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Reviewer's report:

- Minor Essential Revisions

(1) Since this article is essentially a medium size case series, greater emphasis should be given arguing the relevance of the publication. To me the relevance is that cricket in India is the most popular sport in a country that has almost a sixth of the world’s population, yet there have been no publications on injuries to date, as the authors point out. Although India has relative poverty, the ruling body of cricket in India (the BCCI) is very wealthy yet it is obviously not putting resources into injury research. Although it may be somewhat politically insensitive for the authors to do so, I would encourage a greater discussion for the need for FUNDING for more research on cricket injuries in India.

(2) Although the authors state towards the end of the methods that they are using the consensus definitions of injuries, they are actually using a different definition (including injuries which caused missed practice time rather than only missed match time). There is no problem with this, as for a specific further analysis of an injury subset, it makes sense to use a broader definition of injury. This should be made clear – i.e. which aspects of the consensus definitions were used and where did this study vary. It would be worth the authors making clear how many of the injuries presented actually caused match time to be missed.

- Discretionary Revisions

(1) Middle paragraph of introduction:
There is obviously a big variation between the two injury rates presented. It is pretty clear that at professional level, high workloads for fast bowlers are responsible for the much higher injury rate seen at professional level cricket than at amateur level. In a study like the current Indian one, the workloads may be somewhat between those seen at international and amateur level.

(2) It may be worth discussing that the much higher specialisation in spin bowling in India would probably lead to lower injury rates than in countries where fast bowling is more predominant (e.g. Australia, South Africa, West Indies), given that spin bowlers have lower injury rates than fast bowlers.

(3) Last sentence in first par of results should be re-written so it doesn’t start with a number.
(4) Tables 2-4 – may be worth splitting the categorisation into ‘fast’ and ‘spin’ bowlers, rather than just bowlers.

(5) Other recent papers worth referring to:
Saw et al (particularly as looked at shoulder injuries):
Throwing workload and injury risk in elite cricketers
Richard Saw, Rebecca J Dennis, David Bentley, Patrick Farhart
Br J Sports Med 2011;45:805-808 Published Online First: 20 July 2009

A Mansingh,

2010 Orchard et al.

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.