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Reply to Silje Endresen Reme’s comments

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The main aim is also revised through the article, in the abstract (background and conclusion), introduction (page 3), and page 12.

2. The article was sent back to the editing service for re-editing the work and changes were made through the whole article.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Sick leave could have been caused by other health conditions or diseases is inserted the discussion (page 14), in “functional resources and health promoting effect” first paragraph, last sentence with “Further, sick leave could have been caused by other health problems or diseases than MSP, since we did not control for other diagnoses.”

2. and 3. In the discussion section, (page 12), the second paragraph is revised to “There are differences between participants in the work group and the sick leave group in health promoting resources, such as in feeling strength or in absence of neuroticism. Effective pain management recognize the importance of functional factors, but also emphasizes the influences that psychological factors (e.g., anxiety, perceived control) and social factors (e.g., family and work environment) can have on the experience of pain [23]. Attitudes and beliefs are relevant in relation to work participation, but it is beyond the scope of this study.” The last sentence is reformulated to a question because attitudes to work participation are relevant, but it is beyond the scope of this study.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Of course, participants who reported moderate, strong, or very strong pain is changed (in the abstract, and page 4).

Reply to Julitta Boschman’s comments

Major Compulsory Revisions

2. Measures gathered by interview/collected by means of the questionnaire are stated in the abstract (method section) and in the “work resources” paragraph, last sentence, page 7. Headings in the methods section are as recommended, added with personal resources, social resources, functional resources and work resources (page 5, and 6).

5. Some speculations are revised. The word and is changed to OR (page 12) to be more precise “There are differences between participants in the work group and the sick leave group in health promoting resources, such as in feeling strength or in absence of neuroticism.”

To avoid any speculations, (page 13) the sentences is changed to a question: “One question that remains is however, is it possible that health promoting effect in pain distraction lies in the absence of neuroticism qualities, and not as assumed, in extroversion qualities? This question is beyond the scope of this study to answer, but our findings point out these issues as relevant to follow up in future studies.”

6. Potentially bias of limitations of not taken type of occupation into account is stated (page 16, second paragraph) with “This may have affected the results in a way that females with heavy work and work-related MSP, may have been interpreted as females with a lack of health promoting resources in this study.” A limitation and strengths heading (page 15) is inserted.

9. The editing service was re-writing past tense in the method section.

Some typo errors are altered from “knowledge on the area” to “most area knowledge” (page 3), “musculoskeletal health call for an understanding of both what in person’s life that contributes” to “musculoskeletal health calls for an understanding of what contributes to a better health, and to the development of disease” (page 3), “the statistical analysis was tested for” to “the statistical analysis was first used testing for assumptions” (page 7), and “to test if there is any differences” to “to test if there were any differences” (page 9, first sentence, in chapter of work group and sick leave comparisons).

Due to an overload of information on statistical procedures are the whole section of “work group and sick leave comparisons” revised (page 9 and 10) and the results from Mann-Whitney U test are presented in table 2. Only p-values are presented in the text.

- The heading “Crosstabs and chi-square variable relationships” is rephrased to “Meaning, friends’ support and cohesion” (page 10).

- The sentence “the method is a reliable prevalence study”, is deleted because it did not made sense in this context (page 15).
In addition, in chapter “Crosstabs and chi-square relationships” (page 11) first paragraph, last sentence is changed to be more punctual to “No significant difference was found between the work and sick leave group in the meaning variable…” The next paragraph is also changed to be more punctual.