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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very well written protocol for a systematic review with an important research question. The research question is novel and clinically important. I wish the authors all the best of luck with this systematic review.

While reading the protocol four questions came up:

The first two questions concern the study population:

1. The title of the manuscript indicates that you study persons with physical disabilities, however, in the final protocol you only choose to include persons with SCI or LLA. Why only include persons with SCI or LLA impairment types? Why not include all persons with e.g. chronic non-progressive physical disabilities? It is in particular also pointed out by the authors that previous research has found that the severity of the physical impairment and/or motor disability demonstrates a poor relationship with QOL, which does not support your choice of only including two impairment types. My concern is that by only including SCI or LLA it will not be possible to assess the sex perspective because study samples might be mainly men and not women. I therefore believe it will greatly benefit the generalizability of the results when authors could consider to include all physical impairments.

2. For LLA it has been defined (lines 197-198) that only above ankle amputations will be included. What about persons with SCI? There is a growing group of persons with an incomplete spinal cord injury with less severe impairments? Will those be included?

3. Aim of the study: "the degree to which" is a bit vague, can you further specify? Also whether you will look at cross-sectional or longitudinal relations? I think it would be informative if you could also specify here what the secondary purposes are that you will address.

4. Could you consider making the title a bit more specific? It would be nice to know from the start that the focus is on age and time since injury.
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