

Reviewer's report

Title: Community uptake of safe storage boxes to reduce self-poisoning from pesticides in rural Sri Lanka

Version: 1 Date: 10 November 2006

Reviewer: Eloisa Caldas

Reviewer's report:

General

Very nice, objective and concise paper, which brings many issues still to be resolved in the field.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

- 1) In the abstract and discussion, the authors mentioned "agricultural benefits", however it is not clear which are they. Clearly human safety and the safety of the pesticide containers (preventing from theft) are the benefits
- 2) It was not clear from the study if the household could keep more than one box in. By the dimensions of the boxes, not too many containers could fit into one box and there is a possibility that some households would have many containers at the same time to be stored.
- 3) What is the meaning of the term "compound" used in the paper, e.g. pg 6, 4th paragraph from results? Apparently is the farm, but it should be clarified. The word is normally used for a chemical substance.
- 4) Leaving containers in the field can also have an impact in the environment, as they can accidentally contaminate the soil and the water. Although the goal of the study was to prevent human adverse effects, this aspect should also be included in the discussion.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'