

17th January, 2017,

Editor,

World Journal of Ophthalmology

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to address peer reviewer comments. We have updated our manuscript taking in to consideration of all potential and doable peer reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1: Statistical analysis of the results for differences of age groups and gender *conclusion* - accept for publication without despite statistical analysis

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We are not able to do this because age groups and gender may not be feasible or meaningful, given that the number of eye injuries in each age group is significantly low. Moreover, according to privacy issues we cannot report cases under 5. We appreciate peer reviewers understanding in this regards, as he recommends publication without further statistical analysis.

Reviewer 2: Present exact numbers in the tables. If not, exclude the data from manuscript *conclusion* - need major revisions.

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We have modified all the tables taking in to consideration of your comments. We also revamped the manuscript according to your valuable advice and the guidance.

Reviewer 3: Thank you for your valuable comments and we do really appreciate your feedback.

Our comments: Thank you for your valuable comments:

1.data system used does not suit for a detailed study:

Our comments: British Columbia Trauma Registry (BCTR) is the most detailed data system available for injury related morbidity in British Columbia-Please could you see appended article which is supportive our assumption: Canadian Institute for Health Information: National Trauma Registry Analytic Bulletin: Pedestrian Injury Hospitalizations in Canada, 2001–2002. 2004, Toronto: CIHI

2.modify the sentence; "The BCTR provides the most detailed information on severe injuries throughout the province of BC. There are 12 trauma-receiving facilities in BC from which BCTR collects data."

Our comments: It is not possible to modify this sentence because the statement is true

3. Only 50 cases were tested for alcohol or drugs

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. This is true and we have added more details to the methods section to justify why only 50 cases tested for alcohol and drugs:

“Toxicology tests are not routinely done. Toxicology tests are often done more selective manner due to inadequate resources, time of presentation, and other administrative guidelines. Therefore, this information is only available for tested patients.

4. How was this conclusion reached from this study: " A combination of legal, social, behavioral, environmental, and medical interventions are necessary to reduce alcohol-related eye injuries. "

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We have removed this sentence from the conclusion as per your guidance.

5. Analysis software:

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We have used SPSS to analyses the data.

6. Ethics

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We have obtained the ethics prior to obtained the BCTR data. The statement is added the manuscript to reflect your valuable comment.

7. Include numbers lower than 5

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We are not able to include numbers lower than 5 due to privacy reasons and it is one of our condition in the data sharing agreement. However, we have modified all the tables taking in to consideration of your valuable comments.

Reviewer 4: Add some photos of major traumas
conclusion - accept for publication without changes.

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We are not able to obtain any pictures from the data base and we suspect that BCTR does not maintain any eye injury pictures.

Reviewer 5:

- 1) I think all the patients are less than 19 years old. I think “adolescent” is not right for this manuscript. I suggest use “teenage”.

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We prefer to keep the “adolescents” over the “teenage”. See for example-**Adolescent** - being of the age 13 through 19;- Please also see the free dictionary definition on adolescent- <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/adolescent>

- 2) Abstract, Methods, line 3. I think replace “for” as “from”.

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We have revised this sentence to reflect this peer reviewer’s comment.

- 3) P2, Introduction, 2nd paragraph, line 5. I think if authors can mention the age range of those children, it will be better to understand.

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We have added new sentence to reflect this peer reviewer’s comment.

- 4) Table 3, I think put the number of unspecific place of occurrence is better. It would be 4 (2.5%).

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. We are not able to include numbers lower than 5 due to privacy reasons and it is one of our condition in the data sharing agreement. However, we have modified table 3 taking in to consideration of your valuable comments.

- 5) Table 5, I don’t know why the number of total is not equal to the sum of ophthalmology and no ophthalmology consultation
conclusion - High priority for publication

Our comments: Thank you for your comment. In table 5, the total number IS EQUAL to the sum of ophthalmology and no ophthalmology consultations. Therefore, we disagree with the reviewer.

We have revised the manuscript taking in to consideration of most valuable comments of the peer reviewers and further, we feel that the overall quality manuscript improved significantly after the revision.

Thank you,

Dr. Ediriweera Desapriya