

## 1 **Factors affecting social integration after road traffic orthopaedic injuries in Rwanda**

2 *JC Allen Ingabire*[JAI]<sup>1</sup>, *Aimee Stewart*[AS]<sup>2</sup>, *Carine Uwakunda*[CU]<sup>3</sup>, *Didace*  
3 *Mugisha*[DM]<sup>4</sup>, *JB Sagahutu*[JBS]<sup>5</sup>, *Gerard Urimubenshi*[GU]<sup>5</sup>, *David K.Tumusiime*[DT]<sup>5</sup>,  
4 *Georges Bucyibaruta*[GB]<sup>6</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Surgery, University Teaching Hospital of Kigali, University of Rwanda,  
6 Rwanda, [ingabireallenjc2000@gmail.com](mailto:ingabireallenjc2000@gmail.com)

7 <sup>2</sup>Physiotherapy Department, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa,  
8 [Aimee.Stewart@wits.ac.za](mailto:Aimee.Stewart@wits.ac.za)

9 <sup>3</sup>Department of Surgery, Kibagabaga Level II Teaching Hospital, Rwanda,  
10 [uwacary2@gmail.com](mailto:uwacary2@gmail.com)

11 <sup>4</sup>Department of Environmental, University of Rwanda, Rwanda, [d.mugisa@gmail.com](mailto:d.mugisa@gmail.com)

12 <sup>5</sup>Physiotherapy Department, University of Rwanda, Rwanda, [jeanbaptigol@gmail.com](mailto:jeanbaptigol@gmail.com),  
13 [ugerardus@gmail.com](mailto:ugerardus@gmail.com), [dktumusiime@gmail.com](mailto:dktumusiime@gmail.com)

14 <sup>6</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Imperial College London, UK,  
15 [gbucyibaruta@gmail.com](mailto:gbucyibaruta@gmail.com)

16 \*Correspondence: JC Allen Ingabire, [ingabireallenjc@gmail.com](mailto:ingabireallenjc@gmail.com), +250788549975

17

## 18 **Abstract**

19 **Background:** Road traffic injuries (RTIs) leading to long-term disability present a  
20 significant public health challenge, causing immense personal and societal consequences.  
21 However, in many developing countries, information on the social integration of patients post-  
22 RTI remains limited.

23 **Purpose:** This study aimed to identify factors contributing to social integration following  
24 road traffic-related orthopedic injuries in Rwanda.

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Methodology:** The research encompassed a multicenter, cross-sectional study involving  
26 369 adult RTI victims from five Rwandan referral hospitals, all of whom experienced accidents  
27 in 2019. Participants completed the IMPACT-S Questionnaire, which evaluated the level of  
28 social integration in terms of activities and participation. Statistical analysis using logistic  
29 regression, with a significance level set at  $p < 0.05$ , helped estimate odds ratios (OR) and 95%  
30 confidence intervals (CI). We obtained ethical approval to conduct the study from the  
31 University of Rwanda, College of Medicine and Health Sciences Institutional Review Board.  
32 All participants signed a written consent before enrollment into the study, and all data were  
33 kept confidential and only used for the purpose of this study.

34 **Results:** The study's findings indicated that the mean age of RTI victims was  $37.5 \pm 11.26$   
35 years, with a notable male predominance over females. Of the participants, 5.69% were unable  
36 to resume normal life activities. The overall mean score on the IMPACT-S scale was moderate,  
37 at  $77 \pm 17$ . Specifically, participants achieved an average score of  $76 \pm 16$  for "activities" and a  
38 higher average of  $84 \pm 16$  for "participation." Certain factors were associated with poor social  
39 integration compared to others, including belonging to the age group above 65 years (OR=8.25,  
40  $p=0.02$ ), female sex (OR=3.26,  $p=0.02$ ), lack of rehabilitation (OR=3.82,  $p=0.01$ ), and length  
41 of hospital stay  $> 15$  days (OR=4.44,  $p=0.02$ ).

42 **Conclusion:** The majority of RTI victims in Rwanda achieved successful reintegration  
43 into society; nevertheless, their mobility and community engagement were more significantly  
44 impacted compared to other aspects assessed by the IMPACT-S scale. The study emphasized  
45 the importance of early management, effective rehabilitation, and prompt patient discharge  
46 from the hospital in facilitating a successful return to everyday life after road traffic-related  
47 orthopedic injuries.

48 **Keywords:** Social integration, road traffic orthopaedic injuries, activities and participation,  
49 IMPACT-S, rehabilitation

## 50 **Background**

51 Long-term disability resulting from Road Traffic Injuries (RTIs) is a pressing public health  
52 concern with devastating effects on individuals and significant societal and economic impacts  
53 worldwide [1], [2]. Annually, around 50 million people suffer injuries and 1.2 million lose their  
54 lives due to road traffic accidents, leaving 30% of survivors with permanent disabilities and  
55 14% unable to return to work[3]–[5]. This primarily affects the working-age population in low

56 and middle-income countries (LMICs), creating profound consequences for individuals,  
57 society, and the economy[6].

58 Effective management of injured patients aims to restore their normal functioning, and various  
59 biopsychosocial factors influence post-RTI functional outcomes[7], [8]. Social integration of  
60 patients post-RTI is a key outcome of successful management, and early psychological support  
61 and educating family members play vital roles in promoting social reintegration [6], [9][10].

62 The International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) defines  
63 participation in life as a crucial health outcome, encompassing an individual's involvement in  
64 society's usual activities[11]. Social integration, as defined by the ICF, necessitates  
65 interventions to facilitate interaction with the environment for optimal performance in an  
66 individual's life[12]–[14]. Various instruments, such as the IMPACT-S questionnaire, measure  
67 participation and activities following the ICF guidelines[15].

68 However, individuals with disabilities may encounter challenges in acceptance by their  
69 families, limited job opportunities, and difficulties in reintegrating into society[16]–[18].  
70 Adequate rehabilitative care is essential for positive functional outcomes and social  
71 reintegration, particularly in LMICs[19]. Rwanda faces a significant number of RTI  
72 victims[20], but the limited rehabilitation centers and personnel hinder their social  
73 reintegration[21].

74 This study employs the IMPACT-S questionnaire to identify factors contributing to social  
75 integration after road traffic orthopedic injuries in Rwanda, aiming to shed light on improving  
76 outcomes and addressing the challenges faced by RTI victims in the country.

## 77 **Methodology**

### 78 ***Study design and study settings***

79 A multi-centre cross-sectional study was undertaken to analyze hospital-based data on road  
80 traffic-related orthopaedic injuries that occurred in 2019 and were treated at the five Rwandan  
81 referral hospitals. These hospitals are referral and teaching hospitals with emergency,  
82 orthopaedic, mental health departments, and rehabilitation services. The study took place from  
83 the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2022, two years after the injuries occurred, at Centre  
84 Hospitalier Universitaire de Kigali (CHUK), Rwanda Military Hospital (RMH), and King  
85 Faisal Hospital (KFH), all located in Kigali City, but which receive patients from across  
86 Rwanda. The other two hospitals are Centre Hospitalier Universitaire (CHUB) in the Southern  
87 Province and Ruhengeri Hospital (RH) in the Northern Province.

