



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27310
Title of the Manuscript:	Emergency Injury Care (EIC) through community volunteers in rural Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Is this paper intended to be about children? It is not clear at all and is very confusing – it reads as if it is a general paper about adult injury but most of the citations are related to children and the people who were trained are caregivers of children. 2. The authors swap between “emergency injury care” and “emergency medical care” throughout the paper, and in the abstract line 11 says “community volunteers were developed to provide EIC during any emergency situation”. This paper is only about <i>injury</i> care and thus that line is not true. Injury should be used consistently. 3. The sentence beginning on line 40 needs supporting evidence. 4. The sentence beginning on line 41 “In preventive medicine or primary care” does not make sense. Why is preventive medicine and primary care being mentioned here? 5. The sentence beginning on line 43 “The availability of health care providers” needs supporting evidence. 6. The sentence beginning on line 49 states that injury is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide, but the citations appear to only reference Bangladesh. If the authors want to keep the sentence, the references should be broadened, but they could also change the sentence to reflect the burden of injury in Bangladesh only. 7. There should be more information about PRECISE in the	1. This feedback is irrelevant to this paper. Only citation number 10 related to children. 2. Emergency Injury Care is a part of Emergency Medical Care and this paper focused on only injury care provided by community volunteers. Emergency situation means any situations that needed emergency health care (emergency injury care). 3. The definition for EICs is not yet established elsewhere, so to describe purpose some common words were used. 4. Some words were missing, changed in the article 5. I mentioned reference [1-2] for supporting this sentence. 6. Two more citations added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	background. 8. The methods section needs to be reordered – it is very repetitive and the content does not align with the subheadings (for instance, not everything mentioned under study setting is part of the study setting) 9. There should be more information about the doctors selected to conduct the training – what type of doctors were they, with what training level? Were they volunteers? Who trained the trainers? 10. There needs to be some information about the content of the training. What topics were covered? Why were these chosen? Who developed the course? Also, there is a lot of mention of CPR in the methods and it sounds like a significant amount of course time was devoted to the topic. Who decided that CPR was important when training laypersons on injury care? This decision needs to be explained in the paper. 11. The paragraph beginning on line 110 is confusing and should be reworded. 12. The paragraph beginning on line 135 is results. 13. The reporting form, mentioned on line 143, needs to be described; specifically, what type of information was recorded. 14. The paper mentions injury severity multiple times, specifically in the results section, but nowhere is it defined how injury severity was scored and who was doing the scoring. 15. In line with point 10, there <i>needs</i> to be information about the referral training given to course participants, specifically about when they were told to refer patients to a higher level of care. It is a bit concerning that laypersons with 3 days of training were making decisions about whether or not injured persons needed	7. Added 8. Revised 9. Added, Medical officers were MBBS doctor. They were paid volunteer. Emergency medical specialists provided them training. 10. The course was developed with some emergency medical specialist. In Bangladesh Drowning is a major problem so to manage drowning casualty CPR is needed. In addition CPR is also needed for managing any injured with no life signs. So CPR was added in this study. 11. rewarded 12. edited 13. edited 14. The ward severity is written in the conclusion section. I did not find any ward
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	medical care, and so it would be good to describe what they were taught as referral parameters. 16. The results of the drowning patients are not clear. Were there 3 people who were not breathing at all after drowning, and all of them were successfully resuscitated with CPR at the scene? 17. Why were the groups chosen to receive the EIC training chosen? Because they work with children? (this then makes the paper about children – see point 1) 18. Line 307 remove “any emergency health situation” and replace with injury 29. Line 308 needs citation, as this was not a result of this study 30. Line 316 is not a conclusion of this paper – this is an observational paper 31. Line 318, the word “effective” has not been defined anywhere – how was this training effective? Also, how was it low cost? The cost has not been discussed. 32. The conclusions section needs to be reworded to be in line with the actual results of the paper (the types of injury seen by laypersons, and the care provided)	injury severity in the article?? 15. The volunteer trained to refer all injured to the health facilities after providing EICs. There was no specific parameter for deciding referral. 16. Yes after rescued from water volunteers provided CPR in site. All children were survived after the CPR. 17. The PRECISE program was developed fro child injury prevention but the EIC covered all populations living in the community. 18. edited 29. Edited 30. Rewarded 31. Edited (removed) 32. reworded
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. In the first line of the background, the definition of “Emergency Injury Care” is not clear. Who is stabilizing these casualties? 2. I don't think citation 8 is cited correctly. 3. Citation 12 is not cited correctly. 4. The background would be improved in general with more citations and more recent citations (most are from the 90s and early 00s and there are more recent statistics in the literature) 5. On line 61 I would add in “many”, because this is a very strong statement that the authors have not supported at all. 6. This data is from a long time ago (2008), and as a reader I would like to know why the authors are only publishing it now. 7. I would reorder the entire results section to make it easier to read. The paragraph starting on line 183 should be the first paragraph, including demographics of casualties, location, and type. The subsequent paragraphs can then delve deeper into each injury type, and should be ordered by most frequent to least, beginning with cuts, then falls, etc. 8. Tables 1 and 2 should be ordered by frequency.	1. Changed and edited 2. Corrected and more citations added 3. Citation 12 is checked 4. Some new citation added 5. Added 6. I wrote the paper few years back and while I started working with community based first responder in Bangladesh, I realised the importance of this paper for the scientific community. I believe this paper has huge implication for developing countries where by developing community based volunteer it is possible to minimize consequences of injury. 7. I will do it before submitting final draft. 8. I will do it in the final draft
---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The entire abstract needs to be revised to be in-line with the changes requested in the body of the paper. 2. There are many typographical errors that need to be corrected before publication.	1. I will do it in the final draft 2. I will do it in the final draft
--	--	---