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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for submitting this interesting study. It is probably one of the first studies to systematically explain the development of a self-help tool.

Major revisions

Background

The background is too short and should be expanded. The background should start with a description of the health and participation problem. How big is the problem? What is the impact of the health problem on sickness absence or work disability? Why is a work-related guidance tool relevant for sick leave and the prevention of work disability? How can the work-related guidance tool help workers to manage at work?

Method

More details are needed on the method to help the readers understand how the program was developed. In step 1 it is not clear if the participants are on (permanent) sick leave at the moment of the focus group discussions and for how long they have been absent from work. Also there is a bias in including only working participants in the focus group as they can already cope well at work.

step 2, it is not clear who and how the program was defined. The behavior objectives have not been specified in table 2.

In step 3, in table three the performance objectives are missing. So it is not clear which techniques change the attitude or self-efficacy towards which type of behavior.

In step 5, although we understand that a large scale implementation plan was not developed, the authors should add some information on how the program was implemented for the purpose of their study. The authors could add information on how the personnel were mobilized, the marketing strategies used to recruit subjects.

Finally, in step 6, more information of how the evaluation plan has been/ will be developed is needed. In step 6 more information is needed on the methods of the pilot study process evaluation. etc.. Who will be recruited?, how will the participants be recruited? what will be the sample size?, power analysis? which primary and secondary outcomes will be measured, which instruments will you
use?, control group?, method of process evaluation?

Minor revisions

Discussion

The objective of this paper was to present the development and content of the work-related guidance tool. Currently, the discussion focuses more on the intervention mapping approach and the methods used (work-related guidance tool). It should also discuss the possible impact of their program on sickness absence/ work disability and what is innovative about their program (besides from having used a IM).

Again, the objective of this paper was to present the development and content of a programme, not to test the feasibility of the intervention mapping approach. The authors cannot conclude that they have proven that intervention mapping is feasible, since they did not study this issue. The conclusion should be reviewed.
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