



Familial factors and child characteristics as predictors of injuries in toddlers: A prospective cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000740
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Dec-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Myhre, Mia Cathrine; Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Thoresen, Siri; Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Grøgaard, Jens; Oslo University Hospital, Department of Pediatrics Dyb, Grete; Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, ; University of Oslo, Institute of Clinical Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	Community child health < PAEDIATRICS, Developmental neurology & neurodisability < PAEDIATRICS, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

1
2
3 FAMILIAL FACTORS AND CHILD CHARACTERISTICS AS PREDICTORS OF
4 INJURIES IN TODDLERS: A PROSPECTIV COHORT STUDY
5
6
7
8

9 PREDICTORS OF INJURIES IN TODDLERS: A PROSPECTIV COHORT STUDY
10
11
12

13
14 Mia Cathrine Myhre

15 Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies

16
17 Kirkeveien 166

18
19 N-0450 OSLO

20
21 Norway

22
23 Phone: +47 22 59 55 00, Fax: +47 22 59 55 01

24
25 E-mail: m.c.myhre@nkvts.unirand.no
26
27
28
29

30 Mia Cathrine Myhre ^{A, B}

31
32 Siri Thoresen ^A

33
34 Jens Grøgaard ^B

35
36 Grete Dyb ^{A, C}

37
38 Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Oslo, Norway ^A

39
40 Department of pediatrics, Oslo University Hospital - Ullevål, Oslo, Norway ^B

41
42 Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway ^C
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Key words: *epidemiology, injury prevention, child community health, the Norwegian Mother*
53 *and Child Cohort Study*
54

55 Word Count: 2961
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To identify characteristics that put toddlers at risk of injuries, and to assess the relative importance of child-related risk factors compared to familial risk factors for injuries in toddlers.

Design: A prospective cohort study

Setting: This study was based on the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study, conducted by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

Participants: The study sample consisted of 26,087 children and their mothers.

Outcome measures: Family and child characteristics measured before or at 18 months of age were investigated as potential predictors of hospital-attended injuries that occurred between 18 and 36 months of age.

Results: In the multivariable analysis, younger maternal age OR 0.93 (95% CI 0.86, 1.00), financial problems OR 1.18 (95% CI 1.01, 1.39), maternal mental distress OR 1.09 (95% CI 1.03, 1.16), having older siblings OR 1.22 (95% CI 1.08, 1.39), increased gestational age at birth OR 1.04 (95% CI 1.00, 1.07) and male gender OR 1.26 (95% CI 1.11, 1.42) were risk factors for hospital-attended injuries. Children with impaired gross motor development had a decreased risk of injury OR 0.65 (95% CI 0.42, 0.99), whereas those with impaired fine motor development had an increased risk OR 1.55 (95% CI 1.22, 1.97). Shyness was a protective factor OR 0.92 (95% CI 0.86, 0.98). Children with three reported attention problems had a slightly increased risk of hospital-attended injuries (95% CI OR 1.33 (1.02, 1.72), $p = 0.035$), otherwise, behaviour was not a significant risk factor.

Conclusions: The effect sizes of several child-related risk factors were substantially attenuated when adjusted for familial risk factors. Conversely, effect estimates for familial risk factors were not much altered following adjustment for child-related factors. This study suggests that familial factors are robust predictors of injuries in young children.

Article focus

- To identify characteristics that put toddlers at risk of injuries in a large prospective cohort study.
- Several risk factors related both to the child's family situation and individual characteristics of the child have been identified, this study assessed the relative importance of child-related risk factors compared to familial risk factors for injuries in toddlers.

Key Messages

- The assessment of several familial and child related characteristics together as predictor for hospital attended injuries in toddlers provided evidence that familial factors are more robust predictors of injuries in toddlers than child factors.
- Children with impaired gross motor development had a decreased risk of injury, whereas those with impaired fine motor development had an increased risk, and the timing of preventive measures against injuries should be based on motor development in young children and not on age.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- The strengths of this study included its prospective design, large sample size and the inclusion of a large number of potentially important variables.
- A response rate of 42.7% suggests a selection bias, and comparisons with registry data have shown a positive selection into this cohort.
- This study's reliance on self-reported data may have affected the response accuracy, and there may be information biases
- The use of abbreviated scales might have threatened the validity of measures.

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a major cause of morbidity and mortality in toddlers.[1] The incidence of injury, mechanisms of trauma and type of injury vary with children's ages and developmental stages.[2,3] Before adolescence, the highest rate of injury occurs in toddlers 15-17 months of age.[2] Falls are consistently the leading cause of non-fatal injuries in toddlers, followed by poisoning and transportation-related injuries.[2,3] Wounds and head injuries are the most common types of injury.[3]

Until the 1960s, injuries were considered accidental in the sense of being random acts of misfortune. Although they are still referred to as 'accidents', events that result in injuries are no longer regarded as unpredictable; rather, they are thought to have a causal sequence with identifiable risk factors.[4] Several studies have since reported that risk factors related both to the child's family situation and individual characteristics of the child are associated with injuries in children.

Low familial socioeconomic status[5-7] and related aspects, including low parental education, young maternal age, single motherhood, large family size, unemployment and substance abuse, are established risk factors for injuries in children.[6-8] More recently, researchers have found associations between the mother's mental health and an increased risk of injury in toddlers.[9,10] Adequate adult supervision is essential for toddlers to stay free from harm, [11-13] and mothers mental distress may reduce the ability to meet children's needs and may impact awareness of children's safety.

Male sex is probably the best established risk factor for injury, and gender-specific behaviours such as rough play and taking risks are believed to contribute to this association in children.[14] Potentially important predictors that have received less attention in the literature include preterm birth and psychomotor development. Many studies have identified cognitive and behavioural consequences of preterm birth; however, few have examined these

1
2
3 consequences in relation to the risk of later injury. Similarly, the relationship between
4
5 psychomotor development and the risk of injury is not well established, as the few studies that
6
7 have been conducted show conflicting results.[15-17] However, there is considerable
8
9 individual variation in toddlers' motor development, and their physical development precedes
10
11 their ability to understand the consequences of their actions. Motor ability may therefore be of
12
13 specific importance as a risk factor for injuries in this age group.

14
15
16 Temperamental attributes in children have been associated with proneness to injury,
17
18 including a high activity level, impulsiveness, sensation seeking and poor inhibitory
19
20 control.[14] Each of these traits contributes to children's tendencies to place themselves in
21
22 potentially dangerous situations. Externalising behaviours may also be challenging in toddlers
23
24 and can affect child safety.[14,18] Attention problems may affect a child's ability to recognise
25
26 potential environmental hazards and to comply with their supervisor's instructions and rules.
27
28 Aggression and related high levels of oppositional behaviour makes it difficult for parents to
29
30 control their children and keep them safe from harm. [14,18-20]
31
32

33
34 Many unintentional injuries among young children are the results of inadequate
35
36 supervision. Supervision exist on a spectrum from keeping a child overly protected and
37
38 thereby denied opportunities to develop towards inadequate supervision and boundary setting
39
40 exposing a child to avoidable harm. Also, some injuries in children are the results from child
41
42 abuse, and in toddlers, up to 10% of injuries evaluated in emergency departments have been
43
44 reported to be intentional. [21]
45
46

47
48 The aim of this study was to assess the relative importance of child factors compared
49
50 to familial factors for injuries requiring hospital admission in toddlers. Research, mainly on
51
52 older children, has identified a range of characteristics of children and several familial factors
53
54 as risk factors for injuries in childhood, but few have assessed the relative importance of such
55
56 factors in young children. The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa), with its
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 comprehensive data collection over several waves offered a unique opportunity to assess these
4
5 relationships prospectively in a large-scale, population-based study.
6
7

8 9 10 **METHODS**

11 12 **Design and Participants**

13
14 This study used data from the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa),
15 conducted by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health. MoBa is a prospective population-
16 based pregnancy cohort study with a target population of all pregnant women in Norway and
17 their children. The women were recruited to the study at approximately week 17 of gestation
18 through postal invitations prior to routine ultrasound examinations at their local hospitals. The
19 study included 108,000 pregnancies; recruitment began in 1999 and was completed in 2008.
20 The response rate was 42.7% .[22] Questionnaire data were collected at gestational weeks 17
21 and 30 and at child ages of 6, 18, and 36 months. Information from the MBRN was also
22 available (www.fhi.no/mfr). Informed consent was obtained from each participant upon
23 recruitment. The Regional Committee for Medical Research Ethics and the Norwegian Data
24 Inspectorate approved the study. Details of the MoBa study's sampling, design,
25 questionnaires, informed consent processes, and data collection strategies have been reported
26 elsewhere (www.fhi.no/morogbarn).[22]
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Although recruitment to the study is complete, data collection is an on-going process.
46 The current study is based on data files released for research on February 2009. This file
47 comprised the first 27,227 children and their mothers who had completed the questionnaires
48 when their children were 36 months of age. Cases with missing data on hospital attended
49 injuries in the children were excluded (N = 1,140), and the study sample comprised 26,087
50 children and mothers.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Injuries

At 36 months of age, injuries in toddlers were assessed using the following questions: “Has your child suffered any injury or accident since the age of 18 months?” and “If yes, has the child been admitted to or examined in hospital?” The response categories to both items were “yes” or “no”. The outcome variable in our study was an affirmative answer for hospital-attended injuries.

