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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study that demonstrates the benefits of having a multidisciplinary focus on occupational rehabilitation. I think the findings are useful for members who work in the field to think about better ways to deal with long term sick leave participants.

The methods:

A qualitative research method using focus groups are a reasonable method to use in this context. The analysis seems well described.

Quality of English

There are some areas of the manuscript that are difficult to read in terms of sentence length and ways of expressing issues. There are long sentences and the different ways of describing things brings some difficulty for clarity of message. For example, sick leave is generally the way I would understand this and sick listed is a more unknown term. There appears to be a mixture of terms so I would suggest using consistent terms throughout the manuscript. You have also used American English in the text. I have made some suggestions in the text.

You have used the term results for what in qualitative research is generally termed findings.

In the conclusion I think there could be some further suggestions such as a stronger focus on getting people back to work as soon as possible. This could be re emphasised in the conclusion. I hope you find these suggestions useful.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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