

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Bridging the Gap: Parental Supervision as a Mediator Between Home Environment and unintentional injuries in children under 3 years

Original Article, Int. J. Public Health

Reviewer: Elizabeth Orton

Submitted on: 19 Sep 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1606726

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The main findings are that the risk of home injury increases with age in children under 3. That injury occurrence is associated with a less safe home and less engaged parenting and that parenting can somewhat mitigate home hazards in terms of injury outcome.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This is a large survey-based data set (~600 parents surveyed) on home hazards, parental supervision and the interaction between the two. There was a high completion rate of those that agreed to do the survey, though researchers were involved in collecting responses which may have biased results. The sample was also drawn from a population attending hospital which may not be generalisable to the general population and risk/environment interactions may be different in this group.

It is a fairly straightforward analysis that has been undertaken, but the effect of known risk factors for injury such as socioeconomic deprivation, child sex and number of children in the family do not seem to have been included in the multivariate modelling.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Overall this is a fairly straightforward study. The results are not particularly novel as there is a significant amount of literature on parenting and injury and home hazards and injury. It is however a different population and methodology that adds somewhat to the literature, particularly the mediating effects.

Methods;

it is unclear how the three following questions were then categorised into a 5-point scale

Question-1 Have your children suffered an unintentional injury in the last 12 months - [surely this is a binary answer]

Question-2- How many unintentional injuries have your children had in the last 12 months; [continuous variable?]

Question-3 "Please fill in the type and number of injuries your child has had in the last 12 months.[again how is this a 5-point scale?]

Results;

have the authors investigated the effect of parental education as the main economic variable. There is a well-described relationship between economic position and injury risk that has not been addressed in this paper.

Can the authors be more explicit when writing the results as to the main results – to make it easier to follow

- a higher score for environmental risk is a safer home
- a higher score for supervision is more engaged with supervision
- the correlation between environmental risk and parenting with injury is negative – so an increasingly safe home and more parenting reduces injury occurrence. It just needs this making explicit in the results as I had to go back to the methods to understand what a higher score meant for both.

Discussion

There is no discussion of the components of parenting presented in table 2 and so the analysis is quite superficial when it seems there may be more information within the scales analysed.

There is very little discussion about how it relates to the existing literature.

I'm not sure where the reference to community-based interventions comes from? Why not direct interventions to parents specifically?

**PLEASE COMMENT**

**Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is appropriate and caught my attention.

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

**Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

It does need a proof read for English language presentation.

**Q 7** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

There is a lack of inclusion of the literature in the discussion, particularly in relation to other risk factors for injury, which they may have some data on, e.g. socioeconomic deprivation, family size, parental age, child sex. The literature on the effectiveness of parenting programmes or home hazard risk reduction has not been cited with regards to the recommendations.

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

<b>Q 9</b> Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 10</b> Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 11</b> Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 12</b> Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 13</b> Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study

**REVISION LEVEL**

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.