

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 info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Low back pain of emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-029264
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Dong, Hongyun; Shouguang People's Hospital, Zhang, Qiong; Shouguang People's Hospital Zhu, Chunji; Shouguang People's Hospital Liu, Guangzeng; Shouguang People's Hospital
Keywords:	low back pain, ambulance, nurse

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title page**Title**

Low back pain of emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study

Complete names (full first and last)

Hongyun Dong; Qiong Zhang; Chunji Zhu; Guangzeng Liu

The affiliation and address of all the authors

Shouguang People's Hospital. Shouguang People's Hospital, NO. 45 Jiankang Street, Shouguang, Weifang, Shandong Province, China. 262700

The e-mail address, and telephone number of the corresponding author

ayouwang@163.com , 8615006697150

Acknowledgements: None.

Competing interests statement: None declared.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1
2
3
4 Low back pain of emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and
5
6 its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study
7
8
9
10

11 **Abstract**

12 **Objective**

13
14
15 Low back pain (LBP) has become increasingly common among healthcare
16
17 providers and could cause serious consequences among nurses. Studies about the
18
19 prevalence of and risk factors for LBP among emergency ambulance workers are
20
21 scarce in China, and even the world. The study aimed to determine the prevalence of
22
23 LBP among ambulance workers including doctors, nurses, and drivers and to explore
24
25 the risk factors for ambulance nurses' chronic LBP.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Design**

33
34
35 Cross-sectional study.
36
37

38 **Setting**

39
40
41 Emergency ambulance systems from 38 tertiary hospitals were selected by random
42
43 cluster sampling.
44
45

46 **Participants**

47
48
49 1560 ambulance workers completed the study.
50
51

52 **Outcome measures**

53
54
55 A paper-based questionnaire including the Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire
56
57 evaluating LBP, Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire assessing ergonomic factors
58
59 and Job Content Questionnaire assessing stress was used. Multivariate logistic
60

1
2
3
4 regression analysis was conducted to quantify the association of potential risk factors
5
6 with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.
7

8 9 **Results**

10
11 The one-year prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days, three
12 years was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1% respectively among 498 ambulance nurses,
13
14 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% among 519 doctors and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% among
15
16 543 drivers. Factors contributing to chronic LBP among nurses were bending the
17
18 trunk frequently, heavy or awkward lifting, shift work, low job satisfaction, high
19
20 psychological fatigue, high psychological job demand, low job control
21
22 (decision-making authority and skill discretion), low workplace supervisor support,
23
24 old age, female sex and obesity.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 **Conclusions**

34
35 LBP was extremely prevalent among ambulance nurses. Many factors, especially
36
37 psychosocial and ergonomic factors contributed to ambulance nurses' chronic LBP.
38
39
40
41
42

43 44 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

45
46 This is the first large-scale study on the prevalence of low back pain (LBP) among
47
48 emergency ambulance workers and risk factors of ambulance nurses' chronic LBP in
49
50 China.
51

52
53 Various factors including individual, psychosocial, ergonomic and organizational
54
55 factors were collected and analyzed in the study.
56
57

58
59 The cross-sectional design and subjective measures of the study limited the causal
60

1
2
3
4 directions.
5
6
7
8

9 **Keywords**

10
11 low back pain; ambulance; nurse

12
13
14 What this paper adds?

15
16
17 1. What is already known about this subject?

18
19
20 Low back pain (LBP) is prevalent among nurses and other healthcare providers.

21
22
23 Chronic or long-term LBP could cause serious consequences. But little is known
24
25 about the current LBP situation of emergency ambulance workers. Many factors
26
27 such as ergonomic, individual, organizational and psychological factors could
28
29 contribute to LBP but the effects were not the same in a certain working group.
30
31
32

33
34
35 2. What are the new findings?

36
37
38 This is the first large-scale survey concerning LBP prevalence among emergency
39
40 ambulance workers and the risk factors among ambulance nurses in China and
41
42 even the first in the world. Ambulance nurses suffered LBP more than ambulance
43
44 doctors and drivers, and more than the general nursing population. Ergonomic and
45
46 psychological factors played important roles in the development of chronic LBP.
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 3. How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

54
55
56 The LBP prevalence differences in different position of ambulance workers and
57
58 the chronic LBP risk factors among ambulance nurses screened out, especially
59
60

1
2
3
4 ergonomomic and psychological factors, would provide guideline information for
5
6 future intervention measures and for policy makers.
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Introduction**

13
14
15 During the past decades, low back pain (LBP), has become one of the most
16
17 common musculoskeletal disorders and one of the most common occupational health
18
19 problems among nurses and other healthcare providers around the world ^{1 2} and been
20
21 one of the most leading causes of disease burden across the developed and developing
22
23 countries ³. Chronic or severe LBP might have serious consequences such as reduced
24
25 quality of life, loss of working days, occupational disability and changing and/or
26
27 leaving a profession ⁴.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Emergency ambulance service, as an essential part of the healthcare system,
38
39 provides pre-hospital medical emergency service for patients including carrying,
40
41 moving and transporting patients to an emergency center and treating in the
42
43 ambulance such as performing cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Ambulance workers
44
45 seemed to have more musculoskeletal disorders than the general working force ⁵.
46
47
48 Worldwide, attention has been paid to the musculoskeletal disorders of ambulance
49
50 workers over the last decade ^{5 6}. But there has been limited data about the LBP
51
52 prevalence and risk factors among ambulance workers worldwide. Due to
53
54 musculoskeletal disorders, especially LBP, ambulance workers were reported to
55
56 suffer from a higher standardized early retirement than other healthcare providers and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 the general working force ^{5 7}. In Mainland China, scarce attention has been paid to the
5
6 emergency ambulance workers and no study so far has explored the prevalence of
7
8
9 LBP among ambulance workers and their risk factors.
10

11
12
13
14 Studies ⁸ have reported that many factors could contribute to LBP including
15
16 individual, psychosocial, physical and organizational work factors. Psychosocial
17
18 factors including low job support, job dissatisfaction, and occupational stress, and
19
20 individual factors such as high BMI and being female could contribute to
21
22 musculoskeletal disorders of the back region revealed by a systematic review with
23
24 strong evidence⁹. But as to the LBP among a special occupational group, the above
25
26 factors do not have the same effects. Psychosocial factors at work such as stress,
27
28 fatigue and job dissatisfaction have been demonstrated to largely contribute to the
29
30 development of LBP in a follow-up study of 4500 Iranian industrial workers ¹⁰.
31
32
33 Emergency ambulance workers, especially nurses, are faced up with demanding
34
35 nursing skills, rapid work rhythms, violence episodes, threats, increased risks of
36
37 contracting infectious diseases and increasing demands on medical competence ¹¹.
38
39
40 Therefore, ambulance nurses may also suffer from LBP resulted from psychosocial
41
42 factors and the effect was not known. The current study aimed to evaluate the
43
44 prevalence of LBP among the ambulance workers of different work position and to
45
46 determine and quantify the association of influencing factors including occupational
47
48 stress and other well-known factors such as ergonomic and individual factors with
49
50 chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methods

Participants

A cross-sectional survey was implemented from September to November in 2018. Considering LBP prevalence, number of independent variables in logistic regression and response rate, 38 hospitals were selected first by random cluster sampling from among all the tertiary hospitals in Shandong, China. Then, of the selected 38 hospitals, all the emergency ambulance workers who had at least one years of work experience as an ambulance worker were invited to participate. Exclusion criteria were as follows: workers who experienced trauma injury or serious diseases, part-time workers. A total of 1560 ambulance workers (498 nurses, 519 doctors and 543 drivers) completed our questionnaire and 158 (65 nurses, 49 doctors and 44 drivers) failed to participate due to long leaves for vacation, sick leave, maternity leave and personal affairs. As to the questionnaires filled incompletely, the participants were contacted and completed the questionnaire later. The response rate of the study was 90.8%.

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Shouguang People's Hospital. Informed consent was obtained before the participants were invited to participate.

Questionnaire

A self-administered questionnaire was designed and revised after pilot study. The paper-based questionnaire consisted of four sections. Section one dealt with demographic information including age, sex, height, weight, marital status, smoking,

1
2
3
4 alcohol consumption, educational level, marital status, children in household and
5
6 exercise.
7

8
9 Section two was a modified version of the Standardized Nordic Musculoskeletal
10
11 Questionnaire ¹² which has been developed to collect the prevalence information of
12
13 musculoskeletal disorders in different parts of the body. The Chinese version of the
14
15 Nordic questionnaire has been validated and widely used by previous national studies
16
17 ^{13 14}. The participants were asked whether they had suffered from pain or discomfort
18
19 in the low back region lasting for at least 24 hours, lasting for at least seven days and
20
21 lasting for at least three months respectively in the preceding twelve months.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Section three dealt with work information and ergonomic factors mainly derived
31
32 from Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire ¹⁵, which has been validated ¹³.
33

34 Ergonomic factors were measured using a dichotomous scale (Yes/No), and the
35
36 assessment of risk factors was qualitative in this study ^{13 15}. Participants were asked
37
38 whether they were often exposed to the ergonomic risk factors during their work.
39

40 Work information included work position (doctor, nurse, or driver), work shift (shift
41
42 work or day work), work age and employment status.
43
44
45
46
47

48 Section four dealt with psychosocial factors including job satisfaction (high,
49
50 medium, low), self-perceived health status (very good, generally good, generally bad,
51
52 very bad), psychological fatigue (low, medium, high) and occupational stress assessed
53
54 by the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) which has been widely used in different
55
56 groups of numerous studies and showed good reliability and validity¹⁶. In our study,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 22 items of the original 49-item JCQ were applied and consisted of three dimensions:
5
6 psychological job demand (five items), job control including skill discretion (six items)
7
8 and decision-making authority (three items), and workplace social support including
9
10 supervisor social support (four items) and coworker social support (four items). Each
11
12 item was scored on a four-point Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly
13
14 agree”.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Data analysis

23
24 The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 18.0 was used to
25
26 perform statistical analysis. Single-factor chi-square test, independent t-test, or rank
27
28 sum test was used to examine the differences between different groups of participants.
29
30 The association of physical, psychosocial, organizational and individual factors with
31
32 chronic LBP was first examined by univariate analysis such as t- test, chi-square test
33
34 or rank sum test. The significant factors selected in the univariate analysis then
35
36 entered into multivariate logistic regression analysis. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95%
37
38 confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated to evaluate the effect of risk factors
39
40 with chronic LBP. In order to avoid an inaccurate and unstable logistic regression
41
42 model, the significant variable ‘work age’ in the univariate analysis was removed, and
43
44 ‘age’ was kept for the multivariate analysis as they showed collinearity in
45
46 relationships (> 0.6) diagnosed by Spearman correlation matrix. The statistics for
47
48 variable entry and removal were set at $P < 0.05$ and $P > 0.1$ respectively in the
49
50 multivariate analysis. A 0.05 statistical significance level was set for all tests.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

The mean age of the 498 ambulance nurses was 31.1 ± 7.6 years, statistically younger than the ambulance doctors (35.7 ± 6.9) and drivers (38.4 ± 9.5). Most of the ambulance nurses were female, while most of the ambulance doctors and drivers were male. Most nurses never smoked. Ambulance nurses had a statistically younger work age as an ambulance worker than ambulance doctors and drivers. Ambulance nurses had a statistically higher educational level than drivers and lower than doctors. Nurses exercised less than doctors and drivers in their leisure time.

The one-year prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, 7 days and 3 months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1% respectively among ambulance nurses, 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% among doctors, and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% among drivers. For more details, see Table 1.

Nurses with old age, female sex, higher BMI, shift work, more work years as an ambulance nurse or temporary/contract employment status, seemed to suffer from chronic LBP more. As to the ergonomic factors, walking for long periods of time, bending the trunk frequently, heavy or awkward lifting, bending or twisting the neck and maintaining shoulder abduction for long periods of time were all statistically associated with chronic LBP. For more details, see Table 2.

As to the psychosocial factors, scores of psychological job demand was positive associated with chronic LBP while scores of skill discretion, decision-making authority, workplace supervisor support and workplace coworker support were

1
2
3
4 negatively associated with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses. Univariate analysis
5
6 also showed that health status, job satisfaction and psychological fatigue were all
7
8 associated with Chronic LBP. For more details, see Table 3.
9
10

11 Multivariate logistic regression analysis reveal that age, sex, BMI, work shift,
12
13 bending the trunk frequently, heavy or awkward lifting, psychological fatigue, job
14
15 satisfaction, psychological job demand, skill discretion, decision-making authority
16
17 and workplace supervisor support were independently associated with chronic LBP
18
19 among ambulance nurses. For more details, see Table 4.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Discussion**

28
29
30
31
32 To our knowledge, this is the first large-scale survey aimed to explore the LBP
33
34 prevalence among ambulance workers and the risk factors for chronic LBP among
35
36 ambulance nurses in China, even maybe the first in the world. The ambulance
37
38 workers participated in the study were randomly selected in Shandong, China and the
39
40 response rate of 90.8% was acceptable. We found the prevalence of LBP lasting for at
41
42 least 24 hours, for at least 7 days, and for at least three months was 86.1%, 50.6% and
43
44 21.1% respectively among ambulance nurses, 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% respectively
45
46 among ambulance doctors, and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% respectively among
47
48 ambulance drivers. The risk factors screened out for the ambulance nurses' chronic
49
50 LBP were ergonomic factors (bending the trunk frequently, heavy or awkward lifting),
51
52 occupational stress (high psychological job demand, low job control and low
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

workplace supervisor support), high psychological fatigue, low job satisfaction, shift work and individual factors (age, sex, obese).

