medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Updated population-level estimates of child restraint practices among children aged 0-12 years in Australia, ten years after introduction of age-appropriate restraint use legislation.

Julie Brown[abc], Bianca Albanese[a,b,c], Catherine Ho[b], Jane Elkington[b], Sjaan Koppel[d], Judith L. Charlton[d], Jake Olivier[e], Lisa Keay[b,f], Lynne Bilston[a,c]

[a]Neuroscience Research Australia, Sydney 2031, Australia, [b]The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2042, Australia, [c]Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia, [d]Monash University Accident Research Centre, Monash University, Melbourne 3800, Australia, [e]School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia, [f]School of Optometry and Vision Science, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2033, Australia

Abstract

Children must correctly use an appropriate restraint type to receive optimal crash protection. To this end, legislation was introduced in Australia in 2009/2010 requiring correct use of age-appropriate restraints among all children up to age 7 years. Prior to this legislation population-referenced estimates of restraint practices in NSW, Australia in 2008 showed suboptimal restraint practices to be widespread. There have been no updated estimates since that time. In this study, we aim to update these estimates using data collected approximately 10 years after the introduction of the legislation.

A stratified cluster sample was constructed to collect population referenced observational data from children aged 0-12 years across the Greater Sydney region of NSW. Data collection methods mimicked those used in the 2008 data. Randomly selected children were observed in their own restraints in their own vehicles by trained researchers. Appropriate use was assessed based on compliance with current NSW legislation. Correct use was defined as use exactly as the manufacturer intended. Errors were categorised as minor or serious on their likely impact of crash protection, and whether they related to installing the restraint in the vehicle or securing the child in the restraint.

Almost all children were appropriately restrained (99.3%, 95%CI 98.4-100). However, less than half were correctly restrained (Any error = 40.4%, 95%CI 32.6-48.3; Any serious error= 43.8%, 95%CI 35.0-52.7). Both securing and installation related errors remain common. There were variations in the extent of errors in use in different restraint types with the least errors among seat belt and the most among booster seat users. While, overall, the odds of incorrect use decreased with increasing age (OR), the relationship between age and incorrect use was different among booster seats user, with decreasing odds with ever year older.

While there was no attempt to test the impact of the legislation on restraint use, it was clear there had been substantial increases in the proportion of children using appropriate forms of restraint over the last 10 years. However there appears to have been no real change in rates of correct use.

Key Words

Child passenger, child restraints, car seats, seat belts, appropriate use, correct use,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

It is well established that the use of seat belts and child restraints in cars is an effective countermeasure to serious injury and death in crashes. However, it also now well understood that optimal crash protection for child passengers requires the correct use of a restraint that is most appropriate for the child's size.[1-3] In recognition of this, new legislation was introduced in Australia in 2009/2010 requiring that all child passengers up to the age of 7 years correctly use an age-appropriate restraint when ever they travel in car. Similar appropriate restraint laws for child passengers exist in many jurisdictions.

In Australia, like many developed countries with long histories of car restraint use, the rate of restraint use by children is high. In Australia rates of child restraint use in cars has been over 90% since the late 1990's,[4] yet children continue to be seriously and fatally injured in crashes. A study conducted in NSW prior to the introduction of the 2009/2010 age-appropriate restraint use legislation found that most children seriously or fatally injured in crashes despite using restraints were using an inappropriate restraint and/or using the restraint incorrectly.[3] Similar results were reported from multiple studies in other countries.[1] Population observation studies conducted around that time also reported that suboptimal restraint practices were widespread in Australia. Only around 20% children were found to be optimally restrained with around one third using inappropriate restraints, another third using their restraint incorrectly and the remaining one in five children incorrectly using an inappropriate type of restraint, i.e. population rates of inappropriate restraint and incorrect restraint were similar, at approximately 50% each.[5] As the intention of the legislative change introduced after these observations were made was to ensure the proportion of children correctly using age-appropriates increased, we might postulate that child restraint practices in Australia have improved over the last decade.

