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Dear Editor,

Thank you for obtaining a second round of reviews of our paper titled “Do outcomes differ between work and non-work-related injury in a universal injury compensation system? Findings from the New Zealand Prospective Outcomes of Injury Study”, manuscript 6879441059661806.

A point by point response to the final reviewer comments has been prepared and the response follows this letter. There was also a editorial request to state the type of ethical approval obtained from participants to our study and this has also been addressed in our response and revised manuscript.

We thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in the BMC Public Health.

Kind regards

Dr Rebbecca Lilley
Lead Author

Reviewer: Judith Savageau

I believe the authors did a fine job addressing the concerns I raised. I would, however, have liked to see a little bit more about the generalizability of the findings and how these results might be used by others (ie the utility) - even though only 3- and 12-month follow-ups were conducted. This was also raised by the first reviewer in terms of what the policy implications might be of these findings. While there may not yet be sufficient follow-up in order to project those policy implications widely, this might be an opportunity to propose some thoughts that others could weigh in on in developing follow on work from this study. Otherwise, I think all other comments were addressed.

Response: The final paragraph of the discussion (Pgs 15-16) now includes additional discussion of the utility of our findings and on further development of this work (underlined below).

“As this study represents the first time the financial gain hypothesis has been tested in the context of universal entitlement these findings should be confirmed in another study using a population with equivalent entitlement to compensation. For example, a number of outcomes examined at both 3- and 12-months following injury had confidence intervals just including the null value, suggesting these outcomes may be important and are thus worthy of future study to confirm if these outcomes differ for workers by injury setting. Additionally, further investigation of the possible time-dependent pattern of recovery by injury setting is warranted with possible consideration of outcomes beyond 12 months, as well as research to understand potential differences in the predictors of outcomes by injury setting. Comparison of outcomes by injury setting, independent of differences in entitlement to compensation, allows for further insight into the workplace, healthcare and compensation rehabilitation system factors associated with work-related injury. Therefore, if confirmed, the policy implications of our findings have utility beyond the New Zealand context. An improved
understanding of differences in the outcomes by injury setting would enable workers compensation rehabilitation systems to further understand the importance of policies & practices beyond entitlement to workers compensation in improving recovery outcomes for those workers with work-related injury.

Editorial request

'Kindly modify your consent statement. Instead of using “Ethical permission” please use the word consent.'

Response: Added as requested to Methods section, Study sample & data collection sub-section, paragraph 1 as follows “Consent was obtained verbally from each participant.”