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Reviewer's report:

This article is a secondary study of the main STUMBL study, which assesses the face validity and the easy to use of prognostic tool for management of blunt chest wall trauma patients.

The form of the article:
- not easy to read.
- review the plan to clarify the aim of this study, including the method.

Methods setting / eligibility criteria / data collection / data analysis / ethics and dissemination
- lack of study bias after discussion
- review the bibliography according to recommendations to the authors.

The subject of the article: need an important work of clarification.

-This article give an impression of confusion between the face validity and social impact. We get the impression that the initial aim of this article has changed or it's ill-defined.

- The methodology could be better explained.

The main STUMBL study should be better exposed so that the reader better understands the interviewer clinicians. Specify the validity criteria of the STUMBL prognostic tool: internal validity (Cronbach coefficient), Internal consistency, inter-assessor reliability, construct validity, discriminatory ability to know if it is a reliable and objectively reproducible tool.

- results:

Citing interviews with a few clinicians is not enough.
Give tables with the qualitative data the 21 items then the 9 items.

Summarize the positive results either in the text or in the table:

- questioning of the decision, medical
- improved communication between colleagues
- patient / clinician communication
- logical criteria but with weighting
- many biases:

the chosen FDIs and clinicians are involved in the study design and therefore they are the most motivated. " were selected because they were directly involved in the recruitment and follow-up of patients" " Principal Investigators at sites who then facilitated recruitment through a process of snowballing to identify key people"

This explains the good results with face validity. In addition, In numerous studies, it has been shown that setting up a diagnostic or prognostic tool improves overall management because clinicians talk about it among themselves.

- the correlation between NVIVO clinicians is good but is not described in the methodology.

- Show in this article data has been presented in the results papers [17]

A study with so few evaluated people who are investigators or involved in the main study, does not seem to have a good level of evidence. This study shows intuitive results without prove them and without be able to extend them to all emergency physicians. This study is insufficient

The face validity and the easy to use of STUMBL tool is good in this study for only few clinician involved in STUMBL study

**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.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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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