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Reviewer's report:
1. Most of the revisions have been satisfactory
2. The paper could still benefit from improved grammar in places. For example:
   * On line 8, page 7 in the abstract, replace "strategies of …" with "strategies for …"
   * On lines 22-23, p. 10, replace "when" with "where". The meaning of "terminated" is not
     clear in this context
3. The revised introduction has become quite long. I'm wondering if the limitations of trauma
   (lines 5-10 on p. 11) could be tied in with the limitations of the systematic review and shifted
   to the discussion
4. In line with the search strategy used by O'Reilly et al 2013, the authors expanded the search
   terms as suggested. However, they rejected these terms because the 45 new papers picked up
   were not "relevant". Could a future application of the new terms not yield relevant papers?
5. I am not aware that qualitative studies could be assessed for risk of bias (line 1, page 13).
   Qualitative studies are inherently biased.
6. The discussion reads like the introduction. The strengths and limitations of the paper are not
   addressed. Neither is the policy implication of their review.
7. The PICOS strategy has not been well-applied in Table 1. What is presented as the population
   should be in the Setting (the S in PICOS). There is no comparator and so the C is not
   applicable. The study design does not fit in the table.
8. Contrary to my earlier suggestion, a conclusion is not needed in a systematic review protocol.
   The information presented there is useful and so could be merged with the discussion
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