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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is well-structured using an Introduction, Method and Result (IMR) approach. It has not explicitly mentioned the objectives of the study, knowledge gap has not been articulated well at the outset but has covered considerable amount of literature. In the discussion part it has compared with other identical studies and findings have been compared.

Under the methodology it has covered considerable number of samples, used a scientific method for data collection and analysis, taken into account the risk of bias responses. Nevertheless, the study is to a considerable extent a perceptive view of the respondents where the researchers heavily depended on reported data. Non-response was also there which have been mentioned in the paper.

The study does not contain the period of the survey but followed the required ethical standard. Considered all basic explanatory variables for collection and analyses of data. For statistical analysis some basic important techniques have been used.

The paper also contains the limitation of the study. However, it has not considered the natural deterioration of the health which likely to occur after 5 years of accidents what the respondents might have considered spuriously as caused by the whiplash.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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