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Author’s response to reviews:

The Editor
BMC Emergency Medicine
Re: resubmission of revised manuscript (EMMD-D-17-00046)

Kindly receive a revised version of our manuscript entitled “Weaknesses and Capacities Affecting Prehospital Emergency Care for Victims of Road Traffic Incidents in Greater Kampala Metropolitan Area: A Cross Sectional Study”.

Once again, thank you for giving us this opportunity to revise the manuscript basing on your comment and the reviewer’s reports. The revised version categorically clarifies and addresses your comment and those of the reviewer.

We feel the manuscript has improved a lot and hope that, in its revised form you will find it acceptable for publication.

Find below a point to point response to your comment and to those of the reviewer.

Yours sincerely,

Joseph Balikuddembe Kimuli

On behalf of other authors
Response to Editor’s and reviewers’ comments:

Q: Please provide a title for the questionnaire and cite it properly in main text.

A: Thank you Editor-in-Chief for this important point! In the revised manuscript in the method section under the sub-heading “Data Collection”, we have provided the title of the questionnaire in italics from line 2 to 4, on page 6.

Reviewer 1 (Sang Do Shin):

1. Thanks for your revision. All things I commented were revised.

R: Thanks to the reviewer and indeed your previous comments were invaluable to our manuscript!

2. However, the discussion part should be reduced. Please discuss the relevant points with this study findings, deleting the paragraphs which are not directly related with study results.

R: Thanks and your recommendation has been considered! In the revised manuscript we tried as much as possible to reduce all the discussion paragraphs. The present manuscript now consists of 8 paragraphs on pages 15 – 19 unlike the pervious manuscript which had 9 discussion paragraphs. The second last paragraph in the previous manuscript which started with a statement “The swift and safe transportation of RTI victims is a critical……” has been merged with the 2nd last paragraph of the revised manuscript, line 14 -15 on page 18 which starts with a statement “The absence of formal EMS systems like in the GKMA necessitates…………”. Each paragraph in the discussion of the revised manuscript discussed categorically the study’s findings. Also, some statements we deemed not much important were deleted from almost all the paragraphs in the discussion section. Hope this response addresses your concern!

3. Please shorten the conclusion. Do not repeat the result section. Summarize the your meaningful study findings related with hypothesis.

R: Again, many thanks for this vital remark! In the revised manuscript the conclusion has been considerably composed to 9 lines on page 19, reducing from 14 lines in the previous manuscript. Also, we have tried as much as possible to direct the manuscript’s conclusion to our (authors) viewpoint but based on the study’s objective and findings