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Reviewer’s report:

It’s a well designed study, multicenter, and includes a great number of patients (43516). The aim was to develop and validate a simplified Thai-Pediatric trauma and injury severity score of death. In addition, scoring scheme and risk stratifications were created, and compared its performance with the original and modified PTSSs.

The research question is easily identifiable and understood and original in the pediatric patients because previous scores were based on adult studies.

There are some aspects which may improve the paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

It will be necessary to review the English writing.

An explanation about the utility of the score or not in other settings or countries may be useful, and compare the major causes of trauma with the literature too.

The score system with decimal numbers seems to difficulty the utility of the score. Please specify if there is any possibility or not for to convert this to an whole number.

Minor Essential Revisions

Page 6, line 6. When it’s said “Six domains of predictive variables were collected…” I count 7 variables, explain or correct please.

Page 6, line 9. In the sentence “…mechanism of injury (i.e., surgical perspective mechanism (blunt penetrating and both…) is missing the “)”. 

Page 6, third paragraph, the sentence “The SBP was categorized as abnormal if SBP < 60, < 70, <70 + (2 x age in years), and < 90 mmHg for neonate, infants, 1-10, and # 10 year is difficult to understand and may finish with a “.” And after following with “Otherwise it was classified as normal PR was classified as tachycardia if PR >190, > 140…”

Page 10 line 2 “Abnormal PR, RR, and SBP) were…” To eliminate “)”. The same page 13, line 16.

Page 12. All first paragraph is like an abstract of the results. It will be better to
intensifie this results in the discussion probably comparing with other literature.

Page 14. First paragraph “...and they are easily prone to hypoxemia and hypoventilation, although they only have simple upper airway obstruction.” Is irrelevant for the study it will be better to compare what adds to other scores.

Why age and weight are in different exposition (median and SD and mean and max-min respectively)?

Discretionary Revisions

Why age and weight are in different exposition (median and SD and mean and max-min respectively)?

It may help to understand the paper, signalling the number of patients (n) previous to the percentages. Especially, when the author writes about the death.

**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:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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