Reviewer’s report

Title: Performance during cardiopulmonary resuscitation: a prospective randomised simulator-based comparison between general practitioners and hospital physicians

Version: 2 Date: 30 November 2008

Reviewer: Rade Vukmir

Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. There is a well defined study question and a prospective randomized clinical trial.

2. The methods are appropriate, however a significant amount of extraordinary detail is included and could be better served in a condensed version.

3. The data is reported in a proper descriptive fashion, however the external clinical validity of the scenarios is questioned.

4. The standards for reporting in data deposition are completed including their entry algorithm.

5. The limitations contained within the Discussion but are not explicitly stated.

6. The authors do cite studies related to the resuscitation process, however there are some broad brushed statements made such as assuming that general practitioners “might be less exposed to specific emergencies like cardiac arrest and hence are less familiar.” This is clearly not substantiated in the literature guidance for this article.

7. The title does not specifically convey the outcome of the research trial.

8. The writing itself meets some basic standards for scientific reporting, however may benefit from a specific editorial syntax analysis.

SPECIFICS:

9. Abstract - The “leadership utterances” are not a well-defined externally bench-marked tracking item.

10. Background - General practitioners might be less exposed to emergencies like cardiac arrest was stated in the Background section and again is an unsubstantiated hypothesis. It should also note that results should not be dated in the Background section as they were included in this document.

11. Methods - This article might be better served by submission to an educational or teaching methodology journal as well as a journal with a resuscitation focus.
12. Results - Demographic comparisons need to be done if gender is examined. Unfortunately, although nicely done methodology, it appears that the external utility of a document such as this is questionable at best.

13. Summary - I believe that the major hindrance with this work is that the level of interest for a practicing emergency or critical care physician would be minimal at best in this research question.
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