

We thank the reviewers for their comments on our manuscript and provide the following responses to each.

Reviewers' comment	Authors' response	Changes made
<p>1. The last two paragraph of the "introduction" are slightly misleading and have two typos. 'of' should be added and (ref) omitted. "In Australia, Rothmore et al undertook a study (of ?) 25 workgroups..." In addition, readers may assume that this sentence refers to another study, but we assume it is citation to a different analysis from the same study recently published in Applied Ergonomics (reference 10). This should be clarified for the reader and then in the last sentence of the intro it should be clear how the analysis in the current paper aims to advance what was found in the previous analysis. How this paper has advanced what was found in ref 10 should also be briefly discussed in the discussion.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>The two typos have been corrected and the final paragraph of the Introduction has been rewritten to clarify the link between this paper and the paper recently published in Applied Ergonomics and to highlight the differences. While the paper published in Applied Ergonomics was focussed on differences in the rate of implementation between the tailored and standard groups this paper is focussed on the health benefits, in the form of MSPD on the worker populations The final paragraph now reads as follows:</p> <p><i>"Utilising an Australian study population Stewart et al¹² investigated baseline MSPD amongst a broad range of industries. Subsequently Rothmore et al¹⁰, reported on the implementation of interventions applied to 25 workgroups. These workgroups were randomly assigned to receive either standard ergonomics advice or advice tailored according to the SOC profile of the workers. At 12-months follow-up, companies in receipt of tailored ergonomics advice had implemented recommended changes at a significantly higher rate than those in receipt of standard ergonomics advice. Rothmore et al¹⁰ did not include health outcomes and thus the purpose of this paper is to systematically report on the differences between the interventions in respect of MSPD."</i></p> <p>We have also introduced the findings published in Applied Ergonomics as the final sentence under "Factors influencing the effectiveness of the intervention" which reads:</p>

		<p><i>“This is further supported by Rothmore et al¹⁰ ref who reported that while companies in receipt of advice tailored according to the SOC approach introduced significantly more changes this was primarily driven by the implementation of the easiest and less expensive options.”</i></p> <p>We have also added a paragraph (third to last paragraph under “Strengths and weaknesses of the research” to highlight the differences between the findings reported in this study and how it adds to the Applied Ergonomics paper recently published. The wording is as follows:</p> <p><i>“While Rothmore et al¹⁰ previously reported on the differences in implementation rates between organisations in receipt of tailored versus standard ergonomics advice they did not report on the associated health benefits. This is an important consideration in organisations where workplace changes require budgetary justification. This study provides further evidence for the potential economic benefits associated with SOC based interventions.”</i></p>
<p>2. We note that you made a comment in your cover letter that your word length of the revised paper was in excess of the OEM limit, but the words in tables are not included in the word limit of 4500 words. Could you please recount the words in your paper, excluding words in the tables, figures and reference list</p>	<p>Excluding words in tables, figures and reference list the paper is 4495 words (including title, abstract, “What this paper adds”).</p>	