Familial factors

Demographic information regarding older siblings, maternal age, maternal education, and occupational status was reported at gestational week 17. At child’s age 18 months, whether the mother and child lived with the child’s father was assessed with the following question: “Do you and your child live with your child’s father?” Current financial problems were assessed with the following questions: “Have you had financial problems since the previous questionnaire?” The response categories were “yes” or “no”. Data on ethnicity were not available at the individual level in this study; however, the MoBa cohort comprised predominantly ethnic Norwegian and Scandinavian families (95%).

Maternal mental health

The mother’s mental health was assessed when the child was 18 months of age with the Symptom Checklist SCL-8.[23,24] The SCL-8 is designed to measure psychological distress, particularly anxiety and depression, in population surveys. Each item has four response categories, ranging from “not at all”=1 to “severe”=4.[25] Cronbach’s α was 0.84.

Child factors

Information regarding the child’s sex, birth weight, and gestational age was retrieved from the MBRN.

Child development

Development was assessed using items derived from the Norwegian version of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The ASQ was designed for first-level screening and to monitor developmental delay in children.[26] When the child was 18 months of age, development was assessed using three items from the gross motor area, three items from the fine motor area, three items from the communication area, and four items from the personal–social area of the ASQ 18 months form. The choice of responses was “not yet”, “sometimes” or “yes”. Responses of “not yet” and “sometimes” are indicative of delayed development and were categorised jointly as “not yet”. The number of developmental skills that were not achieved was summarised, and the following 3 categories were formed: “all skills achieved”, “one skill not achieved” and “two or more skills not achieved”.

Child temperament

The Emotionality, Activity, Shyness, and Sociability Temperament Survey for Children (EAS)[27] was used to assess temperament at 18 months of age. Three items from each of the emotionality, activity, and shyness subscales were included. “Emotionality” refers to the tendency to become easily and intensely aroused or upset. “Activity” refers to the preferred level of activity and speed of action. “Shyness” refers to the tendency to be inhibited and awkward in new social situations. Each item was rated using a five-point scale, ranging from “not typical” = 1 to “very typical” = 5. Cronbach’s α was 0.64 for emotionality, 0.64 for activity, and 0.65 for shyness.

Child behaviour

Child externalising behaviour was assessed using items from the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) for ages 1.5 to 5 years[28] when the child reached 18 months of age. Five items assessing aggressiveness and three items assessing attention problems were available. All items were rated “not true”, “somewhat or sometimes true”, and “very true or often true”.

1
2
3 “Somewhat or sometimes true” and “very true or often true” were categorised together to
4 indicate problem behaviours. The number of problems were summarised and then categorised
5 as “no problems”, one, two or three problems for the attention subscale and one, two or three
6 or more problems for the aggressiveness subscale.
7
8
9
10

11 12 13 14 **Statistical Analysis**

15
16 Predictors of hospital-attended injuries in children were analysed using logistic
17 regression with a Generalised Estimating Equation (GEE) approach to account for correlation
18 due to the inclusion of siblings in the study sample. Associations are presented as crude odds
19 ratios (cORs) and adjusted odds ratios (aORs) with 95% confidence intervals [95% CI]. The
20 corresponding tests for significance were performed using the Wald-test statistic and a
21 significance level of $P < 0.05$. The sum scores of independent continuous measures were
22 standardised, and the presented odds ratios represent the difference in risk for an increase of
23 one standard deviation. Measures with internal consistency of Cronbach’s $\alpha < 0.60$ were
24 categorised. Variance inflation factors were computed to assess multicollinearity. The model
25 was cross-validated in two randomly selected subsamples. Stratification by gender produced
26 only minor differences in effect estimates of potential risk factors. The rate of missing
27 information ranged from 0% to 11.9%. Modelling was based on 20 multiply imputed datasets.
28
29 Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE) was used for imputations.
30
31 All analyses were performed using R (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
32 Austria) with the R packages gee for logistic regression using GEE, and MICE for multiple
33 imputation.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

The study sample comprised 50.7% males, with 53% of the children having older siblings. The mean gestational age at birth was 39.4 weeks (SD = 2.0). Maternal age ranged from 14 to 47 years, with a mean of 29.7 years (SD = 4.4). The majority of mothers (60.5%) had more than 12 years of education. Only 0.9% of the subjects (N = 252) were teenage mothers, and 3.4% (N=853) reported not living with the father of their child. Four per cent of mothers were unemployed or disabled. Current financial problems were reported by 18.5% of mothers. A hospital-attended injury between 18 and 36 months of age was reported for 4.6% (N = 1,247) of the children.

Table 1 displays univariable and multivariable comparisons between children with and without hospital-attended injuries. In unadjusted analyses, a range of factors were significantly associated with injuries, including maternal mental distress, financial problems, gender, gestational age at birth, development, temperament and behaviour.

Similarly, several potential predictors were significantly associated with hospital-attended injuries in toddlers in the multivariable analyses.

Familial factors

In the adjusted model, financial problems, maternal mental distress and having older siblings were risk factors for hospital-attended injuries in toddlers. Older maternal age was a protective factor. Maternal education, occupational status and not living with the child's father were not associated with hospital-attended injuries.

Child factors

Male gender and increased gestational age at birth were risk factors for hospital-attended injuries in the toddlers. Children with impaired gross motor development were less prone to injury, whereas children with less fine motor skills were more at risk. Social development was not significantly associated with hospital-attended injuries. Impaired

communication, the temperamental traits of emotionality and activity and aggressive behaviour did not achieve statistical significance in the adjusted analysis. Following adjustment shyness remained a protective factor and children with at least three reported attention problems had a modestly increased risk for hospital-attended injuries ($p = 0.035$).

Table 1

Descriptive comparison between children with and without hospital attended injuries and univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis of potential risk factors, N=26087.

	Overall N=26087	Without injuries	With injuries		
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)		
	/mean(SD)	/mean(SD)	/mean(SD)	OR (95% CI)	aOR (95% CI)
<i>Family factors</i>					
Older sibling(s)	53.3% (13902)	53.1% (13197)	56.5% (705)	1.15 (1.02, 1.29)*	1.22 (1.08, 1.39)**
Maternal age	29.7 (4.43)	29.7 (4.44)	29.5 (4.44)	0.95 (0.89, 1.02)	0.93 (0.86, 1.00)*
Maternal education \leq 12 years	37.6% (9534)	37.6% (9078)	37.6% (456)	0.99 (0.88, 1.12)	0.90 (0.80, 1.02)
Mother unemployed or disabled	4.1% (1069)	4.1% (1017)	4.2% (52)	1.01 (0.76, 1.36)	0.95 (0.71, 1.26)
Mother and child not living with the father	3.4% (819)	3.4% (778)	3.6% (41)	1.06 (0.77, 1.46)	0.96 (0.69, 1.33)
Financial problems	18.6% (4379)	18.4% (4129)	22.4% (250)	1.27 (1.09, 1.48)**	1.18 (1.01, 1.39)*
Maternal mental health problems (8-32)	10.2 (2.84)	10.1 (2.82)	10.5 (3.06)	1.12 (1.06, 1.18)***	1.09 (1.03, 1.16)**
<i>Child factors</i>					
Male	50.8% (13250)	50.5% (12540)	56.9% (710)	1.30 (1.16, 1.45)***	1.26 (1.11, 1.42)***
Gestational age	39.4 (1.94)	39.4 (1.96)	39.5 (1.79)	1.04 (1.01, 1.07)*	1.04 (1.00, 1.07)*
Gross motor development					
All skills achieved	82.2% (19742)	82.1% (18794)	83.8% (948)	Reference	Reference
One skill not achieved	14.5% (3481)	14.5% (3322)	14.1% (159)	0.94 (0.80, 1.12)	0.94 (0.79, 1.12)
Two or three skills not achieved	3.4% (800)	3.4% (776)	2.1% (24)	0.65 (0.43, 0.98)*	0.65 (0.42, 0.99)*

