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Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the brief report titled: Neglected increases in rural road traffic mortality in China: findings based on health data from 2005 to 2010. Developing countries are in epidemiological transition and injuries burden is on rise in rural areas.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes question is fairly well defines

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Not much details in the report but are standardised and previously well published methods

3. Are the data sound?
   Needs some details but I would believe that data is good quality

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Difficult to comment as for what is required for “brief report”!

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Data presented is very little. Recommendations are very generalizable and not necessarily supported by data

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes limitations are stated.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Disagree with the title: it is mortality data or vital registration data
   Results in abstract can be better written and some contextual data in last line would be useful

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes it is acceptable but use of words like “contrast” “obvious” etc are not very scientific….can be better written

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Comments:

Background:
Page 3, line 3- Many control measure? Namely?
Page 3, second paragraph- How do rural vs urban rates compare to other countries in the region like India and globally?
Page 3, paragraph 4- needs to be re-written

Methods- Though I understand that methods are well known and well published it would still be a good idea to give some more details.

Results:
This is where editors need to decide what details are expected in a brief report. Author’s have not reported age, sex, road user etc details. With ICD-10 3 digit codes road users would be easily identifiable. Data should be presented with 3 digit or at least ICD block distribution.

For any intervention or policy implication detailed results are needed.

Discussion
Overall is quite repetitive of introduction.

Page 5 paragraph 1- needs to be supported by references.
Page 5, Paragraph 2, - what does “civil” imply…not military? Why does this term need to be used?
Page 5, Paragraph 2- reference second last sentence
Page 6, Paragraph 3- numbers for – “coding errors to some degree”

Overall recommendations are very generalizable and not well supported by data that had been reported.
There is only 1 take home message in this report – Injuries in rural China are rising!