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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions:

APLS is evaluated in this study. In 2010 the weight estimation formulae used in teaching material for this was changed; your references are prior to this, where the formula \((\text{age}+4) \times 2\) was solely used. Was the 'old' or 'new' formula used? If the prior formula was used then this should be clearly stated (ie as pre 2010), or compared against current APLS formulae.

You state in the results section that the weight distribution for the population is negatively skewed. Fig 1 shows a positive skew for weight distribution.

In the results section you state "In comparison with the mercy method, none of the comparator weight estimation methods predicted weight in 100% of the participants enrolled in this study". Why were the comparator weight estimation methods not able to estimate weight in all participants? Please clarify.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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