

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Cohort Profile: The Ontario Life After Workplace Injury Study (OLAWIS)
AUTHORS	Mustard, Cameron; Nadalin, Victoria; Carnide, Nancy; Tompa, Emile; Smith, Peter

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bockerman, Petri Labour Institute for Economic Research, Helsinki
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Mar-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Comments 1. The contribution to the (international) literature should be stated in the revised introduction of the paper. 2. Was attrition to the survey over time random or not? 3. Do the data contain (survey) weights or not? 4. Is the length of the follow-up sufficient to identify the effects? 5. An important issue is that employees are not randomly assigned into workplaces. Failure to account for sorting of employees will bias any estimated effects for the measures of well-being at work. The size of the bias is difficult to evaluate. This problem can be addressed using information on employees' wage and work histories (see e.g. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.09.005 and references therein). The issue should be discussed in the revised version. Are the possibilities to link the survey data to register-based data containing information on employees' wage and work histories? 6. What is the external validity of the findings using the data?
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

We very much appreciate the comments provided by Dr Bockerman, Labour Institute for Economic Research, Helsinki.

1. The contribution to the (international) literature should be stated in the revised introduction of the paper.

We appreciate the reviewer's advice, and have included the following sentence at the conclusion of the introduction.

Examination of these hypotheses will contribute to the international literature on the impact of health

impairments secondary to traumatic injury on labour force participation, and the role of workplace accommodation in enabling employment participation among workers with health impairments.

2. Was attrition to the survey over time random or not?

As we documented in the manuscript, no substantive differences were observed between claimants participating in the 18 month follow-up interview and non-participating claimants in the randomly selected recruitment sample. As recruitment for participation in the 36 month follow-up interview is currently in progress, we are unable to provide an estimate of characteristics that may be associated with attrition between the 18 month and 36 month interviews. We will be formally assessing attrition in future analytic work.

3. Do the data contain (survey) weights or not?

We appreciate the reviewer's observation that a description of survey weights was omitted from the manuscript. We have included the following sentence.

Survey weights are applied for analyses that focus on representing the target population of claimants with durations of 5 days or longer.

4. Is the length of the follow-up sufficient to identify the effects?

Our perspective on the length of follow-up is the following. The 18 month follow-up has documented strong persistence in health impairments among those workers with the longest durations of work absence. Additionally, the 18 month follow-up is sufficient to estimate the frequency of changes in employment among workers who are employed, and the frequency of non-employment among workers who were employed in the baseline period. We anticipate that the 36 month follow-up will contribute to understanding the persistence of both health impairments and the frequency of non-employment among this group of workers disabled by a work injury or illness. At this point, we have not offered an adjustment to the manuscript.

5. An important issue is that employees are not randomly assigned into workplaces. Failure to account for sorting of employees will bias any estimated effects for the measures of well-being at work. The size of the bias is difficult to evaluate. This problem can be addressed using information on employees' wage and work histories (see e.g. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.09.005> and references therein). The issue should be discussed in the revised version. Are the possibilities to link the survey data to register-based data containing information on employees' wage and work histories?

The reviewer is correct in noting that labour market outcomes will differ among cohort participants, in part, as a function of their employment arrangement, and the economic sector in which they work, and that administrative data on workers' wage and work history would potentially improve analytic precision. We have provided the following brief discussion of this issue in the 'Strengths and limitations' section of the manuscript.

Further, there will plausibly be differences in labour market outcomes in the cohort that cannot be accurately accounted for by the self-reported information obtained by the interviewer-administered questionnaire. Although not available in this context, longitudinal information on workers' wage and work history from administrative sources would enhance the interpretation of differences in labour market outcomes (34).

6. What is the external validity of the findings using the data?

The reviewer raises a good point, and one that, on reflection, we think should be incorporated in the 'Strengths and limitations' section.

The dual objectives of this cohort, to describe the long-term health and labour market outcomes of workers disabled by work injury or illness, may have different implications for the external validity of findings from this cohort. We would be most confident that the long-term health outcomes observed in this cohort would plausibly generalize to other developed country settings. In contrast, however, the labour market outcomes observed in this cohort will, to some degree, be a function of the labour and social security protections specific to this jurisdiction.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bockerman, Petri Labour Institute for Economic Research, Helsinki
REVIEW RETURNED	06-Aug-2021
GENERAL COMMENTS	I am happy with the paper.