Fine motor development						
	All skills achieved	73.8% (17569)	73.9% (16754)	72.3% (815)	Reference	Reference
	One skill not achieved	21.0% (5004)	21.0% (4774)	20.4% (230)	1.01 (0.87, 1.18)	1.03 (0.89, 1.19)
	Two or three skills not achieved	5.2% (1236)	5.1% (1154)	7.3% (82)	1.45 (1.15, 1.83) **	1.55 (1.22, 1.97)***
Communication development						
	All skills achieved	46.6% (11117)	46.8% (10631)	43.1% (486)	Reference	Reference
	One skill not achieved	26.5% (6313)	26.4% (5989)	28.7% (324)	1.16 (1.00, 1.34) *	1.11 (0.95, 1.28)
	Two or three skills not achieved	26.93% (6413)	18.3% (6095)	19.3% (318)	1.13 (0.98, 1.31)	1.04 (0.89, 1.22)
Social development						
	All skills achieved	71.3% (17094)	71.4% (16302)	70.3% (792)	Reference	Reference
	One skill not achieved	19.6% (4688)	19.5% (4451)	21.0% (237)	1.09 (0.94, 1.27)	1.04 (0.90, 1.21)
	Two or more skill not achieved	6.6% (1582)	6.6% (1510)	6.4% (72)	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.92 (0.73, 1.15)
Temperament						
	Activity (3-15)	12.1 (1.96)	12.1 (1.96)	12.2 (1.97)	1.09 (1.02, 1.16) **	1.02 (0.95, 1.09)
	Emotionality (3-15)	8.2 (2.27)	8.2 (2.26)	8.3 (2.37)	1.06 (0.99, 1.12)	1.02 (0.96, 1.09)
	Shyness (3-15)	6.1 (1.93)	6.1 (1.93)	6.0 (1.95)	0.92 (0.87, 0.98)**	0.92 (0.86, 0.98) *
Externalizing behaviour						
Attention						
	No attention problem	10.7% (2464)	10.8% (2371)	8.7% (93)	Reference	Reference
	One attention problem	41.9% (9653)	42.1% (9231)	39.3% (422)	1.15 (0.91, 1.44)	1.13 (0.89, 1.43)
	Two attention problems	28.7% (6611)	28.7% (6288)	30.0% (323)	1.26 (1.00, 1.60)	1.19 (0.93, 1.53)
	Three attention problems	18.7% (4294)	18.5% (4057)	22.0% (237)	1.47 (1.16, 1.86)**	1.33 (1.02, 1.72) *
Aggression						
	No aggression problem	14.6% (3278)	14.6% (3151)	12.1% (127)	Reference	Reference
	One aggression problem	22.8% (5953)	26.3% (5685)	25.5% (268)	1.13 (0.92, 1.38)	1.07 (0.87, 1.31)
	Two aggression problems	24.3% (6332)	27.9% (6018)	29.8% (314)	1.21 (0.99, 1.47)	1.09 (0.89, 1.34)
	Three or more aggression problems	27.2% (7091)	31.2% (6747)	32.7% (344)	1.21 (1.00, 1.47)	1.01 (0.82, 1.25)

* p value < 0.05, **p value < 0.01, ***p value < 0.001 from Wald-test statistic

DISCUSSION

The current population-based study of toddlers found that both familial factors and developmental factors in children were associated with injury risk, but that familial factors were more robust predictors of injuries. These findings are consistent with previous studies and our clinical experience; children admitted to hospitals with injuries are not randomly selected.

Similar to earlier studies,[8] having older siblings was a risk factor for hospital-attended injuries. Differences in parental supervision or the possibility that older siblings sometimes act as supervisors may explain this association. Research has shown that children are allowed to engage in more risky behaviour and show poor compliance when supervised by their older siblings rather than by their mothers.[29]

Education and socioeconomic status are closely intertwined, and most prior studies have found that low maternal education is a risk factor for injuries in children. In this study, maternal education, unemployment and single parenthood were not associated with injury. This lack of association may be due to the generally high educational level, well-developed social security system, and high standard of living in Norway. Financial problems, which were significantly associated with injury, were reported by a rather large proportion of the mothers in this study and are not likely to represent poverty, but perhaps problems to adapt to a life situation with a growing family. As in other studies older maternal age was a protective factor.[6,7]

In line with previous research maternal mental health problems constituted a risk factor for injuries in children.[9,10] Mental distress may reduce a parent's attention to external cues, and may negatively impact the parent-child relationship. Maternal mental distress withstood adjustment for other familial and child-related predictors. This observation calls for further investigation of the mechanisms involved.

1
2
3 Behavioural and temperamental differences between boys and girls have been
4
5 proposed as explanations for the well-established relationship between gender and injury risk.
6
7 In this study, adjustment for development, temperament, and behaviour did barely attenuate
8
9 this relationship. Perhaps other differences, for example gender-specific socialisation,
10
11 supervision and guidance, games and encouraged activities, might explain this disparity.
12
13

14 Our finding that the risk of injury is increased with increasing gestational age at birth
15
16 was unanticipated. Many studies have identified later behavioural problems, including
17
18 attention deficit and hyperactivity in children who are born preterm, [30] attributes that are
19
20 also linked to injury proneness. On the other hand studies of adolescents have suggested that
21
22 children born at extremely low birth weight are more cautious, shy and risk averse than their
23
24 normal birth weight counterparts [31], and our finding might be explained by such attributes.
25
26 More research is needed to confirm and explain this finding.
27
28

29 Novel findings in this study were that children with impaired gross motor development
30
31 had a decreased risk for injury, whereas those with impaired fine motor development had an
32
33 increased risk. Toddlers' physical development often precedes their ability to understand the
34
35 consequences of their actions, and early physical mobility may put children at greater risk of
36
37 injury, regardless of their temperament, behaviour or environment. Impaired fine motor
38
39 development may be linked to clumsiness, which subsequently leads to injury proneness.
40
41 Alternatively, early fine motor development may reflect a preference for calmer activities.
42
43 The different directionalities of the associations between gross and fine motor development
44
45 and injury risk imply that these areas should be assessed separately in future studies.
46
47
48

49 Shyness was a consistent protective factor against injury. Shyness is considered to be
50
51 an inhibition to the unfamiliar and is associated with inhibitory control.[32,33] The protective
52
53 effect of shyness observed in this study indicates that inhibitory control may also be a
54
55 protective factor against injury in young children. Attention problems was borderline
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 significant after adjustment and may be a risk factor for injuries in toddlers. Aggression was
4
5 not significant. These findings are different from the many studies concluding with child
6
7 behaviour as a predictor for injuries.[14,18-20] In our study the associations between
8
9 temperament and behavior, and injury were substantially attenuated when adjusted for family
10
11 factors without the contrary being observed. This finding provides support that familial
12
13 factors are more robust predictors of injuries in young children.
14
15

16
17 There are some important limitations of this study. A response rate of 42.7% suggests
18
19 a selection bias, and comparisons with data from MBRN have shown a positive selection into
20
21 this cohort, [22,34] and the study sample can be regarded as a low-risk population; this fact
22
23 may have resulted in an underestimation of the true effect sizes. However, few significant
24
25 differences in exposure-outcome associations have been identified in studies of this
26
27 cohort,[34] and the positive associations found in this study is likely to be generalisable.
28
29

30
31 This study's reliance on self-reported data may have affected the response accuracy.
32
33 Self-reported medically-attended or hospital-attended injuries are common measures in the
34
35 injury literature. However, injury recall has been shown to decrease with time and tends to be
36
37 more accurate for major injuries.[35,36] The expected over-representation of more recent
38
39 injuries and more severe injuries will however not affect the association measures. Our study
40
41 did not include systematic measures of injury severity, injury mechanism or injury type.
42
43 Another omitted variable in this study was adult supervision, which is an important factor in
44
45 preventing injuries in preschool children. This study was also unable to discriminate injuries
46
47 that resulted from abuse.
48

49
50 The sample predominantly comprised ethnic Norwegian participants, and did not
51
52 allow us to investigate the influence of ethnicity or culture. As in other large population
53
54 studies, there was extensive use of abbreviated scales that might threaten the validity of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measures. The strengths of this study included its prospective design, large sample size and
4
5 the inclusion of a large number of potentially important variables.
6

7 An injury brings the family in contact with healthcare and gives professionals an
8
9 opportunity to identify potential risk factors. In addition, the fact that injuries may also be
10
11 caused by poor supervision and, sometimes neglect or abuse emphasize that a thorough
12
13 assessment of the circumstances surrounding injuries in young children is important to
14
15 identify families where children are at risk of further injury.
16
17
18
19

20 **Acknowledgements**

21
22 We are grateful to all the participating families in Norway who take part in this on-going
23
24 cohort study.
25
26
27

28 **Competing Interest**

29
30
31 None to declare
32
33
34
35

36 **Contributorship**

37
38 MCM cleaned and analysed the data, and drafted and revised the paper. ST, JBG and GD
39
40 contributed to the interpretation of the data and critical revisions of the manuscript. All
41
42 authors have studied the manuscript in the form submitted, and have accepted the order of
43
44 authorship.
45
46
47
48

49 **Data sharing statement**

50
51 Researchers can apply for access to data from the Norwegian Institute of Public health
52
53 <http://www.fhi.no>, dataaccess@fhi.no
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Copyright

The Corresponding Author, Mia Cathrine Myhre, has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd, and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in Injury Prevention and any other BMJ PGL products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.”

