

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_115700
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Triage Tools in Mass Casualty Incidents: A Narrative Review
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, I'm Agree this is important. This article talking about tools to assessment mass casualty incident. This tools very important to sorting out which patients need urgent care and which do not need immediate care. 2. Yes, I really agree with the title of the article 3. Yes, the abstract written by the author includes background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions 4. From reading the entire contents of the manuscript, the reviewer sees that it is in accordance with the background described. The objectives and methods are appropriate. Writing of results, discussion and conclusions is correct. Everything is interrelated and the discussion has been explained explicitly 5. Yes, it is in accordance with the rules of scientific writing 6. The use of references is quite good. However, there are some references that are too old. The results of searching for references in this manuscript even still use the year 1999. So it needs improvement by adding the latest references in the last 10 years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 2. The discussion topic still does not explicitly explain which method is best for triaging 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use of language is good and in accordance with scientific language rules 2. The discussion topic still does not explicitly explain which method is best for triaging MCI conditions. So, it is necessary to add what the advantages and disadvantages of each triage system 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is necessary to add a brief discussion regarding which method is most effective in carrying out triage based on certain cases (for example, earthquakes are recommended using START triage, floods are recommended using SALT triage etc.)</p> <p>In the conclusion section there is no discussion of which triage can be used in certain conditions.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sucipto Dwitanta
Department, University & Country	Poltekkes Kemenkes Palangka Raya, Indonesia