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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Sir/Madam:

This is our point-by-point response to queries raised by reviewers for our paper entitled: ”A case control study of differences in non-work injury and accidents among middle aged men in rural compared to urban British Columbia, Canada”.

A) Response to Editorial Team’s Comments:

Please can we ask you to revise your Methods section to ensure that there is no word-for-word duplication from your previous papers, as you should not plagiarise your own work. METHODS HAVE BEEN RE-WRITTEN AS REQUESTED TO REDUCE SIMILARITY WITH PREVIOUS PAPERS BASED ON THIS COHORT.

B) Response to FIRST Reviewers Comments:

I am satisfied with the authors response to the reviews and the consequent amendments to the original text. NO RESPONSE REQUIRED BY ME TO THESE COMMENTS.

C) Response to SECOND Reviewers Comments:

This reviewer says that we have addressed the main issues and need only minor changes as follows:

1. In the abstract reference is made to four outcomes, when in fact five outcomes were considered (including ‘other’). WE HAVE NOW CORRECTED THIS ERROR.

2. They suggest, as well, that consistency is needed in the abstract and in the early part of Methods section 3.0) and table 1 in listing and dealing with these five outcome groups- order should remain the same for ease of reading. DONE.
3. Spell out the abbreviation CMA in discussion.
DONE.