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Reviewer's report:

I only have minor comments left.

Minor essential revisions

age 4 : add an S for existing databases
p. 11: last paragraph “males than females” instead of “male that females”

p. 6: same paragraph : RTC is used here for the 1st time ; please write it in full here (road traffic crashes (instead of “collisions”, as is written on page 7))

Discretionary revisions

page3 : the way you present the AIS : it seems that it lists only serious injuries.
In the sentence “scores each injury from one to six) ; I strongly suggest that you change it into “scores the immediate severity of each injury from 1 to 6”
In the next sentence you should explain that these several measures of severity (all based on the single AIS severity scores) were constructed in order to measure one’s patient global severity when he/she has multiple injuries.

p.4 : I suggest that you present the MAIS first, then the ISS, and lastly the NISS (that will follow the chronological order of their construction; at the same time, it starts from the simplest one)

Last paragraph: I suggest adding the MAIS and the NISS to the sentence “ISS is congenitally attached “ (they are attached to the AIS severity scores as much as the ISS is ).

p. 6: the 2 sentences starting the last paragraph “table 2 … 14-19y” should be made only one sentence so that it would be clearer that table 2 only applies to children and adolescents.

p. 7: last paragraph : sentence starting with “table 3”: You may introduce it by saying that it is not restricted to children and adolescent but deals with the population as a whole.

p. 8: 3rd paragraph starting with “child injury .. from 19.9 to 43/100000. ?”isn’t it the other way round? From 43 to 19? Later you mention a decline...

p. 14: I did not mention “capture-recapture” method with the hope that you would
cite my paper; in fact, I believe that here, this paper and the other 2 you cite are too specific (to RTC) (references 112 to 114). I suggest that instead you cite two excellent general papers on capture-recapture:


I would also suggest that you develop a bit more about the capture-recapture method; I think it is of at least equal importance as the previous issue (mismatch between numerators and denominators)
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