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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this well-written protocol for a systematic review of work-related outcomes following road traffic accidents. This review, when completed, has the potential to help identify areas for prevention/intervention regarding work-related outcomes after injury in a road traffic accident. I commend the authors for registering their protocol with PROSPERO and for following the PRISMA-P reporting guidelines. I have a few comments to hopefully improve clarity.

1. The authors state (lines 215-216) "After scoring, authors will weigh the evidence and judge if a study can be rated as 'good', 'fair', or 'poor' overall." This judgement seems a bit subjective. Why did the authors decide to divide the risk of bias scores in this manner? I don't think that the Cochrane Collaboration recommends this approach (not that Cochrane has to be followed for everything). A bit more of an objective description of how these decisions will be made would be helpful.

2. Starting on line 229, the authors describe the statistical analysis component. This section is very short. I think more is needed for the stats section. For example, sub-group analyses need to be explicitly defined, how will you decide to pool data, are you planning to explore heterogeneity statistically (or otherwise), and any other statistical decisions that will need to be made.
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