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**Reviewer’s report:**

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

This is a cohort study comparing self-reported sickness absence and disability pension with national register data. Additionally the authors have analyzed concordance in reporting behavior between gender and also between different twin zygosity groups.

Few studies have explored the validity of self-reported sick leave and disability pension benefits. This calls for more studies in the field and make the main aim of this study relevant and important.

The paper is well written and the communication is clear, however I have some comments.

**General comment:**

It is difficult to see the uniqueness of the data being from a twin cohort. The focus on possible differences in reporting behavior between twin zygosity groups seemed a little bit odd. Even though I realize that it is not necessary for the limited aim of this study, I would prefer some more background information beyond Figure 1. It would be interesting and useful with more specific information about the actual number of individuals on DP and LTSA (self reported and registered) reported separately for MZ and DZ pairs of twins, for instance presented in contingency tables. I believe the manuscript would communicate better with this information available.

Some minor comments to this manuscript are presented below:

**Background**

§ 3 “Most studies have compared self-reported number of sick-leave days during a specific time period (weekly, …) compared to employer administrative register data [7-9, 11, 16], …”

Reference no. 11 has not compared to employer register data. Content of the first part of the sentence is correct though and is believed to be the most important message in this sentence. Suggest therefore to write: “(weekly, …) compared to register data [7-9, 11, 16], …”
Results
§ 3 under “Twin pair correspondence”:
“Chi-square test yield no statistically significant differences between zygosity groups for DP or LTSA (p>0.05), …” Reporting the exact p-value would be preferable.
And in the same paragraph:
“The number of concordant female twin pairs in which both members of the pair reported incorrectly being on LTSA as compared to the male pairs were 8/2 in MZ twins and 4/1 in DZ twins,...” This whole sentence is unclear and may be due to the lack of more background information.
Discussion
§ 4, Last sentence: “Part-time DP benefits can also be granted in Sweden which might explain the underreporting of DP in this study and suggests that in countries with only full-time DP benefits, estimates of agreement might be as high or even higher, such as in Norwegian reports [11,18].”
This statement is based on wrong information. It is possible to receive part-time DP benefits also in Norway (50 percent or more).

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests`.