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**Reviewer's report:**

This study is nicely conducted to test the hypothesis whether there will be no differences in recovery outcomes for workers between occupational injury and non-occupational injury if they get a universal financial gain.

This report contains useful new information, but the presentation could be much clearer.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In table 2, non-occupational injury seems to have more hospital admissions and higher injury severity score. Could it be interpreted as non-occupational injury tends to be more severe than occupational injury? And how this observation links to the result that occupational injury have poorer recovery outcome? Authors may need more explanation about this in discussion.

2. In 4th paragraph of discussion, healthcare system or compensation system should be excluded from the potential explanation for poorer outcomes among occupational injury in NZ. This paragraph need more work since it contains repeated, redundant sentences.

3. How pre-injury status variables were used in the analysis? Although there were not many workers had pre-existing disability or health problems, it might be helpful to examine study population by pre-injury status. Please check the result by restricting workers only who does not have any pre-existing disabilities or health problems.

4. In abstract method section, time period for data should be noted.

5. in method section, window period of the depression questionnaires should be stated.

6. Modeling process should be explained in method section. How did you select adjusted variables and how did you select your model? Authors seem to put every covariates in the model, and did not provide the rationale for that.

7. In Table1, numbers do not sum to total for both work-related and non-work-related groups. This might be due to missing values. If this is the case, it should be noted below the table a footnote. It also applies to Table 2.
8. In Table2, the total number of non-work should be 1348 rather than 1341.
9. Legend of Table 3 should be placed above the table.
10. In Table 4, mark of * and ** in 12-month column was misplaced.

Discretionary Revisions

In the discussion, authors seem to state the return to the site of injury is main explanation for their results. Additional description about practical, policy implication what workplace needs to prevent future injury again will make the paper richer.
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