



Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey 1994-2006

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002052
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Sep-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Mo, Frank; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Neutel, Ineke; Department of Epidemiology, University of Ottawa Morrison, Howard; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Hopkins, Doug; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Da Silva, Caroline; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Jiang, Ying; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada
Primary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey**
5 **1994-2006**
6
7

8 Frank Mo¹, PhD; Ineke Neutel², PhD; Howard Morrison, PhD; Doug Hopkins, BA; Caroline Da Silva,
9 BSc; Ying Jiang¹, MSc
10
11

12 **Author references:**
13

14
15 ¹Consumer Product Safety and Injury Risk Assessment Program Working Group
16 Science Integration Division
17 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
18 Public Health Agency of Canada
19
20

21 ²Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **KEYWORDS** Activity limiting injury; impact factors, longitudinal health survey; epidemiology;
31 injury prevention; Canada.
32
33
34

35 **Correspondence to**
36

37
38 Dr. Frank Mo, Science Integration Division
39 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
40 Public Health Agency of Canada
41 Frank.Mo@phac-aspc.gc.ca.
42
43
44

45 **Running title: Impact of Activity-Limiting Injury trends**
46
47

48 **Word count:**

49 Abstract: 295
50 Manuscript: 3,496
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine the impact factors of activity-limiting injuries (ALI) on individuals and on the Canadian population; to detect short and long term impact after injuries in the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS) from 1994 to 2006.

Design: This is a randomised longitudinal cohort study with biennial interview, which ranged from age, sex, education, marital status, income, residence, height and weight to self-perceived health status, health care utilization and medication use.

Setting: The study population was drawn from the NPHS with a random sample of 7,300 to 8,300 participants in both sexes over 20 years old from ten provinces and three territories in Canada.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Logistic regression models were used to detect the potential impact of ALI on individuals and on Canadian population. The interviews two years before and two years after the ALI were compared to examine long-term effects, and the McNemar test option in SAS was used for the matched analysis.

Results: The immediate impact was pain, disability, disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor visits after ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity of 10% of the most productive and a considerable increase in health care access and cost. The odds ratios (ORs) for the 20-39 age group and males is more than for females for most years (OR, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.8-2.7 and OR, 1.4; 95% CI, 1.1-1.6). Individuals consuming nine or more alcoholic drinks per week have significantly differences (OR, 1.5; 95% CI, 1.3-1.8).

Conclusion: The findings from this study illustrated the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. Injury control policies should aim to prevent the both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Summary Boxes:

What is already known on this subject?

1. Activity-limiting injuries (ALI) burden such as increased steadily prevalence, mortality and economic costs in Canada;
2. Showing increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use related to ALI;
3. Nature and types related to ALI;

What does this study add?

1. Potential associations between health care utilization and ALI before and after injury;
2. Hospital admission, Department emergency and medical doctors visits impacted on ALI;

3. The immediate individuals impact such as pain, disability, disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were sequelae, chronic pain, stress and increased medical doctor visits after ALL. Population impact included loss of productivity of 10% of the most productive and a considerable increase in health care access and cost.
4. policies should aim to prevent both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Competing Interest:

None to declare.

Funding Statement:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Contributorship Statement:

Dr. Frank Mo, leader of the research project, and play the major role in research design, drafted the article and critical review, and advising for data analysis and results interpretation.

Dr. Ineke C. Neutel, contributed to data analysis, assisted in research design and data analysis, interpretation, and the report.

Dr. Howard Morrison, contributed to research consultation, provided critical review comments, and advising for data analysis and revised critically the article.

Mr. Doug Hopkins, assisted in research design, provided literature review and critical comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Caroline Da Silva, participated in research design, provided critical review comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Ying Jiang, contributed to research design, provided literature and critical review comments, and signed final version of the manuscript for submission.

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a serious public health issue with a major impact on the lives of Canadians. They are leading causes of death and hospitalization, as well as of disability, loss of productivity and potential years of life lost (PYLL) [1]. Sequelae from injuries can impact the quality of life for individuals and population levels, such as activity limitation, functional disability and pain as process influenced by a variety of social, psychological, and economic factors [2–5]. A rather complete analysis of injury in Canada was based on emergency department (ED) visits and hospitalisation admissions for all of Ontario province [6]. The analysis noted that one in four ED visits were injury-related, as were one in every 17 hospitalisations [6]. These data accentuate the importance of injuries to the health care system. Other studies have also demonstrated the increasing medical doctor (MD) contact, the use more medications for pain, more days in hospital, and more hours of home care services [6-8].

Several studies of traumatic disability have also focused on injuries resulting in hospitalization [9], types of injury [10-11], and serious head injuries [12]. Moreover, half of patients had some limitation in activity for two days or more due to injury, and patients treated in the clinic were somewhat more likely to have two or more days of limited activity than were patients treated in the ED [13].

Injuries are not only preventable, but the impact of injuries could also be lessened. In order to develop effective policies leading to prevention of injuries and reduced impact of injuries on society, information is needed about the influenced effects that individuals with injuries treated in the primary care setting and not requiring hospitalization frequently result in significant functional impairment and

1
2
3
4 to identify those injuries which, by virtue of their contribution to disability, would be targets for
5
6 prevention programs.
7
8
9

10
11 The objectives of this study are to explore the immediate and longer term consequences of injury
12 including physical, psychological, social and occupational functioning. This comprises a longitudinal
13 population health study, which will measure the impact of injuries on individual's and population level
14 health status and well-being due to activity-limiting injuries (ALI) in the NPHS from 1994 to 2006 in
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Canada.
22
23
24
25

26 **METHODOLOGY**

27 **Study population**

28
29
30 The source population for this study is the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS),
31 from 1994/1995 (cycle 1) to 2006/2007 (cycle 7) with 17,276 of the respondents in the survey except for
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
persons living on reserves or on Canadian Forces bases [6, 8]. The sample design is a multiple cluster
[14]. The sampling frame for the first cycle (1994/5) originated with the Canadian Labour Force
Survey (CLFS), a multi-stage, stratified sampling technique used for all provinces except Quebec for
which a provincial sampling frame was used [14]. In the second cycle 1996-1997 the NPHS started
using 17,276 of the respondents for a longitudinal component. For the 2000 cycle a few changes were
made in the questionnaire including more detailed questions on health care use after the ALI.

Nearly all respondents were re-interviewed biennially by telephone except for individuals
without telephone, for whom face to face interviews were used. Interviewers were instructed to follow

1
2
3
4 all reasonable strategies to trace people. Response rates were 83.6% from cycle one to cycle two-92.8%,
5
6 cycle three-88.3%, cycle four-84.9%, cycle five-80.8%, cycle six-77.6%, and cycle seven-77.0%.
7
8
9

10
11 For the present study, interview cycles for 1996 to 2006 were used. Data were used from
12
13 respondents who were willing to share their data for data analysis, and who completed all interviews to
14
15 date and achieved ages 20 and over. Since the source population, i.e. the total NPHS population,
16
17 covered more ages than the study population, i.e. the population analysed for this study, it was possible
18
19 to add younger persons from the source population to our study population after the cycle at which they
20
21 reached age of 20 years old. Consequently, the study population changed somewhat over the years of
22
23 the study, 1996 to 2006 allowing comparable cross-sectional analysis of populations with the same age
24
25 range and age distribution.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Variables**

34
35 The interview ranged from background questions (age, sex, education, marital status, income,
36
37 residence, height and weight) to health-related questions (self-perceived health status, health care
38
39 utilization and medication use). For this study the answers were dichotomized. Body mass index (BMI)
40
41 was calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared [15]. A BMI of 30 and over
42
43 was considered obese. Respondents were asked to rate their health as one of five categories: excellent,
44
45 very good, good, fair or poor and for this study, the lower two categories were combined as poorer
46
47 health and the top three as good health. Quartiles of total household income were calculated for the
48
49 population and the lower two quartiles combined for the low income category to be compared to the top
50
51 two as highest income category. A three-part physical activity index was calculated based on kilo-
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 calories per kilogram of body weight per day expended (KKD). Physically active is defined as energy
5
6 expenditure of at least 3 KKD; moderately active corresponds to energy expenditure between 1.5 and 3
7
8 KKD; physically inactive is defined as less than 1.5 KKD. Medication use was elicited by the question:
9
10 “In the past 30 days, did you take . . . ?” This was followed by a series of questions, such as “Did you
11
12 take antidepressants?” “Did you take anything for pain?” A 'no' answer to the question "Are you
13
14 usually free of pain and discomfort?" was taken as indication that the respondent often suffered pain.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The definition of injury in the NPHS data was “In the past 12 months, did you have any injuries
22
23 serious enough to limit your normal activities?” If more than one, the following questions were to refer
24
25 to the most serious one. A separate question asked respondents a general question about limitations in
26
27 activity, “Because of a long-term physical or mental condition or a health problem, are you limited in the
28
29 kind or amount of activity you can do: at home? at school? at work? in other activities?”
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Data Analysis**

36
37 For the statistical analysis, SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used. Logistic
38
39 regression provided odds ratios (OR) with presence/absence of ALI as the dependent variable, adjusted
40
41 for age (in single years) and sex. Since the data were collected as a statistical sample of the Canadian
42
43 population, the ‘weight’ option was used in all SAS statistical analyses to make the results representative
44
45 of the Canadian population from 1994 to 2006 in seven cycles of cross-sectional studies. Weights were
46
47 provided by Statistics Canada according to their sampling procedures. In order to produce a meaningful
48
49 estimate of the variance for the weighted results, the weights were adjusted using the formula: [average
50
51 weight = (sample weight/sum of the sample weights) * sample size].
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 In order to determine the characteristics, life style and health status, medical attention and health
8 care utilization as well as activity limitation and disability, which were impacted by ALI, all new injury
9 cases, i.e., those who had not reported an injury in the previous interview were identified. For each new
10 case, data from three cycles were selected, 1) the cycle before reporting, 2) the cycle of reporting, 3) the
11 cycle after reporting. Data for the 1994 cycle were used only in this 'before and after' analysis. Only
12 the first recorded ALI report per person was included. The McNemar test option in SAS was used for
13 matched analysis.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 RESULTS

27
28 The numbers of ALI in adult Canadians increased from 755 cases in 1996 to 1,006 in 2006 (not
29 shown in table). The weighted prevalence of all ALI increased steadily from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in
30 2006. The population is showing increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status,
31 medication use, and potential injury sequelae, such as pain, stress and depression but declining trends in
32 lower income and current smoking (**Table 1**). The weighted percentages of medical doctor (MD) visits
33 decreased from 29.8% to 25.3%, emergency department (ED) visits went from 34.0% to 28.8%, and
34 hospital admission within 48 hours went from 6.5% to 4.9% from 2000-2006 for all ALI (**Table 2**). The
35 rate of hospital admissions within 48 hours for adults aged 50+ years was higher than that of young aged
36 (20-49) group. Rates of ALI for males were higher and increased more than for females. Furthermore,
37 younger adults (20-49 yrs.) tended to have more ALI (12.2% to 14.0%) than the older (50+ yrs.) adults
38 (8.6% to 9.8%) (**Table 3**).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The most frequent types of ALI were sprains and strains (42%), followed by fractures and
5 dislocations (20%), and cuts, punctures and bites (10%) (Table 4). Only 3.3 to 5.0% of ALI were in the
6 category of brain, internal and multiple injuries. Men tend to have more cuts, punctures and bites while
7 women have more scrapes, bruises and blisters. Younger ages tend to have more sprains and strains and
8 older ages more fractures and dislocations (Table 4). Logistic regression analysis indicated that
9 younger age groups and male participants were more impacted by ALI, the OR for the 20-39 age group
10 and males is more than for females for most years. Only a few of the other variables show associations
11 with ALI - immigrants have consistently lower rates of ALI, while people consuming nine or more
12 alcoholic drinks per week have significantly higher rates. (Table 5).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Attributes in the interview cycle before the ALI were compared with the rates in the interview
29 year with the ALI and rates in the cycle after the ALI (Table 6). Some attributes showed higher rates
30 for the cycle with the ALI compared to the previous one, i.e., two years earlier, and then continued the
31 higher rate in the next cycle, i.e., two years after the ALI. This was true for limited activity, medical
32 doctor (MD) visits, experiencing pain, medication use for pain, sedatives/ tranquillizers, and
33 antidepressants for the patients with stress and depression ($P<0.001$) (Table 6).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 DISCUSSION

48
49 Clearly, the impact of ALI can be found on several different levels. Immediate consequences
50 were experienced by the more than 10% of the Canadian population who annually report an ALI, with
51 rates increasing from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. According to the definition of ALI as activity-
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 limiting injuries, all people with ALI experience a certain amount of disruption of their daily activities
5
6 with the impact varying according to the type and severity of their injury and depending on their
7
8 customary type of activity [16-19]. The most severe injury includes the 3-6% of ALI with brain, internal
9
10 and multiple injuries. About 20% of ALI were fractures and dislocations, many of whom necessitate a
11
12 period of altered activity. The elderly people are more likely to experience fractures than the younger
13
14 age groups. The most common injuries are sprains and strains, the impact of which also varies a great
15
16 deal depending on type and severity [20-21]. Groups most impacted by ALI were men and the younger
17
18 ages, and thus more likely to have their busy schedules and possibly income, as well as that of their
19
20 families disrupted. A widespread impact of injuries are on the workplace through absenteeism and on the
21
22 family through the disruption of customary activities. Besides the impact of injuries on every day
23
24 activities, there is also the impact on the health care system. About two thirds of people with ALI
25
26 sought some kind of medical care in the year 2000. Evidence was presented showing that the impact of
27
28 ALI might be even more far-reaching, as seen by the higher levels of medical care, and continued pain
29
30 remaining two years after the ALI were reported.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Other research on injuries have used a variety of definition of injuries, based on different sources
41
42 of information. Questions in the NPHS were able to put these other measures in perspective when
43
44 compared to ALI. For example, some studies use hospital-based data [22], but the present study shows
45
46 that only about 5% of ALI are admitted to hospital within the first 48 hours of the event. Assuming that
47
48 all injuries that require hospitalization are within the activity-limiting rubric, it is clear that studies done
49
50 on hospital data include only a small portion of important injuries [23]. However, the hospitalized
51
52 injuries will be the more severe injuries which take a disproportional share of the health care cost and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 disability [22]. Other studies have used ED visits as unit of measurement [6]. The present study showed
5
6 less than one third of ALI went to an ED to obtain treatment. Again, the latter are the more severe
7
8 injuries or those needing specialized treatment, e.g., casts on fractures, and thus have a greater impact
9
10 on daily life and cost. Another source of data commonly used has been mortality data. Although deaths
11
12 are definitely activity-limiting, obviously, none are included in this study. Mortality rates will also refer
13
14 to a quite different range of injuries than ALI. For example, in an US study, firearm-related injuries
15
16 were 22% of all injury deaths, second only to traffic accident related injuries, but firearms amounted to
17
18 less than 1% for non-fatal injuries [8]. Thus, different measuring units for measuring injury rates will
19
20 target different slices of the spectrum of injuries and provide different results. ALI are of special public
21
22 health importance not sufficiently studied.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Another level of impact resulting from ALI would consist of impact on the health care system.
31
32 Approximately 60% of people with ALI obtain medical care of some type. Of these, approximately one
33
34 third of persons with ALI went to ED to experience the often long wait before receiving treatment. Back
35
36 at home the patient would not only experience the pain and disability of the ALI, but also the need to
37
38 negotiate the health care system, such as making appointments with physicians, specialists,
39
40 physiotherapists, etc., finding transportation, often needing someone to accompany them [24-27]. Even
41
42 though the proportion of the population with ALI increased over the years 2000-2006, decreases were
43
44 seen in use of primary care and the hospital ED visits as well as hospitalisation. This decrease in health
45
46 care use could be an indication either of greater difficulty in accessing health care, or the ALI reported
47
48 becoming less severe over the years. Berdahl found variation by ethnic group and sex, both in the
49
50 reporting of work-related injuries and in the seeking of medical care and the change in ethnic
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 composition over the years could also be a factor in the NPHS data [28-30]. In any case, ALI are
5
6 suffered by a large proportion of the population annually, and a majority of these seek medical treatment
7
8 whether primary care, ED or hospital care. Some of these would need an ambulance for transportation.
9
10 Clearly, this entails a large cost to the health care system and any prevention would not only improve
11
12 quality of life of the putative victims but also would result in significantly lower health care costs.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Another type of impact would be long-term changes after the injury. The 'before and after' data
20
21 available in the NPHS consisted of comparing the cross-sectional data from the interview cycle before
22
23 the ALI with the data of the cycle reporting the ALI and with the next cycle after the ALI. While the
24
25 interviews for each respondent could be linked for the 'before and after' cycles it was more difficult to
26
27 determine which changes in attributes in the year of the ALI or subsequent years were sequelae of the
28
29 ALI. For example, it might make sense that the increasing obesity for people with ALI be linked to
30
31 after-effects, e.g. [31], due to inactivity resulting from the ALI but, in fact, similar changes are
32
33 happening in the overall population. Given these caveats, we can note that no changes were found for
34
35 smoking and little change in excessive alcohol use. Most likely to show long-term effects due to ALI
36
37 were visits to medical doctors and ongoing pain. People with ALI showed increasing likelihood of
38
39 visiting a MD at least five times during the year which continued for the subsequent cycle. Similarly
40
41 pain increased in the cycle with the ALI and remained high over the years. Although this is weak
42
43 evidence, it confirms work on long-term effects of other researchers [32-33] and again emphasizes the
44
45 impact of ALI in the population.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Injuries have been found to lead to lost productivity, medical costs, compensation cost and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 possibly long-term health problems and disability [34-36], which was confirmed by the present results
5
6 for the Canadian population. Many injuries can be prevented and a better understanding of all aspects of
7
8 injuries will lead to better ways of prevention or the minimizing of their effects. However, collaboration
9
10 and cooperation is needed [37]. The European Union has committed itself to reducing number of traffic
11
12 fatalities from 450,000 to 235,000 by 2010, which as Goule et al., point out, will require strong measures
13
14 against use of alcohol [38-41], illicit and medicinal drugs before driving [42]. A difficulty is the multi-
15
16 faceted aspect of injuries. For example, a fall may have many causes, such as unsafe working conditions
17
18 or slippery stairs at home. Each of these would require different approaches to prevention. Similar
19
20 diversities are found for most other types of injuries. With all difficulties inherent in devising effective
21
22 interventions, prevention is still the best approach to lower the tremendous impact of ALI on the
23
24 Canadian population.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The NPHS data have important strengths, such as its representativeness of the Canadian
34
35 population and its longitudinal nature. Because of the longitudinal design, it was possible to identify
36
37 new ALI, meaning no ALI in the previous interview, and compare risk factors before and after the event,
38
39 as well as its consequences. The 'before and after' comparisons of the same person allowed for matched
40
41 analysis at different times. Important also is the extensive and consistent information available on each
42
43 respondent over the multiple cycles of the survey, such as type of ALI, and the medical care needed.
44
45 Besides strengths, the NPHS also has limitations. In spite of the abundance of data available, further
46
47 information is always desirable for particular uses of the data. One issue is the lack of distinction
48
49 between intentional and unintentional injuries, another is the large time spans over which the
50
51 information is available. Another issue is that of self-reported data. Part of self-reporting is recall of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 events. Recall of having had ALI has been shown elsewhere to be less accurate with increasing time and
5
6 is also likely to vary with severity of the injury [43-44]. Both of these would likely lead to an under-
7
8 reporting of ALI. In spite of its limitations the NPHS gives an invaluable view of the level of serious
9
10 injury in the Canadian adult population over a 12 year time period.
11
12
13

14
15
16 Another strength of these data is the use of ALI as a measurement of injury. There are various
17
18 units of measurement in measuring rates of injury in a population. The unit of measurement used in the
19
20 present study consists of the most serious ALI over the previous 12 months, excluding repetitive strains
21
22 injuries. The use of ALI means the delimitation of a particular kind of injury in the spectrum of injuries
23
24 as a concept meaningful to both respondent and researchers. In addition, it identifies a type of injury
25
26 sufficiently severe to impact a person's regular routine.
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 CONCLUSION

34
35 The findings from this study quantified the immediate and long term impact of individuals and
36
37 population level injuries in Canada. The immediate impact was pain, disability, and disruption of regular
38
39 life. The two-thirds seeking medical care needed time, effort and know-how to negotiate the health care
40
41 system, let alone transportation and other related help. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain
42
43 and increased medical doctor's visits remaining two years after the ALI. Population impact included
44
45 loss of productivity of 10% of the most productive and a considerable increase in health care access and
46
47 cost. This study also particularly contributes to injury prevention in social and psychological health
48
49 services to help injured people make a better recovery and maintain the quality of life after injuries.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 **REFERENCES**
6

- 7 1. Centre for Surveillance Coordination HC. Injury Surveillance in Canada: Current realities and
8 Challenges. Ottawa: 2003; Health Canada.
9
- 10 2. Frank JW, Brooker AS, DeMaio S et al. Disability resulting from occupational low back pain part II:
11 What do we know about secondary prevention? A review of the scientific evidence on prevention after
12 disability begins. *Spine* 1996; 21(24): 2918–2929.
13
- 14 3. Krause N, Frank JW, Dasinger LK et al. Determinants of duration of disability and return to work
15 after work-related injury and illness: Challenges for future research. *Am J Industr Med* 2001; 40:464–
16 484.
17
- 18 4. Krause N, Ragland DR. Occupational disability due to low back pain: A new interdisciplinary
19 classification based on a phase model of disability. *Spine* 1994; 19(9):1011–1020.
20
- 21 5. Verbrugge LM, Jette AM. The disablement process. *Soc Sci Med* 1994; 38(1): 1–14.
22
- 23 6. MacPherson AK, Schull M, Manuel D et al. Injuries in Ontario: ICES Atlas. Toronto: Institute for
24 Clinical Evaluative Sciences 2005;
25
- 26 7. MacKenzie EJ: Epidemiology of injuries: current trends and future challenges. *Epidemiol Rev* 2000;
27 22: 112-9.
28
- 29 8. Schneier AJ, Shields BJ, Hostetler SG et al. Incidence of Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury and
30 Associated Hospital Resource Utilization in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2006; 118 (2): 483-492.
31
- 32 9. Mayer T, Walker ML, Clark P. Further experience with a modified Abbreviated Injury Severity Scale.
33 *J Trauma*. 1984; 24:31-34.
34
- 35 10. Kraus JF, Fife D, Conroy C. Pediatric brain injuries: the nature, clinical course, and early outcomes
36 in a defined United States' population. *Pediatrics*. 1987; 79:501-507.
37
- 38 11. Casey R, Ludwig S, McCormick MC. Morbidity following minor head trauma in children.
39 *Pediatrics*. 1986; 78:497-502.
40
- 41 12. Kraus JP, Fife D, Cox P et al. Incidence, severity and external causes of pediatric brain injury.
42 *AJDC*. 1986; 140:687-693.
43
- 44 13. Rivara FP, Calonge N, and Thompson R. Population-Based Study of Unintentional Injury Incidence
45 and Impact during Childhood. *Am J Public Health* 1989; 79:990-994.
46
- 47 14. Tambay J-L, Catlin G. Sample design of the National Population Health Survey. *Health Reports*
48 (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-003). 2006; 7(1): 29-38.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

15. World Health Organization. What are overweight and obesity? Factsheet 2006; N°.311.
16. Majori S, Ricci G, Capretta F et al. Epidemiology of domestic injuries. A survey in an emergency department in North-East Italy. *J Prev Med Hyg.* 2009; 50: 164-9.
17. Scheiman S, Moghaddas HS, Bjornstig U et al. Bicycle injury events among older adults in Northern Sweden: a 10-year population based study. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2010; 42: 758-63.
18. Ahmed LA, Schirmer H, Bjornerem A et al. The gender- and age-specific 10-year and lifetime absolute fracture risk in Tromso, Norway. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2009; 24 : 441-8.
19. Ahmed LA, Emaus N, Berntsen GK, et al. Bone loss and the risk of non-vertebral fractures in women and men: the Tromso study. *Osteoporos Int.* 2010; 21: 1503-11.
20. Aschkenasy MT, Rothenhaus TC. Trauma and falls in the elderly. *Emerg Med Clin North Am.* 2006; 24: 413-32.
21. Wilkins K. Medications and fall-related fractures in the elderly. *Health Rep.* 1999; 11: 45-53 .
22. Frisina PG, Guellnitz R, Alverzo J. A time series analysis of falls and injury in the inpatient rehabilitation setting. *Rehabil Nurs.* 2010; 35:141-6.
23. Pickett W, Hartling L, Brison RJ. A population-based study of hospitalized injuries in Kingston, Ontario, identified via the Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program. *Chronic Dis Can* 1997; 18: 61-9.
24. Dryden DM, Saunders LD, Rowe BH et al. Utilization of health services following spinal cord injury: a 6-year follow-up study. *Spinal Cord.* 2004; 42:513–525.
25. Brown JA, Shannon HS, McDonough P et al. Healthcare Use of Families of Injured Workers Before and After a Workplace Injury in British Columbia, Canada. *Healthcare Policy*, 2007; 2(3): 1-124.
26. Berthelot J-M and the Project Team. Injury hospitalizations and socio-economic status. Ottawa, Ontario: 2010; CIHI.
27. Compston J. Osteoporosis: social and economic impact. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 2010; 48:477-82.
28. Berdahl TA, Zodet M. Medical care utilization for work-related injuries in the United States 2002-2006. *Med Care* 2010; 48: 645-51.
29. de Castro AB, Fujishiro K, Rue T et al. Associations between work schedule characteristics and occupational injury and illness. *Int Nurs Rev.* 2010; 57: 188-94.
30. Lombardi DA, Folkard S, Willetts JL et al. Daily sleep, weekly working hours, and risk of work-related injury: US National Health Interview Survey (2004-2008). *Chronobiol Int.* 2010; 27(5):1013-30.

