

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** How and why community hospital clinicians document a positive screen for intimate partner violence: a cross-sectional study.

**Version:** 4 **Date:** 3 October 2005

**Reviewer:** Gene Feder

### **Reviewer's report:**

General

The authors have addressed all the points raised in my original review and those of Therese Zink, the other reviewer.

The outstanding question is how to report the associations between documentation of referral and characteristics of the patients and clinicians. There is no doubt that both the uni- and multivariate models are under-powered and I don't think that this problem is resolved using a different type of analysis (ie. chi-square tests.) The confidence intervals make this explicit. So, is this a fatal flaw in the paper and should this analysis be removed? On balance, I think not. The point estimates still tell a useful story.

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

A sentence or two in the discussion about the different implications of detecting current/recent vs. past abuse. The former has safety implications and therefore is, arguably, more important in the short term, than the latter. Although one shouldn't take point estimates too seriously, in this study referral documentation has an OR < 1 for women who experienced IPV in the past year...

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that i have no competing interests.