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Author's response to reviews:

Revisions
Title: The relationship of health promoting resources on work participation in a population reporting musculoskeletal pain. A sample from the Nord-Trøndelag Health Study, HUNT 3, Norway.

According to Silje Endresen Reme’s report

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The main aim is revised to “The main hypothesis is that there is associations between work participation and health promoting resources i.e. personal, social and functional resources in individuals reporting MSP (p3, second paragraph) and the research question is to investigate for differences in health promoting resources between the work and sick leave group, men and female participants.

2. The main outcome “work participation/sick leave” is a gross measure because there is not possible to distinguish between lengths of sick leave from HUNT 3. To meet the criteria of more homogeneous groups for the study participants the nature of pain is limited to moderate to very strong in the study (p3, bottom).

3. In the discussion section are the second paragraph (p10) and last paragraph revised (p12).

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The title is corrected.
2. Grammatical and typo errors are corrected.

Discretionary Revisions
1. In the introduction section the first sentence is expanded (p12).
2. In the result section the term “predictors” are changed to “independent associations” (p10).
3. Statement about MSP is further explained with references (p12).
4. Reflections about neuroticism are included (p11-12).
According to Julitta Boschman’s report

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The research question is described above in the first item (p3).
2. The time and how collection of data were stated in the method section (p3), the items of Eysenck scale is clarified and how we arrived to the total score of work is clarified (p4). Examples of questions for social resources are noted and the term “feeling strong” is used thorough the study (p4).
3. To gather more homogeneous groups the participants ranging their MSP in “moderate” to “very strong” is included and participants reporting “weak” and “” are excluded. Participants reporting “moderate pain” were 78, 8% in the work group and 78, 1% in the sick leave group, “strong pain” was reported by 20, 1% and 19, 3 % respectively and “very strong pain” was reported by 1, 8% and 1, 9% respectively. The work and sick leave groups are nearly as equal to homogeneous (p3).

Type of occupation is not taken into account in this study and could produce bias (p14).


5. There is done some clear up in the discussion section and there is stated some implications for future research and occupation health professionals in the conclusions section (p14).

6. The effect of limitations is stated and an explanation for the gross measure for sick leave is explained (p14).

7. Lacking reference is added and more recent relevant literature is included.

8. The title is altered to “the relationship of”.

9. The article revised from a editing service.