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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors do a relatively thorough job of outlining the necessary criteria for an injury surveillance system and for what it takes to do a thorough evaluation. My primary concern with the article is that the authors state in the first paragraph that there are no standard guidelines to evaluate an injury surveillance system, and from that is the implication that there are no guidelines when in fact there are many and they are cited in this very article.

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

However, there are at least three additional citations that are needed:


I do not agree with all the methods used nor with the way they are described. For example, in Stage 1- I would like to know how the terms searched were decided upon and what the outcome of the search was. As an example, what combination yielded the most fruitful results? If there is no page limit to what can be published, can some of the results of the search be included?

Stage 2- I have no familiarity with SMART criteria but they seem quite reasonable. My question, however, is who decided and based on what criteria did the SMART criteria move to the next stage of EFISS development?

Stage 3- The 50% response rate for the expert panel is a concern. How were the 14 chosen?

Paragraph 3, sentence 1 of Stage 3- I don’t understand what definition was lacking.

Stage 4: This paragraph was confusing to me. The last sentence seems to appear out of context.
I am not an expert by any means on the Delphi technique so I will not comment on that approach.

Minor:
Table 1- please note that the numbers in [ ] refer to references.

Minor/Compulsory??
Table 2 (as well as text)…assigning percentages based on 7 respondents and then using these as your gold standard is a major concern (but not one that I have an immediate solution to).

Minor:
Tables 5 – 7: I think these are very useful (layout needs some work because the rating criteria are difficult to associate with the data quality characteristic.
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Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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