

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Precarious employment, business performance and occupational injuries – a study protocol of a register-based Swedish project.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026091
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Aug-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Orellana, Cecilia; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Kreshpaj, Bertina; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Johansson, Gun; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine; Stockholm County Council, Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine Burström, Bo; Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Social Medicine; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Kjellberg, Katarina; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine; Stockholm County Council, Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine Hemmingsson, Tomas; Karolinska Institute, Department of Public Health Sciences; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Axén, Magnus; Uppsala Universitet, Department of Business studies Davis, Letitia; Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Occupational Health Surveillance Program Wegman, David; University of Massachusetts Lowell Bodin, Theo; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE, Protocol, Occupational injury, Precarious employment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Precarious employment, business performance and occupational injuries – a**
8 **study protocol of a register-based Swedish project.**
9

10 Cecilia Orellana^{1*}, Bertina Kreshpaj¹, Gun Johansson^{1,2}, Bo Burström^{1,2,3}, Katarina Kjellberg^{1,2}, Tomas
11 Hemmingsson^{1,4}, Magnus Axén⁵, Letitia Davis⁶, David Wegman⁷, Theo Bodin^{1,2}.

12
13
14
15 * Correspondence: Cecilia.orellana@ki.se

16 ¹ Unit of Occupational Medicine, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden

17
18 ² Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Stockholm County Council, Solnavägen 4, SE-
19 113 65 Stockholm, Sweden

20
21 ³ Department of Public Health Sciences, Equity and Health Policy Research Group, Karolinska
22 Institutet, Stockholm, SE 171 77, Sweden

23 ⁴ Department of Public Health Sciences, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

24 ⁵ Department of Business studies, Uppsala University

25
26 ⁶ Occupational Health Surveillance Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Boston,
27 MA.

28
29 ⁷ University of Massachusetts Lowell, 7 Camden Place, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Word count: 4029

Field Code Changed

ABSTRACT

Introduction: There is uncertainty regarding the trends in occupational injuries (OI) in Sweden due to a significant and increasing problem with under-reporting to injury registers. Under-reporting in general is likely to be exacerbated by the rise in precarious employment (PE), a set of unfavourable employment characteristics that would benefit from formal definition and study. PE and global trends is believed also to affect companies and their commitment to health and safety. The present study attempts to bridge these knowledge gaps and presents a study protocol for planned studies, with three main objectives: first, to review the literature for definitions of PE emphasizing those that are multi-dimensional and operationalize components in routinely collected register data; second, using results from the first objective, to conduct large, register-based prospective studies, designed to measure effect sizes and interactions between PE, business performance and OI; and third, to estimate the under-reporting of OI in Swedish registers.

Methods and analysis: First, a scientific literature review will be conducted, including scientific databases and grey literature. Second, all residents aged 18-70 in Sweden with any registered income during 2003-2015 will be included. Data sources encompass Swedish population and labour market registers with linkage to both the main occupational injury register with national coverage and hospital records. Trends in PE and OI will be explored, together with risk of OI associated to PE and business performance. Finally, data from two major occupational injury registers will be used to estimate the magnitude of under-report using capture-recapture methodology.

Ethics and dissemination: The project has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee, Stockholm (dnr:2016/2325-31;2017/2173-32). Dissemination of study results will include a series of peer-reviewed papers, a PhD thesis and one report in Swedish, engaging relevant stakeholders. Results will be presented in national and international conferences and through press releases to mass media.

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Keywords:** Precarious employment, occupational injury, business performance, study protocol,
7
8 register-based.
9

10 11 12 **Article Summary**

13 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 14
15
16
17 • We present a systematic approach to operationalization of the arising social determinant of
18 health; precarious employment. This effort is much needed and is likely to be valuable to the
19 research community.
20
21
- 22
23 • The use of nation-wide register data of high quality covering the total working population
24 provides power to the study and virtually zero-loss to follow-up.
25
- 26
27 • A wide range of variables from different sources, together with the long follow-up period
28 will enable us to adjust for confounders and apply longitudinal designs, mitigating several
29 sources of bias.
30
- 31
32 • Potential risk of misclassification for both exposure and outcome, due to factors such as data
33 availability and self-reporting.
34
- 35
36 • For the under-report of occupational injuries, the main limitation refers to differences in the
37 coverage of the different data sources, which will limit our ability to make good estimates in
38 some labour market sectors.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

INTRODUCTION

Setting priorities for workplace health and safety research depends upon accurate and reliable accident and injury data. In Norway and Denmark studies suggest that as few as 9-26% of all occupational accidents reaching hospitals are also reported to the national occupational injury registers. [1, 2] There is uncertainty regarding the trends in occupational injuries in Sweden due to under-reporting to Swedish injury registers. [3, 4] It is known that larger workplaces in Sweden generally have better routines for reporting occupational injuries than smaller companies. [4] Among the latter, there is a widespread poor awareness that reporting of occupational injuries is mandatory. No systematic analysis of the magnitude of under-reporting and factors associated with this problem has been performed.

The problem with underreporting could be exacerbated by the rise in precarious employment, non-standard employment relations encompassing short-term and temporary contracts, as well as powerlessness, vulnerability, employment insecurity and insufficient wages. There is no internationally accepted definition of precarious employment, but several multidimensional constructs have been proposed. [5-7]

There is reason to believe that precariously employed workers are less likely to report occupational injuries due to lack of knowledge, education, unionization and empowerment in exercising rights. Precariously employed workers are also likely to be at higher risk of occupational injuries. A recent review by our group [8] supports an association between some of the dimensions of precarious employment and occupational injuries; most notably for multiple jobholders [9-12] and employees of temporary agencies or subcontractors at the same worksite. [13-15] Results for employees on fixed-term contracts were inconclusive.

The rise in non-standard employment relations is a trend in many countries in all stages of development and Sweden is no exception. Here, temporary employment rose during the nineties crisis and is especially common among young adults, where the proportion on temporary contracts

1
2
3
4
5
6 is 65% among both men and women aged 20-34. [16] International trends in management and
7
8 increased competition also affect companies and their commitment to health and safety. In order to
9
10 stay economically competitive and to earn maximum profits, it has been found that construction
11
12 contractors only execute basic safety measures and eliminate many important hazard prevention
13
14 training programs during project implementation. [17] Others have found that when the financial
15
16 condition of a firm deteriorates, then it is likely to adopt policies that will lead to an increase in
17
18 safety violations, an increased accident rate, and an increase in environmental hazards. [18] In
19
20 contrast, companies that prosper could be more likely to invest in occupational health and safety. In
21
22 a study of U.S. coal mining companies a 10% increase in real total revenue per hour worked was
23
24 associated with 0.9% decrease in the incidence rates of all reported injuries. [19] However, which
25
26 variables are good indicators of business performance and what is the situation in Sweden has not
27
28 been explored.

29
30 Research regarding the association between precarious employment, business performance and
31
32 occupational injuries faces several challenges. Firstly, the employer-employee relationship is
33
34 increasingly complex and there is mounting evidence that a single variable, such as temporary
35
36 employment or job insecurity is not enough to explore this relationships association to health
37
38 outcomes. [8, 20, 21] A multidimensional approach is needed, but the variety in definitions used
39
40 makes comparison between studies and countries difficult.

41
42 To address these challenges, **the first objective** of this project is to review the literature for multi-
43
44 dimensional definitions of precarious employment and similar constructs and identify its main
45
46 components. We will then suggest ways to operationalize these components in routinely collected
47
48 register data.

49
50 **The second objective** of this project is to use the results from our methodological work in the first
51
52 objective to conduct large, register-based prospective studies, designed to identify trends on the
53
54 labor market and measure effect sizes and interactions of the relation between precarious

1
2
3
4
5
6 employment, key business indicators and occupational injuries as well as their interaction with
7 sociodemographic and economic indicators.

8
9
10 Finally, there is a pressing need for better injury statistics in order to set priorities for prevention and
11 future research. Therefore, *the third objective* of this study is to estimate the magnitude of under-
12 reporting of injuries in Swedish registers and investigate which factors are related to this.
13
14

15
16 In this protocol we provide an overview of the data sources and methods to be used in the project.
17
18

19 **Specific Research Questions**

20
21 Studies are planned based on specific research questions (RQ) aligned to overarching objectives
22 above.
23
24

25 **Objective 1**

26 RQ1. How has precarious employment been previously defined and how can this be
27 operationalized in Swedish registers?
28
29

30 **Objective 2**

31 RQ2. What are the trends in precarious employment on the Swedish labour market?
32

33 RQ3. What are the occupational injury trends over time for precarious workers and
34 organizations or industries that go through economic change?
35
36

37 RQ4. Are precarious workers at higher risk of occupational injuries compared to others?
38
39

40 RQ5. Are changes in key business indicators risk factors for occupational accidents over short-
41 term and long-term periods?
42
43

44 **Objective 3**

45 RQ6. What is the magnitude of under-reporting of occupational injuries in Sweden 2013, and is
46 underreporting differential with respect to:
47
48

- 49 a. individual factors such as age, sex educational level and precarious employment
50 status,
51
52

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 b. organization-level factors such as company size, industry or sector, gender
7
8 composition, age composition, and proportion of immigrant workers,
9
10 c. injury severity, and cause of accident?
11

12 **Ethics**

13
14 The project has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee, Stockholm (dnr: 2016/2325-31
15 and 2017/2173-32).
16
17

18 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

19 **Description of data sources**

20
21 This study includes all residents aged 18-70 in Sweden with any registered income during at least
22 one year, January 1st 2003 through December 31st 2015. For the main analysis this cumulatively
23 amounts to approximately 7 000 000 individuals over the years 2003-2015. This project will use the
24
25 Longitudinal Integration Database for Health Insurance and Labour Market Studies (LISA) with
26
27 linkage to the Information System on Occupational Injuries (ISA) and hospital records, described in
28
29 greater detail in Tables 1 and 2. We will use the unique personal identity number assigned to each
30
31 resident in Sweden to link information from all the registers mentioned above. Also, there is an
32
33 identification number specific for each company and workplace within companies, which will allow
34
35 us to make an additional company-specific linkage. This linkage will provide aggregate exposure data
36
37 at the company level, such as company-specific characteristics related to individuals, number of
38
39 employees at each workplace, etc. We will also be able to follow individuals moving between
40
41 workplaces.
42
43

44 Statistics Sweden has de-identified the original identification numbers, thus ensuring the
45
46 confidentiality of the information.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Table 1. Characteristics of the data sources used in this project to identify occupational injuries.

Data Source	Population Covered	Injury reporting and definition	Eligibility, compensation and data access
ISA ^a (Information System on Occupational Injuries)	<p>All employees and self-employed persons in Sweden.</p> <p>To be employed in Sweden you need to be a resident (temporary or permanent) or EU citizen. EU-citizens can work without registering to the authorities for up to 6 months. Those directly employed in EU/ESS or third country but stationed in Sweden are not covered.</p>	<p>The employee is responsible to notify the employer who in turn is obliged by law to report any injury. There is no deadline for reporting an injury. Reports are filed online and to a lesser extent on paper.</p> <p>An occupational injury is an injury due to accident[s], which occurred at the workplace or other place where the injured person had been for work. For an event to be counted as an accident, it is required that the course was relatively short and arose in connection with a particular event. Injuries caused by threats, assaults, robberies, etc., are also counted as occupational injuries. Both physical and mental injuries are counted here. Injuries such as heat stroke, frostbite, inflammation and injuries due to mechanical effects for a shorter period of time, no more than a few days, are also considered to be caused by accidents.”</p>	<p>Days of work lost due to the injury (except in the case of annuity) are paid through the regular sickness benefit system*. So, despite the law to report injuries, no report is needed to get compensation lost work days.</p> <p>The worker can claim compensation for costs related to dental care, special assistive devices or medical care abroad. If the injury is likely to reduce work-ability for more than 1-year, compensation for lost work income (annuity) can be approved if the injury has led to a lower income for the worker (other job and/or fewer hours).</p> <p>The injury reporting system (ISA) automatically sends the report to the national insurance board who administrates both the sickness benefit and worker’s compensation but no assessment of the injuries validity is made unless the worker makes a claim for compensation.</p> <p>Data access: Open and closed cases are available alike at the time of data extraction. Final statistics are published approximately 11 months after the close of the calendar year.</p> <p>* except for special cases where the worker doesn’t qualify for sickness benefit or if his/her sickness benefit is low. These workers are covered by the</p>

			occupational injury sickness benefit.
AFA insurance ^b	All employees within the private sector (also self-employed) who have signed a collective agreement. All employees in municipalities and county councils as they are always covered by collective agreements. AFA also administrates the occupational injury insurance for all national government employees. Thus, in total, the AFA register covers 100% of the public sector employees and approximately 90% of the total Swedish Labour market. The same regulations regarding employment in Sweden as described under ISA applies.	Employees report directly through an online form to AFA. There is no deadline for reporting an injury. However, there is a 10-year deadline to receive compensation (6 years for income loss) The same definition of occupational injury is used as for ISA.	Eligibility: The employer confirms that the person was an employee at the time of the injury through a direct query from AFA. AFA also checks with the national insurance board if there are sick-days reported. The claim's validity is assessed and if granted compensation can be given for lost income, direct costs associated to the injury and sometimes compensation for pain and suffering. If the injury still causes suffering after 18 months, compensation can be given for medical disability/permanent impairment and/or annuity. Thus, AFA provides a broader compensation scheme than the national insurance board. Data access: Open and closed cases are available alike at the time of data extraction.
^a ISA register is held by the Swedish Work Environment Agency			
^b AFA is a privately held insurance company owned by the Swedish trade unions and employer's organizations. Available data for the year 2013.			

Apart from the data sources described above, for the third objective we will also include occupational injuries that occurred in the year 2013 using data from AFA Insurance, an organization owned by the Sweden's labour market parties (Table 1).

Table 2. Additional sources of data used in this project.

Data Source	Population covered	Available variables	Timeliness
LISA (Longitudinal Integration database for health insurance and labour market studies) ^a	It holds annual registers since 1990 and includes all individuals 16 years of age and older that were registered in Sweden as of December 31 for each year.	The database integrates multiple databases from the labour market, educational and social sectors. It contains not only individual data, but also connections to family, companies and places of employment.	Temporal resolution: Variables are on yearly basis for both individuals and businesses, this applies to e.g. income, revenue, etc. Multiple employers are registered (total number and details on the three major employers). Data access: Data is compiled with an 18 months' lag.
NPR (National Patient Register) ^b	All visits to inpatient or specialised outpatient care (i.e. excluding primary care).	Our dataset includes every person who was diagnosed with external cause of injury (ICD10 chapters S and T). Duration of hospitalization, to characterize severity.	All hospitals and specialized outpatient clinics in Sweden report to a central register, coverage is >95%. Data includes exact date of visits admission and discharge.
DR (Cause of Death Register) ^b	It includes all those who died during one calendar year and were registered in Sweden at the time of death, regardless of whether the death occurred inside or outside the country. ^c	It shows the underlying cause of death coded according to the international version of the disease classification ICD-10. For injuries, the external cause of injury is shown.	Reported by physician no later than 3 weeks after death.

^a LISA is held by Statistics Sweden. ^b NPR and DR are held by the National Board of Health and Welfare.
^c The statistics do not include stillborns, persons who died on a temporary visit to Sweden or asylum seekers who have not yet obtained residence permits. Swedes who have emigrated and are no longer registered in Sweden are not included either.

