

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2941
Title of the Manuscript:	Major Road Traffic Emergencies: The Role of Disaster Victim Identification
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript entitled “ Major road traffic emergencies: The role of disaster victim identification” emphasises on the risk factors and management associated with traffic accidents leading to a large number of fatal injuries and deaths, the identification processes of the victims despite the challenges like the use of DVI processes such as DNA profiling , dental records and others to ensure accurate results. This is important not only to the scientific community but also the society as it creates awareness towards handling road traffic accidents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The provided title “ Major road traffic emergencies: The role of disaster victim identification” was found to be suitable due to its concise and descriptive nature.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The provided abstracts highlights more of the maxillofacial injuries from mass disasters arising from manmade circumstances which is very informative but does not state the objective of the study which can either be the identification of victims in road traffic emergencies; or elaborate its scope based on the context. It is also lacking a concluding phrase summarizing the overall findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections of this manuscript are appropriate as they start with the understanding of road traffic emergencies and their handling, emphasizing on the pre hospital care, trauma as well as airway managements; the triage system, disaster victim identification and forensic odontology along with advances in disaster victim identification.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Despite the minor conformities, the manuscript was found to be scientifically robust due to its comprehensive review on road traffic emergencies and DVI with clear methodologies employed in disaster victim identification such as dental records and DNA profiling to ensure accurate identification of the victim. Both ante mortem and post mortem identification methods were explained, the interdisciplinary approach was demonstrated and the latest advances in disaster victim identification were incorporated in the study. The use of measures adhering to the interpol guidelines ensures the reliability and quality of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The number of references provided is sufficient but I would suggest the addition of the dates on which the author accessed the websites in references 1 and 2. And the references are not written in the same format, better to choose one format either APA or Vancouver style or any other as suggested by the journal for example; reference 4 and 5 are different.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English is quite good with minor corrections in punctuations like in points 2.5, 2.6.2, 5.1, and others; line spacing mainly in point 4, tenses in point 5 where some words are written in past tense changing the understanding of the sentences and other writing mistakes such as saying must be or have to be instead of must to be, external body description instead of body description external or hand them over to families instead of hand over them.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is very informative and comprehensive but in point 2.6.3. the good Samaritan law, I find it important to first state the law before explaining what it helps people with; and in the introduction. If possible, it would be better to add some data from 2022 and 2023 to show recent findings.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cynthia Umutoniwase
Department, University & Country	Rwanda Forensic Institute, Rwanda