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I have the following comments:

General:
I still think that especially Table 3 would benefit from reducing the text and giving more schematic information, e.g. specific paragraphs in the column headed ‘Purpose and special features of the study’ like Study population, response rate, percent females, aim, follow-up period. This should be more or less identical from study to study. Exclusion of all irrelevant matter (e.g. in Aarås 2001 a whole paragraph “In addition to the results relevant for this review…”) will really improve the value of the Table as a tool for an overview. It is not possible for me to go through all the studies in this way but I hope this gives the general idea.

Major:
1. The review is specifically on diagnosis-based disorders – hence it would be reasonable to include epicondylitis etc. as search terms.
3. The authors should also include number of studies identified by search and from files
4. I recommend that the review focuses on the aim “…a possible causal relationship”. The studies of Aarås (2001) and Brisson have no results concerning this. As the authors point out themselves the intervention studies using mainly training add very little information on associations between computer work and disease. In my opinion, they should also be excluded. The fact that the literature according to the study aim is sparse is not a good reason to include non-informative studies.

Level of interest: An article of importance 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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