Peer Review Report

Review Report on Typologies of Intimate Partner Violence against Women in five Latin-American countries: A Latent Class Analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Maria Isabel Gutierrez

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.**

Dear editors, the article approach is interesting, but there are some issues related with structure of the article and the methods used, as well as some analysis issues.

The abstract conclusions should be reviewed, as well as the main article. Conclusions should address the use of the found typologies, in the studied problem and also they should mention the conclusions of the other two aims of the study.

Aims:

1.to estimate and describe typologies of IPV against women,

2. to explore associations between attitudes justifying IPV

3. female participation in household decisions with each typology of IPV

All these aims should be mentioned and analyzed in the paper and they are not clearly addressed.

Methods:

First, this is not an easy to review paper. It is interesting but is not clear the use of the different type of analysis carried out.

The authors mentioned that it is a database analysis from a five countries demographic surveys from different periods of time, there is not technical detail information from each survey that permits its comparability (telescope time, since they are using life time; variables to compare, population sample, among others). The possibility from different type of bias is high (temporality, uniformity, selection, etc).

The outcome variables are confused, the categories for the outcome variables do not have clear definitions. The proposed classification for outcome variables because the definition problems have a possible overlap risk.

The outcome variable named "Attitudes that justify IPV" is not clear why they used this questions for what Aim and why.

It is not clear which LCA is used, should be nice draw why the authors justify this analysis methods as seen in other articles which use this analysis methods, for example which variables are trying to explain or complement according with information drawn from other analysis. Why they use multinomial logistic regression after LCA, or the used of the correspondence analysis. It is not clear the logic of the different order, objective and indication of all this type of statistical analysis.

Results:

The results should be presented according the study aims. Tables should be reorganizing according with related variables to avoid long table or should be presented in different way, to improve the possibility of read and understand the information presented.

It is not clear how they get the categories out of the LCA.

Discussion: reorganized according with results.

Conclusions:

should address the use of the found typologies in public health to prevent IPV, and also the conclusions of the other two aims of the study.

Q 2	Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The author's main findings are three typologies of IPV: high-level, middle-level, and low-level of IPV. From the LCA analysis

Q 3	Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations: The authors mentioned that it is a database analysis from a five countries demographic surveys from different periods of time, there is not technical detail information from each survey that permits its comparability (telescope time, since they are using life time; variables to compare, population sample, among others). The possibility from different type of bias is high (temporality, uniformity, selection, etc).

Strengths: the effort to contribute in the solution of IPV

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4	Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is appropriate, attractive and concise.

Q 5	Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 6	Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

Q 7	Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8	Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9	Originality	████ (4/5)
Q 10	Rigor	██ (2/5)
Q 11	Significance to the field	███ (3/5)
Q 12	Interest to a general audience	███ (3/5)
Q 13	Quality of the writing	████ (4/5)
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	██ (2/5)

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15	Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.