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Reviewer’s report:

No revisions

Overall a clearly written paper with a clear hypothesis and clearly presented findings on a relevant topic.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The authors examined whether working disability in mid-adulthood was specifically associated with ADHD or whether it was associated with all types of childhood mental disorder.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The method was appropriate and well described. My only comment is that following up a sample who had inpatient psychiatric childhood admissions may not be truly representative of the many children with ADHD who are never hospitalised. There is a danger of giving the impression that the employment prospects of all people who have ADHD in childhood are bleak. However the purpose of the research was to examine how specific working disability is to ADHD as compared with other disorders and the authors used an appropriate comparison group as they were also people who had had inpatient admissions as children for psychiatric problems.

3. Are the data sound?
The results are clearly reported and appropriately analysed.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes the discussion and conclusions are balanced and supported by the data.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes the authors mention the fact that conduct disorder patients may have poor work histories due to delinquency but not have qualified for disability pensions; that the study was based on a retrospective chart review and the lack of statistical power to look at ADHD alone compared with ADHD with co-morbid
disorders.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes they reference the larger study population that the current sample was drawn from.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes the writing is clear.

   **Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

   **Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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