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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 so much for accepting our manuscript in principles for publication in BMC Public Health. Reviewer 1 just asked reviewing of the manuscript by a native English language, which was done. Moreover, the revised version addresses two comments made by reviewer 2 as well as formatting changes requested by the Editorial Team Members. We explained in the outline of modifications how those were dealt with.

Yours sincerely,

Davoud Khorasani-Zavareh

On behalf of all co-authors
Outline of modifications

Reviewer's 2 report:

• The quality of English still leaves much to be desired.

The paper was edited by a native English language before publication.

• There are too many references still. For example: reference 15 is unnecessary, references 16 and 17 on page 6 ("study area") serve little purpose.

We leaved all above three references from the paper (please see reference section).

• Page 7 "data source and case selection" mentions 187 cases omitted from study because of incomplete data. Some analysis of these charts must be made, to show they do not, potentially, skew the data very significantly (e.g. they were all of very long response or scene times with extrication or bad weather etc.).

Thanks for reviewer comment. This is an important point and we did consider that closely. We critically tested using the available information at hand and there was no skew and significant variation between this data with that presented in the tables (see paragraph 1 in the limitation section, page 13).

• Page 23 contains 2 references which have an unclear link to the manuscript.

Thanks for reviewer close attention. We fixed the two references and now it has a right sequence in the text.

In conclusion: the paper is much improved. I would recommend that it be published with 2 requests:

- Further improvement in the quality of the English.

The article was edited by a Native English Editor.

-Further reduction in the number of references.

We reviewed the references and we reduced them as well as the references that reviewer requested.