- 1
2
3
4
5 31. Bergkvist D, Hekmat K, Svensson T et al. Obesity in orthopedic patients. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*.
6 2009; 5:670-2.
7
8 32. Cameron CM, Kliewer EV, Purdie DM et al. Long term health outcomes after injury in working age
9 adults: a systematic review. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006; 60: 341-4.
10
11 33. Toft AM, Moller H, Laursen B. The years after an injury: long-term consequences of injury on self-
12 rated health. *J Trauma* 2010; 69: 26-30.
13
14 34. Borgstrom F, Zethraeus N, Johnell O, et al. Costs and quality of life associated with osteoporosis-
15 related fractures in Sweden. *Osteoporos Int* 2006; 17: 637-50.
16
17 35. Brinsky A, Glick H, Lydick E, et al. The economic cost of hip fractures in community-dwelling
18 older adults: a prospective study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997; 45: 281-7.
19
20 36. Hendrie D, Hall SE, Arena G et al. Health system costs of falls of older adults in Western Australia.
21 *Aust Health Rev* 2004; 28: 363-73.
22
23 37. Sleet DA, Moffett DB. Framing the problem: injuries and public health. *Fam Community Health*
24 2009; 32: 88-97.
25
26 38. Desapriya E, Pike I, Raina P. Severity of alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes in British Columbia:
27 case - control study. *Int J Contr Saf Promot*. 2006; 13: 89-94.
28
29 39. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Robinson E et al. The contribution of alcohol to falls at home among
30 working-aged adults. *Alcohol*. 2008; 42: 383-8.
31
32 40. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Jackson R. The role of alcohol in unintentional falls among young and
33 middle-aged adults: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Inj Prev*. 2009; 15: 341-7.
34
35 41. Ahlm K, Bjornstig U, Ostrom M. Alcohol and drugs in fatally and non-fatally injured motor vehicle
36 drivers in northern Sweden. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2009; 41:129-36.
37
38 42. Gouille JP, Verstraete A, Boulu R, et al. Illicit drugs, medications and traffic accidents. *Ann Pharm*
39 *Fr* 2008; 66: 196-205.
40
41 43. Wilkins K, Mackenzie SG. Work injuries. *Health Rep*. 2007; 18: 25-42.
42
43 44. Warner M, Schenker N, Heinen MA et al. The effects of recall on reporting injury and poisoning
44 episodes in the National Health Interview Survey. *Inj Prev* 2005; 11: 282-7.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Weighted percentages of characteristics of ALI for which were impacted on the study population, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

Year	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
	wt% ¹	wt% ¹	wt% ¹	wt% ¹	wt% ¹	wt% ¹
Total Number ²	7,313	7,529	7,717	7,875	8,085	8,324
ALI (wt%)	10.5	10.9	11.4	12.6	12.6	12.8
Background variables						
Partner	71.0	69.3	68.2	66.2	65.7	64.7
Low income	40.0	34.2	27.9	26.0	23.5	19.8
Completed High School	89.6	89.9	89.3	84.7	84.5	84.5
Rural	17.9	20.5	21.0	20.6	19.9	22.0
Immigrant	17.5	17.3	16.8	16.2	16.1	15.7
Health related variables						
Current smoking	22.7	21.3	20.4	17.1	17.1	16.0
Inactive	58.3	52.9	56.1	48.3	51.0	45.9
Obese	18.4	21.2	23.0	24.3	25.0	26.4
9+ alcohol drinks/ week	11.0	11.6	11.9	11.8	11.6	14.8
Region of residence						
Atlantic	8.8	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.7
Quebec	25.5	25.6	25.9	26.0	26.1	25.9
Ontario	36.3	36.0	36.0	35.8	36.1	36.2
Prairies	17.0	17.3	17.1	17.4	17.3	17.4
BC	12.5	12.4	12.1	12.0	11.8	11.9
Outcome-related						
Ltd activity	17.3	17.8	17.98	22.9	24.5	26.6
Health status	33.6	33.2	38	41.2	42.3	43.5
5+ Medical Doctor visits /year	24.2	26.3	26.64	27.6	28.3	26.8
Pain	12.3	13.7	13.3	15.1	16.4	15.8
Stress	26.3	29.2	25.09	27.3	28.3	27.4
Depression	6.1	5.8	6.43	6.9	7.1	6.0
Medication use in last 30 years						
Pain medication	65.6	67.5	70.1	70.23	70.4	70.6
Tranquilizer/ sedative	5.1	5.3	6.8	8.12	8.2	10.0
Antidepressants	3.6	4.4	5.4	5.9	6.9	7.0

¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

² Number in study population

Table 2: Percent of persons with ALI for which were impacted on medical attention and health care resource utilization by age and sex groups, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006*

Year		2000 wt% ¹	2002 wt% ¹	2004 wt% ¹	2006 wt% ¹
All	Number of ALI	865	932	913	1,005
	None	33.5	40.1	38.5	40.7
	Medical Doctor (MD) visits	29.8	27.1	27.3	25.3
	Emergency Department (ED) visits	34.0	28.5	31.0	28.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.5	5.4	5.5	4.9
	Other	2.7	4.3	3.1	5.2
	Any	66.6	60.0	61.5	59.3
Males	Number of ALI	394	460	463	482
	None	34.8	42.2	41.6	41.5
	MD visits	26.6	26.5	24.7	23.6
	ED visits	34.5	27.4	30.8	29.7
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	9.5	4.5	4.6	4.1
	Other	4.1	4.0	2.9	5.3
	Any	65.2	57.8	58.4	58.5
Females	Number of ALI	471	472	450	523
	None	32.3	37.6	34.8	39.7
	MD visits	32.6	27.7	30.5	27.3
	ED visits	33.6	29.9	31.3	27.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	4.0	6.4	6.6	5.7
	Other	1.5	4.7	3.4	5.1
	Any	67.7	62.4	65.2	60.2
Age 20-49	Number of ALI	588	601	564	590
	None	34.2	40.7	39.7	41.1
	MD visits	29.1	27.7	28.5	24.3
	ED visits	34.3	27.6	28.7	27.3
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.2	4.1	2.9	3.6
	Other	2.5	4.1	3.1	7.3
	Any	65.8	59.3	3.2	58.9
Age 50+	Number of ALI	277	331	349	415
	None	31.8	38.6	36.6	40.1
	MD visits	31.5	25.8	25.3	26.9
	ED visits	33.6	30.6	34.9	31.1
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	7.3	8.1	9.9	6.9
	Other	3.2	4.9	3.2	1.9
	Any	61.4	59.3	63.5	59.9

* Data on medical treatment was available only from 2000-2006

wt%¹ ---Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

Table 3: Percentages for ALI for which were impacted by activity limitation per year, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006*

Years		2000	2002	2004	2006
	Injury status	wt%¹	wt%¹	wt%¹	wt%¹
All	None	85.5	84.0	84.0	82.2
	Activity limiting only	10.8	12.1	11.6	12.0
	Non-activity limiting	3.1	3.0	3.5	5.1
	Both	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8
Males	None	84.9	82.0	82.2	80.1
	Activity limiting only	10.5	13.5	13.2	13.2
	Non-activity limiting	3.9	3.9	3.4	5.6
	Both	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.1
Females	None	86.0	85.8	85.7	84.1
	Activity limiting only	11.1	10.8	10.1	10.9
	Non-activity limiting	2.4	3.0	3.6	4.6
	Both	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5
Ages 20-49	None	83.5	81.7	81.2	79.3
	Activity limiting only	12.2	13.9	13.3	14.0
	Non-activity limiting	3.5	3.7	4.3	5.8
Ages 50+	None	88.5	87.2	87.4	85.3
	Activity limiting	8.6	9.5	9.5	9.8
	Non-activity limiting	2.6	3.1	2.5	4.2
	Both	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6

* Data on medical treatment was available only from 2000-2006

¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

Table 4: The pathology of ALI for which were impacted on patients' ED visits, admission and length of stay in hospital and consequence, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

	Interview cycles	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
N ²	Number of ALI	755	786	865	931	911	1,006
	Patterns of ALI	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%
ALL	Brain, internal, multiple	4.9	3.3	5.8	3.2	3.9	4.3
	Fractures/dislocation	20.6	21.2	19.9	20.3	22.2	24.9
	Burns	5.3	3.3	4.3	2.8	4.3	3.7
	Sprains, strains	42.0	42.3	42.4	47.3	42.8	42.2
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.2	15.5	11.8	11.6	11.1	9.7
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	7.7	6.9	7.8	4.8	7.1	6.3
	Other	9.3	7.5	8.0	10.0	8.6	8.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Males	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	2.8	5.0	2.4	4.1	4.5
	Fractures/dislocation	21.3	21.5	21.5	20.3	21.0	26.1
	Burns	5.8	2.4	3.9	3.5	4.6	2.7
	Sprains, strains	39.6	42.6	40.5	47.2	41.7	39.8
	Cuts, punctures, bites	12.2	17.4	16.7	13.9	13.6	13.1
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	6.2	5.2	5.7	4.4	6.2	5.8
	Other	9.5	8.1	6.7	8.3	8.8	8.0
Females	Brain, internal, multiple	4.3	3.9	6.4	3.8	3.6	4.2
	Fractures/dislocation	19.8	21.0	18.5	21.6	23.6	23.3
	Burns	4.5	4.1	4.7	3.6	4.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	45.0	41.9	44.1	46.0	44.3	44.9
	Cuts, punctures, bites	7.8	13.3	7.7	9.1	7.9	6.0
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	9.5	8.9	9.5	6.4	8.2	7.0
	Other	9.1	6.9	9.1	9.5	8.4	9.8
Age 20-49	Brain, internal, multiple	4.8	3.3	4.9	3.1	3.7	3.0
	Fractures/dislocation	17.4	19.8	22.5	17.4	18.2	22.9
	Burns	5.5	3.3	4.1	3.5	5.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	43.8	47.2	42.8	51.3	50.9	46.3
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.9	15.5	11.5	10.7	9.4	9.4
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	8.5	5.0	7.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
	Other	9.1	5.9	6.7	9.5	8.4	9.0
Age 50+	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	3.4	7.6	3.4	4.2	6.3
	Fractures/dislocation	30.8	24.9	13.8	26.4	29.0	27.9
	Burns	4.3	3.0	4.9	1.4	3.3	1.9
	Sprains, strains	36.2	30.2	41.7	39.0	29.1	35.8

1							
2							
3							
4							
5	Cuts, punctures, bites	8.1	15.2	12.5	13.4	13.7	10.3
6	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	5.1	11.7	8.5	5.4	11.7	9.1
7	Other	10.1	11.6	11.0	11.0	9.0	8.7
8							
9							

10 ¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

11 ² Number of ALI in study population

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

For peer review only

Table 5: Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence interval (C.I.) of ALI for which were impacted by life style and socioeconomic status, adjusted for sex and age, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		1996		1998		2000		2002		2004		2006		
		OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	
Age groups														
	M/F	1.4*	1.1 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.6	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.4	
	20-39	2.1*	1.6 - 2.9	1.9*	1.5 - 2.4	1.8*	1.4 - 2.3	2.2*	1.8 - 2.7	1.8*	1.5 - 2.2	2.2*	1.8 - 2.6	
	40-59	1.6*	1.1 - 2.1	1.4*	1.1 - 1.8	1.3	1.0 - 1.6	1.6*	1.3 - 2.0	1.3	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.2 - 1.8	
	60+ (reference)	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	
Background variables²														
	Married/ Common-law	yes/no	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.9	0.8 - 1.0
	income	low/high	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4
	Completed High School	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
	Rural	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
	Non-English Immigrant	yes/no	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.7	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
		yes/no	0.6	0.5 - 0.8	0.7	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.7	0.5 - 0.8	0.7	0.6 - 0.9
Health related³														
	Current smoking	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.1
	Physical inactivity	yes/no	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 0.9	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
	Obese	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
	Alcohol drink /week	9+/less	1.2	0.9 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.6	1.3	1.0 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.8	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.3 - 1.8
	Alcohol 5+ at a time	weekly/less	1.3	1.0 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5

51. For sex group, females are the reference group

52. For background variables comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group

53. For health-related comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group

54* Means that there are statistically significant difference compared with control groups

Table 6: Persons with ALI for which were impacted on life style, socioeconomic status, and health care utilization before and after the injury, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		Before	During	After	p value*			N**
		%	%	%	A vs B	B vs C	A vs C	
		A	B	C				
Risky behaviours and socioeconomic status								
Income	low	36.3	32.1	28.5	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	2,892
Obese	obese	17.8	19.7	22.4	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	1,780
Physical activity	inactive	50.4	47.1	48.1	0.001	0.197	0.343	3,044
Smoking	current	19.0	18.5	18.2	0.265	0.384	0.077	1,693
Alcohol drinking	9+/wk	9.6	10.7	11.2	0.048	0.535	0.349	3,548
Health-related issues								
Limited activity	yes	18.7	25.5	26.3	<0.001	0.221	<0.001	3,657
Health status	poor	33.1	36.3	39.6	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,653
Medical Doctor								
visits	5+/year	26.5	34.0	29.8	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,616
Pain	yes	13.7	16.8	17.3	<0.001	0.432	<0.001	3,657
Stress	yes	29.7	31.3	29.4	0.104	0.050	0.757	2,967
Medication use in past 30 days before interview								
Pain medication	yes	61.9	70.2	70.8	<0.001	0.489	<0.001	3,640
Sedatives								
/tranquiliser	yes	5.7	7.2	8.1	0.001	0.055	<0.001	3,639
Antidepressants	yes	4.2	5.9	6.2	<0.001	0.346	0.403	3,641
*P value calculated by McNemar's test								
** N of persons making up the matched analysis for the before and after analysis								

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Page 1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 2, 3
Introduction			Page 4
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 4
Methods			Page 5
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 5, 6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	Page 5, 6
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	Page 5, 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Page 7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Page 7, 8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Page 7, 8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Page 7, 8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Page 7, 8
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	Page 7, 8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Page 7, 8
Results			Page 8

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	Page 5, 6 Page 5, 6 Page 5, 6
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Page 8, 9
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			Page 9-13
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 9, 10, 11
Limitations			Page 12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 9-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 3

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey 1994-2006

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002052.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Dec-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Mo, Frank; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Neutel, Ineke; Department of Epidemiology, University of Ottawa Morrison, Howard; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Hopkins, Doug; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Da Silva, Caroline; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Jiang, Ying; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada
Primary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey**
5 **1994-2006**
6
7

8 Frank Mo¹, PhD; Ineke Neutel², PhD; Howard Morrison, PhD; Doug Hopkins, BA; Caroline Da Silva,
9 BSc; Ying Jiang¹, MSc
10
11

12 **Author references:**
13

14
15 ¹Consumer Product Safety and Injury Risk Assessment Program Working Group
16 Science Integration Division
17 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
18 Public Health Agency of Canada
19
20

21 ²Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **KEYWORDS** Activity limiting injury; impact factors, longitudinal health survey; epidemiology;
31 injury prevention; Canada.
32
33
34

35 **Correspondence to**
36

37
38 Dr. Frank Mo, Science Integration Division
39 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
40 Public Health Agency of Canada
41 Frank.Mo@phac-aspc.gc.ca.
42
43
44

45 **Running title:** Impact of Activity-Limiting Injury trends
46

47 **Word count:**

48 Abstract: 300
49 Manuscript: 3,496
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine the prevalence and factors affecting activity-limiting injuries (ALI) on individuals and on the Canadian population; to estimate the short and long term impact on health status and well-being due to ALI in Canada from 1994 to 2006 using the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS).

Design: The NPHS is a randomised longitudinal cohort study with biennial interviews, with information on age, sex, education, marital status, income, residence, height and weight to self-perceived health status, health care utilization and medication use in addition to ALI.

Setting: The study population was a random sample of male and female participants 20 years and older from ten provinces and three territories in Canada.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Logistic regression models were used to assess the potential impact of ALI on individuals and on the Canadian population. The interviews two years before and two years after the ALI were compared to examine long-term effects, and the McNemar test option in SAS was used for the matched analysis.

Results: The immediate impacts of ALI were pain, disability, and disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor visits. Population impact included a considerable increase in health care access and cost. The odds ratios (ORs) for the 20-39 age group compared to those 60+ was OR, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.8-2.7, while the OR associated with being male was 1.4; 95% CI, 1.1-1.6. Individuals consuming nine or more alcoholic drinks per week were also significantly more likely to report an ALI (OR, 1.5; 95% CI, 1.3-1.8).

Conclusion: The findings from this study illustrated the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. Injury control policies should aim to prevent the both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Summary Boxes:

What is already known on this subject?

1. Activity-limiting injuries (ALI) burden such as increased steadily prevalence, mortality and economic costs in Canada;
2. Showing increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use related to ALI;
3. Nature and types related to ALI;

What does this study add?

1. Potential associations between health care utilization and ALI before and after injury;
2. Hospital admission, Department emergency and medical doctors visits impacted on ALI;

3. The immediate individuals impact such as pain, disability, disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were sequelae, chronic pain, and increased medical doctor visits after ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity and a considerable increase in health care access and cost.
4. policies should aim to prevent both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Competing Interest:

None to declare.

Funding Statement:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Contributorship Statement:

Dr. Frank Mo, leader of the research project, and play the major role in research design, drafted the article and critical review, and advising for data analysis and results interpretation.

Dr. Ineke C. Neutel, contributed to data analysis, assisted in research design and data analysis, interpretation, and the report.

Dr. Howard Morrison, contributed to research consultation, provided critical review comments, and advising for data analysis and revised critically the article.

Mr. Doug Hopkins, assisted in research design, provided literature review and critical comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Caroline Da Silva, participated in research design, provided critical review comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Ying Jiang, contributed to research design, provided literature and critical review comments, and signed final version of the manuscript for submission.

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a serious public health issue with a major impact on the lives of Canadians. They are leading causes of death and hospitalization, as well as of disability, loss of productivity and potential years of life lost (PYLL) [1-4]. Sequelae from injuries include activity limitation, functional disability and pain which in turn influence a variety of social, psychological, labour force, and economic factors [5-8]. An analysis of emergency department (ED) visits and hospitalisation admissions for Ontario noted that one in four ED visits were injury-related, as were one in every 17 hospitalisations [9]. These data accentuated the importance of injuries to the health care system. Other studies have demonstrated the increasing medical doctor (MD) contacts, the use more medications for pain, more days in hospital, and more hours of home care services [9-11].

Several studies of traumatic disability have also focused on injuries resulting in hospitalization [12], types of injury [13-14], and serious head injuries [15]. One study reported that half of patients had some limitation in activity for two days or more due to injury, and patients treated in the clinic were somewhat more likely to have two or more days of limited activity than were patients treated in the ED [16].

Injuries are not only largely preventable, but the impact of injuries can usually be lessened. To develop effective policies leading to the prevention of injuries and to reduce the impact of injuries on society, information is needed about the influenced effects that individuals with injuries treated in the primary care setting and not requiring hospitalization frequently result in significant functional

1
2
3
4 impairment and to identify those injuries which, by virtue of their contribution to disability, would be
5
6 targets for prevention programs.
7
8
9

10
11 The objectives of this study are to explore the immediate and longer term consequences of injury
12 including physical, psychological, social and occupational functioning. This comprises a longitudinal
13 population health study, which will measure the impact of injuries on individual's and population level
14 health status and well-being due to activity-limiting injuries (ALI) in the NPHS from 1994 to 2006 in
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Canada.
22
23
24

25 26 **METHODOLOGY**

27 28 **Study population**

29
30 The source population for this study was the Canadian National Population Health Survey
31 (NPHS), from 1994/1995 (cycle 1) to 2006/2007 (cycle 7). The study population was designed to be
32 representative of the Canadian population with the exception of persons living on Indian reserves or on
33 Canadian Forces bases [9, 11]. The sample design was a multiple cluster [17], ideal for controlling costs
34 when personal interviews are needed, as was the case for cycle 1 of the NPHS. To cover as much as
35 possible of the Canadian population, separate components of the survey were also carried out in the
36 Territories and in health care institutions. In the Territories, a simpler stratified design was used. As
37 well, anticipating the creation of Nunavut, separate strata were formed for each of the future territories,
38 Nunavut and NWT [17]. The sampling frame for the first cycle (1994/5) originated with the Canadian
39 Labour Force Survey (CLFS), a multi-stage, stratified sampling technique used for all provinces except
40 Quebec for which a provincial sampling frame was used [17]. From the 2000 cycle onward, additional
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 questions were added to the questionnaire, such as more detailed questions on health care use after the
5
6 ALI, with the result that some analyses are restricted to data from 2000 to 2006
7
8
9

10
11 Nearly all respondents were re-interviewed biennially by telephone except for individuals
12
13 without a telephone, for whom face to face interviews were used. Interviewers were instructed to follow
14
15 all reasonable strategies to trace people. Response rates were 83.6% for cycle one, 92.8% for cycle two,
16
17 88.3% for cycle three, 84.9% for cycle four, 80.8% for cycle five, 77.6% for cycle six and 77.0% for
18
19 cycle seven.
20
21
22

23
24
25 To look at ADIs resulting from new injuries, data for cycles from 1996 to 2006 were used; data
26
27 for 1994 was only used for the “before and after” analysis (Table 6). Data were used from respondents
28
29 who were willing to share their data for data analysis, who completed all interviews to date, and who
30
31 achieved the age of 20 before 2006. Since the source population, i.e. the total NPHS population,
32
33 covered more ages than the population analysed for this study, it was possible to add younger persons
34
35 from the source population to our study population after the cycle at which they reached age of 20 years
36
37 old. Consequently, the study population changed somewhat over the years of the study allowing
38
39 comparable cross-sectional analysis of populations with the same age range and age distribution.
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 47 **Variables**

48
49 The interview ranged from background questions (age, sex, education, marital status, income,
50
51 residence, height and weight) to health-related questions (self-perceived health status, health care
52
53 utilization and medication use). Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilograms divided
54
55
56
57
58

1
2
3
4 by height in meters squared [18]. A BMI of 30 or over was considered obese. Respondents were asked
5
6
7 to rate their health as one of five categories: excellent, very good, good, fair or poor and for this study,
8
9 the lower two categories were combined as poorer health and the top three as good health. Depression
10
11 and stress were measured by the following questions: “have you had 2 weeks in a row during the past 12
13
14 months when you were sad, blue, or depressed?” and “During the past month, about how often did you
15
16 feel: ... so sad that nothing could cheer you up? ... nervous? ... restless or fidgety? ... hopeless?...
17
18 worthless?”. A question about number of visits to any type of physician or medical specialist in the past
19
20 year was dichotomized as: “five or more visits, versus fewer than five visits”. Alcohol consumption was
21
22 based on a series of question on the number of drinks consumed each day of the past seven days before
23
24 the interview. For this study, this was expressed as drinking nine or more drinks per week, versus
25
26 drinking eight or less. In this study, “alcohol used 5+ at a time” was defined as "How often in the past
27
28 week have you had 5 or more drinks on one occasion?". The variable “hospital treatment” was
29
30 described as "Did you receive any medical attention for this injury from a health professional within 48
31
32 hours?" For example, doctor, hospital emergency room. Quartiles of total household income were
33
34 calculated for the study population, with the lower two quartiles combined for the low income category
35
36 to be compared to the top two as the high income category. A Physical activity index was calculated
37
38 based on kilocalories per kilogram of body weight per day expended (KKD). Physically active was
39
40 defined as energy expenditure of at least 3 KKD; and physically inactive was defined as less than 1.5
41
42 KKD. Medication use was elicited by the question: “In the past 30 days, did you take . . . ?” This was
43
44 followed by a series of questions, such as “Did you take antidepressants and or anti-stressants?” “Did
45
46 you take anything for pain?” A 'no' answer to the question "Are you usually free of pain and
47
48 discomfort?" was taken as indication that the respondent often suffered pain.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The definition of injury in the NPHS data was “In the past 12 months, did you have any injuries
5 serious enough to limit your normal activities?” If more than one injury, the following questions were to
6 refer to the most serious one. A separate question asked respondents a general question about
7 limitations in activity, “Because of a long-term physical or mental condition or a health problem, have
8 you limited in the kind or amount of activity you could do: at home? at school? at work? in other
9 activities?”. Otherwise, they should be defined as non-activity limiting.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Data Analysis**

22
23 For the statistical analysis, SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used. Logistic
24 regression was used to calculate odds ratios (OR) with the presence/absence of ALI as the dependent
25 variable, adjusted for age (in single years) and sex. Since the data were collected as a statistical sample
26 of the Canadian population, the ‘weight’ option was used in all SAS statistical analyses to make the
27 results representative of the Canadian population from 1994 to 2006 in seven cycles of cross-sectional
28 studies. Weights were provided by Statistics Canada according to their sampling procedures. In order to
29 produce a meaningful estimate of the variance for the weighted results, the weights were adjusted using
30 the formula: [average weight = (sample weight/sum of the sample weights) * sample size].
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In order to determine the characteristics, life style and health status, medical attention and health
43 care utilization as well as activity limitation and disability, which were impacted by ALI, all new injury
44 cases, i.e., those who had not reported an injury in the previous interview were identified. For each new
45 case, data from three cycles were selected, 1) the cycle before reporting, 2) the cycle of reporting, 3) the
46 cycle after reporting. Data for the 1994 cycle were used only in this ‘before and after’ analysis. Only
47 the first recorded ALI report per person was included. The McNemar test option in SAS was used for
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

matched analysis. This study approved by the research ethics committee of Health Canada.

RESULTS

The numbers of ALI in the study population increased from 755 cases in 1996 to 1,006 in 2006. The weighted prevalence of all ALI increased steadily from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. Those reporting ALI showed increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use, and potential injury sequelae, such as pain, stress and depression but declining trends in lower income and current smoking (**Table 1**). The proportion of injuries which resulted in activity limitations were higher for males, and increased more over time than for females (**Table 2**). Furthermore, younger adults (20-49 yrs.) were more likely to report activity limiting injuries (12.2% to 14.0%) compared to older (50+ yrs.) adults (8.6% to 9.8%). Among respondents who reported a ALI, the weighted percentages who reported five or more visits to a medical doctor (MD) within the previous year decreased from 29.8% in 2000 to 25.3% in 2006, emergency department (ED) visits went from 34.0% to 28.8%, and hospital admission within 48 hours after the injury went from 6.5% to 4.9% (**Table 3**). The rate of hospital admissions within 48 hours for adults aged 50+ years was higher than that of young aged (20-49) group.

The most frequently reported injuries resulting in activity limitation were sprains and strains (42%), followed by fractures and dislocations (20%), and cuts, punctures and bites (10%) (**Table 4**). Only 3.3 to 5.0% of ALIs were in the category of brain, internal and multiple injuries. Men tended to have more cuts, punctures and bites while women had more scrapes, bruises and blisters. Younger ages tended to have more sprains and strains and older ages more fractures and dislocations.

1
2
3
4
5 Logistic regression analysis indicated that younger age groups and male participants were more
6
7 impacted by ALI. Only a few of the other variables showed associations with ALI - immigrants had
8
9 consistently lower rates of ALI, while people consumed nine or more alcoholic drinks per week had
10
11 significantly higher rates (**Table 5**).

12
13
14
15
16 Attributes of persons with an ALI were compared in the cycles before and after their injury
17
18 (**Table 6**). Most behavioural risk factors examined showed a pattern of an increase from the two years
19
20 previous to the ALI to the time of the ALI to a further increase the two years after the ALI. A similar
21
22 pattern was observed for health status and interactions with the health care system. (**Table 6**).

