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Reviewer's report:

Effects of self-rated health on sick leave, disability pension, hospital admissions and mortality

Comments for the authors

The authors had responded to my prior comments adequately, and in my opinion the manuscript has much improved. I would have only minor additional comments for editing the text.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The title could be shorter. Maybe drop the “of nearly 15,000 observations among Swedish women and men followed 1973-2003” as the follow-ups were not the same for women and men

2. Please check the use of commas throughout the text, e.g. on page 3, 2nd para: “extensively studied, however, less…” and 3rd para: “…of health care [16-19] have consistently…” (no comma)

3. Please use “follow-up” consistently (instead of “follow up”)

4. Could you report Odds Ratios instead of Betas in Table 3 and text?

5. Page 4, 1st para: “as compared with” should be “compared to”

6. Page 4, 1st para: the last sentence could be shortened as: “…women and men [21,22], although mixed findings have also been reported [20].”

7. Page 4, 2nd para: The first sentence could be shortened as: “…cohort of adult women and men, using outcome data based on official registers.”


9. Page 6, 2nd para: The first sentence begins with: “Data used in this report…” that seems to refer to ”all data”. Could you begin the paragraph with the sentence: “Outcome data were…” and continue “Other data used in this report…”?
10. Page 8, 2nd para: I asked for the authors to add SAS procedures, and they did, thank you for that. However, for t-test and chi-square test these are not necessary.

11. Page 9, 2nd para: Please reword: “SAS procedure “Phreg” providing hazards ratios (HR), 95% confidence intervals (CI),…” and then use HR and CI consistently in the rest of the paper.

12. Page 9, 3rd para: “stratified for sex” should be “stratified by sex”

13. Page 10, para: Could: “…for each SHR step” be replaced with: “by each increasing category of SHR”

14. Page 11, 1st para of discussion: Please remove “a novel finding” because it sounds vague to highlight this issue here. Consider e.g.: “Among men, the effects were strong and consistent during follow-up, and the predictive power of SRH spanned up to three decades.”

15. Page 13, 2nd para: “A major strength of the study concerns…” should be “Major strengths of this study are: large sample size, ”


17. On the same para, then, an expression “A second strength” is used although three are already mentioned, please use e.g. “Another strength”

18. Page 14, Conclusions: The last sentence could be re-worded as: “…, and in men, the predictive power may last up to three decades.” (i.e. use the same term as in the Background section)

19. Table 4: Could you put the numbers of women and men in each outcome category in the table, i.e. on the row of each outcome?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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