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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Please see below for responses to reviewer comments.

Paul Bangirana

1. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other sources:

   http://fogartyfellows.org/fellow-paul-bangirana/

   This overlap mainly exists in the Background sections.

   Please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from other sources. Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.
2. Please change 'Introduction' to 'Background'.

This has been changed, line 46

3. Please include the committee’s reference number in the 'Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate' section.

These have been added, line 305 and 306

4. Please can you clarify whether assent was also given in written form?

Yes, written assent was sought, this has been added, line 303

5. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

This has been added, line 322

6. The individual contributions of ALL authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. Guidance and criteria for authorship can be found here:

http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship

This section has been updated, line 325

7. Please note that authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements section. If no acknowledgements are necessary then please state 'None'.

Permission was sought from those mentioned in the acknowledgement section
8. Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

Email addresses are provided and the corresponding author indicated, line 13

9. Please remove the running title from the manuscript file.

This had been removed

10. Please remove the response letter from the File Inventory as it is no longer required at this stage in the editorial process.

This had been removed

11. Please address the reviewers' comments (below).

12. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

BMC Neurology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Marianne Løvstad (Reviewer 1): Thank you for letting me read the revised version of the manuscript. I find that the comments provided in the first review has been adequately addressed. I only have a few grammar suggestions to the revised text:
line 78: please rephrase to "...though this time-point may be too early to predict persistent outcomes, as substantial recovery might take place after 6 months."

This section has been revised, line 75

line 120: "...it has been widely used in ...

This correction has been made, line 114

line 136: "...that includes spatial working memory and error monitoring."

This correction has been made, line 129

line 164: "Based on..."

This correction has been made, line 158

line 233: "Bicycles and motorcycles..."

This correction has been made, 226

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: The authors have addressed all of my major concerns. I have only one minor suggestion - the authors revised lines 233-34; however, I would suggest a small wording change for clarity. Perhaps state as: "Bicycles and motorcycles are the commonest forms of transport owned by Ugandans, accounting for high rates of motorcycle accidents". Other than this one line, I feel the manuscript is suitable for publication.

This correction has been made, line 226