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Reviewer's report:

Here are my comments on an interesting paper. Please looka at the attached document - I have highlighted with yellow what I believe are important for the authors to take into account (this yellow is not included in this form).

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. (Re)formulate the aim. There is a discrepancy between different formulations of the aim of the study in several places in the paper and in the abstract.
2. Clarify the methods – for example on the “number of episodes”. The first line in the results section gives results on this variable, but it is not very clear how this variable is constructed. Moreover, it was difficult to follow the authors on which period was studied (12 months, 80 weeks, 130 or 135 weeks). The text in the results section is about week 60 and 70, but the figures only between 80 and 135. In the discussion it is mentioned that this study is a 1-year continuous prolongation of the original 18-month follow-up.
3. Restructure the results section so it is in line with the aim and the research questions.

The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

4. Reformulate the abstract. There is a discrepancy between the text in the paper and the abstract. For example, the aim and the main results. Please mention also the number of total subjects included in the study and the number of subjects with RTW.
5. References: Sometimes the doi-numbers are given, sometimes not. I don’t know if this is important or not.
6. If there is more information about the subjects at time of follow-up, please add this to the manuscript.
7. There is no reference to table 1 in the text. By the way, why do we need all this information for only one group—we need this information also for the control group, and perhaps because we know that there is a discrepancy between the two age groups—is there a possibility to divide table 1 into the two groups?

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

8. See the last part of point 7

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.
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**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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