### 88 ***Study population and sample size***

89 The study population comprised 2019 road traffic injury (RTI) survivors aged 18 and above  
90 admitted to the above five hospitals for both upper and lower limbs injuries. According to the  
91 records of the above five mentioned hospitals, around 4,600 cases post-RTIs with 1986  
92 orthopaedic injuries were admitted during the selected study period. We used Krejcie and  
93 Morgan's formula[22] for sample calculation and random sampling for sample size. The sample  
94 size representative of these RTI victims was 369.

95 We consulted the hospital records from the emergency departments, outpatients and admission  
96 for patients' demographics and contacts, details of the injury pattern, and the length of stay in  
97 the hospital. We excluded participants who were not oriented to time and space and could not  
98 respond to the questionnaire and patients with injuries other than orthopaedic. Those fulfilling  
99 the inclusion criteria of being above 18 years and having an orthopaedic road injury in 2019  
100 were contacted via telephone for their demographic details and requested to come to the  
101 hospital for further evaluation.

### 102 ***Psychometric properties of the instruments***

103 Participation and activities (Social integration) were evaluated using IMPACT-S (ICF Measure  
104 of Participation and ACTivities), an ICF-based participation tool called Patient Reported  
105 Outcome Measures (PROMS). The measure is designed to describe functioning and disability  
106 independent of health conditions and guide the participation level of patients with disabilities.  
107 This tool consists of 32 items grouped into nine domains (learning and applying knowledge,

108 general tasks and demands, communication, mobility, self-care, domestic life, interpersonal  
109 interactions and relationships, major life areas, community, social and civic life). The  
110 IMPACT-S also has two sub-total scores for Activities and Participation and one IMPACT-S  
111 total score. All summary scores were averaged item scores, converted into 0–100 scales. Higher  
112 IMPACT-S scores reflect better functioning (or less disability), meaning nearly entirely  
113 socially reintegrated in life after a road traffic injury.

114 This tool was validated by Marcel Post et al., 2008, in 197 road traffic survivors[23] with good  
115 psychometric properties according to the ICF framework. The IMPACT-S tool has been  
116 validated in conditions like carpal tunnel syndrome[24] and many languages, including  
117 Turkish[25]. Amir Javanmard et al.2020 compared six instruments used in the participation  
118 and activities evaluation for patients with spinal cord injuries and found that the IMPACT-S has  
119 had higher psychometric measures than other instruments [26]. The questionnaire was  
120 translated from English to Kinyarwanda by two language experts and back to English by two  
121 other language experts to address the cultural and linguistic equivalence, and the responses  
122 were the same. Also, we sent the questionnaire to experts in orthopaedic and rehabilitation for  
123 their opinion on the quality of translation, clarity and suitability for the Rwandan participants.

#### 124 ***Procedure***

125 Of the 1986 patients with orthopaedic injuries, we contacted 1721 on the phone; some had  
126 died, or their phones malfunctioned. The severity of the injury was evaluated using the  
127 Kampala Trauma Score (KTS), which is classified as mild, moderate and severe. After  
128 sampling, participants were invited to the hospital to assess their current status after almost two  
129 years post-RTIs. Using the IMPACT-S questionnaire, we measured the patient's overall level  
130 of social integration (participation and activities) after road traffic orthopaedic injuries in  
131 Rwanda. Participants filled out the questionnaire by considering how much their impairments  
132 interfered with their lives in the last 30 days before the interview. They answered on a 4-point  
133 response scale from 0- 3 (Extreme, considerable, some and no limitations), and the research  
134 assistants helped the participants to complete the questionnaire if they could not write.

135  
136 We calculated each IMPACT-S domain's mean and standard deviation (learning and applying  
137 knowledge, general tasks and demands, communication, mobility, self-care, domestic life,  
138 interpersonal interactions and relationships, major life areas, community, social and civic life).

139 The participant's socioeconomic status (Ubudehe) was collected according to the Rwanda  
140 government classification, where category I include impoverished and vulnerable citizens.  
141 Category II includes citizens who can afford some form of rented or owned accommodation  
142 but are not gainfully employed and can only afford to eat once or twice a day. Category III  
143 includes citizens who were gainfully employed or employers of labour. Category IV are  
144 citizens who are chief executive officers of big businesses, full-time employees with  
145 organisations, industries or companies, government employees, owners of shops or markets  
146 and owners of commercial transport vehicles or trucks [27].

147 The study's primary outcome is social integration (activities and participation). The risk factors  
148 include demographic data, the Kampala Trauma Scale, length of hospital stay, and  
149 rehabilitation.

#### 150 ***Data management and Statistical analysis***

151 Data were collected using the questionnaires, entered into a computer by a Google form data  
152 entry mode, and analysed using the R Software. We performed a descriptive analysis of the  
153 patient-reported outcome measure scale (IMPACT-S). Categorical variables were summarised  
154 using frequencies and percentages, continuous variables with means and standard deviations  
155 (SD). We used a student's t-test to compare continuous variables and the Chi-Square test for  
156 nominal (categorical) variables. We utilised multivariate logistic regression to assess  
157 associations between risk factors and IMPACT-S score categories. We considered the *P-value*  
158  $< 0.05$  to be statistically significant.

159 ***Ethical consideration***

160 We obtained ethical approval to conduct the study from the University of Rwanda, College of  
161 Medicine and Health Sciences Institutional Review Board (18/CMHS IRB/2022). The Rwanda  
162 National Research Committee operating in the Ministry of Health approved this study  
163 (NHRC/2022/PROT/014), and we collaborated with the Rwanda Biomedical Center  
164 (5535/RBC/2022) injury department. We obtained local ethical approvals from the five  
165 hospitals' ethics committees; CHUK(EC/CHUK/051/2022), CHUB (REC/UTHB/089/2022),  
166 RH(313/RRH/DG/2022), KFH(EC/KFH/015/2022), RMH(RMH IRB/027/2022). We  
167 obtained written consent from all participants before enrollment into the study, after explaining  
168 the purpose of the study, and all data were kept confidential and only used for the purpose of  
169 this study.

170 **Results**

171 ***Demographic characteristics of the participants***

172 Based on the data provided in Table 1, a total of 369 individuals responded to the survey.  
173 Among these, 64.5% (238 participants) were recruited from CHUK. The average age of all  
174 participants was 37.5±11.26 years, with the majority falling within the age range of 31-50  
175 years. Males constituted the majority at 74.25%. Approximately 41.73% (172) of all  
176 participants attended primary school, and 46.34% (171) resided in Kigali city. A significant  
177 portion, 41.73% (154), were engaged in business, while 29% (107) were part of the informal  
178 sector without fixed employment. The majority of our participants belonged to category III of  
179 the socioeconomic class (Ubudehe), comprising 61.52% (227) of individuals. This was  
180 followed by category II, which represented 33.06% of the participants. Additionally, 61.52%  
181 of the reported injuries were associated with motorcycle-related accidents.

