

**Mortality causes in goldsmiths of Bangladesh: Findings from verbal autopsy.**Khan FA et al. ([zaman.dphi@bsmmu.edu.bd](mailto:zaman.dphi@bsmmu.edu.bd))

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	8-Apr-23	Date review returned	9-Apr-23
Reviewer name	A	Affiliation	-
Email	-	ORCID	-
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No

Reviewer's comments [Please select "Yes" or "No"]		Author's response [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "No". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
1. Is the title appropriate?	Yes	
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	The abstract has been revised as advised (Page 2).
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	Yes	
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?		
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	Yes	
9. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	Yes	
10. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	
11. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	
12. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?		
13. Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	
14. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	
15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	
16. <b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
<b>MINOR points</b> It will be better if you put a photo of workplace using guideline		Thanks for the guidance, however we are unable to provide the advised photograph, since we conducted the interviews at deceased's residence, and we did not take photographs of their workplaces.
17. <b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Minor revision	

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	8-Apr-23	Date review returned	8-Apr-23
Reviewer name	Md. Sahidul Islam	Affiliation	National Consultant-Data Management, WHO
Email	mDSA@who.int	ORCID	0000-0001-6361-2870
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes

Reviewer's comments (10-Apr-23) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]		Author's response (18-Apr-23) [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "No". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
1. Is the title appropriate?	Yes	
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	Yes	
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	Yes	
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	Yes	
9. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	Yes	
10. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	
11. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	
12. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	Yes	
13. Are the conclusions justified by the results?	Yes	
14. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	
15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	
16. <b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
<b>MINOR points</b> Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript titled "Mortality cause in goldsmith workers of Banladesh: findings from verbal autopsy. The article presents in a well-designed and structured way. Age category splited in <=70 as premature death is well understandable and correctly referenced. However, I have a few comments below and recommended acceptance after minor revisions. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sample size is very small. As well as non-response rate is very high (43%). Please mention those two points in the limitations.</li> <li>Please elaborate on the Discussion section a bit more.</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small sample size is mentioned as a limitation in line no. 214-215. We found that 43% is difficult to categorize as non-response since we failed to find the respondents because of their incorrect addresses and migration history.</li> <li>Since we ought to publish this article as a brief report, there are word limitations for the publication.</li> </ol>
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Minor revision	

<b>Executive Editor's comments (10-Apr-23)</b>	<b>Author's response (18-Apr-23)</b> Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is an interesting manuscript but is based on 20 subjects. It is unknown how these 20 cases from Dhaka, Tangail, and Manikganj represent all deaths of goldsmiths.</li> <li>2. The objective is to determine the causes of death. Results on causes are given in Table 4 percentages. Most of the cells have 5% or 10% cases. This means 1 or 2 deaths. I suggest using numbers for the broader causes of death (e.g., cardiovascular diseases, I00–I99) rather than percentages. Otherwise, it would be misleading.</li> <li>3. Considering the sample size, this manuscript may be considered as a brief report. Kindly see the criteria for a brief article from the attached Submission Checklist. In brief, it should have 200 words Abstract, 1500 words main text, 3 data visuals (table or graph), 20 references.</li> <li>4. Kindly format the manuscript as per the Checklist.</li> <li>5. Use Vancouver-style references as they can be copied from PubMed along with a DOI.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We acknowledged this in discussion section.</li> <li>2. Thank you for your advice. We have changed the tables.</li> <li>3. Agreed with your suggestion. We have converted the manuscript to a brief report.</li> <li>4. Has been updated as per the checklist.</li> <li>5. References have been updated along with available DOI.</li> </ol>
<b>Editor's Decision</b>	Major revision