Main variables

Precarious Employment and Key Business Indicators:

The definition of precarious employment will be developed through the systematic literature review, development of a functional PE definition applicable to available registers and then operationalization in registers (RQ1). Information on exposure to precarious employment and key business indicators will be constructed from data obtained through LISA register (Table 2).

1
2
3
4
5
6 Relevant key business indicators will be selected through discussions and workshops within the
7
8 research team, that includes a business economist. There is very limited guidance in previous
9
10 research on which key business indicators could be related to occupational injuries. Under the well-
11
12 founded assumption that managers make decisions (including those affecting health and safety)
13
14 based on the projected future of the company, the initial work has focused on identifying key
15
16 indicators of company value, as reflected by operating assets, future earnings and cash flows.
17 Preliminary discussions suggest that return on equity, operating margin, net turnover/employee,
18
19 employee costs/net turnover, solidity, operating result/employee, employee costs/employee,
20
21 financial leverage, labour costs as well as total gross and net investments are highly relevant. All
22
23 these variables are available directly from LISA for all Swedish companies. Stock market prices have
24
25 been contemplated but discarded since most companies are not listed. We also have ongoing work
26
27 identifying which key business indicators that are useful in comparing companies across industries
28
29 and within specific industries. Likely we will adopt an exploratory approach on a subset of the
30
31 dataset before deciding on which indicators to use.

32 Occupational Injuries:

33
34 Information on occupational injuries caused by an accident is being obtained from two different
35
36 Swedish registers: ISA and AFA Insurance (Table 1). Thanks to the linkage with Swedish population
37
38 and labour market registers together with hospital records, we will be able to characterize injuries in
39
40 terms of severity and add information on potential confounders.

41 Occupational Injury Definition:

42
43 We will use the definition used in Swedish Law and which is applied by both the ISA and AFA
44
45 registers. *“An occupational injury is an injury due to accident[s], which occurred at the workplace or
46
47 other place where the injured person had been for work. For an event to be counted as an accident, it
48
49 is required that the course was relatively short and arose in connection with a particular event.*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 *Injuries caused by threats, assaults, robberies, etc., are also counted as occupational injuries. Both*
7 *physical and mental injuries are counted here. Injuries such as heat stroke, frostbite, inflammation*
8 *and injuries due to mechanical effects for a shorter period of time, no more than a few days, are also*
9 *considered to be caused by accidents.” [22]*

14 Since under-reporting is one of our main objectives, we will study reported occupational injuries. In
15 ISA, claims can only be made for a limited set of compensations (Table 1). No assessment of reports
16 is made without a claim; thus an inclusion of claims or approved claims would be too limiting. The
17 occurrence of false reports is thought to be very low (personal communication with the work
18 environment authority) and is likely random. However, we will explore this issue further.

23 Moreover, we will exclude injuries that occurred during transit to/from work, occupational diseases
24 and near injuries.

28 *Occupational Injury severity*

30 Severity of occupational injuries will be assessed in two different ways.

32 Days of work lost: Data from the Swedish Social Insurance Agency provided by employers and part of
33 the ISA and AFA registers, will be used to obtain days lost from work due to sickness absence and
34 disability pension, in connection with occupational injuries. This information covers all employees.

38 Specialized care, Hospitalisation and Death: Specialized care, Hospitalization and Death will be
39 obtained from the National Patient Register (NPR) and Cause of death register (DR) (Table 2). We
40 have limited this study to chapters S and T in International Classification of Disease 10 (ICD-10)
41 which contain injuries, poisoning and some other consequences of external causes. Since all
42 diagnoses are not covered, this dataset does not include all occupational injuries leading to
43 specialized care, hospitalization and death. Regarding injuries to the musculoskeletal system, it only
44 covers fractures, dislocations and distortions. However, it will allow a subpopulation analysis of
45 severe acute injuries in RQ2-6.

Covariates/Confounders

We will use information from LISA register to adjust for confounding factors, perform stratified analysis and sub-group analysis (Table 2).

Individual: age, sex, educational level, income, country of birth (four groups: Sweden, other Nordic country, other EU 25, and rest of the world) and occupation according to the Swedish Standard Classification of Occupations (SSYK 1996), [23] which is based on the International Standard Classification of Occupations 1988 (ISCO-88).

Workplace: In addition to key business indicators, we have information on workplace level on industry (Swedish Standard Industrial Classification), [24] number of employees, educational level of workforce and workplace sex distribution.

Analysis plan

Definitions and operationalization of precarious employment (RQ1)

We will deconstruct all definitions obtained by our literature search into single dimensions and perform a qualitative and quantitative appraisal of their appropriateness. Based on our findings, we will propose a core set of variables that should be included in a multidimensional definition of precarious employment depending on data availability. Once these are defined, we will operationalize a multidimensional definition in Swedish registers to be able to use it in the subsequent studies and develop a job exposure matrix for precarious employment including these variables (study 1).

Trends in precarious employment and occupational injuries (RQ2 and RQ3)

Using data from the whole study period, we will then explore trends in precarious employment over time in Sweden, for the years 2003-2015 (as laid out in study 1). We will put special attention to changes over time for women and men, different industries, and foreign born compared to Swedish born (study 2).

1
2
3
4
5
6 We will also explore the trends over time with regards to the risk for occupational injuries for
7 precarious workers and organizations or industries in economic trouble (study 3).

8
9
10 Risk of injury associated to precarious employment (RQ4)

11
12 Precarious employment, as defined through formative work in study 1, will be the independent
13 variable of interest in a multivariate analysis with occupational injury as outcome. It is well known
14 that the risk of occupational injuries decreases with tenure at any given job. It is unlikely that there is
15 an accumulation of risk or latency in the precarious employment–occupational injuries relationship.
16 We will therefore measure risk and outcome at the same point in time, i.e. precarious employment
17 and injury in the same year. We will also explore the interaction effects of age and
18 tenure/experience. Analysis will be adjusted for socio-demographic variables. A longitudinal
19 dimension will be introduced by analyzing the changes in risks over the time of the study period
20 (2003-2015). Due to the large differences in risk of injury based on occupation, sector and industry,
21 we will perform stratified analysis based on these variables.

22
23 The outcome will be stratified based on severity of injury and differences in risk of injury severity
24 between precarious and non-precarious employees will be explored.

25
26 Risk of injury associated to key business indicators (RQ5)

27
28 A cohort of all Swedish companies will be created. The outcome will be defined as occupational
29 injury per full-time employee and calculated for each year for each individual company. We will
30 calculate short-term (1 year) and long-term (5-year) trajectories in key business indicators for each
31 company and use these as the main independent variables of interest in a multivariate regression
32 analysis. Stratified analysis will be carried out based on company size, industry/sector. As in RQ4,
33 the outcome will be stratified based on severity of injury.

34
35 Under-reporting of occupational injuries (RQ6)

36
37 In order to estimate the magnitude of underreporting of occupational injuries for the year 2013
38 (RQ6), two sources of data on occupational injuries (ISA and AFA registers) will be used to obtain

1
2
3
4
5
6 estimates by means of capture-recapture methodology (study 6). This method, based on log-linear
7
8 models, has been successfully used by others and it is used to estimate the incomplete
9
10 ascertainment using information from overlapping lists of cases from distinct sources. [25]
11

12 **DISCUSSION**

13
14 In this project we aim at operationalizing precarious employment in Swedish labor market registers
15
16 and use this definition to conduct several large, register-based prospective etiological studies,
17
18 designed to measure effect sizes and interactions of the relation between precarious employment,
19
20 business performance and occupational injuries. Taking advantage of two separate and
21
22 comprehensive reporting systems for occupational injuries in Sweden we will also estimate under-
23
24 reporting of occupational injuries and the factors which are related to this issue. In this protocol, we
25
26 present preliminary results for the overlapping of occupational injuries for the year 2013.
27

28 **Strengths and limitations**

29
30 We believe that the major strength of our project will arise from the results from the first study, i.e.
31
32 the operationalization of precarious employment. This, together with the identification of key
33
34 business indicators of relevance for the association between precariousness and occupational
35
36 injuries can be considered as a valuable start point for future research investigating these factors.

37
38 By using the unique Swedish personal and organisation identification numbers from ISA and LISA we
39
40 are able to link both individuals and companies to each other and to the injury databases. The use of
41
42 nation-wide register data of high quality covering the total working population provides power to
43
44 the study and virtually zero-loss to follow-up. A wide range of variables from different sources,
45
46 together with the long follow-up period will enable us to adjust for confounders and apply
47
48 longitudinal designs, mitigating several sources of bias. Information on sickness absence and
49
50 hospitalization allows us to characterize our outcome in terms of severity, further adding quality
51
52 aspects to outcome measurement.

53
54 However, some limitations and methodological challenges should be addressed.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Injury definition:
7

8
9 The system of self-reporting and somewhat ambiguous definition of occupational injury introduces
10 the risk of misclassification between occupational injury and disease. This problem is likely to be
11 most serious in the case of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) where repeated over-exertion leading
12 to an MSD could be reported as both an occupational injury and occupational disease. For women,
13 over-exertion injuries (physical over-exertion such as during heavy lifting and carrying, jerks, slips)
14 constituted the second most common cause/type of occupational injury with at least one day of
15 sickness absence in Sweden. [26] For men it was the third most common cause. If the
16 misclassification was random and steady over time this would pose a lesser problem, but we have
17 reason to believe that the preference to choose between reporting MSDs as injuries or diseases
18 might be biased by preconceptions about chances of getting a claim granted in either category and
19 that this changes over time as a consequence of regulatory changes.
20
21

22 Additionally, there is risk of including “non-occupational” injuries while investigating reports rather
23 than approved claims. The rationale for not limiting the reports to approved injuries is that the rules
24 for receiving compensation have been tightened over the last decade and we believe that on the
25 group level, there is more consistency over time in employee’s notion of what qualifies as an
26 occupational injury than in the assessment by the social insurance agency. In personal
27 communication with civil servants at the Swedish Work Environment Authority, the presence of non-
28 occupational injuries has been deemed “an issue in the margin”.
29

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Injury severity:
44

45 In Sweden, sickness absence is reimbursed by the Swedish Social Insurance Agency starting on day
46 15. The near universal coverage of the regular sickness insurance scheme and the additional
47 coverage specifically for injuries makes us rather confident that we will be able to identify most
48 serious injuries occurring in the formal labour market. The other severity measure obtained through
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6 hospital records only covers injuries, poisoning and some other consequences of external causes (S
7 and T chapters in ICD-10). Thereby, we will not identify major injury categories such as acute
8 lumbago (M45.3).
9

10
11
12 Whether we characterize severity in terms of days of hospitalization or reimbursed days lost of
13 work, we have a rather large difference between mild and severe cases, losing the broad spectrum
14 of less severe injuries while severe cases can be classified much finer.
15

16
17
18 Precarious employees:
19

20
21 Although we have not yet operationalized precarious employment in registers, we foresee some
22 constraints. Among other issues, type of contract (permanent/temporary) is not registered and will
23 have to be constructed by proxy variables with lower specificity. EU citizens stationed in Sweden and
24 informal workers are not covered in this study, groups that are of special interest in research on
25 precarious employment. This is a major limitation but the constraints in data do not allow us to
26 study these two categories of potentially precarious workers.
27

28
29 Precarious employees are less likely to be covered by collective agreements and therefore the issue
30 will be greatest here. We also hypothesise that they are less likely to report injuries. This will affect
31 both our analysis of under-reporting using capture-recapture, and also the estimates for the
32 association between precarious employment and the risk of occupational injuries.
33

34
35
36 Key business indicators:
37

38
39 Previous studies have found that as the financial condition of a firm deteriorates, it is likely to adopt
40 policies that will lead to an increase in safety violations, an increased accident rate, and an increase
41 in environmental hazards [18] and that when revenue increases the opposite would occur. [19] The
42 opposite might however be true as well. As revenue falls, the work tempo might shift downwards
43 temporarily and the short-term effects on injuries might be positive. Lay-offs of those with least
44 tenure may also leave a larger proportion of experienced workers which could lead to fewer injuries.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6 Mirroring this; as revenue increases in a company, new employees come in who are at higher risk.
7
8 Disentangling these effects and counter effects of changes in key business indicators will be a major
9
10 challenge and will require important formative work on causal pathways and the construction of
11
12 logic models prior to analysis. Due to the lack of prior research in this area, an exploratory approach
13
14 using data-mining or machine learning algorithms will also be applied to discover risk factors and
15
16 pathways which we cannot foresee at the moment.

17 Working hours:

18
19
20 When calculating risk of occupational injuries, a measure of working hours is needed as denominator
21
22 in order to make just comparisons. Lacking data on individual working hours in this project we have
23
24 to rely on proxy variables to make estimations. Due to collective bargaining the wage structure in
25
26 Sweden is rather homogenous, especially for blue collar workers and white collar workers with low
27
28 skills. We are currently exploring the feasibility of using wage in combination with occupational code
29
30 and industry code as well as the public registers on median salaries in certain occupations (survey-
31
32 based information) to create a proxy for fulltime employment based on the deviation from the
33
34 median wage.

35 Formal/informal work:

36
37
38 As this study partly focuses on precarious employment, we need to spell out that this study is only
39
40 investigating the formal economy. Not including people working in the Informal sector completely or
41
42 partly will be one of our major limitations. Especially those who are formally employed but receive
43
44 part of their salary “under the table” will be at high risk of being misclassified. Also, foreign citizens
45
46 working in Sweden but whose employer is registered in another country will be absent in this study.
47
48 We know that these workers are very common in construction and logistics, two industries with high
49
50 risk of injury.