Funding

The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education and Research, NIH/NIEHS(contract no NO-ES-75558), NIH/NINDS (grant no.1 UO1 NS 047537-01), and the Norwegian Research Council/FUGE (grant no. 151918/S10). The current study did not receive any specific funding, but was conducted as part of the authors employment at the Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies.

References

1. Dowd MD, Keenan HT, Bratton SL. Epidemiology and prevention of childhood injuries. *Crit Care Med* 2002;30(11 Suppl):S385-92.
2. Agran PF, Anderson C, Winn D, et al. Rates of pediatric injuries by 3-month intervals for children 0 to 3 years of age. *Pediatrics* 2003;111(6 Pt 1):92.
3. Flavin MP, Dostaler SM, Simpson K, et al. Stages of development and injury patterns in the early years: a population-based analysis. *BMC Public health* 2006;6:187.
4. Haddon W. The changing approach to the epidemiology, prevention, and amelioration of trauma: the transition to approaches etiologically rather than descriptively based. *Am J Public Health Nation Health* 1968;58(8):1431-8.
5. Faelker T, Pickett W, Brison RJ. Socioeconomic differences in childhood injury: a population based epidemiologic study in Ontario, Canada. *Inj Prev* 2000;6(3):203-8.
6. Hjern A, Ringback-Weitof G, Andersson R. Socio-demographic risk factors for home-type injuries in Swedish infants and toddlers. *Acta Paediatr* 2001;90(1):61-8.
7. Laursen B, Nielsen JW. Influence of sociodemographic factors on the risk of unintentional childhood home injuries. *Eur J Public Health* 2008;18(4):366-70.
8. Bijur PE, Golding J, Kurzon M. Childhood accidents, family size and birth order. *Soc Sci Med* 1988;26(8):839-43.
9. Phelan K, Khoury J, Atherton H, et al. Maternal depression, child behavior, and injury. *Inj Prev* 2007;13(6):403-8.
10. Schwebel DC, Brezausek CM. Chronic maternal depression and children's injury risk. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2008;33(10):1108-16.
11. Morrongiello BA, Corbett M, Brison RJ. Identifying predictors of medically-attended injuries to young children: do child or parent behavioural attributes matter? *Inj Prev* 2009;15(4):220-5.

- 1
2
3 12. Schwebel DC, Brezausk CM, Ramey SL, et al. Interactions between child behavior
4
5 patterns and parenting: implications for children's unintentional injury risk. *J Pediatr*
6
7 *Psychol* 2004;29(2):93-104.
8
- 9
10 13. Morrongiello BA, Klemencic N, Corbett M. Interactions between child behavior patterns
11
12 and parent supervision: implications for children's risk of unintentional injury. *Child*
13
14 *Dev* 2008;79(3):627-38.
15
- 16 14. Schwebel DC, Gaines J. Pediatric unintentional injury: behavioral risk factors and
17
18 implications for prevention. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 2007;28(3):245-54.
19
- 20 15. Manheimer DI, Mellinger GD. Personality characteristics of the child accident repeater.
21
22 *Child Dev* 1967;38(2):491-513.
23
- 24 16. Angle CR. Locomotor skills and school accidents. *Pediatrics* 1975;56(5):819-22.
25
- 26 17. Schwebel DC, Binder SC, Sales JM, et al. Is there a link between children's motor abilities
27
28 and unintentional injuries? *J Safety Res* 2003;34(2):135-41.
29
- 30 18. Wazana A. Are there injury-prone children? A critical review of the literature. *Can J*
31
32 *Psychiatry* 1997;42(6):602-10.
33
- 34 19. Bijur PE, Stewart-Brown S, Butler N. Child behavior and accidental injury in 11,966
35
36 preschool children. *Am J Dis Child* 1986;140(5):487-92.
37
- 38 20. Byrne JM, Bawden HN, Beattie T, et al. Risk for injury in preschoolers: relationship to
39
40 attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Child Neuropsychol* 2003;9(2):142-51.
41
- 42 21. DiScala C, Sege R, Li G, et al. Child abuse and unintentional injuries: a 10-year
43
44 retrospective. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2000;154(1):16-22.
45
- 46 22. Magnus P, Irgens LM, Haug K, et al. Cohort profile: the Norwegian Mother and Child
47
48 Cohort Study (MoBa). *Int J Epidemiol* 2006;35(5):1146-50.
49
- 50 23. Tambs K, Moum T. How well can a few questionnaire items indicate anxiety and
51
52 depression? *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1993;87(5):364-7.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 24. Strand BH, Dalgard OS, Tambs K, et al. Measuring the mental health status of the
4
5 Norwegian population: a comparison of the instruments SCL-25, SCL-10, SCL-5 and
6
7 MHI-5 (SF-36). *Nord J Psychiatry* 2003;57(2):113-8.
8
9
10 25. Sandanger I, Moum T, Ingebrigtsen G, et al. Concordance between symptom screening
11
12 and diagnostic procedure: the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 and the Composite
13
14 International Diagnostic Interview I. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*
15
16 1998;33(7):345-54.
17
18
19 26. Squires J PL, Bricker D *The ASQ User`s Guide for the Ages and Stages Questionnaires: A*
20
21 *Parent- Completed, Child Monitoring System*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.,
22
23 1999.
24
25 27. Mathiesen KS, Tambs K. The EAS temperament questionnaire--factor structure, age
26
27 trends, reliability, and stability in a Norwegian sample. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*
28
29 1999;40(3):431-9.
30
31
32 28. Aschenbach TM, Rescorla LA. *Manuale for the ASEBA Preschoole Forms and Profiles:*
33
34 Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth and
35
36 Families., 2000.
37
38 29. Morrongiello BA, Schell SL, Schmidt S. "Please keep an eye on your younger sister":
39
40 sibling supervision and young children's risk of unintentional injury. *Inj prev*
41
42 2010;16(6):398-402.
43
44
45 30. Aarnoudse-Moens CS, Weisglas-Kuperus N, van Goudoever JB, et al. Meta-analysis of
46
47 neurobehavioral outcomes in very preterm and/or very low birth weight children.
48
49 *Pediatrics* 2009;124(2):717-28.
50
51
52 31. Schmidt LA, Miskovic V, Boyle MH, et al. Shyness and timidity in young adults who
53
54 were born at extremely low birth weight. *Pediatrics* 2008;122(1):e181-7.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 32. Pfeifer M, Goldsmith HH, Davidson RJ, et al. Continuity and change in inhibited and
4 uninhibited children. *Child Dev* 2002;73(5):1474-85.
5
6
7 33. Schwebel DC, Plumert JM. Longitudinal and concurrent relations among temperament,
8 ability estimation, and injury proneness. *Child Dev* 1999;70(3):700-12.
9
10
11 34. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, et al. Self-selection and bias in a large prospective
12 pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2009;23(6):597-608.
13
14
15 35. Pless CE, Pless IB. How well they remember. The accuracy of parent reports. *Arch*
16
17
18
19
20
21 36. Cummings P, Rivara FP, Thompson RS, et al. Ability of parents to recall the injuries of
22 their young children. *Inj prev* 2005;11(1):43-7.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Familial factors and child characteristics as predictors of injuries in toddlers: A prospective cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000740.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Feb-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Myhre, Mia Cathrine; Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Thoresen, Siri; Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Grøgaard, Jens; Oslo University Hospital, Department of Pediatrics Dyb, Grete; Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, ; University of Oslo, Institute of Clinical Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	Community child health < PAEDIATRICS, Developmental neurology & neurodisability < PAEDIATRICS, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

1
2
3 FAMILIAL FACTORS AND CHILD CHARACTERISTICS AS PREDICTORS OF
4
5 INJURIES IN TODDLERS: A PROSPECTIV COHORT STUDY
6
7
8

9 Mia Cathrine Myhre

10 Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies

11 Kirkeveien 166

12 N-0450 OSLO

13 Norway

14 Phone: +47 22 59 55 00, Fax: +47 22 59 55 01

15 E-mail: m.c.myhre@nkvts.unirand.no

16
17
18 Mia Cathrine Myhre ^{A, B}

19 Siri Thoresen ^A

20 Jens Grøgaard ^B

21 Grete Dyb ^{A, C}

22 Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, Oslo, Norway ^A

23 Department of pediatrics, Oslo University Hospital - Ullevål, Oslo, Norway ^B

24 Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway ^C

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Key words: *epidemiology, injury prevention, the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study*

48
49 Word Count: 2961

ABSTRACT

Objective: To identify family and child characteristics that put toddlers at risk of injuries,
and to assessed the relative importance of child related risk factors compared to familial risk
factors for injuries in toddlers.