182

183 **Table1: *Demographic characteristics of the participants***

| Factors         | n(%)       | Factors                   | n(%)       |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|
| <b>Hospital</b> |            | <b>Level of education</b> |            |
| CHUK            | 238(64.50) | None                      | 28(7.58)   |
| CHUB            | 32(8.67)   | Primary                   | 172(41.73) |
| RH              | 29(7.86)   | Secondary                 | 110(29.81) |
| RMH             | 30(8.13)   | University                | 59(15.99)  |

|                       |                     |  |            |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|------------|
| KFH                   | 40(10.84)           | <b>Residence</b>                       |            |
| <b>Age group</b>      | Mean= 37.57(±11.26) | Kigali City                            | 171(46.34) |
| 18-30                 | 102(27.64)          | Secondary cities                       | 94(25.47)  |
| 31-45                 | 199(53.93)          | Other Districts                        | 104(28.18) |
| 46-65                 | 59(15.99)           | <b>Occupation</b>                      |            |
| >65                   | 9(2.44)             | Farmer                                 | 31(8.40)   |
| <b>Sex</b>            |                     | Business                               | 154(41.73) |
| Male                  | 274(74.25)          | Students                               | 5(1.36)    |
| Female                | 95(25.75)           | Public service                         | 58(15.72)  |
| <b>Marital status</b> |                     | Informal sector                        | 107(29.00) |
| Single                | 87(23.58)           | Retired                                | 14(3.79)   |
| Married               | 265(71.82)          | <b>Socio-economic status (Ubudehe)</b> |            |
| Divorced              | 8(2.17)             | I                                      | 20(5.42)   |
| Other                 | 9(2.44)             | II                                     | 122(33.06) |
|                       |                     | III                                    | 227(61.52) |

184 *Source: Primary data*

### 185 **Clinical factors**

186 "Table 2 shows that 52.85% (195) of all participants had isolated lower limb injuries, while  
 187 polytrauma represented 21.14% (78) of cases. Half of our participants were managed within  
 188 one day (49.32%), with a mean treatment duration of 30 days, and 42.01% (155) were treated  
 189 with Open Reduction and Internal Fixation (ORIF). Regarding hospital stay, about 55.29%  
 190 (204) were discharged within 14 days, and the mean hospital stay was 30 days. Our findings  
 191 indicate that 66.84% (246) had a moderate Kampala Trauma Score (KTS). After completing  
 192 their injury treatment, 37.13% of the participants were unable to undergo rehabilitation, and  
 193 5.69% experienced limitations in integrating into Rwandan society.

194

195

### 196 **Table2: Clinical factors**

| Factors                     | n(%)     | Factors              | n(%)      |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|
| <b>Kampala Trauma Score</b> |          | <b>Intervention</b>  |           |
| Mild                        | 22(5.96) | Closed reduction+POP | 40(10.84) |



|   |            |                                       |            |
|---|------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Moderate                                | 247(66.94) | Open Reduction Internal Fixation      | 155(42.01) |
| Severe                                  | 100(27.1)  | Open Reduction External Fixation      | 57(15.45)  |
| <b>In Hospital Diagnosis</b>            |            | Amputation                            | 12(3.25)   |
| Upper extremity injuries                | 48(13.01)  | Other                                 | 105(28.46) |
| Lower extremity injuries                | 195(52.85) | <b>Length of Hospital Stay</b>        |            |
| Both upper and lower extremity injuries | 20(5.42)   | 0-7 days                              | 149(40.38) |
| Polytrauma                              | 78(21.14)  | 8-14 days                             | 55(14.91)  |
| Soft tissues injuries                   | 28(7.59)   | 15-30 days                            | 71(19.24)  |
| <b>Time before management</b>           |            | >30days                               | 94(25.47)  |
| ≤1day                                   | 182(49.32) | <b>Rehabilitation</b>                 |            |
| 2-7 days                                | 116(31.44) | Yes                                   | 232(62.87) |
| 8-14 days                               | 23(6.23)   | No                                    | 137(37.13) |
| 15-30 days                              | 30(8.13)   | <b>Level of reintegration</b>         |            |
| >30days                                 | 18(4.88)   | No limitations(None+Some)             | 348(94.30) |
|   |            | Limitations<br>(Considarable+Extreme) | 21(5.69)   |

197 *Source: Primary data*

198 Table 3 shows the components of the IMPACT-S, with 32 elements of the ICF domains  
 199 presented as questions. The questions were graded into four categories: extreme limitations,  
 200 considerable limitations, some limitations, and no limitations in activities (18 items) and  
 201 participation (14 items). Among all participants, the highest score in the "no limitations"  
 202 category was 97.83% for communicating and producing, while the lowest was 15.99% for  
 203 lifting and carrying objects. The category of "some limitations" ranged from 1.63% for  
 204 communicating and producing to 22.49% for washing and dressing. The category of  
 205 "considerable limitations ranged from 0.27% for communicating and receiving to 41.46% for  
 206 community life. Extreme limitations ranged from 0.00% for communicating and producing to  
 207 55.01% for lifting and carrying objects. These findings demonstrate the impact of road traffic  
 208 orthopaedic injuries on everyday life, even though most victims have fully reintegrated.

209 **Table 3: Item scores of IMPACT-S**

| <i>Factors</i>                |                | <i>Extreme<br/>limitations (%)</i> | <i>Considerable<br/>limitations (%)</i> | <i>Some<br/>limitations (%)</i> | <i>No<br/>limitations (%)</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Purposeful experiences</b> | <b>sensory</b> | 1.90                               | 1.08                                    | 4.07                            | 92.95                         |
| <b>Basic learning</b>         |                | 8.67                               | 2.17                                    | 8.94                            | 80.22                         |

|  |       |       |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>Applying knowledge</b>                          | 13.01 | 3.52  | 10.30 | 73.17 |
| <b>Task execution in quiet circumstances</b>       | 5.69  | 1.63  | 6.78  | 85.91 |
| <b>Task execution in stressful circumstances</b>   | 26.56 | 21.14 | 14.36 | 37.94 |
| <b>Communicating, receiving</b>                    | 0.27  | 0.27  | 2.71  | 96.75 |
| <b>Communicating, producing</b>                    | 0.00  | 0.54  | 1.63  | 97.83 |
| <b>Use of communication devices and techniques</b> | 0.81  | 1.63  | 4.88  | 92.68 |
| <b>Changing and maintaining body position</b>      | 12.20 | 28.46 | 7.86  | 51.49 |
| <b>Lifting and carrying objects</b>                | 55.01 | 21.68 | 7.32  | 15.99 |
| <b>Moving objects using lower extremities</b>      | 14.63 | 26.56 | 10.30 | 48.51 |
| <b>Fine hand use</b>                               | 2.44  | 1.08  | 5.42  | 91.06 |
| <b>Gross movements of hand and arm</b>             | 13.55 | 10.03 | 5.69  | 70.73 |
| <b>Walking and moving</b>                          | 17.34 | 33.60 | 6.23  | 42.82 |
| <b>Moving around using transportation</b>          | 36.59 | 22.22 | 7.05  | 34.15 |
| <b>Washing and dressing</b>                        | 10.30 | 18.16 | 22.49 | 49.05 |
| <b>Caring for body parts and toileting</b>         | 2.98  | 14.63 | 16.53 | 65.85 |
| <b>Eating, drinking, maintaining good health</b>   | 1.63  | 17.89 | 14.91 | 65.58 |
| <b>Acquisition of necessities</b>                  | 5.42  | 16.26 | 6.23  | 72.09 |
| <b>Household tasks</b>                             | 21.95 | 40.11 | 5.96  | 31.98 |
| <b>Caring for household objects</b>                | 12.47 | 25.75 | 10.57 | 51.22 |
| <b>Assisting others</b>                            | 11.11 | 12.74 | 11.65 | 64.50 |
| <b>General interpersonal interactions</b>          | 0.27  | 1.63  | 2.71  | 95.39 |
| <b>Formal relationships</b>                        | 2.17  | 1.90  | 3.52  | 92.41 |
| <b>Informal and family relationships</b>           | 2.71  | 2.17  | 3.79  | 91.33 |
| <b>Intimate relationships</b>                      | 1.36  | 2.44  | 3.52  | 92.68 |
| <b>Education, work and employment</b>              | 5.69  | 27.91 | 4.07  | 62.33 |
| <b>Managing the long-term financial situation</b>  | 4.61  | 2.71  | 8.13  | 84.55 |
| <b>Community life</b>                              | 21.68 | 41.46 | 6.23  | 30.62 |
| <b>Recreational and leisure</b>                    | 49.86 | 22.76 | 7.32  | 20.05 |
| <b>Religious and spiritual life</b>                | 3.79  | 3.25  | 4.07  | 88.89 |
| <b>Citizenship</b>                                 | 0.54  | 1.63  | 3.52  | 94.31 |