23 24 25 26 27 28 **DISCUSSION**

29
30 Based on NPHS data, more than 10% of the adult Canadian population annually experience an
31
32 ALI, with the proportion increasing from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. According to the definition
33
34 of ALI as activity-limiting injuries, all people with ALI experienced a certain amount of disruption of
35
36 their daily activities with the impact varying according to the type and severity of their injury and
37
38 depending on their customary type of activity [19-22]. About 20% of ALIs were fractures and
39
40 dislocations, many of whom necessitated a period of altered activity. Older people were more likely to
41
42 report fractures than the younger age groups. The most common injuries were sprains and strains, the
43
44 impact of which also varied a great deal depending on type and severity [23-24]. An important impact
45
46 of injuries is on the workplace through absenteeism and on the family through the disruption of
47
48 customary activities [25-26]. Besides the impact of injuries on every day activities, there was also the
49
50 impact on the health care system [27]. In our data, in 2000, about two thirds of people with ALI sought
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 some kind of medical care. Evidence was presented showing that the impact of ALI might be even more
5
6 far-reaching, as seen by the higher levels of medical care, and continued pain remaining two years after
7
8 the ALI were reported.
9
10

11
12
13
14 Other research on injuries has used a variety of definition of injuries, based on different sources
15
16 of information. Questions in the NPHS were able to put these other measures in perspective. For
17
18 example, some studies used hospital-based data [28], but the present study showed that only about 5% of
19
20 ALI were resulted in a hospital admission within the first 48 hours after the event. Assuming that all
21
22 injuries that required hospitalization were within the activity-limiting rubric, it is clear that studies using
23
24 only hospital data would include only a small portion of important injuries [29]. However, the
25
26 hospitalized injuries will be the more severe injuries which are responsible for a disproportional share of
27
28 the health care cost and disability [25]. Other studies have used ED visits as a unit of measurement [9].
29
30 The present study showed less than one third of ALI went to an ED to obtain treatment. Again, the latter
31
32 were the more severe injuries or those needing specialized treatment, e.g., casts on fractures, and thus
33
34 had a greater impact on daily life and cost. Another source of data commonly used has been mortality
35
36 data. Although deaths are definitely activity-limiting, obviously, none were included in this study. Fatal
37
38 injuries reflect a different range of injuries than those for ALI. For example, in an US study, firearm-
39
40 related injuries were 22% of all injury deaths, second only to traffic accident related injuries, but
41
42 firearms amounted to less than 1% for non-fatal injuries [11]. Thus, different measuring units for
43
44 measuring injury rates will target different slices of the spectrum of injuries and provide different results.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 ALI are of special public health importance, but are not sufficiently studied.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Another level of impact resulting from ALI would consist of impact on the health care system.
6
7 Approximately 60% of people with ALI obtained medical care of some type. Of these, approximately
8
9 one third of persons with ALI went to ED to experience the often long wait before receiving treatment.
10
11 Back at home the patient would not only experience the pain and disability of the ALI, but also the need
12
13 to negotiate the health care system, such as making appointments with physicians, specialists,
14
15 physiotherapists, etc., finding transportation, often needing someone to accompany them [30-33]. Even
16
17 though the proportion of the population with ALI increased over the years 2000-2006, decreases were
18
19 seen in use of primary care and the hospital ED visits as well as hospitalisation. This decrease in health
20
21 care use could be an indication either of greater difficulty in accessing health care, or that the nature of
22
23 ALIs has moderated over the years. Berdahl found variation by ethnic group and sex, both in the
24
25 reporting of work-related injuries and in the seeking of medical care and the change in ethnic
26
27 composition over the years could also be a factor in the NPHS data [34-36]. In any case, ALI are
28
29 suffered by a large proportion of the population annually, and a majority of these seek medical treatment
30
31 whether primary care, ED or hospital care. Clearly, this entails a large cost to the health care system and
32
33 any prevention would not only improve quality of life of the putative victims but also would result in
34
35 significantly lower health care costs.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Another type of impact would be long-term changes after the injury. The 'before and after' data
46
47 available in the NPHS consisted of comparing the cross-sectional data from the interview cycle before
48
49 the ALI with the data of the cycle reporting the ALI and with the next cycle after the ALI. While the
50
51 interviews for each respondent could be linked for the 'before and after' cycles it was more difficult to
52
53 determine which changes in attributes in the year of the ALI or subsequent years were sequelae of the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 ALI. For example, it might make sense that the increasing obesity for people with ALI be linked to
5 after-effects, e.g. [37], due to inactivity resulting from the ALI but, in fact, similar changes were
6
7 happening in the overall population. Given these caveats, we can note that no changes were found for
8
9 smoking and little change in excessive alcohol use. Most likely to show long-term effects due to ALI
10
11 were visits to medical doctors and ongoing pain. People with ALI showed increasing likelihood of
12
13 visiting a MD at least five times during the year which continued for the subsequent cycle. Similarly
14
15 pain increased in the cycle with the ALI and remained high over the years. Although this is weak
16
17 evidence, it confirms work on long-term effects of other researchers [38-39] and again emphasizes the
18
19 impact of ALI in the population.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Injuries have been found to lead to lost productivity, medical costs, compensation costs and
29
30 long-term health problems and disability [40-42], which was confirmed by the present results for the
31
32 Canadian population. Many injuries can be prevented and a better understanding of all aspects of
33
34 injuries will lead to better ways of prevention or the minimizing of their effects. However, collaboration
35
36 and cooperation is needed [43]. The European Union has committed itself to reducing number of traffic
37
38 fatalities from 45,000 to 25,000 by 2010, which as several reports point out, will require strong measures
39
40 against use of alcohol [44-47] and illicit and medicinal drugs before driving [48]. A difficulty in injury
41
42 prevention is the multi-faceted aspect of injuries. For example, a fall may have many causes, such as
43
44 unsafe working conditions or slippery stairs at home. Each of these issues would require different
45
46 approaches to prevention. Similar diversities are found for most other types of injuries. With all
47
48 difficulties inherent in devising effective interventions, prevention is still the best approach to lower the
49
50 tremendous impact of ALI on the Canadian population.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The NPHS data have important strengths, such as its representativeness of the Canadian
8 population and its longitudinal nature. Because of the longitudinal design, it was possible to identify
9 new ALI, meaning no ALI in the previous interview, and compare risk factors before and after the event,
10 as well as its consequences. The 'before and after' comparisons of the same person allowed for matched
11 analysis at different times. Important also is the extensive and consistent information available on each
12 respondent over the multiple cycles of the survey, such as type of ALI, and the medical care needed.
13
14 Besides strengths, the NPHS also has limitations. One issue is the lack of distinction between intentional
15 and unintentional injuries. Another issue is that of self-reported data. Part of self-reporting is recall of
16 events. Recall of having had an ALI has been shown elsewhere to be less accurate with increasing time
17 and is also likely to vary with the severity of the injury [49-50]. Both of these would likely lead to an
18 under-reporting of ALI. In spite of its limitations the NPHS gives an invaluable view of the level of
19 serious injury in the Canadian adult population over a 12 year time period.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Another strength of these data is the use of ALI as a measurement of injury. There are various
39 units of measurement in measuring rates of injury in a population. The unit of measurement used in the
40 present study consists of the most serious ALI over the previous 12 months, excluding repetitive strains
41 injuries. The use of ALI means the delimitation of a particular kind of injury in the spectrum of injuries
42 as a concept meaningful to both respondent and researchers. In addition, it identifies a type of injury
43 sufficiently severe to impact a person's regular routine.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 CONCLUSION

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The findings from this study quantified the immediate and long term impact of individuals and
5 population level injuries in Canada. The immediate impact was pain, disability, and disruption of regular
6
7
8
9 life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor's visits remaining
10
11 two years after the ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity and a considerable increase in
12
13 health care access and cost. This study also particularly contributes to injury prevention in social and
14
15
16 psychological health services to help injured people make a better recovery and maintain the quality of
17
18
19 life after injuries.
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

REFERENCES

1. Centre for Surveillance Coordination HC. Injury Surveillance in Canada: Current realities and Challenges. Ottawa: 2003; Health Canada.
2. Holtslag HR, Beeck EF van, Lichtveld RA, et al. Individual and population burdens of major trauma in the Netherlands. *Bull World Health Organ* 2008; 86:111–117.
3. Lyons RA, Kendrick D, Towner EM, et al. Measuring the Population Burden of Injuries—Implications for Global and National Estimates: A Multi-centre Prospective UK Longitudinal Study. *PLoS Med* 2011; 8(12): e1001140. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001140.
4. Rivara FP, Thompson RS, Thompson, DC Calonge N. Injuries to Children and Adolescents: Impact on Physical Health. *Pediatrics* 1991;88:783-788.
5. Frank JW, Brooker AS, DeMaio S et al. Disability resulting from occupational low back pain part II: What do we know about secondary prevention? A review of the scientific evidence on prevention after disability begins. *Spine* 1996; 21(24):2918–2929.
6. Krause N, Frank JW, Dasinger LK et al. Determinants of duration of disability and return to work after work-related injury and illness: Challenges for future research. *Am J Ind Med* 2001;40:464–484.
7. Krause N, Ragland DR. Occupational disability due to low back pain: A new interdisciplinary classification based on a phase model of disability. *Spine* 1994;19(9):1011–1020.
8. Verbrugge LM, Jette AM. The disablement process. *Soc Sci Med* 1994;38(1):1–14.
9. MacPherson AK, Schull M, Manuel D et al. Injuries in Ontario: ICES Atlas. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences 2005;
10. MacKenzie EJ. Epidemiology of injuries: current trends and future challenges. *Epidemiol Rev* 2000; 22:112-9.
11. Schneier AJ, Shields BJ, Hostetler SG et al. Incidence of Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury and Associated Hospital Resource Utilization in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118 (2):483-492.
12. Mayer T, Walker ML, Clark P. Further experience with a modified Abbreviated Injury Severity Scale. *J Trauma*. 1984;24:31-34.
13. Kraus JF, Fife D, Conroy C. Pediatric brain injuries: the nature, clinical course, and early outcomes in a defined United States' population. *Pediatrics*. 1987;79:501-507.
14. Casey R, Ludwig 5, McCormick MC. Morbidity following minor head trauma in children. *Pediatrics*. 1986;78:497-502.

15. Kraus JP, Fife D, Cox P et al. Incidence, severity and external causes of pediatric brain injury. *AJDC*. 1986;140:687-693.
16. Rivara FP, Calonge N, and Thompson R. Population-Based Study of Unintentional Injury Incidence and Impact during Childhood. *Am J Public Health* 1989;79:990-994.
17. Tambay J-L, Catlin G. Sample design of the National Population Health Survey. *Health Reports* 2006;7(1):29-38.
18. World Health Organization. What are overweight and obesity? Factsheet 2006; N°.311.
19. Majori S, Ricci G, Capretta F et al. Epidemiology of domestic injuries. A survey in an emergency department in North-East Italy. *J Prev Med Hyg*. 2009;50:164-9.
20. Scheiman S, Moghaddas HS, Bjornstig U et al. Bicycle injury events among older adults in Northern Sweden: a 10-year population based study. *Accid Anal Prev* 2010;42:758-63.
21. Ahmed LA, Schirmer H, Bjornerem A et al. The gender- and age-specific 10-year and lifetime absolute fracture risk in Tromso, Norway. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2009;24:441-8.
22. Ahmed LA, Emaus N, Berntsen GK, et al. Bone loss and the risk of non-vertebral fractures in women and men: the Tromso study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2010;21: 1503-11.
23. Aschkenasy MT, Rothenhaus TC. Trauma and falls in the elderly. *Emerg Med Clin North Am* 2006; 24:413-32.
24. Wilkins K. Medications and fall-related fractures in the elderly. *Health Rep* 1999;11:45-53.
25. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Getting back to work after injury: the UK Burden of Injury multicentre longitudinal study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;1 (12):584.
26. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Making a successful return to work: the UK burden of injury multicentre longitudinal study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012 Feb; 62(595):e82-90.10.3399/bjgp12X625139.
27. Franche RL, Krause N. Readiness for Return to Work Following Injury or Illness: Conceptualizing the Interpersonal Impact of Health Care, Workplace, and Insurance Factors. *JOccup Rehabil* 2002; December 12 (4):233-256.
28. Frisina PG, Guellnitz R, Alverzo J. A time series analysis of falls and injury in the inpatient rehabilitation setting. *Rehabil Nurs* 2010;35:141-6.

- 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
29. Pickett W, Hartling L, Brison RJ. A population-based study of hospitalized injuries in Kingston, Ontario, identified via the Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program. *Chronic Dis Can* 1997;18:61-9.
30. Dryden DM, Saunders LD, Rowe BH et al. Utilization of health services following spinal cord injury: a 6-year follow-up study. *Spinal Cord* 2004; 42:513-525.
31. Brown JA, Shannon HS, McDonough P et al. Healthcare Use of Families of Injured Workers Before and After a Workplace Injury in British Columbia, Canada. *Healthcare Policy* 2007; 2(3):1-124.
32. Berthelot J-M and the Project Team. Injury hospitalizations and socio-economic status. Ottawa, Ontario: 2010; CIHI.
33. Compston J. Osteoporosis: social and economic impact. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2010;48:477-82.
34. Berdahl TA, Zodet M. Medical care utilization for work-related injuries in the United States 2002-2006. *Med Care* 2010;48:645-51.
35. de Castro AB, Fujishiro K, Rue T et al. Associations between work schedule characteristics and occupational injury and illness. *Int Nurs Rev* 2010;57:188-94.
36. Lombardi DA, Folkard S, Willetts JL et al. Daily sleep, weekly working hours, and risk of work-related injury: US National Health Interview Survey (2004-2008). *Chronobiol Int* 2010;27(5):1013-30.
37. Bergkvist D, Hekmat K, Svensson T, et al. Obesity in orthopedic patients. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2009; 5:670-2.
38. Cameron CM, Kliwer EV, Purdie DM et al. Long term health outcomes after injury in working age adults: a systematic review. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006;60:341-4.
39. Toft AM, Moller H, Laursen B. The years after an injury: long-term consequences of injury on self-rated health. *J Trauma* 2010;69:26-30.
40. Borgstrom F, Zethraeus N, Johnell O, et al. Costs and quality of life associated with osteoporosis-related fractures in Sweden. *Osteoporos Int* 2006;17:637-50.
41. Brainsky A, Glick H, Lydick E, et al. The economic cost of hip fractures in community-dwelling older adults: a prospective study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997;45:281-7.
42. Hendrie D, Hall SE, Arena G et al. Health system costs of falls of older adults in Western Australia. *Aust Health Rev* 2004; 28:363-73.
43. Sleet DA, Moffett DB. Framing the problem: injuries and public health. *Fam Community Health* 2009;32:88-97.

- 1
2
3
4
5 44. Desapriya E, Pike I, Raina P. Severity of alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes in British Columbia:
6 case - control study. *Int J Contr Saf Promot* 2006;13:89-94.
7
8 45. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Robinson E et al. The contribution of alcohol to falls at home among
9 working-aged adults. *Alcohol* 2008;42:383-8.
10
11 46. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Jackson R. The role of alcohol in unintentional falls among young and
12 middle-aged adults: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Inj Prev* 2009; 15:341-7.
13
14 47. Ahlm K, Bjornstig U, Ostrom M. Alcohol and drugs in fatally and non-fatally injured motor vehicle
15 drivers in northern Sweden. *Accid Anal Prev* 2009; 41:129-36.
16
17 48. Gouille JP, Verstraete A, Boulu R, et al. Illicit drugs, medications and traffic accidents. *Ann Pharm*
18 *Fr* 2008;66:196-205.
19
20 49. Wilkins K, Mackenzie SG. Work injuries. *Health Rep* 2007;18:25-42.
21
22 50. Warner M, Schenker N, Heinen MA et al. The effects of recall on reporting injury and poisoning
23 episodes in the National Health Interview Survey. *Inj Prev* 2005;11:282-7.
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

Table 1: The estimated percent of adult Canadians reporting an activity limiting injury in the previous year based on NPHS data, 1996-2006

Year	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
All	10.5	10.9	11.4	12.6	12.6	12.8
Background variables						
Married/common law	71.0	69.3	68.2	66.2	65.7	64.7
Low income	40.0	34.2	27.9	26.0	23.5	19.8
Completed High School	89.6	89.9	89.3	84.7	84.5	84.5
Rural	17.9	20.5	21.0	20.6	19.9	22.0
Immigrant	17.5	17.3	16.8	16.2	16.1	15.7
Health related variables						
Current smoking	22.7	21.3	20.4	17.1	17.1	16.0
Inactive	58.3	52.9	56.1	48.3	51.0	45.9
Obese	18.4	21.2	23.0	24.3	25.0	26.4
9+ alcohol drinks/ week	11.0	11.6	11.9	11.8	11.6	14.8
Region of residence						
Atlantic	8.8	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.7
Quebec	25.5	25.6	25.9	26.0	26.1	25.9
Ontario	36.3	36.0	36.0	35.8	36.1	36.2
Prairies	17.0	17.3	17.1	17.4	17.3	17.4
BC	12.5	12.4	12.1	12.0	11.8	11.9
Outcome-related						
Limited activity	17.3	17.8	18.0	22.9	24.5	26.6
Poor health status	33.6	33.2	38.0	41.2	42.3	43.5
5+ Medical Doctor visits /year	24.2	26.3	26.6	27.6	28.3	26.8
Pain	12.3	13.7	13.3	15.1	16.4	15.8
Stress	26.3	29.2	25.1	27.3	28.3	27.4
Depression	6.1	5.8	6.4	6.9	7.1	6.0
Medication use in last 30 days						
Pain medication	65.6	67.5	70.1	70.2	70.4	70.6
Tranquilizer/ sedative	5.1	5.3	6.8	8.1	8.2	10.0
Antidepressants	3.6	4.4	5.4	5.9	6.9	7.0
Total Number ¹	7,313	7,529	7,717	7,875	8,085	8,324

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

¹ total number of survey respondents used to calculate weighted percentages representative of the Canadian population

For peer review only

Table 3: The percent of persons reporting specific health care use among those reporting an ALI by age group and sex, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006*

Year		2000	2002	2004	2006
All	Number of ALI	865	932	913	1,005
	Medical Doctor (MD) visits (5+/year)	29.8	27.1	27.3	25.3
	Emergency Department (ED) visits	34.0	28.5	31.0	28.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.5	5.4	5.5	4.9
	Other	2.7	4.3	3.1	5.2
	Any	66.6	60.0	61.5	59.3
	None	33.5	40.1	38.5	40.7
Males	Number of ALI	394	460	463	482
	MD visits (5+/year)	26.6	26.5	24.7	23.6
	ED visits	34.5	27.4	30.8	29.7
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	9.5	4.5	4.6	4.1
	Other	4.1	4.0	2.9	5.3
	Any	65.2	57.8	58.4	58.5
	None	34.8	42.2	41.6	41.5
Females	Number of ALI	471	472	450	523
	MD visits (5+/year)	32.6	27.7	30.5	27.3
	ED visits	33.6	29.9	31.3	27.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	4.0	6.4	6.6	5.7
	Other	1.5	4.7	3.4	5.1
	Any	67.7	62.4	65.2	60.2
	None	32.3	37.6	34.8	39.7
Age 20-49	Number of ALI	588	601	564	590
	MD visits (5+/year)	29.1	27.7	28.5	24.3
	ED visits	34.3	27.6	28.7	27.3
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.2	4.1	2.9	3.6
	Other	2.5	4.1	3.1	7.3
	Any	65.8	59.3	3.2	58.9
	None	34.2	40.7	39.7	41.1
Age 50+	Number of ALI	277	331	349	415
	MD visits (5+/year)	31.5	25.8	25.3	26.9
	ED visits	33.6	30.6	34.9	31.1
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	7.3	8.1	9.9	6.9
	Other	3.2	4.9	3.2	1.9
	Any	61.4	59.3	63.5	59.9
	None	31.8	38.6	36.6	40.1

Table 2: Percentages for ALI for which were impacted by activity limitation per year, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006

Years		2000	2002	2004	2006
	Injury status				
All	None	85.5	84.0	84.0	82.2
	Activity limiting (yes)	10.8	12.1	11.6	12.0
	Activity limiting (no)	3.1	3.0	3.5	5.1
	Both	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8
Males	None	84.9	82.0	82.2	80.1
	Activity limiting (yes)	10.5	13.5	13.2	13.2
	Activity limiting(no)	3.9	3.9	3.4	5.6
	Both	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.1
Females	None	86.0	85.8	85.7	84.1
	Activity limiting (yes)	11.1	10.8	10.1	10.9
	Activity limiting(no)	2.4	3.0	3.6	4.6
	Both	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5
Ages 20-49	None	83.5	81.7	81.2	79.3
	Activity limiting (yes)	12.2	13.9	13.3	14.0
	Activity limiting(no)	3.5	3.7	4.3	5.8
	Both	0.8	0.7	1.3	0.9
Ages 50+	None	88.5	87.2	87.4	85.3
	Activity limiting (yes)	8.6	9.5	9.5	9.8
	Activity limiting (no)	2.6	3.1	2.5	4.2
	Both	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6

Table 4: The type of activity-limiting injury as a proportion of all activity-limiting injuries ALI NPHS, Canada, 1996-2006

	Interview cycles	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
N ²	Number of ALI	755	786	865	931	911	1,006
		¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%
ALL	Brain, internal, multiple	4.9	3.3	5.8	3.2	3.9	4.3
	Fractures/dislocation	20.6	21.2	19.9	20.3	22.2	24.9
	Burns	5.3	3.3	4.3	2.8	4.3	3.7
	Sprains, strains	42.0	42.3	42.4	47.3	42.8	42.2
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.2	15.5	11.8	11.6	11.1	9.7
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	7.7	6.9	7.8	4.8	7.1	6.3
	Other	9.3	7.5	8.0	10.0	8.6	8.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Males	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	2.8	5.0	2.4	4.1	4.5
	Fractures/dislocation	21.3	21.5	21.5	20.3	21.0	26.1
	Burns	5.8	2.4	3.9	3.5	4.6	2.7
	Sprains, strains	39.6	42.6	40.5	47.2	41.7	39.8
	Cuts, punctures, bites	12.2	17.4	16.7	13.9	13.6	13.1
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	6.2	5.2	5.7	4.4	6.2	5.8
	Other	9.5	8.1	6.7	8.3	8.8	8.0
Females	Brain, internal, multiple	4.3	3.9	6.4	3.8	3.6	4.2
	Fractures/dislocation	19.8	21.0	18.5	21.6	23.6	23.3
	Burns	4.5	4.1	4.7	3.6	4.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	45.0	41.9	44.1	46.0	44.3	44.9
	Cuts, punctures, bites	7.8	13.3	7.7	9.1	7.9	6.0
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	9.5	8.9	9.5	6.4	8.2	7.0
	Other	9.1	6.9	9.1	9.5	8.4	9.8
Age 20-49	Brain, internal, multiple	4.8	3.3	4.9	3.1	3.7	3.0
	Fractures/dislocation	17.4	19.8	22.5	17.4	18.2	22.9
	Burns	5.5	3.3	4.1	3.5	5.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	43.8	47.2	42.8	51.3	50.9	46.3
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.9	15.5	11.5	10.7	9.4	9.4
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	8.5	5.0	7.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
	Other	9.1	5.9	6.7	9.5	8.4	9.0
Age 50+	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	3.4	7.6	3.4	4.2	6.3
	Fractures/dislocation	30.8	24.9	13.8	26.4	29.0	27.9
	Burns	4.3	3.0	4.9	1.4	3.3	1.9
	Sprains, strains	36.2	30.2	41.7	39.0	29.1	35.8

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

Cuts, punctures, bites	8.1	15.2	12.5	13.4	13.7	10.3
Scrapes, bruises, blisters	5.1	11.7	8.5	5.4	11.7	9.1
Other	10.1	11.6	11.0	11.0	9.0	8.7

¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

² Number of ALI in study population

For peer review only

Table 5: Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence interval (C.I.) of ALI by life style and socioeconomic status, adjusted for sex and age, NPHS, Canada, 1996-2006

		1996		1998		2000		2002		2004		2006		
		OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	
Age groups														
	M/F	1.4*	1.1 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.6	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.4	
	20-39	2.1*	1.6 - 2.9	1.9*	1.5 - 2.4	1.8*	1.4 - 2.3	2.2*	1.8 - 2.7	1.8*	1.5 - 2.2	2.2*	1.8 - 2.6	
	40-59	1.6*	1.1 - 2.1	1.4*	1.1 - 1.8	1.3	1.0 - 1.6	1.6*	1.3 - 2.0	1.3	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.2 - 1.8	
	60+ (reference)	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	
Background variables²														
	Married/ Common-law	yes/no	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.9	0.8 - 1.0
	income	low/high	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4
	Completed High School	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
	Rural	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
	Non-English Immigrant	yes/no	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.7	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
		yes/no	0.6*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.7*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9
Health related³														
	Current smoking	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.1
	Physical inactivity	yes/no	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 0.9	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
	Obese	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
	Alcohol drink /week	9+/less	1.2	0.9 - 1.5	1.2*	1.0 - 1.6	1.3*	1.0 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.8	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.3 - 1.8
	Alcohol 5+ at a time	weekly/less	1.3*	1.0 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.2*	1.0 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5

1. For sex group, females are the reference group

2. For background variables comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group

3. For health-related comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group

* Means that there are statistically significant difference compared with control groups

Table 6: life style, socioeconomic status, and health care utilization of persons with an activity limiting injury before and after the injury, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		Before	During	After	p value*			N**	
		%	%	%	A vs B	B vs C	A vs C		
		A	B	C					
Risky behaviours and socioeconomic status									
Income	low	36.3	32.1	28.5	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	2,892	
Obese	obese	17.8	19.7	22.4	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	1,780	
Physical activity	inactive	50.4	47.1	48.1	0.001	0.197	0.343	3,044	
Smoking	current	19.0	18.5	18.2	0.265	0.384	0.077	1,693	
Alcohol drinking	9+/week	9.6	10.7	11.2	0.048	0.535	0.349	3,548	
Health-related issues									
Limited activity	yes	18.7	25.5	26.3	<0.001	0.221	<0.001	3,657	
Health status	poor	33.1	36.3	39.6	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,653	
Medical Doctor	visits	5+/year	26.5	34.0	29.8	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,616
Pain	yes	13.7	16.8	17.3	<0.001	0.432	<0.001	3,657	
Stress	yes	29.7	31.3	29.4	0.104	0.050	0.757	2,967	
Medication use in past 30 days before interview									
Pain medication	yes	61.9	70.2	70.8	<0.001	0.489	<0.001	3,640	
Sedatives	/tranquiliser	yes	5.7	7.2	8.1	0.001	0.055	<0.001	3,639
Antidepressants	yes	4.2	5.9	6.2	<0.001	0.346	0.403	3,641	
*P value calculated by McNemar's test									
** N of persons making up the matched analysis for the before and after analysis									

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

Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey 1994-2006

Frank Mo¹, PhD; Ineke Neutel², PhD; Howard Morrison, PhD; Doug Hopkins, BA; Caroline Da Silva, BSc; Ying Jiang¹, MSc

Author references:

¹[Science¹ Consumer Product Safety and Injury Risk Assessment Program Working Group](#)

[Science](#) Integration Division

[Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control](#)

Public Health Agency of Canada

²Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa

KEYWORDS [Activity limiting injury; impact factors; longitudinal health survey; epidemiology; injury prevention; Canada.](#)

Correspondence to

[Dr. Frank Mo, Science Integration Division](#)

[Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control](#)

[Public Health Agency of Canada](#)

Frank.Mo@phac-aspc.gc.ca

Running title: Impact of Activity-Limiting Injury trends

Word count:

Abstract: 286

Manuscript: 3,496

Formatted: Right: 1"

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: No widow/orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: -0.76", Left + -0.5", Left + 0", Left + 0.5", Left + 1", Left + 1.5", Left + 2", Left + 2.5", Left + 3", Left + 3.5", Left + 4", Left + 4.5", Left + 5", Left + 5.5", Left + 6", Left + 6.5", Left + 7", Left + 7.5", Left + 8", Left + 8.5", Left + 9", Left + 9.5", Left + 10", Left + 10.5", Left + 11", Left + 11.5", Left + 12", Left + 12.5", Left + 13", Left

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine the ~~impact~~prevalence and factors ~~of affecting~~ activity-limiting injuries (ALI) on individuals and on the Canadian population; to ~~detect-estimate the~~ short and long term impact ~~after injuries on health status and well-being due to ALI in Canada from 1994 to 2006 using~~ the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS) ~~from 1994 to 2006-].~~

MethodsDesign: The NPHS is a randomised longitudinal cohort study with biennial interviews, with information on age, sex, education, marital status, income, residence, height and weight to self-perceived health status, health care utilization and medication use in addition to ALI.

Setting: The study population was ~~drawn from the National Population Health Survey which was started from 1994 to 2006 with a random sample of 17,276 people, who were re-interviewed biennially. The study population consisted of 7,300 to 8,300 people over male and female participants 20 years old and older from ten provinces and three territories in Canada.~~

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Logistic regression ~~model was models were~~ used to ~~detect assess~~ the potential impact of ALI on individuals and on ~~the~~ Canadian population. The interviews two years before and two years after the ALI were compared to examine long-term effects, and the McNemar test option in SAS was used for ~~the~~ matched analysis.

Results: The immediate ~~impact was impacts of an ALI were~~ pain, disability, and disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor visits ~~after ALI~~. Population impact included ~~loss of productivity of 10% of the most productive and~~ a considerable increase in health care access and cost. The odds ratios (ORs) for the 20-39 age group ~~and males is more than for females for most years (compared to those 60+ was~~ OR, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.8-2.7 ~~and), while the OR associated with being male was~~ 1.4; 95% CI, 1.1-1.6). Individuals consuming nine or more alcoholic drinks per week ~~have were also~~ significantly ~~difference~~ more likely to report an ALI (OR, 1.5; 95% CI, 1.3-1.8).

Conclusion: The findings from this study illustrated the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. Injury control policies should aim to prevent the both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

KEYWORDS ~~Activity limiting injury; impact factors; longitudinal health survey; epidemiology; injury prevention; Canada.~~

~~Word count:~~

~~Abstract: 265~~

~~Manuscript: 3,496~~

Summary Boxes:

What is already known on this subject?

