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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. In Table 1, the line dividing "Preparation before ..." from "During Assessment ..." is in the wrong place. The 6th row "Barriers/Suport" belongs in "During assessment ..." and not in "Preparation ...":

2. In Table 1, the column for "Claimant" has an empty cell for the row "Social influence". There are social influences that affect Claimants as well as Physicians. Reference Ernest Volinn, SPINE 2005; Volume 30, Number 6: pp 697–704 PhD,*Back Pain Claim Rates in Japan and the United States: Framing the Puzzle

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. This is an important article that should be of interest to those with a PhD in Psychology, who probably are already familiar with many of the terms used, but which also should be of interest to, and read by, occupational physicians, insurance physicians, governmental disability insurance system administrators, private disability insurance executives, disability advocate attorneys, and legislators. Many of these individuals, like this physician reviewer, will not know the definitions of many of the terms used in this paper. In addition, this appears to have been written by individuals for whom English is not their primary language. The paper has many grammatical errors and odd ways of phrasing things that make this a difficult paper to read. Many of the above categories of individuals who would profit from reading this may start the article, and give up half way through it. Most American universities teach Technical Writing in the English department. I suggest an individual trained as a technical writer be recruited to help rewrite the paper. Such a person would not know the subject matter, and would need to be in dialog with the authors, but would help rewrite this so that terms are defined at a level easily understood by those without a PhD in Psychology, and the grammar/syntax would be improved.

2. On page 7 the TPB is introduced as an option, chosen as the option, and then used throughout the rest of the paper, but the TPB is not defined. Please define the elements of this model. The other models briefly considered and not chosen are also not defined, but since they are not the focus of the article, this omission may be acceptable.

Discretionary Revision:
1. On page 5 under "Objectives" it would help the reader see the big picture, before the discussion of the details begins, if under "Objectives" the conclusions from the first 3 sentences under "Implications for Future Research" on page 29 were stated.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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