210 *Source: Primary Data*

211 Based on Table 4, which summarizes the nine categories of the IMPACT-S and two subtotals  
212 (activity and participation) out of 100, the overall average score for the IMPACT-S was  $77\pm 17$ ,  
213 indicating a favorable rating for these participants. Among the domains, participants excelled  
214 in communication, achieving the highest average score of  $98\pm 8$ , while mobility obtained the  
215 lowest score of  $62\pm 25$ . Activities had an average score of  $76\pm 16$  compared to  $84\pm 16$  for  
216 participation, which are the two primary components of the IMPACT-S questionnaire.

217

218 Generally, all the average scores are above 50 on a 0-100 scale, indicating that the majority of  
219 the participants have made significant progress in their recovery and can carry out and  
220 participate in most of their daily activities. Nevertheless, the average score for mobility was  
221 lower than the scores for the other domains, suggesting that some victims may still face  
222 mobility challenges due to their injuries. This highlights the importance of ongoing  
223 rehabilitation and support for the victims.

224

225 **Table 4: IMPACT-S summary scores**

226

| Factors                    | MEAN  | SD    |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|
| <b>Knowledge</b>           | 88.05 | 22.92 |
| <b>General tasks</b>       | 72.76 | 28.71 |
| <b>Communication</b>       | 98.07 | 8.00  |
| <b>Mobility</b>            | 62.27 | 24.58 |
| <b>Self-care</b>           | 77.78 | 26.10 |
| <b>Domestic-life</b>       | 68.59 | 29.41 |
| <b>Interpersonal</b>       | 95.89 | 12.29 |
| <b>Major life areas</b>    | 82.61 | 25.41 |
| <b>Community life</b>      | 67.75 | 20.01 |
| <b>Activities total</b>    | 76.28 | 17.81 |
| <b>Participation total</b> | 84.16 | 17.62 |
| <b>IMPACT-S total</b>      | 77.10 | 16.72 |

227 *Source: Primary Data*

228 IMPACT-S scored 0 for extreme limitations, 1 for considerable limitations, 2 for some  
229 limitations, and 3 for no limitations. The binary score combined extreme and considerable  
230 limitations into one category labelled as a limitation (score 1), while the remaining categories  
231 were combined and labelled as no limitation (score 0). Poor social integration was associated  
232 with the age group  $>65$  years ( $p\text{-value}<0.01$ ) and female sex ( $p\text{-value}=0.04$ ). Marital status for

233 separated couples (p-value=0.03), people in the business category (p-value=0.01),  
234 socioeconomic status category III (p-value=0.04), lack of rehabilitation management (p-  
235 value=0.01), and length of hospital stay (p-value=0.02) were also identified as factors  
236 negatively affecting social integration (Table 5).

237 **Table 5: Univariate model: Association between level of limitation and each factor**  
238

| <b>Factors</b>               |                     | <b>OR</b> | <b>CI</b>  | <b>p-value</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|----------------|
| <b>Age group</b>             | Reference (18-30)   | 0.051     | 0.01-0.11  | 0.00           |
|                              | 31-45               | 0.70      | 0.22-2.44  | 0.56           |
|                              | 46-65               | 1.79      | 0.48-6.72  | 0.37           |
|                              | >65                 | 9.7       | 1.68-50.86 | <0.01          |
| <b>Sex</b>                   | Reference (male)    | 0.04      | 0.02-0.07  | 0.00           |
|                              | Female              | 2.50      | 0.97-6.24  | 0.04           |
| <b>Marital Status</b>        | Reference (Single)  | 0.03      | 0.00-0.09  | 0.00           |
|                              | Married             | 1.56      | 0.49-6.89  | 0.49           |
|                              | Divorced            | 4.00      | 0.18-36.43 | 0.25           |
|                              | Separated           | 8.00      | 0.93-56.90 | 0.03           |
| <b>Occupation</b>            | Reference (Farmer)  | 0.14      | 0.04-0.37  | 0.00           |
|                              | Business            | 0.13      | 0.02-0.64  | 0.01           |
|                              | Student             | 1.68      | 0.07-15.84 | 0.67           |
|                              | Public service      | 0.24      | 0.03-1.31  | 0.11           |
|                              | Unemployed          | 0.61      | 0.18-2.42  | 0.45           |
|                              | Other               | 0.51      | 0.02-3.96  | 0.57           |
| <b>Socio-economic status</b> | Reference (I)       | 0.17      | 0.04-0.52  | 0.00           |
|                              | II                  | 0.39      | 0.10-1.94  | 0.20           |
|                              | III                 | 0.23      | 0.62-1.12  | 0.04           |
| <b>Rehabilitation</b>        | Reference (Yes)     | 0.03      | 0.01-0.06  | 0.00           |
|                              | No                  | 3.36      | 1.34-9.17  | 0.01           |
| <b>Length Hospital</b>       | Reference (1-7days) | 0.02      | 0.00-6.52  | 0.00           |

|             |           |      |            |      |
|-------------|-----------|------|------------|------|
| <b>Stay</b> | 8-14days  | -    | -          | 0.99 |
|             | 15-30days | 3.96 | 1.15-15.58 | 0.03 |
|             | >30days   | 3.8  | 1.21-14.51 | 0.02 |

239

240 In the multiple logistic regression analysis, several factors were found to contribute to  
 241 limitations in social reintegration after injury. The results are summarized in Table 6. Age  
 242 group above 65 OR= 8.25( 95%CI =1.15-55.56), p-value=0.02.This means that individuals  
 243 above the age of 65 are 8.25 times more likely to experience poor social reintegration compared  
 244 to other age groups. Being female is associated with a 3.26 times higher likelihood of  
 245 experiencing limitations in social reintegration with OR=3.26(95%CI =1.14-9.25), p-  
 246 value=0.02.