Formatted: Font color: Black, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: Not at -0.76" + -0.5" + 0" + 0.5" + 1" + 1.5" + 2" + 2.5" + 3" + 3.5" + 4" + 4.5" + 5" + 5.5" + 6" + 6.5" + 7" + 7.5" + 8" + 8.5" + 9" + 9.5" + 10" + 10.5" + 11" + 11.5" + 12" + 12.5" + 13"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: No widow/orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: -0.76", Left + -0.5", Left + 0", Left + 0.5", Left + 1", Left + 1.5", Left + 2", Left + 2.5", Left + 3", Left + 3.5", Left + 4", Left + 4.5", Left + 5", Left + 5.5", Left + 6", Left + 6.5", Left + 7", Left + 7.5", Left + 8", Left + 8.5", Left + 9", Left + 9.5", Left + 10", Left + 10.5", Left + 11", Left + 11.5", Left + 12", Left + 12.5", Left + 13", Left

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: Not at -0.76" + -0.5" + 0" + 0.5" + 1" + 1.5" + 2" + 2.5" + 3" + 3.5" + 4" + 4.5" + 5" + 5.5" + 6" + 6.5" + 7" + 7.5" + 8" + 8.5" + 9" + 9.5" + 10" + 10.5" + 11" + 11.5" + 12" + 12.5" + 13"

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 1. Activity-limiting injuries (ALI) burden such as increased steadily prevalence, mortality and
- 11 economic costs in Canada;
- 12 2. Showing increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use related
- 13 to ALI;
- 14 3. Nature and types related to ALI;
- 15

16 What does this study add?

- 17 1. Potential associations between health care utilization and ALI before and after injury;
- 18 2. Hospital admission, Department emergency and medical doctors visits impacted on ALI;
- 19 3. The immediate individuals impact such as pain, disability, disruption of regular life. Long-term
- 20 effects in patients were sequelae, chronic pain, ~~stress~~ and increased medical doctor visits after
- 21 ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity ~~of 10% of the most productive~~ and a
- 22 considerable increase in health care access and cost.
- 23
- 24 4. policies should aim to prevent both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences
- 25 among survivors.
- 26

27 **Competing Interest:**

28 None to declare.

29

30 **Funding Statement:**

31 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-

32 profit sectors.

33

34 **Contributorship Statement:**

35 Dr. Frank Mo, leader of the research project, and play the major role in research design, drafted the

36 article and critical review, and advising for data analysis and results interpretation.

37 Dr. Ineke C. Neutel, contributed to data analysis, assisted in research design and data analysis,

38 interpretation, and the report.

39 Dr. Howard Morrison, contributed to research consultation, provided critical review comments, and

40 advising for data analysis and revised critically the article.

41 Mr. Doug Hopkins, assisted in research design, provided literature review and critical comments and

42 signed final version of the manuscript.

43 Ms. Caroline Da Silva, participated in research design, provided critical review comments and signed

44 final version of the manuscript.

45 Ms. Ying Jiang, contributed to research design, provided literature and critical review comments, and

46 signed final version of the manuscript for submission.

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Formatted: Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a serious public health issue with a major impact on the lives of Canadians. They are leading causes of death and hospitalization, as well as of disability, loss of productivity and potential years of life lost (PYLL) [1]. ~~Sequelae-4]. Sequelae~~ from injuries ~~can impact the quality of life for individuals and population levels, such as include~~ activity limitation, functional disability and pain ~~as process influenced by which in turn influence~~ a variety of social, psychological, ~~labour force,~~ and economic factors [2-5]. ~~A rather complete-8]. An~~ analysis of ~~injury in Canada was based on~~ emergency department (ED) visits and hospitalisation admissions for ~~all of Ontario province [6]. The analysis noted Ontario noted~~ that one in four ED visits were injury-related, as were one in every 17 hospitalisations [6]. These data ~~accentuate accentuated~~ the importance of injuries to the health care system. Other studies have ~~also~~ demonstrated the increasing medical doctor (MD) ~~contact contacts~~, the use more medications for pain, more days in hospital, and more hours of home care services [6-8,9-11].

Several studies of traumatic disability have also focused on injuries resulting in hospitalization [9,12], types of injury [10-11,13-14], and serious head injuries [12]. ~~Moreover, 15]. One study reported that~~ half of patients had some limitation in activity for two days or more due to injury, and patients

Formatted: Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 treated in the clinic were somewhat more likely to have two or more days of limited activity than were
11 patients treated in the ED [~~13~~16].

12
13
14
15 Injuries are not only largely preventable, but the impact of injuries ~~could also~~ can usually be
16 lessened. ~~In order to~~ To develop effective policies leading to the prevention of injuries and ~~reduced to~~
17 reduce the impact of injuries on society, information is needed about the influenced effects that
18
19 individuals with injuries treated in the primary care setting and not requiring hospitalization frequently
20
21 result in significant functional impairment and to identify those injuries which, by virtue of their
22
23 contribution to disability, would be targets for prevention programs.
24
25

26
27
28 The objectives of this study are to explore the immediate and longer term consequences of injury
29 including physical, psychological, social and occupational functioning. This comprises a longitudinal
30 population health study, which will measure the impact of injuries on individual's and population level
31
32 health status and well-being due to activity-limiting injuries (ALI) in the NPHS from 1994 to 2006 in
33
34 Canada.
35
36

37 38 39 40 **METHODS**

41 42 **METHODOLOGY**

43 44 **Study population**

45 The source population for this study ~~is was~~ the Canadian National Population Health Survey
46 (NPHS), from 1994/1995 (cycle 1) to 2006/2007 (cycle 7) ~~with 17,276~~. The study population was
47
48 designed to be representative of the ~~respondents in~~ Canadian population with the ~~survey except~~
49
50

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

~~for~~exception of persons living on Indian reserves or on Canadian Forces bases [~~6, 89, 11~~]. The sample design ~~is~~was a multiple cluster [~~14~~–~~17~~], ~~ideal for controlling costs when personal interviews are needed, as was the case for cycle 1 of the NPHS. To cover as much as possible of the Canadian population, separate components of the survey were also carried out in the Territories and in health care institutions. In the Territories, a simpler stratified design was used. As well, anticipating the creation of Nunavut, separate strata were formed for each of the future territories, Nunavut and NWT [17].~~ The sampling frame for the first cycle (1994/5) originated with the Canadian Labour Force Survey (CLFS), a multi-stage, stratified sampling technique used for all provinces except Quebec for which a provincial sampling frame was used [~~14~~]. ~~In the second cycle 1996–1997 the NPHS started using 17,276 of the respondents for a longitudinal component. For~~. From the 2000 cycle ~~a few changes onward~~, additional questions were ~~made in~~added to the questionnaire ~~including, such as~~ more detailed questions on health care use after the ALI, ~~with the result that some analyses are restricted to data from 2000 to 2006~~.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Nearly all respondents were re-interviewed biennially by telephone except for individuals without a telephone, for whom face to face interviews were used. Interviewers were instructed to follow all reasonable strategies to trace people. Response rates were 83.6% ~~from~~for cycle one ~~to~~, 92.8% for cycle two ~~92.8%~~, 88.3% for cycle three ~~88.3%~~, 84.9% for cycle four ~~84.9%~~, 80.8% for cycle five ~~80.8%~~, 77.6% for cycle six ~~77.6%~~, and 77.0% for cycle seven ~~77.0%~~.

~~For the present study, interview~~ To look at ADIs resulting from new injuries, data for cycles ~~for~~from 1996 to 2006 were used; data for 1994 was only used for the “before and after” analysis (Table

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

6). Data were used from respondents who were willing to share their data for data analysis, ~~and~~ who completed all interviews to date, ~~and~~ ~~achieved ages~~ who achieved the age of 20 and over before 2006. Since the source population, i.e. the total NPHS population, covered more ages than ~~the study~~ ~~population, i.e.~~ the population analysed for this study, it was possible to add younger persons from the source population to our study population after the cycle at which they reached age of 20 years old. Consequently, the study population changed somewhat over the years of the study, ~~1996 to 2006~~ allowing comparable cross-sectional analysis of populations with the same age range and age distribution.

Variables

The interview ranged from background questions (age, sex, education, marital status, income, residence, height and weight) to health-related questions (self-perceived health status, health care utilization and medication use). ~~For this study the answers were dichotomized.~~ Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared [~~15~~18]. A BMI of 30 ~~and/or~~ over was considered obese. Respondents were asked to rate their health as one of five categories: excellent, very good, good, fair or poor and for this study, the lower two categories were combined as poorer health and the top three as good health. Depression and stress were measured by the following questions: “have you had 2 weeks in a row during the past 12 months when you were sad, blue, or depressed?” and “During the past month, about how often did you feel: ... so sad that nothing could cheer you up? ... nervous? ... restless or fidgety? ... hopeless?... worthless?”. A question about number of visits to any type of physician or medical specialist in the past year was dichotomized as: “five or more visits, versus fewer than five visits”. Alcohol consumption was based on a series of question on the

Formatted: Widow/Orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Tab stops: Not at -0.76" + -0.5" + 0" + 0.5" + 1" + 1.5" + 2" + 2.5" + 3" + 3.5" + 4" + 4.5" + 5" + 5.5" + 6" + 6.5" + 7" + 7.5" + 8" + 8.5" + 9" + 9.5" + 10" + 10.5" + 11" + 11.5" + 12" + 12.5" + 13"

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 number of drinks consumed each day of the past seven days before the interview. For this study, this
11 was expressed as drinking nine or more drinks per week, versus drinking eight or less. In this study,
12 “alcohol used 5+ at a time” was defined as “How often in the past week have you had 5 or more drinks
13 on one occasion?”. The variable “hospital treatment” was described as “Did you receive any medical
14 attention for this injury from a health professional within 48 hours?” For example, doctor, hospital
15 emergency room. Quartiles of total household income were calculated for the study population ~~and, with~~
16 the lower two quartiles combined for the low income category to be compared to the top two as
17 highest ~~the high~~ income category. ~~A three part physical~~ A Physical activity index was calculated based
18 on ~~kilo-calories~~ kilocalories per kilogram of body weight per day expended (KKD). Physically active
19 ~~iswas~~ defined as energy expenditure of at least 3 KKD; ~~moderately active corresponds to energy~~
20 ~~expenditure between 1.5 and 3 KKD;~~ and physically inactive ~~iswas~~ defined as less than 1.5 KKD.
21 Medication use was elicited by the question: “In the past 30 days, did you take . . . ?” This was
22 followed by a series of questions, such as “Did you take antidepressants?²² and or anti-stressants?” “Did
23 you take anything for pain?” A 'no' answer to the question "Are you usually free of pain and
24 discomfort?" was taken as indication that the respondent often suffered pain. ▲

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 The definition of injury in the NPHS data was “In the past 12 months, did you have any injuries
40 serious enough to limit your normal activities?” If more than one injury, the following questions were to
41 refer to the most serious one. A separate question asked respondents a general question about
42 limitations in activity, “Because of a long-term physical or mental condition or a health problem,
43 ~~are~~ have you limited in the kind or amount of activity you ~~can~~ could do: at home? at school? at work? in
44 other activities²²?” Otherwise, they should be defined as non-activity limiting.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

Data Analysis

For the statistical analysis, SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used. Logistic regression ~~provided was used to calculate~~ odds ratios (OR) with the presence/absence of ALI as the dependent variable, adjusted for age (in single years) and sex. Since the data were collected as a statistical sample of the Canadian population, the 'weight' option was used in all SAS statistical analyses to make the results representative of the Canadian population from 1994 to 2006 in seven cycles of cross-sectional studies. Weights were provided by Statistics Canada according to their sampling procedures. In order to produce a meaningful estimate of the variance for the weighted results, the weights were adjusted using the formula: [average weight = (sample weight/sum of the sample weights) * sample size].

In order to determine the characteristics, life style and health status, medical attention and health care utilization as well as activity limitation and disability, which were impacted by ALI, all new injury cases, i.e., those who had not reported an injury in the previous interview were identified. For each new case, data from three cycles were selected, 1) the cycle before reporting, 2) the cycle of reporting, 3) the cycle after reporting. Data for the 1994 cycle were used only in this 'before and after' analysis. Only the first recorded ALI report per person was included. The McNemar test option in SAS was used for matched analysis. This study approved by the research ethics committee of Health Canada.

RESULTS

The numbers of ALI in ~~adult Canadians~~ the study population increased from 755 cases in 1996 to 1,006 in 2006 (~~not shown in table~~). The weighted prevalence of all ALI increased steadily from 10.5%

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. ~~The population is showing~~ Those reporting ALI showed increasing trends in
11 obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use, and potential injury sequelae, such as pain,
12 stress and depression but declining trends in lower income and current smoking (Table 1). The
13
14 proportion of injuries which resulted in activity limitations were higher for males, and increased more
15
16 over time than for females (Table 2) s. Furthermore, younger adults (20-49 yrs.) were more likely to
17
18 report activity limiting injuries (12.2% to 14.0%) compared to older (50+ yrs.) adults (8.6% to
19
20 9.8%). Among respondents who reported a ALI, the weighted percentages of who reported five or more
21
22 visits to a medical doctor (MD) visits within the previous year decreased from 29.8% in 2000 to
23
24 25.3%,% in 2006. emergency department (ED) visits went from 34.0% to 28.8%, and hospital admission
25
26 within 48 hours after the injury went from 6.5% to 4.9% from 2000-2006 for all ALI (Table 23). The
27
28 rate of hospital admissions within 48 hours for adults aged 50+ years was higher than that of young aged
29
30 (20-49) group. Rates of ALI for males were higher and increased more than for females. Furthermore,
31
32 younger adults (20-49 yrs.) tended to have more ALI (12.2% to 14.0%) than the older (50+ yrs.) adults
33
34 (8.6% to 9.8%) (Table 3).
35
36
37

38 The most frequent types of ALI frequently reported injuries resulting in activity limitation were
39
40 sprains and strains (42%), followed by fractures and dislocations (20%), and cuts, punctures and bites
41
42 (10%) (Table 4). Only 3.3 to 5.0% of ALI/ALIs were in the category of brain, internal and multiple
43
44 injuries. Men tendended to have more cuts, punctures and bites while women havehad more scrapes,
45
46 bruises and blisters. Younger ages tendended to have more sprains and strains and older ages more
47
48 fractures and dislocations (Table 4).
49
50
51

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 _____ Logistic regression analysis indicated that younger age groups and male participants were more
11 impacted by ALI, ~~the OR for the 20-39 age group and males is more than for females for most years.~~
12 Only a few of the other variables ~~show~~showed associations with ALI - immigrants ~~have~~had consistently
13 lower rates of ALI, while people ~~consuming~~consumed nine or more alcoholic drinks per week ~~have~~had
14 significantly higher rates. (Table 5).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Attributes ~~in the interview cycle before the~~of persons with an ALI were compared ~~with the rates~~
22 in the ~~interview year with the ALI~~cycles before and ~~rates in the cycle after the ALI~~their injury (Table 6).
23 ~~Some attributes~~Most behavioural risk factors examined showed ~~higher rates for the cycle with the ALI~~
24 ~~compared to the previous one, i.e., a pattern of an increase from the~~ two years earlier, and then
25 ~~continued~~previous to the ~~higher rate in ALI to the next cycle, i.e., time of the ALI to a further increase the~~
26 two years after the ALI. ~~This~~A similar pattern was ~~true for limited activity, medical doctor (MD) visits,~~
27 ~~experiencing pain, medication use for pain, sedatives/ tranquilizers, and antidepressants for the patients~~
28 ~~with stress and depression (P<0.001)~~observed for health status and interactions with the health care
29 ~~system.~~ (Table 6).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 DISCUSSION

41 ~~Clearly, the impact of ALI can be found~~Based on several different levels. ~~Immediate~~
42 ~~consequences were experienced by the NPHS data,~~ more than 10% of the ~~adult~~ Canadian population
43 ~~who~~ annually ~~report~~experience an ALI, with ~~rates~~the proportion increasing from 10.5% in 1996 to
44 12.8% in 2006. According to the definition of ALI as activity-limiting injuries, all people with ALI
45 ~~experience~~experienced a certain amount of disruption of their daily activities with the impact varying
46
47
48
49
50
51

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 according to the type and severity of their injury and depending on their customary type of activity [~~16-~~
11 ~~19]. The most severe injury includes the 3-6% of ALI with brain, internal and multiple injuries. 22].~~
12
13 About 20% of ~~ALI~~ ALIs were fractures and dislocations, many of whom ~~neessitate~~ necessitated a period
14 of altered activity. ~~The elderly~~ Older people ~~are~~ were more likely to ~~experience~~ report fractures than the
15 younger age groups. The most common injuries ~~are~~ were sprains and strains, the impact of which also
16 ~~varies~~ varied a great deal depending on type and severity [~~20-21]. Groups most impacted by ALI were~~
17 ~~men and the younger ages, and thus more likely to have their busy schedules and possibly income, as~~
18 ~~well as that of their families disrupted. A widespread~~ 23-24]. An important impact of injuries is on the
19 workplace through absenteeism and on the family through the disruption of customary activities- [~~25-~~
20 26]. Besides the impact of injuries on every day activities, there ~~is~~ was also the impact on the health care
21 system- ~~About~~ [27]. In our data, in 2000, about two thirds of people with ALI sought some kind of
22 medical care ~~in the year 2000~~. Evidence was presented showing that the impact of ALI might be even
23 more far-reaching, as seen by the higher levels of medical care, and continued pain remaining two years
24 after the ALI were reported.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Other ~~researches~~ research on injuries ~~have~~ has used a variety of definition of injuries, based on
39 different sources of information. Questions in the NPHS were able to put these other measures in
40 perspective ~~when compared to ALI~~. For example, some studies ~~use~~ used hospital-based data [~~22~~ 28], but
41 the present study ~~shows~~ showed that only about 5% of ALI ~~are admitted to~~ were resulted in a hospital
42 admission within the first 48 hours ~~of~~ after the event. Assuming that all injuries that ~~require~~ required
43 hospitalization ~~are~~ were within the activity-limiting rubric, it is clear that studies ~~done on~~ using only
44 hospital data would include only a small portion of important injuries [~~23~~ 29]. However, the hospitalized
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 injuries will be the more severe injuries which ~~take~~are responsible for a disproportional share of the
11 health care cost and disability [~~22~~25]. Other studies have used ED visits as a unit of measurement [~~6~~9].
12
13 The present study showed less than one third of ALI went to an ED to obtain treatment. Again, the latter
14 ~~are~~were the more severe injuries or those needing specialized treatment, e.g., casts on fractures, and
15 thus ~~have~~had a greater impact on daily life and cost. Another source of data commonly used has been
16 mortality data. Although deaths are definitely activity-limiting, obviously, none ~~are~~were included in this
17 study. ~~Mortality rates will also refer to a quite~~Fatal injuries reflect a different range of injuries than
18 ~~those for~~ALI. For example, in an US study, firearm-related injuries were 22% of all injury deaths,
19 second only to traffic accident related injuries, but firearms amounted to less than 1% for non-fatal
20 injuries [~~8~~11]. Thus, different measuring units for measuring injury rates will target different slices of
21 the spectrum of injuries and provide different results. ALI are of special public health importance, but
22 ~~are~~not sufficiently studied.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Another level of impact resulting from ALI would consist of impact ~~on~~on the health care
35 system. Approximately 60% of people with ALI ~~obtain~~obtained medical care of some type. Of these,
36 approximately one third of persons with ALI went to ED to experience the often long wait before
37 receiving treatment. Back at home the patient would not only experience the pain and disability of the
38 ALI, but also the need to negotiate the health care system, such as making appointments with
39 physicians, specialists, physiotherapists, etc., finding transportation, often needing someone to
40 accompany them [~~24-27~~30-33]. Even though the proportion of the population with ALI increased over
41 the years 2000-2006, decreases were seen in use of primary care and the hospital ED visits as well as
42 hospitalisation. This decrease in health care use could be an indication either of greater difficulty in
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 accessing health care, or ~~that the ALI reported becoming less severe~~nature of ALIs has moderated over
11 the years. Berdahl found variation by ethnic group and sex, both in the reporting of work-related
12 injuries and in the seeking of medical care and the change in ethnic composition over the years could
13 also be a factor in the NPHS data [~~28-30~~34-36]. In any case, ALI are suffered by a large proportion of
14 the population annually, and a majority of these seek medical treatment whether primary care, ED or
15 hospital care. ~~Some of these would need an ambulance for transportation.~~ Clearly, this entails a large
16 cost to the health care system and any prevention would not only improve quality of life of the putative
17 victims but also would result in significantly lower health care costs.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 Another type of impact would be long-term changes after the injury. The 'before and after' data
28 available in the NPHS consisted of comparing the cross-sectional data from the interview cycle before
29 the ALI with the data of the cycle reporting the ALI and with the next cycle after the ALI. While the
30 interviews for each respondent could be linked for the 'before and after' cycles it was more difficult to
31 determine which changes in attributes in the year of the ALI or subsequent years were sequela of the
32 ALI. For example, it might make sense that the increasing obesity for people with ALI be linked to
33 after-effects, e.g. [~~34~~37], due to inactivity resulting from the ALI but, in fact, similar changes ~~are~~were
34 happening in the overall population. Given these caveats, we can note that no changes were found for
35 smoking and little change in excessive alcohol use. Most likely to show long-term effects due to ALI
36 were visits to medical doctors and ongoing pain. People with ALI showed increasing likelihood of
37 visiting a MD at least five times during the year which ~~continued~~continued for the subsequent cycle.
38 Similarly pain increased in the cycle with the ALI and remained high over the years. Although this is
39 weak evidence, it confirms work on long-term effects of other researchers [~~32-33~~38-39] and again
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 emphasizes the impact of ALI in the population.

11
12
13 Injuries have been found to lead to lost productivity, medical costs, compensation ~~costs~~ and
14 ~~possibly~~ long-term health problems and disability [~~34-36~~40-42], which was confirmed by the present
15 results for the Canadian population. Many injuries can be prevented and a better understanding of all
16 aspects of injuries will lead to better ways of prevention or the minimizing of their effects. However,
17 collaboration and cooperation is needed [~~37~~43]. The European Union has committed itself to reducing
18 number of traffic fatalities from ~~450~~45,000 to ~~235~~25,000 by 2010, which as ~~Goule et al., several reports,~~
19 point out, will require strong measures against use of alcohol [~~38-41~~,44-47] and illicit and medicinal
20 drugs before driving [~~42~~48]. A difficulty in injury prevention is the multi-faceted aspect of injuries. For
21 example, a fall may have many causes, such as unsafe working conditions or slippery stairs at home.
22 Each of these issues would require different approaches to prevention. Similar diversities are found for
23 most other types of injuries. With all difficulties inherent in devising effective interventions, prevention
24 is still the best approach to lower the tremendous impact of ALI on the Canadian population.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The NPHS data have important strengths, such as its representativeness of the Canadian
39 population and its longitudinal nature. Because of the longitudinal design, it was possible to identify
40 new ALI, meaning no ALI in the previous interview, and compare risk factors before and after the event,
41 as well as its consequences. The 'before and after' comparisons of the same person allowed for matched
42 analysis at different times. Important also is the extensive and consistent information available on each
43 respondent over the multiple cycles of the survey, such as type of ALI, and the medical care needed.
44 Besides strengths, the NPHS also has limitations. ~~In spite of the abundance of data available, further~~
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 ~~information is always desirable for particular uses of the data.~~ One issue is the lack of distinction
11 between intentional and unintentional injuries, ~~another is the large time spans over which the~~
12 ~~information is available.~~ Another issue is that of self-reported data. Part of self-reporting is recall of
13 events. Recall of having had an ALI has been shown elsewhere to be less accurate with increasing time
14 and is also likely to vary with the severity of the injury [43-44,49-50]. Both of these would likely lead
15 to an under-reporting of ALI. In spite of its limitations the NPHS gives an invaluable view of the level
16 of serious injury in the Canadian adult population over a 12 year time period.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Another strength of these data is the use of ALI as a measurement of injury. There are various
26 units of measurement in measuring rates of injury in a population. The unit of measurement used in the
27 present study consists of the most serious ALI over the previous 12 months, excluding repetitive strains
28 injuries. The use of ALI means the delimitation of a particular kind of injury in the spectrum of injuries
29 as a concept meaningful to both respondent and researchers. In addition, it identifies a type of injury
30 sufficiently severe to impact a person's regular routine.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 CONCLUSION

39
40 The findings from this study quantified the immediate and long term impact of individuals and
41 population level injuries in Canada. The immediate impact was pain, disability, and disruption of regular
42 life. ~~The two thirds seeking medical care needed time, effort and know how to negotiate the health care~~
43 ~~system, let alone transportation and other related help.~~ Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain
44 and increased medical doctor's visits remaining two years after the ALI. Population impact included
45 loss of productivity ~~of 10% of the most productive~~ and a considerable increase in health care access and
46
47
48
49
50
51

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

cost. This study also particularly contributes to injury prevention in social and psychological health services to help injured people make a better recovery and maintain the quality of life after injuries.

For peer review only

Formatted: [RefList], Font: Bold, Font color: Auto, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Space After: 12 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.3 li, Tab stops: 0.25", Right + 0.38", Left + Not at -0.76" + -0.5" + 6.5" + 7" + 7.5" + 8" + 8.5" + 9" + 9.5" + 10" + 10.5" + 11" + 11.5" + 12" + 12.5" + 13"

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

REFERENCES

1. Centre for Surveillance Coordination HC. Injury Surveillance in Canada: Current realities and Challenges. Ottawa: 2003; Health Canada.
2. [Holtslag HR, Beeck EF van, Lichtveld RA, et al. Individual and population burdens of major trauma in the Netherlands. *Bull World Health Organ* 2008; 86:111–117.](#)
3. [Lyons RA, Kendrick D, Towner EM, et al. Measuring the Population Burden of Injuries—Implications for Global and National Estimates: A Multi-centre Prospective UK Longitudinal Study. *PLoS Med* 2011; 8\(12\): e1001140. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001140.](#)
4. [Rivara FP, Thompson RS, Thompson, DC Calonge N. Injuries to Children and Adolescents: Impact on Physical Health. *Pediatrics* 1991;88:783-788.](#)
5. Frank JW, Brooker AS, DeMaio S et al. Disability resulting from occupational low back pain part II: What do we know about secondary prevention? A review of the scientific evidence on prevention after disability begins. *Spine*. 1996; 21(24):2918–2929.
6. Krause N, Frank JW, Dasinger LK et al. Determinants of duration of disability and return to work after work-related injury and illness: Challenges for future research. *Am J Indust Ind Med*. 2001; 40:464–484.
7. Krause N, Ragland DR. Occupational disability due to low back pain: A new interdisciplinary classification based on a phase model of disability. *Spine*. 1994;19(9):1011–1020.
8. Verbrugge LM, Jette AM. The disablement process. *Soc Sci Med*. 1994;38(1):1–14.
9. MacPherson AK-, Schull M, Manuel D et al. Injuries in Ontario: ICES Atlas. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences 2005;
10. MacKenzie EJ-. Epidemiology of injuries: current trends and future challenges. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2000; 22:-112-9.
11. Schneier AJ, Shields BJ, Hostetler SG et al. Incidence of Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury and Associated Hospital Resource Utilization in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2006;-118 (2):483-492.
12. Mayer T, Walker ML, Clark P. Further experience with a modified Abbreviated Injury Severity Scale. *J Trauma*. 1984;-24:31-34.
13. Kraus JF, Fife D, Conroy C. Pediatric brain injuries: the nature, clinical course, and early outcomes in a defined United States' population. *Pediatrics*. 1987;-79:501-507.

Formatted: [RefList], Font color: Auto, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Formatted: Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font color: Auto, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font color: Auto, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font color: Auto, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 ~~414~~. Casey R, Ludwig S, McCormick MC. Morbidity following minor head trauma in children.
11 Pediatrics. 1986;78:497-502.

12 ~~4215~~. Kraus JP, Fife D, Cox P et al. Incidence, severity and external causes of pediatric brain injury.
13 AJDC. 1986;140:687-693.

14 ~~4316~~. Rivara FP, Calonge N, and Thompson R. Population-Based Study of Unintentional Injury
15 Incidence and Impact during Childhood. Am J Public Health. 1989;79:990-994.

16 ~~4417~~. Tambay J-L, Catlin G. Sample design of the National Population Health Survey. Health Reports
17 (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-003). 2006;7(1):29-38.

18 ~~4518~~. World Health Organization. What are overweight and obesity? Factsheet 2006; N° 311.

19 ~~4619~~. Majori S, Ricci G, Capretta F et al. Epidemiology of domestic injuries. A survey in an emergency
20 department in North-East Italy. J Prev Med Hyg. 2009;50:164-9.

21 ~~4720~~. Scheiman S, Moghaddas HS, Bjornstig U et al. Bicycle injury events among older adults in
22 Northern Sweden: a 10-year population based study. Accid Anal Prev. 2010;42:758-63.

23 ~~4821~~. Ahmed LA, Schirmer H, Bjornerem A et al. The gender- and age-specific 10-year and lifetime
24 absolute fracture risk in Tromso, Norway. Eur J Epidemiol. 2009;24:441-8.

