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Reviewer's report:

General

I still would like to see some health-political reflections, not necessarily based on this specific dataset. Is this the best (or optimal) way of sick-listing patients with musculo-skeletal (or ambiguous) diagnoses?

Even if patient differences, as well as differences in setting (first line vs. second line doctors) are accounted for, I find that this discussion should be even more pointed.
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