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Author’s response to reviews:

#1. The presentation of some results is a bit odd and unnecessarily detailed (e.g., Tables 1 and 2 could/should report means instead of site specific figures, could be made into one Table).

RESPONSE: Tables 1 and 2 were combined as suggested.

#2. In Table, they report Chi2 results to indicate the number of injuries experienced by individuals, by mine time, is statistically significant. Likewise they use Chi2 to indicate the years worked differs by mine type, too.

RESPONSE: It is unclear what Table is being referred to, and unclear what specific changes are being requested. We have reviewed the likely Tables and feel that they are complete.

#3. The labeling in Tables 4, 5 and 6 should be reduced - use better titles or footnotes rather than repeat "injuries/100 person years" in each cell.

RESPONSE: We have reviewed this carefully as well as other papers in the field, and feel that the Table should remain as is. We see no clear way to simplify the information (but welcome specific ideas from the reviewer).

#4 - The manuscript ends on study strengths (and weaknesses); there is no Conclusion section.

RESPONSE: Done as suggested. We added some concluding remarks. (Lines 346-352)
#5 - I think making the changes above would give the paper a more professional appearance. Finally, I suggest removing these figures from the Results section of the Abstract: "(33.8 yrs old, 92% male, 29% completed high school, 66% living with a partner)."

RESPONSE: Done as suggested to the Abstract. (Lines 34-35)