Supporting this supposition is pre-post observations of children aged 2-5 years in low socioeconomic areas of Sydney immediately before and after the introduction of the 2009/2010 age appropriate restraint use laws. Following the introduction of the legislation it was found that in this subset of children, the odds of age-appropriate restraint was almost three times-higher and the odds of correct use was 1.6 times higher post legislation.[6] However, Koppel et al[7] found no significant difference in appropriate restraint or correct use in samples of child restraint observations made in the two years before and two years after the introduction of the legislation. While there were substantial differences in ages of children studied, sampling methods and definitions used for inappropriate and incorrect use between these Australian studies, the contradictions in results reflect similar contradictions in evidence for the impact of child restraint legislation in the literature more broadly.[8] From a recent systematic review, it appears substantial heterogeneity between different studies makes it difficult to interpret the evidence for the impact of legislation on restraint use, particularly in terms of appropriate and correct restraint use. In addition to heterogeneity issues, there is also a paucity of studies that incorporate gold-standard approaches such as using observed restraint practices rather than self-reported practices, randomly selected samples rather than self-selected samples, and samples that are population representative rather than simple convenience-based or focused on one segment of the population.

Regardless of the impact of legislation, it is important to have an updated picture on the state of restraint use. A recent review of deaths of children in cars in NSW from 2007 to 2017 demonstrated that suboptimal restraint practices continue to be common among the most seriously injured children.[9] However, it is unknown whether these practices represent an extreme in behaviour, seen only in the most severe crashes, or if they reflect ongoing widespread issues with suboptimal restraint. Overtime there are also changes in child restraint design that may impact restraint use

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

practices. One important change in Australia was the introduction of ISOFIX compatible anchorage systems in 2013 as an alternative to using the adult seat belt when installing rearward and forward-facing child restraints in the car. The intention of these types of anchorage systems are to reduce the propensity for errors in restraint use.[10] There have been no population-level examinations of restraint practices in Australia since our 2008 study or after the introduction of the legislation and after this change in the design of restraints on the Australian market.

In this study we aimed to provide an update on child restraint practices in NSW, approximately 10 years after the introduction of age-appropriate legislation. While we do not intend to test the impact of the legislation, we used the same methodological approaches as in our 2008 study[5] to allow qualitative comparisons of the situation before and after the legislation using homogenous and gold-standard randomised observational approaches. We also aimed to examine the impact of ISOFIX compatible anchorages on correct restraint use. Finally, our original intention was to provide updated restraint practice estimates for the state of NSW, however our study was impacted by COVID-19 restrictions in 2020 and data collection was limited to the Greater Sydney region. We therefore aim to provide updated estimates for this region only.

Methods

We used a cross-sectional design with a stratified cluster sample constructed to allow observation of restraint practices across a population-representative sample of children aged 0-12 years in the greater metropolitan region of Sydney, Australia. Data collection occurred during 2019/2020. Six strata based on Local Government Areas (LGAs), four from inner metropolitan areas and two from outer areas, were randomly selected from all possible LGAs in the region. The 4:2 ratio was used to select inner and outer areas as this reflects the ratio of population distribution across Greater Sydney. Sites where children of different age groups visit regularly were then randomly selected from each LGA: preschool/long day care centres to capture infants and pre-school aged children, and primary schools to capture school aged children, resulting in 12 data collection clusters.

Participants were children aged 0-12 years and their carer who attended a data collection site during a data collection period. Child-carer dyads were randomly selected as they arrived at the site and invited to participate by on-site researchers before they left their vehicles. Refusals were recorded, and reasons for non-participation noted. If more than one child of eligible age was in the vehicle, the study participant was the one who had last had a birthday. An inability to converse in English, and previous participation in the study were the only study exclusion criteria.

The study methods were approved in August 2018 from the South Eastern Sydney Local Health District (SESLHD) Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). Approval to collect data at education sites was also obtained via the NSW School Education Research Applications Process (SERAP).

Data collection

Data collection methods were the same as we have used previously (Brown et al, 2010). In brief, trained researchers attended the sites over a one-two hour period corresponding with child care/school morning drop-off times. If the driver agreed to participate, initial observations were made of the study child in their restraint within the vehicle. Once the child left the vehicle, a structured interview was conducted with the parent. In addition, the height and weight of the child were measured using scales and a portable potentiometer, and a detailed inspection of the restraint installation was conducted. Data from observations of the child within the vehicle, and of the restraint were recorded on pro-forma case observation records that prompted for detail on restraint

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

type, make and model as well as each possible form of correct/incorrect use of the restraint. Collected data was then transferred to a custom-built data base.

The only difference in data collection method from earlier studies was the addition of a standardised series of photographs of the child in the restraint, and the restraint in the vehicle to the data collection protocol. After data had been entered into the data base, these photographs were reviewed as part of a quality control process.

