Reviewer’s report

Title: Fibromyalgia in the workplace: risk factors for sick leave are related to professional context rather than fibromyalgia characteristics. A French national survey of 955 patients

Version: 1 Date: 24 Jun 2019

Reviewer: Tanja Stamm

Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study on women with fibromyalgia, their workplaces and risk factors for sick leave. The study is timely and important. The method in general is well suited and clearly described. I have a few comments:

What was the rationale to include only women in this study? Why were women with part-time employment for other than medical reasons not included? How was "were off work" defined? Instead of "population" (twice on page 6), I would suggest to write "sample". As the survey seemed to have been rather lengthy, how many participants started, but did not complete the survey? How did the authors ensure that no participant filled in the survey twice?

Why is this considered to be a national survey? Did the authors expect a bias regarding the voluntary participation of women via internet?

Was the sick leave classification set up before the study or based on the data collected?

Was the reason for the sick leave assessed?

Could the numbers in the results section be reduced a bit - maybe some information could be provided in form of tables.

Table 2: I would suggest to mark where it is "mean and sd" and where "n and %".

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:
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