

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Dear Editor,

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments, which are addressed as outlined here:

Reviewer 1

The reviewer indicates that there might be a Type II error because of the small groups. The authors agree with this suggestion, and have added the statistical uncertainty of the statements to the Discussion (lines 289-91).

Reviewer 2

Thank you for your kind comments.

Reviewer 3

- (1) According to the suggestion, the running title has been extended (line 5: "injuries" added).
- (2) Indeed, the reported injury rate indeed may be higher, as discussed under Limitations (lines 334-7).
- (3) The fact that the search might have missed some patients has now been added to Limitations (lines 330-1).
- (4) The reviewer questions the definition of injury, i.e., were only acute injuries included. In the study, inclusions were not limited to acute injuries. Patients simply did not present with tendinopathies or other chronic pathologies during the study period.
- (5) Although this is an interesting suggestion, confidence intervals unfortunately cannot be calculated due to the type of data (similar to other studies).
- (6) McCormick indeed found lower injury rates (stated in lines 271-2).
- (7) The authors agree with the reviewer that the results of other studies do not necessarily validate a study. The previous statement has been weakened to address this issue (line 338).

We believe these modifications lead to a further improvement of the article and look forward to the final decision.

Yours sincerely,

Christiaan van Bergen