51 Under-reporting:

1
2
3
4
5
6 Capture-recapture is a method that has been widely used in epidemiology to estimate unknown size
7 of populations. Methodological issues may appear from dependence among data sources being
8 used to obtain estimates. [25] When it comes to occupational diseases, AFA requires that a report is
9 made first to ISA, therefore one would expect a high level of dependency and that AFA would be
10 completely nested in ISA. For occupational injuries, this is not the case and there is a large
11 proportion of injuries that are only reported to AFA. This said, the detected dependency may result
12 in an overestimation of the true population size, and we must therefore treat our estimations
13 cautiously.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Also, the AFA insurance scheme is not as comprehensive as ISA's. The ISA register covers 100% of the
22 employees and self-employed while the AFA register covers 100% of public sector employees and
23 the of the largest employers. However, collective agreements are less common in small companies
24 and certain industries such as hospitality where 45% of the companies have collective agreements.
25 This will limit our ability to make good estimates in some labour market sectors.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **DISSEMINATION**

32
33 The project is presently planned to result in a series of papers published in international peer-
34 reviewed scientific journals, a PhD thesis and a report in Swedish aimed at relevant stakeholders
35 including governmental agencies, policy-makers and social partners (employers and trade unions).
36
37 Due to the richness of the data obtained and the multiple scientific approaches we anticipate that
38 the project will result also in further publications than those outlined in this protocol. Results of
39 public interest will be formatted as press releases and sent to Swedish and international media with
40 support from the University press services.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

47
48 We believe that this project will address some of the most pressing issues related to occupational
49 injury surveillance and research. Despite some limitations, the inclusion of different studies within
50 this project, using several methodologies, together with the power in numbers and high quality of
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6 the data will allow us to explore trends and risks in occupational injuries in Sweden from many
7 perspectives. The richness of our data will allow us to conduct several specialized sub studies in the
8 future which have not been outlined here, and we would be happy to receive suggestions for further
9 studies and invitations to collaborate.
10
11
12

13 **Acknowledgements**

14
15
16 The authors acknowledge the following data providers: The Swedish Work Environment Agency, AFA
17 insurance, Statistics Sweden and the National Board of Health and Welfare.
18
19

20 **Author Contributions**

21
22 CO has drafted previous versions and the final version of the manuscript. TB is the principal
23 investigator of the project. BK, GJ, BB, KK, TH, MA, LD and DW participate in the project and have
24 contributed to the design of the project and its studies. All authors have read and approved of the
25 final version of the manuscript.
26
27
28

29 **Funding**

30
31
32 This project has been funded by grants from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life
33 and Welfare (FORTE) (Dnr: 2016-00315 and 2017-01956).
34
35

36 **Competing interests**

37
38 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
39

40 **Availability of data and material**

41
42 Data sharing not possible according to Swedish regulations.
43
44

45 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

46
47 Ethical permission for the study for the project duration was granted by the Regional Ethics
48 Committee, Stockholm (Dnr 2016/2325-31 and 2017/2173-32).
49
50
51
52
53
54

REFERENCES

1. Magne Gravseth, H., E. Wergeland, and J. Lund, *Underrapportering av arbeidsskader til Arbeidstilsynet*. Tidsskrift for den norske lægeforening, 2003. **123**(15): p. 2057-2059.
2. Lander, F., et al., *Underrapportering af arbejdsulykker. Øje på arbejdsmiljøet*. København: Landsorganisationen i Danmark, 2012.
3. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket), *Arbetsuskador 2014 - Occupational accidents and work-related diseases*. 2015, Arbetsmiljöverket: Stockholm.
4. Andersson, L., et al., *Hälsorelaterad arbetsmiljöövervakning*. 2014, Arbetsmiljöverket: Stockholm.
5. Standing, G., *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. 2016, London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
6. Vives, A., et al., *The Employment Precariousness Scale (EPRES): psychometric properties of a new tool for epidemiological studies among waged and salaried workers*. Occupational and environmental medicine, 2010. **67**(8): p. 548-555.
7. International Labour Organization (ILO), *From precarious work to decent work: outcome document to the workers' symposium on policies and regulations to combat precarious employment*. 2012, International Labour Office, Bureau for Workers' Activities: Geneva.
8. Koranyi, I., et al., *Precarious employment and occupational accidents and injuries - a systematic review*. Scand J Work Environ Health, 2018.
9. Alali, H., et al., *Relationship between non-standard work arrangements and work-related accident absence in Belgium*. J Occup Health, 2017. **59**(2): p. 177-186.
10. Dong, X., *Long workhours, work scheduling and work-related injuries among construction workers in the United States*. Scand J Work Environ Health, 2005. **31**(5): p. 329-335.
11. Dong, X.S., X. Wang, and J.A. Largay, *Occupational and non-occupational factors associated with work-related injuries among construction workers in the USA*. Int J Occup Environ Health, 2015. **21**(2): p. 142-50.
12. Marucci-Wellman, H.R., et al., *Work in multiple jobs and the risk of injury in the US working population*. Am J Public Health, 2014. **104**(1): p. 134-42.
13. Bena, A., et al., *Impact of organization on occupational injury risk: evidence from high-speed railway construction*. Am J Ind Med, 2011. **54**(6): p. 428-37.
14. Hintikka, N., *Accidents at work during temporary agency work in Finland – Comparisons between certain major industries and other industries*. Saf Sci, 2011. **49**(3): p. 473-483.
15. Smith, C.K., et al., *Temporary workers in Washington state*. Am J Ind Med, 2010. **53**(2): p. 135-45.
16. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Labour force survey 2014* 5 Jul 2018]; Available from: http://www.scb.se/Statistik/AM/AM0401/2014K02/AM0401_2014K02_SM_AM11SM1403.pdf.
17. Cheng, C.-W., et al., *Characteristic analysis of occupational accidents at small construction enterprises*. Safety Science, 2010. **48**(6): p. 698-707.
18. Boisjoly, R.P., *The effects of financial performance and deregulation in the trucking and airline industries on worker safety*. NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy, 1997. **7**(1): p. 38-45.
19. Asfaw, A., C. Mark, and R. Pana-Cryan, *Profitability and occupational injuries in US underground coal mines*. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 2013. **50**: p. 778-786.
20. Benach, J., et al., *Precarious employment: understanding an emerging social determinant of health*. Annu Rev Public Health, 2014. **35**: p. 229-53.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
21. Benach, J., et al., *What should we know about precarious employment and health in 2025? Framing the agenda for the next decade of research*. *Int J Epidemiol*, 2016. **45**(1): p. 232-8.
 22. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket). *Anmäl Arbetsskada (Report Occupational Injury)*. 2018 [cited 2018; Available from: <https://anmalarbetsskada.se/>].
 23. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Swedish standard classification of occupations (SSYK96)*. Stockholm: Reports on Statistical Co-ordination for the Official Statistics of Sweden 1998 5 Jul 2018]; 1-191]. Available from: <https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-yrkesklassificering-ssyk/>.
 24. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Swedish Standard Industrial Classification (SNI)*. 2006 5 Jul 2018]; Available from: <https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-naringsgrensindelning-sni/>.
 25. Hook, E.B. and R.R. Regal, *Capture-recapture methods in epidemiology: methods and limitations*. *Epidemiologic reviews*, 1995. **17**(2): p. 243-264.
 26. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket), *Arbetsskador 2016 - Occupational accidents and work-related diseases, in Report 2017:1*. 2017, Swedish Work Environment Authority: Stockholm.

BMJ Open

Precarious employment, business performance and occupational injuries – a study protocol of a register-based Swedish project.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026091.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Orellana, Cecilia; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Kreshpaj, Bertina; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Johansson, Gun; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine; Stockholm County Council, Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine Burström, Bo; Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Social Medicine; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Kjellberg, Katarina; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine; Stockholm County Council, Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine Hemmingsson, Tomas; Karolinska Institute, Department of Public Health Sciences; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Axén, Magnus; Uppsala Universitet, Department of Business studies Davis, Letitia; Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Occupational Health Surveillance Program Wegman, David; University of Massachusetts Lowell Bodin, Theo; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE, Protocol, Occupational injury, Precarious employment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 1 **Precarious employment, business performance and occupational injuries – a**
5
6 2 **study protocol of a register-based Swedish project.**
7

8 3 Cecilia Orellana^{1*}, Bertina Kreshpaj¹, Gun Johansson^{1,2}, Bo Burström³, Katarina Kjellberg^{1,2}, Tomas
9 4 Hemmingsson^{1,4}, Magnus Axén⁵, Letitia Davis⁶, David Wegman⁷, Theo Bodin^{1,2}.
10
11

12 5
13
14 6 * Correspondence: Cecilia.orellana@ki.se

15 7 ¹ Unit of Occupational Medicine, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden

16 8 ² Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Stockholm County Council, Solnavägen 4, SE-
17 9 113 65 Stockholm, Sweden

18 10 ³ Department of Public Health Sciences, Equity and Health Policy Research Group, Karolinska
19 11 Institutet, Stockholm, SE 171 77, Sweden

20 12 ⁴ Department of Public Health Sciences, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

21 13 ⁵ Department of Business studies, Uppsala University

22 14 ⁶ Occupational Health Surveillance Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Boston,
23 15 MA.

24 16 ⁷ University of Massachusetts Lowell, 7 Camden Place, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

28 Word count: 4491

1
2
3 1 **ABSTRACT**

4 2 **Introduction:** There is uncertainty regarding the trends in occupational injuries (OI) in Sweden due
5
6
7 3 to a significant and increasing problem with under-reporting to injury registers. Underreporting in
8
9 4 general is likely to be exacerbated by the rise in precarious employment (PE), a set of unfavourable
10
11 5 employment characteristics that would benefit from formal definition and study. PE and global
12
13 6 trends are believed also to affect companies and their commitment to health and safety. The
14
15 7 present study attempts to bridge these knowledge gaps and presents a study protocol for planned
16
17 8 studies, with three main objectives: first, to review the literature for definitions of PE emphasizing
18
19 9 those that are multi-dimensional and operationalize components in routinely collected register data;
20
21 10 second, to estimate the under-reporting of OI in Swedish registers; and third, using results from the
22
23 11 first objective, to conduct large, register-based prospective studies, designed to measure effect sizes
24
25 12 and interactions between PE, business performance and OI.

26
27
28
29
30 13 **Methods and analysis:** First, a scientific literature review will be conducted, including scientific
31
32 14 databases and grey literature. Second, data from two major OI registers will be used to estimate the
33
34 15 magnitude of under-reporting using capture-recapture methodology. Finally, all residents aged 18-
35
36 16 65 in Sweden with any registered income during 2003-2015 will be included. Data sources
37
38 17 encompass Swedish population and labour market registers with linkage to both the main OI register
39
40 18 with national coverage and hospital records. Trends in PE and OI will be explored, together with risk
41
42 19 of OI associated to PE and business performance.

43
44
45
46 20 **Ethics and dissemination:** The project has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee,
47
48 21 Stockholm (dnr:2016/2325-31;2017/2173-32). Dissemination of study results will include a series of
49
50 22 peer-reviewed papers, at least one PhD thesis and one report in Swedish, engaging relevant
51
52 23 stakeholders. Results will be presented in national and international conferences and through press
53
54 24 releases to mass media.

1
2
3 1 **Keywords:** Precarious employment, occupational injury, business performance, study protocol,
4
5 2 register-based.
6
7

8 3
9

10 4 **Article Summary**

11 5 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 12 6 • We present a systematic approach to operationalization of the arising social determinant of
13 7 health; precarious employment. This effort is much needed and is likely to be valuable to the
14 8 research community.
- 15 9 • The use of high quality, nation-wide register data of covering the total working population
16 10 provides power to the study and virtually zero loss to follow-up.
- 17 11 • A wide range of variables from different sources, together with the long follow-up period
18 12 will enable us to adjust for confounders and apply longitudinal designs, mitigating several
19 13 sources of bias.
- 20 14 • There exists a potential risk of misclassification for both exposure and outcome, due to
21 15 factors such as data availability and self-reporting.
- 22 16 • For the under-reporting of occupational injuries, the main limitation refers to differences in
23 17 the coverage of the different data sources, which may limit our ability to make good
24 18 estimates in some labour market sectors.

25 19
26 20
27 21
28 22
29 23
30 24
31 25
32 26

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Setting priorities for workplace health and safety research depends upon accurate and reliable
3 accident and injury data. In Norway and Denmark studies suggest that as few as 9-26% of all
4 occupational accidents reaching hospitals are also reported to the national occupational injury
5 registers. [1, 2] There is uncertainty regarding the trends in occupational injuries in Sweden due to
6 under-reporting to Swedish injury registers. [3, 4] It is known that larger workplaces in Sweden
7 generally have better routines for reporting occupational injuries than smaller companies. [4]
8 Among the latter, there is a widespread poor awareness that reporting of occupational injuries is
9 mandatory. No systematic analysis of the magnitude of under-reporting and factors associated with
10 this problem has been performed.

11 The problem with under-reporting could be exacerbated by the rise in precarious employment, non-
12 standard employment relations encompassing short-term and temporary contracts, as well as
13 powerlessness, vulnerability, employment insecurity and insufficient wages. There is no
14 internationally accepted definition of precarious employment, but several multidimensional
15 constructs have been proposed. [5-7]

16 There is reason to believe that precariously employed workers are less likely to report occupational
17 injuries due to lack of knowledge, education, unionization and empowerment in exercising rights.
18 Precariously employed workers are also likely to be at higher risk of occupational injuries. A recent
19 review by our group [8] supports an association between some of the dimensions of precarious
20 employment and occupational injuries, most notably for multiple jobholders [9-12] and employees
21 of temporary agencies or subcontractors at the same worksite. [13-15] Results for employees on
22 fixed-term contracts were inconclusive.

23 The rise in non-standard employment relations is a trend in many countries in all stages of
24 development and Sweden is no exception. Here, temporary employment rose during the nineties
25 crisis and is especially common among young adults, where the proportion on temporary contracts

1
2
3 1 is 65% among both men and women aged 20-34. [16] Precarious employment and business
4
5 2 performance are also likely to be intertwined. International trends in management and increased
6
7 3 competition affect companies and their commitment to both health and safety and good
8
9 4 employment conditions. In order to stay economically competitive and to earn maximum profits, it
10
11 5 has been found that construction contractors only execute basic safety measures and eliminate
12
13 6 many important hazard prevention training programs during project implementation. [17] Others
14
15 7 have found that when the financial condition of a firm deteriorates, then it is likely to adopt policies
16
17 8 that will lead to an increase in safety violations, accident rate, and environmental hazards. [18] In
18
19 9 contrast, companies that prosper could be more likely to invest in occupational health and safety. In
20
21 10 a study of U.S. coal mining companies a 10% increase in real total revenue per hour worked was
22
23 11 associated with 0.9% decrease in the incidence rates of all reported injuries. [19] However, the
24
25 12 relationship between business performance and the risk of occupational injuries remains largely
26
27 13 unstudied, highlighting the importance of such a study.
28
29 14 Research regarding the association between precarious employment, business performance and
30
31 15 occupational injuries faces several challenges. The employer-employee relationship is increasingly
32
33 16 complex and there is mounting evidence that a single variable, such as temporary employment or
34
35 17 job insecurity is not enough to explore this relationships association to health outcomes. [8, 20, 21]
36
37 18 A multidimensional approach is needed, but the variety in definitions used makes comparison
38
39 19 between studies and countries difficult. Which key business indicators that are useful in researching
40
41 20 precarious businesses in relation to occupational injuries is unknown.
42
43 21 To address these challenges, *the first objective* of this project is to review the literature for multi-
44
45 22 dimensional definitions of precarious employment and similar constructs and identify its main
46
47 23 components. We will then suggest ways to operationalize these components in routinely collected
48
49 24 register data.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 There is a pressing need for better injury statistics in order to set priorities for prevention and future
4
5 2 research. Therefore, **the second objective** of this study is to estimate the magnitude of under-
6
7 3 reporting of injuries in Swedish registers and investigate which factors are related to this.
8
9

10 4 Finally, **the third objective** of this project is to use the results from our methodological work in the
11
12 5 first objective to conduct large, register-based prospective studies, designed to identify trends on
13
14 6 the labor market and measure effect sizes and interactions of the relationship between precarious
15
16 7 employment, key business indicators and occupational injuries as well as their interaction with
17
18 8 sociodemographic and economic indicators.
19
20

21
22 9 In this protocol we provide an overview of the data sources and methods to be used in the project.
23
24

25 10 **Specific Research Questions**

26
27
28 11 Studies are planned based on specific research questions (RQ) aligned to the overarching objectives
29
30 12 above.
31
32

33 13 **Objective 1**

34
35 14 RQ1. How has precarious employment been previously defined and how can this be
36
37 15 operationalized in Swedish registers?
38
39

40 16 **Objective 2**

41
42 17 RQ2. What is the magnitude of under-reporting of occupational injuries in Sweden 2013, and is
43
44 18 under-reporting differential with respect to:

- 45
46
47 19 a. individual factors such as age, sex educational level and precarious employment
48
49 20 status,
50
51 21 b. organizational-level factors such as company size, industry or sector, gender
52
53 22 composition, age composition, and proportion of immigrant workers,
54
55 23 c. injury severity, and cause of accident?
56
57
58 24

Objective 3

RQ3. What are the trends in precarious employment in the Swedish labour market?

