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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

1. Please make sure that the verbs used with the word "data" are plural, so "data are..." not "data is..." for example line 16 of the intro.

Thank you for pointing out these mistakes. They have been corrected throughout the text as appropriate.

2. I don't think the sentence that was added - qualitative studies have inherent biases, therefore risk of bias assessment will not be performed in these studies - is useful. I think qualitative studies serve a different purpose than quantitative studies, and this sentence, which I realize was added at the suggestion of a reviewer, make sure it seem that qualitative studies are somehow inferior to quantitative studies. They are not. They are used for different questions.
We agree with you. Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed the wording of this sentence to better reflect that qualitative studies are not inferior to quantitative studies but that they serve a different purpose.

3. I think readers will want to know a little bit more about the qualitative synthesis, other than the use of a meta-narrative analysis. I suggest that you have a look at the RAMSES reporting criteria for realist reviews and meta-narratives, which I realize apply to the published review and not the protocol, and see the kinds of items that RAMSES is going to require you to document - and whether your protocol adequately conveys to readers how this will be done. Also, since this is about implementation, you may want to consider in your evaluation of studies the criteria used by the Journal Implementation Science - see the article by Susan Michie in 2009. You might want to compare this with your list of variables in supplementary material additional file 2.

Thank you for these helpful recommendations. After carefully reviewing the documents you referenced, we have modified our protocol and strategy accordingly. We previously felt that evaluating the quality of reporting for implementation studies in this field of trauma registry deployment was somewhat beyond the scope of our study. In light of your suggestion, however, we recognize that there would be value in evaluating this aspect of the trauma registry literature and have modified our protocol accordingly.