25 ~~4922~~. Ahmed LA, Emaus N, Berntsen GK, et al. Bone loss and the risk of non-vertebral fractures in
26 women and men: the Tromso study. Osteoporos Int. 2010;21: 1503-11.

27 ~~2023~~. Aschkenasy MT, Rothenhaus TC. Trauma and falls in the elderly. Emerg Med Clin North Am.
28 2006; 24:413-32.

29 ~~2124~~. Wilkins K. Medications and fall-related fractures in the elderly. Health Rep. 1999;11:45-53.

30 ~~2225~~. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Getting back to work after injury: the UK Burden
31 of Injury multicentre longitudinal study. BMC Public Health 2012;1 (12):584.

32 ~~26~~. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Making a successful return to work: the UK burden
33 of injury multicentre longitudinal study. Br J Gen Pract 2012 Feb; 62(595):e82-
34 90.10.3399/bjgp12X625139.

35 ~~27~~. Franche RL, Krause N. Readiness for Return to Work Following Injury or Illness: Conceptualizing
36 the Interpersonal Impact of Health Care, Workplace, and Insurance Factors. JOccup Rehabil 2002;
37 December 12 (4):233-256.

38 ~~28~~. Frisina PG, Guellnitz R, Alverzo J. A time series analysis of falls and injury in the inpatient
39 rehabilitation setting. Rehabil Nurs. 2010;35:141-6.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

2329. Pickett W, Hartling L, Brison RJ. A population-based study of hospitalized injuries in Kingston, Ontario, identified via the Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program. *Chronic Dis Can*. 1997;18:61-9.

Formatted: Font: Italic

2430. Dryden DM, Saunders LD, Rowe BH et al. Utilization of health services following spinal cord injury: a 6-year follow-up study. *Spinal Cord*. 2004; 42:513-525.

Formatted: Font: Italic

2531. Brown JA, Shannon HS, McDonough P et al. Healthcare Use of Families of Injured Workers Before and After a Workplace Injury in British Columbia, Canada. *Healthcare Policy*. 2007; 2(3):1-124.

Formatted: Font: Italic, English (Canada)

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font color: Auto, English (Canada)

2632. Berthelot J-M and the Project Team. Injury hospitalizations and socio-economic status. Ottawa, Ontario: 2010; CIHI.

2733. Compston J. Osteoporosis: social and economic impact. *Radiol Clin North Am*. 2010;48:477-82.

Formatted: Font: Italic

2834. Berdahl TA, Zodet M. Medical care utilization for work-related injuries in the United States 2002-2006. *Med Care*. 2010;48:645-51.

Formatted: Font: Italic

2935. de Castro AB, Fujishiro K, Rue T et al. Associations between work schedule characteristics and occupational injury and illness. *Int Nurs Rev*. 2010;57:188-94.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3036. Lombardi DA, Folkard S, Willetts JL et al. Daily sleep, weekly working hours, and risk of work-related injury: US National Health Interview Survey (2004-2008). *Chronobiol Int*. 2010;27(5):1013-30.

Formatted: Font: Italic, French (Canada)

Formatted: French (Canada)

3137. Bergkvist D, Hekmat K, Svensson T, et al. Obesity in orthopedic patients. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*. 2009; 5:670-2.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3238. Cameron CM, Kliewer EV, Purdie DM et al. Long term health outcomes after injury in working age adults: a systematic review. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60:341-4.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

3339. Toft AM, Moller H, Laursen B. The years after an injury: long-term consequences of injury on self-rated health. *J Trauma*. 2010;69:26-30.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3440. Borgstrom F, Zethraeus N, Johnell O, et al. Costs and quality of life associated with osteoporosis-related fractures in Sweden. *Osteoporos Int*. 2006;17:637-50.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3541. Brainsky A, Glick H, Lydick E, et al. The economic cost of hip fractures in community-dwelling older adults: a prospective study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1997;45:281-7.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3642. Hendrie D, Hall SE, Arena G et al. Health system costs of falls of older adults in Western Australia. *Aust Health Rev*. 2004; 28:363-73.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3743. Sleet DA, Moffett DB. Framing the problem: injuries and public health. *Fam Community Health*. 2009;32:88-97.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

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

3844. Desapriya E, Pike I, Raina P. Severity of alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes in British Columbia: case - control study. *Int J Contr Saf Promot*. 2006;-13:-89-94.

Formatted: Font: Italic

3945. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Robinson E et al. The contribution of alcohol to falls at home among working-aged adults. *Alcohol*. 2008;-42:-383-8.

Formatted: Font: Italic

4046. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Jackson R. The role of alcohol in unintentional falls among young and middle-aged adults: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Inj Prev*. 2009; 15:-341-7.

Formatted: Font: Italic

4147. Ahlm K, Bjornstig U, Ostrom M. Alcohol and drugs in fatally and non-fatally injured motor vehicle drivers in northern Sweden. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2009; 41:129-36.

Formatted: Font: Italic

4248. Gouille JP, Verstraete A, Boulu R, et al. Illicit drugs, medications and traffic accidents. *Ann Pharm Fr*. 2008;-66:-196-205.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

4349. Wilkins K, Mackenzie SG. Work injuries. *Health Rep*. 2007;-18:-25-42.

Formatted: Font: Italic

4450. Warner M, Schenker N, Heinen MA et al. The effects of recall on reporting injury and poisoning episodes in the National Health Interview Survey. *Inj Prev*. 2005;-11:-282-7.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Line spacing: single

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

Table 1: Weighted percentages The estimated percent of characteristics of ALI for which were impacted adult Canadians reporting an activity limiting injury in the previous year based on the study population, NPHS, Canada, 1994 data, 1996-2006

Year	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
	wt% ⁺	wt% ⁺	wt% ⁺	wt% ⁺	wt% ⁺	wt% ⁺
Total Number ²	7,313	7,529	7,717	7,875	8,085	8,324
ALI (wt%) <u>All</u>	10.5	10.9	11.4	12.6	12.6	12.8
Background variables						
Partner <u>Married/common law</u>	71.0	69.3	68.2	66.2	65.7	64.7
Low income	40.0	34.2	27.9	26.0	23.5	19.8
Completed High School	89.6	89.9	89.3	84.7	84.5	84.5
Rural	17.9	20.5	21.0	20.6	19.9	22.0
Immigrant	17.5	17.3	16.8	16.2	16.1	15.7
Health related variables						
Current smoking	22.7	21.3	20.4	17.1	17.1	16.0
Inactive	58.3	52.9	56.1	48.3	51.0	45.9
Obese	18.4	21.2	23.0	24.3	25.0	26.4
9+ alcohol drinks/ week	11.0	11.6	11.9	11.8	11.6	14.8
Region of residence						
Atlantic	8.8	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.7
Quebec	25.5	25.6	25.9	26.0	26.1	25.9
Ontario	36.3	36.0	36.0	35.8	36.1	36.2
Prairies	17.0	17.3	17.1	17.4	17.3	17.4
BC	12.5	12.4	12.1	12.0	11.8	11.9
Outcome-related						
Limit Limited activity	17.3	17.8	17.9 18.0	22.9	24.5	26.6
Health Poor health status	33.6	33.2	38.0	41.2	42.3	43.5
5+ Medical Doctor visits /year	24.2	26.3	26.6	27.6	28.3	26.8
Pain	12.3	13.7	13.3	15.1	16.4	15.8
Stress	26.3	29.2	25.0	27.3	28.3	27.4
Depression	6.1	5.8	6.4	6.9	7.1	6.0
Medication use in last 30 years days						
Pain medication	65.6	67.5	70.1	70.2	70.4	70.6
Tranquilizer/ sedative	5.1	5.3	6.8	8.1	8.2	10.0
Antidepressants	3.6	4.4	5.4	5.9	6.9	7.0

⁺ wt% Weighted percentages

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

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

making rates representative of the Canadian population

²Number in study population

<u>Total Number¹</u>	<u>7,313</u>	<u>7,529</u>	<u>7,717</u>	<u>7,875</u>	<u>8,085</u>	<u>8,324</u>
---------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

¹ total number of survey respondents used to calculate weighted percentages representative of the Canadian population

For peer review only

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

Table 2: Percent3: The percent of persons with ALI for which were impacted on medical attention and reporting specific health care resource utilization use among those reporting an ALI by age group and sex groups, NPHS, Canada, 19942000-2006*

Year		2000 wt% [†]	2002 wt% [†]	2004 wt% [†]	2006 wt% [†]
All	Number of ALI	865	932	913	1,005
	None	33.5	40.1	38.5	40.7
	Medical Doctor (MD) visits (5+/year)	29.8	27.1	27.3	25.3
	Emergency Department (ED) visits	34.0	28.5	31.0	28.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.5	5.4	5.5	4.9
	Other	2.7	4.3	3.1	5.2
	Any	66.6	60.0	61.5	59.3
Males	None	33.5	40.1	38.5	40.7
	Number of ALI	394	460	463	482
	None	34.8	42.2	41.6	41.5
	MD visits (5+/year)	26.6	26.5	24.7	23.6
	ED visits	34.5	27.4	30.8	29.7
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	9.5	4.5	4.6	4.1
	Other	4.1	4.0	2.9	5.3
Females	Any	65.2	57.8	58.4	58.5
	None	34.8	42.2	41.6	41.5
	Number of ALI	471	472	450	523
	None	32.3	37.6	34.8	39.7
	MD visits (5+/year)	32.6	27.7	30.5	27.3
	ED visits	33.6	29.9	31.3	27.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	4.0	6.4	6.6	5.7
Age 20-49	Other	1.5	4.7	3.4	5.1
	Any	67.7	62.4	65.2	60.2
	None	32.3	37.6	34.8	39.7
	Number of ALI	588	601	564	590
	None	34.2	40.7	39.7	41.1
	MD visits (5+/year)	29.1	27.7	28.5	24.3
	ED visits	34.3	27.6	28.7	27.3
Age 50+	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.2	4.1	2.9	3.6
	Other	2.5	4.1	3.1	7.3
	Any	65.8	59.3	3.2	58.9
	None	34.2	40.7	39.7	41.1
	Number of ALI	277	331	349	415
	None	31.8	38.6	36.6	40.1
	MD visits (5+/year)	31.5	25.8	25.3	26.9
ED visits	33.6	30.6	34.9	31.1	

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

Hospital admission in 48 hours	7.3	8.1	9.9	6.9
Other	3.2	4.9	3.2	1.9
Any	61.4	59.3	63.5	59.9

31.8 38.6 36.6

* Data on medical treatment was available only from 2000-2006

wt%+
Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population 40.1

None

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Formatted: Right

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

For peer review only

Table 32: Percentages for ALI for which were impacted by activity limitation per year, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006*

Years		2000	2002	2004	2006
	-Injury status	wt%⁺	wt%⁺	wt%⁺	wt%⁺
All	None	85.5	84.0	84.0	82.2
	Activity limiting <u>only(yes)</u>	10.8	12.1	11.6	12.0
	Non-activity <u>Activity</u> limiting <u>(no)</u>	3.1	3.0	3.5	5.1
	Both	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8
Males	None	84.9	82.0	82.2	80.1
	Activity limiting <u>only(yes)</u>	10.5	13.5	13.2	13.2
	Non-activity <u>Activity</u> limiting <u>(no)</u>	3.9	3.9	3.4	5.6
	Both	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.1
Females	None	86.0	85.8	85.7	84.1
	Activity limiting <u>only(yes)</u>	11.1	10.8	10.1	10.9
	Non-activity <u>Activity</u> limiting <u>(no)</u>	2.4	3.0	3.6	4.6
	Both	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5
Ages <u>20-49</u>	None	83.5	81.7	81.2	79.3
	Activity limiting <u>only(yes)</u>	12.2	13.9	13.3	14.0
	Non-activity <u>Activity</u> limiting <u>(no)</u>	3.5	3.7	4.3	5.8
	Both	0.8	0.7	1.3	0.9
Ages <u>50+</u>	None	88.5	87.2	87.4	85.3
	Activity limiting <u>(yes)</u>	8.6	9.5	9.5	9.8
	Non-activity <u>Activity</u> limiting <u>(no)</u>	2.6	3.1	2.5	4.2
	Both	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6

* Data on medical treatment was available only from 2000-2006

⁺wt% - Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

Formatted Table

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

Table 4: The pathology type of activity-limiting injury as a proportion of all activity-limiting injuries ALI for which were impacted on patients' ED visits, admission and length of stay in hospital and consequence, NPHS, Canada, 1994-1996-2006

	Interview cycles	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
N ²	Number of ALI	755	786	865	931	911	1,006
	Patterns of ALI	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%
ALL	Brain, internal, multiple	4.9	3.3	5.8	3.2	3.9	4.3
	Fractures/dislocation	20.6	21.2	19.9	20.3	22.2	24.9
	Burns	5.3	3.3	4.3	2.8	4.3	3.7
	Sprains, strains	42.0	42.3	42.4	47.3	42.8	42.2
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.2	15.5	11.8	11.6	11.1	9.7
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	7.7	6.9	7.8	4.8	7.1	6.3
	Other	9.3	7.5	8.0	10.0	8.6	8.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Males	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	2.8	5.0	2.4	4.1	4.5
	Fractures/dislocation	21.3	21.5	21.5	20.3	21.0	26.1
	Burns	5.8	2.4	3.9	3.5	4.6	2.7
	Sprains, strains	39.6	42.6	40.5	47.2	41.7	39.8
	Cuts, punctures, bites	12.2	17.4	16.7	13.9	13.6	13.1
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	6.2	5.2	5.7	4.4	6.2	5.8
	Other	9.5	8.1	6.7	8.3	8.8	8.0
Females	Brain, internal, multiple	4.3	3.9	6.4	3.8	3.6	4.2
	Fractures/dislocation	19.8	21.0	18.5	21.6	23.6	23.3
	Burns	4.5	4.1	4.7	3.6	4.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	45.0	41.9	44.1	46.0	44.3	44.9
	Cuts, punctures, bites	7.8	13.3	7.7	9.1	7.9	6.0
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	9.5	8.9	9.5	6.4	8.2	7.0
	Other	9.1	6.9	9.1	9.5	8.4	9.8
Age 20-49	Brain, internal, multiple	4.8	3.3	4.9	3.1	3.7	3.0
	Fractures/dislocation	17.4	19.8	22.5	17.4	18.2	22.9
	Burns	5.5	3.3	4.1	3.5	5.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	43.8	47.2	42.8	51.3	50.9	46.3
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.9	15.5	11.5	10.7	9.4	9.4

Formatted Table

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

10	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	8.5	5.0	7.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
11	Other	9.1	5.9	6.7	9.5	8.4	9.0
12	Age 50+ Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	3.4	7.6	3.4	4.2	6.3
13	Fractures/dislocation	30.8	24.9	13.8	26.4	29.0	27.9
14	Burns	4.3	3.0	4.9	1.4	3.3	1.9
15	Sprains, strains	36.2	30.2	41.7	39.0	29.1	35.8
16	Cuts, punctures, bites	8.1	15.2	12.5	13.4	13.7	10.3
17	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	5.1	11.7	8.5	5.4	11.7	9.1
18	Other	10.1	11.6	11.0	11.0	9.0	8.7

¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

² Number of ALI in study population

Table 5: Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence interval (C.I.) of ALI for which were impacted by life style and socioeconomic status, adjusted for sex and age, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		1996		1998		2000		2002		2004		← 2006		
		OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	
Age groups														
	M/F	1.4*	1.1 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.6	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.4	
	20-39	2.1*	1.6 - 2.9	1.9*	1.5 - 2.4	1.8*	1.4 - 2.3	2.2*	1.8 - 2.7	1.8*	1.5 - 2.2	2.2*	1.8 - 2.6	
	40-59	1.6*	1.1 - 2.1	1.4*	1.1 - 1.8	1.3	1.0 - 1.6	1.6*	1.3 - 2.0	1.3	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.2 - 1.8	
	60+ (reference)	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	
Background variables²														
	Married/ Common-law	yes/no	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.9	0.8 - 1.0
	Income	low/high	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4
	Completed High School	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
	Rural	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
	Non-English Immigrant	yes/no	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.7	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
		yes/no	0.6*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.7*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9
Health related³														
	Current Smoking	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.1
	Physical Inactivity	yes/no	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 0.9	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
	Obese	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
	Alcohol Drink /week	9+/less	1.2	0.9 - 1.5	1.2*	1.0 - 1.6	1.3*	1.0 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.8	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.3 - 1.8
	Alcohol 5+ at time	weekly/less	1.3*	1.0 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.2*	1.0 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5

Formatted Table

For sex group, females are the reference group
 For background variables comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group
 For health-related comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group
 * Means that there are statistically significant difference compared with control groups

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

Table 6: ~~Persons with ALI for which were impacted on~~ life style, socioeconomic status, and health care utilization of persons with an activity limiting injury before and after the injury, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		Before	During	After	Pp value*			N**	
		%	%	%	A vs B	B vs C	A vs C		
		A	B	C					
Risky behaviours and socioeconomic status									
Income	low	36.3	32.1	28.5	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	2,892	
Obese	obese	17.8	19.7	22.4	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	1,780	
Physical activity	inactive	50.4	47.1	48.1	0.001	0.197	0.343	3,044	
Smoking	current	19.0	18.5	18.2	0.265	0.384	0.077	1,693	
Alcohol drinking	9+/wk	9.6	10.7	11.2	0.048	0.535	0.349	3,548	
Health-related issues									
Limited activity	yes	18.7	25.5	26.3	<0.001	0.221	<0.001	3,657	
Health status	poor	33.1	36.3	39.6	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,653	
Medical Doctor	visits	5+/year	26.5	34.0	29.8	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,616
Pain	yes	13.7	16.8	17.3	<0.001	0.432	<0.001	3,657	
Stress	yes	29.7	31.3	29.4	0.104	0.050	0.757	2,967	
Medication use in past 30 days before interview									
Pain medication	yes	61.9	70.2	70.8	<0.001	0.489	<0.001	3,640	
Sedatives	/tranquiliser	yes	5.7	7.2	8.1	0.001	0.055	<0.001	3,639
Antidepressants	yes	4.2	5.9	6.2	<0.001	0.346	0.403	3,641	

*P value calculated by McNemar's test

** N of persons making up the matched analysis for the before and after analysis

Formatted Table

Formatted: Line spacing: At least 12 pt

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Page 1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 2, 3
Introduction			Page 4
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 4
Methods			Page 5
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 5, 6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	Page 5, 6
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	Page 5, 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Page 7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Page 7, 8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Page 7, 8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Page 7, 8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Page 7, 8
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	Page 7, 8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Page 7, 8
Results			Page 8

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	Page 5, 6 Page 5, 6 Page 5, 6
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Page 8, 9
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			Page 9-13
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 9, 10, 11
Limitations			Page 12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 9-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 3

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey 1994-2006

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002052.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Jan-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Mo, Frank; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Neutel, Ineke; Department of Epidemiology, University of Ottawa Morrison, Howard; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Hopkins, Doug; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Da Silva, Caroline; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada Jiang, Ying; Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control, Public Health Agency of Canada
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Occupational and environmental medicine, Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, PUBLIC HEALTH, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey**
5 **1994-2006**
6
7

8 Frank Mo¹, PhD; Ineke Neutel², PhD; Howard Morrison, PhD; Doug Hopkins, BA; Caroline Da Silva,
9 BSc; Ying Jiang¹, MSc
10
11

12 **Author references:**
13

14
15 ¹Consumer Product Safety and Injury Risk Assessment Program Working Group
16 Science Integration Division
17 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
18 Public Health Agency of Canada
19
20

21 ²Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **KEYWORDS** Activity limiting injury; impact factors, longitudinal health survey; epidemiology;
31 injury prevention; Canada.
32
33
34

35 **Correspondence to**
36

37
38 Dr. Frank Mo, Science Integration Division
39 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
40 Public Health Agency of Canada
41 Frank.Mo@phac-aspc.gc.ca.
42
43
44

45 **Running title:** Impact of Activity-Limiting Injury trends
46
47

48 **Word count:**

49 Abstract: 300
50 Manuscript: 3,496
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine the prevalence and factors affecting activity-limiting injuries (ALI) on individuals and on the Canadian population; to estimate the short and long term impact on health status and well-being due to ALI in Canada from 1994 to 2006 using the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS).

Design: The NPHS is a randomised longitudinal cohort study with biennial interviews, with information on age, sex, education, marital status, income, residence, height and weight to self-perceived health status, health care utilization and medication use in addition to ALI.

Setting: The study population was a random sample of male and female participants 20 years and older from ten provinces and three territories in Canada.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Logistic regression models were used to assess the potential impact of ALI on individuals and on the Canadian population. The interviews two years before and two years after the ALI were compared to examine long-term effects, and the McNemar test option in SAS was used for the matched analysis.

Results: The immediate impacts of ALI were pain, disability, and disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor visits. Population impact included a considerable increase in health care access and cost. The odds ratios (ORs) for the 20-39 age group compared to those 60+ was OR, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.8-2.7, while the OR associated with being male was 1.4; 95% CI, 1.1-1.6. Individuals consuming nine or more alcoholic drinks per week were also significantly more likely to report an ALI (OR, 1.5; 95% CI, 1.3-1.8).

Conclusion: The findings from this study illustrated the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. Injury control policies should aim to prevent the both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Summary Boxes:

What is already known on this subject?

1. Activity-limiting injuries (ALI) burden such as increased steadily prevalence, mortality and economic costs in Canada;
2. Showing increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use related to ALI;
3. Nature and types related to ALI;

What does this study add?

1. Potential associations between health care utilization and ALI before and after injury;
2. Hospital admission, Department emergency and medical doctors visits impacted on ALI;

3. The immediate individuals impact such as pain, disability, disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were sequelae, chronic pain, and increased medical doctor visits after ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity and a considerable increase in health care access and cost.
4. policies should aim to prevent both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Competing Interest:

None to declare.

Funding Statement:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Contributorship Statement:

Dr. Frank Mo, leader of the research project, and play the major role in research design, drafted the article and critical review, and advising for data analysis and results interpretation.

Dr. Ineke C. Neutel, contributed to data analysis, assisted in research design and data analysis, interpretation, and the report.

Dr. Howard Morrison, contributed to research consultation, provided critical review comments, and advising for data analysis and revised critically the article.

Mr. Doug Hopkins, assisted in research design, provided literature review and critical comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Caroline Da Silva, participated in research design, provided critical review comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Ying Jiang, contributed to research design, provided literature and critical review comments, and signed final version of the manuscript for submission.

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a serious public health issue with a major impact on the lives of Canadians. They are leading causes of death and hospitalization, as well as of disability, loss of productivity and potential years of life lost (PYLL) [1-4]. Sequelae from injuries include activity limitation, functional disability and pain which in turn influence a variety of social, psychological, labour force, and economic factors [5-8]. An analysis of emergency department (ED) visits and hospitalisation admissions for Ontario noted that one in four ED visits were injury-related, as were one in every 17 hospitalisations [9]. These data accentuated the importance of injuries to the health care system. Other studies have demonstrated the increasing medical doctor (MD) contacts, the use more medications for pain, more days in hospital, and more hours of home care services [9-11].

Several studies of traumatic disability have also focused on injuries resulting in hospitalization [12], types of injury [13-14], and serious head injuries [15]. One study reported that half of patients had some limitation in activity for two days or more due to injury, and patients treated in the clinic were somewhat more likely to have two or more days of limited activity than were patients treated in the ED [16].

Injuries are not only largely preventable, but the impact of injuries can usually be lessened. To develop effective policies leading to the prevention of injuries and to reduce the impact of injuries on society, information is needed about the influenced effects that individuals with injuries treated in the primary care setting and not requiring hospitalization frequently result in significant functional

1
2
3
4 impairment and to identify those injuries which, by virtue of their contribution to disability, would be
5
6 targets for prevention programs.
7
8
9

10
11 The objectives of this study are to explore the immediate and longer term consequences of injury
12 including physical, psychological, social and occupational functioning. This comprises a longitudinal
13 population health study, which will measure the impact of injuries on individual's and population level
14 health status and well-being due to activity-limiting injuries (ALI) in the NPHS from 1994 to 2006 in
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Canada.
22
23
24

25 26 **METHODOLOGY**

27 28 **Study population**

29
30 The source population for this study was the Canadian National Population Health Survey
31 (NPHS), from 1994/1995 (cycle 1) to 2006/2007 (cycle 7). The study population was designed to be
32 representative of the Canadian population with the exception of persons living on Indian reserves or on
33 Canadian Forces bases [9, 11]. The sample design was a multiple cluster [17], ideal for controlling costs
34 when personal interviews are needed, as was the case for cycle 1 of the NPHS. To cover as much as
35 possible of the Canadian population, separate components of the survey were also carried out in the
36 Territories and in health care institutions. In the Territories, a simpler stratified design was used. As
37 well, anticipating the creation of Nunavut, separate strata were formed for each of the future territories,
38 Nunavut and NWT [17]. The sampling frame for the first cycle (1994/5) originated with the Canadian
39 Labour Force Survey (CLFS), a multi-stage, stratified sampling technique used for all provinces except
40 Quebec for which a provincial sampling frame was used [17]. From the 2000 cycle onward, additional
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 questions were added to the questionnaire, such as more detailed questions on health care use after the
5
6 ALI, with the result that some analyses are restricted to data from 2000 to 2006
7
8
9

10
11 Nearly all respondents were re-interviewed biennially by telephone except for individuals
12
13 without a telephone, for whom face to face interviews were used. Interviewers were instructed to follow
14
15 all reasonable strategies to trace people. Response rates were 83.6% for cycle one, 92.8% for cycle two,
16
17 88.3% for cycle three, 84.9% for cycle four, 80.8% for cycle five, 77.6% for cycle six and 77.0% for
18
19 cycle seven.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 To look at ADIs resulting from new injuries, data for cycles from 1996 to 2006 were used; data
27
28 for 1994 was only used for the “before and after” analysis (Table 6). Data were used from respondents
29
30 who were willing to share their data for data analysis, who completed all interviews to date, and who
31
32 achieved the age of 20 before 2006. Since the source population, i.e. the total NPHS population,
33
34 covered more ages than the population analysed for this study, it was possible to add younger persons
35
36 from the source population to our study population after the cycle at which they reached age of 20 years
37
38 old. Consequently, the study population changed somewhat over the years of the study allowing
39
40 comparable cross-sectional analysis of populations with the same age range and age distribution.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Variables

48
49 The interview ranged from background questions (age, sex, education, marital status, income,
50
51 residence, height and weight) to health-related questions (self-perceived health status, health care
52
53 utilization and medication use). Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilograms divided
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 by height in meters squared [18]. A BMI of 30 or over was considered obese. Respondents were asked
5
6
7 to rate their health as one of five categories: excellent, very good, good, fair or poor and for this study,
8
9 the lower two categories were combined as poorer health and the top three as good health. Depression
10
11 and stress were measured by the following questions: “have you had 2 weeks in a row during the past 12
13
14 months when you were sad, blue, or depressed?” and “During the past month, about how often did you
15
16 feel: ... so sad that nothing could cheer you up? ... nervous? ... restless or fidgety? ... hopeless?...
17
18 worthless?”. A question about number of visits to any type of physician or medical specialist in the past
19
20 year was dichotomized as: “five or more visits, versus fewer than five visits”. Alcohol consumption was
21
22 based on a series of question on the number of drinks consumed each day of the past seven days before
23
24 the interview. For this study, this was expressed as drinking nine or more drinks per week, versus
25
26 drinking eight or less. In this study, “alcohol used 5+ at a time” was defined as "How often in the past
27
28 week have you had 5 or more drinks on one occasion?". The variable “hospital treatment” was
29
30 described as "Did you receive any medical attention for this injury from a health professional within 48
31
32 hours?" For example, doctor, hospital emergency room. Quartiles of total household income were
33
34 calculated for the study population, with the lower two quartiles combined for the low income category
35
36 to be compared to the top two as the high income category. A Physical activity index was calculated
37
38 based on kilocalories per kilogram of body weight per day expended (KKD). Physically active was
39
40 defined as energy expenditure of at least 3 KKD; and physically inactive was defined as less than 1.5
41
42 KKD. Medication use was elicited by the question: “In the past 30 days, did you take . . . ?” This was
43
44 followed by a series of questions, such as “Did you take antidepressants and or anti-stressants?” “Did
45
46 you take anything for pain?” A 'no' answer to the question "Are you usually free of pain and
47
48 discomfort?" was taken as indication that the respondent often suffered pain.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The definition of injury in the NPHS data was “In the past 12 months, did you have any injuries
5 serious enough to limit your normal activities?” If more than one injury, the following questions were to
6 refer to the most serious one. A separate question asked respondents a general question about
7 limitations in activity, “Because of a long-term physical or mental condition or a health problem, have
8 you limited in the kind or amount of activity you could do: at home? at school? at work? in other
9 activities?”. Otherwise, they should be defined as non-activity limiting.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Data Analysis

22
23 For the statistical analysis, SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used. Logistic
24 regression was used to calculate odds ratios (OR) with the presence/absence of ALI as the dependent
25 variable, adjusted for age (in single years) and sex. Since the data were collected as a statistical sample
26 of the Canadian population, the ‘weight’ option was used in all SAS statistical analyses to make the
27 results representative of the Canadian population from 1994 to 2006 in seven cycles of cross-sectional
28 studies. Weights were provided by Statistics Canada according to their sampling procedures. In order to
29 produce a meaningful estimate of the variance for the weighted results, the weights were adjusted using
30 the formula: [average weight = (sample weight/sum of the sample weights) * sample size].
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In order to determine the characteristics, life style and health status, medical attention and health
43 care utilization as well as activity limitation and disability, which were impacted by ALI, all new injury
44 cases, i.e., those who had not reported an injury in the previous interview were identified. For each new
45 case, data from three cycles were selected, 1) the cycle before reporting, 2) the cycle of reporting, 3) the
46 cycle after reporting. Data for the 1994 cycle were used only in this ‘before and after’ analysis. Only
47 the first recorded ALI report per person was included. The McNemar test option in SAS was used for
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 matched analysis. This study approved by the research ethics committee of Health Canada.
5
6
7
8

9 RESULTS

10
11 The numbers of ALI in the study population increased from 755 cases in 1996 to 1,006 in 2006
12
13 .The weighted prevalence of all ALI increased steadily from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. Those
14
15 reporting ALI showed increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, people who live
16
17 in the rural areas and drank more than 9 drinks per week, medication use, and potential injury sequelae,
18
19 such as pain, stress but declining trends in lower income, current smoking, and immigrants (**Table 1**).
20
21 The proportion of injuries which resulted in activity limitations were higher for males, and increased
22
23 more over time than for females (**Table 2**). Furthermore, younger adults (20-49 yrs.) were more likely
24
25 to report activity limiting injuries (12.2% to 14.0%) compared to older (50+ yrs.) adults (8.6% to
26
27 9.8%).Among respondents who reported a ALI, the weighted percentages who reported five or more
28
29 visits to a medical doctor (MD) within the previous year decreased from 29.8% in 2000 to 25.3% in
30
31 2006, emergency department (ED) visits went from 34.0% to 28.8%, and hospital admission within 48
32
33 hours after the injury went from 6.5% to 4.9% (**Table 3**). The rate of hospital admissions within 48
34
35 hours for adults aged 50+ years was higher than that of young aged (20-49) group.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The most frequently reported injuries resulting in activity limitation were sprains and strains
46
47 (42%), followed by fractures and dislocations (20%), and cuts, punctures and bites (10%) (**Table 4**).
48
49 Only 3.3 to 5.0% of ALIs were in the category of brain, internal and multiple injuries. Men tended to
50
51 have more cuts, punctures and bites while women had more scrapes, bruises and blisters. Younger ages
52
53 tended to have more sprains and strains and older ages more fractures and dislocations.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Logistic regression analysis indicated that younger age groups and male participants were more
8
9 impacted by ALI. Only a few of the other variables showed associations with ALI - immigrants had
10
11 consistently lower rates of ALI, while people consumed nine or more alcoholic drinks per week had
12
13 significantly higher rates (**Table 5**).

