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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is well-written and clear to understand. It is a good starting point in order to look at interventions effective to reduce childhood injuries.

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

None

• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. In the method section of the abstract, the last sentence ends abruptly. Probably a few words are missing.

2. In the results section of the abstract, change mothers into mothers’.

3. In the background section, the authors state the following: parental lack of… significant barrier to change… To change what? Please define.

4. In the study aims section, change mothers decisions in mothers’ decisions

5. The provision of informed consent is stated in the method section and in the results section. I suppose it should only be in the method section.

6. Where the interviews took place should be in the method section.

• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

7. The study aim is defined differently in the abstract and the study aim after the background section. I am not quite sure whether they mean the same. Please define one study aim and make sure that it is the same throughout the paper.

8. In the method section, the authors state that mothers were questioned about their use of five safety devices and six practice. Which devices and practices were asked? And to which types of injury prevention (for example prevention of falls, poisoning, drowning, or burns) did they apply?
9. In the results section the authors speak of recent arrivals to the UK (seven years or less). Where was this definition based on? I wonder this because in the abstract the authors talk about mothers who were recent migrants had not always encountered safety messages or safety equipment commonly used in the UK. On the other hand mothers were recruited when they were pregnant, so they would have had plenty of time to get familiar with the safety equipment and messages in the UK? Seven years would be long enough?

10. Why do the authors report on preliminary findings and eventual findings?

11. Are first-time mothers different from mother who have one child?

12. The conclusion from the abstract and the discussion do not seem to be in line with each other.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests