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Reviewer’s report:

It was a pleasure to review this manuscript presenting an analysis of survey data investigating the relationship between adolescent depressive symptoms and injury. This is a well written paper that is methodologically sound and addresses a gap in the literature. Below are some suggestions that could aid with clarity.

Discretionary Revisions

1. It may be helpful if you put Nova Scotia in context in terms of the number of adolescents and the injury risk among adolescents (is it similar to the rest of Canada) - this has already been done for depression

Minor Essential Revisions

1. As this is an international journal it is important to clarify the age range of the adolescents involved in this survey, not just the grades
2. At the top of page 5 you indicate that “all students in grades 9-12 in each participating school were eligible…” and on page 7, under the results heading you indicate that “Of the students in grades 10-12 about 51% were male” – did you limit this analysis to students in grades 10-12 despite the survey being done among students in grades 9-12? If so this should be made clear in the methods.
3. Under ‘Measures’ the sub-scales are explained, however it was not until I read the analysis plan and saw that you were using a logistic regression did I realize that these were dichotomous variables (I think using the term “sub-scale” for a dichotomous variable was confusing) – it is suggested that you clarify that these are dichotomous variables in the measures section (bottom of page 5)
4. Multivariate refers to statistical models that have 2 or more dependent variables whereas multivariable analysis refers to models in which there are multiple independent variables – it is suggested that all models in this paper be referred to as multivariable not multivariate (Hidalgo, B, Goodman M. Multivariate or Multivariable Regression? Am J Public Health. Nov 2012. : http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3518362/)
5. It is suggested that 95% CI be included around the percentages in table 1 to allow the reader to consider statistical significance (differences across categories)
6. On page 9 under violence-related injury, you have already used the abbreviation ‘CI’ in the previous section, you don’t need to state it in full again. It
is also suggested that the first OR and 95% CI be moved to the end of the first sentence rather than where it is currently.

7. Missing data - we know that there was a 57% response rate, but were all surveys that were returned complete for the variables relevant to this analysis? If so this should be stated, otherwise the number of exclusions need to be stated and consideration should be given to the potential impact on the results. Regardless, the size of the final analytic sample needs to be made clear as this is not in table 1 which only presents percentages.

8. It is suggested that the authors address the 57% response rate in the limitations section of the discussion and consider the possible implications this response rate had on the results (or how weighting attempted to address this limitation)

9. For clarity it is suggested that the table titles for tables 2 -6 include the word ‘multivariable’ so the reader knows when looking at the tables that all variables were included in the model at the same time

10. It is suggested that the authors include the crude relationship (IRR and OR) between injury/injury type and depressive symptoms prior to presenting the adjusted results.
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