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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Methods: Abdominal compartment definitions are not clear. Either clearly defined anatomical compartments should be used and the references highlighted in the methods section, else, if a new classification is being developed, then the compartments should be clearly defined.

While the analysis using these 4 abdominal compartments is interesting, it is not clear how this will relate clinically or academically. The value of this exercise needs to be explained. The reader does understand from the title, that the sorting of abdominal injuries into compartments may not be useful clinically, but its exact 'academic' application is not obvious either. The authors have classified them retrospectively, through case records, CT scans and Operative findings, which has its problems of misclassification. The use of this classification would be preoperatively, as the authors correctly state, in the conclusion, but it there is no attempt to explain how that is actually possible – when they themselves have struggled with retrospective classification.

The figures and tables need revision. They do not convey information adequately nor appropriately. Table 1 is always demography. The authors have used Table 1: Overall clinical profiles of abdominal injury, which does not say much, and appears like a data dump. It needs to be broken up into subsections for easier understanding and cannot be in two columns. I would suggest that since the authors speak about ‘expatriates’ so often in the paper, it would be good to show a demographic similarity or difference between the two groups (70% expats and 30% Nationals). This would make a good Table 1, with the same sub-headings. It may even make a good theme for this paper, as it seems quite clear that the Expats are the working force of Doha, Qatar and a good case for improved safety standards can be made in this paper.

Figure 1 can be kept, but I am not sure what Figure 2 and Figure 3 are trying to say. Figure 2 shows combined Head Injury with Abdominal injuries; but the discussion (in Paragraph 4) speaks of mortality rate (which figure 2 does not represent). Figure 3 is obviously conveying mortality (though it does not say so – no title) but does not need this figure to state this. It is simply done on a table, and though significant, was not an independent predictor of mortality unlike Head injury – which again begs the authors to reconsider Figure 2.
SPSS statistical methods are adequate.

- Minor Essential Revisions

Titles on Figures, and legends in Black and white patterns. All columns and pies are showing up in black or shades thereof, in the printout.

Results Paragraph 3 last line: were belonged (correct to belonged)

- Discretionary Revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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