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Reviewer's report:
This is an important paper in that it introduces a tool that can be used for standardizing data collection in disasters in a field that is becoming standardized but that lacks tools. It is also important because it provides a cross comparative analysis of 8 disaster responses and analyzes the data collected in these disasters. It demonstrates the kind of impact on practice and policy that a tool like this can have in terms of informing and improving future disaster response efforts.

Ideally the sample size would be larger but the 8 cases here are a good start. As a reader I would like to know if there are any other standardized checklists for this kind of data or if this is the first of its kind. And if there are other checklists out there, how this one compares. Finally, how is this tool "marketed" for use by other entities.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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