5 above) for the Table.
3. Note that 7% of 45 respondents = 3. Such percentages become meaningless with such small numbers.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.