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**Response to editor and referee comments**

Please find the response to your comments below.

Kind regards

A Nordén-Hägg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor/Referees</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editor</strong></td>
<td><strong>We would like to ask for the details of the Swedish law stating that this type of research does not need ethical approval.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editors</strong></td>
<td>The law &quot;Lag (2003:460) om etikprövning av forskning som avser människor&quot; (law about ethical approval of research on humans) state that ethical approval is needed if: 1. the research involves storing sensitive personal data, 2. The research involves storage of data on crime and sentences, 3. If there is an intended physical or psychological impact from the research (e.g. clinical trials of medicine, testing new therapies), and 4. The research involves tissue from humans. None of this is applicable on this research. No data was stored that could link an answer to a specific individual. Unfortunately it can only be found in Swedish: <a href="http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Lagar/Svenskforfattningssamling/Lag-2003460-om-etikprovning_sfs-2003-460/">http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Lagar/Svenskforfattningssamling/Lag-2003460-om-etikprovning_sfs-2003-460/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Request for structured abstract.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editors</strong></td>
<td>The abstract has been revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Abstract of the manuscript should not exceed 350 words and must be structured into separate sections: Background, the context and purpose of the study; Results, the main findings; Conclusions, brief summary and potential implications. Please minimize the use of abbreviations and do not cite references in the abstract. Trial registration, if your Research article articles reports the results of a controlled health care intervention, please list your trial registry, along with the unique identifying number (e.g. Trial registration: Current Controlled Trials [SRCTN73824458]). Please note that there should be no space between the letters and numbers of your trial registration number. We recommend manuscripts that report randomized controlled trials follow the CONSORT extension for abstracts.
**Please provide a title page.**

Please include a title page at the front of your manuscript file. It should contain, at minimum, the names, institutions, countries and email addresses of all authors, and the full postal address of the submitting author.

This was provided, but obviously not in the correct manner, apologize for that.
**Please provide competing interest section.**

Manuscripts should include a "Competing interests" section. This should be placed after the Conclusions/Abbreviations. Please consider the following questions and include a declaration of competing interests in your manuscript:

**Financial competing interests**
- In the past five years have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? Is such an organization promoting this manuscript (including the article-processing charge)? If so, please specify.
- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? If so, please specify.
- Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript? Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript? If so, please specify.
- Do you have any other financial competing interests? If so, please specify.

**Non-financial competing interests**
- Are there any non-financial competing interests (political, personal, religious, ideological, academic, intellectual, commercial or any other) to declare in relation to this manuscript? If so, please specify.

For more information please visit the instructions for authors: [INSERT.URL.OF.JOURNAL'S.CI.GUIDELINES]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Referee 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Referee 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please also remove additional file 2.</td>
<td>Discretionary revision - page 2, paragraph 3, sentence 4. The words variance and variables are used in the same sentence which makes it a little clumsy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is done</td>
<td>The sentence is: The term diversity is used to describe the variance of demographic variables such as for instance age, education and role at worksite. Variables is exchanged for characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The article should begin with an abstract. Apart from that, I believe the article is ready for publishing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don't know enough about statistics to comment on whether the tests applied to the SAQ, to validated it in a smaller group of people than the original validation, are the right ones and whether it has been validated adequately. As the key message of the paper relies on this tool being valid for groups of 3 or more, which is different from the original validity, I think a statistician needs to review the paper.

As one of the authors is the original inventor of the SAQ instrument, we are very confident in the statistics provided. In addition, Andrew Knight, who has provided the statistic calculations, is a well-renowned statistician.