Variables

The primary outcomes of interest were (i) appropriate and (ii) correct restraint use. Appropriate restraint use was defined using the current legal definitions of appropriate restraint in NSW, Australia (see Table 1). Children were categorised as appropriately or inappropriately restrained using their age at the time of the observation, and the restraint type they were observed to be using.

Child Age	Restraint type
0 – 6 months	Rearward-facing restraint
6 months – <4 years	Rearward or forward-facing restraint
4 years - <7 years	Forward facing restraint or Booster Seat
7+ years	Forward facing restraint, booster seat or adult belt.

Table 1: Appropriate restraint definitions based on current restraint use laws in NSW, Australia

Correct use was defined as the restraint being used exactly as the manufacturer intended. Incorrect use refers to errors in how the restraint is installed in the vehicle or how the child is secured within the restraint. Each type of error was categorised as an 'installation error' or a 'securing error'. Each error was also assessed as a 'minor' or 'serious' depending on the likely degradation in protection or increased risk of injury in a crash introduced by that error. Minor/serious error codes were pre-defined and based on the same categorisations we have used and published previously.[5] Dichotomous coding of any error present/not present was then used for six correct use outcome variables (i) any error (minor and serious errors), (ii) any serious error, (iii) any installation error (minor and serious errors) (iv) any serious installation error, (v) any securing error (minor and serious errors), and (vi) any serious securing errors.

Restraints were categorised by type (i.e. rearward-facing, forward-facing, booster seat or adult seat) belt and whether they were convertible or non- convertible restraint types. A convertible restraint is one that is designed to be used in more than one mode, e.g. rearward- and forward-facing or forward-facing and as a booster seat.

In Australia, rearward-facing and forward-facing restraints are installed in the vehicle via a lower anchorage system and a top-tether strap. The lower anchorage can be formed by the adult seat belt, or ISOFIX compatible anchorages. The method of lower anchorage was recorded during the observations and categorised as 'ISOFIX compatible" or "seatbelt". Booster seats and adult seat belts were recorded as N/A for lower anchorage method.

Child age at the time of the observation was calculated from date of birth as reported by the carer and rounded to last birthday.

Data Analysis

All data analysis was performed using SAS Version 9.2 (SAS Institute, 2008). Sample weights were constructed using standard weighting procedures.[11,12] Post-stratification weighting for age distribution variations, and under-and over sampling at different sites were used to generate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

population-level figures for the Greater Sydney region. The SURVEYFREQ procedure in SAS was used to generate population weighted estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the proportion of children appropriately and correctly restrained, and using different restraint types. The SURVEYLOGISTIC procedure in SAS was used to examine the significance of associations of different restraint types, anchorage methods and child age with correct use. The relationship between restraint type and correct use was also examined while controlling for child age, and significant interactions explored through sub-group analysis. Odds ratios (OR) and 95% CI were calculated, and associations assessed as significant when the confidence interval did not pass through 1.

Results

Data was collected from 213 children aged 0-12 years across the greater Sydney Region. The refusal rate was 60%, with lack of time given as the primary reason for refusal. No children were unrestrained, and almost all (99.3%, 95%CI 98.4-100) were using an appropriate restraint as defined by current legislation. However, less than half were correctly restrained (any error = 40.4%, 95%CI 32.6-48.3; any serious error= 43.8%, 95%CI 35.0-52.7).

Across the sample, 5.1% (95% CI 0-11.1) used a rearward-facing restraint, 54.8% (95% CI 26.6-83.0) used a forward-facing restraint, 14.0% (95% CI 26.6-83.0) used a booster seat and 9.8% (95% CI 2.9-49.3) used an adult seat belt. Most of the rearward and forward-facing restraints were installed using the adult seat belt as the lower anchorage system, with 12.5% using an ISOFIX compatible system.

Among the children using inappropriate restraint types, all where aged three years and had been prematurely graduated to a booster seat. All these children were in restraints observed to also have serious errors in the way the restraint was being used.

Single mode restraints, i.e. restraints that were not designed to be converted between rearward-facing and forward-facing, or forward-facing and booster seat modes, were significantly less likely to be used incorrectly (for *any error*, OR 0.43 95% CI 0.26- 0.69), for *any serious error* OR 0. 32, 95% CI 0.17-0.62).

