

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

This paper was submitted to a another journal from Archives of Disease in Childhood but declined for publication following peer review. The authors addressed the reviewers' comments and submitted the revised paper to BMJ Paediatrics Open. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication at BMJ Paediatrics Open.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	PREDICTORS OF NON-FATAL VIOLENCE OR ASSAULT AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN RURAL BANGLADESH: CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY
AUTHORS	Osaghae, Ikponmwosa; Bhuiyan, Md.; Alonge, Olakunle

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Mashreky, Saidur Rahman Institution and Country: Bangladesh University of Health Sciences, Non Communicable Diseases Competing interests: Nothing declared
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Jan-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Appreciating authors for conducting an interesting study in the field of injury prevention. However, I have some issues that need to be addressed before considering it for publication.</p> <p>In the abstract section in Page2, line31 statement can be written differently, as violence is found lower in more than one socioeconomic strata compare to the lowest.</p> <p>On page 2, line 36, it is better if you can insert 95% CI.</p> <p>In the abstract section, the first line of the conclusion is not proper. Males are at higher risk of violence overall not only in the lowest socioeconomic quintile. Socioeconomic condition is an independent predictor, and gender is another.</p> <p>In page5, you have mentioned about three IRB approval, and you have specified one reference number? Is it the reference number of JHU IRB? You can rewrite the statement for more clarity.</p> <p>In the result section, you have inserted p-values, it is better if you can show the 95% CI, that will give better clarity to the readers.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

WE APPRECIATE THE REVIEWERS' COMMENTS AND HELPFUL FEEDBACK

Comments to the Author

In the abstract section in Page2, line31 statement can be written differently, as violence is found lower in more than one socioeconomic strata compare to the lowest: ABSTRACT ON PAGE 2 REVISED TO READ:

“COMPARED TO THE LOWEST SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUINTILE, BEING IN A HIGHER QUINTILE WAS ASSOCIATED WITH LOWER PREVALENCE OF VIOLENCE, WITH A 39% DECREASE IN THE ADJUSTED PREVALENCE OF VIOLENCE AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN HIGHEST COMPARED TO LOWEST SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX (PR:0.61, 95% CI: 0.44-0.84).”

On page 2, line 36, it is better if you can insert 95% CI: 95% CI INCLUDED IN ABSTRACT RESULT SECTION ON PAGE 2.

In the abstract section, the first line of the conclusion is not proper. Males are at higher risk of violence overall not only in the lowest socioeconomic quintile. Socioeconomic condition is an independent predictor, and gender is another: ABSTRACT CONCLUSION REVISED TO READ; “MALE ADOLESCENTS ARE AT INCREASED RISK OF SUFFERING VIOLENCE IN RURAL BANGLADESH. ALSO, SOCIOECONOMIC QUINTILE AND PLACE (DISTRICTS) ARE STRONG PREDICTORS OF ADOLESCENT VIOLENCE.”

In page5, you have mentioned about three IRB approval, and you have specified one reference number? Is it the reference number of JHU IRB? You can rewrite the statement for more clarity: STATEMENT RE-WRITTEN AS FOLLOW ON PAGE 5: “THE PROTOCOL WAS APPROVED BY THE ETHICS COMMITTEE OF JOHNS HOPKINS BLOOMBERG SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, CENTER FOR INJURY PREVENTION AND RESEARCH, BANGLADESH AND INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR DIARRHEAL DISEASE AND RESEARCH, BANGLADESH. ETHICAL APPROVAL WAS PROVIDED BY THE JOHNS HOPKINS BLOOMBERG SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH (APPROVAL CODE—00004746).”

In the result section, you have inserted p-values, it is better if you can show the 95% CI, that will give better clarity to the readers: 95% CI RATHER THAN P-VALUES INCLUDED IN ALL RESULTS PRESENTED ON PAGES 7-9

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Peter Flom Institution and Country: Peter Flom Consulting, USA Competing interests: None
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Apr-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I confine my remarks to statistical aspects of this paper. They were clearly presented but there is one problem: Since the sampling was not random and, indeed, was deliberately biased, all the estimates (point estimates, p values, confidence intervals) are going to be misleading.</p> <p>Although the authors note this in the limitations, they nevertheless state their results and conclusions in ways that make it sound like the results should apply to all of Bangladesh.</p> <p>It may be possible to adjust the estimates, if the authors know how far off their sample was. If not, then the results and conclusions need to be stated more modestly</p>
REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Saidur Mashreky Institution and Country: Centre for Injury Prevention and Research, Bangladesh Competing interests: Although I was not directly involved with the study. The study was conducted by Centre for Injury Prevention and Research Bangladesh.

REVIEW RETURNED	08-Apr-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	Well written article. I am aware of the extent and volume of filed work for this study.

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Our responses are shown below in bold blue fonts as well as in tracked changes on the main manuscript document.

Comments to the Author:

Please note the comments of the statistical reviewer and state your conclusions more modestly:
CONCLUSION ON ABSTRACT (PAGE 2) AND MAIN PAPER (PAGE 14) REVISED TO READ MORE MODESTLY.

Title replace "Observational study" with "Cross-sectional study": TITLE REVISED (PAGE 1)

What this study adds delete the first statement as it is purely Methods: FIRST STATEMENT ON "WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS" DELETED (PAGE 15).