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November 27, 2012

To the editor of BMC Public Health,

Thank you for the further revisions and the opportunity to resubmit. Our comments, responses, and rebuttals to reviewer comments are indicated below in bold italics.

Best,

Kristin Wall
Department of Epidemiology
Rollins School of Public Health
Emory University
Cell: (512) 785-4779
Email: kmwall@emory.edu
Reviewer's report

Title: Actor-partner effects associated with experiencing intimate partner violence or coercion among male couples enrolled in an HIV prevention trial

Version: 2  Date: 7 November 2013

Reviewer: Katie Edwards

Reviewer's report:
The authors did a commendable job responding to all of my initial concerns. I believe that this paper provides important and interesting data on an understudied and important topic, and have no additional comments or concerns.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Reviewer: Paul Hewson

Reviewer's report:
Well, if you don't think CONSORT is appropriate then you should use STROBE. I don't think it's clear enough that you have data from an RCT but consider it observational.

Since we are not evaluating trial arm, but are considering the trial participants to be our analysis cohort, we did use the CONSORT criteria. However, we have made revisions to the article in keeping with the STROBE criteria.

I still think the profusion of p-values is risky - I appreciate you have some comments now in the discussion but it still makes it look like you are formally testing a primary outcome.

We maintain that p-values are appropriate to report for our secondary outcomes, and have tried to clarify in the article that we are not testing the effect of the trial arm, but a secondary outcome.
**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.
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