Figure 1 illustrates the variation in proportion of children with observed errors by restraint type. The proportion of children with *any error* was the same as the proportion with *serious errors* in all restraint types except booster seats, indicating minor errors only were only observed in children using booster seats.

Seatbelts were more commonly used correctly than all dedicated child restraint types. Among the dedicated restraints, there were more errors in forward-facing restraints than in rearward-facing restraints, but this difference was not significant (for *any error/any serious error* in forward-facing restraints OR 2.1, 95% CI 0.64-6.88). Compared to rearward-facing restraints, booster seats were 9 times more likely to be observed with *any error* (OR 9.4, 95% CI 1.7-53.4), but the difference in *serious errors* was not significant (OR 4.5, 95% CI 0.8-23.8). Compared to forward-facing restraints, booster seats were 4 times more likely to be incorrectly used (for *any error* OR 4.5, 95% CI 1.3-15.7) but again the difference in *serious errors* was not significant (OR 2.1 95% CI 0.49-9.24).

We found that the odds of errors decreased with increasing age of the child. For *any error* the odds decreased by 21% with every year older, and for *serious error* by 25% with every year older (for *any error* OR 0.79, 95% 0.66-0.93; for *any serious error* OR 0.75 95% CI 0.60-0.93). When age was added to the child restraint type models, all significant differences in odds of error by restraint type were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

lost. However, a significant interaction between age and booster seats was observed for '*any error*' indicating age may have a moderating effect on the differences observed in likelihood of error by restraint type.



Figure 1: Proportion of any error, and any serious error by restraint type. RF= Rearward-Facing Restraint, FF=Forward-Facing Restraint, BS=Booster Seat, SB= Seat belt.

It appeared that age had different relationships with errors in use in different restraint types. There was no significant relationship between age and errors in forward-facing restraints (for *any error/any serious error* OR 0.915, 95% CI 0.67-1.2, for *any serious error* OR) and adult seat belts (for *any error* OR 1.5 95% CI 0.38-6.1, for *any serious error* OR). However, for rearward-facing restraints, the odds of errors *increased* with age (for *any error/any serious error* OR 2.7 95% CI 1.1-6.6). For booster seats, the odds of errors *decreased* by 40% for *any error*, and 38% for *any serious error*, with every year increase in age (for *any error* OR 0.59 95% CI 0.39-0.89, for *any serious error* OR 0.62, 95% CI 0.17-2.2).

While there was a lower proportion of restraints with errors in those restraints installed using ISOFIX compatible lower anchorage systems and those installed using the adult seat belt, this difference was not statistically different in the whole sample (for *any error/any serious error* OR 0.325, 95% CI 0.098-1.08.), or in the subset of rearward and forward restraints only (for *any error/any serious error* 0.312 95% CI 0.091-1.07)

Discussion

This study demonstrates high rates of age-appropriate restraint use among children 0-12 years in the Greater Sydney region of NSW, Australia, approximately ten years after the introduction of age-appropriate legislation. This appears a substantial increase to appropriate restraint use rates observed in NSW 10 years after introduction of this legislation. However, this study also demonstrates that incorrect restraint use continues to be widespread. Both securing and installation related errors remain common. The uptake of rearward- and forward-facing restraints with ISOFIX compatible anchorages appears relatively low, and in this study the difference in the proportion of restraints correctly used between restraints installed with or without this type of anchorage system, was not significant.

While only a small number of children were observed to be using inappropriate restraints, the characteristics of these cases were like those reported in the 2008 study. In that study, inappropriate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

restraint also commonly involved premature graduation to booster seats, and serious errors were commonly observed in those children inappropriately restrained.[5] However, there are stark differences between the 2008[5] and current studies in terms of premature graduation to adult seat belts. In this current study, there was no observed premature graduation to adult seat belts, yet this was common in 2008. One important intrinsic difference before and after the introduction of the age-appropriate legislation is how appropriate use is defined. In this study we have used the legal age-based definition. Before the legislation was enacted there was no legal definition, and we used restraint type designations set by the product standard AS/NZS 1754 to guide appropriate use definitions. These were based on weight and age approximations and so there is some potential that appropriate use and premature graduation to booster or adult seat belts may have been assessed differently in the two studies.

