

## Review of the revised manuscript “Injuries among adolescents in Greenland: behavioural and socio-economic correlates among a nationally representative sample”

I thank the authors for their rebuttal letter, which is very clear. I also thank them for the revision of their manuscript on injuries among adolescents. I must say the revision is a serious improvement. Congratulations for that. I have some minor comments, some recommendations and some questions.

### Introduction

The authors provide a clear purpose of the study: investigating the socioeconomic and behavioural correlates associated with injury occurrence. However, I wish to provide three recommendations.

1. A difference between intentional and unintentional injuries are provided, but it is not mentioned whether both kinds of injury are under investigation, or only one of them. This is important for understanding the discussion.
2. In the abstract it is mentioned that the primary outcome is measuring the experience of injury. This does not match with the newly formulated purpose in the introduction.
3. The introduction is on violence and injury. At the end of the introduction they refer to Schnohr and Niclasen who found an increase on bullying. This term is not mentioned earlier. Although bullying can be perceived as a behavioural correlate associated with injury, the authors should provide a link to injury and violence on the one hand, and bullying on the other.

### Materials and methods

I understand the argument of the authors concerning the time limitation of the data. And I agree with them, concerning the purpose of the research. Most comments on the measurement part are not relevant anymore. Here I have four recommendations and one question.

1. Although there is a link to the website for more information, it is convenient to provide some information on the data collection methods, for example the situation in which the questionnaire was completed.
2. The cut points for the independent variable is mentioned twice: under the measurements as well as under the statistical analysis. Since in the latter part the base for this choice for these cut points is provided, they can be deleted in the measurement part.
3. The first part of the statistical analysis concerns the measurements. This part should be moved the description of the measurements.
4. As is mentioned in the comments in the rebuttal letter, injury is the dependent variable and all the others are the independent variables. However, ‘Significant differences between each category and independent variables were explored using ... ANOVA for the continuous variable age’. I don’t understand how the ANOVA is conducted. This sentence suggests that in this analysis a continuous variable (age) is the independent variable and a categorical variable (injury) is the dependent one. In ANOVA the independent variable should be the categorical and the dependent should be the continuous one.

5. Since for the measurement of the independent variables the authors refer to a website, and no information is provided about the answering categories of these variables, it is more convenient to mention there that these variables are categorical and to provide some examples.

## Results

Two recommendations on the results:

1. Some more frequencies are reported, but they are not completely clear. It is mentioned that parent socio-economic status and self-assessed wealth are independent variables, but frequencies are provided for mothers' SES, for fathers' SES and for families' SES. And I don't understand the frequencies for 'living with parents': of the participating adolescents, 78% lived with their mother and 60% lived with their father. Together that's 138%. Also, frequencies for physical activity (VPA) and VPA (outside school hours) are missing.
2. Table 1 is very clear. Except for the living circumstances. An extra line for adolescent who live with both parents makes it complete.

## Discussion

The discussion is seriously improved. I have one question and one suggestion.

1. As mentioned above, it is not clear whether the authors measured intended or unintended injuries, or both. For the lower prevalence, they provide the explanation concerning transportation in Canada. Since my problem concerning the definition of HBSC is cleared in this revision, I don't understand why the authors deleted the explanation concerning difficulties seeing a healthcare provider (and the explanation concerning time spending indoors).
2. There is a lot of literature on parenting style and difference between mothers and fathers. These studies mostly suggest that mothers are more protective than fathers. That may be an explanation for the finding that living without a mother increases injuries, whereas living without a father does not.