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Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Please find attached a revised version of our article entitled “Pre-hospital care among victims of road traffic injuries in Iran - A cross-sectional study on time intervals”.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript and clarify the reviewers reports. The revised version addresses all comments made by reviewer 1 and reviewer 2 as well as the editorial team members.

We feel the manuscript has improved a lot and better represents our intentions and contribution. We hope that in its revised form, you will find it acceptable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Davoud Khorasani-Zavareh

On behalf of all co-authors
Reviewer's 1:

1. This is an interesting description of the times of pre-hospital response and care of trauma victims in a region of Iran. As such, it provides an important international perspective. However, there are significant limitations to the manuscript, including the lack of clearly defined methods of data abstraction, a rather narrow focus on times only and no analysis of potential correlations between injury type and severity and on-site care and transportation times; there are too many tables and figures, the discussion is too long and repetitive for a rather narrow range of data; there are too many references for the scope of the paper; the language requires some work.

Point taken. By data at hand, in the discussion section we added those points and we discussed them as limitation of the study including just focusing on times intervals rather than the severity of the injury and a lack of analysis as potential correlations between injury type and its severity as well as on-site care and transportation times (see paragraph 2 in the limitation section, page 13).

However, it is important to note that the above points were not the scope of our study and we didn't have such data to do that. In this line, we did shortened the manuscript and we omit two figures. The discussion section also is shortened and we did try to reduce the number of references (the number of word in whole manuscript decreased from 4600 words to 3107 words).

Moreover, in the method section we clarified the data abstraction and we explained how we collected and treat the data with more details (see pages 6 and 7).
Reviewer 2

1. This is a useful paper but needs some work before I would support publication. The paper describes response times for an EMS service and also describes the epidemiology of road accident victims. On the face of it the response times are very good and the increased time of response to rural (interurban) locations is reasonable and logical. I think that the paper could and should be shortened as the narrative strays into survival. Survival will depend on the severity of injury and the access to definitive care. To do this, we would need to know the patients' trauma scores and details of management, levels of care provided by the receiving hospitals etc. This aspect is not available and therefore can only be referred to in very general terms.

Thanks for reviewer comments. We did reduce the narrative, and the manuscript now is shortened. Regarding the survival, as reviewer explained, it depends to several points. Since we didn't have data about victims' trauma scores, levels of care provided by the receiving hospitals and the other factors, we clarified this points in the limitation section of discussion (see paragraph 2 in the limitation section, page 13). However, it is important to note that these points were not the scope of this study. In the limitation section we relayed on this fact that these points need more data, which in currently we are going to conduct a study and we will try to do that.

2. The English needs some work and a review is recommended.

Before resubmission the manuscript have sent the manuscript for English Edition and we wish it can be acceptable now.
Editorial comments:

1. *Shorten the abstract of your manuscript - this should not exceed 350 words.*

The abstract section is shortened and now it contains 334 words.

2. *Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style ([http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals](http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals)). It is important that your files are correctly formatted.*

We followed the Journal style according to the introduced link and we wish it is acceptable.