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Reviewer's report:

General
I find that the authors have complied thoughtfully and satisfactory to my review, and have only one minor revision to ask for - which probably is nothing but a mistake. With this minor correction, I think the paper is acceptable for publication.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In their supplementary letter, the authors have responded that they have discussed my recent paper (Gulbrandsen 2007). They have done so, and relevantly as well, but have forgotten to put in the reference in the reference list. The complete reference is Gulbrandsen P, Hofoss D, Nylenna M, Saltyte-Benth J, Aasland OG. General practitioners' relationship to sickness certification. Scand J Prim Health Care 2007; 26: 20-6.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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