

Peer review 1 for Maria Cuellar:

A Probabilistic Analysis of Short Fall Arguments in Legal Cases of Abusive Head Trauma

Reviewer: Josue Orellana

1) General comments on Section 4

The writing is clear and cohesive. I thought your arguments are compelling and easy to follow. I only have a couple of general questions:

- 1) Do you want to end subsection 4.1,2 saying that other people have raised similar arguments? Is section 4.3 a novel argument? If so, it might be a good opportunity to mention it as such.
- 2) Consistency in topic for each subsection: 4.2, and 4.3 start with arguments against the use of Chadwick's, section 4.1 is different. Is this a trend you want to keep in your argument?

2) Specific comments on Section 4

Page 5, Section 4, sentence 1. "Determining whether a specific child with head trauma..." I am a little confused when I read this and the parenthesis that follows it, did you mean "experiences AHT" instead of "with head trauma"?

Page 5, Section 4, sentence 1.

"so it makes sense", as I read this I expect a contrast instead of an agreement. Perhaps: "resort to use the only quantity available".

Page 5, Section 4, sentence 1.

There appear to be two ideas in this sentence. You might want to split them into separate sentences. 1) Determining whether abused occurred is difficult. 2) Courts use the only statistic available.

Page 5, Section 4, sentence 2.

"for three reasons". This sounds more appropriate for the topic position instead of the stress position.

Page 6, Section 4.1, Sentence 2.

"Which implies that..." The amount of information in this sentence is a little high. Is it necessary to mention: "if 0.48 out of 1 million fall in a year"? This sentence could be more concise by saying: ", which implies that we [can] expect to see 12 children die from a short fall this year alone. ". If the first part is necessary, maybe the sentence should be re-structured with 2 stress positions? or split in two?

Page 6, Section 4.2. Reason 2 subtitle

"In light of the evidence". This seems like a contextual reference, maybe it would go better at the beginning or the end.

Page 6, Section 4.2. Reason 2

Thinking of the fast reader, I think it might be helpful to start the paragraph with the topic: “We have additional information in each case” instead of a reference to Chadwick et. al.

Page 7, Section 4.3. Paragraph below equation (7)

“But there could be other possible...”. The use of but suggests a contrast, but I feel that you want to make an “indeed” suggestion. That is because you just introduced the idea of computing competing hypotheses.