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25 October 2018

Dear Assistant Professor Cheungpasitporn

RE: SYSR-D-18-00329 The impact of musculoskeletal injuries sustained in road traffic crashes on work-related outcomes: protocol for a systematic review.

Thank you for the opportunity to revise this manuscript in response to comments from the reviewers. Please find below our point-by-point responses to each of the comments raised. Please don’t hesitate to contact us if anything further is required.

Kind regards

Dr Elise Gane

Corresponding author
Reviewer #1:

Comment: All of my comments has been addressed. I have no further comments.

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for their feedback.

Reviewer #2:

Comment: Overall, my opinion is that (1) the clinical question is relevant, (2) the research methodology is appropriate, (3) the data analysis is sound, (4) the conclusions are reasonable and relevant, (5) the limitations were addressed by the authors, (6) the clinical message is clear.

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for their feedback.

Reviewer #3:

Comment: I have ready reevaluate this manuscript and change my opinion from reject to accept as, for this time being, this manuscript is well-written and would provide a big impact regarding the aid for those who suffer from injury.

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for their feedback.

Reviewer #4:

Comment: I have reviewed the original submission. The authors have changed the manuscript significantly and have done an excellent job. They have addressed all the my and other reviewers suggestions. One minor point for the authors is, in page 3, line 53-54. The protocol submitted to PROSPERO, and they have a registration number which the authors mention in the paper on
page 7 line 147. Not sure why the authors wrote, 'A registration number has not yet been allocated. The registration number will be included in the final manuscript' in abstract and on page 3.

Response: The registration reference number for the protocol on the PROSPERO database has now been added to this section of the abstract. Lines 53-54, page 3 now reads:

“Systematic review registration: Registered on PROSPERO, reference number CRD42018099252, dated 14 August 2018.”

Reviewer #5:

Comment: Thank you to the authors for their efforts in addressing my comments. I am satisfied that the authors have addressed all of my comments. I hope that the authors found my comments to be useful. I consider the revised manuscript, particularly the incorporation of search strategy.

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for their feedback.

Reviewer #6:

No comments received from Reviewer #6.

Reviewer #7:

No comments received from Reviewer #7.