

Essay on critique of article

[Science](#), [Agriculture](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Executive Summary](#) \n \t
2. [Summary of Article](#) \n \t
3. [Reference](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

Executive Summary

Executive Summary

Summary of Article

Farm injuries leads to associated expenses that are incurred by those whose occupations are in agriculture. The study was carried out examined the estimates of the cost of occupational injuries in agriculture. The study also has a primary purpose of providing estimates relating to the number of fatal and non-fatal injuries. The data and information presented in this study was obtained from national surveys on fatal and non-fatal injuries. Examples of surveys include; the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Annual Survey, the Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries (CFOI) for 1992 and National Traumatic Occupational fatality Survey (NTOF). The data under scrutiny refers to the data collected in the year 1992.

The data presented by the authors of this study show that 13. 2% out of the total civilian deaths (6083) in all industries was from the agricultural sector. The study has shown that there is a number of cases of undercounting of injuries by the surveys that have been conducted. By use of an adjustment formula, the number of estimated fatal injuries has been calculated as 841.

51% of agricultural related injuries are disabling injuries. The total injuries were 512, 539 which accounts for 230, 640 cases of disabling injuries and 281, 816 non disabling injuries.

In this article, the authors have made various assumptions and applied sensitivity analysis in an effort to analyze the data collected. They have compared their estimates with other similar studies. The study has identified costs as the relevant measure of the burden that is brought about by the injuries sustained.

The study has provided a problem statement that is clear and concise. However, the authors have failed to concentrate their research on the problem statement. They have gone way far to disregard the sources of data they have used to base their analysis. Instead of analyzing the data the way they have obtained it, they have adjusted it thereby providing an interpretation that is not based on the original data.

On a positive side, the authors have well described the nature of the agricultural sector and the injury associated costs. They have introduced their objective and analysis in a clear manner. They have, however, failed to diversify their investigation. They have only used sensitivity analysis in their data analysis. I felt that the subject needed more analysis and presentation by use of other methods of analysis like regression. They should have also employed the use of pictorial representation by use of charts and graphs. The data analyzed has only been presented in tables.

The study has identified many shortcomings associated with the data presented by the national surveys. The study does not give recommendations on how to correct the problems of undercounting. The

authors can improve the study by developing recommendations to be implemented, in the agricultural sector to minimize the costs associated with the occupational injuries.

Reference

Leigh, J. P., McCurry, S. A., & Schenker, M. B. (2001, May--June). Cost of Occupational Injuries in Agriculture. *Public Health Reports* , pp. 235-248.