Limitations of our study included the use of self-reported measures and retrospective questionnaire. Therefore, it is inevitable to suffer from measurement bias. The cross-sectional design of the study precluded causal conclusions and a prospective cohort study might be needed in the future.

In our study, the prevalence rates of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, for at least 7 days, and for at least three months among ambulance nurses were all statistically higher than that among ambulance doctors and drivers. To our knowledge, after searching several databases such as Medline, Embase, CNKI and Wanfang, research about the prevalence of LBP among ambulance workers was very limited so that comparison between different countries was not made. As to LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, the prevalence was higher among ambulance nurses than that among the general nursing personal in Greece (75%)¹⁷, Nepal (67%)¹⁸, Chinese Taiwan (66.0%)¹⁹ and other countries^{8 17 20}. As to chronic LBP (lasting for at least three months), the prevalence among ambulance nurses was higher than that among the nursing personal in Dutch (12%), Greek (11%)¹⁷, and Taiwan (8.6%)¹⁹. Although prevalence variance may exist between the above studies, more attention should be paid to the ambulance nurses' LBP and its risk factors need to be pinpointed.

Just as reported that most individuals would suffer from short-term or minor LBP in their whole life²¹, serious or chronic LBP was caused mainly due to work and

1
2
3
4 other factors. Therefore, we analyzed the risk factors of chronic LBP other than
5
6 short-term LBP.
7
8

9 Epidemiological studies have reported that LBP could be caused by combinations
10
11 of physical factors alone ²². A cross-sectional study ¹⁹ in Taiwan found that certain
12
13 manual patient-transfer tasks played important roles in severe LBP (such as care
14
15 seeking, intense pain, and sick leave) than in minor LBP (pain lasting for at least 24
16
17 hours). Tasks such as often with twisted or bent posture or heavy lifting have been
18
19 demonstrated to cause high spinal stress ²³. Patient-handling, as one of the main tasks
20
21 of nurses, could generate a burden of severe biomechanical load on spinal parts of the
22
23 body and could impose compressive and shear forces on nurses' low spine ²⁴.
24
25
26
27
28

29 Different from a cohort study ²⁵ in Norway which found prolonged standing and
30
31 awkward lifting were important factors of the ergonomic factors for LBP, our study
32
33 found bending the trunk frequently and heavy or awkward lifting contributed to
34
35 chronic LBP, which again confirmed the above findings among ambulance nurses.
36
37 Musculoskeletal loads and injuries resulted from patient-handling tasks need to be
38
39 reduced and could be reduced by efficient and cost-effective ergonomic intervention
40
41 measures including LBP knowledge learning, transferring equipments, lifting teams
42
43 and training on safe patient transfer techniques reported by previous studies²⁶. For
44
45 example, in an intervention study ²⁷ conducted in Turkey, ergonomic training was
46
47 proved to be an acceptable method to prevent LBP. Therefore, in order to prevent
48
49 chronic LBP among ambulance nurses, ergonomic intervention measures need to be
50
51 taken.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Psychosocial factors are perceived feelings of the work environment which could
5
6 bring about psychological fatigue, job dissatisfaction and occupational stress²⁸. Our
7
8 study found that high psychological job demand, low job control and low supervisor
9
10 support were independently associated with chronic LBP, consistent with other
11
12 studies^{29 30 31 23}. A cross-sectional study²⁹ in Brazil confirmed that both physical and
13
14 psychosocial work demands were independently associated with LBP. In a
15
16 prospective study³⁰, an increased risk of hospitalization due to musculoskeletal
17
18 disorders and an increased rate of musculoskeletal sickness absence were reported to
19
20 be associated with lack of job control. In other studies^{31 23}, poor job content and low
21
22 workplace social support were also shown to be risk factors for back pain. In our
23
24 study, workplace coworker support was noted to be significantly associated with
25
26 chronic LBP in the univariate analysis but did not remain in the multivariate logistic
27
28 regression analysis, probably because the ambulance workers as a group to some
29
30 extent worked collaboratively and the factor of coworker support was not that
31
32 significantly important like other psychological factors. Our study also found that
33
34 psychological fatigue and job satisfaction were all associated with chronic LBP,
35
36 consistent with other studies^{6 32} which showed that employees dissatisfied with their
37
38 work were more prone to complain of back pain. High psychological fatigue could not
39
40 only increase the possibility of worker injuries and medical errors, but also negatively
41
42 affect one's physical and mental work performance³³. A cohort study²⁵ of the general
43
44 working population in Norway showed that psychosocial factors such as high
45
46 psychological job demands and low job control were reported as the most consistent
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 and important predictors of LBP, in addition to ergonomic factors of prolonged
5
6 standing and awkward lifting. Emergency ambulance nursing work not only needs
7
8 high-intensity physical activity, but also demanding professional skills and rapid
9
10 response in emergencies, which increased their psychological demand. As is known to
11
12 us all, a perfect job without any negative psychosocial work factors does not exist.
13
14
15 Therefore, an optimal job design proposed by Smith and Carayon-Sainfort was
16
17 recommended for ambulance nurses. And negative psychosocial work factors should
18
19 be decreased to an acceptable level in order to control chronic LBP among ambulance
20
21 nurses.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Multivariate logistic regression analysis also revealed that work shift (shift work vs.
31
32 day work) was independently associated with chronic LBP, which surprised us.
33
34 However, another cross-sectional study³⁴ of including 1203 Iranian petrochemical
35
36 employees also reported that musculoskeletal disorders in shift workers were
37
38 statistically more prevalent than in day workers. In a prospective study³⁵ of nurses'
39
40 aides, LBP related sick leaves were revealed to be correlated with working night shifts.
41
42 A study in Japan³⁶ found that a short rest or nap at night could help reduce
43
44 musculoskeletal pain. Proper management of shift work was reported to be important
45
46 in reducing health problems experienced by nurses³⁷. Although the mechanism
47
48 between night shift work and chronic LBP has not been illuminated, measures such as
49
50 short rests at night and adequate nurses in shift work should be considered to reduce
51
52 exposure of LBP risk factors.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Female ambulance nurses were noted to suffer from chronic LBP statistically more
5
6 than male nurses. Since most of the ambulance nurses were female around the world,
7
8 more attention should be given to the female nurses' health when introducing
9
10 interventions.
11
12
13

14
15
16
17 Age was found to be associated with chronic LBP but the effect was slight,
18
19 consistent with previous studies, probably because aging is associated with muscle
20
21 weakness and muscle atrophy which would lead to LBP³⁸. Obesity was correlated
22
23 with chronic LBP, probably because excess abdominal weight pressure on the
24
25 vertebrae might trigger chronic spasms in the low back region ³⁹. Therefore,
26
27 maintaining a normal body weight seems important for preventing LBP among
28
29 ambulance nurses.
30
31
32
33

34
35 As to the many risk factors of chronic LBP among ambulance nurses, one simple
36
37 intervention measure alone may not be inadequate. To achieve the aim of decreasing
38
39 musculoskeletal disorders in healthcare professionals, a multi-component intervention
40
41 was required revealed by previous reviews ⁴⁰. Therefore, comprehensive measures
42
43 need to be considered in order to prevent chronic LBP.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Conclusions

51
52
53 This study suggests a pretty high prevalence of LBP among ambulance nurses.
54
55
56 Psychosocial factors such as stress and fatigue, and ergonomic factors such as
57
58 bending the trunk frequently and heavy or awkward lifting played important roles in
59
60

1
2
3
4 the development of chronic LBP. Many factors including ergonomic, psychosocial,
5
6 organizational and individual factors contributed to chronic LBP among ambulance
7
8 nurses. Comprehensive intervention measures might be needed when to explore
9
10 prevention methods.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Contributors HD designed the study and drafted the manuscript. QZ participated in
18
19 the design of the work, data analysis and revising it. All authors participated in the
20
21 data collection, paper revising and final approval of the version to be published.
22
23
24

25 Competing interests None declared.

26 Patient consent Obtained.

27 Ethics approval The Ethics Committee of Shouguang People's Hospital.

28 Data sharing statement No additional data are available.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 References

- 39
40 1 Dawson AP, McLennan SN, Schiller SD, Jull GA, Hodges PW, Stewart S. Interventions to
41
42 prevent back pain and back injury in nurses: a systematic review. *Occup Environ Med*
43
44 2007;64:642-50.
45
46
47 2 Bejia I, Younes M, Jamila HB et al. Prevalence and factors associated to low back pain among
48
49 hospital staff. *Joint Bone Spine* 2005;72:254-9.
50
51
52 3 David GC. Ergonomic methods for assessing exposure to risk factors for work-related
53
54 musculoskeletal disorders. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2005;55:190-9.
55
56
57 4 McDonald M, DiBonaventura M, Ullman S. Musculoskeletal pain in the workforce: the
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 effects of back, arthritis, and fibromyalgia pain on quality of life and work productivity. *J*
5
6
7 *Occup Environ Med* 2011;53:765-70.
8
- 9 5 Sterud T, Ekeberg O, Hem E. Health status in the ambulance services: a systematic review.
10
11 *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;6:82.
12
- 13
14 6 Jones AY, Lee RY. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation and back injury in ambulance officers. *Int*
15
16 *Arch Occup Environ Health* 2005;78:332-6.
17
- 18
19 7 Rodgers LM. A five year study comparing early retirements on medical grounds in ambulance
20
21 personnel with those in other groups of health service staff. Part II: Causes of retirements.
22
23 *Occup Med (Lond)* 1998;48:119-32.
24
- 25
26
27 8 Coluci MZ, Alexandria NM. Job factors related to musculoskeletal symptoms among nursing
28
29 personnel--a review. *Work* 2012;41 Suppl 1:2516-20.
30
- 31
32
33 9 da Costa BR, Vieira ER. Risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders: A
34
35 systematic review of recent longitudinal studies. *Am J Ind Med* 2010;53:285-323.
36
- 37
38 10 Ghaffari M, Alipour A, Farshad AA, Jensen I, Josephson M, Vingard E. Effect of
39
40 psychosocial factors on low back pain in industrial workers. *Occup Med (Lond)*
41
42 2008;58:341-7.
43
- 44
45
46 11 Estryng-Behar M, van der Heijden B, Camerino D et al. Violence risks in nursing--results from
47
48 the European 'NEXT' Study. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2008;58:107-14.
49
- 50
51 12 Kuorinka I, Jonsson B, Kilbom A et al. Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of
52
53 musculoskeletal symptoms. *Appl Ergon* 1987;18:233-7.
54
- 55
56 13 Du WW, Wang S, Wang JX et al. [The assessment of reliability and validity of
57
58 musculoskeletal questionnaire]. *Zhonghua Lao Dong Wei Sheng Zhi Ye Bing Za Zhi*
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 2012;30:335-8.
5
6
7 14 Yu S, Lu ML, Gu G, Zhou W, He L, Wang S. Musculoskeletal symptoms and associated risk
8
9 factors in a large sample of Chinese workers in Henan province of China. *Am J Ind Med*
10
11 2012;55:281-93.
12
13
14 15 Hildebrandt VH, Bongers PM, van Dijk FJ, Kemper HC, Dul J. Dutch Musculoskeletal
16
17 Questionnaire: description and basic qualities. *Ergonomics* 2001;44:1038-55.
18
19 16 Li J, Yang W, Liu P, Xu Z, Cho SI. Psychometric evaluation of the Chinese (mainland)
20
21 version of Job Content Questionnaire: a study in university hospitals. *Ind Health*
22
23 2004;42:260-7.
24
25
26
27 17 Alexopoulos EC, Burdorf A, Kalokerinou A. A comparative analysis on musculoskeletal
28
29 disorders between Greek and Dutch nursing personnel. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*
30
31 2006;79:82-8.
32
33
34
35 18 Sharma S, Shrestha N, Jensen MP. Pain-related factors associated with lost work days in
36
37 nurses with low back pain: A cross-sectional study. *Scand J Pain* 2016;11:36-41.
38
39
40 19 Feng CK, Chen ML, Mao IF. Prevalence of and risk factors for different measures of low back
41
42 pain among female nursing aides in Taiwanese nursing homes. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*
43
44 2007;8:52.
45
46
47
48 20 Sadeghian F, Hosseinzadeh S, Aliyari R. Do Psychological Factors Increase the Risk for Low
49
50 Back Pain Among Nurses? A Comparing According to Cross-sectional and Prospective
51
52 Analysis. *Saf Health Work* 2014;5:13-6.
53
54
55
56 21 Scott NA, Moga C, Harstall C. Managing low back pain in the primary care setting: the
57
58 know-do gap. *Pain Res Manag* 2010;15:392-400.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 22 Punnett L, Pruss-Utun A, Nelson DI et al. Estimating the global burden of low back pain
5
6 attributable to combined occupational exposures. *Am J Ind Med* 2005;48:459-69.
7
8
9 23 Warming S, Precht DH, Suadicani P, Ebbeltoft NE. Musculoskeletal complaints among nurses
10
11 related to patient handling tasks and psychosocial factors--based on logbook registrations.
12
13
14
15 *Appl Ergon* 2009;40:569-76.
16
17 24 Jager M, Jordan C, Theilmeyer A et al. Lumbar-load analysis of manual patient-handling
18
19 activities for biomechanical overload prevention among healthcare workers. *Ann Occup Hyg*
20
21 2013;57:528-44.
22
23
24
25 25 Sterud T, Tynes T. Work-related psychosocial and mechanical risk factors for low back pain:
26
27 a 3-year follow-up study of the general working population in Norway. *Occup Environ Med*
28
29 2013;70:296-302.
30
31
32 26 Hodder JN, MacKinnon SN, Ralhan A, Keir PJ. Effects of training and experience on patient
33
34 transfer biomechanics. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 2010;40:282-288.
35
36
37 27 Karahan A, Bayraktar N. Effectiveness of an education program to prevent nurses' low back
38
39 pain: an interventional study in Turkey. *Workplace Health Saf* 2013;61:73-8.
40
41
42 28 Huang GD, Feuerstein M, Sauter SL. Occupational stress and work-related upper extremity
43
44 disorders: concepts and models. *Am J Ind Med* 2002;41:298-314.
45
46
47
48 29 Fernandes Rde C, Carvalho FM, Assuncao AA, Silvany Neto AM. Interactions between
49
50 physical and psychosocial demands of work associated to low back pain. *Rev Saude Publica*
51
52 2009;43:326-34.
53
54
55 30 Yip VY. New low back pain in nurses: work activities, work stress and sedentary lifestyle. *J*
56
57 *Adv Nurs* 2004;46:430-40.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 31 Louw QA, Morris LD, Grimmer-Somers K. The prevalence of low back pain in Africa: a
5
6 systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007;8:105.
7
8
9 32 From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Ambulance crash-related injuries
10
11 among Emergency Medical Services workers--United States, 1991-2002. *JAMA*
12
13 2003;289:1628-9.
14
15
16 33 Barker LM, Nussbaum MA. The effects of fatigue on performance in simulated nursing work.
17
18 *Ergonomics* 2011;54:815-29.
19
20 34 Choobineh A, Soltanzadeh A, Tabatabaee H, Jahangiri M, Khavaji S. Health effects
21
22 associated with shift work in 12-hour shift schedule among Iranian petrochemical employees.
23
24 *Int J Occup Saf Ergon* 2012;18:419-27.
25
26
27 35 Eriksen W, Bruusgaard D, Knardahl S. Work factors as predictors of intense or disabling low
28
29 back pain; a prospective study of nurses' aides. *Occup Environ Med* 2004;61:398-404.
30
31
32 36 Takahashi M, Iwakiri K, Sotoyama M, Hirata M, Hisanaga N. Musculoskeletal pain and
33
34 night-shift naps in nursing home care workers. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2009;59:197-200.
35
36
37 37 Nagai M, Morikawa Y, Kitaoka K et al. Effects of fatigue on immune function in nurses
38
39 performing shift work. *J Occup Health* 2011;53:312-9.
40
41
42 38 Hoy D, Bain C, Williams G et al. A systematic review of the global prevalence of low back
43
44 pain. *Arthritis Rheum* 2012;64:2028-37.
45
46
47 39 Meredith DS, Huang RC, Nguyen J, Lyman S. Obesity increases the risk of recurrent
48
49 herniated nucleus pulposus after lumbar microdiscectomy. *Spine J* 2010;10:575-80.
50
51
52 40 Tullar JM, Brewer S, Amick BC, 3rd et al. Occupational safety and health interventions to
53
54 reduce musculoskeletal symptoms in the health care sector. *J Occup Rehabil*
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