An important point to keep in mind is that legislation stipulates the minimum accepted practice and does not always align with best practice. Best practice in Australia is guided by advice to parents to keep children in their current form of restraint until they no longer 'fit', where 'fit' is guided by shoulder height markers affixed to the restraint. Shoulder height markers, and the heights to which they are positioned in different types of restraint, are mandated in the Australian product Standard. They are therefore included on all rearward-facing, forward-facing and booster seats sold in Australia. Parents are advised to not move their child into the next type of restraint until the child's shoulders are above this label. No assessment of compliance with this advice was made in this current study. However, data collected from children aged 7-12 years were analysed in separate work[13] and it was clear that despite all children in this age range being appropriately restrained according to the legal definition, only 40% of these children achieved good belt fit. Our estimates of appropriate use may underestimate the proportion of children prematurely graduated based on actual restraint fit. However, if this is the case it is most likely to occur in the transition from booster seat to adult belt.

Restraint designs change over time, and since the legislation was introduced in Australia there have been two substantial revisions to the Australian product Standard (in 2010 and in 2013). It is possible that increasing complexity of design may be a factor in the higher rates of incorrect use observed in this current study, as there was an increase in the number of possible errors in this study compared to the earlier 2008 study.[5] This was because there were a number of 'new' types of errors observed in this current study. However, an additional explanation is the shift of children from inappropriate forms of restraint with lower propensity for errors like adult seat belts to more complex dedicated child restraint systems. The finding that incorrect use occurs significantly more often in convertible, dual-mode restraints compared to non-convertible, single-mode restraints is consistent with several earlier studies7, [14] and supports the idea that propensity for errors increases with complexity of restraint design. However, while the same basic data collection and method of identifying errors in use was used in this and the earlier 2008 study,[5] new quality control measures introduced may have led to more errors being detected than would have without the secondary review of all cases.

One set of new potential errors in the current study, was errors associated with the use of ISOFIX compatible anchorage systems. Overall, there were proportionally less restraints observed to be incorrectly used, and incorrectly installed, among those using this form of anchorage however no significant difference was identified. This is contrary to results reported in a different analysis that pooled observations from the current study for rearward- and forward-facing restraints with observations made during restraint fitting day checks (Albanese et al, manuscript in preparation). In that study, restraints using ISOFIX compatible lower anchorage systems were significantly less likely to be used incorrectly. It is possible that this discrepancy indicates a lower statistical power in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

current study, as the proportion of restraints using this type of anchorage was much lower in this randomly selected sample than in the self-selected sample used in that study. This difference in the uptake of ISOFIX compatible anchorage systems may be linked to differences in the socioeconomics identified between the samples randomly and self-selected (Albanese et al, manuscript in preparation) and further work is needed to examine differences in restraint design among different demographic segments of the population.

Regardless of the discrepancy in the significance of the difference, it is important to note that errors still did occur in restraints using this form of anchorage. The severities assigned to these errors were made theoretically on the likely impact of the error on allowing additional movement of the restraint in a crash. There is a need for further research to confirm the likely impact of errors in ISOFIX compatible anchorage systems and to confirm that the benefits of lower propensity for error are not offset by the impact of errors in degradation of protection in a crash. It is also important to note that ISOFIX compatible anchorages only address installation errors, and securing errors continue to be just as common as installation errors. ISOFIX compatible anchorages in isolation are therefore not a panacea to the problem of incorrect restraint use.

The impact of child age on likelihood of incorrect use was not studied in the same way in our 2008 study. In the earlier study, age was only examined as a categorical variable with age categorised into three groups:'0-3', '4-8' and 9+' years. Incorrect use was reported to be most common in the youngest children, however there was no analysis controlling for restraint type. In this current study we used age as a continuous variable and saw an overall decrease in likelihood of errors with increasing age, consistent with observations made in the earlier study. However, our different style of analysis revealed a more complex relationship between child age, restraint type and odds of correct/incorrect restraint. In considering the implications of these observations it is worth noting that there are two primary sources of errors in restraint use – the parent, when they install the restraint in the vehicle or secure the child within the restraint, and the child, when they secure themselves or interact with the restraint during travel. In this current study, we found that in children using rearward-facing restraints the odds of incorrect use increased by nearly three times with every year older and this might align with observations we have made in previous studies that the likelihood of incorrect use increases the longer a person owns a restraint.[14] The mechanism behind this has not been studied but it is possible that over time the increased opportunity to move the restraint between vehicles and need for adjustment to the restraint as the child grows may play a role in this. It is also possible that as the child moves from infancy to a toddler, the opportunity for child-induced errors may increase. This would align with findings reported in a recent analysis of data collected during a naturalistic driving study (Albanese, Cross et al, under review), where we saw increased movement and errors in harness use with increasing age in children in forward-facing restraints. However, in this current study where we examined all forms of error, we did not see a significant relationship between age and likelihood of incorrect use in forward-facing restraints or adult seat belts. The reverse relationship between age and incorrect use we observed in booster seats is a new finding, and it is possible the increased likelihood of errors in use in younger children using booster seat may be related to discomfort associated with poor fit. Further investigation of these issues is warranted.