247 Other contributing factors to social integration limitation include lack of rehabilitation  
 248 associated with a 3.82 times higher likelihood of experiencing limitations in social reintegration  
 249 with OR=3.82(95%CI =1.39-17.39), p-value=0.01 and length of hospital stay of 15-30 days  
 250 associated with a 4.44 times higher likelihood of experiencing limitations in social reintegration  
 251 with an OR=4.44(95%CI =1.19-18.81), p-value= 0.02 as well as the length of hospital stay of  
 252 >30 days with an OR=4.04(95%CI =1.15-16.71), p-value= 0.03.

253 **Table6: Multiple logistic regression of**

| <b>Factors</b>              |         | <b>OR</b> | <b>CI</b>  | <b>z-value</b> | <b>p-value</b> |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Intercept</b>            |         | 0.09      | 0.03-0.36  | -6.110         | <0.01          |
| <b>Age group</b>            | 18-30   | 1         |            |                |                |
|                             | 31-45   | 0.51      | 0.15-1.88  | -1.042         | 0.29           |
|                             | 46-65   | 1.46      | 0.54-5.99  | 0.536          | 0.59           |
|                             | >65     | 8.25      | 1.15-55.56 | 2.185          | 0.02           |
| <b>Sex</b>                  | Male    | 1         |            |                |                |
|                             | Female  | 3.26      | 1.14-9.25  | 2.243          | 0.02           |
| <b>Rehabilitation</b>       | Yes     | 1         |            |                |                |
|                             | No      | 3.82      | 1.39-17.39 | 2.511          | 0.01           |
| <b>Length Hospital Stay</b> | 0-7days | 1         |            |                |                |

|           |       |            |        |      |
|-----------|-------|------------|--------|------|
| 8-14days  | 0.004 | -          | -0.012 | 0.99 |
| 15-30days | 4.44  | 1.19-18.81 | 2.172  | 0.02 |
| >30days   | 4.04  | 1.15-16.71 | 2.099  | 0.03 |

## 254 **Discussion**

255 Our study aimed to determine the level of social integration (activities and participation)  
256 following road traffic orthopaedic injuries (RTIs) in Rwanda. The findings of our study  
257 revealed several significant factors contributing to limitations in social integration after RTIs  
258 in Rwanda, including the age group above 65, female sex, lack of rehabilitation, and a hospital  
259 stay of more than two weeks.

260 In 2019, half of the road traffic injuries in Rwanda were limb trauma, consistent with findings  
261 from other studies conducted in LMICs[28], [29]. Males were more predominant than females,  
262 which can be explained by the higher mobility of men and their greater involvement in general  
263 activities in Rwanda, a pattern observed in other Sub-Saharan African countries as  
264 well[30][31][32]. Globally, road traffic injury victims are typically in the working age  
265 group[33]–[35] with fewer unemployed [36]–[38] and our study confirmed this finding. The  
266 mean age of our participants was 37.5 years, with a predominant representation in the age group  
267 of 31-50 years. The results of our study indicate that the majority of the RTI victims were able  
268 to integrate back into their daily activities after the accident.

269 More than half of the participants in our study belonged to socioeconomic class category III,  
270 which included individuals who were gainfully employed or even employers themselves. This  
271 finding highlights the association between accidents and a high rate of movement among the  
272 victims. Motorcycles were identified as the leading cause of accidents, followed by motor  
273 vehicles. As of 2021, there were over 100,000 motorcycles in Rwanda, with half of them  
274 operating as moto-taxis [39]. It is noteworthy that more than half of the victims in our study  
275 had lower limb injuries, and a quarter of them experienced polytrauma at the time of injury.  
276 This trend aligns with findings from studies conducted in LMICs, where lower limb injuries  
277 are commonly observed in road traffic injuries[40], [41]. Among the orthopaedic injuries, more  
278 than half of the cases required surgical intervention, either through open reduction and internal  
279 fixation or external fixation. The average hospital stay for the participants was 30 days. It is  
280 important to note that polytrauma patients who required multiple interventions tended to have  
281 extended hospital stays.

282 Our findings showed that half of our participants were managed within one day (49.32%), with  
283 a mean of 30 days and 42.01% were treated by Open Reduction and Internal Fixation (ORIF).  
284 The majority were discharged within 14 days (40.38%), mean hospital stay was 30 days  
285 246/368(66.84%) had moderate Kampala Trauma Score (KTS). After injury treatment, 37.13%  
286 of the victims could not undergo any rehabilitation management. For our study, 37% of the  
287 prescribed rehabilitation was not done after injury management, primarily due to financial  
288 issues and the long distance between their homes and the district hospitals. The same findings  
289 were observed in other studies from LMICs where access to rehabilitation ranges from 5%-  
290 59%, and in many countries, rehabilitation centres are lacking [42]–[44]. Lack of rehabilitation  
291 in post-RTI has been associated with a low rate of return to work through a significant impact  
292 on the activities and participation of the victims, which is the case in our findings. Many  
293 researchers have suggested community-based rehabilitation in post-RTI for complete social  
294 integration [45]–[47].

295 The primary outcome of this study was the evaluation of social integration using the Measure  
296 of Participation and Activities Screener (IMPACT-S). The results indicated that participants  
297 had higher scores in the category of no limitations for activities such as communication and  
298 production, while the lowest scores were observed in the category of lifting and carrying  
299 objects, suggesting that participants were more comfortable with communication tasks  
300 compared to tasks that required physical strength. Participants who had some limitations in  
301 activities and participation performed relatively well in communication and production but  
302 faced difficulties with tasks related to washing and dressing. The category of considerable  
303 limitations included participants who encountered significant challenges in executing  
304 community life activities, struggling with various daily tasks. More than half of the participants  
305 experienced extreme limitations when it came to lifting and carrying objects. These findings  
306 underscore the impact of road traffic orthopaedic injuries on important aspects of daily life.

307 The study findings revealed that while participants scored high in terms of social participation,  
308 they faced difficulties in performing activities. This can be attributed to the focus of our  
309 research on orthopaedic injuries, which predominantly affect the limbs compared to other body  
310 systems. These findings align with similar studies conducted in different countries, such as the  
311 study by M. Post et al. in 2008, which validated the IMPACT-S tool. Ahmed Nour et al. (2023)  
312 conducted a study in Cameroon and found that more than 39% of patients with limb injuries  
313 experienced difficulties with activities of daily living [23][48]. These findings emphasize the

314 need to improve rehabilitation services from the early stages of post-road traffic injuries to  
315 address the limitations in activities and promote better social integration.

316 Studies have consistently shown that the IMPACT-S tool is the most effective tool for  
317 summarizing all chapters of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and  
318 Health (ICF) when compared to other tools [15], [26]. The IMPACT-S tool consists of nine  
319 domains and two subtotals. In this study, the overall IMPACT-S mean score was found to be  
320 good for the participants, which is consistent with findings reported by other authors who have  
321 also used this tool. These authors have explained that the level of activities and participation  
322 becomes acceptable after accidents [24], [25].

