

## **Reviewer's report**

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

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 18 September 2007

**Reviewer:** Peter Leggat

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

Minor Essential Revisions

BMC Public Health

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

Overall

This is an interesting survey examining predictors of tobacco counselling practices. It covers a relatively small population.

Title

This could be simplified. Study could be deleted. Survey suggests a cross-sectional study. Maybe just a Survey of.... It may be useful to include the location.

Abstract

Background: Could be culled.

Methods: Year of study should be given.

Results: Can more results be incorporated? There are no quantitative findings at present.

Conclusions: What were the main findings of the study? These should match those of the main text.

Introduction

A 1.5 page introduction is given. It is suggested that a more international approach is used for the initial impact statements, given the journal's readership. In any case, the first statement is a bit sweeping given that it relies on one reference. Are there any other impact statements that could be sourced from the literature?

It would be interesting to mention what the smoking rates are in the doctor population, especially the group to be studied.

There are just some minor points:

§ Page 4, paragraph 2, 6th last line: 28,000 not 28.000.

The objectives are given in the last paragraph.

## Methods

It would be interesting to know whether it was known what the coverage rate was for the NMHMS? Does this include all Hispanic physicians?

There are just some minor comments:

§ Presumably “institutionally approved informed consent form” implies ethics clearance or was this further discussed in reference 11?

§ Page 6, Procedures, 4th line: comma after 25 physicians.

§ In the discussion of the instrument, it may be sufficient to mention that a likert scale was used and just list the major variables investigated.

§ Page 7, the international audience may not appreciate how popular the documents referred to under knowledge and skills are. It may be useful to fully reference these and also to perhaps mention what measures of their popularity have been undertaken.

§ Page 8, SPSS should preferably be referenced.

## Results

Obviously 45 is a small sample size. It does make analysis more difficult with a high likelihood of small categories. The response rate itself is satisfactory and expected in this type of survey. It may have been interesting to mention the response before the follow-up was conducted.

## Tables

There are four tables.

From Table 2, it appears that physicians were not asked about their own smoking habits, which is a pity.

## Discussion

The limitations of the study are described in the last paragraph after the conclusions. Should these be brought forward to the beginning of the discussion? In the limitations, it is mentioned that a considerable number of Hispanic physicians working in the US were born and educated outside the US. This is not borne out by this study (91% born in US) and may need a supporting reference. Could language be a barrier to the response by this latter group in this study?

The statement that physicians play an important role in smoking cessation needs to be supported by referenced discussion.

There are some minor comments:

§ Page 12, 2nd line: ETS may need to be defined, if not done so earlier in the text.

### Conclusions

A one paragraph discussion is given. It does not really highlight the main findings of the study. It should be reworked and made consistent with the abstract conclusions.

### Acknowledgements

Is it worth acknowledging the participants?

### References

There are 34 references in the year range 1987-2006 (mode~1999).

The references need some general revision for journal style.

The access dates on the URLs seem a little dated (2004). It would be worth checking these.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

'I declare that I have no competing interests'