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Emily Crow
Executive Editor

BMC Women's Health
BioMed Central
Floor 6, 236 Gray's Inn Road
London, WC1X 8HL

Dear Miss Crow,

Re: Resubmission of Manuscript

On behalf of my research team, I would like to thank once again for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript entitled “Patterns, aetiology and risk factors of intimate partner violence-related injuries to head, neck and face in Chinese women: A retrospective study”. Please find attached for the point-by-point responses to reviewers.

Thank you very much for your considerations.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Janet Wong
PhD, RN
Assistant Professor
School of Nursing, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine
The University of Hong Kong
E-mail: janetyh@hku.hk
Title: Patterns, aetiology and risk factors of intimate partner violence-related injuries to head, neck and face in Chinese women: A retrospective study

Reviewer 1: N. Zoe Hilton

Point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers in italics.

The authors have responded to the reviewers’ comments and the rationale is stronger, the potential problems of the data and how they were handled are dealt with in the method section, and a measure of inter-rater agreement (although not a strong method) has been included.

Minor Essential
1. page 5, the line “consideration of the causal relationships among the variables” should state “consideration of the hypothesized causal relationships among the variables.”
   Response: We have now amended and elaborated the procedure. Therefore, the above sentence has been removed.

2. I still find the description of the regression analyses confusing. The authors cite Lam, Fong, Lauder, and Lam (2002) are cited for the analysis, perhaps because their article describes the steps used in that particular study. Please provide the same details of the steps in the current study. It seems to me that the multi-phases are actually separate regression analyses and this might elsewhere be called set-wise regression. Were significant variables at one phase forced into the analysis for the next phase?
   Response: We have now elaborated on the procedures we conducted in the structured multiphase logistic regression in page 7-8 of the revised manuscript. The reviewer is correct that significant variables at one phase were forced into the analysis in the next phase. We have also mentioned this in the revised version. The structured multiphase logistic regression may sometimes be called differently. We chose to label the analysis in this way in order to echo the name used in the cited references and it appears to be a popular term in the literature as well.
**Title:** Patterns, aetiology and risk factors of intimate partner violence-related injuries to head, neck and face in Chinese women: A retrospective study

**Reviewer 2:** Sheila Sprague

*Point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers in italics.*

**General Comments:**
I would like to thank the editor and authors once again for the opportunity to review this manuscript titled “Patterns, aetiology and risk factors of intimate partner violence-related injuries to head, neck and face in Chinese women: A retrospective study”. The authors have done an excellent job at addressing the comments and questions I raised previously. Overall, the manuscript is well-written and the results are well-presented. The content will be of use to health care professionals who treat Chinese women in emergency situations. There are a few minor language errors throughout the manuscript but they can be corrected during the publication process.

*Response: We thank for the reviewer’s positive comments. We have proofread the paper again.*