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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript “a systematic review of studies measuring health-related quality of life of general injury populations” by Polinder et al. is admirable. It seems they have done a lot of work to review these studies. Their manuscript has improved based on the reviewers comments. My comments have been taken into account. However, I do have some additional minor issues:

Minor essential revisions:
- The authors might want to remove or rephrase research question d). The authors now claim to be mostly descriptive and to not want to report on responsiveness but on changes over time. However, this did not completely work out through the manuscript:
- My former comment on responsiveness (i.e. responsiveness was reported as a statement of whether there was change reported in the study empirically, instead of whether the questionnaire is able to measure change adequately, etc) is probably the same for “discriminative power”, because this was not assessed either in the manuscript. If, hypothetically, in a study no differences between groups are found, this does not necessarily mean that the instrument has inadequate discriminative power. Therefore, I would recommend to also “describe” differences between groups like the authors chose to do with the responsiveness issue. Consequently, the description of the results on p11 should be slightly altered as well. See also p31 in table, change column name “discriminative power” into something else, for example associated variables or predictors.
- Also, in the new “changes over time” paragraph (p11), still “responsiveness” is mentioned. Please rewrite first sentence into something like: “All HRQL instruments reported changes over time...” instead of “All HRQL instruments were responsive to changes over time...” and check carefully if any statements on responsiveness or discriminative power are in place.
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