RQ4. What are the occupational injury trends over time for precarious workers and

organizations or industries that go through economic change?

RQ5. Are precarious workers at higher risk of occupational injuries compared to others?

RQ6. Are changes in key business indicators risk factors for occupational accidents over short-term and long-term periods?

Ethics

The project has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee, Stockholm (dnr: 2016/2325-31 and 2017/2173-32).

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Patient and public involvement

Patients and/or members of the public have not been involved in the design of this study. Results from scientific publications will be shared with stakeholders, policy makers and social partners.

Description of data sources

This study includes all residents aged 18-65 in Sweden with any registered income for at least one year, from January 1st 2003 through December 31st 2015. For the main analysis this cumulatively amounts to approximately 7 000 000 individuals over the years 2003-2015. This project will use the Longitudinal Integration Database for Health Insurance and Labour Market Studies (LISA) with linkage to the Information System on Occupational Injuries (ISA) and hospital records, described in greater detail in Tables 1 and 2. We will use the unique personal identity number assigned to each resident in Sweden to link information from all the registers used in this project.

1 Statistics Sweden has removed the original personal identity number and replaced with a new,
 2 unique and unidentifiable identification number, thus ensuring the confidentiality of the
 3 information.

Table 1. Characteristics of the data sources used in this project to identify occupational injuries.

Data Source	Population Covered	Injury reporting and definition	Eligibility, compensation and data access
Information System on Occupational Injuries (ISA) ^a	All employees and self-employed persons in Sweden. To be employed in Sweden you need to be a resident (temporary or permanent) or EU citizen. EU-citizens can work without registering to the authorities for up to 6 months. Those directly employed in EU/ESS or third country but stationed in Sweden are not covered.	The employee is responsible for notifying the employer who in turn is obliged by law to report any injury. There is no deadline for reporting an injury. Reports are filed online and to a lesser extent on paper. An occupational injury is an injury due to accident(s), which occurred at the workplace or other place where the injured person had been for work. For an event to be counted as an accident, it is required that the course was relatively short and arose in connection with a particular event. Injuries caused by threats, assaults, robberies, etc., are also counted as occupational injuries. Both physical and mental injuries are counted here. Injuries such as heat stroke, frostbite, inflammation and injuries due to mechanical effects for a shorter period of time, no more than a few days, are also considered to be caused by accidents.	Days of work lost due to the injury (except in the case of annuity) are paid through the regular sickness benefit system ^b . So, despite the law to report injuries, no report is needed to get compensation for lost work days. If the injury is likely to reduce work-ability for more than 1-year, compensation for lost work income (annuity) can be approved if the injury has led to a lower income for the worker (other job and/or fewer hours). ISA automatically sends the report to the national insurance board who administrates both the sickness benefit and worker's compensation. No assessment of the injuries validity is made unless the worker makes a claim for compensation. Data access: Open and closed cases are available alike at the time of data extraction. Final statistics are published approximately 11 months after the close of the calendar year.

AFA insurance ^b	All employees within the private sector (also self-employed) who have signed a collective agreement. All employees in municipalities and county councils as they are always covered by collective agreements. AFA also administrates the occupational injury insurance for all national government employees. Thus, in total, the AFA register covers 100% of the public sector employees and approximately 90% of the total Swedish Labour market. The same regulations regarding employment in Sweden as described under ISA applies.	Employees report directly to AFA through an online form. There is no deadline for reporting an injury. However, there is a 10-year deadline to receive compensation (6 years for income loss) The same definition of occupational injury as ISA is used.	Eligibility: The employer confirms that the person was an employee at the time of the injury through a direct query from AFA. AFA also checks with the national insurance board if there are sick-days reported. The claim's validity is assessed and if granted compensation can be given for lost income, direct costs associated to the injury and sometimes compensation for pain and suffering. If the injury still causes suffering after 18 months, compensation can be given for medical disability/permanent impairment and/or annuity. Data access: Open and closed cases are available alike at the time of data extraction.
<p>^a ISA register is held by the Swedish Work Environment Agency^b Special cases (workers who do not qualify for sickness benefit or if his/her sickness benefit is low) are covered by the occupational injury sickness benefit.</p> <p>^c AFA is a privately held insurance company owned by the Swedish trade unions and employer's organizations. Available data for the year 2013.</p>			

1

2 Apart from the data sources described above, for the second objective we will also include
 3 occupational injuries that occurred in the year 2013 using data from AFA Insurance, an organization
 4 owned by the Swedish labour market parties (Table 1).

5

6

Table 2. Additional sources of data used in this project.			
Data Source	Population covered	Available variables	Timeliness
Longitudinal Integration database for health insurance	It holds annual registers since 1990 and includes all individuals 16 years of age and older who were	The database integrates multiple databases from the labour market,	Temporal resolution: Variables are on yearly basis for both individuals and

and labour market studies (LISA) ^a	registered in Sweden as of December 31 for each year.	educational and social sectors. It contains not only individual data, but also connections to family, companies and places of employment.	businesses, this applies to e.g. income, revenue, etc. Multiple employers are registered (total number and details on the three major employers). Data access: Data is compiled with an 18 months' lag.
National Patient Register (NPR) ^b	All visits to inpatient or specialised outpatient care (i.e. excluding primary care).	Our dataset includes every person who was diagnosed with external cause of injury (ICD10 chapters S and T). Duration of hospitalization will be used to characterize severity.	All hospitals and specialized outpatient clinics in Sweden report to a central register, coverage is >95%. Data includes exact date of visits admission and discharge.
Cause of Death Register (DR) ^b	It includes all those who died during one calendar year and were registered in Sweden at the time of death, regardless of whether the death occurred inside or outside the country. ^c	It shows the underlying cause of death coded according to the international version of the disease classification ICD-10. For injuries, the external cause of injury is shown.	Reported by physician no later than 3 weeks after death.
^a LISA is held by Statistics Sweden. ^b NPR and DR are held by the National Board of Health and Welfare. ^c The statistics do not include stillborns, persons who died on a temporary visit to Sweden or asylum seekers who have not yet obtained residence permits. Swedes who have emigrated and are no longer registered in Sweden are not included either.			

Main variables

Precarious Employment and Key Business Indicators:

The definition of precarious employment will be developed through the systematic literature review, development of a functional PE definition applicable to available registers and then operationalization in registers (RQ1). Information on exposure to precarious employment and key business indicators will be constructed from data obtained through the LISA register (Table 2).

Relevant key business indicators will be selected through discussions and workshops within the research team, which includes a business economist. There is very limited guidance in previous

1
2
3 1 research on which key business indicators could be related to occupational injuries. Under the well-
4
5 2 founded assumption that managers make decisions (including those affecting health and safety)
6
7 3 based on the projected future of the company, the initial work has focused on identifying key
8
9 4 indicators of company value, as reflected by operating assets, future earnings and cash flows.
10
11 5 Preliminary discussions suggest that return on equity, operating margin, net turnover/employee,
12
13 6 employee costs/net turnover, solidity, operating result/employee, employee costs/employee,
14
15 7 financial leverage, labour costs as well as total gross and net investments are highly relevant. All
16
17 8 these variables are available directly from LISA for all Swedish companies. Stock market prices have
18
19 9 been contemplated but discarded since most companies are not listed. We also have ongoing work
20
21 10 identifying which key business indicators that are useful in comparing companies across industries
22
23 11 and within specific industries. We will most likely adopt an exploratory approach on a subset of the
24
25 12 dataset before deciding on which indicators to use.
26
27
28
29

30 13 Occupational Injuries:

31
32 14 Information on occupational injuries caused by an accident is being obtained from two different
33
34 15 Swedish registers: ISA and AFA Insurance (Table 1). By linking Swedish population and labour market
35
36 16 registers together with hospital records, we will be able to characterize injuries in terms of severity
37
38 17 and add information on potential confounders.
39

40 18 Occupational Injury Definition:

41
42 19 We will use the definition used in Swedish Law and which is applied by both the ISA and AFA
43
44 20 registers. *“An occupational injury is an injury due to accident[s], which occurred at the workplace or
45
46 21 other place where the injured person had been for work. For an event to be counted as an accident, it
47
48 22 is required that the course was relatively short and arose in connection with a particular event.
49
50 23 Injuries caused by threats, assaults, robberies, etc., are also counted as occupational injuries. Both
51
52 24 physical and mental injuries are counted here. Injuries such as heat stroke, frostbite, inflammation
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60*

1
2
3 1 *and injuries due to mechanical effects for a shorter period of time, no more than a few days, are also*
4
5 2 *considered to be caused by accidents.” [22]*
6
7

8 3 Since estimating under-reporting is one of our main objectives, we will study reported occupational
9
10 4 injuries. In ISA, claims can only be made for a limited set of compensations (Table 1). No assessment
11
12 5 of reports is made without a claim; thus an inclusion of claims or approved claims would be too
13
14 6 limiting. The occurrence of false reports is thought to be very low (personal communication with the
15
16 7 work environment authority) and is likely random. However, we will explore this issue further.
17
18

19
20 8 Moreover, we will exclude injuries that occurred during transit to/from work, occupational diseases
21
22 9 and near injuries.
23
24

25 10 *Occupational Injury severity*

26
27 11 Severity of occupational injuries will be assessed in two different ways.
28
29

30 12 Days of work lost: Data from the Swedish Social Insurance Agency provided by employers and part of
31
32 13 the ISA and AFA registers, will be used to obtain days lost from work due to sickness absence and
33
34 14 disability pension, in connection with occupational injuries. This information covers all employees.
35
36

37 15 Specialized care, Hospitalisation and Death: Specialized care, hospitalization and death will be
38
39 16 obtained from the National Patient Register (NPR) and Cause of death register (DR) (Table 2). We
40
41 17 have limited this study to chapters S and T in International Classification of Disease 10 (ICD-10)
42
43 18 which contain injuries, poisoning and some other consequences of external causes. Since all
44
45 19 diagnoses are not covered, this dataset does not include all occupational injuries leading to
46
47 20 specialized care, hospitalization and death. Regarding injuries to the musculoskeletal system, it only
48
49 21 covers fractures, dislocations and distortions. However, it will allow a subpopulation analysis of
50
51 22 severe acute injuries in RQ2-6.
52
53

54 23 *Linkage of data sources*

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 The unique personal identity number assigned to each resident in Sweden, enables the linkage of
4
5 2 information from all the registers mentioned above. Also, there is an identification number specific
6
7 3 for each company and workplace within companies, which will allow us to conduct a 3-level analysis
8
9 4 (individuals, workplaces and companies). This linkage will provide aggregate exposure data, such as
10
11 5 company-specific characteristics related to individuals, number of employees at each workplace, etc.
12
13 6 We will also be able to follow individuals moving between workplaces.
14
15
16

17 7 For objective 2 specifically, occupational injury registers (AFA and ISA) have been linked on a +/-7
18
19 8 day's range basis, which means that accidents reported within a week in either register were
20
21 9 considered to be the same. We present preliminary results for this linkage. Data from the NPR will
22
23 10 be linked using the same criteria (+/-7 day's range), using injury date from the occupational injury
24
25 11 registers and admission date from both in- and out-patient registers. Finally, data on socio
26
27 12 demographic characteristics, key business indicators and all relevant covariates will be added from
28
29 13 the LISA register.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 15 **Covariates/Confounders**

39 16 We will use information from LISA register (Table 2) to adjust for confounding factors, perform
40
41 17 stratified analyses and sub-group analyses.
42
43

44 18 Individual: age, sex, educational level, income, country of birth (four groups: Sweden, other Nordic
45
46 19 country, other EU 25, and rest of the world) and occupation according to the Swedish Standard
47
48 20 Classification of Occupations (SSYK 1996), [23] which is based on the International Standard
49
50 21 Classification of Occupations 1988 (ISCO-88). All analyses will be stratified by sex and age.
51
52

53 22 Workplace: In addition to key business indicators, we have information on workplace level on
54
55 23 industry (Swedish Standard Industrial Classification), [24] number of employees, educational level of
56
57 24 workforce and workplace sex distribution.
58
59
60

1 **Analysis plan**

2 Definitions and operationalization of precarious employment (RQ1)

3 We will deconstruct all definitions obtained by our literature search into single dimensions and
4 perform a qualitative and quantitative appraisal of their appropriateness. Based on our findings, we
5 will propose a core set of variables that should be included in a multidimensional definition of
6 precarious employment depending on data availability. Once these are defined, we will
7 operationalize a multidimensional definition in Swedish registers to be able to use it in the
8 subsequent studies and develop a job exposure matrix for precarious employment including these
9 variables (study 1).

10 Under-reporting of occupational injuries (RQ2)

11 In order to estimate the magnitude of under-reporting of occupational injuries for the year 2013
12 (RQ6), two sources of data on occupational injuries (ISA and AFA registers) will be used to obtain
13 estimates by means of capture-recapture methodology (study 2). This method, based on log-linear
14 models, has been successfully used by others and it is used to estimate the incomplete
15 ascertainment using information from overlapping lists of cases from distinct sources. [25] We will
16 conduct stratified analyses by precarious employment status, based on results from RQ1.

17 Trends in precarious employment and occupational injuries (RQ3 and RQ4)

18 Using data from the whole study period, we will then explore trends in precarious employment over
19 time in Sweden, for the years 2003-2015 (as laid out in study 1). We will put special attention to
20 changes over time for women and men, different industries, and foreign born compared to Swedish
21 born (study 3).

22 We will also explore the trends over time with regards to the risk for occupational injuries for
23 precarious workers and organizations or industries in economic trouble (study 4).

1
2
3 1 Risk of injury associated to precarious employment (RQ5)
4

5 2 Precarious employment, as defined through formative work in study 1, will be the independent
6
7 3 variable of interest in a multivariate analysis with occupational injury as the outcome. It is well
8
9 4 known that the risk of occupational injuries decreases with tenure at any given job. It is unlikely that
10
11 5 there is an accumulation of risk or latency in the precarious employment–occupational injuries
12
13 6 relationship. We will therefore measure risk and outcome at the same point in time, i.e. precarious
14
15 7 employment and injury in the same year. We will also explore the interaction effects of age and
16
17 8 tenure/experience. Analysis will be adjusted for socio-demographic variables. A longitudinal
18
19 9 dimension will be introduced by analyzing the changes in risks over the time of the study period
20
21 10 (2003-2015). Due to the large differences in risk of injury based on occupation, sector and industry,
22
23 11 we will perform stratified analysis based on these variables. Apart from this, we will provide the
24
25 12 population attributable fraction as part of our results.
26
27
28
29

30 13 The outcome will be stratified based on severity of injury and differences in risk of injury severity
31
32 14 between precarious and non-precarious employees will be explored.
33
34

35
36 15 Risk of injury associated to key business indicators (RQ6)
37

38 16 A cohort of all Swedish companies will be created. The outcome will be defined as occupational
39
40 17 injury per full-time employee and calculated for each year for each individual company. We will
41
42 18 calculate short-term (1 year) and long-term (5-year) trajectories in key business indicators for each
43
44 19 company and use these as the main independent variables of interest in a multivariate regression
45
46 20 analysis. Stratified analysis will be carried out based on company size, industry/sector. As in RQ5,
47
48 21 the outcome will be stratified based on severity of injury and the population attributable fraction
49
50 22 will be calculated.
51
52
53

54 23
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Preliminary findings

2 In this protocol we present preliminary findings based on linkage of different data sources for the
3 working population aged 18-65 years, during the year 2013. The total number of occupational
4 injuries reported only in AFA, only in ISA as well as the overlap (presence in both registers) are
5 shown in Table 3. Linkage between AFA and ISA registers for this preliminary analysis was conducted
6 on id-number (de-identified) and injury date, on a +/- 7 days' range. There was approximately a 36%
7 overlap between the two data sources.

