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Reviewer’s report:

General: Overall the protocol is clear and covers all important issues regarding systematic reviews

1. Title: The title may be misleading as 'physical disabilities' is much broader than lower limb amputation and spinal cord injury. Please adjust.

2. My main struggle was with the combination of the two impairments, i.e. lower limb amputation and spinal cord injury. Why are these two categories of impairments combined in one study, what is the rationale? As I understood it correctly, all analyses will be done separately, or will there be a synthesis of the findings?

3. In the abstract it is confusing that two quality of life instruments were selected, but later in the manuscript this becomes clear. It may be wise to explain this briefly in the abstract, e.g. just by stating that these are the only two that are validated.

4. Quality assessment is a good thing to do, but what is the consequence when a paper scores a poor quality? Will it still be included in the review and analyses? Please be clear about that.

5. In the discussion it is again stated that the conditions are different, and that a 'comparative view' is necessary. What exactly does this entail?
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