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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors

The objective of this paper was to estimate the European burden of injuries in the home that can be attributed to remedial structural hazards. The authors suggest that lack of window guards and domestic smoke detectors resulted in an estimated 7,500 deaths and 200,000 DALY’s per year. The study has used well established methodology and the findings are clearly presented. The resulting estimates have contributed to the limited body of knowledge in this area. However, I think the paper would benefit from some revision/clarification.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. Introduction: Overall I found this section to be too long and too detailed (4 pages). Some elements are surplus to requirements, others could be condensed, and others would sit better in the Discussion section of the paper. Specific feedback follows:

1.1. Paragraph 1: Unnecessary

1.2. Paragraph 3: Sentence 2 not required. Sentence 3 and 4 – abbreviate and combine.

1.3. Paragraph 5: I don’t think this is necessary except sentence 1 which could appear at the end of the Introduction section “The aim of this paper is to quantify the housing-related ......”

1.4. Paragraph 6: last sentence redundant

1.5. Paragraphs 7 & 8: too much detail. Tables 1 & 2 not required information could be summarised in a couple of sentences

1.6. Paragraphs 9: 2nd to last sentence would sit better in the Discussion.

2. Methods: All the essential elements are clearly described however, again there is information that is either surplus or could be described more succinctly. Specifically:

2.1. ? Paragraphs 4 & 5– Methods for measuring exposure to lack of smoke detectors. These next 3 paragraphs could be summarised more succinctly Tables 3 & 4 are redundant. E.g. “Information on the prevalence of domestic smoke detectors is available from a range of sources including.... estimates range from x% to x%.

2.2. ? Paragraphs 6 & 7– Limitations for examining other injury hazards...: These
next 2 paragraphs fit better in the Discussion.

2.3. Paragraphs 9 to 11 – Total burden of disease from certain types.: Paragraph 9 begins “the figures for deaths...” Again could be condensed e.g. Delete 1st sentence. I don’t think Table 5 is necessary, paragraphs 10 & 11 could be consolidated and considerable abbreviated.

3. Results: Overall these are clearly presented.

3.1. Paragraph 1: 1st sentence What does the “above” in the this sentence relate to?

3.2. Last paragraph: I would state what the annual estimates are - as you have done. The latter points re the estimate being an underestimate fits better in the Discussion.

Minor essential revisions:

Be consistent with the age category definition for children e.g. 0-14 years vs. < 15 years

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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