Table 3. Number of occupational accidents reported to either ISA, AFA or both (overlap)*, together with presence in the National Patient Register (in- and out-patient), for the year 2013 in Sweden.

	All reported injuries		Total NPR		In-patient		Out-patient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ISA only	49 356	47,6	5 343	10,8	368	0,7	4 975	10,1
AFA only	17 095	16,5	4 458	26,1	371	2,2	4 087	23,9
ISA and AFA	37 138	35,9	10 131	27,3	1 119	3,0	9 012	24,3
Total	103 589	100,0	19 932	19,2	1 858	1,8	18 074	17,4

8 *Linkage of datasets conducted on id-number (de-identified) and injury date in a +/-7 days' range.

9 NPR= National Patient Register

11 DISCUSSION

12 In this project we aim at operationalizing precarious employment in Swedish labor market registers
13 and use this definition to conduct several large, register-based prospective etiological studies,
14 designed to measure effect sizes and interactions of the relation between precarious employment,
15 business performance and occupational injuries. Taking advantage of two separate and
16 comprehensive reporting systems for occupational injuries in Sweden we will also estimate under-
17 reporting of occupational injuries and the factors which are related to this issue. In this protocol, we
18 present preliminary results for the overlapping of occupational injuries for the year 2013.

19 Strengths and limitations

20 We believe that the major strength of our project will arise from the results from the first study, i.e.
21 the operationalization of precarious employment. This, together with the identification of key

1
2
3 1 business indicators of relevance for the association between precariousness and occupational
4
5 2 injuries can be considered as a valuable start point for future research investigating these factors.
6
7
8 3 By using the unique Swedish personal and organisation identification numbers from ISA and LISA we
9
10 4 are able to link both individuals and companies to each other and to the injury databases. The use of
11
12 5 high quality, nationwide register data covering the total working population provides power to the
13
14 6 study and virtually zero loss to follow-up. A wide range of variables from different sources, together
15
16 7 with the long follow-up period will enable us to adjust for confounders and apply longitudinal
17
18 8 designs, mitigating several sources of bias. Information on sickness absence and hospitalization
19
20 9 allows us to characterize our outcome in terms of severity, further adding quality aspects to
21
22 10 outcome measurement.
23
24

25
26
27 11 However, some limitations and methodological challenges should be addressed.
28
29

30 12 Occupational injury definition:
31
32

33 13 The system of self-reporting and somewhat ambiguous definition of occupational injury introduces
34
35 14 the risk of misclassification between occupational injury and disease. This problem is likely to be
36
37 15 most serious in the case of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) where repeated over-exertion leading
38
39 16 to an MSD could be reported as both an occupational injury and occupational disease. For women,
40
41 17 over-exertion injuries (physical over-exertion such as during heavy lifting and carrying, jerks, slips)
42
43 18 constituted the second most common cause/type of occupational injury with at least one day of
44
45 19 sickness absence in Sweden. [26] For men it was the third most common cause. If the
46
47 20 misclassification was random and steady over time this would pose a lesser problem, but we have
48
49 21 reason to believe that the preference to choose between reporting MSDs as injuries or diseases
50
51 22 might be biased by preconceptions about chances of getting a claim granted in either category and
52
53 23 that this changes over time as a consequence of regulatory changes.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Additionally, there is risk of including “non-occupational” injuries while investigating reports rather
4
5 2 than approved claims. The rationale for not limiting the reports to approved injuries is that the rules
6
7 3 for receiving compensation have been tightened over the last decade and we believe that on the
8
9 4 group level, there is more consistency over time in employees’ notion of what qualifies as an
10
11 5 occupational injury than in the assessment by the social insurance agency. In personal
12
13 6 communication with civil servants at the Swedish Work Environment Authority, the presence of non-
14
15 7 occupational injuries has been deemed “an issue in the margin”.

18
19 8 Finally, although the occurrence of traffic-related injuries is increasing in some countries, [27] we
20
21 9 decided to exclude those from our study. Injuries that occurred during transit to/from work may be
22
23 10 covered by car insurances and may therefore not appear in the occupational injury registers.

24
25
26
27 11 Injury severity:

28
29
30 12 In Sweden, sickness absence is reimbursed by the Swedish Social Insurance Agency starting on day
31
32 13 15. The near universal coverage of the regular sickness insurance scheme and the additional
33
34 14 coverage specifically for injuries makes us rather confident that we will be able to identify most
35
36 15 serious injuries occurring in the formal labour market. The other severity measure obtained through
37
38 16 hospital records only covers injuries, poisoning and some other consequences of external causes (S
39
40 17 and T chapters in ICD-10). Thereby, we will not identify major injury categories such as acute
41
42 18 lumbago (M45.3).

43
44
45
46 19 Whether we characterize severity in terms of days of hospitalization or reimbursed days lost of
47
48 20 work, we have a rather large difference between mild and severe cases, losing the broad spectrum
49
50 21 of less severe injuries while severe cases can be classified in more detail.

51
52
53 22 Precarious employees:

54
55
56 23 Although we have not yet operationalized precarious employment in registers, we foresee some
57
58 24 constraints. Among other issues, type of contract (permanent/temporary) is not registered and will

1
2
3 1 have to be constructed by proxy variables with lower specificity. EU citizens stationed in Sweden and
4
5 2 informal workers are not covered in this study, groups that are of special interest in research on
6
7 3 precarious employment. This is a major limitation, but the constraints in data do not allow us to
8
9 4 study these two categories of potentially precarious workers.

10
11
12 5 Precarious employees are less likely to be covered by collective agreements and therefore the issue
13
14 6 will be greatest here. We also hypothesise that they are less likely to report injuries. This will affect
15
16 7 both our analysis of under-reporting using capture-recapture, and also the estimates for the
17
18 8 association between precarious employment and the risk of occupational injuries.

19
20
21
22 9 Key business indicators:

23
24
25 10 Previous studies have found that as the financial condition of a firm deteriorates, it is likely to adopt
26
27 11 policies that will lead to an increase in safety violations, accident rate, and in environmental hazards
28
29 12 [18] and that when revenue increases the opposite would occur. [19] The opposite might however
30
31 13 be true as well. As revenue falls, the work tempo might shift downwards temporarily and the short-
32
33 14 term effects on injuries might be positive. Lay-offs of those with least tenure may also leave a larger
34
35 15 proportion of experienced workers which could lead to fewer injuries. Mirroring this; as revenue
36
37 16 increases in a company, new employees come in who are at higher risk. Disentangling these effects
38
39 17 and counter effects of changes in key business indicators will be a major challenge and will require
40
41 18 important formative work on causal pathways and the construction of logic models prior to analysis.
42
43 19 Due to the lack of prior research in this area, an exploratory approach using data-mining or machine
44
45 20 learning algorithms will also be applied to discover risk factors and pathways which we cannot
46
47 21 foresee at the moment.

48
49
50
51
52 22 Working hours:

53
54
55 23 When calculating risk of occupational injuries, a measure of working hours is needed as denominator
56
57 24 in order to make just comparisons. Lacking data on individual working hours in this project we have
58
59
60

1 to rely on proxy variables to make estimations. Due to collective bargaining the wage structure in
2 Sweden is rather homogenous, especially for blue collar workers and white collar workers with low
3 skills. We are currently exploring the feasibility of using wage in combination with occupational code
4 and industry code as well as the public registers on median salaries in certain occupations (survey-
5 based information) to create a proxy for fulltime employment based on the deviation from the
6 median wage.

7 Formal/informal work:

8 As this study partly focuses on precarious employment, we need to spell out that this study is only
9 investigating the formal economy. Not including people working in the informal sector completely or
10 partly will be one of our major limitations. According to the 2015 European Working Conditions
11 Survey (EWCS), the prevalence of informal employment for Sweden is estimated to be 5%, lying
12 below the average for the European union (10%). [28] Those who are formally employed but receive
13 part of their salary “under the table” will be especially at high risk of being misclassified. Also,
14 foreign citizens working in Sweden but whose employer is registered in another country will be
15 absent in this study. We know that these workers are very common in construction and logistics,
16 two industries with high risk of injury.

17 Under-reporting:

18 Capture-recapture is a method that has been widely used in epidemiology to estimate unknown size
19 of populations. Methodological issues may appear from dependence among data sources being
20 used to obtain estimates. [25] When it comes to occupational diseases, AFA requires that a report is
21 made first to ISA, therefore one would expect a high level of dependency and that AFA would be
22 completely nested in ISA. For occupational injuries, this is not the case and there is a large
23 proportion of injuries that are only reported to AFA. This said, the detected dependency may result
24 in an overestimation of the true population size, and we must therefore treat our estimations
25 cautiously.

1
2
3 1 Also, the AFA insurance scheme is not as comprehensive as ISA's. The ISA register covers 100% of the
4
5 2 employees and self-employed while the AFA register covers 100% of public sector employees and all
6
7 3 employees within the private sector who have signed a collective agreement. However, collective
8
9 4 agreements are less common in small companies and certain industries such as hospitality where
10
11 5 45% of the companies have collective agreements. This will limit our ability to make good estimates
12
13 6 in some labour market sectors.
14
15

16
17 7 Finally, under-reporting of occupational injuries may be higher among precarious workers, and
18
19 8 conversely, these workers may have a higher rate of injuries compared to non-precarious workers.
20
21 9 To be able to observe differences in the under-reporting for precarious workers compared to non-
22
23 10 precarious, we will conduct stratified analyses.
24
25

26 27 11 **DISSEMINATION**

28
29
30 12 The project is presently planned to result in a series of papers published in international peer-
31
32 13 reviewed scientific journals, at least one PhD thesis and a report in Swedish aimed at relevant
33
34 14 stakeholders including governmental agencies, policy-makers and social partners (employers and
35
36 15 trade unions). Due to the richness of the data obtained and the multiple scientific approaches we
37
38 16 anticipate that the project will result also in further publications than those outlined in this protocol,
39
40 17 including future collaborations. Results of public interest will be formatted as press releases and sent
41
42 18 to Swedish and international media with support from the University press services.
43
44

45 46 19 **CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

47
48 20 We believe that this project will address some of the most pressing issues related to occupational
49
50 21 injury surveillance and research. Despite some limitations, the inclusion of different studies within
51
52 22 this project, using several methodologies, together with the statistical and high quality of the data
53
54 23 will allow us to explore trends and risks in occupational injuries in Sweden from many perspectives.
55
56 24 The richness of our data will allow us to conduct several specialized sub studies in the future which
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 have not been outlined here, and we would be happy to receive suggestions for further studies and
4
5 2 invitations to collaborate.
6
7

8 3 **Acknowledgements**

10
11 4 The authors acknowledge the following data providers: The Swedish Work Environment Agency, AFA
12
13 5 insurance, Statistics Sweden and the National Board of Health and Welfare.
14
15

16 6 **Author Contributions**

17
18 7 CO has drafted previous versions and the final version of the manuscript. TB is the principal
19
20 8 investigator of the project. BK, GJ, BB, KK, TH, MA, LD and DW participate in the project and have
21
22 9 contributed to the design of the project and its studies. All authors have read and approved of the
23
24 10 final version of the manuscript.
25
26

27 11 **Funding**

28
29
30 12 This project has been founded by grants from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life
31
32 13 and Welfare (FORTE) (Dnr: 2016-00315 and 2017-01956).
33
34

35 14 **Competing interests**

36
37 15 None declared.
38
39

40 16 **Availability of data and material**

41
42
43 17 Data sharing not possible according to Swedish regulations.
44
45

46 18 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

47
48 19 Ethical permission for the study for the project duration was granted by the Regional Ethics
49
50 20 Committee, Stockholm (Dnr 2016/2325-31 and 2017/2173-32).
51
52

53 21 54 22 **REFERENCES**

- 55
56 23 1. Magne Gravseth, H., E. Wergeland, and J. Lund, *Underrapportering av arbeidsskader til*
57 24 *Arbeidstilsynet*. Tidsskrift for den norske lægeforening, 2003. **123**(15): p. 2057-2059.
58 25 2. Lander, F., et al., *Underrapportering af arbejdsulykker. Øje på arbejdsmiljøet*. København:
59 26 Landsorganisationen i Danmark, 2012.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 3. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket), *Arbetskadorna 2014 - Occupational accidents and work-related diseases*. 2015, Arbetsmiljöverket: Stockholm.
- 2 4. Andersson, L., et al., *Hälsorelaterad arbetsmiljöövervakning*. 2014, Arbetsmiljöverket: Stockholm.
- 3 5. Standing, G., *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. 2016, London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- 4 6. Vives, A., et al., *The Employment Precariousness Scale (EPRES): psychometric properties of a new tool for epidemiological studies among waged and salaried workers*. *Occupational and environmental medicine*, 2010. **67**(8): p. 548-555.
- 5 7. International Labour Organization (ILO), *From precarious work to decent work: outcome document to the workers' symposium on policies and regulations to combat precarious employment*. 2012, International Labour Office, Bureau for Workers' Activities: Geneva.
- 6 8. Koranyi, I., et al., *Precarious employment and occupational accidents and injuries - a systematic review*. *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 2018.
- 7 9. Alali, H., et al., *Relationship between non-standard work arrangements and work-related accident absence in Belgium*. *J Occup Health*, 2017. **59**(2): p. 177-186.
- 8 10. Dong, X., *Long workhours, work scheduling and work-related injuries among construction workers in the United States*. *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 2005. **31**(5): p. 329-335.
- 9 11. Dong, X.S., X. Wang, and J.A. Largay, *Occupational and non-occupational factors associated with work-related injuries among construction workers in the USA*. *Int J Occup Environ Health*, 2015. **21**(2): p. 142-50.
- 10 12. Marucci-Wellman, H.R., et al., *Work in multiple jobs and the risk of injury in the US working population*. *Am J Public Health*, 2014. **104**(1): p. 134-42.
- 11 13. Bena, A., et al., *Impact of organization on occupational injury risk: evidence from high-speed railway construction*. *Am J Ind Med*, 2011. **54**(6): p. 428-37.
- 12 14. Hintikka, N., *Accidents at work during temporary agency work in Finland – Comparisons between certain major industries and other industries*. *Saf Sci*, 2011. **49**(3): p. 473-483.
- 13 15. Smith, C.K., et al., *Temporary workers in Washington state*. *Am J Ind Med*, 2010. **53**(2): p. 135-45.
- 14 16. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Labour force survey 2014* 5 Jul 2018]; Available from: http://www.scb.se/Statistik/AM/AM0401/2014K02/AM0401_2014K02_SM_AM11SM1403.pdf.
- 15 17. Cheng, C.-W., et al., *Characteristic analysis of occupational accidents at small construction enterprises*. *Safety Science*, 2010. **48**(6): p. 698-707.
- 16 18. Boisjoly, R.P., *The effects of financial performance and deregulation in the trucking and airline industries on worker safety*. *NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy*, 1997. **7**(1): p. 38-45.
- 17 19. Asfaw, A., C. Mark, and R. Pana-Cryan, *Profitability and occupational injuries in US underground coal mines*. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 2013. **50**: p. 778-786.
- 18 20. Benach, J., et al., *Precarious employment: understanding an emerging social determinant of health*. *Annu Rev Public Health*, 2014. **35**: p. 229-53.
- 19 21. Benach, J., et al., *What should we know about precarious employment and health in 2025? Framing the agenda for the next decade of research*. *Int J Epidemiol*, 2016. **45**(1): p. 232-8.
- 20 22. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket). *Anmäl Arbetskada (Report Occupational Injury)*. 2018 [cited 2018; Available from: <https://anmalarbetskada.se/>].
- 21 23. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Swedish standard classification of occupations (SSYK96)*. Stockholm: Reports on Statistical Co-ordination for the Official Statistics of Sweden 1998 5 Jul 2018]; 1-191]. Available from: <https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-yrkesklassificering-ssyk/>.
- 22 24. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Swedish Standard Industrial Classification (SNI)*. 2006 5 Jul 2018]; Available from: <https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-naringsgrensindelning-sni/>.