2010;20:199-219.

For peer review only

Table 1 Characteristics of emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals

	Nurses	Doctors	P (between nurses and doctors)	Drivers	P (between nurses and drivers)
Total number of subjects	498	519		543	
Age (M±SD)	31.1±7.6	35.7±6.9	<0.001	38.4±9.5	<0.001
Sex			<0.001		<0.001
Male	73	396		471	
Female	425	123		72	
BMI			0.009		<0.001
< 18.5 (Underweight)	43	45		21	
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)	276	249		291	
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	125	129		93	
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	54	96		138	
Marital status			<0.001		<0.001
Never married	75	91		32	
Married/cohabiting	363	402		471	
Divorced/separated/widowed	60	26		40	
Smoking			<0.001		<0.001
Never smoked	485	159		75	
Ex-smoker	10	147		111	
Current smoker	3	213		357	
Workage as an ambulance worker (M±SD)	8.3±8	12.8±9.3	<0.001	14.5±8.8	<0.001
Educational level			<0.001		<0.001
Lower than junior college	111	33		539	
Junior college	261	97		3	
Bachelor	96	259		1	
Master or above	30	132		0	
Exercise in leisure time			<0.001		<0.001
Never/almost never	295	198		219	
Sometimes	97	185		159	
Often	106	136		165	
LBP lasting for at least					
24 hours	429(86.1)	366(70.5)	<0.001	312(57.5)	<0.001
7 days	252(50.6)	189(36.4)	<0.001	129(23.8)	<0.001
3 months	105(21.1)	82(15.8)	0.030	67(12.3)	<0.001

T-test for "age" and "Workage as an ambulance worker". Chi-square test for "Sex", "Marital status", "Smoking" and "LBP". Rank sum test for "BMI", "Educational level" and "Exercise in leisure time".

Table 2 Univariate analysis of individual and ergonomic factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Factors	Chronic LBP sufferers	Non-chronic-LBP sufferers	P
Number of subjects	105	393	
Age	36.5±7.7	29.7±6.7	<0.001
Sex			0.022
Male	8	65	
Female	97	328	
BMI			<0.001
< 18.5 (Underweight)	4	39	
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)	45	231	
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	29	96	
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	27	27	
Work shift			<0.001
Shift work	60	129	
Day work	45	264	
Workage as an ambulance nurse	13.8±8.7	6.8±7.2	<0.001
Employment status			0.014
Permanent	39	199	
Temporary/contract	66	194	
Ergonomic factors			
Walking for long periods of time (Yes/No)	54/51	154/239	0.024
Bending the trunk frequently (Yes/No)	66/39	93/300	<0.001
Heavy or awkward lifting (Yes/No)	75/30	112/281	<0.001
Bending or twisting the neck (Yes/No)	39/66	97/296	0.011
Maintaining shoulder abduction for long periods of time (Yes/No)	48/57	136/257	0.036

T-test for "age" and "workage as an ambulance nurse". Chi-square test for "Sex", "Work shift", "Employment status" and ergonomic factors. Rank sum test for BMI.

Table 3 Univariate analysis of psychosocial factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Psychosocial factors	Chronic LBP		P
	sufferers	Non-chronic-LBP sufferers	
Number of subjects	105	393	
Occupational stress			
Psychological job demand	14.5±4.1	11.1±3.2	<0.001
Decision-making authority	5.8±3.8	8.1±2.5	<0.001
Skill discretion	11.7±5.3	16.2±4.6	<0.001
Supervisor social support	6.8±3.2	9.8±2.2	<0.001
Coworker social support	8.7±3.8	10.3±2.6	<0.001
Health status			0.043
Very good	19	89	
Generally good	25	109	
Generally bad	29	117	
Very bad	32	78	
Psychological fatigue			0.004
Low	27	127	
Medium	45	207	
High	33	59	
Job satisfaction			0.025
High	42	187	
Medium	33	144	
Low	30	62	

T-test for components of occupational stress. Rank sum test for "Job satisfaction", "Psychological fatigue" and "Health status".

Table 4 Multivariate logistic regression analysis of Chronic LBP risk factors among ambulance nurses.

Factors	B	SE	P	OR (95% C.I.)
Age	0.912	0.453	0.023	2.489 (1.024-6.049)
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	0.891	0.381	0.017	2.438 (1.155-5.144)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0.641	0.546	0.513	0.527 (0.181-1.536)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0.439	0.263	0.329	1.551 (0.926-2.597)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1.638	0.313	<0.001	5.145 (2.786-9.502)
Work shift (1=shift work, 0=day work)	1.005	0.223	<0.001	2.732 (1.765-4.229)
Ergonomic factors				
Bending the trunk frequently	1.701	0.232	<0.001	5.479 (3.477-8.634)
Heavy or awkward lifting	1.838	0.242	<0.001	6.284 (3.911-10.098)
Psychosocial factors				
Psychological fatigue				
Low				Reference
Medium	0.021	0.267	0.214	1.021 (0.605-1.723)
High	0.968	0.296	<0.001	2.633 (1.474-4.703)
Job satisfaction				
High				Reference
Medium	0.031	0.262	0.154	1.031 (0.617-1.724)
Low	0.768	0.279	<0.001	2.155 (1.248-3.724)
Occupational stress				
Psychological job demand	1.031	0.414	<0.001	2.804 (1.246-6.312)
Decision-making authority	-0.924	0.411	<0.001	0.397 (0.177-0.888)
Skill discretion	-0.973	0.402	<0.001	0.378 (0.172-0.831)
Supervisor social support	-1.213	0.393	<0.001	0.297 (0.138-0.642)

BMJ Open

Low back pain in emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-029264.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Jun-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Zhang, Qiong; Shouguang People's Hospital Dong, Hongyun; Shouguang People's Hospital Zhu, Chunji; Shouguang People's Hospital Liu, Guangzeng; Shouguang People's Hospital
Primary Subject Heading:	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Occupational and environmental medicine, Public health
Keywords:	low back pain, ambulance, nurse, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title page**Title**

Low back pain in emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study

Complete names (full first and last)

Qiong Zhang; Hongyun Dong; Chunji Zhu; Guangzeng Liu

The affiliation and address of all the authors

Shouguang People's Hospital. Shouguang People's Hospital, NO. 45 Jiankang Street, Shouguang, Weifang, Shandong Province, China. 262700

The e-mail address, and telephone number of the corresponding author

ayouwang@163.com , 8615006697150

Acknowledgements: None.

Competing interests statement: None declared.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1
2
3
4 Low back pain in emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and
5
6 its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study
7
8
9
10

11 **Abstract**

12 **Objective**

13
14
15 Low back pain (LBP) could cause serious consequences and has been shown to be
16
17 prevalent among emergency ambulance workers. Studies on the prevalence of and
18
19 risk factors for LBP among emergency ambulance workers are scarce in China. The
20
21 study aimed to determine the prevalence of LBP among ambulance workers,
22
23 including doctors, nurses, and drivers, and to explore the risk factors for ambulance
24
25 nurses' chronic LBP.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Design**

33
34 Cross-sectional study.
35
36

37 **Setting**

38
39
40 Emergency ambulance systems from 38 tertiary hospitals were selected by random
41
42 cluster sampling.
43
44

45 **Participants**

46
47 A total of 1560 ambulance workers completed the study.
48
49

50 **Outcome measures**

51
52 A paper-based questionnaire that included the Nordic Musculoskeletal
53
54 Questionnaire, which evaluated LBP, the Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire,
55
56 which assessed ergonomic factors, and the Job Content Questionnaire, which assessed
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 stress, was used. Multivariate logistic regression analysis was conducted to quantify
5
6 the association of potential risk factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.
7

8 9 **Results**

10
11 The one-year prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days and three
12 months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1%, respectively, among 498 ambulance nurses;
13
14 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% among 519 doctors; and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% among
15
16 543 drivers. The factors contributing to chronic LBP among ambulance nurses were
17
18 the frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting, shift work, low job
19
20 satisfaction, high psychological fatigue, high psychological job demand, low job
21
22 control (decision-making authority and skill discretion), low workplace supervisor
23
24 support, older age, female sex and obesity.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 **Conclusions**

34
35 LBP was more prevalent among ambulance nurses than among ambulance doctors
36
37 and drivers in Shandong, China. Many factors, especially psychosocial and ergonomic
38
39 factors, contributed to ambulance nurses' chronic LBP. Comprehensive measures
40
41 might be needed to control chronic LBP.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 49 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

50
51 This is the first large-scale study on the prevalence of low back pain (LBP) among
52
53 emergency ambulance workers and risk factors for ambulance nurses' chronic LBP in
54
55 China.
56

57
58 Various factors, including individual, psychosocial, ergonomic and organizational
59
60

1
2
3
4 factors, were collected and analysed in the study.
5

6 The cross-sectional design and subjective measures of the study limited the
7
8 establishment of causal directions.
9
10

