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Reviewer’s report:

“Are self-report of disability pension and long-term sickness absence accurate? Comparisons of self-reported interview data with national register data in a Swedish twin cohort”

Svedberg et al.

This paper tests the degree of agreement between self-report, disability pension and long-term sickness absence in a large twin survey (SALT) in Sweden compared to the official Swedish registers. The paper is very clearly written and easy to follow, but there are two major concerns and a couple of minor:

1. The results are only applicable to the Swedish registers. The whole manuscript is written as if it is a more or less universal finding that self-report of DP and LTSA would also apply to other settings. This might be true for other Nordic countries, but the manuscript should include some discussion of this. In any case, the results are unlikely to be of interest for researchers outside the Nordic countries where such resources rarely are available.

2. It is not clear why this is a separate paper; the authors are undoubtedly in a process of estimating the relative importance of genetic and environmental factors on disability pension and long-term sickness absence, and they have in this connection access to both self-reported data and register data. So, it seems that the whole paper would be better suited for a few paragraphs in a paper on these topics, where the results of the twin analyses were reported, and where the register data and self-reported data were used showing that the results were robust towards which source of information is used.

Minor comments:

3. It is stated on page 7 that it is assumed that national register data are correct, but it would be good with some backup of this statement.

4. Table 2 is very hard to read and interpret. It gives basically just the raw numbers and no summary statistics. Also, the few key results reported in the text actually point in the direction that MZ twins are more concordant for misreporting than DZ, but there is no formal statistical testing of this.
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