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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper reporting an important topic. Below I have outlined several suggestions that could improve the overall quality of the paper. My main concern is that the introduction and results need more focusing. The authors provide good arguments that working conditions and related health issues have been widely documented in larger organizations, but much less so in smaller companies. However, a conceptual shift is also made from employees to self-employed, since employees within small enterprises were not included in the study. I suggest the authors critically reflect on this in the paper. For instance, in the introduction when previous research on small enterprises is discussed, the distinction between findings on employees vs. self-employed is not clearly made. Background, second paragraph: please be more specific about the type of psychosocial risks that have been documented to impact worker health (also by including references), since this relates to the hypothesis testing in the current study. Information on the sampling and procedure of data collection should be placed in the Methods section. Concerning the data collection on working conditions, have any standardized instruments been used to assess psychosocial risk factors? This is an important issue since the main aim is to unravel working conditions in this sample. For work-home interference and chronic fatigue, the 75th percentile was used to dichotomize. Please critically reflect on this approach. I advise to add a descriptive table showing the description of participants and businesses. It would also be relevant to include more tables showing main results of the paper. On the other hand, I believe the Results section should be more focused. Several findings are now described that do not seem directly related to the specific research aims, for instance the part on motivation and centrality of work. The paper is very descriptive and the link to a clear research question and hypotheses is often blurred. For instance, a comparison is made between the smallest and somewhat larger businesses, was this based on a priori hypothesis? Likewise, work-home interference is outlined in great detail (at item level) and compared between genders, but justification for this is not provided. I have doubts whether the comparison with the survey in small shops is the most relevant or valid comparison to make here. In light of the research question, would it not be more relevant to compare the findings to representative data from employees in larger organizations, such as the Eurofound data? My confusion here relates to the first comment: is the situation of small entrepreneurs compared to employees or to larger organizations, what is the main focus here? Apart from this, if percentages are compared with other survey findings, a formal statistical testing should be added (is the difference statistically significant?).
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