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Reviewer’s report:

My major concerns are:
This study does not measure "job stress" but experience of psychosocial working conditions measured by the job strain model.

2. The exposure measure used is a ratio between strain and control. Why not use the usual way of splitting the exposure into relaxed, active, passive and strained as suggested by Karasek.

To relate the increase in health care expenses to job strain is an overinterpretation. I think that reporting the data as done in the tables is just enough.

Figure 2 could be deleted
A full text explanation on Table 1 would make this easier to understand.
The tables might be shortened in order to provide a better overview

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? No
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? The exposure should be defined as working condition, not stress
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? The reference list is poor
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No
Is the writing acceptable? Yes
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