As with any study there are several limitations to keep in mind when considering the results. The first is that since this data was collected in metropolitan regions, population-level optimal restraint practices may be slightly over estimated and suboptimal practices under-estimated in terms of the state-wide situation as restraint practices are generally reported to be poorer in rural and regional areas.8,[9] Rural and regional data collection should be prioritised in future work to clarify the extent

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

of this. Estimates reported in this study are also biased through high refusal rate. Ethical conduct of research requires consent for participation, and it is possible that people who are knowingly not using optimal child restraint practice may choose not to participate. This might also lead to over-estimations of optimal restraint practices.

Strengths of this study include the randomly selected sample and the homogeneity of methods with studies conducted prior to the introduction of the legislation in NSW in 2009/2010. This allows qualitative comparison between population-level estimates of restraint practices ten years after the introduction of the legislation and the prior situation in NSW Australia. The results indicate a substantial increase in appropriate use of restraints but no improvement in rates of correct use.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by Australian Research Council Discovery Project DPXXXXXXX, and funding from the NSW Centre for Road Safety.

References

1. Du W, Finch CF, Hayen A, Bilston L, Brown J, Hatfield J. Relative benefits of population-level interventions targeting restraint-use in child car passengers. Pediatrics. 2010;125(2):304-12

2. Elliott, M.R., Kallan, M.J., Durbin, D.R., Winston, F.K., 2006. Effectiveness of child safety seats vs seat belts in reducing risk for death in children in passenger vehicle crashes. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine 160 (6), 617–621

3. Brown J, McCaskill ME, Henderson M, Bilston LE. Serious injury is associated with suboptimal restraint use in child motor vehicle occupants. Journal of paediatrics and child health. 2006 Jun;42(6):345-9.

4. Brown J, Bilston LE. Child occupant protection in Australia. Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety. 2012 Jun;23(2):37-45.

5. Brown J, Hatfield J, Du W, Finch CF, Bilston LE. Population-level estimates of child restraint practices among children aged 0–12 years in NSW, Australia. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2010 Nov 1;42(6):2144-8.

6. Brown J, Keay L, Hunter K, Bilston LE, Simpson JM, Ivers R. Increase in best practice child car restraint use for children aged 2–5 years in low socioeconomic areas after introduction of mandatory child restraint laws. Australian and New Zealand journal of public health. 2013 Jun;37(3):272-7.

7. Koppel S, Charlton JL, Rudin-Brown CM. The impact of new legislation on child restraint system (CRS) misuse and inappropriate use in Australia. Traffic injury prevention. 2013 Mar 25;14(4):387-96.

8. Sartin EB, Lombardi LR, Mirman JH. Systematic review of child passenger safety laws and their associations with child restraint system use, injuries and deaths. Injury prevention. 2021 Dec 1;27(6):577-81.

9. Whyte T, Albanese B, Elkington J, Bilston L, Brown J. Restraint factors and child passenger deaths in New South Wales, Australia. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2020 Jan;17(4):1147.

10. Lowne R, Le Claire M, Roy P, Paton I. Dedicated child attachment system (ISOFix). Traffic Injury Prevention. 2002 Mar 1;3(1):19-29.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.22272591; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

11.Korn, E.L., Graubard, B.I., 1999. Analysis of Health Surveys. Wiley, New York.

12. Lohr, S., 1999. Sampling: Design and Analysis. Duxbury Press, Pacific Grove

13. Parab A, Whyte T, Albanese B, Bilston L, Koppel S, Charlton JL, Olivier J, Keay L, Brown J. Can age or height define appropriate thresholds for transition to adult seat belts? An analysis of observed seat belt fit in children aged 7–12 years. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2022 Jan 28;19(3):1524.

14. Brown J, Finch CF, Hatfield J, Bilston LE. Child restraint fitting stations reduce incorrect restraint use among child occupants. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2011 May 1;43(3):1128-33.