

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

Yuta Yokobori<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Center for Global Health and Medicine in Japan

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for giving me the precious opportunities to review such an important article. I learned a lot about the exact situation of the data system for RTA in Zambia. Overall, I could not understand the ways used for data collection and analysis or from what kind of samples. Please write it in systematic and academic ways. Also, I expect this article to show the overall picture of the data collection system of RTC. However, there is no explanation. Please write more about the details, such as the role of each stakeholder and how to synthesize and report the data from different stakeholders. I summarized several comments by page as shown below.

## Page 2: Introduction

The meaning of “vulnerable road users” is not clear.

## Page 3: Introduction

Problem Statements, Research Questions, and Objectives are not consistent. The problem seems to be the lack of knowledge about the process and procedure of RTC mortality data collection. However, the objective is written to identify the potential areas for improvement and provide recommendations. I am confused about the focus of this article: clarifying the process and procedure? or developing the recommendations? Also, if the problem was the lack of knowledge about the process and procedure, please discuss more details of this: how this (lack of knowledge about the process and procedure) is the problem in Zambia.

## Page 4: Literature Review

I think that a literature review is not necessary in this article since this is not based on the systematic review methodology. However, if you intend to include it, you should focus on the literature related to the research questions; that is, the complexity of data collection methods for RTC and the influences on data collection outcomes.

## Page 6: Methodology

I am confused about what method you used for which research questions. I have several questions as follows. Please explain the method for each item in systematic and academic ways.

1. What research questions are addressed by which method? While there seem to be several methods of data collection and analysis, the purpose of each method seems to be mixed. I am very confused.

2. How the business map is drawn and updated (para 1 and 4 in the Methodology section).
3. How the accuracy and reliability of the existing data collection are validated (para 1 in the Methodology section).
4. How the data from documents, meetings, and interviews is synthesized for business processes (para 2 in the Methodology section).
5. How the data from surveyors, stakeholders, interviews, analysis of existing data is synthesized. Also, how you selected them and why. Moreover, how you use the data from time-motion studies (para 3 in the Methodology section).

#### Page 7: Finding

I expect the finding of the overall process and procedure for mortality data collection of RTC. This seems to be Figure 1. However, there is no explanation. Please explain the picture involved with multiple stakeholders (police, CRVS, health facilities, and so on) and the problems in inter-stakeholder data management (data sharing, data missing, data duplication, data quality, and so on).

#### Page 10: Discussion

While I understand the situations of each stakeholder in the Finding section, it is hard to judge if the situations should be improved or not without knowing the roles of each stakeholder in the overall process and procedure for mortality data collection of RTC. Therefore, I expect that the discussion section should be organized to discuss the expected role of each stakeholder in the Finding section with reference to previous related publications in other countries or the international society. Also, if you develop recommendations to improve the data collection system of RTC in Zambia, the solutions against the challenges listed in the Finding section should be discussed with reference. Otherwise, the recommendations would not be convincing and plausible.