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Reviewer’s report:

This paper reaffirms the important role played by easy accessibility of pesticide in the public health problem of pesticide suicides in Asia. The major advantage of the study is the fact that it is a large study.

In the Methods section, it may be useful to have more information about the demographics of the catchment area. It may also be interesting to know the number of patients who were treated only as an out patient and not admitted in the hospital for ingestion of pesticide. The authors have stated that 125 patients were excluded as unintentional, homicidal or occupational pesticide exposure. How was this established?

The Results seem to suggest that the case fatality is low (36 + 4?) of the total self ingestion cases. The authors have mentioned that majority of the pesticide was obtained from storage inside the home and outside. It may be useful to have the description of the variety of such places. When the authors mention locked storage is the locked storage part of the study or intervention or individual decision. Is there any difference in the type of pesticide used gender wise. In purchasing behaviour was any seasonality found in the study period.? In table 2, it may be useful to have the segregation for males and females also to see whether the sex difference is persistent whether they are farmers or non-farmers.

It would also be interesting to know whether all the self harm by pesticide were by ingestion or by any other method. Was there any difference in case fatality in the different mode of pesticide self harm.

The discussion is relevant and concise. Language is clear although a few typo errors are seen. The references need to be uniform as there are many references where only the first author’s name is mentioned and the rest are written as et al.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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