Design: A prospective cohort study

Setting: This study was based on the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study, conducted
by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

Participants: The study sample consisted of 26,087 children and their mothers.

Outcome measures: Family and child characteristics measured before or at 18 months of age
were investigated as potential predictors of hospital-attended injuries that occurred between
18 and 36 months of age.

Results: In the multivariable analysis, younger maternal age OR 0.93 (95% CI 0.86, 1.00),
financial problems OR 1.18 (95% CI 1.01, 1.39), maternal mental distress OR 1.09 (95% CI
1.03, 1.16), having older siblings OR 1.22 (95% CI 1.08, 1.39), increased gestational age at
birth OR 1.04 (95% CI 1.00, 1.07) and male gender OR 1.26 (95% CI 1.11, 1.42) were risk
factors for hospital-attended injuries. Children with impaired gross motor development had a
decreased risk of injury OR 0.65 (95% CI 0.42, 0.99), whereas those with impaired fine motor
development had an increased risk OR 1.55 (95% CI 1.22, 1.97). Shyness was a protective
factor OR 0.92 (95% CI 0.86, 0.98). Children with three reported attention problems had a
slightly increased risk of hospital-attended injuries (95% CI OR 1.33 (1.02, 1.72), $p = 0.035$),
otherwise, behaviour was not a significant risk factor.

Conclusions: This study demonstrated that a wide variety of factors was in play as
predictors of injuries in young children. Both child related factors (gender, gestational age at
birth, child motor development, shyness, attention) and familial factors (having older siblings,

maternal age, financial difficulties and maternal mental health problems) were associated with injuries in toddlers.

~~The effect sizes of several child related risk factors were substantially attenuated when adjusted for familial risk factors. Conversely, effect estimates for familial risk factors were not much altered following adjustment for child related factors. This study provides support that familial factors are robust predictors of injuries in young children.~~

Article focus

- To identify characteristics that put toddlers at risk of injuries in a large prospective cohort study.
- ~~Several risk factors related both to the child's family situation and individual characteristics of the child have been identified, and this study assessed both important child-factors and familial factors together. ~~the relative importance of child related risk factors compared to familial risk factors for injuries in toddlers~~~~

Key Messages

- This longitudinal population-based study of toddlers confirmed that a wide-variety of factors is in play as predictors of injuries.
- Both child related factors (gender, gestational age at birth, child motor development, shyness, attention) and familial factors (having older siblings, maternal age, financial difficulties and maternal mental health problems) were associated with injuries in toddlers.
- ~~The assessment of several familial and child related characteristics together as predictor for hospital attended injuries in toddlers provided evidence that familial factors are more robust predictors of injuries in toddlers than child factors.~~

- 1
2
3 • Children with impaired gross motor development had a decreased risk of injury,
4
5 whereas those with impaired fine motor development had an increased risk and the
6
7 timing of preventive measures against injuries should be based on motor development
8
9 in young children and not on age.
10
11

12 13 14 **Strengths and limitations**

- 15
16 • The strengths of this study included its prospective design, large sample size and the
17
18 inclusion of a large number of potentially important variables.
19
20
21 • A response rate of 42.7% suggests a selection bias, and comparisons with registry data
22
23 have shown a positive selection into this cohort.
24
25
26 • This study's reliance on self-reported data may have affected the response accuracy,
27
28 and there may be information biases
29
30
31 • The use of abbreviated scales might have threatened the validity of measures.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a major cause of morbidity and mortality in toddlers.[1] The incidence of injury, mechanisms of trauma and type of injury vary with children's ages and developmental stages.[2,3] Before adolescence, the highest rate of injury occurs in toddlers 15-17 months of age.[2] Falls are consistently the leading cause of non-fatal injuries in toddlers, followed by poisoning and transportation-related injuries.[2,3] Wounds and head injuries are the most common types of injury.[3]

Until the 1960s, injuries were considered accidental in the sense of being random acts of misfortune. Although they are still referred to as 'accidents', events that result in injuries are no longer regarded as unpredictable; rather, they are thought to have a causal sequence with identifiable risk factors.[4] Several studies have since reported that risk factors related both to the child's family situation and individual characteristics of the child are associated with injuries in children.

Low familial socioeconomic status[5-7] and related aspects, including low parental education, young maternal age, single motherhood, large family size, unemployment and substance abuse, are established risk factors for injuries in children.[6-8] More recently, researchers have found associations between the mother's mental health and an increased risk of injury in toddlers.[9,10] Adequate adult supervision is essential for toddlers to stay free from harm, [11-13] and mothers mental distress may reduce the ability to meet children's needs and may impact awareness of children's safety. Many unintentional injuries among young children are the results of inadequate supervision. Supervision exist on a spectrum from keeping a child overly protected and thereby denied opportunities to develop towards inadequate supervision and boundary setting exposing a child to avoidable harm.

Male sex is probably the best established risk factor for injury, and gender-specific behaviours such as rough play and taking risks are believed to contribute to this association in

1
2
3 children.[14] Potentially important predictors that have received less attention in the literature
4
5 include preterm birth and psychomotor development. Many studies have identified cognitive
6
7 and behavioural consequences of preterm birth; however, few have examined these
8
9 consequences in relation to the risk of later injury. Similarly, the relationship between
10
11 psychomotor development and the risk of injury is not well established, as the few studies that
12
13 have been conducted show conflicting results.[15-17] However, there is considerable
14
15 individual variation in toddlers' motor development, and their physical development precedes
16
17 their ability to understand the consequences of their actions. Motor ability may therefore be of
18
19 specific importance as a risk factor for injuries in this age group.
20
21

22
23 Temperamental attributes in children have been associated with proneness to injury,
24
25 including a high activity level, impulsiveness, sensation seeking and poor inhibitory
26
27 control.[14] Each of these traits contributes to children's tendencies to place themselves in
28
29 potentially dangerous situations. Externalising behaviours may also be challenging in toddlers
30
31 and can affect child safety.[14,18] Attention problems may affect a child's ability to recognise
32
33 potential environmental hazards and to comply with their supervisor's instructions and rules.
34
35 Aggression and related high levels of oppositional behaviour makes it difficult for parents to
36
37 control their children and keep them safe from harm. [14,18-20]
38
39

40
41 ~~Many unintentional injuries among young children are the results of inadequate~~
42
43 ~~supervision. Supervision exist on a spectrum from keeping a child overly protected and~~
44
45 ~~thereby denied opportunities to develop towards inadequate supervision and boundary setting~~
46
47 ~~exposing a child to avoidable harm.[21] Also, some injuries in children are the results from~~
48
49 ~~child abuse, and in toddlers, up to 10% of injuries evaluated in emergency departments have~~
50
51 ~~been reported to be intentional.~~
52

53
54 The aim of this study was to assess ~~the relative importance of important~~ child factors
55
56 ~~compared to and~~ familial factors for injuries requiring hospital admission in toddlers.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Research, mainly on older children, has identified a range of characteristics of children and
4
5 several familial factors as risk factors for injuries in childhood, but few have assessed [them](#)
6
7 [together the relative importance of such factors](#) in young children. The Norwegian Mother
8
9 and Child Cohort Study (MoBa), with its comprehensive data collection over several waves
10
11 offered a unique opportunity to assess these relationships prospectively in a large-scale,
12
13 population-based study.
14
15

18 **METHODS**

19 **Design and Participants**

20
21 This study used data from the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa),
22
23 conducted by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health. MoBa is a prospective population-
24
25 based pregnancy cohort study with a target population of all pregnant women in Norway and
26
27 their children. The women were recruited to the study at approximately week 17 of gestation
28
29 through postal invitations prior to routine ultrasound examinations at their local hospitals. The
30
31 study included 108,000 pregnancies; recruitment began in 1999 and was completed in 2008.
32
33 The response rate was 42.7% .[21] Questionnaire data were collected at gestational weeks 17
34
35 and 30 and at child ages of 6, 18, and 36 months. Information from the MBRN was also
36
37 available (www.fhi.no/mfr). Informed consent was obtained from each participant upon
38
39 recruitment. The Regional Committee for Medical Research Ethics and the Norwegian Data
40
41 Inspectorate approved the study. Details of the MoBa study's sampling, design,
42
43 questionnaires, informed consent processes, and data collection strategies have been reported
44
45 elsewhere (www.fhi.no/morogbarn).[21]
46
47
48
49
50