- 1
2
3 1 25. Hook, E.B. and R.R. Regal, *Capture-recapture methods in epidemiology: methods and*
4 2 *limitations*. *Epidemiologic reviews*, 1995. **17**(2): p. 243-264.
5 3 26. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket), *Arbetskadorna 2016 - Occupational*
6 4 *accidents and work-related diseases, in Report 2017:1*. 2017, Swedish Work Environment
7 5 Authority: Stockholm.
8 6 27. Lopez-Ruiz, M., et al., *Impact of road safety interventions on traffic-related occupational*
9 7 *injuries in Spain, 2004-2010*. *Accid Anal Prev*, 2014. **66**: p. 114-9.
10 8 28. Eurofund (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions).
11 9 *European Working Conditions Survey*. 2015 01 November 2018]; Available from:
12 10 <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/data/european-working-conditions-survey>.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Precarious employment, business performance and occupational injuries – a study protocol of a register-based Swedish project.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026091.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Orellana, Cecilia; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Kreshpaj, Bertina; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Johansson, Gun; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine; Stockholm County Council, Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine Burström, Bo; Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Social Medicine; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Kjellberg, Katarina; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine; Stockholm County Council, Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine Hemmingsson, Tomas; Karolinska Institute, Department of Public Health Sciences; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine Axén, Magnus; Uppsala Universitet, Department of Business studies Davis, Letitia; Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Occupational Health Surveillance Program Wegman, David; University of Massachusetts Lowell Bodin, Theo; Karolinska Institutet, Unit of Occupational Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	EPIDEMIOLOGY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE, Protocol, Occupational injury, Precarious employment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 1 **Precarious employment, business performance and occupational injuries – a**
5
6 2 **study protocol of a register-based Swedish project.**
7

8 3 Cecilia Orellana^{1*}, Bertina Kreshpaj¹, Gun Johansson^{1,2}, Bo Burström³, Katarina Kjellberg^{1,2}, Tomas
9 4 Hemmingsson^{1,4}, Magnus Axén⁵, Letitia Davis⁶, David Wegman⁷, Theo Bodin^{1,2}.
10
11

12 5
13
14 6 * Correspondence: Cecilia.orellana@ki.se

15 7 ¹ Unit of Occupational Medicine, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden

16 8 ² Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Stockholm County Council, Solnavägen 4, SE-
17 9 113 65 Stockholm, Sweden

18 10 ³ Department of Public Health Sciences, Equity and Health Policy Research Group, Karolinska
19 11 Institutet, Stockholm, SE 171 77, Sweden

20 12 ⁴ Department of Public Health Sciences, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden.

21 13 ⁵ Department of Business studies, Uppsala University

22 14 ⁶ Occupational Health Surveillance Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Boston,
23 15 MA.

24 16 ⁷ University of Massachusetts Lowell, 7 Camden Place, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

28 Word count: 4509

1 1 **ABSTRACT**

2 2 **Introduction:** There is uncertainty regarding the trends in occupational injuries (OI) in Sweden due
3 3 to a significant and increasing problem with under-reporting to injury registers. Underreporting in
4 4 general is likely to be exacerbated by the rise in precarious employment (PE), a set of unfavourable
5 5 employment characteristics that would benefit from formal definition and study. PE and global
6 6 trends are believed also to affect companies and their commitment to health and safety. The
7 7 present study attempts to bridge these knowledge gaps and presents a study protocol for planned
8 8 studies, with three main objectives: first, to review the literature for definitions of PE emphasizing
9 9 those that are multi-dimensional and operationalize components in routinely collected register data;
10 10 second, to estimate the under-reporting of OI in Swedish registers; and third, using results from the
11 11 first objective, to conduct large, register-based prospective studies, designed to measure effect sizes
12 12 and interactions between PE, business performance and OI.

13 13 **Methods and analysis:** First, a scientific literature review will be conducted, including scientific
14 14 databases and grey literature. Second, data from two major OI registers will be used to estimate the
15 15 magnitude of under-reporting using capture-recapture methodology. Finally, all residents aged 18-
16 16 65 in Sweden with any registered income during 2003-2015 will be included. Data sources
17 17 encompass Swedish population and labour market registers with linkage to both the main OI register
18 18 with national coverage and hospital records. Trends in PE and OI will be explored, together with risk
19 19 of OI associated to PE and business performance.

20 20 **Ethics and dissemination:** The project has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee,
21 21 Stockholm (dnr:2016/2325-31;2017/2173-32). Dissemination of study results will include a series of
22 22 peer-reviewed papers, at least one PhD thesis and one report in Swedish, engaging relevant
23 23 stakeholders. Results will be presented in national and international conferences and through press
24 24 releases to mass media.

1
2
3 1 **Keywords:** Precarious employment, occupational injury, business performance, study protocol,
4
5 2 register-based.
6
7

8 3
9

10 4 **Article Summary**

11 5 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 12 6 • We present a systematic approach to operationalization of the arising social determinant of
13 7 health; precarious employment. This effort is much needed and is likely to be valuable to the
14 8 research community.
- 15 9 • The use of high quality, nation-wide register data of covering the total working population
16 10 provides power to the study and virtually zero loss to follow-up.
- 17 11 • A wide range of variables from different sources, together with the long follow-up period
18 12 will enable us to adjust for confounders and apply longitudinal designs, mitigating several
19 13 sources of bias.
- 20 14 • There exists a potential risk of misclassification for both exposure and outcome, due to
21 15 factors such as data availability and self-reporting.
- 22 16 • For the under-reporting of occupational injuries, the main limitation refers to differences in
23 17 the coverage of the different data sources, which may limit our ability to make good
24 18 estimates in some labour market sectors.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Setting priorities for workplace health and safety research depends upon accurate and reliable
3 accident and injury data. In Norway and Denmark studies suggest that as few as 9-26% of all
4 occupational accidents reaching hospitals are also reported to the national occupational injury
5 registers. [1, 2] There is uncertainty regarding the trends in occupational injuries in Sweden due to
6 under-reporting to Swedish injury registers. [3, 4] It is known that larger workplaces in Sweden
7 generally have better routines for reporting occupational injuries than smaller companies. [4]
8 Among the latter, there is a widespread poor awareness that reporting of occupational injuries is
9 mandatory. No systematic analysis of the magnitude of under-reporting and factors associated with
10 this problem has been performed.

11 The problem with under-reporting could be exacerbated by the rise in precarious employment, non-
12 standard employment relations encompassing short-term and temporary contracts, as well as
13 powerlessness, vulnerability, employment insecurity and insufficient wages. There is no
14 internationally accepted definition of precarious employment, but several multidimensional
15 constructs have been proposed. [5-7]

16 There is reason to believe that precariously employed workers are less likely to report occupational
17 injuries due to lack of knowledge, education, unionization and empowerment in exercising rights.
18 Precariously employed workers are also likely to be at higher risk of occupational injuries. A recent
19 review by our group [8] supports an association between some of the dimensions of precarious
20 employment and occupational injuries, most notably for multiple jobholders [9-12] and employees
21 of temporary agencies or subcontractors at the same worksite. [13-15] Results for employees on
22 fixed-term contracts were inconclusive.

23 The rise in non-standard employment relations is a trend in many countries in all stages of
24 development and Sweden is no exception. Here, temporary employment rose during the nineties
25 crisis and is especially common among young adults, where the proportion on temporary contracts

1
2
3 1 is 65% among both men and women aged 20-34. [16] Precarious employment and business
4
5 2 performance are also likely to be intertwined. International trends in management and increased
6
7 3 competition affect companies and their commitment to both health and safety and good
8
9 4 employment conditions. In order to stay economically competitive and to earn maximum profits, it
10
11 5 has been found that construction contractors only execute basic safety measures and eliminate
12
13 6 many important hazard prevention training programs during project implementation. [17] Others
14
15 7 have found that when the financial condition of a firm deteriorates, then it is likely to adopt policies
16
17 8 that will lead to an increase in safety violations, accident rate, and environmental hazards. [18] In
18
19 9 contrast, companies that prosper could be more likely to invest in occupational health and safety. In
20
21 10 a study of U.S. coal mining companies a 10% increase in real total revenue per hour worked was
22
23 11 associated with 0.9% decrease in the incidence rates of all reported injuries. [19] However, the
24
25 12 relationship between business performance and the risk of occupational injuries remains largely
26
27 13 unstudied, highlighting the importance of such a study.
28
29 14 Research regarding the association between precarious employment, business performance and
30
31 15 occupational injuries faces several challenges. The employer-employee relationship is increasingly
32
33 16 complex and there is mounting evidence that a single variable, such as temporary employment or
34
35 17 job insecurity is not enough to explore this relationships association to health outcomes. [8, 20, 21]
36
37 18 A multidimensional approach is needed, but the variety in definitions used makes comparison
38
39 19 between studies and countries difficult. Which key business indicators that are useful in researching
40
41 20 precarious businesses in relation to occupational injuries is unknown.
42
43 21 To address these challenges, *the first objective* of this project is to review the literature for multi-
44
45 22 dimensional definitions of precarious employment and similar constructs and identify its main
46
47 23 components. We will then suggest ways to operationalize these components in routinely collected
48
49 24 register data.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 There is a pressing need for better injury statistics in order to set priorities for prevention and future
4
5 2 research. Therefore, **the second objective** of this study is to estimate the magnitude of under-
6
7 3 reporting of injuries in Swedish registers and investigate which factors are related to this.
8
9

10 4 Finally, **the third objective** of this project is to use the results from our methodological work in the
11
12 5 first objective to conduct large, register-based prospective studies, designed to identify trends on
13
14 6 the labor market and measure effect sizes and interactions of the relationship between precarious
15
16 7 employment, key business indicators and occupational injuries as well as their interaction with
17
18 8 sociodemographic and economic indicators.
19
20

21
22 9 In this protocol we provide an overview of the data sources and methods to be used in the project.
23
24

25 10 **Specific Research Questions**

26
27
28 11 Studies are planned based on specific research questions (RQ) aligned to the overarching objectives
29
30 12 above.
31
32

33 13 **Objective 1**

34
35 14 RQ1. How has precarious employment been previously defined and how can this be
36
37 15 operationalized in Swedish registers?
38
39

40 16 **Objective 2**

41
42 17 RQ2. What is the magnitude of under-reporting of occupational injuries in Sweden 2013, and is
43
44 18 under-reporting differential with respect to:

- 45
46
47 19 a. individual factors such as age, sex educational level and precarious employment
48
49 20 status,
50
51 21 b. organizational-level factors such as company size, industry or sector, gender
52
53 22 composition, age composition, and proportion of immigrant workers,
54
55 23 c. injury severity, and cause of accident?
56
57
58 24

1 Objective 3

2 RQ3. What are the trends in precarious employment in the Swedish labour market?

3 RQ4. What are the occupational injury trends over time for precarious workers and

4 organizations or industries that go through economic change?

5 RQ5. Are precarious workers at higher risk of occupational injuries compared to others?

6 RQ6. Are changes in key business indicators risk factors for occupational accidents over short-
7 term and long-term periods?

8 Ethics

9 The project has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee, Stockholm (dnr: 2016/2325-31
10 and 2017/2173-32).

11 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

12 Patient and public involvement

13 Patients and/or members of the public have not been involved in the design of this study. Results
14 from scientific publications will be shared with stakeholders, policy makers and social partners.

15 Description of data sources

16 This study includes all residents aged 18-65 in Sweden with any registered income for at least one
17 year, from January 1st 2003 through December 31st 2015. For the main analysis this cumulatively
18 amounts to approximately 7 000 000 individuals over the years 2003-2015. This project will use the
19 Longitudinal Integration Database for Health Insurance and Labour Market Studies (LISA) with
20 linkage to the Information System on Occupational Injuries (ISA) and hospital records, described in
21 greater detail in Tables 1 and 2. We will use the unique personal identity number assigned to each
22 resident in Sweden to link information from all the registers used in this project.

1 Statistics Sweden has removed the original personal identity number and replaced with a new,
 2 unique and unidentifiable identification number, thus ensuring the confidentiality of the
 3 information.

Table 1. Characteristics of the data sources used in this project to identify occupational injuries.

Data Source	Population Covered	Injury reporting and definition	Eligibility, compensation and data access
Information System on Occupational Injuries (ISA) ^a	All employees and self-employed persons in Sweden. To be employed in Sweden you need to be a resident (temporary or permanent) or EU citizen. EU-citizens can work without registering to the authorities for up to 6 months. Those directly employed in EU/ESS or third country but stationed in Sweden are not covered.	The employee is responsible for notifying the employer who in turn is obliged by law to report any injury. There is no deadline for reporting an injury. Reports are filed online and to a lesser extent on paper. An occupational injury is an injury due to accident(s), which occurred at the workplace or other place where the injured person had been for work. For an event to be counted as an accident, it is required that the course was relatively short and arose in connection with a particular event. Injuries caused by threats, assaults, robberies, etc., are also counted as occupational injuries. Both physical and mental injuries are counted here. Injuries such as heat stroke, frostbite, inflammation and injuries due to mechanical effects for a shorter period of time, no more than a few days, are also considered to be caused by accidents.	Days of work lost due to the injury (except in the case of annuity) are paid through the regular sickness benefit system ^b . So, despite the law to report injuries, no report is needed to get compensation for lost work days. If the injury is likely to reduce work-ability for more than 1-year, compensation for lost work income (annuity) can be approved if the injury has led to a lower income for the worker (other job and/or fewer hours). ISA automatically sends the report to the national insurance board who administrates both the sickness benefit and worker's compensation. No assessment of the injuries validity is made unless the worker makes a claim for compensation. Data access: Open and closed cases are available alike at the time of data extraction. Final statistics are published approximately 11 months after the close of the calendar year.

