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Dear Dr Griebler,

REF: A systematic review protocol examining workplace interventions that aim to improve employee health and wellbeing in male-dominated industries

Please find attached our detailed responses to each of the items and reviewers’ comments, along with page numbers and sections/line numbers as they appear in the clean version. A clean version has been submitted with all changes accepted and the manuscript text with revisions tracked in the supplemental file upload. The revised version meets all the listed editorial requirements.

Protocol Editor: Before formal acceptance of your manuscript, please consider the following:

Systematic Reviews requires prospective registration of systematic reviews in PROSPERO. Please, include PROSPERO registration number in Abstract (p.3 line 47) and main text (p.6 line 123).

Thank you for your comments. The PROSPERO registration number has been added to the Abstract (p.3 line 47) and main text (p.6 line 123).

Additional (minor) comments:
Page 12. Line 266. Please, rename as “Discussion” (not “Conclusion”).
Thank you for the comment, we have revised the wording as suggested. Page 12. Please, discuss potential limitations at study level, and at review level you anticipate. Thank you for your comment, we have added a paragraph (lines 274-284) discussing the potential limitations that we anticipate. Line 274: Limitations of this review include: the inclusion of English language papers only; and the inclusion only of studies using a controlled design, either randomised controlled trials or intervention studies with non-randomised group allocation. A disadvantage of limiting to the English language only is that male-dominated industries from non-English speaking countries may be less represented in the review and any findings could only be applicable to particular countries. Including only controlled designs could exclude valuable information from workplaces within male-dominated industries where randomised controlled trials or non-randomised intervention group are not always possible. Such information includes the type of male-dominated industry, study environment and intervention content and/or target. Study-specific limitations will be discussed in detail in the published final review. Page 12. Please, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments. Thank you for your comment, we have added a paragraph (lines 263-265) explaining how we will document any important protocol amendments. Line 263: In case of any changes to this protocol, the details of any changes will be outlined in the published final review and updated in PROSPERO. However, no further amendments to this protocol are foreseen. 

Best Wishes,

Paige M Hulls