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Author’s response to reviews:

We would like to thank the Editor and Reviewers’ feedback on our manuscript. Our responses to their comments are presented below.

Editor Comments:

In the revision, please address the following

~Abstract - Rename "Introduction" into Background.

---

Response:
Page 1, line 2: We renamed "Introduction" into Background in the Abstract.

~Provide Acknowledgements
---
Response:
Page 16, line 28: We added Acknowledgements under the Declarations section.

~Remove Fig caption in the Fig files.
---
Response:
Figures, in a separate file: We removed caption from all figures.

~Provide a Fig legend after the Reference.
---
Response:
Page 20, line 1-7: We added legends for Figure 2 and Figure 3.

~Rename "Introduction" into Background.
---
Response:

Page 3, line 2: We renamed “Introduction” into Background in the Main text.

~Declaration needs re-ordering of sub-sections as per journal submission guidelines.

---

Response:

Page 16, line 1-36: We added “Acknowledgement” and “Authors’ information”; and re-ordered all sub-sections as provided in the guidelines.

Reviewer reports:

Jessica J. Wong (Reviewer 1): Thank you to the authors for the revised manuscript and detailed responses. My previous comments have been adequately addressed.

A couple of minor suggestions:

1. Abstract (results section): Revise to: "There were no differences between injury types for recovery and return to work at 6 months." This is because there were differences for health-related quality of life between injury types, as described in the main text.

---

Response:

Page 3, line 26-27: We revised the text as recommended.
2. Limitations (in discussion section): Add the following (page 13, around line 20): "The observed results for health-related quality of life are also potentially confounded due to measured factors, since they were not adjusted for in the analysis." Currently, mainly residual confounding related to unmeasured factors is acknowledged.

---

Response:

Page 13, line 11-13: We revised the text as recommended.