AFA insurance ^b	All employees within the private sector (also self-employed) who have signed a collective agreement. All employees in municipalities and county councils as they are always covered by collective agreements. AFA also administrates the occupational injury insurance for all national government employees. Thus, in total, the AFA register covers 100% of the public sector employees and approximately 90% of the total Swedish Labour market. The same regulations regarding employment in Sweden as described under ISA applies.	Employees report directly to AFA through an online form. There is no deadline for reporting an injury. However, there is a 10-year deadline to receive compensation (6 years for income loss) The same definition of occupational injury as ISA is used.	Eligibility: The employer confirms that the person was an employee at the time of the injury through a direct query from AFA. AFA also checks with the national insurance board if there are sick-days reported. The claim's validity is assessed and if granted compensation can be given for lost income, direct costs associated to the injury and sometimes compensation for pain and suffering. If the injury still causes suffering after 18 months, compensation can be given for medical disability/permanent impairment and/or annuity. Data access: Open and closed cases are available alike at the time of data extraction.
<p>^a ISA register is held by the Swedish Work Environment Agency^b Special cases (workers who do not qualify for sickness benefit or if his/her sickness benefit is low) are covered by the occupational injury sickness benefit.</p> <p>^c AFA is a privately held insurance company owned by the Swedish trade unions and employer's organizations. Available data for the year 2013.</p>			

1

2 Apart from the data sources described above, for the second objective we will also include
 3 occupational injuries that occurred in the year 2013 using data from AFA Insurance, an organization
 4 owned by the Swedish labour market parties (Table 1).

5

6

Table 2. Additional sources of data used in this project.			
Data Source	Population covered	Available variables	Timeliness
Longitudinal Integration database for health insurance	It holds annual registers since 1990 and includes all individuals 16 years of age and older who were	The database integrates multiple databases from the labour market,	Temporal resolution: Variables are on yearly basis for both individuals and

and labour market studies (LISA) ^a	registered in Sweden as of December 31 for each year.	educational and social sectors. It contains not only individual data, but also connections to family, companies and places of employment.	businesses, this applies to e.g. income, revenue, etc. Multiple employers are registered (total number and details on the three major employers). Data access: Data is compiled with an 18 months' lag.
National Patient Register (NPR) ^b	All visits to inpatient or specialised outpatient care (i.e. excluding primary care).	Our dataset includes every person who was diagnosed with external cause of injury (ICD10 chapters S and T). Duration of hospitalization will be used to characterize severity.	All hospitals and specialized outpatient clinics in Sweden report to a central register, coverage is >95%. Data includes exact date of visits admission and discharge.
Cause of Death Register (DR) ^b	It includes all those who died during one calendar year and were registered in Sweden at the time of death, regardless of whether the death occurred inside or outside the country. ^c	It shows the underlying cause of death coded according to the international version of the disease classification ICD-10. For injuries, the external cause of injury is shown.	Reported by physician no later than 3 weeks after death.
<p>^a LISA is held by Statistics Sweden. ^b NPR and DR are held by the National Board of Health and Welfare. ^c The statistics do not include stillborns, persons who died on a temporary visit to Sweden or asylum seekers who have not yet obtained residence permits. Swedes who have emigrated and are no longer registered in Sweden are not included either.</p>			

3 Main variables

4 Precarious Employment and Key Business Indicators:

5 The definition of precarious employment will be developed through the systematic literature review,
6 development of a functional PE definition applicable to available registers and then
7 operationalization in registers (RQ1). Available variables regarding precarious employment and key
8 business indicators from the OI registers are limited. Because of this, we will mainly obtain them
9 through the LISA register (Table 2).

1
2
3 1 Relevant key business indicators will be selected through discussions and workshops within the
4
5 2 research team, which includes a business economist. There is very limited guidance in previous
6
7 3 research on which key business indicators could be related to occupational injuries. Under the well-
8
9 4 founded assumption that managers make decisions (including those affecting health and safety)
10
11 5 based on the projected future of the company, the initial work has focused on identifying key
12
13 6 indicators of company value, as reflected by operating assets, future earnings and cash flows.
14
15 7 Preliminary discussions suggest that return on equity, operating margin, net turnover/employee,
16
17 8 employee costs/net turnover, solidity, operating result/employee, employee costs/employee,
18
19 9 financial leverage, labour costs as well as total gross and net investments are highly relevant. All
20
21 10 these variables are available directly from LISA for all Swedish companies. Stock market prices have
22
23 11 been contemplated but discarded since most companies are not listed. We also have ongoing work
24
25 12 identifying which key business indicators that are useful in comparing companies across industries
26
27 13 and within specific industries. We will most likely adopt an exploratory approach on a subset of the
28
29 14 dataset before deciding on which indicators to use.
30
31
32
33
34

35 Occupational Injuries:

36
37 16 Information on occupational injuries caused by an accident is being obtained from two different
38
39 17 Swedish registers: ISA and AFA Insurance (Table 1). By linking Swedish population and labour market
40
41 18 registers together with hospital records, we will be able to characterize injuries in terms of severity
42
43 19 and add information on potential confounders.
44
45
46

47 Occupational Injury Definition:

48
49 21 We will use the definition used in Swedish Law and which is applied by both the ISA and AFA
50
51 22 registers. *“An occupational injury is an injury due to accident[s], which occurred at the workplace or
52
53 23 other place where the injured person had been for work. For an event to be counted as an accident, it
54
55 24 is required that the course was relatively short and arose in connection with a particular event.*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 *Injuries caused by threats, assaults, robberies, etc., are also counted as occupational injuries. Both*
4
5 2 *physical and mental injuries are counted here. Injuries such as heat stroke, frostbite, inflammation*
6
7 3 *and injuries due to mechanical effects for a shorter period of time, no more than a few days, are also*
8
9 4 *considered to be caused by accidents.” [22]*
10
11
12

13 5 Since estimating under-reporting is one of our main objectives, we will study reported occupational
14
15 6 injuries. In ISA, claims can only be made for a limited set of compensations (Table 1). No assessment
16
17 7 of reports is made without a claim; thus an inclusion of claims or approved claims would be too
18
19 8 limiting. The occurrence of false reports is thought to be very low (personal communication with the
20
21 9 work environment authority) and is likely random. However, we will explore this issue further.
22
23

24
25 10 Moreover, we will exclude injuries that occurred during transit to/from work, occupational diseases
26
27 11 and near injuries.
28
29

30 12 *Occupational Injury severity*

31
32 13 Severity of occupational injuries will be assessed in two different ways.
33
34

35 14 Days of work lost: Data from the Swedish Social Insurance Agency provided by employers and part of
36
37 15 the ISA and AFA registers, will be used to obtain days lost from work due to sickness absence and
38
39 16 disability pension, in connection with occupational injuries. This information covers all employees.
40
41

42 17 Specialized care, Hospitalisation and Death: Specialized care, hospitalization and death will be
43
44 18 obtained from the National Patient Register (NPR) and Cause of death register (DR) (Table 2). We
45
46 19 have limited this study to chapters S and T in International Classification of Disease 10 (ICD-10)
47
48 20 which contain injuries, poisoning and some other consequences of external causes. Since all
49
50 21 diagnoses are not covered, this dataset does not include all occupational injuries leading to
51
52 22 specialized care, hospitalization and death. Regarding injuries to the musculoskeletal system, it only
53
54 23 covers fractures, dislocations and distortions. However, it will allow a subpopulation analysis of
55
56 24 severe acute injuries in RQ2-6.
57
58
59
60

1 *Linkage of data sources*

2 The unique personal identity number assigned to each resident in Sweden, enables the linkage of
3 information from all the registers mentioned above. Also, there is an identification number specific
4 for each company and workplace within companies, which will allow us to conduct a 3-level analysis
5 (individuals, workplaces and companies). This linkage will provide aggregate exposure data, such as
6 company-specific characteristics related to individuals, number of employees at each workplace, etc.
7 We will also be able to follow individuals moving between workplaces.

8 For objective 2 specifically, occupational injury registers (AFA and ISA) have been linked on a +/-7
9 day's range basis, which means that accidents reported within a week in either register were
10 considered to be the same. We present preliminary results for this linkage. Data from the NPR will
11 be linked using the same criteria (+/-7 day's range), using injury date from the occupational injury
12 registers and admission date from both in- and out-patient registers. Finally, data on socio
13 demographic characteristics, key business indicators and all relevant covariates will be added from
14 the LISA register.

16 **Covariates/Confounders**

17 We will use information from LISA register (Table 2) to adjust for confounding factors, perform
18 stratified analyses and sub-group analyses.

19 Individual: age, sex, educational level, income, country of birth (four groups: Sweden, other Nordic
20 country, other EU 25, and rest of the world) and occupation according to the Swedish Standard
21 Classification of Occupations (SSYK 1996), [23] which is based on the International Standard
22 Classification of Occupations 1988 (ISCO-88). All analyses will be stratified by sex and age.

1
2
3 1 Workplace: In addition to key business indicators, we have information on workplace level on
4
5 2 industry (Swedish Standard Industrial Classification), [24] number of employees, educational level of
6
7 3 workforce and workplace sex distribution.
8
9

10 4 **Analysis plan**

11
12
13 5 Definitions and operationalization of precarious employment (RQ1)

14
15 6 We will deconstruct all definitions obtained by our literature search into single dimensions and
16
17 7 perform a qualitative and quantitative appraisal of their appropriateness. Based on our findings, we
18
19 8 will propose a core set of variables that should be included in a multidimensional definition of
20
21 9 precarious employment depending on data availability. Once these are defined, we will
22
23 10 operationalize a multidimensional definition in Swedish registers to be able to use it in the
24
25 11 subsequent studies and develop a job exposure matrix for precarious employment including these
26
27 12 variables (study 1).
28
29

30
31 13 Under-reporting of occupational injuries (RQ2)

32
33 14 In order to estimate the magnitude of under-reporting of occupational injuries for the year 2013
34
35 15 (RQ6), two sources of data on occupational injuries (ISA and AFA registers) will be used to obtain
36
37 16 estimates by means of capture-recapture methodology (study 2). This method, based on log-linear
38
39 17 models, has been successfully used by others and it is used to estimate the incomplete
40
41 18 ascertainment using information from overlapping lists of cases from distinct sources. [25] We will
42
43 19 conduct stratified analyses by precarious employment status, based on results from RQ1.
44
45
46
47

48 20 Trends in precarious employment and occupational injuries (RQ3 and RQ4)

49
50 21 Using data from the whole study period, we will then explore trends in precarious employment over
51
52 22 time in Sweden, for the years 2003-2015 (as laid out in study 1). We will put special attention to
53
54 23 changes over time for women and men, different industries, and foreign born compared to Swedish
55
56 24 born (study 3).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 We will also explore the trends over time with regards to the risk for occupational injuries for
4
5 2 precarious workers and organizations or industries in economic trouble (study 4).
6
7

8 3 Risk of injury associated to precarious employment (RQ5)
9

10 4 Precarious employment, as defined through formative work in study 1, will be the independent
11
12 5 variable of interest in a multivariate analysis with occupational injury as the outcome. It is well
13
14 6 known that the risk of occupational injuries decreases with tenure at any given job. It is unlikely that
15
16 7 there is an accumulation of risk or latency in the precarious employment–occupational injuries
17
18 8 relationship. We will therefore measure risk and outcome at the same point in time, i.e. precarious
19
20 9 employment and injury in the same year. We will also explore the interaction effects of age and
21
22 10 tenure/experience. Analysis will be adjusted for socio-demographic variables. A longitudinal
23
24 11 dimension will be introduced by analyzing the changes in risks over the time of the study period
25
26 12 (2003-2015). Due to the large differences in risk of injury based on occupation, sector and industry,
27
28 13 we will perform stratified analysis based on these variables. Apart from this, we will provide the
29
30 14 population attributable fraction as part of our results.
31
32
33
34
35

36 15 The outcome will be stratified based on severity of injury and differences in risk of injury severity
37
38 16 between precarious and non-precarious employees will be explored.
39
40

41 17 Risk of injury associated to key business indicators (RQ6)
42

43 18 A cohort of all Swedish companies will be created. The outcome will be defined as occupational
44
45 19 injury per full-time employee and calculated for each year for each individual company. We will
46
47 20 calculate short-term (1 year) and long-term (5-year) trajectories in key business indicators for each
48
49 21 company and use these as the main independent variables of interest in a multivariate regression
50
51 22 analysis. Stratified analysis will be carried out based on company size, industry/sector. As in RQ5,
52
53 23 the outcome will be stratified based on severity of injury and the population attributable fraction
54
55 24 will be calculated.
56
57
58
59
60

1 Preliminary findings

2 In this protocol we present preliminary findings based on linkage of different data sources for the
3 working population aged 18-65 years, during the year 2013. The total number of occupational
4 injuries reported only in AFA, only in ISA as well as the overlap (presence in both registers) are
5 shown in Table 3. Linkage between AFA and ISA registers for this preliminary analysis was conducted
6 on id-number (de-identified) and injury date, on a +/- 7 days' range. There was approximately a 36%
7 overlap between the two data sources.

Table 3. Number of occupational accidents reported to either ISA, AFA or both (overlap)*, together with presence in the National Patient Register (in- and out-patient), for the year 2013 in Sweden.

	All reported injuries		Total NPR		In-patient		Out-patient	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ISA only	49 356	47,6	5 343	10,8	368	0,7	4 975	10,1
AFA only	17 095	16,5	4 458	26,1	371	2,2	4 087	23,9
ISA and AFA	37 138	35,9	10 131	27,3	1 119	3,0	9 012	24,3
Total	103 589	100,0	19 932	19,2	1 858	1,8	18 074	17,4

8 *Linkage of datasets conducted on id-number (de-identified) and injury date in a +/-7 days' range.

9 NPR= National Patient Register

11 DISCUSSION

12 In this project we aim at operationalizing precarious employment in Swedish labor market registers
13 and use this definition to conduct several large, register-based prospective etiological studies,
14 designed to measure effect sizes and interactions of the relation between precarious employment,
15 business performance and occupational injuries. Taking advantage of two separate and
16 comprehensive reporting systems for occupational injuries in Sweden we will also estimate under-
17 reporting of occupational injuries and the factors which are related to this issue. In this protocol, we
18 present preliminary results for the overlapping of occupational injuries for the year 2013.

19 Strengths and limitations

20 We believe that the major strength of our project will arise from the results from the first study, i.e.
21 the operationalization of precarious employment. This, together with the identification of key

1
2
3 1 business indicators of relevance for the association between precariousness and occupational
4
5 2 injuries can be considered as a valuable start point for future research investigating these factors.
6
7
8 3 By using the unique Swedish personal and organisation identification numbers from ISA and LISA we
9
10 4 are able to link both individuals and companies to each other and to the injury databases. The use of
11
12 5 high quality, nationwide register data covering the total working population provides power to the
13
14 6 study and virtually zero loss to follow-up. A wide range of variables from different sources, together
15
16 7 with the long follow-up period will enable us to adjust for confounders and apply longitudinal
17
18 8 designs, mitigating several sources of bias. Information on sickness absence and hospitalization
19
20 9 allows us to characterize our outcome in terms of severity, further adding quality aspects to
21
22 10 outcome measurement.