323 Among the domains of the IMPACT-S tool, communication had a higher mean score compared  
324 to mobility, which had a lower mean across all domains. This can be explained by the high  
325 number of lower limb injuries observed in this study, which is consistent with findings from  
326 other studies [23], [25]. Furthermore, the activity domain had a lower mean for the IMPACT-  
327 S subtotal compared to the participation domain. These findings can be attributed to the specific  
328 injuries sustained by these patients at the time of the accident.

329  
330 After calculating the IMPACT-S scores, we analyzed the factors associated with activities and  
331 participation using a binary score. In this scoring system, scores 0 and 1 were combined to  
332 represent limitations, while scores 2 and 3 were grouped into 1 to indicate no limitations.  
333 Several factors were found to be associated with limitations in social integration. These  
334 included being above 65 years of age, female sex, being in a separated marital status, belonging  
335 to the business category for occupation, and falling into socioeconomic status category III.  
336 These findings provide insights into the univariate factors that can help explain the long-term  
337 outcomes of victims of road traffic injuries (RTIs) and their ability to return to everyday life.

338 Among the clinical factors, the lack of rehabilitation management was also found to contribute  
339 to limitations in social integration and longer hospital stays. These factors align with findings  
340 from other studies that have identified them as predictors of poor participation and activities in  
341 post-RTI scenarios in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [43], [49].

342 Social integration following road traffic injuries (RTIs) is a critical health outcome influenced  
343 by various factors. Through multiple logistic regression analysis, we have identified the factors  
344 that contribute to limitations in social integration among individuals post-accident. Among



345 these factors, the age group above 65 years was found to contribute eight times more to social  
346 integration limitations compared to other age groups. Additionally, females were found to  
347 contribute three times more to these limitations compared to males. Lack of rehabilitation had  
348 a significant impact, contributing nearly four times more to limitations in social integration  
349 compared to attending rehabilitation sessions.

350 Furthermore, the length of hospital stay has been shown in other studies to be a determinant of  
351 social integration following RTIs [17], [40]. In our study, a hospital stay of more than two  
352 weeks contributed four times more to social integration limitations compared to individuals  
353 who spent less than two weeks in the hospital. These findings highlight the importance of  
354 considering these factors in understanding and addressing limitations in social integration  
355 among individuals recovering from RTIs.

356 This study will serve as a foundation for future research aimed at assessing the quality of life  
357 of individuals with long-term disabilities resulting from orthopedic injuries sustained in road  
358 traffic accidents. The findings from this study will provide valuable insights for stakeholders  
359 in developing policies and interventions to enhance activities and participation after road traffic  
360 injuries (RTIs). Consideration of rehabilitation approaches such as home-based rehabilitation  
361 or E-rehabilitation can potentially expedite the process of post-RTI social integration. These  
362 strategies can be explored further in order to improve the overall outcomes and quality of life  
363 for individuals recovering from RTIs.

364 By incorporating these findings into policy development, stakeholders can work towards  
365 enhancing the support and rehabilitation services available to individuals affected by long-term  
366 disabilities resulting from road traffic orthopedic injuries. This, in turn, can contribute to  
367 improving the activities and participation of individuals post-RTIs.

368 Our study has identified several limitations that should be acknowledged. Firstly, there was a  
369 two-year gap between the time of injury and the assessment of patient outcomes. This time  
370 lapse may have introduced variability and could affect the generalizability of our findings.  
371 Secondly, we relied on secondary data for both the baseline and follow-up measurements,  
372 which presented certain challenges. The use of existing data may have led to missing  
373 information and limited our ability to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the patients'  
374 conditions. Furthermore, the presence of missing information in the recorded data was another  
375 limitation that impacted the generalizability of our findings. The incomplete data may have  
376 introduced biases and affected the accuracy of our analysis.

## 377 **Conclusion**

378 Our study findings indicate that the majority of road traffic orthopedic injury victims in  
379 Rwanda are able to reintegrate into society following the accident. However, certain domains  
380 such as mobility and community life are more adversely affected than others. We identified  
381 several factors that have a negative impact on social integration after road traffic injuries in  
382 Rwanda. These factors include older age, being female, lack of rehabilitation, and longer  
383 hospital stays. The study highlights the significance of early management, rehabilitation, and  
384 timely discharge from the hospital in facilitating the return to everyday life after the accident.  
385 These factors play a crucial role in improving social integration outcomes for individuals  
386 affected by road traffic orthopedic injuries.

### 387 ***Research funding***

388 This research (or “[initials of fellow]”) was supported by the Consortium for Advanced  
389 Research Training in Africa (CARTA). CARTA is jointly led by the African Population and  
390 Health Research Center and the University of the Witwatersrand and funded by the Carnegie  
391 Corporation of New York (Grant No. G-19-57145), Sida (Grant No:**54100113**), Uppsala  
392 Monitoring Center, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), and by the  
393 Wellcome Trust [reference no. 107768/Z/15/Z] and the UK Foreign, Commonwealth &  
394 Development Office, supported by the Developing Excellence in Leadership, Training  
395 and Science in Africa (DELTA Africa) programme. The statements made, and views  
396 expressed are solely the responsibility of the Fellow.

397 This research also was funded by the University of Rwanda through the SIDA open grant 2021-  
398 2023.

### 399 **Acknowledgement**

400 I acknowledge everyone who supported and contributed to this study, including the participants  
401 and research assistants from the five referral hospitals, especially Joel Nshumuyiki, the chief  
402 research assistant. Special thanks go to my Supervisors for the PhD project entitled” Health  
403 Outcomes of long term disabilities following Road Traffic Injuries in Rwanda”.

#### 404 **Data availability statement**

405 Data supporting the study findings are available on request from the corresponding author  
406 [JAI]. The data are not publicly available due to ethical data transfer restrictions of IRB that  
407 could compromise the privacy of research participants.

#### 408 **Disclaimer**

409 The views and opinions expressed in the submitted article are the author's own and not the  
410 official position of the affiliated institutions.

#### 411 **Competing interest statements**

412 The authors have declared that there is no competing interest exists.

#### 413 **Contributions**

414 • JAI, JBS, AS, CU, DM, DT, GU, and GB participated in all stages of this paper, from  
415 the study design, methodology, grant writing, data collection, analysis and paper  
416 writing.

