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Reviewer's report:

Thankyou for allowing me to review this paper.

1. The question posed is well defined and refers to a specific major incident with a sudden large number of casualties

2. The methodology is well described, although at six pages long I found this section quite difficult to follow; could it be streamlined in some way to make it slightly less long winded?

3. The data appears sound and the statistical analysis is well described in the results section.

4. The standards for data disposition seem sound.

5. The discussion seems well balanced and the authors are correct in their assertion that this work could be used to inform planning practice in the future.

6. The limitations are very clearly stated and recommendations given as to what others may do in the future to mitigate some of these, which is helpful.

7. The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found and the recommendations given follow this.

8. Some areas of the writing let the paper down. Bing bang has various iterations (big bang, big-bang, 'big bang') and consistency in this is required. The English used has American spelling (organizations, analyze as examples). This may be the journal style but if not then the English spellings should be used.

Overall a good paper and useful contribution to the knowledge base in this area.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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