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Reviewer's report:

The focus area is not clearly articulated and there is need for strict adherence with PRISMA-P guidelines in reporting the protocol. Please refer to the attached review report.

Reference Comment(s)

Introduction

Lines 61-62 There is need for authors to reference all important statements

Lines 66-67 In general authors need to ensure that there is a logical flow of ideas and avoid unnecessary repletion which makes the manuscript lengthy and difficult to follow. For example, the there is no synergy between the statement: "Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) are a metric used to quantify disease burden by estimating the number…” and preceding statements.

Lines 70-72 Authors refer to the "national" and "global" economic burden of road traffic crashes in the same sentence in a confusing manner. It is not clear what they imply by "national" and if the statistics are generalizable to other resource settings, there is need to provide full context to avoid selective reporting in justifying the scope of the review.

Lines 74-87 Authors suddenly shift their focus to whiplash associated disorder (WAD) yet the review title and introduction section focus on general musculoskeletal disorders, this is very confusing. I advise that authors decide if they intend on either a specific condition i.e. WAD or impact of musculoskeletal disorders!

Lines 91-92 Authors may consider omitting this statement, it is not adding value to their argument

Lines 89 -104 It is difficult to deduce how the information provided blends with the scope of the review. I suggest that authors either redo the paragraph by succinctly summarizing the information or remove the information.

Lined 109 Please correct the punctuation error
Objectives

Lines 127 -132 The objectives were articulated much better, however, given the lack of synergy between the protocol title and the introduction section, it is difficult to make a sound judgement on the specificity of the objectives.

Lines 155-156 It may be worthwhile to justify the exclusion of RCTs and other designs

Lines 158 - 160 The two sentences can be synthesised into one to improve clarity

Line 161 The phrase "Fault status" is confusing

Lines 165-170 There is mismatch between the study objectives and proposed outcomes, this is a huge methodological flaw.

Lines 165-176 The information might have been better presented in a table to improve clarity and readability of the protocol.

Lines 178-193 * The section on searches is just too long, authors ought to summarize the text

* There is also need to provide a sample search strategy for at least one database in accordance with the PRISMA-P guidelines

Lines 196-205 For consistency and transparency sake, authors need to provide the initials for the data extractors as was done for the literature searches section.

Discussion

Lines 240-274 The discussion is too length for a protocol and it looks like an introduction section. Authors are advised to further consult PRISMA-P guidelines as the discussion should succinctly specify the implications of the proposed systematic review.

Conclusion

Lines 278-286 The discussion is not congruent with the introduction and this again further demonstrates the lack of clarity of the condition which the authors are focusing on
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