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The Editor

BMC Public Health

Re: Incidence and pattern of injuries among residents of a rural area in South western Nigeria: a community-based study (MS 5190095651201410)

Thank you for the email.

We thank the reviewer for the helpful review. Following the comments, we have revised the paper.

Below is a point-by-point response to the comments.

Yours sincerely,

Olawale Omoniyi

Corresponding author
Reviewer: Marilyn Leff

General

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

In calculating the injury rate, the authors used all injuries --- deaths, disability, and full recovery. One of those deaths happened outside of the 4 month time period and that one should be excluded when figuring the one year injury rate.

Thank you for the correction, we have excluded the death that occurred outside the 4-month study period from incidence and related calculations. Thus, the number of injuries was 59, and injury incidence 100 per 1000 per year. The death that occurred outside the study, and was thus excluded, was of a 58-year old man who died from a blunt injury to the head suffered on a road in town three years prior to the study period.
In addition, based on the questionnaire, it is not clear to me whether all the injuries that resulted in disability occurred in the 4 month time period. Based on the text, I would assume they did; but based on the questionnaire I would assume that they didn’t. It seems to me that the injury rate should be based on any injury that happened within the 4 month time period only. From my reading of the paper, it looked like the authors used the following calculation

\[((60/1766)*3)*1000\].

Shouldn’t the number of injuries be the number that happened in that 4 month time period ---- any death, disability, or recovery ---- just that it happened in that time period.

*The error has been corrected in the questionnaire. The disabilities considered were only those in the 4-month study period.*

The authors state that the Ugandan study by Kubosingye et al. had an injury prevalence rate of 116 per 1000 per year. I could not find that number in the study. It could be my misreading of the study; but please check it.
The statement has been deleted. The injury prevalence was not stated in the Uganda paper; the authors arrived at that figure by their own calculation from the figures presented.

In the discussion, the authors report lower injury rates in both Pakistan and Tanzania. One reason for this discrepancy may be the difference in the definition of injury used in the different studies. The authors never mention that. For instance, the definition for the Tanzanian study was an injury that resulted in losing one or more days of normal activity. In this study, all injuries were reported and there was no such restriction of lost time due to injury in this study. The authors could look to see how many of the injuries sustained resulted in such restricted activity and then calculate that to compare with the study from Tanzania.

The authors had already noted in the Discussion section that the above-mentioned reason could account for the high injury incidence in the study (page 10, para 4). We have also considered injuries that resulted in at least a day’s loss at work/school, and found the incidence to still be relatively high as outlined in the Discussion section.

-----------------------------------------------

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)