11 12 13 14 **Keywords**

15
16
17 low back pain; ambulance; nurse
18
19

20 21 22 **Introduction**

23
24
25
26
27 Emergency ambulance service, as an essential part of the healthcare system,
28
29 provides pre-hospital medical emergency service for patients, including carrying,
30
31 moving and transporting patients to an emergency centre and treating them in the
32
33 ambulance, such as performing cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Ambulance workers
34
35 have been reported to experience more musculoskeletal disorders than the general
36
37 workforce¹⁻⁴. In Denmark, data from a nationwide study showed that a substantially
38
39 high proportion (42%) of 1689 ambulance personnel reported musculoskeletal pain,
40
41 which was significantly higher than corresponding reports from the core workforce of
42
43 14,175 individuals (29%)⁵. In Australia, ambulance officers and paramedics had the
44
45 highest rates for musculoskeletal injury compared with other healthcare workers in
46
47 the 2003-2012 time period⁶. Worldwide, attention has been paid to the
48
49 musculoskeletal disorders of ambulance workers over the last decade because of
50
51 serious consequences, such as reduced quality of life, loss of working days,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 occupational disability and the need to change and/or leave a profession ⁷. Due to
5
6 musculoskeletal disorders, especially low back pain (LBP), ambulance workers have
7
8
9 been reported to suffer from a higher standardized early retirement than other
10
11 healthcare providers and the general workforce ^{1 8}. In mainland China, scarce
12
13 attention has been paid to emergency ambulance workers, and no study thus far has
14
15 explored the prevalence of LBP among ambulance workers and their risk factors.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Studies ⁹ have reported that many factors could contribute to LBP, including
23
24 individual, psychosocial, physical and organizational work factors. Psychosocial
25
26 factors, including low job support, job dissatisfaction, and occupational stress, and
27
28 individual factors, such as high BMI and being female, could contribute to
29
30 musculoskeletal disorders of the back region, as revealed by a systematic review with
31
32 strong evidence¹⁰. However, regarding the LBP among a special occupational group,
33
34 the above factors do not have the same effects. Psychosocial factors at work, such as
35
36 stress, fatigue and job dissatisfaction, have been demonstrated to largely contribute to
37
38 the development of LBP in a follow-up study of 4500 Iranian industrial workers ¹¹.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Emergency ambulance workers, especially nurses, are faced with demanding nursing
skills, rapid pace of work, episodes of violence, threats, increased risks of contracting
infectious diseases and increasing demands on medical competence ¹². Therefore,
ambulance nurses may also suffer from LBP resulting from psychosocial factors, and
this effect is not known. The current study aimed to evaluate the prevalence of LBP
among ambulance workers in different work positions and to determine and quantify

1
2
3
4 the association between influencing factors, including individual, physical and
5
6 psychosocial factors, and chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.
7
8
9

10 11 **Methods**

12
13
14 A cross-sectional survey was implemented from September to November 2018.
15
16
17 The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Shouguang People's Hospital.
18
19
20 Informed consent was obtained before the participants were invited to participate.
21
22
23

24 25 **Participants**

26
27 Given the prevalence of LBP, the number of independent variables in the logistic
28
29 regression and the response rate, 38 hospitals were selected first by random cluster
30
31 sampling from among all the tertiary hospitals (182 tertiary-level hospitals in total) in
32
33 Shandong, China. Then, of the selected 38 hospitals, all the emergency ambulance
34
35 workers who had at least one year of work experience as an ambulance worker were
36
37 invited to participate with the help of the management departments and the directors
38
39 of emergency departments. The exclusion criteria were as follows: part-time workers
40
41 or workers who had experienced trauma, injury, or serious diseases. A total of 1560
42
43 ambulance workers (498 nurses, 519 doctors and 543 drivers) completed our
44
45 questionnaire, and the response rate of the study was 90.8%.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 57 **Questionnaire**

58
59 A self-administered questionnaire that included the Standardized Nordic
60

1
2
3
4 Musculoskeletal Questionnaire¹³, the Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire¹⁴ and the
5
6 Job Content Questionnaire¹⁵, was designed and revised after a pilot study. The
7
8 paper-based questionnaire consisted of four sections. Section one addresses
9
10 demographic information, including age, sex, height, weight, marital status, smoking,
11
12 alcohol consumption, educational level, marital status, children in the household and
13
14 exercise.
15
16
17
18

19 Section two was a modified version of the Standardized Nordic Musculoskeletal
20
21 Questionnaire. The Chinese version of the Nordic questionnaire has been widely used,
22
23 validated and contextualized by previous national studies according to a cross-cultural
24
25 understanding of the Chinese population¹⁶⁻¹⁸. The participants were asked whether
26
27 they had suffered from pain or discomfort in the low back region lasting for at least 24
28
29 hours, for at least seven days and lasting for at least three months in the preceding
30
31 twelve months. If a participant reported LBP lasting for at least three months in the
32
33 past twelve months, he or she was considered to have chronic LBP¹⁹.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Section three addresses work information and ergonomic factors mainly derived
44
45 from Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire¹⁴, which has been systematically
46
47 translated into Chinese¹⁶ and validated¹⁷. Ergonomic factors were measured using a
48
49 dichotomous scale (yes/no), and the assessment of risk factors was qualitative in this
50
51 study^{14 17}. Participants were asked whether they were often exposed to the ergonomic
52
53 risk factors during their work without further explanation. Work information included
54
55 work position (doctor, nurse, or driver), work shift (shift work or day work), work
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 experience and employment status (permanent vs. temporary/contract).
5

6 Section four addresses psychosocial factors, including job satisfaction (high,
7
8 medium, low), self-perceived health status (very good, generally good, generally bad,
9
10 very bad), psychological fatigue (low, medium, high) and occupational stress assessed
11
12 by the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ), which has been widely used in different
13
14 groups of numerous studies and has shown good reliability and validity in the Chinese
15
16 working population¹⁵. In our study, 22 items of the original 49-item JCQ, whose
17
18 content validity indices were all above 0.80, were applied and consisted of three
19
20 dimensions: psychological job demand (five items); job control, including skill
21
22 discretion (six items) and decision-making authority (three items); and workplace
23
24 social support, including supervisor social support (four items) and co-worker social
25
26 support (four items). Each item was scored on a four-point Likert scale from “strongly
27
28 disagree” to “strongly agree”, with higher scores indicating higher psychological job
29
30 demand, higher job control and higher workplace social support. In this study,
31
32 Cronbach’s α coefficients for psychological job demand, job control and workplace
33
34 social support were 0.79, 0.87 and 0.90, respectively.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Data analysis

49
50 The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 18.0, was used to
51
52 perform statistical analysis. A single-factor chi-square test, independent t-test, or
53
54 rank-sum test was used to examine the differences between different groups of
55
56 participants. The association of physical, psychosocial, organizational and individual
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 factors with chronic LBP (lasting for at least three months) was first examined with
5
6 univariate analysis, such as t-tests, chi-square tests or rank-sum tests. The significant
7
8 factors selected in the univariate analysis were then entered into multivariate logistic
9
10 regression analysis. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were
11
12 calculated to evaluate the effect of risk factors on chronic LBP. To avoid an
13
14 inaccurate and unstable logistic regression model, the significant variable 'work
15
16 experience' in the univariate analysis was removed, and 'age' was kept for the
17
18 multivariate analysis, as it showed collinearity in relationships ($\rho > 0.6$) diagnosed by
19
20 Spearman correlation matrix. The statistics for variable entry and removal were set at
21
22 $P < 0.05$ and $P > 0.1$, respectively, in the multivariate analysis. A 0.05 statistical
23
24 significance level was set for all tests.

31 32 Patient and public involvement

33
34 No patients or members of the public were involved in the design or
35
36 implementation of the study. The results of the study were disseminated to the health
37
38 authorities and the selected 38 hospitals.

41 42 43 44 45 **Results**

46
47 All 1560 questionnaires (498 ambulance nurses, 519 doctors and 543 drivers) were
48
49 included in the study, and with respect to the questionnaires that were not fully
50
51 completed, the participants were contacted again and completed the questionnaire
52
53 later. Approximately 158 individuals (65 ambulance nurses, 49 doctors and 44 drivers)
54
55 failed to participate in the survey due to long leaves for vacation, sick leave, maternity
56
57
58
59
60

leave and personal affairs.

The mean age of the 498 ambulance nurses was 31.1 ± 7.6 years, which was significantly younger than the mean age of the ambulance doctors (35.7 ± 6.9) and drivers (38.4 ± 9.5). Most of the ambulance nurses were female, while most of the ambulance doctors and drivers were male. Most nurses never smoked. Ambulance nurses had significantly less work experience as an ambulance worker (8.3 ± 8.0 years) than did ambulance doctors (12.8 ± 9.3 years) and drivers (14.5 ± 8.8 years). Ambulance nurses had an educational level that was significantly higher than that of drivers and lower than that of doctors, and the rank-sum test is shown in Table 1. Nurses exercised less than doctors and drivers did in their leisure time (Table 1).

The twelve-month prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, 7 days and 3 months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1%, respectively, among ambulance nurses; 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% among doctors; and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% among drivers. For more details, see Table 1.

Table 1 Characteristics of emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals

	Nurses	Doctors	P^1	Drivers	P^2
Total number of subjects	498	519		543	
Age (M \pm SD)	31.1 ± 7.6	35.7 ± 6.9	<0.001	38.4 ± 9.5	<0.001
Sex			<0.001		<0.001
Male	73 (14.7%)	396 (76.3%)		471 (86.7%)	
Female	425 (85.3%)	123 (23.7%)		72 (13.3%)	
BMI			0.009		<0.001
< 18.5 (Underweight)	43 (8.6%)	45 (8.7%)		21 (3.9%)	
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)	276 (55.4%)	249 (48.0%)		291 (53.6%)	
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	125 (25.1%)	129 (24.9%)		93 (17.1%)	
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	54 (10.8%)	96 (18.5%)		138 (25.4%)	

Marital status			<0.001		<0.001
Never married	75 (15.1%)	91 (17.5%)		32 (5.9%)	
Married/cohabiting	363 (72.9%)	402 (77.5%)		471 (86.7%)	
Divorced/separated/widowed	60 (12.0%)	26 (5.0%)		40 (7.4%)	
Smoking			<0.001		<0.001
Never smoked	485 (97.4%)	159 (30.6%)		75 (13.8%)	
Ex-smoker	10 (2.0%)	147 (28.3%)		111 (20.4%)	
Current smoker	3 (0.6%)	213 (41.0%)		357 (65.7%)	
Work experience as an ambulance worker (M±SD)	8.3±8.0	12.8±9.3	<0.001	14.5±8.8	<0.001
Educational level			<0.001		<0.001
Lower than junior college	111 (22.3%)	33 (6.4%)		539 (99.3%)	
Junior college	261 (52.4%)	96 (18.5%)		3 (0.6%)	
Bachelor	96 (19.3%)	258 (49.7%)		1 (0.2%)	
Master or above	30 (6.0%)	132 (25.4%)		0 (0.0%)	
Exercise in leisure time			<0.001		<0.001
Never/almost never	295 (59.2%)	198 (38.2%)		219 (40.3%)	
Sometimes	97 (19.5%)	185 (35.6%)		159 (29.3%)	
Often	106 (21.3%)	136 (26.2%)		165 (30.4%)	
LBP lasting for at least					
24 hours	429(86.1%)	366(70.5%)	<0.001	312(57.5%)	<0.001
7 days	252(50.6%)	189(36.4%)	<0.001	129(23.8%)	<0.001
3 months	105(21.1%)	82(15.8%)	0.030	67(12.3%)	<0.001

1 P value between ambulance nurses and doctors. 2 P value between ambulance nurses and drivers. T-test for “age” and “work experience as an ambulance worker”. Chi-square test for “sex”, “marital status”, “smoking” and “LBP”. Rank-sum test for “BMI”, “educational level” and “exercise in leisure time”.

Ambulance nurses who were older in age, were female, had higher BMI, performed shift work, and had worked longer as an ambulance worker or in temporary/contract employment seemed to suffer from chronic LBP more. Regarding ergonomic factors, walking for long periods of time, the frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting, bending or twisting the neck and maintaining shoulder abduction for long periods of time were all statistically associated with chronic LBP. For more details,

see Table 2.

Table 2 Univariate analysis of individual and ergonomic factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Factors	Chronic LBP	Non-chronic-LBP	<i>P</i>
Number of subjects	105	393	
Age	36.5±7.7	29.7±6.7	<0.001
Sex			0.022
Male	8	65	
Female	97	328	
BMI			<0.001
< 18.5 (Underweight)	4	39	
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)	45	231	
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	29	96	
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	27	27	
Work shift			<0.001
Shift work	60	129	
Day work	45	264	
Work experience as an ambulance worker	13.8±8.7	6.8±7.2	<0.001
Employment status			0.014
Permanent	39	199	
Temporary/contract	66	194	
Ergonomic factors			
Walking for long periods of time (Yes/No)	54/51	154/239	0.024
Frequent bending of the trunk (Yes/No)	66/39	93/300	<0.001
Heavy or awkward lifting (Yes/No)	75/30	112/281	<0.001
Bending or twisting the neck (Yes/No)	39/66	97/296	0.011
Maintaining shoulder abduction for long periods of time (Yes/No)	48/57	136/257	0.036

T-test for “age” and “work experience as an ambulance worker”. Chi-square test for “sex”, “work shift”, “employment status” and ergonomic factors. Rank-sum test for BMI.