#### 417 **References**

- 418 [1] Organização Mundial da Saúde, "Global Status Report on Road," *World Heal. Organ.*,  
419 p. 20, 2018.
- 420 [2] G. K. Gathecha *et al.*, "Prevalence and predictors of injuries in Kenya: findings from  
421 the national STEPs survey," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 18, no. S3, 2018, doi:  
422 10.1186/s12889-018-6061-x.
- 423 [3] R. Alemany, M. Ayuso, and M. Guillén, "Impact of road traffic injuries on disability  
424 rates and long-term care costs in Spain," *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, vol. 60.  
425 pp. 95–102, 2013.
- 426 [4] Oluwaseyi Joseph Afolabi and T Gbadamosi Kolawole, "Road Traffic Crashes in  
427 Nigeria: Causes and Consequences," *Int. J. Shipp. Transp. Logist.*, vol. 17, no. 42, pp.  
428 40–49, 2017 [Online]. Available: file:///C:/Users/KING SOLOMON  
429 1/Downloads/TrafficAccidentJournal.pdf
- 430 [5] K. Hyder, Adnan; Puvanachandra, Prasanthi; Allen, "Road Traffic Injury and Trauma  
431 Care: Innovations for Policy (Road Trip)," *WISH Road Traffic Inj. Rep.*, 2013.
- 432 [6] Y. Üzümcüoğlu *et al.*, "Life quality and rehabilitation after a road traffic crash: A  
433 literature review," *Transp. Res. Part F Traffic Psychol. Behav.*, vol. 40, pp. 1–13,  
434 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.trf.2016.02.002.
- 435 [7] B. Gopinath, J. Jagnoor, N. Elbers, and I. D. Cameron, "Overview of findings from a 2  
436 - year study of claimants who had sustained a mild or moderate injury in a road traffic  
437 crash : prospective study," *BMC Res. Notes*, pp. 1–7, 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13104-017-  
438 2401-7.
- 439 [8] R. Alharbi, I. Mosley, C. Miller, S. Hillel, and V. Lewis, "Transportation Research

- 440 Interdisciplinary Perspectives Factors associated with physical , psychological and  
441 functional outcomes in adult trauma patients following Road Traf fi c Crash : A  
442 scoping literature review,” *Transp. Res. Interdiscip. Perspect.*, vol. 3, p. 100061, 2019,  
443 doi: 10.1016/j.trip.2019.100061. [Online]. Available:  
444 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2019.100061>
- 445 [9] C. L. Brakenridge, E. M. Gane, E. J. Smits, N. E. Andrews, and V. Johnston, “Impact  
446 of interventions on work-related outcomes for individuals with musculoskeletal  
447 injuries after road traffic crash: A systematic review protocol,” *Syst. Rev.*, vol. 8, no. 1,  
448 pp. 1–7, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s13643-019-1178-2.
- 449 [10] F. P. Sabet, K. N. Tabrizi, H. R. Khankeh, S. Saadat, H. A. Abedi, and A. Bastami,  
450 “Road traffic accident victims’ experiences of return to normal life: A qualitative  
451 study,” *Iran. Red Crescent Med. J.*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, doi: 10.5812/ircmj.29548.
- 452 [11] M. W. M. Post, L. P. De Witte, E. Reichrath, M. Manon, G. J. Wijnhuizen, and R. J. M.  
453 Perenboom, “ORIGINAL REPORT DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF  
454 IMPACT-S , AN ICF-BASED QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE ACTIVITIES  
455 AND PARTICIPATION,” no. 2002, pp. 620–627, 2008, doi: 10.2340/16501977-0223.
- 456 [12] R. O. M. J. M. Perenboom and A. M. J. Chorus, “Measuring participation according to  
457 the International Classification of Functioning , Disability and Health ( ICF ),” 2003,  
458 doi: 10.1080/0963828031000137081.
- 459 [13] R. R. J. Ifver and M. H. H. Y. Berg, “Quality of life following road traffic injury : the  
460 impact of age and gender,” *Qual. Life Res.*, no. 0123456789, 2020, doi:  
461 10.1007/s11136-020-02427-3. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-020-02427-3)  
462 [020-02427-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-020-02427-3)
- 463 [14] C. Péliissier, E. Fort, L. Fontana, B. Charbotel, and M. Hours, “Factors associated with  
464 non-return to work in the severely injured victims 3 years after a road accident: A  
465 prospective study,” *Accid. Anal. Prev.*, vol. 106, pp. 411–419, 2017, doi:  
466 10.1016/j.aap.2017.06.020.
- 467 [15] C. Van Der Zee, *Measuring participation outcomes in rehabilitation medicine*. 2013  
468 [Online]. Available:  
469 [https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/279587/van\\_der\\_zee.pdf?sequence=](https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/279587/van_der_zee.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y)  
470 [2&isAllowed=y](https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/279587/van_der_zee.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y)
- 471 [16] R. E. Kohler, J. Tomlinson, T. E. Chilunjika, S. Young, M. Hosseinipour, and C. N.  
472 Lee, “‘Life is at a standstill’ Quality of life after lower extremity trauma in Malawi,”  
473 *Qual. Life Res.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1027–1035, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11136-016-1431-2.
- 474 [17] L. Resnik, M. Borgia, and B. Silver, “Measuring Community Integration in Persons  
475 with Limb Trauma and Amputation: A Systematic Review,” *Arch. Phys. Med.*  
476 *Rehabil.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2016.08.463. [Online]. Available:  
477 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2016.08.463>
- 478 [18] M. M. Grimm and C. C. Treibich, “Socio-economic determinants of road traffic  
479 accident fatalities in low and middle income countries,” *ISS Work. Pap. Ser. / Gen.*  
480 *Ser.*, vol. 504, no. 504, pp. 1–44, 2010 [Online]. Available:  
481 <https://repub.eur.nl/pub/19841/>

- 482 [19] O. A. M. Neagu, “INSIGHTS ON THE ESTIMATE OF COSTS IN ROAD TRAFFIC  
483 ACCIDENTS,” *Rev. Med. Chir. Soc. Med. Nat.*, vol. 121, no. 3, pp. 624–630, 2020.
- 484 [20] S. Nabeel, J. K. Canner, N. Nagarajan, and A. L. Kushner, “Road traffic injuries :  
485 Cross-sectional cluster randomized countrywide population data from 4 low-income  
486 countries,” *Int. J. Surg.*, vol. 52, no. February, pp. 237–242, 2018, doi:  
487 10.1016/j.ijisu.2018.02.034.
- 488 [21] H. N. Locke, V. Randriamarotsiresy, M. A. Chamberlain, and R. J. O’Connor, “Delays  
489 to accessing healthcare and rehabilitation following trauma in Madagascar—a  
490 qualitative study,” *Disabil. Rehabil.*, vol. 0, no. 0, pp. 1–8, 2020, doi:  
491 10.1080/09638288.2020.1741696. [Online]. Available:  
492 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2020.1741696>
- 493 [22] J. E. Fincham and J. R. Draugalis, “The importance of survey research standards,” *Am.*  
494 *J. Pharm. Educ.*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 7–10, 2013, doi: 10.5688/ajpe7714.
- 495 [23] M. W. M. Post, L. P. de Witte, E. Reichrath, M. M. Verdonshot, G. J. Wijnhuizen, and  
496 R. J. M. Perenboom, “Development and validation of impact-s, an ICF-based  
497 questionnaire to measure activities and participation,” *J. Rehabil. Med.*, vol. 40, no. 8,  
498 pp. 620–627, 2008, doi: 10.2340/16501977-0223.
- 499 [24] M. P. Sharma and V. Choudhary, “Validity of IMPACT-S for Assessing Activities and  
500 Participation in patients with Carpal Tunnel Syndrome,” no. 3, pp. 1–9, 2022.
- 501 [25] A. Aşkın, E. Atar, A. Tosun, Ü. Demirdal, and Ö. Koca, “Activities and participation  
502 after stroke: validity and reliability of the Turkish version of IMPACT-S  
503 questionnaire,” *Disabil. Rehabil.*, vol. 42, no. 13, pp. 1912–1917, 2020, doi:  
504 10.1080/09638288.2018.1542038. [Online]. Available:  
505 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2018.1542038>
- 506 [26] A. Javanmard, K. Abdi, A. Ebadi, and S. Hosseinzadeh, “Participation instruments in  
507 persons with spinal cord injury: A narrative review,” *Med. J. Islam. Repub. Iran*, vol.  
508 34, no. 1, 2020, doi: 10.34171/mjiri.34.66.
- 509 [27] R. Sabates-Wheeler, S. Yates, E. Wylde, and J. Gatsinzi, “Challenges of measuring  
510 graduation in rwanda,” *IDS Bull.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 103–114, 2015, doi:  
511 10.1111/1759-5436.12133.
- 512 [28] Y. Mousazadeh *et al.*, “Functional Consequences of Road Traffic Injuries: Preliminary  
513 Results from PERSIAN Traffic Cohort (PTC),” *Trauma Mon.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 294–  
514 304, 2021, doi: 10.30491/TM.2021.289262.1314.
- 515 [29] O. Access, “Pattern of road traffic injuries in Yemen: a hospital-based study,” *Pan Afr.*  
516 *Med. J.*, vol. 8688, pp. 1–9, 2018, doi: 10.11604/pamj.2018.29.145.12974.
- 517 [30] A. Ingabire, R. T. Petroze, F. Calland, J. C. Okiria, and J. C. Byiringiro, “Profile and  
518 economic impact of motorcycle injuries treated at a university referral hospital in  
519 Kigali, Rwanda,” *Rwanda Med. J.*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 5–11, 2015, doi:  
520 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2013.07.134.
- 521 [31] L. H. Lugo, H. I. García, B. C. Cano, J. C. Arango-Lasprilla, and O. L. Alcaraz,  
522 “Multicentric study of epidemiological and clinical characteristics of persons injured in

