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Reviewer’s report:

General comments
This is an interesting paper on an important issue. There is a well-defined objective that is clearly stated. However, there are some significant changes recommended before publishing. The paper would also benefit from some professional editing.

Major Compulsory revisions
The authors need to provide a rationale for the age categories provided. At this stage the age ranges are broad and not particularly homogenous. It is understood that the age range 6-18 represents ‘school-age’, however, there would still be a lot of difference between the eldest and youngest of this group particular ‘adolescents’ and the young children.
There is a need for more detail on how ‘knowledge’ of first-aid was assessed. In the results, it seems as though this represents parents’ awareness of first-aid as a term not their knowledge of what is appropriate to do. There is a table describing categories the authors have created with the groups ‘proper first-aid’ and ‘traditional methods’. These terms and how the participants were categorised needs explanation.
Results are repeated unnecessarily in the discussion

Minor Essential revisions
A description of the geographical divisions is required for an international audience
Need to be careful about using the terms ‘risk’ as this has a particular meaning that is not appropriate when simply comparing proportions
Some justification for the age of the mother categories is required and also discussion of the relationship between this and the age of the child.
A sentence or two is needed to justify why the things listed in lines 17-20 (page 9) were not examined.
Needs greater discussion of the explanation for results relating to age
Needs greater discussion of the implication of all the results – What are the recommendations for action and intervention based on the study results?

Discretionary revisions
I would consider removing the pie chart. It does not add anything (beyond the text).

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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