Reviewer's report

Title: Environmental and cultural determinants challenge causal attribution for serious burns to women in India: a qualitative study from two major burns units

Version: 2 Date: 12 September 2014

Reviewer: Tanya Caulfield

Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written article. The paper provides a fascinating insight into the determinants of serious burns to women in India.

Minor essential revisions

1. The research question could be defined more explicitly. At present, it is unclear why the study is being undertaken and what it hopes to contribute to. An inclusion of the reasons/need for undertaking the study, such as filling gaps in knowledge, building on existing literature etc would help to clarify this. Clarification should be done in both the abstract and main article.

2. In the methods section, need to explain how participants were chosen, in particular, the women admitted to hospital with burns.

3. Should explain the reason for choosing Delhi and Mumbai as research sites. The authors explain the reason for the selection of hospitals but it is unclear why the 2 cities were chosen.

4. What was the reason for doing a FGD with counsellors given that all other respondents were interviewed individually?

5. The use of the term ‘burns deaths’ is difficult to read. Suggest revising using another term such as burn related deaths/death by burning etc

6. Consistency in the use of percentages - lines 98-101 - percentages provided in classification breakdown should be provided for all classifications.

7. Editorial changes: lines 36-38 - consistency in tense - change ‘was’ to ‘is’; Line 172 - remove brackets around quote; line 201 reference required; line 347 question mark should be included in quote (before quotation mark)

8. In data collection section - lines 45-49 - for consistency and readability, suggest using the word ‘investigator’ or ‘each investigator’ instead of replacing this with the pronoun 'she' as has been done in the text.
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