51 Although recruitment to the study is complete, data collection is an on-going process.
52
53 The current study is based on data files released for research on February 2009. This file
54
55 comprised the first 27,227 children and their mothers who had completed the questionnaires
56
57 when their children were 36 months of age. Cases with missing data on hospital attended
58
59
60

1
2
3 injuries in the children were excluded (N = 1,140), and the study sample comprised 26,087
4
5 children and mothers.
6
7

9 10 **Injuries**

11 At 36 months of age, injuries in toddlers were assessed using the following questions:
12 “Has your child suffered any injury or accident since the age of 18 months?” and “If yes, has
13 the child been admitted to or examined in hospital?” The response categories to both items
14 were “yes” or “no”. The outcome variable in our study was an affirmative answer for
15 hospital-attended injuries.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Familial factors**

26 Demographic information regarding older siblings, maternal age, maternal education, and
27 occupational status was reported at gestational week 17. At child’s age 18 months, whether
28 the mother and child lived with the child’s father was assessed with the following question:
29 “Do you and your child live with your child’s father?” Current financial problems were
30 assessed with the following questions: “Have you had financial problems since the previous
31 questionnaire?” The response categories were “yes” or “no”. Data on ethnicity were not
32 available at the individual level in this study; however, the MoBa cohort comprised
33 predominantly ethnic Norwegian and Scandinavian families (95%).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Maternal mental health*

46
47 The mother’s mental health was assessed when the child was 18 months of age with
48 the Symptom Checklist SCL-8.[22,23] The SCL-8 is designed to measure psychological
49 distress, particularly anxiety and depression, in population surveys. Each item has four
50 response categories, ranging from “not at all”=1 to “severe”=4.[24] Cronbach’s α was 0.84.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Child factors

Information regarding the child's sex, birth weight, and gestational age was retrieved from the MBRN. Births before gestational age of 37 weeks were classified as preterm births.

Child development

Development was assessed using items derived from the Norwegian version of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ). The ASQ was designed for first-level screening and to monitor developmental delay in children.[25] When the child was 18 months of age, development was assessed using three items from the gross motor area (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.63$), three items from the fine motor area (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.30$), three items from the communication area (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.59$), and four items from the personal-social area (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.50$) of the ASQ 18 months form. Due to poor internal consistency these measures were analysed as categorical variables. The choice of responses was "not yet", "sometimes" or "yes".

Responses of "not yet" and "sometimes" are indicative of delayed development and were categorised jointly as "not yet". The number of developmental skills that were not achieved was summarised, and the following 3 categories were formed: "all skills achieved", "one skill not achieved" and "two or more skills not achieved".

Child temperament

The Emotionality, Activity, Shyness, and Sociability Temperament Survey for Children (EAS)[26] was used to assess temperament at 18 months of age. Three items from each of the emotionality, activity, and shyness subscales were included. "Emotionality" refers to the tendency to become easily and intensely aroused or upset. "Activity" refers to the preferred level of activity and speed of action. "Shyness" refers to the tendency to be inhibited and awkward in new social situations. Each item was rated using a five-point scale, ranging from "not typical" = 1 to "very typical" = 5. Cronbach's α was 0.64 for emotionality, 0.64 for activity, and 0.65 for shyness.

Child behaviour

Child externalising behaviour was assessed using items from the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) for ages 1.5 to 5 years[27] when the child reached 18 months of age. Five items assessing aggressiveness and three items assessing attention problems were available.

Cronbach's α was 0.44 for the aggressive subscale and 0.59 for the attention subscale. Due to poor internal consistency these measures were analysed as categorical variables. All items

were rated "not true", "somewhat or sometimes true", and "very true or often true".

"Somewhat or sometimes true" and "very true or often true" were categorised together to indicate problem behaviours. The number of problems were summarised and then categorised as "no problems", one, two or three problems for the attention subscale and one, two or three or more problems for the aggressiveness subscale.

Statistical Analysis

Predictors of hospital-attended injuries in children were analysed using logistic regression with a Generalised Estimating Equation (GEE) approach to account for correlation due to the inclusion of siblings in the study sample. Associations are presented as crude odds ratios (cORs) and adjusted odds ratios (aORs) with 95% confidence intervals [95% CI]. The corresponding tests for significance were performed using the Wald-test statistic and a significance level of $P < 0.05$. The sum scores of independent continuous measures were standardised, and the presented odds ratios represent the difference in risk for an increase of one standard deviation. Measures with internal consistency of Cronbach's $\alpha < 0.60$ were categorised. Variance inflation factors were computed to assess multicollinearity. The model was cross-validated in two randomly selected subsamples. Stratification by gender produced only minor differences in effect estimates of potential risk factors. The rate of missing

1
2
3 information ranged from 0% to 11.9%. Modelling was based on 20 multiply imputed datasets.
4
5 Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE) was used for imputations.
6
7 All analyses were performed using R (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
8
9 Austria) with the R packages gee for logistic regression using GEE, and MICE for multiple
10
11 imputation.
12
13

14 15 16 17 **RESULTS**

18
19 The study sample comprised 50.7% males, with 53% of the children having older
20
21 siblings. The mean gestational age at birth was 39.4 weeks (SD = 2.0). Maternal age ranged
22
23 from 14 to 47 years, with a mean of 29.7 years (SD = 4.4). The majority of mothers (60.5%)
24
25 had more than 12 years of education. Only 0.9% of the subjects (N = 252) were teenage
26
27 mothers, and 3.4% (N=853) reported not living with the father of their child. Four per cent of
28
29 mothers were unemployed or disabled. Current financial problems were reported by 18.5% of
30
31 mothers. A hospital-attended injury between 18 and 36 months of age was reported for 4.6%
32
33 (N = 1,247) of the children.
34
35

36
37 Table 1 displays univariable and multivariable comparisons between children with and
38
39 without hospital-attended injuries. In unadjusted analyses, a range of factors were
40
41 significantly associated with injuries, including maternal mental distress, financial problems,
42
43 gender, gestational age at birth, development, temperament and behaviour. Children born
44
45 preterm had a decreased risk of injury (OR = 0.74 95% CI (0.56, 0.96), p = 0.024).
46
47

48
49 Similarly, several potential predictors were significantly associated with hospital-
50
51 attended injuries in toddlers in the multivariable analyses.

52 *Familial factors*

53
54
55 In the adjusted model, financial problems, maternal mental distress and having older
56
57 siblings were risk factors for hospital-attended injuries in toddlers. Older maternal age was a
58
59

protective factor. Maternal education, occupational status and not living with the child's father were not associated with hospital-attended injuries.

Child factors

Male gender and increased gestational age at birth were risk factors for hospital-attended injuries in the toddlers. Children with impaired gross motor development were less prone to injury, whereas children with less fine motor skills were more at risk. Social development was not significantly associated with hospital-attended injuries. Impaired communication, the temperamental traits of emotionality and activity and aggressive behaviour did not achieve statistical significance in the adjusted analysis. Following adjustment shyness remained a protective factor and children with at least three reported attention problems had a modestly increased risk for hospital-attended injuries ($p = 0.035$).

Table 1

Descriptive comparison between children with and without hospital attended injuries and univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis of potential risk factors, N=26087.

