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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

The authors have appropriately responded to the previous feedback. There remain just a couple of typographical / language errors to be addressed

• Thank you for comment and observation

1. Page 9, line 29 - missing word 'for' as in "...... and number of injured persons cared (for) were included."

• Thank you for observation, we have inserted word 'for' as suggested. See page 9 under Questionnaire section, line 12 of the section.

2. The insertion of the word 'repeatedly' (Page 9 line 53 and Page 10 line 17) is potentially confusing. The text could be amended to reduce the risk of confusion, for example, the text on Page 9 line 53 could be amended to, "Knowledge of PFA. The same eight multiple choice questions assessing participants' knowledge of PFA were asked before and immediately after PFA training."

• Thank you for the comment. The word repeatedly has been removed. The suggested amendments have been made. However since the measurements of outcome were done in three points in time (before, immediately after and after six months) the amendments accommodate the time frame. See page 9 under the Outcome measure section, line 3-4 of the section and page 10 line 6-8 of the section.

3. "at least one RTI victims" - Victims should be singular, not plural (Page 12 line 27 and Page 12 line
49)  
• Thank you for the comment. The word victim is now singular. See page 12 under Baseline characteristic section, line 10 of the section, also page 12 under Follow-up information section, line 7 of the section.

4. Page 13 line 10, the sentence "the eta square statistic indicated a large effect size" should be deleted.
• Thank you for the comment. The mentioned sentence has been deleted

5. The new text on Page 19, lines 12-17 needs to be revised as it is unclear. 'RCT' needs to be written in full as this is the first time the acronym has been used in the text. I was unclear why the authors state that assessing clinical injuries will indicate quality of care. I think what is required here is that an outcome in the trial could be a clinical assessment of the first aid provided to determine if it was appropriate and the injury managed correctly. The text regarding cost effectiveness is also potentially confusing. An assessment of cost effectiveness is a necessary pre-requisite before a roll out of an intervention shown to be effective. It would be helpful to state that this is to determine the affordability of the intervention in that setting / context.

• Thank you for comments. The text has been revised to make it clearer and suggestions incorporated in the revision. See page 19 under heading Suggestions for future research, line 6-8 of the section.