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REVIEWER'S REPORT

This is a well written and interesting paper. It explores processes by which occupational health decisions are made, describes the sources of information used during the decision making process and occupational health decisions maker's knowledge about different economic evaluation methods. I have made some suggestions for the authors below.

Minor Essential Revisions

“Introduction”, second last para – needs some more references to support the statement that “occupational health decisions makers are equipped with an adequate skill to interpret and use scientific evidence…”.

“Recruitment and sampling” (p8) – not entirely sure how the participants for the study were selected, and how this “sampling and snowballing” was done. It should include more explanation for the reader who is not familiar with qualitative research methodology.

“In depth interviews (p9) – examples of short questions, or questionnaire should be included into the paper, perhaps as supplementary information. The same applies to the structured telephone interviews. It would be interesting to see what sort of questions were asked.

“Results”, top of p19. Authors say that “some participants tried to guess the definition of CUA..”. I was wondering if participants had an option to answer “I do not know”, and what was the proportion of such responses? In addition, it would be also interesting to discuss in depth what it could mean in practise?

Table 2 – there is a typo in the row 1, a parenthesis is needed to the number “16” in the “Never” column, currently is “4 16)”.

Figure 1 – Triggers/ “legislation”. – Capital L is needed.

Discretionary Revisions

Table 1 – characteristics of the study populations – it would be interesting to
have some statistical comparisons as well to describe differences among the
groups. It also would be interesting to know the average age of participants and
any other demographics characteristics that might be available.

The next steps

I suggest accepting this manuscript for publication after minor essential and
discretionary revisions.

Level of interest

This manuscript is very interesting and its findings are important to those with
closely related research interests.

Quality of written English

The quality of written English is excellent.

Statistical review

The manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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