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**Reviewer's report:**

Reviewer questions:
1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?

Yes, the case control design is adequate to test the association between bicycle collision injury and the use of conspicuity aids.

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?

Yes, the design and details are sufficient.

3. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition: if not, in what ways?

Yes, the manuscript adheres to these standards.

4. Is the writing acceptable?

The manuscript is well written.

**Major revisions:**

1. The authors should not use the term accident in the publication. Please see Davis and Pless "BMJ bans accidents" BMJ Feb. 14, 2005 for the rational. Use crash, collision or injury instead.

2. What is the purpose of asking multiple questions on ethnicity (see "Questions About You) in the supplementary material. Do the Irish take more risks than the British?

3. I would suggest replacing the ethnicity questions with level of education and/or income. This would provide a better direct measure of socioeconomic status than the proposed use of postal code to indirectly measure "deprivation".

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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