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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors

I received your paper as a reviewer. As far as I understand, you tried to assess the viewpoints of ED clinicians regarding all aspects of using a prediction model dealing with blunt chest trauma patients. Overall it's a valuable paper for publication but needs minor revisions. Below, you can find my comments in details:

Title

I suggest you be more careful about the title of the article. In my opinion it would be better as "Prognostic prediction tools and clinician communication: a qualitative study on feasibility and acceptability of STUMBL". In current mode, it seems that "STUMBL" is your study abbreviation!

Abstract

The propose of the study should replace from the methods to the end of background. So make some revision to summarize the whole background.

Please mention the study period and location in methods

Please point to the number of interviewees and their baseline information such as their experience years in ED and etc.

The first paragraph of the conclusion seems to be enough and the second part is not proper as a conclusion of the current study.

Main text

It is a bit disorganized and needs to be re-written in a consecutive manner. The definition of STUMBL study should also be included in this part and not the methods.
It is highly suggested to write the methods part in subheadings including study design (type, place, duration, ethical considerations, ...), participants (sampling method, inclusion and exclusion criteria, details of interviewees selection, ...), interview and data gathering (main question, pre-prepared interview framework, ...), and statistical analysis.

Please point to the number of interviewees and their baseline information such as their experience years in ED and etc.

Please insert a table for the extracted main themes and also the related sub-category.

It is highly recommended to start the discussion part with clear reply to the main question of the study, mentioned at the end of background.

Kind Regards

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

No

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

Yes

**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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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