With respect to the opinions of Journals’ reviewers, the article was revised again. The grammar and language changes have been determined in yellow color in the manuscript and the content points and new sentences have been highlighted in blue color in the text.

Also, the authors’ response to the comments of reviewers has been written in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer no.1** | **Authors’ response** |
| 1) I recommend explaining in more detail the increase in demographic count between the pre-accident phase and post-accident phase when 32.4% of the victims perished according to the study.  It's somewhat unclear from a reader's perspective how the educational status of victims increases from pre to post-accident states.  I see your annotation that post-accident is (present), however this should be clarified in the narrative to avoid confusion.  The initial impression is that the status of victims is immediately peri-incident. If the majority of victims suffered their injuries as far back as 1991, did the geographic conditions, regarding landmine population and local populace awareness change? | It was explained in more details in the methodology section; P.2, sentence 3-8. The authors hope to be clarified the mentioned ambiguities with the added explanation.  About public awareness change about mine hazards at local level, some measures have been done but it is quite insufficient. So, this public education should continue and cover all landmine polluted regions through the Kurdistan province. This point has been mentioned in discussion section; P.3, sentence 7-8. |
| 2) I'm also adding the suggestion to possible add maps since this is very geospatial in nature.  Showing consolidations of landmine incidents on a map can give the reader a better appreciation for the explosion hazard saturation condition which likely exists. | Adding maps is very good suggestion but unfortunately we couldn’t access to GIS shape files of area understudy during this period. |
| **Reviewer no.2** | **Authors’ response** |
| I think this is an important contribution to the literature. | Thank you very much for the positive view and giving encouragement to the authors. |
| **Reviewer no.3** | **Authors’ response** |
| 1) There are many interesting findings in this paper but they are masked by English language issues which make the article difficult to understand and read. Minor point but 'landmine' is one word. | The whole article revised again for English language and the changes have been highlighted in yellow color. |
| 2) In the introduction I am wary of sentence 54 (p.2) – 'is considered the second largest country in the world facing a massive number of landmines left over from the war with Iraq.' Not sure this is true and would need a citation. | With thanks to reviewer, the mentioned point is correct. Iran has been considered as one of the polluted country due to planted landmines in the world but not as the second country. However it is corrected in the introduction section; P.3, sentence 1. |
| 3) As I understand it the research question is what are the health-related consequences of landmines on identified victims in urban and rural communities in Kurdistan province? The rationale for this could be strengthened - In the discussion p.11 sentence 3-10 is a good rationale for the study and could be moved to the introduction? | The comment was true and the enough rationale for research question of this study provided in the introduction section (P.3, sentence 5-15) by removing the mentioned sentences from discussion to introduction. |
| 4) Sample size needs clarifying. P.3 Sentence 55 The 410 landmine blast victims that were selected, how many were survivors and how many were deceased? Was the 410 chosen as part of a larger number of victims in the database, if yes what was the total number and how were the 410 selected? If no, be explicit that this was the total number of victims from that period. | We clarified the sample size in the result section; P.1, sentence 1-5. |
| 5) How was the data collected? Was it interviews or questionnaire with victims and relatives or were questionnaires completed by health authorities. It's unclear between methodology, results and discussion. | Data collection tool was a questionnaire consisting of 78 questions and we trained health staff for interviewing with the victims or their relatives to complete the questionnaire. The point was also clarified in the last 4 sentences of method section. |
| 6) The discussion section makes no mention on survivors dependence on others to carry out daily activities (p.6, 7 and 10). | The authors highlighted the mentioned point in the last paragraph of discussion section. |
| 7) Table 3 p.6 the final column 'Not able to do the activity at all' maybe needs rewording as some categories such as 'going to the toilet', 'eating and drinking' are basic functions and would have to be fulfilled somehow - would they fall under 'for doing the activity is completely dependent on others'? | With regards to reviewer, the mentioned point is absolutely correct. So, the authors decided to reword the title of the 3rd and 4th column of table 3 in order to clarify the difference between these two columns. |
| 8) Check numbering in the text matches numbers in the tables e.g. p.4 sentence 13 and 14 urban = 39 and rural = 371, in table 1 urban = 47 and rural = 363 | With thanks to the respected reviewer, we corrected the non-compliance numbering in the text with the numbers in the Table. It was highlighted in P.2, sentences 2-3 of result section. |