PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (**http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf**) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Study protocol for a framework analysis using video review to identify latent safety threats: Trauma Resuscitation Using in-situ Simulation Team Training (TRUST)
AUTHORS	Fan, Mark; Petrosoniak, Andrew; Pinkney, Sonia; Hicks, Christopher; White, Kari; Almeida, Ana; Campbell, Douglas; McGowan, Melissa; Gray, Alice; Trbovich, Patricia

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Andrew K. Hall Queen's University Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Aug-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a very well-written protocol for a potentially important study in trauma medicine / medical education. Fan et al. propose a prospective study using video review to identify Latent Safety Threats (LSTs) in trauma resuscitation. The use of both inductive and deductive methods should be comprehensive and their proposed framework analysis by human factor experts seems quite detailed and appropriate. It is impressive that they have been able to get institutional clearance to perform this real-time in-situ study with physicians balancing patient care simultaneously without supplemental staffing. I am slightly concerned about the participation of trauma team members who may find their concurrent patient care distracting or important enough to decline participation in the simulation. This has been addressed in the limitations section appropriately. The scenario development seems quite rigorous and the use of scenarios which have precipitated adverse events or have been reviewed by morbidity and mortality processes seems appropriate. The scenarios have been mapped to relevant HF elements in an attempt to ensure content validity of the overall process. Lastly, the scenarios have been designed with the concept Functional Task Alignment to maximize their fidelity. Overall, this protocol is written at a high level with impressive detail grounded in educational theory.

REVIEWER	K. Michael Hughes WellSpan York Hospital Division of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery USA
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Aug-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	1: There is no research question. This manuscript appears to describe a research proposal. This is evident throughout where the future tense is used. However, explicitly, page 8, line 12 describes a future completion date (November 2016, anticipated). 4: There were no results as this is a description of a proposed tool for simulation training. 6: There are no reported outcomes, only that of hypothetical results of reduction in latent safety threats. 7: No date upon which to base statistics. 9: There were no results. A list of identified "LSTs", for example, might provide a starting point for data. There is nothing in the manuscript that validates the proposed simulation project. 10: There is no data to discuss or upon which to draw conclusions.

REVIEWER	Lawrence Gillman University of Manitoba, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Sep-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	A fascinating and well thought out study design. I look forward to reading the results of the final study once data collection is complete.