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Author's response to reviews:

Response to Referee's comments

1044061423451572 How is the NPM applied in the occupational health care system? – decision-makers' and OH personnel's views in Finland

The referees are acknowledged for the appreciated work for reviewing this manuscript. Authors hope that the responses to addressed comments and corresponding modifications to the manuscript are sufficient and satisfactory for publication.

Detailed information on the corrections/modification to the manuscript can be found below:

Major recommendation

Better context description

(Plomp: "Constellation of Finnish OH remains too vague what makes is difficult to understand / interpret the data gathered, at least for non Finns...")

Authors Response: Authors have now described the context of Finnish occupational health care in more detail. Authors also included description of Finnish health care management in order to provide more solid background to the topic for the readers. Authors noticed these issues also in conclusions section. Authors have now modified discussions to correspond better on the description of context. Authors have also now included some discussion on the international value of this article. Authors hope that now the content and results are more understandable also for a non-Finnish audience.

Minor recommendations

More recent references
(Ollila: "The data are sound and well controlled, but the references are too old.")

Authors have made a new retrieval of literature and sought more recent references.

Quotations place

(Plomp: "Quotations are now collected at the end of each paragraph...")

Authors have now placed quotations after the statement of which they refer, as referee recommended.

Table 2 needs description

(Ollila: "The part of results should be more described at the beginning before the table 2.")

Authors have made introduction paragraph of results before table 2. Abbreviations are explained on the methods section.

The profile of chosen policy makers

(Plomp: "Are politicians meant, who can disappear after period? Between the political representatives and workers mostly exists a management shift that has to deal with the workers who mostly preferred to as the professionals.")

Authors have now described chosen policymakers in more detail and changed the term as a decision-maker.

Categories on the Table 2 should be identical with following text (Ollila)

Authors have revised this and modified the headings concerning other categories to correspond with the table 2.

Presentation of research question

(Plomp: "A clear question is formulated." Ollila: "The question or questions of this research should have been picked up better.")

The referees had conflicting views on this. Authors have carefully revised this and decided to kept this unchanged.

An authorized native speaker translator has been consulted. Moreover, the text of results has been now condensed in order to clarify the message. These modifications have not been marked to the text.