Regarding the psychosocial factors, scores on psychological job demand were positively associated with chronic LBP, while scores on skill discretion, decision-making authority, workplace supervisor support and workplace co-worker support were negatively associated with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Univariate analysis also showed that self-perceived health status, job satisfaction and psychological fatigue were all associated with chronic LBP. For more details, see Table 3.

Table 3 Univariate analysis of psychosocial factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Psychosocial factors	Chronic LBP	Non-chronic-LBP	<i>P</i>
Number of subjects	105	393	
Occupational stress			
Psychological job demand	14.5±4.1	11.1±3.2	<0.001
Decision-making authority	5.8±3.8	8.1±2.5	<0.001
Skill discretion	11.7±5.3	16.2±4.6	<0.001
Supervisor social support	6.8±3.2	9.8±2.2	<0.001
Coworker social support	8.7±3.8	10.3±2.6	<0.001
Health status			0.043
Very good	19	89	
Generally good	25	109	
Generally bad	29	117	
Very bad	32	78	
Psychological fatigue			0.004
Low	27	127	
Medium	45	207	
High	33	59	
Job satisfaction			0.025
High	42	187	
Medium	33	144	
Low	30	62	

T-test for components of occupational stress. Rank-sum test for “job satisfaction”, “psychological fatigue” and “health status”.

Multivariate logistic regression analysis revealed that age, sex, BMI, work shift, frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting, psychological fatigue, job satisfaction, psychological job demand, skill discretion, decision-making authority and workplace supervisor support were independently associated with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses. For more details, see Table 4.

Table 4 Multivariate logistic regression analysis of chronic LBP risk factors among ambulance nurses.

Factors	B	SE	P	OR (95% C.I.)
Age	0. 912	0. 453	0. 023	2.489 (1.024-6.049)
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	0. 891	0. 381	0. 017	2.438 (1.155-5.144)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0. 641	0. 546	0. 513	0.527 (0.181-1.536)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0. 439	0. 263	0. 329	1.551 (0.926-2.597)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1. 638	0. 313	<0. 001	5.145 (2.786-9.502)
Work shift (1=shift work, 0=day work)	1. 005	0. 223	<0. 001	2.732 (1.765-4.229)
Ergonomic factors				
Frequent bending of the trunk	1. 701	0. 232	<0. 001	5.479 (3.477-8.634)
Heavy or awkward lifting	1. 838	0. 242	<0. 001	6.284 (3.911-10.098)
Psychosocial factors				
Psychological fatigue				
Low				Reference
Medium	0. 021	0. 267	0. 214	1.021 (0.605-1.723)
High	0. 968	0. 296	<0. 001	2.633 (1.474-4.703)
Job satisfaction				
High				Reference
Medium	0. 031	0. 262	0. 154	1.031 (0.617-1.724)
Low	0. 768	0. 279	<0. 001	2.155 (1.248-3.724)
Occupational stress				
Psychological job demand	1. 031	0. 414	<0. 001	2.804 (1.246-6.312)
Decision-making authority	-0. 924	0. 411	<0. 001	0.397 (0.177-0.888)
Skill discretion	-0. 973	0. 402	<0. 001	0.378 (0.172-0.831)
Supervisor social support	-1. 213	0. 393	<0. 001	0.297 (0.138-0.642)

Multivariate logistic regression analysis also revealed that age, sex, BMI, frequent bending of the trunk and psychological job demand were associated with chronic LBP among ambulance doctors and that age, BMI, sitting for long periods of time and psychological fatigue were associated with chronic LBP among ambulance drivers. For more details, see Table 5.

Table 5 Multivariate logistic regression analysis of chronic LBP risk factors among ambulance

doctors and among ambulance drivers.

Factors	B	SE	P	OR (95% C.I.)
For doctors' chronic LBP				
Age	1.031	0.448	<0.001	2.804 (1.165-6.747)
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	0.502	0.253	0.034	1.652 (1.006-2.713)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0.537	0.512	0.427	0.584 (0.214-1.594)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0.556	0.309	0.141	1.744 (0.952-3.195)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1.571	0.322	<0.001	4.811 (2.560-9.044)
Ergonomic factors				
Frequent bending of the trunk	1.313	0.352	<0.001	3.717 (1.865-7.411)
Psychosocial factors				
Occupational stress				
Psychological job demand	1.055	0.401	<0.001	2.872 (1.309-6.303)
For drivers' chronic LBP				
Age	1.115	0.501	0.004	3.050 (1.142-8.141)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0.722	0.473	0.643	0.486 (0.192-1.228)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0.948	0.305	<0.001	2.581 (1.419-4.692)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1.804	0.354	<0.001	6.074 (3.035-12.156)
Ergonomic factors				
Sitting for long periods of time	1.936	0.315	<0.001	6.931 (3.738-12.851)
Psychosocial factors				
Psychological fatigue				
Low				Reference
Medium	0.557	0.275	0.002	1.745 (1.018-2.992)
High	1.011	0.311	<0.001	2.748 (1.494-5.056)

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first large-scale survey aimed at exploring the LBP prevalence among ambulance workers and the risk factors for chronic LBP among ambulance nurses in China. The ambulance workers participating in the study were randomly selected in Shandong, China, and the response rate of 90.8% was acceptable.

1
2
3
4 We found that the twelve-month prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, for at
5
6 least 7 days, and for at least three months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1%, respectively,
7
8 among ambulance nurses; 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8%, respectively, among ambulance
9
10 doctors; and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3%, respectively, among ambulance drivers. The
11
12 risk factors that were found for the ambulance nurses' chronic LBP were ergonomic
13
14 factors (frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting), occupational stress
15
16 factors (high psychological job demand, low job control and low workplace supervisor
17
18 support), high psychological fatigue, low job satisfaction, shift work and individual
19
20 factors (age, sex, obesity). The limitations of our study included the use of
21
22 self-reported measures and retrospective questionnaires. Therefore, it is inevitable to
23
24 suffer from measurement bias. The cross-sectional design of the study precluded
25
26 causal conclusions, and a prospective cohort study might be needed in the future.
27
28 Some of the 158 subjects who failed to participate in the study might suffer from LBP,
29
30 and the subjects who had left their ambulance position due to serious LBP were not
31
32 included in the study. Therefore, the prevalence of LBP and the extent of its risk
33
34 factors might be underestimated accordingly.

35
36 In our study, the prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, for at least 7 days,
37
38 and for at least three months among ambulance nurses was statistically higher than
39
40 that among ambulance doctors and drivers. Regarding LBP lasting for at least 24
41
42 hours, the prevalence was higher among ambulance nurses than among the general
43
44 nursing personnel in Greece (75%)²⁰, Nepal (67%)²¹, Chinese Taiwan (66.0%)²² and
45
46 other countries^{9 20 23}. Regarding chronic LBP (lasting for at least three months), the
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 prevalence among ambulance nurses was higher than that among the nursing
5
6 personnel in the Netherlands (12%), Greece (11%)²⁰, and Taiwan (8.6%)²². Although
7
8 measurement variance, cultural differences and differences in the perception of
9
10 terminology may exist among the above mentioned studies, more attention should be
11
12 paid to the ambulance nurses' LBP and its risk factors need to be identified.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 As reported, most individuals suffer from short-term or minor LBP at some point in
21
22 their lives²⁴, and most acute LBP is a self-limiting symptom with a recovery rate of
23
24 90% within six weeks^{19 25}. Serious or chronic LBP was caused mainly by work and
25
26 other factors. Therefore, we analysed the risk factors of chronic LBP other than
27
28 short-term LBP. Epidemiological studies have reported that LBP could be caused by
29
30 combinations of physical factors alone²⁶. A cross-sectional study²² in Taiwan found
31
32 that certain manual patient-transfer tasks played important roles in severe LBP (such
33
34 as care seeking, intense pain, and sick leave). Tasks that are often performed with
35
36 twisted or bent posture or tasks involving heavy lifting have been demonstrated to
37
38 cause high spinal stress²⁷. Patient handling, as one of the main tasks of nurses, could
39
40 generate a severe biomechanical load on spinal parts of the body and could impose
41
42 compressive and shear forces on nurses' low spine²⁸. In contrast to the ergonomic
43
44 factors for chronic LBP among ambulance doctors (frequent bending of the trunk) and
45
46 drivers (sitting for long periods of time) and in contrast to the findings of a cohort
47
48 study²⁹ in Norway that showed that prolonged standing and awkward lifting were
49
50 important factors of the ergonomic factors for LBP, our study found the frequent
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 bending of the trunk and heavy or awkward lifting contributed to chronic LBP, which
5
6 again confirmed the above findings among ambulance nurses. Musculoskeletal loads
7
8 and injuries resulting from patient-handling tasks need to be reduced and could be
9
10 reduced by efficient and cost-effective ergonomic intervention measures, including
11
12 sharing LBP knowledge, transferring equipment, lifting teams and training in safe
13
14 patient-transfer techniques reported by previous studies³⁰. Therefore, to prevent
15
16 chronic LBP among ambulance nurses, ergonomic intervention measures need to be
17
18 taken.
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Psychosocial factors are perceived feelings of the work environment that could
26
27 bring about psychological fatigue, job dissatisfaction and occupational stress³¹. Our
28
29 study found that high psychological job demand, low job control and low supervisor
30
31 support were independently associated with chronic LBP, consistent with the findings
32
33 of other studies^{27 32-34}. A cross-sectional study³² in Brazil reported that both physical
34
35 and psychosocial work demands were independently associated with LBP. In a
36
37 prospective study³³, an increased risk of hospitalization due to musculoskeletal
38
39 disorders and an increased rate of musculoskeletal sickness were reported to be
40
41 associated with a lack of job control. In other studies^{27 34}, poor job content and low
42
43 workplace social support were also shown to be risk factors for back pain. In our
44
45 study, workplace co-worker support was noted to be significantly associated with
46
47 chronic LBP in the univariate analysis but this association did not remain in the
48
49 multivariate logistic regression analysis, probably because the ambulance workers as
50
51 a group, worked collaboratively, to some extent, and the factor of co-worker support
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 was not as significantly important as other psychological factors. Our study also
5
6 found that psychological fatigue and job satisfaction were all associated with chronic
7
8 LBP, consistent with the findings of other studies^{35 36} that showed that employees
9
10 dissatisfied with their work were more prone to complain of back pain. High
11
12 psychological fatigue could not only increase the possibility of worker injuries and
13
14 medical errors but could also negatively affect one's physical and mental work
15
16 performance³⁷. A cohort study²⁹ of the general working population in Norway
17
18 showed that psychosocial factors such as high psychological job demands and low job
19
20 control were reported as the most consistent and important predictors of LBP, in
21
22 addition to ergonomic factors. Emergency ambulance nursing work not only requires
23
24 high-intensity physical activity, but also demands professional skills and rapid
25
26 responses in emergencies, which affect individuals' social psychology. Therefore,
27
28 negative psychosocial work factors also need to be decreased to an acceptable level to
29
30 control chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 We also found that age, sex, BMI and work shift (shift work vs. day work) were
44
45 associated with chronic LBP. Another cross-sectional study³⁸ of 1203 Iranian
46
47 petrochemical employees also reported that musculoskeletal disorders were
48
49 statistically more prevalent in shift workers than in day workers. In a prospective
50
51 study³⁹ of nurses' aides, LBP-related sick leaves were revealed to be correlated with
52
53 working night shifts. Regarding the many risk factors of chronic LBP among
54
55 ambulance nurses, one simple intervention measure alone may not be adequate⁴⁰. To
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 achieve the aim of decreasing chronic LBP in ambulance nurses, multi-component
5
6 comprehensive measures might be considered in the future.
7
8
9

10 11 Conclusions

12
13 This study suggests a relatively high prevalence of LBP among ambulance nurses.
14
15 Psychosocial factors, such as stress and fatigue, and ergonomic factors, such as the
16
17 frequent bending of the trunk and heavy or awkward lifting, played important roles in
18
19 the development of chronic LBP. Comprehensive intervention measures might be
20
21 the development of chronic LBP. Comprehensive intervention measures might be
22
23 needed in explorations of prevention methods.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 Contributors

32
33 HD designed the study, participated in the data collection, and drafted and revised
34
35 the manuscript. QZ participated in the design of the work, data collection, data
36
37 analysis, interpretation of findings and revising the manuscript. CZ and GL
38
39 contributed to data collection, interpretation of findings, and revisions. All authors
40
41 contributed to the paper revising and final approval of the version to be published.
42
43
44

45 Competing interests None declared.

46
47 Patient consent Obtained.

