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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions

1. It is PsycInfo, not PsychInfo
2. P. 9 focused not focused (first paragraph) (also on p. 15 in first full paragraph
3. P. 10 heading “Outcome measures en definition of return to work” – please correct
4. P. 15 – first line “targeting on RTW” should read “targeting RTW”. Also, line 8 – “As result” should read “as a result”.
5. On reference list, incorrect reference for #2 – it is 2010 volume 17, 177-190

Discretionary revisions

1. There is no definition of “return to work” or “vocational rehabilitation” in the background section. A short definition would be helpful.
2. P.4 – Paragraph starting “According to Lee and Kielhofner…” While this is valuable information, is seems to be out of place in the background section. It would be better suited to the discussion section. Either move the paragraph or develop a clearer transition
3. P.13 Paragraph on Vanderploeg article – the way it is written is a bit confusing – clarification would be helpful
4. P. 14 – Paragraph starting “Only an experienced occupational therapist…” is very confusing – please clarify.
5. The inclusion of depression as a category in RTW seems to work from a theoretical perspective. From a practical and clinical perspective (and this seems to be the goal from the conclusion), however, the jump seems to be quite large between the two categories of clients. It is recommended either that more be done in the methodology/background to describe the scope or to eliminate the depression article and clarify the population in the methodology/background.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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