

Review of: "A Review of the Processes and Procedures of Road Traffic Accident Mortality Data Collection in Zambia"

Uneb Gazder¹

¹ University of Bahrain

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I believe the discussion at the start of the introduction section could be curtailed. It will help the readers to focus more on the scope of the article, which is related to accident reporting. It will also reduce the introduction section, which is presently quite lengthy.

Similar to the efforts being carried out in Africa with ASRO, there are private NGOs working in other parts of the world on the collection, assimilation, and availability of accident data. One such example can be seen in the following article for Karachi, which itself suffers many problems related to accident reporting.

Gazder, U., Adnan, M., & Ahmed, M. Spatial & Temporal Investigation of Road Accidents in Karachi.

The authors should also identify the usefulness of their study for other countries in the world. It should be done both at the end of the introduction and the conclusion sections.

The following statement is counterintuitive.

"Data from police sources tend to underreport injuries and deaths."

Instead, it is the other way around with the police data, which mainly focuses on injury- and death-related accidents. The above statement could be true for a specific case (such as Zambia), but there are many parts of the world where the police data mainly focuses on injury and fatal crashes.

Figure 1 shows that all relevant stakeholders are already involved in accident reporting (fatal and injury) based upon their severity. It would be interesting if the authors could prepare a similar figure with their proposed recommendations. This would really highlight the shortcomings and proposed recommendations.

The current methods shown in the article, as well as the recommendations by the authors, are clearly biased towards injury and fatal accidents. Although these accidents are considered more important, the underreporting issue is far greater with the property damage accidents, which also outnumber the other accidents in any given case. Hence, I suggest that the recommendations and discussion of the study should be revised to mitigate the underreporting of these property damage accidents.

The authors should briefly mention the recommendations in relation to the shortcomings shown in section 4 so that they do not seem completely new to the readers at the end of the article.

