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Reviewer’s report:

In this article the authors describe their experience with military mass casualty victims, after a political conflict on April 10th 2010. Their objective was to study the factors influencing the ISS of these wounded soldiers.

In total they evaluated 728 soldiers, resulting in 158 patients enrolled in the study. The mechanism of injury was blast injury, followed by gunshots and personal assault. The most injured body part were the extremities. Within the group 18 patients were considered severely injured with an ISS of 16 or higher. Main injured body region contributing to the high ISS were head and neck, abdomen and external. The authors conclude that these data lead the way for protective measures and tailoring the medical care for this kind of incident.

In this retrospective study only patients that had a significant injury were included in the study. These (arbitrary) criteria are clearly described in the manuscript. Primary and secondary outcome are clearly defined, whereas ethical clearance for the study is obtained and clearly reported. Statistics used were the t-test and a one way ANOVA. Although this is a relative small group and certainly not normally distributed, this is borderline acceptable.

Missing in the manuscript is a clear description of the incident. It is not clear, until reading the Tables, that there must have been several places with several bombings. This is not obvious from the text. Moreover that this study has some limitations is clear under these circumstances, however it would be nice to know how the hospital was organized and how many (military) people died before reaching the hospital or on the battle field, just to get some idea on the total impact of the incident.

The discussion is rather meager. The authors more or less refer to their own study some years ago, however much more is known, also from bombings on other occasions and battlefield experiences. This should be extended. Regarding the tables and figures. The current form presented is rather redundant. It is either the table or the figure that should be included.
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