48 49 50 Ethics approval

51
52 The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Shouguang People's Hospital
53
54 (2016SD02011).
55
56

57 58 Data sharing statement

1
2
3
4 The raw data used in the study are not publicly available due to ethical restrictions
5
6 and privacy protection but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable
7
8 request.
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

References

1. Sterud T, Ekeberg O, Hem E. Health status in the ambulance services: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;6:82. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-6-82 [published Online First: 2006/07/05]
2. Broniecki M, Esterman A, May E, et al. Musculoskeletal disorder prevalence and risk factors in ambulance officers. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil* 2010;23(4):165-74. doi: 10.3233/bmr-2010-0265 [published Online First: 2010/11/17]
3. Sterud T, Hem E, Ekeberg O, et al. Health problems and help-seeking in a nationwide sample of operational Norwegian ambulance personnel. *BMC Public Health* 2008;8:3. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-8-3 [published Online First: 2008/01/08]
4. Xia T, Collie A. Work-related injury and illness in the Victorian healthcare sector: a retrospective analysis of workers. *Aust Health Rev* 2018 doi: 10.1071/ah18017 [published Online First: 2018/12/06]
5. Hansen CD, Rasmussen K, Kyed M, et al. Physical and psychosocial work environment factors and their association with health outcomes in Danish ambulance personnel - a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:534. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-534 [published Online First: 2012/07/25]
6. Roberts MH, Sim MR, Black O, et al. Occupational injury risk among ambulance officers and paramedics compared with other healthcare workers in Victoria, Australia: analysis of workers' compensation claims from 2003 to 2012. *Occup Environ Med* 2015;72(7):489-95. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2014-102574 [published Online First: 2015/03/18]
7. McDonald M, DiBonaventura M, Ullman S. Musculoskeletal pain in the workforce: the effects of back, arthritis, and fibromyalgia pain on quality of life and work productivity. *J Occup Environ Med* 2011;53(7):765-70. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e318222af81 [published Online First: 2011/06/21]
8. Rodgers LM. A five year study comparing early retirements on medical grounds in ambulance personnel with those in other groups of health service staff. Part II: Causes of retirements. *Occup Med (Lond)* 1998;48(2):119-32. [published Online First: 1998/06/06]
9. Coluci MZ, Alexandria NM. Job factors related to musculoskeletal symptoms among nursing personnel--a review. *Work* 2012;41 Suppl 1:2516-20. doi: 10.3233/wor-2012-0492-2516 [published Online First: 2012/02/10]

10. da Costa BR, Vieira ER. Risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders: A systematic review of recent longitudinal studies. *Am J Ind Med* 2010;53(3):285-323. doi: 10.1002/ajim.20750 [published Online First: 2009/09/16]
11. Ghaffari M, Alipour A, Farshad AA, et al. Effect of psychosocial factors on low back pain in industrial workers. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2008;58(5):341-7. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqn006 [published Online First: 2008/02/26]
12. Estryng-Behar M, van der Heijden B, Camerino D, et al. Violence risks in nursing--results from the European 'NEXT' Study. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2008;58(2):107-14. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqm142 [published Online First: 2008/01/24]
13. Kuorinka I, Jonsson B, Kilbom A, et al. Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of musculoskeletal symptoms. *Appl Ergon* 1987;18(3):233-7. [published Online First: 1987/09/01]
14. Hildebrandt VH, Bongers PM, van Dijk FJ, et al. Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire: description and basic qualities. *Ergonomics* 2001;44(12):1038-55. doi: 10.1080/00140130110087437 [published Online First: 2002/01/10]
15. Li J, Yang W, Liu P, et al. Psychometric evaluation of the Chinese (mainland) version of Job Content Questionnaire: a study in university hospitals. *Ind Health* 2004;42(2):260-7. [published Online First: 2004/05/07]
16. Yang L, Hildebrand V, Yu S, et al. The introduction of a musculoskeletal disorders questionnaire-the questionnaire attached. *Industrial health and occupational diseases* 2009;1:25-31.
17. Du WW, Wang S, Wang JX, et al. [The assessment of reliability and validity of musculoskeletal questionnaire]. *Zhonghua Lao Dong Wei Sheng Zhi Ye Bing Za Zhi* 2012;30(5):335-8. [published Online First: 2012/07/19]
18. Yu S, Lu ML, Gu G, et al. Musculoskeletal symptoms and associated risk factors in a large sample of Chinese workers in Henan province of China. *Am J Ind Med* 2012;55(3):281-93. doi: 10.1002/ajim.21037 [published Online First: 2011/11/30]
19. van Tulder M, Becker A, Bekkering T, et al. Chapter 3. European guidelines for the management of acute nonspecific low back pain in primary care. *Eur Spine J* 2006;15 Suppl 2:S169-91. doi: 10.1007/s00586-006-1071-2 [published Online First: 2006/03/22]
20. Alexopoulos EC, Burdorf A, Kalokerinou A. A comparative analysis on musculoskeletal disorders between Greek and Dutch nursing personnel. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2006;79(1):82-8. doi: 10.1007/s00420-005-0033-z [published Online First: 2005/09/01]
21. Sharma S, Shrestha N, Jensen MP. Pain-related factors associated with lost work days in nurses with low back pain: A cross-sectional study. *Scand J Pain* 2016;11:36-41. doi: 10.1016/j.sjpain.2015.11.007 [published Online First: 2016/04/01]
22. Feng CK, Chen ML, Mao IF. Prevalence of and risk factors for different measures of low back pain among female nursing aides in Taiwanese nursing homes. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007;8:52. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-8-52 [published Online First: 2007/06/27]
23. Sadeghian F, Hosseinzadeh S, Aliyari R. Do Psychological Factors Increase the Risk for Low Back Pain Among Nurses? A Comparing According to Cross-sectional and Prospective Analysis. *Saf Health Work* 2014;5(1):13-6. doi: 10.1016/j.shaw.2013.11.004 [published Online First: 2014/06/17]
24. Scott NA, Moga C, Harstall C. Managing low back pain in the primary care setting: the know-do

- gap. *Pain Res Manag* 2010;15(6):392-400. [published Online First: 2010/12/18]
25. European guidelines for the management of low back pain. *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl* 2002;73(305):20-5. [published Online First: 2003/01/28]
26. Punnett L, Pruss-Utun A, Nelson DI, et al. Estimating the global burden of low back pain attributable to combined occupational exposures. *Am J Ind Med* 2005;48(6):459-69. doi: 10.1002/ajim.20232 [published Online First: 2005/11/22]
27. Warming S, Precht DH, Suadicani P, et al. Musculoskeletal complaints among nurses related to patient handling tasks and psychosocial factors--based on logbook registrations. *Appl Ergon* 2009;40(4):569-76. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2008.04.021 [published Online First: 2008/09/16]
28. Jager M, Jordan C, Theilmeier A, et al. Lumbar-load analysis of manual patient-handling activities for biomechanical overload prevention among healthcare workers. *Ann Occup Hyg* 2013;57(4):528-44. doi: 10.1093/annhyg/mes088 [published Online First: 2012/12/21]
29. Sterud T, Tynes T. Work-related psychosocial and mechanical risk factors for low back pain: a 3-year follow-up study of the general working population in Norway. *Occup Environ Med* 2013;70(5):296-302. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2012-101116 [published Online First: 2013/01/17]
30. Hodder JN, MacKinnon SN, Ralhan A, et al. Effects of training and experience on patient transfer biomechanics. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 2010;40(3):282-88. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2010.01.007>
31. Huang GD, Feuerstein M, Sauter SL. Occupational stress and work-related upper extremity disorders: concepts and models. *Am J Ind Med* 2002;41(5):298-314. doi: 10.1002/ajim.10045 [published Online First: 2002/06/20]
32. Fernandes Rde C, Carvalho FM, Assuncao AA, et al. Interactions between physical and psychosocial demands of work associated to low back pain. *Rev Saude Publica* 2009;43(2):326-34. [published Online First: 2009/03/17]
33. Yip VY. New low back pain in nurses: work activities, work stress and sedentary lifestyle. *J Adv Nurs* 2004;46(4):430-40. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03009.x [published Online First: 2004/05/01]
34. Louw QA, Morris LD, Grimmer-Somers K. The prevalence of low back pain in Africa: a systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007;8:105. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-8-105 [published Online First: 2007/11/03]
35. Jones AY, Lee RY. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation and back injury in ambulance officers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2005;78(4):332-6. doi: 10.1007/s00420-004-0577-3 [published Online First: 2005/04/14]
36. From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Ambulance crash-related injuries among Emergency Medical Services workers--United States, 1991-2002. *JAMA* 2003;289(13):1628-9. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.13.1628 [published Online First: 2003/04/04]
37. Barker LM, Nussbaum MA. The effects of fatigue on performance in simulated nursing work. *Ergonomics* 2011;54(9):815-29. doi: 10.1080/00140139.2011.597878 [published Online First: 2011/08/23]
38. Choobineh A, Soltanzadeh A, Tabatabaee H, et al. Health effects associated with shift work in 12-hour shift schedule among Iranian petrochemical employees. *Int J Occup Saf Ergon* 2012;18(3):419-27. doi: 10.1080/10803548.2012.11076937 [published Online First: 2012/09/22]
39. Eriksen W, Bruusgaard D, Knardahl S. Work factors as predictors of intense or disabling low back

1
2
3 pain; a prospective study of nurses' aides. *Occup Environ Med* 2004;61(5):398-404.
4 [published Online First: 2004/04/20]
5

- 6 40. Tullar JM, Brewer S, Amick BC, 3rd, et al. Occupational safety and health interventions to reduce
7 musculoskeletal symptoms in the health care sector. *J Occup Rehabil* 2010;20(2):199-219. doi:
8 10.1007/s10926-010-9231-y [published Online First: 2010/03/12]
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

For peer review only

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
60STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-8
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8-9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9, results
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8-9
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6, 9
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	no
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	10-14

		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	10-11, tables
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	no
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	14
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	15-16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	16-19
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15-16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1, title page

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Low back pain in emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-029264.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Zhang, Qiong; Shouguang People's Hospital Dong, Hongyun; Shouguang People's Hospital Zhu, Chunji; Shouguang People's Hospital Liu, Guangzeng; Shouguang People's Hospital
Primary Subject Heading:	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Occupational and environmental medicine, Public health
Keywords:	low back pain, ambulance, nurse, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title page**Title**

Low back pain in emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study

Complete names (full first and last)

Qiong Zhang; Hongyun Dong; Chunji Zhu; Guangzeng Liu

The affiliation and address of all the authors

Shouguang People's Hospital. Shouguang People's Hospital, NO. 45 Jiankang Street, Shouguang, Weifang, Shandong Province, China. 262700

The e-mail address, and telephone number of the corresponding author

ayouwang@163.com , 8615006697150

Acknowledgements: None.

Competing interests statement: None declared.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

1
2
3
4 Low back pain in emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals in China and
5
6 its risk factors among ambulance nurses: a cross-sectional study
7
8
9
10

11 **Abstract**

12 **Objective**

13
14
15 Low back pain (LBP) could cause serious consequences and has been shown to be
16
17 prevalent among emergency ambulance workers. Studies on the prevalence of and
18
19 risk factors for LBP among emergency ambulance workers are scarce in China. The
20
21 study aimed to determine the prevalence of LBP among ambulance workers,
22
23 including doctors, nurses, and drivers, and to explore the risk factors for ambulance
24
25 nurses' chronic LBP (lasting for at least three months).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Design**

33
34 Cross-sectional study.
35
36

37 **Setting**

38
39 Emergency ambulance systems from 38 tertiary hospitals in Shandong, China were
40
41 selected by random cluster sampling.
42
43
44

45 **Participants**

46
47 A total of 1560 ambulance workers completed the study.
48
49

50 **Outcome measures**

51
52 A paper-based questionnaire that included the Nordic Musculoskeletal
53
54 Questionnaire, which evaluated LBP, the Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire,
55
56 which assessed ergonomic factors, and the Job Content Questionnaire, which assessed
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 stress, was used. Multivariate logistic regression analysis was conducted to quantify
5
6 the association of potential risk factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.
7
8

9 **Results**

10
11 The one-year prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days and three
12
13 months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1%, respectively, among 498 ambulance nurses;
14
15 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% among 519 doctors; and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% among
16
17 543 drivers. The factors contributing to chronic LBP among ambulance nurses were
18
19 the frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting, shift work, low job
20
21 satisfaction, high psychological fatigue, high psychological job demand, low job
22
23 control, low supervisor support, older age, female sex and obesity.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Conclusions**

31
32 LBP was more prevalent among ambulance nurses than among ambulance doctors
33
34 and drivers. Many factors, especially psychosocial and ergonomic factors, contributed
35
36 to ambulance nurses' chronic LBP. Comprehensive measures might be needed to
37
38 control LBP.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

