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Reviewer's report:

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. 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

\[(\frac{60}{1766})*3)*1000.\] 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 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.

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.

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)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

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.
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