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Answer to comments reviewer title article: A self-management program for employees with a chronic somatic disease in the Netherlands

Dear editor and reviewer,

We thank you for the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript “A self-management program for employees with a chronic somatic disease in the Netherlands”. We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments.

REVIEWER 1

1) The paper presents a very clear and through description of the intervention, but there is very little information on the Evaluation Plan (Step 6), considering that this is a study protocol.

This article was designed to describe the use of intervention mapping to develop a vocational rehabilitation program for a specific target group. The objective of the article is to describe the use of intervention mapping and the content of the intervention. Our intention was not to describe the protocol of the RCT. By reading the sharp comments of the reviewer we realize that we have not used the right category of study when submitting the article. The article is a research article on the systematic development of a self-management program by means of intervention mapping and not a study protocol of the RCT. We have chosen for a similar presentation of step 6 according to the following publications (1-3).

2) The paper should therefore be revised to include details of the methods of the RCT and the accompanying process evaluation. The BMC guidance states that “Protocols for randomized controlled trials should follow the CONSORT guidelines (http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/1/2)”, so quite a bit more methodological information may need to be provided here. The abstract should also refer to the RCT, as at the minute it only refers to the intervention - perhaps the title also needs changed.

We agree with the comment of the reviewer that our article does not contain enough information about the RCT and process evaluation in order to be a study protocol. However, it was not our intention to write a study protocol. The study design will be described in more detail in a new paper with the results of our RCT and process evaluation, following the CONSORT guidelines. In order to preclude misleading of the readers we have changed the title of the article into; research article; “The use of intervention mapping to develop a self-management program for employees with a chronic somatic disease in the Netherlands”. We have also added a results section to the abstract conform the guidelines for a research article. If the editor and reviewer prefers we will rewrite step 6 but we have chosen for a similar presentation of step 6 according to the following publications (1-3).

We apologize for the inconvenience and we hope that you will reconsider to re-review our article from a different perspective. We look forward to your response.

Yours Sincerely,

Sarah Detaille