47
48 This is the first large-scale study on the prevalence of low back pain (LBP) among
49
50 emergency ambulance workers and risk factors for ambulance nurses' LBP in China.
51
52

53
54 Various factors, including individual, psychosocial, ergonomic and organizational
55
56 factors, were collected and analysed in the study.
57

58
59 The cross-sectional design and subjective measures of the study limited the
60

1
2
3
4 establishment of causal directions.
5

6 Those subjects having left ambulance position due to LBP were not included in the
7
8 study, which might underestimate the prevalence of LBP and the extent of its risk
9
10 factors.
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 **Keywords**

18 low back pain; ambulance workers; nurse
19
20
21
22

23 24 25 **Introduction**

26
27
28
29
30 Emergency ambulance service, as an essential part of the healthcare system,
31
32 provides pre-hospital medical emergency service for patients, including carrying,
33
34 moving and transporting patients to an emergency centre and treating them in the
35
36 ambulance, such as performing cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Ambulance workers
37
38 have been reported to experience more musculoskeletal disorders than the general
39
40 workforce ¹⁻⁴. In Denmark, data from a nationwide study showed that a substantially
41
42 high proportion (42%) of 1689 ambulance personnel reported musculoskeletal pain,
43
44 which was significantly higher than corresponding reports from the core workforce of
45
46 14,175 individuals (29%) ⁵. In Australia, ambulance officers and paramedics had the
47
48 highest rates for musculoskeletal injury compared with other healthcare workers in
49
50 the 2003-2012 time period ⁶. Worldwide, attention has been paid to the
51
52 musculoskeletal disorders of ambulance workers over the last decade because of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 serious consequences, such as reduced quality of life, loss of working days,
5
6 occupational disability and the need to change and/or leave a profession ⁷. Due to
7
8 musculoskeletal disorders, especially low back pain (LBP), ambulance workers have
9
10 been reported to suffer from a higher standardized early retirement than other
11
12 healthcare providers and the general workforce ¹⁻⁸. In mainland China, scarce
13
14 attention has been paid to emergency ambulance workers, and no study thus far has
15
16 explored the prevalence of LBP among ambulance workers and their risk factors.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Studies ⁹⁻¹¹ have reported that many factors could contribute to LBP, including
26
27 individual, psychosocial, physical and organizational work factors. Psychosocial
28
29 factors, including low job support, job dissatisfaction, and occupational stress, and
30
31 individual factors, such as high BMI and being female, could contribute to
32
33 musculoskeletal disorders of the back region, as revealed by a systematic review with
34
35 strong evidence¹². However, regarding the LBP among a special occupational group,
36
37 the above factors do not have the same effects. Psychosocial factors at work, such as
38
39 stress, fatigue and job dissatisfaction, have been demonstrated to largely contribute to
40
41 the development of LBP in a follow-up study of 4500 Iranian industrial workers ¹³.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Emergency ambulance workers, especially nurses, are faced with demanding nursing
49
50 skills, rapid pace of work, episodes of violence, threats, increased risks of contracting
51
52 infectious diseases and increasing demands on medical competence ¹⁴⁻¹⁸. Therefore,
53
54 ambulance nurses may also suffer from LBP resulting from psychosocial factors, and
55
56 this effect is not well known. Besides, in mainland China, during the process of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 transporting patients to emergency center, most often, ambulance nurse needs to do
5
6 the lifting, sometimes with the help of ambulance doctor while ambulance driver is
7
8 only responsible for driving the ambulance vehicle, which might contribute to
9
10 prevalence variance of LBP among ambulance workers. The current study aimed to
11
12 evaluate the prevalence of LBP among ambulance workers in different work positions
13
14 and to determine and quantify the association between influencing factors, including
15
16 individual, physical and psychosocial factors, and chronic LBP (lasting for at least
17
18 three months) among ambulance nurses.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Methods**

28
29 A cross-sectional survey was implemented from September to November 2018.
30
31 The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Shouguang People's Hospital.
32
33 Informed consent was obtained before the participants were invited to participate.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Participants**

41
42 Given the prevalence of LBP, the number of independent variables in the logistic
43
44 regression and the response rate, 38 hospitals were selected first by random cluster
45
46 sampling from among all the tertiary hospitals (182 tertiary-level hospitals in total) in
47
48 Shandong, China. Then, of the selected 38 hospitals, all the emergency ambulance
49
50 workers who had at least one year of work experience in this job were invited to
51
52 participate in collaboration with the the management departments and the directors of
53
54 emergency departments. The exclusion criteria were as follows: part-time workers or
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 workers who had experienced trauma, injury, or serious diseases. A total of 1560
5
6 ambulance workers (498 nurses, 519 doctors and 543 drivers) completed our
7
8 questionnaire, and the response rate of the study was 90.8%.
9
10

11 12 13 14 Questionnaire

15
16 A self-administered questionnaire that included the Standardized Nordic
17
18 Musculoskeletal Questionnaire¹⁹, the Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire²⁰ and the
19
20 Job Content Questionnaire²¹, was revised after a pilot study. The paper-based
21
22 questionnaire consisted of four sections. Section one addresses demographic
23
24 information, including age, sex, height, weight, marital status, smoking, alcohol
25
26 consumption, educational level, marital status, the presence of the children at home
27
28 and exercise.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Section two was a modified version of the Standardized Nordic Musculoskeletal
36
37 Questionnaire. The participants were asked whether they had suffered from pain or
38
39 discomfort in the low back region lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days and three
40
41 months in the preceding twelve months. If a participant reported LBP lasting for at
42
43 least three months in the past twelve months, he or she was considered to have
44
45 chronic LBP²². The Chinese version of the Nordic questionnaire has been widely
46
47 used, validated and contextualized by previous national studies according to a
48
49 cross-cultural understanding of the Chinese population²³⁻²⁵.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Section three addresses work information and ergonomic factors mainly derived
59
60

1
2
3
4 from Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire²⁰, which has been systematically
5
6 translated into Chinese²³ and validated²⁴. Ergonomic factors, which were directly
7
8 selected from the Chinese version Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire, were
9
10 measured using a dichotomous scale (yes/no), and the assessment of risk factors was
11
12 qualitative in this study^{20,23}. Participants were asked whether they were often exposed
13
14 to the ergonomic risk factors during their work. Work information included work
15
16 position (doctor, nurse, or driver), shift work or day work, work experience and
17
18 employment status (permanent vs. temporary/contract).
19
20
21
22
23

24 Section four addresses psychosocial factors, including job satisfaction (high,
25
26 medium, low), self-perceived health status (very good, generally good, generally bad,
27
28 very bad), psychological fatigue (low, medium, high) and occupational stress assessed
29
30 by the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ), which has been widely used in different
31
32 groups of numerous studies and has shown good reliability and validity in the Chinese
33
34 working population²¹. In our study, 22 items of the original 49-item JCQ were
35
36 applied and consisted of three dimensions: psychological job demand (five items); job
37
38 control, including skill discretion (six items), decision-making authority (three items);
39
40 and workplace social support, including supervisor social support (four items) and
41
42 co-worker social support (four items). Each item was scored on a four-point Likert
43
44 scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”, with higher scores indicating
45
46 higher psychological job demand, job control and workplace social support. In this
47
48 study, Cronbach’s α coefficients for psychological job demand, job control and
49
50 workplace social support were 0.79, 0.87 and 0.90, respectively. The validity of the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Chinese version JCQ has been confirmed in previous Chinese studies ²¹.
5
6
7

8 9 Data analysis

10
11 The SPSS, version 18.0, was used to perform statistical analysis. A single-factor
12
13
14 chi-square test, independent t-test, or rank-sum test was used to examine the
15
16
17 differences between different groups of participants. The association of physical,
18
19 psychosocial, organizational and individual factors with chronic LBP (lasting for at
20
21
22 least three months) was first examined with univariate analysis. The significant
23
24
25 factors selected at the *p*-value of 0.25 in the univariate analysis were then entered into
26
27
28 multivariate logistic regression analysis. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence
29
30
31 intervals (95% CI) were calculated to evaluate the effect of risk factors on chronic
32
33
34 LBP. To avoid an inaccurate and unstable logistic regression model, the significant
35
36
37 variable 'work experience' in the univariate analysis was removed, and 'age' was kept
38
39
40 for the multivariate analysis, as it showed collinearity in relationships ($\rho > 0.6$)
41
42
43 diagnosed by Spearman correlation matrix. The statistics for variable entry and
44
45
46 removal were set at $P < 0.05$ and $P > 0.1$, respectively, in the multivariate analysis.
47
48
49 And the multivariate logistic regression analysis was also conducted separately in
50
51
52 ambulance doctors and drivers, in addition to ambulance nurses. A 0.05 statistical
53
54
55 significance level was set for all tests.

56 57 Patient and public involvement

58
59 No patients or members of the public were involved in the design or
60
implementation of the study. The results of the study were disseminated to the health

1
2
3
4 authorities and the selected 38 hospitals.
5
6
7

8 9 **Results**

10
11 All 1560 participants (498 ambulance nurses, 519 doctors and 543 drivers) were
12 included in the study, and with respect to the questionnaires that were not fully
13
14 included in the study, and with respect to the questionnaires that were not fully
15 completed, the participants were contacted again and completed them later.
16
17

18
19 Approximately 158 individuals (65 ambulance nurses, 49 doctors and 44 drivers)
20 failed to participate in the survey due to long leaves for vacation, sick leave, maternity
21
22 leave and personal affairs.
23
24

25
26 The mean age of the 498 ambulance nurses was 31.1 ± 7.6 years, which was
27 significantly younger than ambulance doctors (35.7 ± 6.9) and drivers (38.4 ± 9.5). Most
28
29 of the ambulance nurses were female, while most of the ambulance doctors and
30
31 drivers were male. Most nurses never smoked. Ambulance nurses had significantly
32
33 less work experience as an ambulance worker (8.3 ± 8.0 years) than did ambulance
34
35 doctors (12.8 ± 9.3 years) and drivers (14.5 ± 8.8 years). Ambulance nurses had an
36
37 educational level that was significantly higher than that of drivers and lower than that
38
39 of doctors, and the rank-sum test is shown in Table 1. Nurses exercised less than
40
41 doctors and drivers did in their leisure time (Table 1).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 The twelve-month prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days and
52
53 three months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1%, respectively, among ambulance nurses;
54
55 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8% among doctors; and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3% among
56
57
58
59
60 drivers. For more details, see Table 1.

Table 1 Characteristics of emergency ambulance workers in tertiary hospitals

	Nurses	Doctors	<i>P</i> ^a	Drivers	<i>P</i> ^b
Total number of subjects	498	519		543	
Age (years) ^c	31.1±7.6	35.7±6.9	<0.001*	38.4±9.5	<0.001*
Sex			<0.001†		<0.001†
Male	73 (14.7%)	396 (76.3%)		471 (86.7%)	
Female	425 (85.3%)	123 (23.7%)		72 (13.3%)	
BMI			0.009‡		<0.001‡
< 18.5 (Underweight)	43 (8.6%)	45 (8.7%)		21 (3.9%)	
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)	276 (55.4%)	249 (48.0%)		291 (53.6%)	
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	125 (25.1%)	129 (24.9%)		93 (17.1%)	
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	54 (10.8%)	96 (18.5%)		138 (25.4%)	
Marital status			<0.001†		<0.001†
Never married	75 (15.1%)	91 (17.5%)		32 (5.9%)	
Married/cohabiting	363 (72.9%)	402 (77.5%)		471 (86.7%)	
Divorced/separated/widowed	60 (12.0%)	26 (5.0%)		40 (7.4%)	
Smoking			<0.001†		<0.001†
Never smoked	485 (97.4%)	159 (30.6%)		75 (13.8%)	
Ex-smoker	10 (2.0%)	147 (28.3%)		111 (20.4%)	
Current smoker	3 (0.6%)	213 (41.0%)		357 (65.7%)	
Work experience as an ambulance worker (years) ^c	8.3±8.0	12.8±9.3	<0.001*	14.5±8.8	<0.001*
Educational level			<0.001‡		<0.001‡
Lower than junior college	111 (22.3%)	33 (6.4%)		539 (99.3%)	
Junior college	261 (52.4%)	96 (18.5%)		3 (0.6%)	
Bachelor	96 (19.3%)	258 (49.7%)		1 (0.2%)	
Master or above	30 (6.0%)	132 (25.4%)		0 (0.0%)	
Exercise in leisure time			<0.001‡		<0.001‡
Never/almost never	295 (59.2%)	198 (38.2%)		219 (40.3%)	
Sometimes	97 (19.5%)	185 (35.6%)		159 (29.3%)	
Often	106 (21.3%)	136 (26.2%)		165 (30.4%)	
LBP lasting for at least					
24 hours	429(86.1%)	366(70.5%)	<0.001†	312(57.5%)	<0.001†
7 days	252(50.6%)	189(36.4%)	<0.001†	129(23.8%)	<0.001†
3 months	105(21.1%)	82(15.8%)	0.030†	67(12.3%)	<0.001†

a: P value between ambulance nurses and doctors, b: P value between ambulance nurses and

drivers, c: mean± standard deviation; *t-test, †Chi-square test, ‡Rank-sum test.

