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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Most problematic in this manuscript is the lack of a definition of an injury. The methods section suggests that an athlete reported the injuries which then are reviewed and documented by the medical team. I therefore do not know what is the working definition of an injury. Most surveys of athletic injuries define an injury as an event which causes the participant to discontinue participation. This does not seem to be the case here, and therefore is confusing and misleading. This must be in the paper.

Second if there was an attempt to review all contacts with medical staff (the apparent working definition) then the data concerning severity might be helpful. An example is the use of the term concussion. There is no discussion of what severity were the concussions and was the means by which this was determined. Without this it is not clear that any guidelines were adhered to.

Another definition among the injury definitions is that of "joint dysfunction" In the discussion there is a definition that is discussed which notes that "motion radiography investigation" is useful when using this diagnosis. It is clear that there was no use of radiography here. It speaks again to the confusion as to what were counted as injuries.

The second major issue is the lack of a discussion of the rules of this particular organization. Was contact allowed/encouraged? Where was contact allowed and did this differ for different ranks? As there are several governing bodies for Tae Kwon Do this is a critical issue. There is some discussion of the recent rule changes in the conclusion section as a reason for the "injury rates". This serves to highlight the lack of discussion of the current and the past rules.

Another issue is the separation of "injuries" If a contusion a laceration and epistaxis all occur with the same blow to the face, were there really three injuries? By the NCAA definition of injury, unless the individual ceased competition there was no injury at all. This seems a worrisome issue.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

There is no discussion of injury by rank. This would be helpful to compare with others studies.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No
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