	Overall N=26087	Without injuries	With injuries	OR (95% CI)	aOR (95% CI)
	% (N)	% (N)	% (N)		
	/mean(SD)	/mean(SD)	/mean(SD)		
<i>Family factors</i>					
Older sibling(s)	53.3% (13902)	53.1% (13197)	56.5% (705)	1.15 (1.02, 1.29) *	1.22 (1.08, 1.39)**
Maternal age	29.7 (4.43)	29.7 (4.44)	29.5 (4.44)	0.95 (0.89, 1.02)	0.93 (0.86, 1.00)*
Maternal education \leq 12 years	37.6% (9534)	37.6% (9078)	37.6% (456)	0.99 (0.88, 1.12)	0.90 (0.80, 1.02)
Mother unemployed or disabled	4.1% (1069)	4.1% (1017)	4.2% (52)	1.01 (0.76, 1.36)	0.95 (0.71, 1.26)
Mother and child not living with the father	3.4% (819)	3.4% (778)	3.6% (41)	1.06 (0.77, 1.46)	0.96 (0.69, 1.33)
Financial problems	18.6% (4379)	18.4% (4129)	22.4% (250)	1.27 (1.09, 1.48)**	1.18 (1.01, 1.39)*

Maternal mental health problems (8-32)	10.2 (2.84)	10.1 (2.82)	10.5 (3.06)	1.12 (1.06, 1.18)***	1.09 (1.03, 1.16)**
<i>Child factors</i>					
Male	50.8% (13250)	50.5% (12540)	56.9% (710)	1.30 (1.16, 1.45)***	1.26 (1.11, 1.42)***
Gestational age	39.4 (1.94)	39.4 (1.96)	39.5 (1.79)	1.04 (1.01, 1.07) *	1.04 (1.00, 1.07)*
Gross motor development					
All skills achieved	82.2% (19742)	82.1% (18794)	83.8% (948)	Reference	Reference
One skill not achieved	14.5% (3481)	14.5% (3322)	14.1% (159)	0.94 (0.80, 1.12)	0.94 (0.79, 1.12)
Two or three skills not achieved	3.4% (800)	3.4% (776)	2.1% (24)	0.65 (0.43, 0.98)*	0.65 (0.42, 0.99)*
Fine motor development					
All skills achieved	73.8% (17569)	73.9% (16754)	72.3% (815)	Reference	Reference
One skill not achieved	21.0% (5004)	21.0% (4774)	20.4% (230)	1.01 (0.87, 1.18)	1.03 (0.89, 1.19)
Two or three skills not achieved	5.2% (1236)	5.1% (1154)	7.3% (82)	1.45 (1.15, 1.83) **	1.55 (1.22, 1.97)***
Communication development					
All skills achieved	46.6% (11117)	46.8% (10631)	43.1% (486)	Reference	Reference
One skill not achieved	26.5% (6313)	26.4% (5989)	28.7% (324)	1.16 (1.00, 1.34) *	1.11 (0.95, 1.28)
Two or three skills not achieved	26.93% (6413)	18.3% (6095)	19.3% (318)	1.13 (0.98, 1.31)	1.04 (0.89, 1.22)
Social development					
All skills achieved	71.3% (17094)	71.4% (16302)	70.3% (792)	Reference	Reference
One skill not achieved	19.6% (4688)	19.5% (4451)	21.0% (237)	1.09 (0.94, 1.27)	1.04 (0.90, 1.21)
Two or more skill not achieved	6.6% (1582)	6.6% (1510)	6.4% (72)	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.92 (0.73, 1.15)
Temperament					
Activity (3-15)	12.1 (1.96)	12.1 (1.96)	12.2 (1.97)	1.09 (1.02, 1.16) **	1.02 (0.95, 1.09)
Emotionality (3-15)	8.2 (2.27)	8.2 (2.26)	8.3 (2.37)	1.06 (0.99, 1.12)	1.02 (0.96, 1.09)
Shyness (3-15)	6.1 (1.93)	6.1 (1.93)	6.0 (1.95)	0.92 (0.87, 0.98)**	0.92 (0.86, 0.98) *
Externalizing behaviour					
Attention					
No attention problem	10.7% (2464)	10.8% (2371)	8.7% (93)	Reference	Reference
One attention problem	41.9% (9653)	42.1% (9231)	39.3% (422)	1.15 (0.91, 1.44)	1.13 (0.89, 1.43)
Two attention problems	28.7% (6611)	28.7% (6288)	30.0% (323)	1.26 (1.00, 1.60)	1.19 (0.93, 1.53)
Three attention problems	18.7% (4294)	18.5% (4057)	22.0% (237)	1.47 (1.16, 1.86)**	1.33 (1.02, 1.72) *
Aggression					
No aggression problem	14.6% (3278)	14.6% (3151)	12.1% (127)	Reference	Reference

One aggression problem	22.8% (5953)	26.3% (5685)	25.5% (268)	1.13 (0.92, 1.38)	1.07 (0.87, 1.31)
Two aggression problems	24.3% (6332)	27.9% (6018)	29.8% (314)	1.21 (0.99, 1.47)	1.09 (0.89, 1.34)
Three or more aggression problems	27.2% (7091)	31.2% (6747)	32.7% (344)	1.21 (1.00, 1.47)	1.01 (0.82, 1.25)

* p value < 0.05, **p value < 0.01, ***p value < 0.001 from Wald-test statistic

DISCUSSION

Injuries in toddlers are multifaceted phenomena with a wide variety of relevant risk-factors in play. The current population-based study of toddlers found that both familial factors and developmental factors in children were associated with injury risk, ~~but that familial factors were more robust predictors of injuries. These findings are e~~ Consistent with previous studies and our clinical experience; children admitted to hospitals with injuries are not randomly selected.

Similar to earlier studies,[8] having older siblings was a risk factor for hospital-attended injuries. Differences in parental supervision or the possibility that older siblings sometimes act as supervisors may explain this association. Older siblings may also act as models of risky behaviour. Research has shown that children are allowed to engage in more risky behaviour and show poor compliance when supervised by their older siblings rather than by their mothers.[28]

Education and socioeconomic status are closely intertwined, and most prior studies have found that low maternal education is a risk factor for injuries in children. In this study, maternal education, unemployment and single parenthood were not associated with injury. This lack of association may be due to the generally high educational level, well-developed social security system, and high standard of living in Norway. Financial problems, which were significantly associated with injury, were reported by a rather large proportion of the

1
2
3 mothers in this study and are not likely to represent poverty, but perhaps problems to adapt to
4
5 a life situation with a growing family. As in other studies older maternal age was a protective
6
7 factor.[6,7]
8

9
10 In line with previous research maternal mental health problems constituted a risk
11
12 factor for injuries in children.[9,10] Mental distress may reduce a parent's attention to
13
14 external cues, and may negatively impact the parent-child relationship. Maternal mental
15
16 distress withstood adjustment for other familial and child-related predictors. This observation
17
18 calls for further investigation of the mechanisms involved.
19

20
21 Behavioural and temperamental differences between boys and girls have been
22
23 proposed as explanations for the well-established relationship between gender and injury risk.
24
25 In this study, adjustment for development, temperament, and behaviour did barely attenuate
26
27 this relationship. Perhaps other differences, for example gender-specific socialisation,
28
29 supervision and guidance, games and encouraged activities, might explain this disparity.
30

31
32 Our finding that the risk of injury was increased with increasing gestational age at
33
34 birth, and that preterm birth was associated with a decreased risk was unanticipated. Many
35
36 studies have identified later behavioural problems, including attention deficit and
37
38 hyperactivity in children who are born preterm, [29] attributes that are also linked to injury
39
40 proneness. On the other hand studies of adolescents have suggested that children born at
41
42 extremely low birth weight are more cautious, shy and risk averse than their normal birth
43
44 weight counterparts [30], and our finding might be explained by such attributes. More
45
46 research is needed to confirm and explain this finding.
47
48

49
50 Novel findings in this study were that children with impaired gross motor development
51
52 had a decreased risk for injury, whereas those with impaired fine motor development had an
53
54 increased risk. Toddlers' physical development often precedes their ability to understand the
55
56 consequences of their actions, and early physical mobility may put children at greater risk of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 injury, regardless of their temperament, behaviour or environment. Impaired fine motor
4
5 development may be linked to clumsiness, which subsequently leads to injury proneness.
6
7 Alternatively, early fine motor development may reflect a preference for calmer activities.
8
9
10 The different directionalities of the associations between gross and fine motor development
11
12 and injury risk imply that these areas should be assessed separately in future studies.
13

14 Shyness was a consistent protective factor against injury. Shyness is considered to be
15
16 an inhibition to the unfamiliar and is associated with inhibitory control.[31,32] The protective
17
18 effect of shyness observed in this study indicates that inhibitory control may also be a
19
20 protective factor against injury in young children. Attention problems was borderline
21
22 significant after adjustment and may be a risk factor for injuries in toddlers. Aggression was
23
24 not significant. These findings are different from the many studies of older children
25
26 concluding with behaviour as a predictor for injuries.[14,18-20] This disparity may be due to
27
28 measurement difficulties at this early age, or lack of stability in aggressive behaviour in the
29
30 developmental period in this study (18 and 36 months). In our study the associations between
31
32 temperament and behavior, and injury were substantially attenuated following adjustment,
33
34 perhaps indicating when adjusted for family factors without the contrary being observed. This
35
36 finding provides support that other familial factors may be are more robust predictors of
37
38 injuries in young children.
39
40
41
42

