Good, interesting and important paper, I have only very few remarks:

1. Table 1 (see screenshot): marked stats should be in one row to the others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family member requiring care</th>
<th>152</th>
<th>26.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of hospitalization immediately after injury in 2009 (days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;8 days</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥8 days</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury-induced changes in appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Table 1: it would be helpful to know the stats (if available) of those workers, who didn’t join the study. Is it possible to include this stats in sense of a responder-nonresponder-analysis in Table 1?

3. Figure 2: I think, that should be 0–10% in the ordinate instead of 0–1%, is this right?