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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting manuscript which attempts to perform a global survey on occupational health services in a number of countries. Health services are described in detail, however there are several issues that have to be addressed before a possible publication. Specifically:

1. There are several grammatical and syntactical flaws in the manuscript that should be addressed. A native English speaker could assist the authors on that. There are too many to describe in detail, however in many cases it is hard for the reader to follow.
2. The authors should be careful on the tense (past-present) that they use.
3. Try not to have too long sentences.
4. Psychosocial risks should also be mentioned in the background section, since these kinds of risks have taken troublesome dimensions.
5. Page 8, lines 9-10. The authors should just mention the that p-value for statistical significance was taken as p<0.001.
6. Page 13, lines 40-51. The "average density" of occupational physicians per workers may be misleading. There are specific limits in the number employees' at which an enterprise is obliged to provide occupational health services. In many countries, micro and small firms are not required to provide occupational health services, while they employ a vast percentage of the country's workforce. On the contrary all firms are obliged to have a safety engineer. This should be clarified in the discussion section.
7. The "Results" section should just present the results. Justification of the results should be provided in the "Discussion" section. The authors should try to keep those separately and at a clear and structured way.
8. A single p-value should be used for the whole study, such as p<0.001 or p<0.05, since in Page 18, line 7 p<0.06948 is considered as "almost significant"

9. As mentioned before, in many countries, micro and small firms are not required to provide occupational health services, while they employ a vast percentage of the country's workforce. This is mentioned in the manuscript as the "implementation gap", however it should be further discussed.

10. The "Representativeness of the study" and this explanation should be moved to the "Methods" section.

11. Page 24, line 31: Bias should be moved to the "Limitations" section.

12. The need for the development of national information and statistics systems on occupational health service policies, should also be discussed to the Discussion section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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