14
15
16
17
18
19 Attributes of persons with an ALI were compared in the cycles before and after their injury
20
21 (**Table 6**). Most behavioural risk factors examined showed a pattern of an increase from the two years
22
23 previous to the ALI to the time of the ALI to a further increase the two years after the ALI. A similar
24
25 pattern was observed for health status and interactions with the health care system. (**Table 6**).

30 **DISCUSSION**

31
32
33 Based on NPHS data, more than 10% of the adult Canadian population annually experience an
34
35 ALI, with the proportion increasing from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. According to the definition
36
37 of ALI as activity-limiting injuries, all people with ALI experienced a certain amount of disruption of
38
39 their daily activities with the impact varying according to the type and severity of their injury and
40
41 depending on their customary type of activity [19-22]. About 20% of ALIs were fractures and
42
43 dislocations, many of whom necessitated a period of altered activity. Older people were more likely to
44
45 report fractures than the younger age groups. The most common injuries were sprains and strains, the
46
47 impact of which also varied a great deal depending on type and severity [23-24]. An important impact
48
49 of injuries is on the workplace through absenteeism and on the family through the disruption of
50
51 customary activities [25-26]. Besides the impact of injuries on every day activities, there was also the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 impact on the health care system [27]. In our data, in 2000, about two thirds of people with ALI sought
5 some kind of medical care. Evidence was presented showing that the impact of ALI might be even more
6 far-reaching, as seen by the higher levels of medical care, and continued pain remaining two years after
7 the ALI were reported.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16 Other research on injuries has used a variety of definition of injuries, based on different sources
17 of information. Questions in the NPHS were able to put these other measures in perspective. For
18 example, some studies used hospital-based data [28], but the present study showed that only about 5% of
19 ALI were resulted in a hospital admission within the first 48 hours after the event. Assuming that all
20 injuries that required hospitalization were within the activity-limiting rubric, it is clear that studies using
21 only hospital data would include only a small portion of important injuries [29]. However, the
22 hospitalized injuries will be the more severe injuries which are responsible for a disproportional share of
23 the health care cost and disability [25]. Other studies have used ED visits as a unit of measurement [9].
24 The present study showed less than one third of ALI went to an ED to obtain treatment. Again, the latter
25 were the more severe injuries or those needing specialized treatment, e.g., casts on fractures, and thus
26 had a greater impact on daily life and cost. Another source of data commonly used has been mortality
27 data. Although deaths are definitely activity-limiting, obviously, none were included in this study. Fatal
28 injuries reflect a different range of injuries than those for ALI. For example, in an US study, firearm-
29 related injuries were 22% of all injury deaths, second only to traffic accident related injuries, but
30 firearms amounted to less than 1% for non-fatal injuries [11]. Thus, different measuring units for
31 measuring injury rates will target different slices of the spectrum of injuries and provide different results.
32 ALI are of special public health importance, but are not sufficiently studied.
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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Another level of impact resulting from ALI would consist of impact on the health care system.
8
9 Approximately 60% of people with ALI obtained medical care of some type. Of these, approximately
10
11 one third of persons with ALI went to ED to experience the often long wait before receiving treatment.
12
13 Back at home the patient would not only experience the pain and disability of the ALI, but also the need
14
15 to negotiate the health care system, such as making appointments with physicians, specialists,
16
17 physiotherapists, etc., finding transportation, often needing someone to accompany them [30-33]. Even
18
19 though the proportion of the population with ALI increased over the years 2000-2006, decreases were
20
21 seen in use of primary care and the hospital ED visits as well as hospitalisation. This decrease in health
22
23 care use could be an indication either of greater difficulty in accessing health care, or that the nature of
24
25 ALIs has moderated over the years. Berdahl found variation by ethnic group and sex, both in the
26
27 reporting of work-related injuries and in the seeking of medical care and the change in ethnic
28
29 composition over the years could also be a factor in the NPHS data [34-36]. In any case, ALI are
30
31 suffered by a large proportion of the population annually, and a majority of these seek medical treatment
32
33 whether primary care, ED or hospital care. Clearly, this entails a large cost to the health care system and
34
35 any prevention would not only improve quality of life of the putative victims but also would result in
36
37 significantly lower health care costs.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Another type of impact would be long-term changes after the injury. The 'before and after' data
48
49 available in the NPHS consisted of comparing the cross-sectional data from the interview cycle before
50
51 the ALI with the data of the cycle reporting the ALI and with the next cycle after the ALI. While the
52
53 interviews for each respondent could be linked for the 'before and after' cycles it was more difficult to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 determine which changes in attributes in the year of the ALI or subsequent years were sequelae of the
5
6 ALI. For example, it might make sense that the increasing obesity for people with ALI be linked to
7
8 after-effects, e.g. [37], due to inactivity resulting from the ALI but, in fact, similar changes were
9
10 happening in the overall population. Given these caveats, we can note that no changes were found for
11
12 smoking and little change in excessive alcohol use. Most likely to show long-term effects due to ALI
13
14 were visits to medical doctors and ongoing pain. People with ALI showed increasing likelihood of
15
16 visiting a MD at least five times during the year which continued for the subsequent cycle. Similarly
17
18 pain increased in the cycle with the ALI and remained high over the years. Although this is weak
19
20 evidence, it confirms work on long-term effects of other researchers [38-39] and again emphasizes the
21
22 impact of ALI in the population.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Injuries have been found to lead to lost productivity, medical costs, compensation costs and
31
32 long-term health problems and disability [40-42], which was confirmed by the present results for the
33
34 Canadian population. Many injuries can be prevented and a better understanding of all aspects of
35
36 injuries will lead to better ways of prevention or the minimizing of their effects. However, collaboration
37
38 and cooperation is needed [43]. The European Union has committed itself to reducing number of traffic
39
40 fatalities from 45,000 to 25,000 by 2010, which as several reports point out, will require strong measures
41
42 against use of alcohol [44-47] and illicit and medicinal drugs before driving [48]. A difficulty in injury
43
44 prevention is the multi-faceted aspect of injuries. For example, a fall may have many causes, such as
45
46 unsafe working conditions or slippery stairs at home. Each of these issues would require different
47
48 approaches to prevention. Similar diversities are found for most other types of injuries. With all
49
50 difficulties inherent in devising effective interventions, prevention is still the best approach to lower the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 tremendous impact of ALI on the Canadian population.
5
6
7
8

9 The NPHS data have important strengths, such as its representativeness of the Canadian
10 population and its longitudinal nature. Because of the longitudinal design, it was possible to identify
11 new ALI, meaning no ALI in the previous interview, and compare risk factors before and after the event,
12 as well as its consequences. The 'before and after' comparisons of the same person allowed for matched
13 analysis at different times. Important also is the extensive and consistent information available on each
14 respondent over the multiple cycles of the survey, such as type of ALI, and the medical care needed.
15
16 Besides strengths, the NPHS also has limitations. One issue is the lack of distinction between intentional
17 and unintentional injuries. Another issue is that of self-reported data. Part of self-reporting is recall of
18 events. Recall of having had an ALI has been shown elsewhere to be less accurate with increasing time
19 and is also likely to vary with the severity of the injury [49-50]. Both of these would likely lead to an
20 under-reporting of ALI. In spite of its limitations the NPHS gives an invaluable view of the level of
21 serious injury in the Canadian adult population over a 12 year time period.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Another strength of these data is the use of ALI as a measurement of injury. There are various
41 units of measurement in measuring rates of injury in a population. The unit of measurement used in the
42 present study consists of the most serious ALI over the previous 12 months, excluding repetitive strains
43 injuries. The use of ALI means the delimitation of a particular kind of injury in the spectrum of injuries
44 as a concept meaningful to both respondent and researchers. In addition, it identifies a type of injury
45 sufficiently severe to impact a person's regular routine.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONCLUSION

The findings from this study quantified the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. The immediate impact was pain, disability, and disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor's visits remaining two years after the ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity and a considerable increase in health care access and cost. This study also particularly contributes to injury prevention in social and psychological health services to help injured people make a better recovery and maintain the quality of life after injuries.

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
REFERENCES

1. Centre for Surveillance Coordination HC. Injury Surveillance in Canada: Current realities and Challenges. Ottawa: 2003; Health Canada.
2. Holtslag HR, Beeck EF van, Lichtveld RA, et al. Individual and population burdens of major trauma in the Netherlands. *Bull World Health Organ* 2008; 86:111–117.
3. Lyons RA, Kendrick D, Towner EM, et al. Measuring the Population Burden of Injuries—Implications for Global and National Estimates: A Multi-centre Prospective UK Longitudinal Study. *PLoS Med* 2011; 8(12): e1001140. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001140.
4. Rivara FP, Thompson RS, Thompson, DC Calonge N. Injuries to Children and Adolescents: Impact on Physical Health. *Pediatrics* 1991;88:783-788.
5. Frank JW, Brooker AS, DeMaio S et al. Disability resulting from occupational low back pain part II: What do we know about secondary prevention? A review of the scientific evidence on prevention after disability begins. *Spine* 1996; 21(24):2918–2929.
6. Krause N, Frank JW, Dasinger LK et al. Determinants of duration of disability and return to work after work-related injury and illness: Challenges for future research. *Am J Ind Med* 2001;40:464–484.
7. Krause N, Ragland DR. Occupational disability due to low back pain: A new interdisciplinary classification based on a phase model of disability. *Spine* 1994;19(9):1011–1020.
8. Verbrugge LM, Jette AM. The disablement process. *Soc Sci Med* 1994;38(1):1–14.
9. MacPherson AK, Schull M, Manuel D et al. Injuries in Ontario: ICES Atlas. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences 2005;
10. MacKenzie EJ. Epidemiology of injuries: current trends and future challenges. *Epidemiol Rev* 2000; 22:112-9.
11. Schneier AJ, Shields BJ, Hostetler SG et al. Incidence of Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury and Associated Hospital Resource Utilization in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118 (2):483-492.
12. Mayer T, Walker ML, Clark P. Further experience with a modified Abbreviated Injury Severity Scale. *J Trauma*. 1984;24:31-34.
13. Kraus JF, Fife D, Conroy C. Pediatric brain injuries: the nature, clinical course, and early outcomes in a defined United States' population. *Pediatrics*. 1987;79:501-507.
14. Casey R, Ludwig 5, McCormick MC. Morbidity following minor head trauma in children. *Pediatrics*. 1986;78:497-502.

15. Kraus JP, Fife D, Cox P et al. Incidence, severity and external causes of pediatric brain injury. *AJDC*. 1986;140:687-693.
16. Rivara FP, Calonge N, and Thompson R. Population-Based Study of Unintentional Injury Incidence and Impact during Childhood. *Am J Public Health* 1989;79:990-994.
17. Tambay J-L, Catlin G. Sample design of the National Population Health Survey. *Health Reports* 2006;7(1):29-38.
18. World Health Organization. What are overweight and obesity? Factsheet 2006; N°.311.
19. Majori S, Ricci G, Capretta F et al. Epidemiology of domestic injuries. A survey in an emergency department in North-East Italy. *J Prev Med Hyg*. 2009;50:164-9.
20. Scheiman S, Moghaddas HS, Bjornstig U et al. Bicycle injury events among older adults in Northern Sweden: a 10-year population based study. *Accid Anal Prev* 2010;42:758-63.
21. Ahmed LA, Schirmer H, Bjornerem A et al. The gender- and age-specific 10-year and lifetime absolute fracture risk in Tromso, Norway. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2009;24:441-8.
22. Ahmed LA, Emaus N, Berntsen GK, et al. Bone loss and the risk of non-vertebral fractures in women and men: the Tromso study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2010;21: 1503-11.
23. Aschkenasy MT, Rothenhaus TC. Trauma and falls in the elderly. *Emerg Med Clin North Am* 2006; 24:413-32.
24. Wilkins K. Medications and fall-related fractures in the elderly. *Health Rep* 1999;11:45-53.
25. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Getting back to work after injury: the UK Burden of Injury multicentre longitudinal study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;1 (12):584.
26. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Making a successful return to work: the UK burden of injury multicentre longitudinal study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012 Feb; 62(595):e82-90.10.3399/bjgp12X625139.
27. Franche RL, Krause N. Readiness for Return to Work Following Injury or Illness: Conceptualizing the Interpersonal Impact of Health Care, Workplace, and Insurance Factors. *JOccup Rehabil* 2002; December 12 (4):233-256.
28. Frisina PG, Guellnitz R, Alverzo J. A time series analysis of falls and injury in the inpatient rehabilitation setting. *Rehabil Nurs* 2010;35:141-6.

- 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
29. Pickett W, Hartling L, Brison RJ. A population-based study of hospitalized injuries in Kingston, Ontario, identified via the Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program. *Chronic Dis Can* 1997;18:61-9.
 30. Dryden DM, Saunders LD, Rowe BH et al. Utilization of health services following spinal cord injury: a 6-year follow-up study. *Spinal Cord* 2004; 42:513-525.
 31. Brown JA, Shannon HS, McDonough P et al. Healthcare Use of Families of Injured Workers Before and After a Workplace Injury in British Columbia, Canada. *Healthcare Policy* 2007; 2(3):1-124.
 32. Berthelot J-M and the Project Team. Injury hospitalizations and socio-economic status. Ottawa, Ontario: 2010; CIHI.
 33. Compston J. Osteoporosis: social and economic impact. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2010;48:477-82.
 34. Berdahl TA, Zodet M. Medical care utilization for work-related injuries in the United States 2002-2006. *Med Care* 2010;48:645-51.
 35. de Castro AB, Fujishiro K, Rue T et al. Associations between work schedule characteristics and occupational injury and illness. *Int Nurs Rev* 2010;57:188-94.
 36. Lombardi DA, Folkard S, Willetts JL et al. Daily sleep, weekly working hours, and risk of work-related injury: US National Health Interview Survey (2004-2008). *Chronobiol Int* 2010;27(5):1013-30.
 37. Bergkvist D, Hekmat K, Svensson T, et al. Obesity in orthopedic patients. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2009; 5:670-2.
 38. Cameron CM, Kliwer EV, Purdie DM et al. Long term health outcomes after injury in working age adults: a systematic review. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006;60:341-4.
 39. Toft AM, Moller H, Laursen B. The years after an injury: long-term consequences of injury on self-rated health. *J Trauma* 2010;69:26-30.
 40. Borgstrom F, Zethraeus N, Johnell O, et al. Costs and quality of life associated with osteoporosis-related fractures in Sweden. *Osteoporos Int* 2006;17:637-50.
 41. Brinsky A, Glick H, Lydick E, et al. The economic cost of hip fractures in community-dwelling older adults: a prospective study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997;45:281-7.
 42. Hendrie D, Hall SE, Arena G et al. Health system costs of falls of older adults in Western Australia. *Aust Health Rev* 2004; 28:363-73.
 43. Sleet DA, Moffett DB. Framing the problem: injuries and public health. *Fam Community Health* 2009;32:88-97.

- 1
2
3
4
5 44. Desapriya E, Pike I, Raina P. Severity of alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes in British Columbia:
6 case - control study. *Int J Contr Saf Promot* 2006;13:89-94.
7
8 45. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Robinson E et al. The contribution of alcohol to falls at home among
9 working-aged adults. *Alcohol* 2008;42:383-8.
10
11 46. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Jackson R. The role of alcohol in unintentional falls among young and
12 middle-aged adults: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Inj Prev* 2009; 15:341-7.
13
14 47. Ahlm K, Bjornstig U, Ostrom M. Alcohol and drugs in fatally and non-fatally injured motor vehicle
15 drivers in northern Sweden. *Accid Anal Prev* 2009; 41:129-36.
16
17 48. Gouille JP, Verstraete A, Boulu R, et al. Illicit drugs, medications and traffic accidents. *Ann Pharm*
18 *Fr* 2008;66:196-205.
19
20
21 49. Wilkins K, Mackenzie SG. Work injuries. *Health Rep* 2007;18:25-42.
22
23
24 50. Warner M, Schenker N, Heinen MA et al. The effects of recall on reporting injury and poisoning
25 episodes in the National Health Interview Survey. *Inj Prev* 2005;11:282-7.
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

Table 1: The percent and univariate analyses of the characteristics related to adult Canadians reporting an activity limiting injury in the NPHS data, 1996-2006*

Year	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2006/ 1996	P- value
All	10.5	10.9	11.4	12.6	12.6	12.8	1.22	0.048
Background variables								
Married/common law	71.0	69.3	68.2	66.2	65.7	64.7	0.91	0.063
Low income	40.0	34.2	27.9	26.0	23.5	19.8	0.50	0.039
Completed High School	89.6	89.9	89.3	84.7	84.5	84.5	0.94	0.068
Rural	17.9	20.5	21.0	20.6	19.9	22.0	1.23	0.041
Immigrant	17.5	17.3	16.8	16.2	16.1	15.7	0.90	0.081
Health related variables								
Current smoking	22.7	21.3	20.4	17.1	17.1	16.0	0.70	0.153
Inactive	58.3	52.9	56.1	48.3	51.0	45.9	0.79	0.098
Obese	18.4	21.2	23.0	24.3	25.0	26.4	1.43	0.001
9+ alcohol drinks/ week	11.0	11.6	11.9	11.8	11.6	14.8	1.35	0.001
Region of residence								
Atlantic	8.8	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.7	0.99	0.086
Quebec	25.5	25.6	25.9	26.0	26.1	25.9	1.01	0.078
Ontario	36.3	36.0	36.0	35.8	36.1	36.2	1.00	0.101
Prairies	17.0	17.3	17.1	17.4	17.3	17.4	1.02	0.098
BC	12.5	12.4	12.1	12.0	11.8	11.9	0.95	0.156
Outcome-related								
Limited activity	17.3	17.8	18.0	22.9	24.5	26.6	1.54	0.001
Poor health status	33.6	33.2	38.0	41.2	42.3	43.5	1.29	0.035
5+ Medical Doctor visits /year	24.2	26.3	26.6	27.6	28.3	26.8	1.11	0.056
Pain	12.3	13.7	13.3	15.1	16.4	15.8	1.28	0.039
Stress	26.3	29.2	25.1	27.3	28.3	27.4	1.04	0.083
Depression	6.1	5.8	6.4	6.9	7.1	6.0	0.98	0.158
Medication use in last 30 days								
Pain medication	65.6	67.5	70.1	70.2	70.4	70.6	1.08	0.096
Tranquilizer/ sedative	5.1	5.3	6.8	8.1	8.2	10.0	1.96	0.001
Antidepressants	3.6	4.4	5.4	5.9	6.9	7.0	1.94	0.001
Total Number ¹	7,313	7,529		7,717	7,875	8,085	8,324	

*Univariate analysis was used to compare the trend of ALI between 1996 and 2006 in the different characteristics; P value <0.05 means a significant difference between study and control groups.

¹ total number of survey respondents used to calculate weighted percentages representative of the Canadian population

Table 2: Percentages for ALI for which were impacted by activity limitation per year, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006

Years		2000	2002	2004	2006
	Injury status				
All	None	85.5	84.0	84.0	82.2
	Activity limiting (yes)	10.8	12.1	11.6	12.0
	Activity limiting (no)	3.1	3.0	3.5	5.1
	Both	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8
Males	None	84.9	82.0	82.2	80.1
	Activity limiting (yes)	10.5	13.5	13.2	13.2
	Activity limiting(no)	3.9	3.9	3.4	5.6
	Both	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.1
Females	None	86.0	85.8	85.7	84.1
	Activity limiting (yes)	11.1	10.8	10.1	10.9
	Activity limiting(no)	2.4	3.0	3.6	4.6
	Both	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5
Ages 20-49	None	83.5	81.7	81.2	79.3
	Activity limiting (yes)	12.2	13.9	13.3	14.0
	Activity limiting(no)	3.5	3.7	4.3	5.8
	Both	0.8	0.7	1.3	0.9
Ages 50+	None	88.5	87.2	87.4	85.3
	Activity limiting (yes)	8.6	9.5	9.5	9.8
	Activity limiting (no)	2.6	3.1	2.5	4.2
	Both	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6

Table 3: The percent of persons reporting specific health care use among those reporting an ALI by age group and sex, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006*

Year		2000	2002	2004	2006
All	Number of ALI	865	932	913	1,005
	Medical Doctor (MD) visits (5+/year)	29.8	27.1	27.3	25.3
	Emergency Department (ED) visits	34.0	28.5	31.0	28.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.5	5.4	5.5	4.9
	Other	2.7	4.3	3.1	5.2
	Any	66.6	60.0	61.5	59.3
	None	33.5	40.1	38.5	40.7
Males	Number of ALI	394	460	463	482
	MD visits (5+/year)	26.6	26.5	24.7	23.6
	ED visits	34.5	27.4	30.8	29.7
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	9.5	4.5	4.6	4.1
	Other	4.1	4.0	2.9	5.3
	Any	65.2	57.8	58.4	58.5
	None	34.8	42.2	41.6	41.5
Females	Number of ALI	471	472	450	523
	MD visits (5+/year)	32.6	27.7	30.5	27.3
	ED visits	33.6	29.9	31.3	27.8
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	4.0	6.4	6.6	5.7
	Other	1.5	4.7	3.4	5.1
	Any	67.7	62.4	65.2	60.2
	None	32.3	37.6	34.8	39.7
Age 20-49	Number of ALI	588	601	564	590
	MD visits (5+/year)	29.1	27.7	28.5	24.3
	ED visits	34.3	27.6	28.7	27.3
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.2	4.1	2.9	3.6
	Other	2.5	4.1	3.1	7.3
	Any	65.8	59.3	3.2	58.9
	None	34.2	40.7	39.7	41.1
Age 50+	Number of ALI	277	331	349	415
	MD visits (5+/year)	31.5	25.8	25.3	26.9
	ED visits	33.6	30.6	34.9	31.1
	Hospital admission in 48 hours	7.3	8.1	9.9	6.9
	Other	3.2	4.9	3.2	1.9
	Any	61.4	59.3	63.5	59.9
	None	31.8	38.6	36.6	40.1

Table 4: The type of activity-limiting injury as a proportion of all activity-limiting injuries ALI NPHS, Canada, 1996-2006

	Interview cycles	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
N ²	Number of ALI	755	786	865	931	911	1,006
		¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%
ALL	Brain, internal, multiple	4.9	3.3	5.8	3.2	3.9	4.3
	Fractures/dislocation	20.6	21.2	19.9	20.3	22.2	24.9
	Burns	5.3	3.3	4.3	2.8	4.3	3.7
	Sprains, strains	42.0	42.3	42.4	47.3	42.8	42.2
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.2	15.5	11.8	11.6	11.1	9.7
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	7.7	6.9	7.8	4.8	7.1	6.3
	Other	9.3	7.5	8.0	10.0	8.6	8.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Males	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	2.8	5.0	2.4	4.1	4.5
	Fractures/dislocation	21.3	21.5	21.5	20.3	21.0	26.1
	Burns	5.8	2.4	3.9	3.5	4.6	2.7
	Sprains, strains	39.6	42.6	40.5	47.2	41.7	39.8
	Cuts, punctures, bites	12.2	17.4	16.7	13.9	13.6	13.1
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	6.2	5.2	5.7	4.4	6.2	5.8
	Other	9.5	8.1	6.7	8.3	8.8	8.0
Females	Brain, internal, multiple	4.3	3.9	6.4	3.8	3.6	4.2
	Fractures/dislocation	19.8	21.0	18.5	21.6	23.6	23.3
	Burns	4.5	4.1	4.7	3.6	4.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	45.0	41.9	44.1	46.0	44.3	44.9
	Cuts, punctures, bites	7.8	13.3	7.7	9.1	7.9	6.0
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	9.5	8.9	9.5	6.4	8.2	7.0
	Other	9.1	6.9	9.1	9.5	8.4	9.8
Age 20-49	Brain, internal, multiple	4.8	3.3	4.9	3.1	3.7	3.0
	Fractures/dislocation	17.4	19.8	22.5	17.4	18.2	22.9
	Burns	5.5	3.3	4.1	3.5	5.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	43.8	47.2	42.8	51.3	50.9	46.3
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.9	15.5	11.5	10.7	9.4	9.4
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	8.5	5.0	7.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
	Other	9.1	5.9	6.7	9.5	8.4	9.0
Age 50+	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	3.4	7.6	3.4	4.2	6.3
	Fractures/dislocation	30.8	24.9	13.8	26.4	29.0	27.9
	Burns	4.3	3.0	4.9	1.4	3.3	1.9
	Sprains, strains	36.2	30.2	41.7	39.0	29.1	35.8

