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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) In general, this is a clearly written article. The research hypotheses are clearly laid out as are the processes used to explore them. What I had difficulty grasping, however, was the importance of the research questions being asked and/or the significance of the study findings. The authors might address this more directly or in a more compelling way by describing in the introduction and/or in the discussion sections how exploring the research question expands our understanding of women's and/or men's health or how public health experts can use study findings to improve the health of these groups. As the reader, I found myself struggling with the overall meaning and value of this research.

2) Although this is a clearly written article, it seemed that the authors provided few details at times. For instance, more information on the two Swedish registers that were used to conduct the data analysis would have been helpful--particularly given an international readership. Under the methods and data collection sections, it would be useful to provide more background information about the registers, including how the data comprising them are collected and how long the data have been collected. For instance, when discussing the LISA database in the data collection section, the authors state that "It focuses on the individual, but there are also connections to the family and the workplace." However, no follow-up information is given about what specific type of connections there are to the family and the workplace and how the data connecting the family and the workplace were obtained.

3) Authors should expand upon why the computer and grocery sectors were chosen for the application of OGGI. Under the methods section, it simply says they were chosen with no explanation or rationale. This would be helpful to the reader.

4) The discussion and conclusions sections are a bit thin. The authors can expand these sections by providing more elaboration on the significance of study findings and their practical and/or theoretical implications as previously mentioned.

5) Although study limitations are acknowledged. Again, not very much elaboration is provided. For instance, the use of sickness absence as a health outcome is flawed as the authors acknowledge. They might provide more of an explanation for why sickness absence is problematic and how future studies of
this sort might incorporate a stronger, less problematic measure of health.

Minor Essential Revisions
None.

Discretionary Revisions
None.
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