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Reviewer's report:

Diagnosis-specific disability pension and risk of all-cause and cause-specific mortality – a cohort study of 4.9 million inhabitants in Sweden

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. This is an important, but largely neglected area, and analyses such as this add richness and understanding to a complex area that incorporates social, economic and health policy.

Major compulsory revision:
1. In order to understand the findings of this work, more effort needs to be put into understanding the theory, context and evidence in this complex area. I would suggest that the authors consult the papers referenced, 1-15 which are directly relevant to this work, and revise the introduction and discussion in light of these. I also suggest that the authors look more widely for literature, as there are bound to be papers that I have missed. The paper would greatly benefit from having more theoretical understanding of the area, in order to understand the results and better frame the discussion.

Minor essential revisions:
1. ‘Mental diagnoses’ is used throughout the paper- mental health diagnoses or psychiatric diagnoses are better alternatives
2. The word sex is used throughout the paper- I am interested as to whether you are thinking about the differences as biological in which case sex is fine, or as a social construct in which case gender would be better
3. Page 14 para 2- the statement about an RCT is a ‘strawman argument’, there are many options other than RCTs. The paper I references by Popham et al looks at one of these issues, there are papers that consider the role of smoking in this population and others that look at social position etc. There are many creative ways of researching and understanding these issues.
4. Page 2 line 16/17- this sentence is confusing
5. Page 3 line 5- economic not economical
6. Page 3 line 6- there is a typo on this line, also please be more specific than ‘consequences’
7. Page 3 line 10- overrisk needs to be changed
8. Page 3 line 20- acknowledge not acknowledging
9. Page 8 line 11 needs to have education after elementary school
10. Page 8 line 14 should be lesser rather than minor
11. Page 8 line 21 – use is probably better than consumption
12. Page 9 line 3- typo
13. Page 12 line 25- typo
14. Page 13 line 6- typo
15. Page 13 line 14 - typo
16. Page 14 line 22- includes is probably better than represents
17. Page 15 line 5 - typo


Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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