1							
2							
3							
4							
5	Cuts, punctures, bites	8.1	15.2	12.5	13.4	13.7	10.3
6	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	5.1	11.7	8.5	5.4	11.7	9.1
7	Other	10.1	11.6	11.0	11.0	9.0	8.7
8							
9							

10 ¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

11 ² Number of ALI in study population

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

For peer review only

Table 5: Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence interval (C.I.) of ALI by life style and socioeconomic status, adjusted for sex and age, NPHS, Canada, 1996-2006

		1996		1998		2000		2002		2004		2006	
		OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.
Age groups													
	M/F	1.4*	1.1 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.6	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.4
	20-39	2.1*	1.6 - 2.9	1.9*	1.5 - 2.4	1.8*	1.4 - 2.3	2.2*	1.8 - 2.7	1.8*	1.5 - 2.2	2.2*	1.8 - 2.6
	40-59	1.6*	1.1 - 2.1	1.4*	1.1 - 1.8	1.3	1.0 - 1.6	1.6*	1.3 - 2.0	1.3	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.2 - 1.8
	60+ (reference)	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~
Background variables²													
Married/ Common-law	yes/no	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.9	0.8 - 1.0
income	low/high	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4
Completed High School	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
Rural	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
Non-English Immigrant	yes/no	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.7	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
	yes/no	0.6*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.7*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9
Health related³													
Current smoking	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.1
Physical inactivity	yes/no	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 0.9	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
Obese	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
Alcohol drink /week	9+/less	1.2	0.9 - 1.5	1.2*	1.0 - 1.6	1.3*	1.0 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.8	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.3 - 1.8
Alcohol 5+ at a time	weekly/less	1.3*	1.0 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.2*	1.0 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5

51. For sex group, females are the reference group

52. For background variables comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group

53. For health-related comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group

54* Means that there are statistically significant difference compared with control groups

Table 6: life style, socioeconomic status, and health care utilization of persons with an activity limiting injury before and after the injury, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		Before	During	After	p value*			N**
		%	%	%	A vs B	B vs C	A vs C	
		A	B	C				
Risky behaviours and socioeconomic status								
Income	low	36.3	32.1	28.5	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	2,892
Obese	obese	17.8	19.7	22.4	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	1,780
Physical activity	inactive	50.4	47.1	48.1	0.001	0.197	0.343	3,044
Smoking	current	19.0	18.5	18.2	0.265	0.384	0.077	1,693
Alcohol drinking	9+/week	9.6	10.7	11.2	0.048	0.535	0.349	3,548
Health-related issues								
Limited activity	yes	18.7	25.5	26.3	<0.001	0.221	<0.001	3,657
Health status	poor	33.1	36.3	39.6	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,653
Medical Doctor								
visits	5+/year	26.5	34.0	29.8	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,616
Pain	yes	13.7	16.8	17.3	<0.001	0.432	<0.001	3,657
Stress	yes	29.7	31.3	29.4	0.104	0.050	0.757	2,967
Medication use in past 30 days before interview								
Pain medication	yes	61.9	70.2	70.8	<0.001	0.489	<0.001	3,640
Sedatives								
/tranquiliser	yes	5.7	7.2	8.1	0.001	0.055	<0.001	3,639
Antidepressants	yes	4.2	5.9	6.2	<0.001	0.346	0.403	3,641

*P value calculated by McNemar's test

** N of persons making up the matched analysis for the before and after analysis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **Impact of Activity-Limiting Injuries based on the Canadian National Population Health Survey**
11 **1994-2006**

12
13 Frank Mo¹, PhD; Ineke Neutel², PhD; Howard Morrison, PhD; Doug Hopkins, BA; Caroline Da Silva,
14 BSc; Ying Jiang¹, MSc
15

16 **Author references:**
17

18 ¹Consumer Product Safety and Injury Risk Assessment Program Working Group
19 Science Integration Division
20 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
21 Public Health Agency of Canada
22

23 ²Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **KEYWORDS** Activity limiting injury; impact factors, longitudinal health survey; epidemiology;
31 injury prevention; Canada.
32
33

34 **Correspondence to**
35

36 Dr. Frank Mo, Science Integration Division
37 Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
38 Public Health Agency of Canada
39 Frank.Mo@phac-aspc.gc.ca.
40
41

42 **Running title:** Impact of Activity-Limiting Injury trends
43

44 **Word count:**

45 Abstract: 300
46 Manuscript: 3,496
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine the prevalence and factors affecting activity-limiting injuries (ALI) on individuals and on the Canadian population; to estimate the short and long term impact on health status and well-being due to ALI in Canada from 1994 to 2006 using the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS).

Design: The NPHS is a randomised longitudinal cohort study with biennial interviews, with information on age, sex, education, marital status, income, residence, height and weight to self-perceived health status, health care utilization and medication use in addition to ALI.

Setting: The study population was a random sample of male and female participants 20 years and older from ten provinces and three territories in Canada.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Logistic regression models were used to assess the potential impact of ALI on individuals and on the Canadian population. The interviews two years before and two years after the ALI were compared to examine long-term effects, and the McNemar test option in SAS was used for the matched analysis.

Results: The immediate impacts of ALI were pain, disability, and disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor visits. Population impact included a considerable increase in health care access and cost. The odds ratios (ORs) for the 20-39 age group compared to those 60+ was OR, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.8-2.7, while the OR associated with being male was 1.4; 95% CI, 1.1-1.6. Individuals consuming nine or more alcoholic drinks per week were also significantly more likely to report an ALI (OR, 1.5; 95% CI, 1.3-1.8).

Conclusion: The findings from this study illustrated the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. Injury control policies should aim to prevent the both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Summary Boxes:

What is already known on this subject?

1. Activity-limiting injuries (ALI) burden such as increased steadily prevalence, mortality and economic costs in Canada;
2. Showing increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, medication use related to ALI;
3. Nature and types related to ALI;

What does this study add?

1. Potential associations between health care utilization and ALI before and after injury;
2. Hospital admission, Department emergency and medical doctors visits impacted on ALI;

3. The immediate individuals impact such as pain, disability, disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were sequelae, chronic pain, and increased medical doctor visits after ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity and a considerable increase in health care access and cost.
4. policies should aim to prevent both the number of injuries fatalities as well as the consequences among survivors.

Competing Interest:

None to declare.

Funding Statement:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Contributorship Statement:

Dr. Frank Mo, leader of the research project, and play the major role in research design, drafted the article and critical review, and advising for data analysis and results interpretation.

Dr. Ineke C. Neutel, contributed to data analysis, assisted in research design and data analysis, interpretation, and the report.

Dr. Howard Morrison, contributed to research consultation, provided critical review comments, and advising for data analysis and revised critically the article.

Mr. Doug Hopkins, assisted in research design, provided literature review and critical comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Caroline Da Silva, participated in research design, provided critical review comments and signed final version of the manuscript.

Ms. Ying Jiang, contributed to research design, provided literature and critical review comments, and signed final version of the manuscript for submission.

INTRODUCTION

Injuries are a serious public health issue with a major impact on the lives of Canadians. They are leading causes of death and hospitalization, as well as of disability, loss of productivity and potential years of life lost (PYLL) [1-4]. Sequelae from injuries include activity limitation, functional disability and pain which in turn influence a variety of social, psychological, labour force, and economic factors [5-8]. An analysis of emergency department (ED) visits and hospitalisation admissions for Ontario noted that one in four ED visits were injury-related, as were one in every 17 hospitalisations [9]. These data accentuated the importance of injuries to the health care system. Other studies have demonstrated the increasing medical doctor (MD) contacts, the use more medications for pain, more days in hospital, and more hours of home care services [9-11].

Several studies of traumatic disability have also focused on injuries resulting in hospitalization [12], types of injury [13-14], and serious head injuries [15]. One study reported that half of patients had some limitation in activity for two days or more due to injury, and patients treated in the clinic were somewhat more likely to have two or more days of limited activity than were patients treated in the ED [16].

Injuries are not only largely preventable, but the impact of injuries can usually be lessened. To develop effective policies leading to the prevention of injuries and to reduce the impact of injuries on society, information is needed about the influenced effects that individuals with injuries treated in the primary care setting and not requiring hospitalization frequently result in significant functional

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 impairment and to identify those injuries which, by virtue of their contribution to disability, would be
11 targets for prevention programs.
12

13
14
15 The objectives of this study are to explore the immediate and longer term consequences of injury
16 including physical, psychological, social and occupational functioning. This comprises a longitudinal
17 population health study, which will measure the impact of injuries on individual's and population level
18 health status and well-being due to activity-limiting injuries (ALI) in the NPHS from 1994 to 2006 in
19 Canada.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **METHODOLOGY**

28 **Study population**

29
30 The source population for this study was the Canadian National Population Health Survey
31 (NPHS), from 1994/1995 (cycle 1) to 2006/2007 (cycle 7). The study population was designed to be
32 representative of the Canadian population with the exception of persons living on Indian reserves or on
33 Canadian Forces bases [9, 11]. The sample design was a multiple cluster [17], ideal for controlling costs
34 when personal interviews are needed, as was the case for cycle 1 of the NPHS. To cover as much as
35 possible of the Canadian population, separate components of the survey were also carried out in the
36 Territories and in health care institutions. In the Territories, a simpler stratified design was used. As
37 well, anticipating the creation of Nunavut, separate strata were formed for each of the future territories,
38 Nunavut and NWT [17]. The sampling frame for the first cycle (1994/5) originated with the Canadian
39 Labour Force Survey (CLFS), a multi-stage, stratified sampling technique used for all provinces except
40 Quebec for which a provincial sampling frame was used [17]. From the 2000 cycle onward, additional
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 questions were added to the questionnaire, such as more detailed questions on health care use after the
11 ALI, with the result that some analyses are restricted to data from 2000 to 2006
12
13

14
15 Nearly all respondents were re-interviewed biennially by telephone except for individuals
16 without a telephone, for whom face to face interviews were used. Interviewers were instructed to follow
17 all reasonable strategies to trace people. Response rates were 83.6% for cycle one, 92.8% for cycle two,
18 88.3% for cycle three, 84.9% for cycle four, 80.8% for cycle five, 77.6% for cycle six and 77.0% for
19 cycle seven.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 To look at ADIs resulting from new injuries, data for cycles from 1996 to 2006 were used; data
28 for 1994 was only used for the “before and after” analysis (Table 6). Data were used from respondents
29 who were willing to share their data for data analysis, who completed all interviews to date, and who
30 achieved the age of 20 before 2006. Since the source population, i.e. the total NPHS population,
31 covered more ages than the population analysed for this study, it was possible to add younger persons
32 from the source population to our study population after the cycle at which they reached age of 20 years
33 old. Consequently, the study population changed somewhat over the years of the study allowing
34 comparable cross-sectional analysis of populations with the same age range and age distribution.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Variables**

44
45 The interview ranged from background questions (age, sex, education, marital status, income,
46 residence, height and weight) to health-related questions (self-perceived health status, health care
47 utilization and medication use). Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kilograms divided
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 by height in meters squared [18]. A BMI of 30 or over was considered obese. Respondents were asked
11 to rate their health as one of five categories: excellent, very good, good, fair or poor and for this study,
12 the lower two categories were combined as poorer health and the top three as good health. Depression
13 and stress were measured by the following questions: "have you had 2 weeks in a row during the past 12
14 months when you were sad, blue, or depressed?" and "During the past month, about how often did you
15 feel: ... so sad that nothing could cheer you up? ... nervous? ... restless or fidgety? ... hopeless?...
16 worthless?". A question about number of visits to any type of physician or medical specialist in the past
17 year was dichotomized as: "five or more visits, versus fewer than five visits". Alcohol consumption was
18 based on a series of question on the number of drinks consumed each day of the past seven days before
19 the interview. For this study, this was expressed as drinking nine or more drinks per week, versus
20 drinking eight or less. In this study, "alcohol used 5+ at a time" was defined as "How often in the past
21 week have you had 5 or more drinks on one occasion?". The variable "hospital treatment" was
22 described as "Did you receive any medical attention for this injury from a health professional within 48
23 hours?" For example, doctor, hospital emergency room. Quartiles of total household income were
24 calculated for the study population, with the lower two quartiles combined for the low income category
25 to be compared to the top two as the high income category. A Physical activity index was calculated
26 based on kilocalories per kilogram of body weight per day expended (KKD). Physically active was
27 defined as energy expenditure of at least 3 KKD; and physically inactive was defined as less than 1.5
28 KKD. Medication use was elicited by the question: "In the past 30 days, did you take . . . ?" This was
29 followed by a series of questions, such as "Did you take antidepressants and or anti-stressants?" "Did
30 you take anything for pain?" A 'no' answer to the question "Are you usually free of pain and
31 discomfort?" was taken as indication that the respondent often suffered pain.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 The definition of injury in the NPHS data was “In the past 12 months, did you have any injuries
11 serious enough to limit your normal activities?” If more than one injury, the following questions were to
12 refer to the most serious one. A separate question asked respondents a general question about
13 limitations in activity, “Because of a long-term physical or mental condition or a health problem, have
14 you limited in the kind or amount of activity you could do: at home? at school? at work? in other
15 activities?”. Otherwise, they should be defined as non-activity limiting.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Data Analysis**

24 For the statistical analysis, SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used. Logistic
25 regression was used to calculate odds ratios (OR) with the presence/absence of ALI as the dependent
26 variable, adjusted for age (in single years) and sex. Since the data were collected as a statistical sample
27 of the Canadian population, the ‘weight’ option was used in all SAS statistical analyses to make the
28 results representative of the Canadian population from 1994 to 2006 in seven cycles of cross-sectional
29 studies. Weights were provided by Statistics Canada according to their sampling procedures. In order to
30 produce a meaningful estimate of the variance for the weighted results, the weights were adjusted using
31 the formula: [average weight = (sample weight/sum of the sample weights) * sample size].
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In order to determine the characteristics, life style and health status, medical attention and health
41 care utilization as well as activity limitation and disability, which were impacted by ALI, all new injury
42 cases, i.e., those who had not reported an injury in the previous interview were identified. For each new
43 case, data from three cycles were selected, 1) the cycle before reporting, 2) the cycle of reporting, 3) the
44 cycle after reporting. Data for the 1994 cycle were used only in this ‘before and after’ analysis. Only
45 the first recorded ALI report per person was included. The McNemar test option in SAS was used for
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 matched analysis. This study approved by the research ethics committee of Health Canada.

11 12 13 **RESULTS**

14
15 The numbers of ALI in the study population increased from 755 cases in 1996 to 1,006 in 2006
16
17 .The weighted prevalence of all ALI increased steadily from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. Those
18
19 reporting ALI showed increasing trends in obesity, limited activity, poor health status, people who live
20
21 in the rural areas and drank more than 9 drinks per week, medication use, and potential injury sequelae,
22
23 such as pain, stress ~~and depression~~ but declining trends in lower income, ~~and~~ current smoking, and
24
25 immigrants (Table 1). The proportion of injuries which resulted in activity limitations were higher for
26
27 males, and increased more over time than for females (Table 2). Furthermore, younger adults (20-49
28
29 yrs.) were more likely to report activity limiting injuries (12.2% to 14.0%) compared to older (50+ yrs.)
30
31 adults (8.6% to 9.8%). Among respondents who reported a ALI, the weighted percentages who reported
32
33 five or more visits to a medical doctor (MD) within the previous year decreased from 29.8% in 2000 to
34
35 25.3% in 2006, emergency department (ED) visits went from 34.0% to 28.8%, and hospital admission
36
37 within 48 hours after the injury went from 6.5% to 4.9% (Table 3). The rate of hospital admissions
38
39 within 48 hours for adults aged 50+ years was higher than that of young aged (20-49) group.

40
41
42 The most frequently reported injuries resulting in activity limitation were sprains and strains
43
44 (42%), followed by fractures and dislocations (20%), and cuts, punctures and bites (10%) (Table 4).
45
46 Only 3.3 to 5.0% of ALIs were in the category of brain, internal and multiple injuries. Men tended to
47
48 have more cuts, punctures and bites while women had more scrapes, bruises and blisters. Younger ages
49
50 tended to have more sprains and strains and older ages more fractures and dislocations.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 Logistic regression analysis indicated that younger age groups and male participants were more
13 impacted by ALI. Only a few of the other variables showed associations with ALI - immigrants had
14 consistently lower rates of ALI, while people consumed nine or more alcoholic drinks per week had
15 significantly higher rates (Table 5).
16
17
18
19

20
21 Attributes of persons with an ALI were compared in the cycles before and after their injury
22 (Table 6). Most behavioural risk factors examined showed a pattern of an increase from the two years
23 previous to the ALI to the time of the ALI to a further increase the two years after the ALI. A similar
24 pattern was observed for health status and interactions with the health care system. (Table 6).
25
26
27
28
29

30 DISCUSSION

31
32 Based on NPHS data, more than 10% of the adult Canadian population annually experience an
33 ALI, with the proportion increasing from 10.5% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2006. According to the definition
34 of ALI as activity-limiting injuries, all people with ALI experienced a certain amount of disruption of
35 their daily activities with the impact varying according to the type and severity of their injury and
36 depending on their customary type of activity [19-22]. About 20% of ALIs were fractures and
37 dislocations, many of whom necessitated a period of altered activity. Older people were more likely to
38 report fractures than the younger age groups. The most common injuries were sprains and strains, the
39 impact of which also varied a great deal depending on type and severity [23-24]. An important impact
40 of injuries is on the workplace through absenteeism and on the family through the disruption of
41 customary activities [25-26]. Besides the impact of injuries on every day activities, there was also the
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 impact on the health care system [27]. In our data, in 2000, about two thirds of people with ALI sought
11 some kind of medical care. Evidence was presented showing that the impact of ALI might be even more
12 far-reaching, as seen by the higher levels of medical care, and continued pain remaining two years after
13 the ALI were reported.
14
15
16

17
18
19 Other research on injuries has used a variety of definition of injuries, based on different sources
20 of information. Questions in the NPHS were able to put these other measures in perspective. For
21 example, some studies used hospital-based data [28], but the present study showed that only about 5% of
22 ALI were resulted in a hospital admission within the first 48 hours after the event. Assuming that all
23 injuries that required hospitalization were within the activity-limiting rubric, it is clear that studies using
24 only hospital data would include only a small portion of important injuries [29]. However, the
25 hospitalized injuries will be the more severe injuries which are responsible for a disproportional share of
26 the health care cost and disability [25]. Other studies have used ED visits as a unit of measurement [9].
27 The present study showed less than one third of ALI went to an ED to obtain treatment. Again, the latter
28 were the more severe injuries or those needing specialized treatment, e.g., casts on fractures, and thus
29 had a greater impact on daily life and cost. Another source of data commonly used has been mortality
30 data. Although deaths are definitely activity-limiting, obviously, none were included in this study. Fatal
31 injuries reflect a different range of injuries than those for ALI. For example, in an US study, firearm-
32 related injuries were 22% of all injury deaths, second only to traffic accident related injuries, but
33 firearms amounted to less than 1% for non-fatal injuries [11]. Thus, different measuring units for
34 measuring injury rates will target different slices of the spectrum of injuries and provide different results.
35 ALI are of special public health importance, but are not sufficiently studied.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 Another level of impact resulting from ALI would consist of impact on the health care system.
13
14 Approximately 60% of people with ALI obtained medical care of some type. Of these, approximately
15
16 one third of persons with ALI went to ED to experience the often long wait before receiving treatment.
17
18 Back at home the patient would not only experience the pain and disability of the ALI, but also the need
19
20 to negotiate the health care system, such as making appointments with physicians, specialists,
21
22 physiotherapists, etc., finding transportation, often needing someone to accompany them [30-33]. Even
23
24 though the proportion of the population with ALI increased over the years 2000-2006, decreases were
25
26 seen in use of primary care and the hospital ED visits as well as hospitalisation. This decrease in health
27
28 care use could be an indication either of greater difficulty in accessing health care, or that the nature of
29
30 ALIs has moderated over the years. Berdahl found variation by ethnic group and sex, both in the
31
32 reporting of work-related injuries and in the seeking of medical care and the change in ethnic
33
34 composition over the years could also be a factor in the NPHS data [34-36]. In any case, ALI are
35
36 suffered by a large proportion of the population annually, and a majority of these seek medical treatment
37
38 whether primary care, ED or hospital care. Clearly, this entails a large cost to the health care system and
39
40 any prevention would not only improve quality of life of the putative victims but also would result in
41
42 significantly lower health care costs.

43
44 Another type of impact would be long-term changes after the injury. The 'before and after' data
45
46 available in the NPHS consisted of comparing the cross-sectional data from the interview cycle before
47
48 the ALI with the data of the cycle reporting the ALI and with the next cycle after the ALI. While the
49
50 interviews for each respondent could be linked for the 'before and after' cycles it was more difficult to
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 determine which changes in attributes in the year of the ALI or subsequent years were sequelae of the
11 ALI. For example, it might make sense that the increasing obesity for people with ALI be linked to
12 after-effects, e.g. [37], due to inactivity resulting from the ALI but, in fact, similar changes were
13 happening in the overall population. Given these caveats, we can note that no changes were found for
14 smoking and little change in excessive alcohol use. Most likely to show long-term effects due to ALI
15 were visits to medical doctors and ongoing pain. People with ALI showed increasing likelihood of
16 visiting a MD at least five times during the year which continued for the subsequent cycle. Similarly
17 pain increased in the cycle with the ALI and remained high over the years. Although this is weak
18 evidence, it confirms work on long-term effects of other researchers [38-39] and again emphasizes the
19 impact of ALI in the population.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Injuries have been found to lead to lost productivity, medical costs, compensation costs and
31 long-term health problems and disability [40-42], which was confirmed by the present results for the
32 Canadian population. Many injuries can be prevented and a better understanding of all aspects of
33 injuries will lead to better ways of prevention or the minimizing of their effects. However, collaboration
34 and cooperation is needed [43]. The European Union has committed itself to reducing number of traffic
35 fatalities from 45,000 to 25,000 by 2010, which as several reports point out, will require strong measures
36 against use of alcohol [44-47] and illicit and medicinal drugs before driving [48]. A difficulty in injury
37 prevention is the multi-faceted aspect of injuries. For example, a fall may have many causes, such as
38 unsafe working conditions or slippery stairs at home. Each of these issues would require different
39 approaches to prevention. Similar diversities are found for most other types of injuries. With all
40 difficulties inherent in devising effective interventions, prevention is still the best approach to lower the
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 tremendous impact of ALI on the Canadian population.
11

12
13 The NPHS data have important strengths, such as its representativeness of the Canadian
14 population and its longitudinal nature. Because of the longitudinal design, it was possible to identify
15 new ALI, meaning no ALI in the previous interview, and compare risk factors before and after the event,
16 as well as its consequences. The 'before and after' comparisons of the same person allowed for matched
17 analysis at different times. Important also is the extensive and consistent information available on each
18 respondent over the multiple cycles of the survey, such as type of ALI, and the medical care needed.
19 Besides strengths, the NPHS also has limitations. One issue is the lack of distinction between intentional
20 and unintentional injuries. Another issue is that of self-reported data. Part of self-reporting is recall of
21 events. Recall of having had an ALI has been shown elsewhere to be less accurate with increasing time
22 and is also likely to vary with the severity of the injury [49-50]. Both of these would likely lead to an
23 under-reporting of ALI. In spite of its limitations the NPHS gives an invaluable view of the level of
24 serious injury in the Canadian adult population over a 12 year time period.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Another strength of these data is the use of ALI as a measurement of injury. There are various
39 units of measurement in measuring rates of injury in a population. The unit of measurement used in the
40 present study consists of the most serious ALI over the previous 12 months, excluding repetitive strains
41 injuries. The use of ALI means the delimitation of a particular kind of injury in the spectrum of injuries
42 as a concept meaningful to both respondent and researchers. In addition, it identifies a type of injury
43 sufficiently severe to impact a person's regular routine.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

CONCLUSION

The findings from this study quantified the immediate and long term impact of individuals and population level injuries in Canada. The immediate impact was pain, disability, and disruption of regular life. Long-term effects in patients were chronic pain and increased medical doctor's visits remaining two years after the ALI. Population impact included loss of productivity and a considerable increase in health care access and cost. This study also particularly contributes to injury prevention in social and psychological health services to help injured people make a better recovery and maintain the quality of life after injuries.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **REFERENCES**

- 11 1. Centre for Surveillance Coordination HC. Injury Surveillance in Canada: Current realities and
12 Challenges. Ottawa: 2003; Health Canada.
- 13 2. Holtslag HR, Beeck EF van, Lichtveld RA, et al. Individual and population burdens of major trauma
14 in the Netherlands. *Bull World Health Organ* 2008; 86:111–117.
- 15 3. Lyons RA, Kendrick D, Towner EM, et al. Measuring the Population Burden of Injuries—
16 Implications for Global and National Estimates: A Multi-centre Prospective UK Longitudinal Study.
17 *PLoS Med* 2011; 8(12): e1001140. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001140.
- 18 4. Rivara FP, Thompson RS, Thompson, DC Calonge N. Injuries to Children and Adolescents: Impact
19 on Physical Health. *Pediatrics* 1991;88:783-788.
- 20 5. Frank JW, Brooker AS, DeMaio S et al. Disability resulting from occupational low back pain part II:
21 What do we know about secondary prevention? A review of the scientific evidence on prevention after
22 disability begins. *Spine* 1996; 21(24):2918–2929.
- 23 6. Krause N, Frank JW, Dasinger LK et al. Determinants of duration of disability and return to work
24 after work-related injury and illness: Challenges for future research. *Am J Ind Med* 2001;40:464–484.
- 25 7. Krause N, Ragland DR. Occupational disability due to low back pain: A new interdisciplinary
26 classification based on a phase model of disability. *Spine* 1994;19(9):1011–1020.
- 27 8. Verbrugge LM, Jette AM. The disablement process. *Soc Sci Med* 1994;38(1):1–14.
- 28 9. MacPherson AK, Schull M, Manuel D et al. Injuries in Ontario: ICES Atlas. Toronto: Institute for
29 Clinical Evaluative Sciences 2005;
- 30 10. MacKenzie EJ. Epidemiology of injuries: current trends and future challenges. *Epidemiol Rev* 2000;
31 22:112-9.
- 32 11. Schneier AJ, Shields BJ, Hostetler SG et al. Incidence of Pediatric Traumatic Brain Injury and
33 Associated Hospital Resource Utilization in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2006;118 (2):483-492.
- 34 12. Mayer T, Walker ML, Clark P. Further experience with a modified Abbreviated Injury Severity
35 Scale. *J Trauma*. 1984;24:31-34.
- 36 13. Kraus JF, Fife D, Conroy C. Pediatric brain injuries: the nature, clinical course, and early outcomes
37 in a defined United States' population. *Pediatrics*. 1987;79:501-507.
- 38 14. Casey R, Ludwig S, McCormick MC. Morbidity following minor head trauma in children.
39 *Pediatrics*. 1986;78:497-502.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 15. Kraus JP, Fife D, Cox P et al. Incidence, severity and external causes of pediatric brain injury.
12 AJDC. 1986;140:687-693.
- 13
14 16. Rivara FP, Calonge N, and Thompson R. Population-Based Study of Unintentional Injury Incidence
15 and Impact during Childhood. *Am J Public Health* 1989;79:990-994.
- 16
17 17. Tambay J-L, Catlin G. Sample design of the National Population Health Survey. *Health Reports*
18 2006;7(1):29-38.
- 19
20 18. World Health Organization. What are overweight and obesity? Factsheet 2006; N° 311.
- 21
22 19. Majori S, Ricci G, Capretta F et al. Epidemiology of domestic injuries. A survey in an emergency
23 department in North-East Italy. *J Prev Med Hyg.* 2009;50:164-9.
- 24
25 20. Scheiman S, Moghaddas HS, Bjornstig U et al. Bicycle injury events among older adults in Northern
26 Sweden: a 10-year population based study. *Accid Anal Prev* 2010;42:758-63.
- 27
28 21. Ahmed LA, Schirmer H, Bjornerem A et al. The gender- and age-specific 10-year and lifetime
29 absolute fracture risk in Tromso, Norway. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2009;24:441-8.
- 30
31 22. Ahmed LA, Emaus N, Berntsen GK, et al. Bone loss and the risk of non-vertebral fractures in
32 women and men: the Tromso study. *Osteoporos Int.* 2010;21: 1503-11.
- 33
34 23. Aschkenasy MT, Rothenhaus TC. Trauma and falls in the elderly. *Emerg Med Clin North Am* 2006;
35 24:413-32.
- 36
37 24. Wilkins K. Medications and fall-related fractures in the elderly. *Health Rep* 1999;11:45-53.
- 38
39 25. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Getting back to work after injury: the UK Burden of
40 Injury multicentre longitudinal study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;1 (12):584.
- 41
42 26. Kendrick D, Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, et al. Making a successful return to work: the UK burden
43 of injury multicentre longitudinal study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012 Feb; 62(595):e82-
44 90.10.3399/bjgp12X625139.
- 45
46 27. Franche RL, Krause N. Readiness for Return to Work Following Injury or Illness: Conceptualizing
47 the Interpersonal Impact of Health Care, Workplace, and Insurance Factors. *JOccup Rehabil* 2002;
48 December 12 (4):233-256.
- 49
50 28. Frisina PG, Guellnitz R, Alverzo J. A time series analysis of falls and injury in the inpatient
51 rehabilitation setting. *Rehabil Nurs* 2010;35:141-6.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 29. Pickett W, Hartling L, Brison RJ. A population-based study of hospitalized injuries in Kingston,
11 Ontario, identified via the Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program. *Chronic Dis*
12 *Can* 1997;18:61-9.
- 13
14 30. Dryden DM, Saunders LD, Rowe BH et al. Utilization of health services following spinal cord
15 injury: a 6-year follow-up study. *Spinal Cord* 2004; 42:513-525.
- 16
17 31. Brown JA, Shannon HS, McDonough P et al. Healthcare Use of Families of Injured Workers Before
18 and After a Workplace Injury in British Columbia, Canada. *Healthcare Policy* 2007; 2(3):1-124.
- 19
20 32. Berthelot J-M and the Project Team. Injury hospitalizations and socio-economic status. Ottawa,
21 Ontario: 2010; CIHI.
- 22
23 33. Compston J. Osteoporosis: social and economic impact. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2010;48:477-82.
- 24
25 34. Berdahl TA, Zodet M. Medical care utilization for work-related injuries in the United States 2002-
26 2006. *Med Care* 2010;48:645-51.
- 27
28 35. de Castro AB, Fujishiro K, Rue T et al. Associations between work schedule characteristics and
29 occupational injury and illness. *Int Nurs Rev* 2010;57:188-94.
- 30
31 36. Lombardi DA, Folkard S, Willetts JL et al. Daily sleep, weekly working hours, and risk of work-
32 related injury: US National Health Interview Survey (2004-2008). *Chronobiol Int* 2010;27(5):1013-30.
- 33
34 37. Bergkvist D, Hekmat K, Svensson T, et al. Obesity in orthopedic patients. *Surg Obes Relat Dis*
35 2009; 5:670-2.
- 36
37 38. Cameron CM, Kliewer EV, Purdie DM et al. Long term health outcomes after injury in working age
38 adults: a systematic review. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006;60:341-4.
- 39
40 39. Toft AM, Moller H, Laursen B. The years after an injury: long-term consequences of injury on self-
41 rated health. *J Trauma* 2010;69:26-30.
- 42
43 40. Borgstrom F, Zethraeus N, Johnell O, et al. Costs and quality of life associated with osteoporosis-
44 related fractures in Sweden. *Osteoporos Int* 2006;17:637-50.
- 45
46 41. Brainsky A, Glick H, Lydick E, et al. The economic cost of hip fractures in community-dwelling
47 older adults: a prospective study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997;45:281-7.
- 48
49 42. Hendrie D, Hall SE, Arena G et al. Health system costs of falls of older adults in Western Australia.
50 *Aust Health Rev* 2004; 28:363-73.
- 51
52 43. Sleet DA, Moffett DB. Framing the problem: injuries and public health. *Fam Community Health*
53 2009;32:88-97.

