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Editing
Extra spacing on Page 5 line 38-39. "by…Sexual"
Extra space on Page 7 line 21-22 "client..was"

Introduction

1) What percentage of woman who are assaulted (by any type of assailant) go to the hospital at all to be seen by SANE nurses? Are the woman in this study a representative sample of woman sexual assaulted. Please provide citation.

2) How are assailants distinguished? In the Logan 2007 they are distinguished by intimate partner, acquaintance, acquaintance just met, or stranger. Then in Stermac et al study assailants are distinguished by current/previous boyfriends and then acquaintance known for less/more than 24 hrs. Is there some form of standardization in the categories of assailants and how do these categories fit within this manuscript?

3) As a follow up to #1, does current or former husband/boyfriend (wife/girlfriend) have any effect on the results presented in the manuscript? Was that accounted for? As in would a utilization of hospital-based violence services be different between current and former partners instead of lumping them together.
Methods

1) Was it known if any woman had any previous sexual assault training courses either provided during high school or college and could that have any effects on the categories?

2) Did any of the participants of the study have any history previous sexual abuse? Was this the first experience of sexual abuse for participants and could previous abuse history affect health service seeking behavior? Why wasn't this included in analysis?

Discussion

1) The study states that woman assaulted by current/former partner less likely to receive prophalaxysis STI and HIV post exposure. The authors claim that forced vaginal/anal penetration increases risk for STI's. This would make sense for HIV but not necessarily for other STI's. If forced penetration is associated with other STI's please provide a citation.

2) On page 12 line 7, authors state WHO "the importance of reducing ongoing risk within intimate relationship…” I am assuming authors are referencing to HIV risk. Please clarify possibly "reducing on going risk [of HIV] within.."

3) Woman assaulted by current/former are offered safety planning more than woman assaulted by strangers or acquaintances. Authors should explore why safety services aren't offered to woman assaulted by strangers and acquaintances.

4) Author states that page 12 line 14. Woman sexual assaulted by an intimate partner less likely to have used medication to prevent pregnancy. Do the author's mean previous oral contraception use or emergency contraception? Please clarify. Also clarify who is administering the emergency oral contraception? Are women taking this themselves before showing up to the hospital or is the hospital administering the emergency contraception?
5) Authors claim that women who suffer and fear violence from partners don't use contraception without permission (reference 31). This citation is of worldwide data. Do these same conditions apply to the population within Toronto? Was there much variance among cultural/ethnic/demographic backgrounds of the manuscript study population?

Table 2

Please indicate how many people fell into the 3 categories at the top of the table (partner+ex-117, other known assailant -?, Stranger- 111)

Why is social supports included in the Table 2 when it isn't mentioned in the methods, results, or discussion?

Disability is listed in Table 2 but should be mentioned in the methods section

Where are the remaining p values? They are listed (even when not significant) in tables 2 and 3

Table 3

Please indicate how many people fell into the 3 categories at the top of the table (partner+ex-117, other known assailant -?, Stranger- 111)

Weapons are listed here but not mentioned in the methods section

Table 4

Please indicate how many people fell into the 3 categories at the top of the table (partner+ex-117, other known assailant -?, Stranger- 111)
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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