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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your comments to my proposals of change. In general I consider this article of interest because of it’s methodologically explorative character.

I think this version has improved and the inserted section on gender aspects seems quite adequate, but maybe a little too strongly pronounced, since this issue is not the main one of your study.

But still I consider that the Introduction as well as the Method sections must undergo further revisions. If not, the manuscript seems unclear and not so well structured.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. The structure of the Introduction must be improved and thus made easier for the reader to grasp. In its present form passages of methodological character are mixed with passages about organizational changes in general.

2. Material and method

Still the material is unclear. For example it must be unambiguous for the reader whether an employee working in a small private nursery is considered to be exposed to expansion if the owners of the "nursery-chain" has expanded with for example 50% by opening a number of new nurseries. If the authors intend to answer this question by the sentence "If the workplace at which the participant worked in......that year" I propose the concept "the workplace" to be defined more exactly.

The opposite of long-term sickness absence must be defined. In the Results the opposite is labelled as "low sickness absence" which is unclear.

In the Discussion under the heading Strengths and weaknesses of the study the effects of the time passage between the exposure of change and the interviews must be commented; the interviews were performed 11 to 16 years after the exposure of change at their workplace.

Minor essential revisions:

In the Introduction where you the authors refer to a previous study, reference 7, I want the figures of the ORs to be included (I think this is an issue of importance for the study since the excessed risk for both sickness absence and hospital
admission was quite weak in the previous study).

Under the heading Interviews the interviews are described as semi-structured. Would it not be more honest to describe the interviews as a mixture of a semi-structured interview and an ordinary discussion with some fairly senior comments?

Under the heading Strengths and weaknesses the issue of potential gender effects is a little too long since you already in the Introduction discussed the importance of this issue.
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