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

44. Desapriya E, Pike I, Raina P. Severity of alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes in British Columbia: case - control study. *Int J Contr Saf Promot* 2006;13:89-94.

45. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Robinson E et al. The contribution of alcohol to falls at home among working-aged adults. *Alcohol* 2008;42:383-8.

46. Kool B, Ameratunga S, Jackson R. The role of alcohol in unintentional falls among young and middle-aged adults: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Inj Prev* 2009; 15:341-7.

47. Ahlm K, Bjornstig U, Ostrom M. Alcohol and drugs in fatally and non-fatally injured motor vehicle drivers in northern Sweden. *Accid Anal Prev* 2009; 41:129-36.

48. Gouille JP, Verstraete A, Boulu R, et al. Illicit drugs, medications and traffic accidents. *Ann Pharm Fr* 2008;66:196-205.

49. Wilkins K, Mackenzie SG. Work injuries. *Health Rep* 2007;18:25-42.

50. Warner M, Schenker N, Heinen MA et al. The effects of recall on reporting injury and poisoning episodes in the National Health Interview Survey. *Inj Prev* 2005;11:282-7.

Table 1: The estimated percent and univariate analyses of the characteristics related to adult Canadians reporting an activity limiting injury in the previous year based on NPHS data, 1996-2006*

Year	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	<u>2006/ 1996</u>	<u>P- value</u>
All	10.5	10.9	11.4	12.6	12.6	12.8	<u>1.22</u>	<u>0.048</u>
Background variables								
Married/common law	71.0	69.3	68.2	66.2	65.7	64.7	<u>0.91</u>	<u>0.063</u>
Low income	40.0	34.2	27.9	26.0	23.5	19.8	<u>0.50</u>	<u>0.039</u>
Completed High School	89.6	89.9	89.3	84.7	84.5	84.5	<u>0.94</u>	<u>0.068</u>
Rural	17.9	20.5	21.0	20.6	19.9	22.0	<u>1.23</u>	<u>0.041</u>
Immigrant	17.5	17.3	16.8	16.2	16.1	15.7	<u>0.90</u>	<u>0.081</u>
Health related variables								
Current smoking	22.7	21.3	20.4	17.1	17.1	16.0	<u>0.70</u>	<u>0.153</u>
Inactive	58.3	52.9	56.1	48.3	51.0	45.9	<u>0.79</u>	<u>0.098</u>
Obese	18.4	21.2	23.0	24.3	25.0	26.4	<u>1.43</u>	<u>0.001</u>
9+ alcohol drinks/ week	11.0	11.6	11.9	11.8	11.6	14.8	<u>1.35</u>	<u>0.001</u>
Region of residence								
Atlantic	8.8	8.7	8.9	8.8	8.7	8.7	<u>0.99</u>	<u>0.086</u>
Quebec	25.5	25.6	25.9	26.0	26.1	25.9	<u>1.01</u>	<u>0.078</u>
Ontario	36.3	36.0	36.0	35.8	36.1	36.2	<u>1.00</u>	<u>0.101</u>
Prairies	17.0	17.3	17.1	17.4	17.3	17.4	<u>1.02</u>	<u>0.098</u>
BC	12.5	12.4	12.1	12.0	11.8	11.9	<u>0.95</u>	<u>0.156</u>
Outcome-related								
Limited activity	17.3	17.8	18.0	22.9	24.5	26.6	<u>1.54</u>	<u>0.001</u>
Poor health status	33.6	33.2	38.0	41.2	42.3	43.5	<u>1.29</u>	<u>0.035</u>
5+ Medical Doctor visits /year	24.2	26.3	26.6	27.6	28.3	26.8	<u>1.11</u>	<u>0.056</u>
Pain	12.3	13.7	13.3	15.1	16.4	15.8	<u>1.28</u>	<u>0.039</u>
Stress	26.3	29.2	25.1	27.3	28.3	27.4	<u>1.04</u>	<u>0.083</u>
Depression	6.1	5.8	6.4	6.9	7.1	6.0	<u>0.98</u>	<u>0.158</u>
Medication use in last 30 days								
Pain medication	65.6	67.5	70.1	70.2	70.4	70.6	<u>1.08</u>	<u>0.096</u>
Tranquilizer/ sedative	5.1	5.3	6.8	8.1	8.2	10.0	<u>1.96</u>	<u>0.001</u>
Antidepressants	3.6	4.4	5.4	5.9	6.9	7.0	<u>1.94</u>	<u>0.001</u>
Total Number ¹	7,313	7,529	7,717	7,875	8,085	8,324		

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

*Univariate analysis was used to compare the trend of ALI between 1996 and 2006 in the different characteristics : P value <0.05 means a significant difference between study and control groups.

¹ total number of survey respondents used to calculate weighted percentages representative of the Canadian population

For peer review only

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Border: Bottom: (Single solid line, Auto, 0.5 pt Line width)

Table 3: The percent of persons reporting specific health care use among those reporting an ALI by age group and sex, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006*

Year		2000	2002	2004	2006
All	Number of ALI	865	932	913	1,005
-	Medical Doctor (MD) visits (5+/year)	29.8	27.1	27.3	25.3
-	Emergency Department (ED) visits	34.0	28.5	31.0	28.8
-	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.5	5.4	5.5	4.9
-	Other	2.7	4.3	3.1	5.2
-	Any	66.6	60.0	61.5	59.3
-	None	33.5	40.1	38.5	40.7
Males	Number of ALI	394	460	463	482
-	MD visits (5+/year)	26.6	26.5	24.7	23.6
-	ED visits	34.5	27.4	30.8	29.7
-	Hospital admission in 48 hours	9.5	4.5	4.6	4.1
-	Other	4.1	4.0	2.9	5.3
-	Any	65.2	57.8	58.4	58.5
-	None	34.8	42.2	41.6	41.5
Females	Number of ALI	471	472	450	523
-	MD visits (5+/year)	32.6	27.7	30.5	27.3
-	ED visits	33.6	29.9	31.3	27.8
-	Hospital admission in 48 hours	4.0	6.4	6.6	5.7
-	Other	1.5	4.7	3.4	5.1
-	Any	67.7	62.4	65.2	60.2
-	None	32.3	37.6	34.8	39.7
Age 20-49	Number of ALI	588	601	564	590
-	MD visits (5+/year)	29.1	27.7	28.5	24.3
-	ED visits	34.3	27.6	28.7	27.3
-	Hospital admission in 48 hours	6.2	4.1	2.9	3.6
-	Other	2.5	4.1	3.1	7.3
-	Any	65.8	59.3	3.2	58.9
-	None	34.2	40.7	39.7	41.1
Age 50+	Number of ALI	277	331	349	415
-	MD visits (5+/year)	31.5	25.8	25.3	26.9
-	ED visits	33.6	30.6	34.9	31.1
-	Hospital admission in 48 hours	7.3	8.1	9.9	6.9
-	Other	3.2	4.9	3.2	1.9
-	Any	61.4	59.3	63.5	59.9
-	None	31.8	38.6	36.6	40.1

Formatted ... [1]

Formatted ... [2]

Formatted ... [3]

Formatted ... [4]

Formatted ... [5]

Formatted ... [6]

Formatted ... [7]

Formatted ... [8]

Formatted ... [9]

Formatted ... [10]

Formatted ... [11]

Formatted ... [12]

Formatted ... [13]

Formatted ... [14]

Formatted ... [15]

Formatted ... [16]

Formatted ... [17]

Formatted ... [18]

Formatted ... [19]

Formatted ... [20]

Formatted ... [21]

Formatted ... [22]

Formatted ... [23]

Formatted ... [25]

Formatted ... [24]

Formatted ... [26]

Formatted ... [27]

Formatted ... [28]

Formatted ... [29]

Formatted ... [30]

Formatted ... [31]

Formatted ... [32]

Formatted ... [34]

Formatted ... [35]

Formatted ... [36]

Formatted ... [37]

Formatted ... [40]

Formatted ... [39]

Formatted ... [42]

Formatted ... [41]

Formatted ... [44]

Formatted ... [43]

Formatted ... [46]

Formatted ... [45]

Formatted ... [48]

Formatted ... [47]

Formatted ... [49]

Formatted ... [50]

Formatted ... [52]

Formatted ... [51]

Formatted ... [54]

Formatted ... [53]

Formatted ... [56]

Formatted ... [55]

Formatted ... [58]

Formatted ... [57]

Table 2: Percentages for ALI for which were impacted by activity limitation per year, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006

Years		2000	2002	2004	2006
	Injury status				
All	None	85.5	84.0	84.0	82.2
	Activity limiting (yes)	10.8	12.1	11.6	12.0
	Activity limiting (no)	3.1	3.0	3.5	5.1
	Both	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.8
Males	None	84.9	82.0	82.2	80.1
	Activity limiting (yes)	10.5	13.5	13.2	13.2
	Activity limiting(no)	3.9	3.9	3.4	5.6
	Both	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.1
Females	None	86.0	85.8	85.7	84.1
	Activity limiting (yes)	11.1	10.8	10.1	10.9
	Activity limiting(no)	2.4	3.0	3.6	4.6
	Both	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5
Ages 20-49	None	83.5	81.7	81.2	79.3
	Activity limiting (yes)	12.2	13.9	13.3	14.0
	Activity limiting(no)	3.5	3.7	4.3	5.8
	Both	0.8	0.7	1.3	0.9
Ages 50+	None	88.5	87.2	87.4	85.3
	Activity limiting (yes)	8.6	9.5	9.5	9.8
	Activity limiting (no)	2.6	3.1	2.5	4.2
	Both	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6

Formatted Table

Table 3: The percent of persons reporting specific health care use among those reporting an ALI by age group and sex, NPHS, Canada, 2000-2006*

<u>Year</u>		<u>2000</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>
<u>All</u>	<u>Number of ALI</u>	<u>865</u>	<u>932</u>	<u>913</u>	<u>1,005</u>
-	<u>Medical Doctor (MD) visits (5+/year)</u>	<u>29.8</u>	<u>27.1</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>25.3</u>
-	<u>Emergency Department (ED) visits</u>	<u>34.0</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>31.0</u>	<u>28.8</u>
-	<u>Hospital admission in 48 hours</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>4.9</u>
-	<u>Other</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>5.2</u>
-	<u>Any</u>	<u>66.6</u>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>61.5</u>	<u>59.3</u>
-	<u>None</u>	<u>33.5</u>	<u>40.1</u>	<u>38.5</u>	<u>40.7</u>
<u>Males</u>	<u>Number of ALI</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>460</u>	<u>463</u>	<u>482</u>
-	<u>MD visits (5+/year)</u>	<u>26.6</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>24.7</u>	<u>23.6</u>
-	<u>ED visits</u>	<u>34.5</u>	<u>27.4</u>	<u>30.8</u>	<u>29.7</u>
-	<u>Hospital admission in 48 hours</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>4.1</u>
-	<u>Other</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>5.3</u>
-	<u>Any</u>	<u>65.2</u>	<u>57.8</u>	<u>58.4</u>	<u>58.5</u>
-	<u>None</u>	<u>34.8</u>	<u>42.2</u>	<u>41.6</u>	<u>41.5</u>
<u>Females</u>	<u>Number of ALI</u>	<u>471</u>	<u>472</u>	<u>450</u>	<u>523</u>
-	<u>MD visits (5+/year)</u>	<u>32.6</u>	<u>27.7</u>	<u>30.5</u>	<u>27.3</u>
-	<u>ED visits</u>	<u>33.6</u>	<u>29.9</u>	<u>31.3</u>	<u>27.8</u>
-	<u>Hospital admission in 48 hours</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>5.7</u>
-	<u>Other</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>5.1</u>
-	<u>Any</u>	<u>67.7</u>	<u>62.4</u>	<u>65.2</u>	<u>60.2</u>
-	<u>None</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>37.6</u>	<u>34.8</u>	<u>39.7</u>
<u>Age 20-49</u>	<u>Number of ALI</u>	<u>588</u>	<u>601</u>	<u>564</u>	<u>590</u>
-	<u>MD visits (5+/year)</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>27.7</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>24.3</u>
-	<u>ED visits</u>	<u>34.3</u>	<u>27.6</u>	<u>28.7</u>	<u>27.3</u>
-	<u>Hospital admission in 48 hours</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>3.6</u>
-	<u>Other</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>7.3</u>
-	<u>Any</u>	<u>65.8</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>58.9</u>
-	<u>None</u>	<u>34.2</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>41.1</u>
<u>Age 50+</u>	<u>Number of ALI</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>331</u>	<u>349</u>	<u>415</u>
-	<u>MD visits (5+/year)</u>	<u>31.5</u>	<u>25.8</u>	<u>25.3</u>	<u>26.9</u>
-	<u>ED visits</u>	<u>33.6</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>34.9</u>	<u>31.1</u>
-	<u>Hospital admission in 48 hours</u>	<u>7.3</u>	<u>8.1</u>	<u>9.9</u>	<u>6.9</u>
-	<u>Other</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>1.9</u>
-	<u>Any</u>	<u>61.4</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>63.5</u>	<u>59.9</u>
-	<u>None</u>	<u>31.8</u>	<u>38.6</u>	<u>36.6</u>	<u>40.1</u>

Table 4: The type of activity-limiting injury as a proportion of all activity-limiting injuries ALI NPHS, Canada, 1996-2006

N ²	Interview cycles Number of ALI	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006
		¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%	¹ wt%
ALL	Brain, internal, multiple	4.9	3.3	5.8	3.2	3.9	4.3
	Fractures/dislocation	20.6	21.2	19.9	20.3	22.2	24.9
	Burns	5.3	3.3	4.3	2.8	4.3	3.7
	Sprains, strains	42.0	42.3	42.4	47.3	42.8	42.2
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.2	15.5	11.8	11.6	11.1	9.7
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	7.7	6.9	7.8	4.8	7.1	6.3
	Other	9.3	7.5	8.0	10.0	8.6	8.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Males	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	2.8	5.0	2.4	4.1	4.5
	Fractures/dislocation	21.3	21.5	21.5	20.3	21.0	26.1
	Burns	5.8	2.4	3.9	3.5	4.6	2.7
	Sprains, strains	39.6	42.6	40.5	47.2	41.7	39.8
	Cuts, punctures, bites	12.2	17.4	16.7	13.9	13.6	13.1
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	6.2	5.2	5.7	4.4	6.2	5.8
	Other	9.5	8.1	6.7	8.3	8.8	8.0
Females	Brain, internal, multiple	4.3	3.9	6.4	3.8	3.6	4.2
	Fractures/dislocation	19.8	21.0	18.5	21.6	23.6	23.3
	Burns	4.5	4.1	4.7	3.6	4.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	45.0	41.9	44.1	46.0	44.3	44.9
	Cuts, punctures, bites	7.8	13.3	7.7	9.1	7.9	6.0
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	9.5	8.9	9.5	6.4	8.2	7.0
	Other	9.1	6.9	9.1	9.5	8.4	9.8
Age 20-49	Brain, internal, multiple	4.8	3.3	4.9	3.1	3.7	3.0
	Fractures/dislocation	17.4	19.8	22.5	17.4	18.2	22.9
	Burns	5.5	3.3	4.1	3.5	5.0	4.8
	Sprains, strains	43.8	47.2	42.8	51.3	50.9	46.3
	Cuts, punctures, bites	10.9	15.5	11.5	10.7	9.4	9.4
	Scrapes, bruises, blisters	8.5	5.0	7.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
	Other	9.1	5.9	6.7	9.5	8.4	9.0

1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10	Age 50+	Brain, internal, multiple	5.4	3.4	7.6	3.4	4.2	6.3
11		Fractures/dislocation	30.8	24.9	13.8	26.4	29.0	27.9
12		Burns	4.3	3.0	4.9	1.4	3.3	1.9
13		Sprains, strains	36.2	30.2	41.7	39.0	29.1	35.8
14		Cuts, punctures, bites	8.1	15.2	12.5	13.4	13.7	10.3
15		Scrapes, bruises, blisters	5.1	11.7	8.5	5.4	11.7	9.1
16		Other	10.1	11.6	11.0	11.0	9.0	8.7
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								

¹ wt%--Weighted percentages making rates representative of the Canadian population

² Number of ALI in study population

Table 5: Odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence interval (C.I.) of ALI by life style and socioeconomic status, adjusted for sex and age, NPHS, Canada, 1996-2006

	1996		1998		2000		2002		2004		2006		
	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	OR	95% C.I.	
Age groups													
M/F	1.4*	1.1 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.6	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.6	1.3*	1.1 - 1.4	
20-39	2.1*	1.6 - 2.9	1.9*	1.5 - 2.4	1.8*	1.4 - 2.3	2.2*	1.8 - 2.7	1.8*	1.5 - 2.2	2.2*	1.8 - 2.6	
40-59	1.6*	1.1 - 2.1	1.4*	1.1 - 1.8	1.3	1.0 - 1.6	1.6*	1.3 - 2.0	1.3	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.2 - 1.8	
60+ (reference)	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	1.0	~	
Background variables²													
Married/ Common-law	yes/no	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.9	0.8 - 1.0
Income	low/high	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.4
Completed High School	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.2	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	1.1	0.9 - 1.3
Rural	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
Non-English immigrant	yes/no	0.9	0.7 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.8	0.7 - 1.0	0.7	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
0.6*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.8	0.6 - 1.0	0.7*	0.5 - 0.8	0.7*	0.6 - 0.9
Health related³													
Current smoking	yes/no	1.1	0.9 - 1.4	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.9	0.7 - 1.1
Physical inactivity	yes/no	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.6 - 0.9	0.9	0.8 - 1.1	0.8	0.7 - 0.9	0.8	0.7 - 0.9
Obese	yes/no	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.9 - 1.2	1.1	0.9 - 1.3	1.0	0.8 - 1.1
Alcohol drink /week	9+/less	1.2	0.9 - 1.5	1.2*	1.0 - 1.6	1.3*	1.0 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.8	1.2	1.0 - 1.5	1.5*	1.3 - 1.8
Alcohol 5+ at time	weekly/less	1.3*	1.0 - 1.5	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.4*	1.2 - 1.7	1.2*	1.0 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5	1.3*	1.1 - 1.5
<p>For sex group, females are the reference group</p> <p>For background variables comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group</p> <p>For health-related comparison groups, the second listed group for binary variables is the reference group</p> <p>* Means that there are statistically significant difference compared with control groups</p>													

Table 6: life style, socioeconomic status, and health care utilization of persons with an activity limiting injury before and after the injury, NPHS, Canada, 1994-2006

		Before	During	After	p value*			N**	
		%	%	%	A vs B	B vs C	A vs C		
		A	B	C					
Risky behaviours and socioeconomic status									
Income	low	36.3	32.1	28.5	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	2,892	
Obese	obese	17.8	19.7	22.4	0.005	<0.001	<0.001	1,780	
Physical activity	inactive	50.4	47.1	48.1	0.001	0.197	0.343	3,044	
Smoking	current	19.0	18.5	18.2	0.265	0.384	0.077	1,693	
Alcohol drinking	9+/week	9.6	10.7	11.2	0.048	0.535	0.349	3,548	
Health-related issues									
Limited activity	yes	18.7	25.5	26.3	<0.001	0.221	<0.001	3,657	
Health status	poor	33.1	36.3	39.6	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,653	
Medical Doctor	visits	5+/year	26.5	34.0	29.8	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	3,616
Pain	yes	13.7	16.8	17.3	<0.001	0.432	<0.001	3,657	
Stress	yes	29.7	31.3	29.4	0.104	0.050	0.757	2,967	
Medication use in past 30 days before interview									
Pain medication	yes	61.9	70.2	70.8	<0.001	0.489	<0.001	3,640	
Sedatives	/tranquiliser	yes	5.7	7.2	8.1	0.001	0.055	<0.001	3,639
Antidepressants	yes	4.2	5.9	6.2	<0.001	0.346	0.403	3,641	

*P value calculated by McNemar's test

** N of persons making up the matched analysis for the before and after analysis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 **Page 22: [1] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

13 Right: -0.08"

14 **Page 22: [2] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

15 Left, Right: -0.08"

16 **Page 22: [3] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

17 Right: -0.08"

18 **Page 22: [4] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

19 Left, Right: -0.08"

20 **Page 22: [5] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

21 Right: -0.08"

22 **Page 22: [6] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

23 Left, Right: -0.08"

24 **Page 22: [7] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

25 Right: -0.08"

26 **Page 22: [8] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

27 Left, Right: -0.08"

28 **Page 22: [9] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

29 Right: -0.08"

30 **Page 22: [10] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

31 Left, Right: -0.08"

32 **Page 22: [11] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

33 Right: -0.08"

34 **Page 22: [12] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

35 Left, Right: -0.08"

36 **Page 22: [13] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

37 Right: -0.08"

38 **Page 22: [14] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

39 Left, Right: -0.08"

40 **Page 22: [15] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

41 Right: -0.08"

42 **Page 22: [16] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

43 Left, Right: -0.08"

44 **Page 22: [17] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

45 Right: -0.08"

46 **Page 22: [18] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

47 Left, Right: -0.08" For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>

48 **Page 22: [19] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

49 Left, Right: -0.08"

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 Left, Right: -0.08"

13 **Page 22: [21] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

14 Left, Right: -0.08"

15 **Page 22: [22] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

16 Left, Right: -0.08"

17 **Page 22: [23] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

18 Left, Right: -0.08"

19 **Page 22: [24] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

20 Right: -0.08"

21 **Page 22: [25] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

22 Left, Right: -0.08"

23 **Page 22: [26] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

24 Right: -0.08"

25 **Page 22: [27] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

26 Left, Right: -0.08"

27 **Page 22: [28] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

28 Left, Right: -0.08"

29 **Page 22: [29] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

30 Left, Right: -0.08"

31 **Page 22: [30] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

32 Left, Right: -0.08"

33 **Page 22: [31] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

34 Left, Right: -0.08"

35 **Page 22: [32] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

36 Left, Right: -0.08"

37 **Page 22: [33] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

38 Right: -0.08"

39 **Page 22: [34] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

40 Left, Right: -0.08"

41 **Page 22: [35] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

42 Right: -0.08"

43 **Page 22: [36] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

44 Left, Right: -0.08"

45 **Page 22: [37] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

46 Right: -0.08"

47 **Page 22: [38] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

48 Left, Right: -0.08"

49 **Page 22: [39] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 **Page 22: [40] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

13 Left, Right: -0.08"

14 **Page 22: [41] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

15 Right: -0.08"

16 **Page 22: [42] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

17 Left, Right: -0.08"

18 **Page 22: [43] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

19 Right: -0.08"

20 **Page 22: [44] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

21 Left, Right: -0.08"

22 **Page 22: [45] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

23 Right: -0.08"

24 **Page 22: [46] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

25 Left, Right: -0.08"

26 **Page 22: [47] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

27 Right: -0.08"

28 **Page 22: [48] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

29 Left, Right: -0.08"

30 **Page 22: [49] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

31 Right: -0.08"

32 **Page 22: [50] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

33 Left, Right: -0.08"

34 **Page 22: [51] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

35 Right: -0.08"

36 **Page 22: [52] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

37 Left, Right: -0.08"

38 **Page 22: [53] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

39 Right: -0.08"

40 **Page 22: [54] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

41 Left, Right: -0.08"

42 **Page 22: [55] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

43 Right: -0.08"

44 **Page 22: [56] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

45 Left, Right: -0.08"

46 **Page 22: [57] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

47 Right: -0.08" or peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>

48 **Page 22: [58] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

49 Left, Right: -0.08"

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 Right: -0.08"

13 **Page 22: [60] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

14 Left, Right: -0.08"

15 **Page 22: [61] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

16 Right: -0.08"

17 **Page 22: [62] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

18 Left, Right: -0.08"

19 **Page 22: [63] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

20 Right: -0.08"

21 **Page 22: [64] Formatted** hcuser 1/28/2013 2:29:00 PM

22 Right: -0.08", Line spacing: single

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Page 1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Page 2, 3
Introduction			Page 4
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Page 4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 4
Methods			Page 5
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Page 5, 6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	Page 5, 6
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	Page 5, 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Page 7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Page 7
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Page 7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Page 7, 8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Page 7, 8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Page 7, 8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Page 7, 8
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	Page 7, 8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	Page 7, 8
Results			Page 8

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	Page 5, 6 Page 5, 6 Page 5, 6
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Page 8, 9
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			Page 9-13
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Page 9, 10, 11
Limitations			Page 12
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Page 9-13
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 3

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.