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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Citation of references: Several references were not suitable. P3: McDonough and Berglund 2003 should be numbered. P4: TA Blakely, BP Kennedy, R Glass and I Kawachi should be Blakely et al. JM Mellor and J Milyo should be Mellor and Milyo. P10: GA Kaplan, SJ Shema and CM Leite should be Kaplan et al. M Benzeval and K Judge should be Benzeval and Judge. TA Blakely, BP Kennedy, R Glass and I Kawachi should be Blakely et al. O Lundberg and J Fritzell should be Lundberg and Fritzell.

2. Data and methods: Analytical methods should be mentioned more clearly in the last part of the Data and Methods. Also, ethical issues should be mentioned.

3. P8, Model 1: The authors described that "For women, two years in income position below median increases...". But Table 1 did not show so.

4. P8, Model 2: The authors described "an 81 percent higher probability". But the Odd ratio did not directly mean the probability.

5. P10, 2nd Paragraph: The authors mentioned that the critical stages were the first year and after three years. But according to Table 2, I understood the first year and after four years were critical.

6. P11 L 10: (?) not sure this is what you want to say??

- Minor Essential Revisions

7. P3: The first sentence should be accompanied with reference(s).

8. P5, self-rated health: The authors should mentioned "bad" and "between" were categorized into "poor" health. And the tables' title said "less than good".

9. P9: The sentence of "Generally, cross-sectional analysis underestimates the flexible ..." should be accompanies with reference(s).

- Discretionary Revisions

10. Results of Abstract: A few quantitative results such as OR (95%CI) could be shown: e.g. 0.22 (1.22-3.55) for men.
11. Table 1: Quintiles did not have equal distributions. The higher had larger subjects.

12. Table 2: I wonder why this model did not include the disposal income quintile.
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