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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript.

The manuscript presents a review of studies from Chinese emergency departments pertaining to handling injuries and organising trauma care. Little is known in the western world about Chinese trauma care, and not at least due to their large population, Chinese research will contribute to current knowledge on trauma care. The subject will be of interest to researchers and clinicians.

The present study is comprehensive, but the manuscript do, in my opinion, have a tendency towards being a policy statement promoting the authors wish for including Chinese trauma research in the international community, rather than being a literature review. To make the manuscript stand as a literature review, there is a need for a few major improvements to reach a level acceptable for publication.

The aim of the study is broad, setting out to give a 10-year overview of studies published in Chinese on research on injury surveillance conducted in emergency departments, describe the patient population and data presented. With such an aim, the methodology and structure, definitions and categorisations must be well defined.

Major compulsory revisions:

The manuscript is too long and difficult to read. Especially the result section should be shortened.

The introduction verifies that trauma is a major health problem in China, but do not in the same way justify why the study was conducted. Which problem would the study solve, or in what way was the study expected to contribute to solving the problem at hand. What are the experiences from other continents/countries regarding injury surveillance.

BMC Emergency Medicine supports the PRISMA guidelines, and the search strategy and results should be presented according to these guidelines. Even if the majority of the included papers is in Chinese, a reader must have the possibility of performing an identical search.

Some information, like the listing of search journals should be presented in a table, rather than in the text.

The presentation of the results is confusing, lacks categorisation, and is too long. It has more the shape of a presentation of each of the included studies, than a
summarised and categorised report. The rationale for the selection of data to extract from the reviewed studies is not presented in the manuscript. There are several factors recognised to be associated with outcome in trauma not presented in the review. It is not possible for the reader to find out if this information is missing in the reviewed studies or if the reviewer themselves has overseen these factors.

A European initiative has published a revised Utstein template for reporting after major trauma (1), and this might contribute to the structure of presenting data from the reviewed studies (table 2).

The discussion section should to a greater extent, discuss the findings in light of similar reports from other parts of the world. There are several references available from US, Australia and Europe, and it would be interesting to read a discussion on similarities and differences in both study methodology and presented results between China and western continents.

The discussion, and hence the reference list, lacks several recently published reports on trauma epidemiology, system, and registry.


Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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