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Reviewer comments:

This submission was a revised version of the earlier submission I reviewed. The author has done a good job in revising the manuscript. Although the introduction dealt with the contribution and argued for why this study is needed, the arguments were still not developed far enough. The results section was much improved. The discussion still needs some work as there were some unresolved issues and undiscussed results. Overall, I was sometimes left with more questions than when I started, so the author should try to argue as thoroughly as possible, while at the same time keeping it concise (difficult, I know, but necessary for scientific literature). The manuscript should be language proofed - there were a lot of language errors and typos. Below are some specific comments, I hope they will be of use for the author.

Introduction

The author has developed the introduction and has been able to formulate a contribution of the study. However, some aspects of the arguments could be further developed. Also, why is it important to study these outcomes? Why is health satisfaction an important outcome? Reflection of these issues are still lacking

Page 6: "whereas over-commitment was often neglected [4]. To the best of my knowledge, it still lacks a methodological debate on, e.g., distributions of the variables or using different model estimators which will be taken into account and discussed in this paper." Why is it a bad thing that overcommitment was neglected? Why is the methodological debate needed?

Methods
What is the final sample size? You just state "more than 7300 respondents" on page 7.

Page 8: "whereas women were less satisfied" Less satisfied than what?

I am wondering why you chose to center the variables instead of standardizing them?

Results

Table 1 and 2: I would advise to only use the standardized coefficients and reporting the standard error in the tables.

What are the actual implications of these results if you look at the standardized estimate? It is quite small and your sample is quite large so what conclusions do you draw based on that? This needs to be addressed in the discussion at the latest.

Discussion

"Therefore, Siegrist first hypothesis was not supported and the use of the ERI ratio should no longer be recommended" Why is this?

On page 16 you discuss the results relating to the second hypothesis but the paragraph steers into a discussion about the ERI ratio and at the end you make suggestions for practice based on rewards and effort - where is overcommitment?

Where was the discussion on the third hypothesis?

Contemplate on the practical implications of the small effect sizes you obtained.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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