Reviewer's report

Title: An ecological study of regional variation in work injuries among young workers

Version: 1 Date: 20 December 2006

Reviewer: Simo Salminen

Reviewer's report:

General The topic of the article is a new and interesting one, because only one study has been done on the regional variation in work injuries among young workers: The work is a continuation for the study Breslin et al (2006) analyzing the whole Canada. That should be mentioned on the ms.

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

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

The factors three and four had a same name: They should have different names.

In page 22. The authors said that earlier studies showed that smaller workplaces have lower injury rates than larger workplaces. However, a review of 12 studies showed that accident frequency is several times higher in small companies than in big ones (Salminen et al. Organizational factors... SJWEH 1993;19:352-357).

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

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

On page 5: The authors should give numbers for the higher rates of work injury of young workers.

On page 20: The authors should give more reasons for Figures 2-5.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

On page 19: The first factor was named rural deprivation. However, any of the items did not pointed directly to countryside. Maybe the authors have more knowledge about Ontario, but readers from outside Canada did not find these.

It is hard to read the Figure 1 without names of districts.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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