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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you for the constructive criticism from the reviewer concerning our paper "Worksite interventions for preventing physical deterioration among employees in job-groups with high physical work demands: Background, design and conceptual model of FINALE".

We have revised the paper taking into account all suggestions made to the extent possible. The trial registration number of the third RCT study is now included in the manuscript. How we addressed the points made by the reviewers appears below.

**Ad reviewer 1.**
We would like to thank the reviewer for the great effort and constructive comments to our paper.

1) We have included a figure picturing the 3 RCT populations with underlying arms, and the programme offered.
2) The intake, randomization and blinding are now described in more detail.
3) A formal power calculation for each RCT is now presented in a separate section
4) The case-control study is described in page 14 and 15 of the manuscript, and functioned as an implementation study, evaluating a tailored intervention performed by a consultant on demand of the company. The definitions of cases and matched controls are now described in more details.
5) A section on statistical analysis is now included. And the information of planned cross-analysis is included.
6) We strongly agree that a formal process evaluation would improve the research programme. Unfortunately, we did not receive a grant for that purpose, and do not have the resources for performing it. We insert the lack of formal process evaluation in the study limitation section of the manuscript

We believe these changes have improved our paper, and hope that our paper can be accepted for publication, and look forward to hearing from you again.

On behalf of the authors,

Andreas Holtermann, PhD
National Research Centre for the Working Environment
Lersø Park Allé 105, 2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
e-mail: aho@nrcwe.dk