23
24
25
26
27 11 However, some limitations and methodological challenges should be addressed.

28
29
30 12 Occupational injury definition:

31
32
33 13 The system of self-reporting and somewhat ambiguous definition of occupational injury introduces
34
35 14 the risk of misclassification between occupational injury and disease. This problem is likely to be
36
37 15 most serious in the case of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) where repeated over-exertion leading
38
39 16 to an MSD could be reported as both an occupational injury and occupational disease. For women,
40
41 17 over-exertion injuries (physical over-exertion such as during heavy lifting and carrying, jerks, slips)
42
43 18 constituted the second most common cause/type of occupational injury with at least one day of
44
45 19 sickness absence in Sweden. [26] For men it was the third most common cause. If the
46
47 20 misclassification was random and steady over time this would pose a lesser problem, but we have
48
49 21 reason to believe that the preference to choose between reporting MSDs as injuries or diseases
50
51 22 might be biased by preconceptions about chances of getting a claim granted in either category and
52
53 23 that this changes over time as a consequence of regulatory changes.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Additionally, there is risk of including “non-occupational” injuries while investigating reports rather
4
5 2 than approved claims. The rationale for not limiting the reports to approved injuries is that the rules
6
7 3 for receiving compensation have been tightened over the last decade and we believe that on the
8
9 4 group level, there is more consistency over time in employees’ notion of what qualifies as an
10
11 5 occupational injury than in the assessment by the social insurance agency. In personal
12
13 6 communication with civil servants at the Swedish Work Environment Authority, the presence of non-
14
15 7 occupational injuries has been deemed “an issue in the margin”.

18
19 8 Finally, although the occurrence of traffic-related injuries is increasing in some countries, [27] we
20
21 9 decided to exclude those from our study. Injuries that occurred during transit to/from work may be
22
23 10 covered by car insurances and may therefore not appear in the occupational injury registers.

24
25
26
27 11 Injury severity:

28
29
30 12 In Sweden, sickness absence is reimbursed by the Swedish Social Insurance Agency starting on day
31
32 13 15. The near universal coverage of the regular sickness insurance scheme and the additional
33
34 14 coverage specifically for injuries makes us rather confident that we will be able to identify most
35
36 15 serious injuries occurring in the formal labour market. The other severity measure obtained through
37
38 16 hospital records only covers injuries, poisoning and some other consequences of external causes (S
39
40 17 and T chapters in ICD-10). Thereby, we will not identify major injury categories such as acute
41
42 18 lumbago (M45.3).

43
44
45
46 19 Whether we characterize severity in terms of days of hospitalization or reimbursed days lost of
47
48 20 work, we have a rather large difference between mild and severe cases, losing the broad spectrum
49
50 21 of less severe injuries while severe cases can be classified in more detail.

51
52
53 22 Precarious employees:

54
55
56 23 Although we have not yet operationalized precarious employment in registers, we foresee some
57
58 24 constraints. Among other issues, type of contract (permanent/temporary) is not registered as such
59
60

1
2
3 1 and will be constructed by proxy variables obtained from LISA, such as number of employers and
4
5 2 number of sources of income. EU citizens stationed in Sweden and informal workers are not covered
6
7 3 in this study, groups that are of special interest in research on precarious employment. This is a
8
9 4 major limitation, but the constraints in data do not allow us to study these two categories of
10
11 5 potentially precarious workers.
12
13
14

15 6 Precarious employees are less likely to be covered by collective agreements and therefore the issue
16
17 7 will be greatest here. We also hypothesise that they are less likely to report injuries. This will affect
18
19 8 both our analysis of under-reporting using capture-recapture, and also the estimates for the
20
21 9 association between precarious employment and the risk of occupational injuries.
22
23
24

25 10 Key business indicators:

26
27 11 Previous studies have found that as the financial condition of a firm deteriorates, it is likely to adopt
28
29 12 policies that will lead to an increase in safety violations, accident rate, and in environmental hazards
30
31 13 [18] and that when revenue increases the opposite would occur. [19] The opposite might however
32
33 14 be true as well. As revenue falls, the work tempo might shift downwards temporarily and the short-
34
35 15 term effects on injuries might be positive. Lay-offs of those with least tenure may also leave a larger
36
37 16 proportion of experienced workers which could lead to fewer injuries. Mirroring this; as revenue
38
39 17 increases in a company, new employees come in who are at higher risk. Disentangling these effects
40
41 18 and counter effects of changes in key business indicators will be a major challenge and will require
42
43 19 important formative work on causal pathways and the construction of logic models prior to analysis.
44
45 20 Due to the lack of prior research in this area, an exploratory approach using data-mining or machine
46
47 21 learning algorithms will also be applied to discover risk factors and pathways which we cannot
48
49 22 foresee at the moment.
50
51
52
53
54

55 23 Working hours:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 When calculating risk of occupational injuries, a measure of working hours is needed as denominator
4
5 2 in order to make just comparisons. Lacking data on individual working hours in this project we have
6
7 3 to rely on proxy variables to make estimations. Due to collective bargaining the wage structure in
8
9 4 Sweden is rather homogenous, especially for blue collar workers and white collar workers with low
10
11 5 skills. We are currently exploring the feasibility of using wage in combination with occupational code
12
13 6 and industry code as well as the public registers on median salaries in certain occupations (survey-
14
15 7 based information) to create a proxy for fulltime employment based on the deviation from the
16
17 8 median wage.

19 8 median wage.
20
21
22 9 Formal/informal work:

23
24
25 10 As this study partly focuses on precarious employment, we need to spell out that this study is only
26
27 11 investigating the formal economy. Not including people working in the informal sector completely or
28
29 12 partly will be one of our major limitations. According to the 2015 European Working Conditions
30
31 13 Survey (EWCS), the prevalence of informal employment for Sweden is estimated to be 5%, lying
32
33 14 below the average for the European union (10%). [28] Those who are formally employed but receive
34
35 15 part of their salary “under the table” will be especially at high risk of being misclassified. Also,
36
37 16 foreign citizens working in Sweden but whose employer is registered in another country will be
38
39 17 absent in this study. We know that these workers are very common in construction and logistics,
40
41 18 two industries with high risk of injury.

42
43
44
45 19 Under-reporting:

46
47
48 20 Capture-recapture is a method that has been widely used in epidemiology to estimate unknown size
49
50 21 of populations. Methodological issues may appear from dependence among data sources being
51
52 22 used to obtain estimates. [25] When it comes to occupational diseases, AFA requires that a report is
53
54 23 made first to ISA, therefore one would expect a high level of dependency and that AFA would be
55
56 24 completely nested in ISA. For occupational injuries, this is not the case and there is a large
57
58 25 proportion of injuries that are only reported to AFA. This said, the detected dependency may result

1
2
3 1 in an overestimation of the true population size, and we must therefore treat our estimations
4
5 2 cautiously.

6
7
8 3 Also, the AFA insurance scheme is not as comprehensive as ISA's. The ISA register covers 100% of the
9
10 4 employees and self-employed while the AFA register covers 100% of public sector employees and all
11
12 5 employees within the private sector who have signed a collective agreement. However, collective
13
14 6 agreements are less common in small companies and certain industries such as hospitality where
15
16 7 45% of the companies have collective agreements. This will limit our ability to make good estimates
17
18 8 in some labour market sectors.

19
20
21
22 9 Finally, under-reporting of occupational injuries may be higher among precarious workers, and
23
24 10 conversely, these workers may have a higher rate of injuries compared to non-precarious workers.

25
26
27 11 To be able to observe differences in the under-reporting for precarious workers compared to non-
28
29 12 precarious, we will conduct stratified analyses.

30 31 32 13 **DISSEMINATION**

33
34
35 14 The project is presently planned to result in a series of papers published in international peer-
36
37 15 reviewed scientific journals, at least one PhD thesis and a report in Swedish aimed at relevant
38
39 16 stakeholders including governmental agencies, policy-makers and social partners (employers and
40
41 17 trade unions). Due to the richness of the data obtained and the multiple scientific approaches we
42
43 18 anticipate that the project will result also in further publications than those outlined in this protocol,
44
45 19 including future collaborations. Results of public interest will be formatted as press releases and sent
46
47 20 to Swedish and international media with support from the University press services.

48 49 50 51 21 **CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

52
53 22 We believe that this project will address some of the most pressing issues related to occupational
54
55 23 injury surveillance and research. Despite some limitations, the inclusion of different studies within
56
57 24 this project, using several methodologies, together with the statistical and high quality of the data
58
59 25 will allow us to explore trends and risks in occupational injuries in Sweden from many perspectives.

1
2
3 1 The richness of our data will allow us to conduct several specialized sub studies in the future which
4
5 2 have not been outlined here, and we would be happy to receive suggestions for further studies and
6
7 3 invitations to collaborate.
8
9

10 4 **Acknowledgements**

11
12
13 5 The authors acknowledge the following data providers: The Swedish Work Environment Agency, AFA
14
15 6 insurance, Statistics Sweden and the National Board of Health and Welfare.
16
17

18 7 **Author Contributions**

19
20
21 8 CO has drafted previous versions and the final version of the manuscript. TB is the principal
22
23 9 investigator of the project. BK, GJ, BB, KK, TH, MA, LD and DW participate in the project and have
24
25 10 contributed to the design of the project and its studies. All authors have read and approved of the
26
27 11 final version of the manuscript.
28
29

30 12 **Funding**

31
32 13 This project has been founded by grants from the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life
33
34 14 and Welfare (FORTE) (Dnr: 2016-00315 and 2017-01956).
35
36

37 15 **Competing interests**

38
39
40 16 None declared.
41
42

43 17 **Availability of data and material**

44
45 18 Data sharing not possible according to Swedish regulations.
46
47

48 19 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

49
50 20 Ethical permission for the study for the project duration was granted by the Regional Ethics
51
52 21 Committee, Stockholm (Dnr 2016/2325-31 and 2017/2173-32).
53
54

55 22

56 23 **REFERENCES**

57
58
59 24 1. Magne Gravseth, H., E. Wergeland, and J. Lund, *Underrapportering av arbeidsskader til*
60 25 *Arbeidstilsynet*. Tidsskrift for den norske lægeförening, 2003. **123**(15): p. 2057-2059.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 2. Lander, F., et al., *Underrapportering af arbejdsulykker. Øje på arbejdsmiljøet*. København: Landsorganisationen i Danmark, 2012.
- 2 3. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket), *Arbetskadorna 2014 - Occupational accidents and work-related diseases*. 2015, Arbetsmiljöverket: Stockholm.
- 3 4. Andersson, L., et al., *Hälsorelaterad arbetsmiljöövervakning*. 2014, Arbetsmiljöverket: Stockholm.
- 4 5. Standing, G., *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. 2016, London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- 5 6. Vives, A., et al., *The Employment Precariousness Scale (EPRES): psychometric properties of a new tool for epidemiological studies among waged and salaried workers*. Occupational and environmental medicine, 2010. **67**(8): p. 548-555.
- 6 7. International Labour Organization (ILO), *From precarious work to decent work: outcome document to the workers' symposium on policies and regulations to combat precarious employment*. 2012, International Labour Office, Bureau for Workers' Activities: Geneva.
- 7 8. Koranyi, I., et al., *Precarious employment and occupational accidents and injuries - a systematic review*. Scand J Work Environ Health, 2018.
- 8 9. Alali, H., et al., *Relationship between non-standard work arrangements and work-related accident absence in Belgium*. J Occup Health, 2017. **59**(2): p. 177-186.
- 9 10. Dong, X., *Long workhours, work scheduling and work-related injuries among construction workers in the United States*. Scand J Work Environ Health, 2005. **31**(5): p. 329-335.
- 10 11. Dong, X.S., X. Wang, and J.A. Largay, *Occupational and non-occupational factors associated with work-related injuries among construction workers in the USA*. Int J Occup Environ Health, 2015. **21**(2): p. 142-50.
- 11 12. Marucci-Wellman, H.R., et al., *Work in multiple jobs and the risk of injury in the US working population*. Am J Public Health, 2014. **104**(1): p. 134-42.
- 12 13. Bena, A., et al., *Impact of organization on occupational injury risk: evidence from high-speed railway construction*. Am J Ind Med, 2011. **54**(6): p. 428-37.
- 13 14. Hintikka, N., *Accidents at work during temporary agency work in Finland – Comparisons between certain major industries and other industries*. Saf Sci, 2011. **49**(3): p. 473-483.
- 14 15. Smith, C.K., et al., *Temporary workers in Washington state*. Am J Ind Med, 2010. **53**(2): p. 135-45.
- 15 16. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Labour force survey 2014* 5 Jul 2018]; Available from: http://www.scb.se/Statistik/AM/AM0401/2014K02/AM0401_2014K02_SM_AM11SM1403.pdf.
- 16 17. Cheng, C.-W., et al., *Characteristic analysis of occupational accidents at small construction enterprises*. Safety Science, 2010. **48**(6): p. 698-707.
- 17 18. Boisjoly, R.P., *The effects of financial performance and deregulation in the trucking and airline industries on worker safety*. NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy, 1997. **7**(1): p. 38-45.
- 18 19. Asfaw, A., C. Mark, and R. Pana-Cryan, *Profitability and occupational injuries in US underground coal mines*. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 2013. **50**: p. 778-786.
- 19 20. Benach, J., et al., *Precarious employment: understanding an emerging social determinant of health*. Annu Rev Public Health, 2014. **35**: p. 229-53.
- 20 21. Benach, J., et al., *What should we know about precarious employment and health in 2025? Framing the agenda for the next decade of research*. Int J Epidemiol, 2016. **45**(1): p. 232-8.
- 21 22. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket). *Anmäl Arbetskada (Report Occupational Injury)*. 2018 [cited 2018; Available from: <https://anmalarbetskada.se/>].
- 22 23. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Swedish standard classification of occupations (SSYK96)*. Stockholm: Reports on Statistical Co-ordination for the Official Statistics of Sweden 1998 5 Jul 2018]; 1-191]. Available from: <https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-yrkesklassificering-ssyk/>.

- 1
2
3 1 24. Statistics Sweden (SCB). *Swedish Standard Industrial Classification (SNI)*. 2006 5 Jul 2018];
4 2 Available from: [https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-](https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-naringsgrensindelning-sni/)
5 3 [standarder/standard-for-svensk-naringsgrensindelning-sni/](https://www.scb.se/dokumentation/klassifikationer-och-standarder/standard-for-svensk-naringsgrensindelning-sni/).
6 4 25. Hook, E.B. and R.R. Regal, *Capture-recapture methods in epidemiology: methods and*
7 5 *limitations*. *Epidemiologic reviews*, 1995. **17**(2): p. 243-264.
8 6 26. Swedish Work Environment Authority (Arbetsmiljöverket), *Arbets skador 2016 - Occupational*
9 7 *accidents and work-related diseases, in Report 2017:1*. 2017, Swedish Work Environment
10 8 Authority: Stockholm.
11 9 27. Lopez-Ruiz, M., et al., *Impact of road safety interventions on traffic-related occupational*
12 10 *injuries in Spain, 2004-2010*. *Accid Anal Prev*, 2014. **66**: p. 114-9.
13 11 28. Eurofund (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions).
14 12 *European Working Conditions Survey*. 2015 01 November 2018]; Available from:
15 13 <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/data/european-working-conditions-survey>.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60