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**Reviewer's report:**

This protocol is very thorough, the review methods are very good, and the results regarding the prognosis after mild traumatic brain injury will be very useful once established with the outlined procedure. I just have a few comments regarding the reporting.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. Please specify the guarantor of the review.
2. I believe there is one keyword too many (max. 10). It might be good to use topic specific MeSH headings, the term 'intervention' as such doesn't seem too helpful.
3. Please elaborate on the role of the funding agency (e.g., role regarding analysis and interpretation of data, decision to submit the review for publication).
4. The process of formulating recommendations should be presented in more detail, for example if a system such as GRADE will be used.

**Discretionary Revisions**

1. It might be better to have a more general section 'Search' and to list the electronic databases as well as the additional methods and sources for identifying literature (reference mining, Task Force member recommendations).
2. For the reader it would be very helpful to know more details about the data extraction and which broad categories will be differentiated (e.g., adult versus pediatric population, examples of 'specialized populations', outcomes).
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