- 523 motor vehicle accidents in Medellín, Colombia, 2009-2010,” *Colomb. Med.*, vol. 44,  
524 no. 2, pp. 100–107, 2013, doi: 10.25100/cm.v44i2.1106.
- 525 [32] N. N. O’Hara *et al.*, “The Socioeconomic Implications of Isolated Tibial and Femoral  
526 Fractures from Road Traffic Injuries in Uganda,” *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.*, vol. 100, no.  
527 7, p. e43, 2018, doi: 10.2106/JBJS.17.00439.
- 528 [33] B. Gopinath *et al.*, “Prognostic indicators of social outcomes in persons who sustained  
529 an injury in a road traffic crash,” *Injury*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 909–917, 2015, doi:  
530 10.1016/j.injury.2015.01.002. [Online]. Available:  
531 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2015.01.002>
- 532 [34] P. Marquez, “The Challenge of Non-Communicable diseases and Road Traffic  
533 Injuries,” *WORLD BANK Rep.*, 2013.
- 534 [35] L. A. Gheshlaghi and H. Shari, “Quality of Life after Motorcycle Traffic Injuries : A  
535 Cohort Study in Northwest of Iran,” pp. 1–14, 2020.
- 536 [36] E. M. Gane *et al.*, “Functional and employment outcomes following road traffic  
537 crashes in Queensland , Australia : Protocol for a prospective cohort study .,” *J.*  
538 *Transp. Heal.*, vol. 15, no. November, p. 100678, 2019, doi:  
539 10.1016/j.jth.2019.100678. [Online]. Available:  
540 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2019.100678>
- 541 [37] J. P. Herrera-escobar *et al.*, “Association of pain after trauma with long-term  
542 functional and mental health outcomes,” *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*, vol. 85, no. 4, pp.  
543 773–779, 2018, doi: 10.1097/TA.0000000000002017.
- 544 [38] S. Davey, E. Bulat, H. Massawe, A. Pallangyo, A. Premkumar, and N. Sheth, “The  
545 economic burden of non-fatal musculoskeletal injuries in Northeastern Tanzania,”  
546 *Ann. Glob. Heal.*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2019, doi: 10.5334/aogh.1355.
- 547 [39] S. Edition, “Tax Statistics in Rwanda,” no. June. 2019.
- 548 [40] A. Chauhan, N. Ahmed, J. V. Singh, V. K. Singh, A. Singh, and S. Kumar, “Disability  
549 and mortality following road traffic injury: a follow-up study from a tertiary care  
550 centre of India,” *Int. J. Community Med. Public Heal.*, vol. 4, no. 12, p. 4712, 2017,  
551 doi: 10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20175356.
- 552 [41] M. Mahdian, M. R. Fazel, M. Sehat, G. Khosravi, and M. Mohammadzadeh,  
553 “Epidemiological profile of extremity fractures and dislocations in road traffic  
554 accidents in Kashan, Iran: A glance at the related disabilities,” *Arch. Bone Jt. Surg.*,  
555 vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 186–192, 2017, doi: 10.22038/abjs.2017.8427.
- 556 [42] M. L. Odland *et al.*, “Equitable access to quality trauma systems in low-income and  
557 middle-income countries: Assessing gaps and developing priorities in Ghana, Rwanda  
558 and South Africa,” *BMJ Glob. Heal.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1–8, 2022, doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-  
559 2021-008256.
- 560 [43] A. Patel *et al.*, “PLOS GLOBAL PUBLIC HEALTH Barriers to accessing follow up  
561 care in post- hospitalized trauma patients in Moshi , Tanzania : A mixed methods  
562 study,” *PLOS Glob. Public Heal.*, pp. 1–18, 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000277.
- 563 [44] J. S. M. and M. K. Mitchel Chatukuta, Nora Groce, “Access to rehabilitation services

- 564 for road traffic injury patients in Namibia.pdf,” *Disabil. Rehabil.*, vol. 44, no. 25, pp.  
565 7985–7992, 2022.
- 566 [45] J. U. Samuel, “Utilization of Community Based Rehabilitation for Persons’ With  
567 Disabilities (PwD) in Nigeria: the Way Forward,” *Eur. Sci. J.*, vol. 11, no. 25, pp.  
568 1857–7881, 2015.
- 569 [46] L. Godlwana, A. Stewart, and E. Musenge, “The effect of a home exercise intervention  
570 on persons with lower limb amputations: a randomized controlled trial,” *Clin.  
571 Rehabil.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 99–110, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0269215519880295.
- 572 [47] L. S. Madsen, C. Handberg, C. M. Jensen, and C. V. Nielsen, “Community-based  
573 rehabilitation approaches in outdoor settings: a systematic review of people with  
574 disabilities’ and professionals’ experiences and perceptions,” *Disabil. Soc.*, vol. 36, no.  
575 7, pp. 1073–1098, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09687599.2020.1783206. [Online]. Available:  
576 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2020.1783206>
- 577 [48] F. M. Ahmed Nour *et al.*, “Limb Injuries and Disability in the Southwest Region of  
578 Cameroon,” *J. Am. Acad. Orthop. Surg. Glob. Res. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1–10, 2023,  
579 doi: 10.5435/jaaosglobal-d-22-00148.
- 580 [49] W. C. Chi *et al.*, “Measuring disability and its predicting factors in a large database in  
581 Taiwan using the world health organization disability assessment schedule 2.0,” *Int. J.  
582 Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 12148–12161, 2014, doi:  
583 10.3390/ijerph111212148.

584