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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Drs. Ekkernkamp and Stengeldirk,

Thank-you so much for your kind review of our manuscript “Complications related to deep venous thrombosis prophylaxis in trauma: A review of the literature.” We have addressed each of the reviewer’s comments by modifying our original manuscript. All edits are highlighted in yellow. More specifically,

Minor essential revisions:
1. Thank-you for noting this error. We have changed the Table number from 1 to 5 in the text (Page 17, line 11).

Discretionary comment:
1. This is an interesting question. We believe the practical reality is that numerous trauma patients (>30%) have lower extremity fractures preventing the use of mechanical compression devices. These fractures also slow these patients from a mobility point of view. As a result, an IVC filter is often not only the best choice, but the only one as well. The other significant issue regarding mechanical prophylactic devices is that they have never been shown to reduce the rates of VTE or death (Page 11). We typically use them because they are “easy and safe.” We know that no modality is free of risk however (as noted in the review). We have added this general comment on the lack of comparison data between IVC filters and mechanical devices to the text (Page 11, Lines 20-21).

Thank-you once again for your kind comments and above suggestions. We hope each of these changes has met with your approval.

Sincerely,

Chad Ball, on behalf of all co-authors