43 There are some important limitations of this study. A response rate of 42.7% suggests
44
45 a selection bias, and comparisons with data from MBRN have shown a positive selection into
46
47 this cohort, [21,33] and the study sample can be regarded as a low-risk population; this fact
48
49 may have resulted in an underestimation of the true effect sizes. However, few significant
50
51 differences in exposure-outcome associations have been identified in studies of this
52
53 cohort,[33] and the positive associations found in this study is likely to be generalizable.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This study's reliance on self-reported data may have affected the response accuracy.
4
5 Self-reported medically-attended or hospital-attended injuries are common measures in the
6
7 injury literature. However, injury recall has been shown to decrease with time and tends to be
8
9 more accurate for major injuries.[34,35] The expected over-representation of more recent
10
11 injuries and more severe injuries will however not affect the association measures. The
12
13 division into children with and without hospital attended injuries leaves children with injuries
14
15 treated in out-patient clinics in the comparison group, and may have led to an underestimation
16
17 of effects. There may also be selection biases regarding injury severity and type of injuries
18
19 which are treated in out-patient clinics. Especially, regional differences with more severe
20
21 injuries treated in out-patient clinics in rural areas are expected. Our study did not include
22
23 systematic measures of injury severity, injury mechanism or injury type. Another omitted
24
25 variable in this study was adult supervision, which is an important factor in preventing
26
27 injuries in preschool children. This study was also unable to discriminate injuries that resulted
28
29 from abuse.
30
31
32
33

34 The sample predominantly comprised ethnic Norwegian participants, and did not
35
36 allow us to investigate the influence of ethnicity or culture. As in other large population
37
38 studies, there was extensive use of abbreviated scales that might threaten the validity of
39
40 measures. The strengths of this study included its prospective design, large sample size and
41
42 the inclusion of a large number of potentially important variables.
43
44

45 An injury brings the family in contact with healthcare and gives professionals an
46
47 opportunity to identify potential risk factors. In addition, the fact that injuries may also be
48
49 caused by poor supervision and, sometimes neglect or abuse emphasize that a thorough
50
51 assessment of the circumstances surrounding injuries in young children is important to
52
53 identify families where children are at risk of further injury.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the participating families in Norway who take part in this on-going cohort study.

Competing Interest: None to declare

Contributorship

MCM cleaned and analysed the data, and drafted and revised the paper. ST, JBG and GD contributed to the interpretation of the data and critical revisions of the manuscript. All authors have studied the manuscript in the form submitted, and have accepted the order of authorship.

Copyright

The Corresponding Author, Mia Cathrine Myhre, has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd, and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in Injury Prevention and any other BMJ PGL products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.”

Funding

The Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study is supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education and Research, NIH/NIEHS(contract no NO-ES-75558), NIH/NINDS (grant no.1 UO1 NS 047537-01), and the Norwegian Research Council/FUGE (grant no. 151918/S10). The current study did not receive any specific funding, but was conducted as part of the authors’ employment at the Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies.

References

1. Dowd MD, Keenan HT, Bratton SL. Epidemiology and prevention of childhood injuries. *Critical care medicine* 2002;30(11 Suppl):S385-92.
2. Agran PF, Anderson C, Winn D, et al. Rates of pediatric injuries by 3-month intervals for children 0 to 3 years of age. *Pediatrics* 2003;111(6 Pt 1):92.
3. Flavin MP, Dostaler SM, Simpson K, et al. Stages of development and injury patterns in the early years: a population-based analysis. *BMC public health* 2006;6:187.
4. Haddon W. The changing approach to the epidemiology, prevention, and amelioration of trauma: the transition to approaches etiologically rather than descriptively based. *American journal of public health and the nation's health* 1968;58(8):1431-8.
5. Faelker T, Pickett W, Brison RJ. Socioeconomic differences in childhood injury: a population based epidemiologic study in Ontario, Canada. *Injury prevention* 2000;6(3):203-8.
6. Hjern A, Ringback-Weitof G, Andersson R. Socio-demographic risk factors for home-type injuries in Swedish infants and toddlers. *Acta Paediatrica* 2001;90(1):61-8.
7. Laursen B, Nielsen JW. Influence of sociodemographic factors on the risk of unintentional childhood home injuries. *European Journal of Public Health* 2008;18(4):366-70.
8. Bijur PE, Golding J, Kurzon M. Childhood accidents, family size and birth order. *Social Science & Medicine* 1988;26(8):839-43.
9. Phelan K, Khoury J, Atherton H, et al. Maternal depression, child behavior, and injury. *Injury prevention* 2007;13(6):403-8.
10. Schwebel DC, Brezaussek CM. Chronic maternal depression and children's injury risk. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology* 2008;33(10):1108-16.
11. Morrongiello BA, Corbett M, Brison RJ. Identifying predictors of medically-attended injuries to young children: do child or parent behavioural attributes matter? *Injury prevention* 2009;15(4):220-5.
12. Schwebel DC, Brezaussek CM, Ramey SL, et al. Interactions between child behavior patterns and parenting: implications for children's unintentional injury risk. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology* 2004;29(2):93-104.
13. Morrongiello BA, Klemencic N, Corbett M. Interactions between child behavior patterns and parent supervision: implications for children's risk of unintentional injury. *Child Development* 2008;79(3):627-38.
14. Schwebel DC, Gaines J. Pediatric unintentional injury: behavioral risk factors and implications for prevention. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics* 2007;28(3):245-54.
15. Manheimer DI, Mellinger GD. Personality characteristics of the child accident repeater. *Child Development* 1967;38(2):491-513.
16. Angle CR. Locomotor skills and school accidents. *Pediatrics* 1975;56(5):819-22.
17. Schwebel DC, Binder SC, Sales JM, et al. Is there a link between children's motor abilities and unintentional injuries? *Journal of Safety Research* 2003;34(2):135-41.
18. Wazana A. Are there injury-prone children? A critical review of the literature. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 1997;42(6):602-10.
19. Bijur PE, Stewart-Brown S, Butler N. Child behavior and accidental injury in 11,966 preschool children. *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 1986;140(5):487-92.
20. Byrne JM, Bawden HN, Beattie T, et al. Risk for injury in preschoolers: relationship to attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Child Neuropsychology* 2003;9(2):142-51.
21. Magnus P, Irgens LM, Haug K, et al. Cohort profile: the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study (MoBa). *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2006;35(5):1146-50.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
22. Tambs K, Moum T. How well can a few questionnaire items indicate anxiety and depression? *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 1993;87(5):364-7.
23. Strand BH, Dalgard OS, Tambs K, et al. Measuring the mental health status of the Norwegian population: a comparison of the instruments SCL-25, SCL-10, SCL-5 and MHI-5 (SF-36). *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry* 2003;57(2):113-8.
24. Sandanger I, Moum T, Ingebrigtsen G, et al. Concordance between symptom screening and diagnostic procedure: the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 and the Composite International Diagnostic Interview I. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 1998;33(7):345-54.
25. Squires J PL, Bricker D *The ASQ User's Guide for the Ages and Stages Questionnaires: A Parent- Completed, Child Monitoring System*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes., 1999.
26. Mathiesen KS, Tambs K. The EAS temperament questionnaire--factor structure, age trends, reliability, and stability in a Norwegian sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 1999;40(3):431-9.
27. Aschenbach TM, Rescorla LA. *Manuale for the ASEBA Preschoole Forms and Profiles*: Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth and Families., 2000.
28. Morrongiello BA, Schell SL, Schmidt S. "Please keep an eye on your younger sister": sibling supervision and young children's risk of unintentional injury. *Injury prevention* 2010;16(6):398-402.
29. Aarnoudse-Moens CS, Weisglas-Kuperus N, van Goudoever JB, et al. Meta-analysis of neurobehavioral outcomes in very preterm and/or very low birth weight children. *Pediatrics* 2009;124(2):717-28.
30. Schmidt LA, Miskovic V, Boyle MH, et al. Shyness and timidity in young adults who were born at extremely low birth weight. *Pediatrics* 2008;122(1):e181-7.
31. Pfeifer M, Goldsmith HH, Davidson RJ, et al. Continuity and change in inhibited and uninhibited children. *Child Development* 2002;73(5):1474-85.
32. Schwebel DC, Plumert JM. Longitudinal and concurrent relations among temperament, ability estimation, and injury proneness. *Child Development* 1999;70(3):700-12.
33. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, et al. Self-selection and bias in a large prospective pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology* 2009;23(6):597-608.
34. Pless CE, Pless IB. How well they remember. The accuracy of parent reports. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* 1995;149(5):553-8.
35. Cummings P, Rivara FP, Thompson RS, et al. Ability of parents to recall the injuries of their young children. *Injury prevention* 2005;11(1):43-7.