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Reviewer's report:

General
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Yes. Information on nonhospitalized injuries are often difficult to obtain, especially from developing countries. This article provides a very good look at such injuries, and will be of good use to researchers interested in populations living outside of more researched, 'Western' populations.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

Recommend that authors include a sample instrument-this would allow for the study to be replicated. Descriptive statistics are employed here in an appropriate fashion, but I strongly recommend that the authors round up their percentage figures, to avoid over-precision in reporting in a small population.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The data seem sound, but I would strongly recommend that the authors drop the bar graphs, and stick to more general data. The main drawback to the article is its over-reporting of findings. A simple table for ages, causes, and outcomes will more than suffice.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Not certain. What did the authors do to protect respondent confidentiality? Were instruments destroyed after data was blind-recorded? As many young African researchers will undoubtedly refer to this article, it behooves the authors to include a few sentences about this subject.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

There are a few grammatical errors- authors may wish to use the term census area to describe which communities they included, (as well as provide a brief description about why they selected those communities.) Titles are missing from graphs, n information would be useful, and there is a conclusion that the population's health seeking behaviors are appropriate, but this conclusion is not discussed nor justified in the article. There is a reference to what I suppose is a health promotion program, but no explanation of this program, nor an explanation as to why this program appears to help with injuries, per se.

I do not think that this work has been previously published, nor do I see any evidence that the findings have been falsified. While the findings may be more general than specific, we lack information of just about any kind on injuries in rural African populations, and so this article will provide important background information on this population. Data on how the study population compares to the national population would be useful, for readers to determine how generalizable the findings are.

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

Please refer to my comments about your conclusions about appropriate health seeking behavior. You must justify your conclusions, as there is no evidence in the article that convinces me about this statement.
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Delete the two bar graphs, please, check your titles and then move the most important information about your findings into a table

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**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'