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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a very interesting report on the challenges and chances of participatory process of developing a worksite intervention to improve return-to-work after stress-related sickness absence. The report strikes a good balance between theoretical considerations and providing practical insights in form of a case history. Especially, the detailed comments from participating stakeholders makes this an important document showing the benefits of a participatory process for planning interventions in a complex and not just technical environment. The literature is up-to-date and relevant. This is a timely and valuable resource and inspiration for researchers, clinicians and policy makers charged with improving RTW outcomes for employees suffering from disabling stress-related conditions. Looking forward to hear the results of the planned randomized controlled trial in 2009!

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
NONE

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
The layout of tables ad figures needs improvement. Figure 3 and 4 look more like tables now, and all tables need to be formatted according to the journal’s style.

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
A definition of what constitutes "stress-related mental disorders" in the Netherlands would be helpful for international readers. E.g., how is this category different from so-called "stress claims" in the US workers' compensation system?

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions
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