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Reviewer's report:

General
Very good manuscript and interesting information.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Lines 187-88, a duplicate sentence should be removed.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Line 118, I would add the term "surgical" before the word "management" to differentiate it from the most important treatment factor, which is probably early administration of antibiotics - or at least it is equally important.

Lines 122-128 the information about road traffic accidents seems to be of only peripheral relevance. Statistics about open fractures specifically and the DALYs or impact of infected open fracture may be more directly relevant, if they exist.

discussion: I was struck by the number of respondents who believed that antiseptic irrigation (iodine, etc) was more effective than saline, when it may be actually worse and there is certainly no evidence that it is any better. this might be worth a comment.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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