



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_49352
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Efficacy of Stop the Bleed Education
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. You state, "It is estimated that 124,760 people are shot each day in America and 35,141 persons shot die from their injuries.⁶": Sorry but please reconfirm if the number is right. Also, 35,141 "per year"? Please state.2. America means USA, right? Worldwide readers interpret the meaning in two ways. America consists of North and South America and also it indicates USA. Define it to extinguish ambiguity. Actually, you state "U.S" in line 26, which makes things more complicated. Please be reader-friendly.3. Please delete "James Alex Fields killed one person and injured 19 during a "Unite the Right" rally held on August 12, 2017 in Charlottesville, VA and Sayfullo Habibuppaevic Saipov killed eight people and injured 12 more when driving a pickup truck onto a busy bicycle path in New York on October 31, 2017.⁷ In 2016, motor vehicle crashes took the lives of 37,461 people in the U.S.⁸ These and other incidents such as the 2015 Amtrak train derailment that killed eight people and injured hundreds more": This is a "medical" paper. If this is a journal of social science or history, this may interest such journal-readers; however, this journal targets worldwide (many being other than Americans) medical readers, and, thus, please completely abolish these "local/historical" issues/news/accidents. Please consider the situation in which "Indian" authors would have written something domestic (Indian) accidents, you may not be interested in it and also feel peculiar. Introduction should be short. Avoid redundant writing. "Sayfullo Habibuppaevic Saipov": Who (other than Americans) care this "name"? I wrote 550 medical papers but I do not know this name. Such writing is not effective for paper writing. Completely extinguish these descriptions. If you insist to write something, write ONLY one symbolizing accident.4. You state; "Currently, there is no publically available published data from the Iowa Department of Health on student evaluations of <i>Stop the Bleed</i>."": Please do not reduce the issue to "Iowa". Once again, readers are worldwide. Many DO NOT even know what "Iowa" is. Do you understand if one names a state of "China" or "Swiss"? The same is true to Iowa. If this is American domestic Journal, it is OK! I do not point out "this locality" that you write here and there from now on. Please edit this point throughout the manuscript.5. "during the months of October and November"; Is it 2018? Write definitely. Please adhere to paper writing rule.6. You state, "The questionnaire was distributed to persons attending planned <i>Stop the Bleed</i> education at locations throughout the state of Louisiana during the months of October and November." How many attended this education. There are marked differences between attendances of 10,000 vs. 500 vs. 200. Of them, how many attended. I mean that study population may have been biased in that study population "willingly accept this study" and thus they are interested in this issue, which naturally lead to "much increase" in the score after.7. This is a typical paper of "Introduction long, Discussion short" paper. Please adhere to paper writing rule. Completely edit the one.8. Abstract is missing.	<p>The authors apologize for this oversight and have changed the wording to "each year" rather than "each day." The authors would also like to point out that the numbers have changed since this article was originally written, so that has been reflected here.</p> <p>Thank you for pointing this out. The authors have clarified U.S. rather than America.</p> <p>The authors wholeheartedly agree with this statement. Rather than focus on U.S. incidents, which you point out would be appropriate for a domestic journal, we have included stats on global mass casualty incidents (and kept minimal data from the U.S.).</p> <p>The authors are not trying reduce the issue to Iowa, but would like to demonstrate how little information is available regarding efficacy of <i>Stop the Bleed</i> education. Unfortunately, the studies that have been done are limited to the U.S., but the authors would be thrilled if this education was implemented globally!</p> <p>Done</p> <p>The numbers attending the education are included in Tables 1 & 2 (n = 89 for professionally trained and n = 57 for laypersons). All those in attendance were voluntary participants.</p> <p>While the authors agree that the discussion is short, they would like to reiterate that very little has been done on assessing efficacy of <i>Stop the Bleed</i> education. The message the authors would like to convey to the readers is that more needs to be done to ensure that <i>Stop the Bleed</i> education is efficacious because it is so valuable.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	9. Reference 11: “Jacobs LM, Burns KJ, Langer G, Kiewiet de Jonge C. The Hartford Consensus: a national survey of the public regarding bleeding control. J Am Col Surg. 2016;222(5): 948–955Some guidelines for Medical papers:”: What do you mean “Some guidelines for Medical papers”. I have never heard of this reference. Please explain.	<p>Abstract is located in the gray box as per template.</p> <p>Some guidelines for Medical papers was left over from template and has been removed. Thank you for picking up on this. The reference is actually “Jacobs “LM, Burns KJ, Langer G, Kiewiet de Jonge C. The Hartford Consensus: a national survey of the public regarding bleeding control. J Am Col Surg. 2016;222(5): 948–955.” The authors apologize for this oversight!</p>
Minor REVISION comments		Comments have been addressed after each point in blue.
Optional/General comments		The authors would like to thank the reviewer for his/her time and thorough evaluation of the article.

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	