Ambulance nurses who were older in age, were female, had higher BMI, performed shift work, and had worked longer as an ambulance worker and in temporary/contract employment seemed to suffer from chronic LBP more. Regarding ergonomic factors, walking for long periods of time, the frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting, bending or twisting the neck and maintaining shoulder abduction for long periods of time were all statistically associated with chronic LBP. For more details, see Table 2.

Table 2 Univariate analysis of individual and ergonomic factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Factors	Chronic LBP	Non-chronic-LBP	<i>P</i>
Number of subjects	105	393	
Age (years) ^a	36.5±7.7	29.7±6.7	<0.001*
Sex			0.022 [†]
Male	8	65	
Female	97	328	
BMI			<0.001 [‡]
< 18.5 (Underweight)	4	39	
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)	45	231	
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	29	96	
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	27	27	
Whether takes shift work?			<0.001 [†]
Yes (Shift work)	60	129	
No (Day work)	45	264	
Work experience as an ambulance worker (years) ^a	13.8±8.7	6.8±7.2	<0.001*
Employment status			0.014 [†]
Permanent	39	199	
Temporary/contract	66	194	
Ergonomic factors			
Walking for long periods of time (Yes/No)	54/51	154/239	0.024 [†]
Frequent bending of the trunk (Yes/No)	66/39	93/300	<0.001 [†]
Heavy or awkward lifting (Yes/No)	75/30	112/281	<0.001 [†]
Bending or twisting the neck (Yes/No)	39/66	97/296	0.011 [†]
Maintaining shoulder abduction for long periods of	48/57	136/257	0.036 [†]

time (Yes/No)

a: mean± standard deviation; *t-test, †Chi-square test, ‡Rank-sum test.

Regarding the psychosocial factors, scores on psychological job demand were positively associated with chronic LBP, while scores on skill discretion, decision-making authority, workplace supervisor support and co-worker support were negatively associated with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses. Univariate analysis also showed that self-perceived health status, job satisfaction and psychological fatigue were all associated with chronic LBP. For more details, see Table 3.

Table 3 Univariate analysis of psychosocial factors with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses.

Psychosocial factors	Chronic LBP	Non-chronic-LBP	<i>P</i>
Number of subjects	105	393	
Occupational stress			
Psychological job demand ^a	14.5±4.1	11.1±3.2	<0.001*
Decision-making authority ^a	5.8±3.8	8.1±2.5	<0.001*
Skill discretion ^a	11.7±5.3	16.2±4.6	<0.001*
Supervisor social support ^a	6.8±3.2	9.8±2.2	<0.001*
Coworker social support ^a	8.7±3.8	10.3±2.6	<0.001*
Health status self-perceived			0.043‡
Very good	19	89	
Generally good	25	109	
Generally bad	29	117	
Very bad	32	78	
Psychological fatigue			0.004‡
Low	27	127	
Medium	45	207	
High	33	59	
Job satisfaction			0.025‡
High	42	187	
Medium	33	144	
Low	30	62	

a: mean± standard deviation; *t-test, ‡Rank-sum test.

Multivariate logistic regression analysis revealed that age, sex, BMI, work shift,

frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting, psychological fatigue, job satisfaction, psychological job demand, skill discretion, decision-making authority and workplace supervisor support were independently associated with chronic LBP among ambulance nurses. For more details, see Table 4.

Table 4 Multivariate logistic regression analysis of chronic LBP risk factors among ambulance nurses.

Factors	B	SE	P	OR (95% C.I.)
Age (years)	0.912	0.453	0.023	2.489 (1.024-6.049)
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	0.891	0.381	0.017	2.438 (1.155-5.144)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0.641	0.546	0.513	0.527 (0.181-1.536)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0.439	0.263	0.329	1.551 (0.926-2.597)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1.638	0.313	<0.001	5.145 (2.786-9.502)
Whether takes shift work (1=shift work, 0=day work)	1.005	0.223	<0.001	2.732 (1.765-4.229)
Ergonomic factors				
Frequent bending of the trunk (1=yes, 0=no)	1.701	0.232	<0.001	5.479 (3.477-8.634)
Heavy or awkward lifting (1=yes, 0=no)	1.838	0.242	<0.001	6.284 (3.911-10.098)
Psychosocial factors				
Psychological fatigue				
Low				Reference
Medium	0.021	0.267	0.214	1.021 (0.605-1.723)
High	0.968	0.296	<0.001	2.633 (1.474-4.703)
Job satisfaction				
High				Reference
Medium	0.031	0.262	0.154	1.031 (0.617-1.724)
Low	0.768	0.279	<0.001	2.155 (1.248-3.724)
Occupational stress				
Psychological job demand	1.031	0.414	<0.001	2.804 (1.246-6.312)
Decision-making authority	-0.924	0.411	<0.001	0.397 (0.177-0.888)
Skill discretion	-0.973	0.402	<0.001	0.378 (0.172-0.831)
Supervisor social support	-1.213	0.393	<0.001	0.297 (0.138-0.642)

Multivariate logistic regression analysis also revealed that age, sex, BMI, frequent

bending of the trunk and psychological job demand were associated with chronic LBP among ambulance doctors and that age, BMI, sitting for long periods of time and psychological fatigue were associated with chronic LBP among ambulance drivers.

For more details, see Table 5.

Table 5 Multivariate logistic regression analysis of chronic LBP risk factors among ambulance doctors and among ambulance drivers.

Factors	B	SE	P	OR (95% C.I.)
For doctors' chronic LBP				
Age (years)	1.031	0.448	<0.001	2.804 (1.165-6.747)
Sex (1=female, 0=male)	0.502	0.253	0.034	1.652 (1.006-2.713)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0.537	0.512	0.427	0.584 (0.214-1.594)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0.556	0.309	0.141	1.744 (0.952-3.195)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1.571	0.322	<0.001	4.811 (2.560-9.044)
Ergonomic factors				
Frequent bending of the trunk (1=yes, 0=no)	1.313	0.352	<0.001	3.717 (1.865-7.411)
Psychosocial factors				
Occupational stress				
Psychological job demand	1.055	0.401	<0.001	2.872 (1.309-6.303)
For drivers' chronic LBP				
Age (years)	1.115	0.501	0.004	3.050 (1.142-8.141)
BMI				
18.5~23.9 (Normal weight)				Reference
< 18.5 (Underweight)	-0.722	0.473	0.643	0.486 (0.192-1.228)
24.0~27.9 (Overweight)	0.948	0.305	<0.001	2.581 (1.419-4.692)
≥ 28.0 (Obesity)	1.804	0.354	<0.001	6.074 (3.035-12.156)
Ergonomic factors				
Sitting for long periods of time (1=yes, 0=no)	1.936	0.315	<0.001	6.931 (3.738-12.851)
Psychosocial factors				
Psychological fatigue				
Low				Reference
Medium	0.557	0.275	0.002	1.745 (1.018-2.992)
High	1.011	0.311	<0.001	2.748 (1.494-5.056)

Discussion

In this study, we found that the twelve-month prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days, and three months was 86.1%, 50.6% and 21.1%, respectively, among ambulance nurses; 70.5%, 36.4% and 15.8%, respectively, among ambulance doctors; and 57.5%, 23.8% and 12.3%, respectively, among ambulance drivers. The risk factors that were found for the ambulance nurses' chronic LBP were ergonomic factors (frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or awkward lifting), occupational stress (high psychological job demand, low job control and low workplace supervisor support), high psychological fatigue, low job satisfaction, shift work and individual factors (age, sex, obesity).

In our study, the prevalence of LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, seven days, and three months among ambulance nurses was statistically higher than that among ambulance doctors and drivers. Regarding LBP lasting for at least 24 hours, the prevalence was higher among ambulance nurses than the general nursing personnel in Greece (75%)²⁶, Nepal (67%)²⁷, Chinese Taiwan (66.0%)²⁸ and other countries^{26 29 30}. Regarding chronic LBP (lasting for at least three months), the prevalence among ambulance nurses was higher than nursing personnel in the Netherlands (12%)²⁶, Greece (11%)²⁶, and Taiwan (8.6%)²⁸. Although measurement variance, cultural differences and differences in the perception of terminology may exist among the above mentioned studies, more attention should be paid to the ambulance nurses' LBP. As reported by the COST B13 Working Group on Guidelines for the Management of

1
2
3
4 Acute Low Back Pain in Primary Care, over 70% of people in industrialized countries
5
6 suffer from short-term or minor LBP at some point in their lives ^{22 31}, and most acute
7
8 LBP is a self-limiting symptom with a recovery rate of 90% within six weeks ^{22 32}.
9
10
11 Serious or chronic LBP was caused mainly by work and other factors. Therefore, we
12
13 analysed the risk factors of chronic LBP other than short-term LBP.
14
15

16
17 We found that ergonomic factors (the frequent bending of the trunk, heavy or
18
19 awkward lifting and sitting for long periods of time) were associated with chronic
20
21 LBP. In line with our study, a cross-sectional study ²⁸ in Taiwan found that certain
22
23 manual patient-transfer tasks played important roles in severe LBP (such as care
24
25 seeking, intense pain, and sick leave). Patient handling, as one of the main tasks of
26
27 nurses, could generate a severe biomechanical load on spinal parts of the body and
28
29 could impose compressive and shear forces on nurses' low spine ³³. In contrast to the
30
31 ergonomic factors for chronic LBP among ambulance doctors (frequent bending of
32
33 the trunk) and drivers (sitting for long periods of time) and in contrast to the findings
34
35 of a cohort study ³⁴ in Norway that showed that prolonged standing and awkward
36
37 lifting were important factors of the ergonomic factors for LBP, our study found the
38
39 frequent bending of the trunk and heavy or awkward lifting contributed to chronic
40
41 LBP, which again confirmed the above findings among ambulance nurses.
42
43

44
45 Musculoskeletal loads and injuries resulting from patient-handling tasks need to be
46
47 reduced and could be reduced by efficient and cost-effective ergonomic intervention
48
49 measures, including sharing LBP knowledge, transferring equipment, lifting teams
50
51 and training in safe patient-transfer techniques reported by previous studies³⁵.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Therefore, to prevent chronic LBP among ambulance nurses, ergonomic intervention
5
6
7 measures need to be taken.

8
9 Psychosocial factors are perceived feelings of the work environment that could
10
11 bring about psychological fatigue, job dissatisfaction and occupational stress ³⁶.
12
13 Firstly, our study found that psychological fatigue and job satisfaction were all
14
15 associated with chronic LBP, consistent with the findings of other studies ^{37 38} that
16
17 showed that employees dissatisfied with their work were more prone to complain of
18
19 back pain. High psychological fatigue could not only negatively affect one's physical
20
21 and mental work performance but also increase the possibility of medical errors and
22
23 worker injuries ³⁹⁻⁴². Secondly, our study found that occupational stressors, including
24
25 high psychological job demand, low job control and low supervisor support, were
26
27 independently associated with chronic LBP, consistent with the findings of other
28
29 studies ^{43 44}. A cohort study ³⁴ of the general working population in Norway showed
30
31 that psychosocial factors such as high psychological job demands and low job control
32
33 were reported as the most consistent and important predictors of LBP, in addition to
34
35 ergonomic factors. In a prospective study ⁴³, an increased risk of hospitalization due
36
37 to musculoskeletal disorders and an increased rate of musculoskeletal sickness were
38
39 reported to be associated with a lack of job control. In other studies ⁴⁴, poor job
40
41 content and low workplace social support were also shown to be risk factors for back
42
43 pain. Thirdly, in our study, workplace co-worker support was noted to be significantly
44
45 associated with chronic LBP in the univariate analysis but this association did not
46
47 remain in the multivariate logistic regression analysis, probably because the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 ambulance workers as a group, worked collaboratively, to some extent, and the factor
5
6 of co-worker support was not as significantly important as other psychological factors.
7
8
9 Emergency ambulance nursing work not only requires high-intensity physical activity,
10
11 but also demands professional skills and rapid responses in emergencies, which affect
12
13 individuals' social psychology. Therefore, negative psychosocial work factors also
14
15 need to be decreased to an acceptable level to control chronic LBP among ambulance
16
17
18
19
20 nurses.

21
22
23
24
25 We also found that age, sex, BMI and work shift (shift work vs. day work) were
26
27 associated with chronic LBP. Another cross-sectional study ⁴⁵ of 1203 Iranian
28
29 petrochemical employees also reported that musculoskeletal disorders were
30
31 statistically more prevalent in shift workers than in day workers. In a prospective
32
33 study ⁴⁶ of nurses' aides, LBP-related sick leaves were revealed to be correlated with
34
35 working night shifts. Regarding the many risk factors of chronic LBP among
36
37 ambulance nurses, one simple intervention measure alone may not be adequate ⁴⁷. To
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 The limitations of our study included the use of self-reported measures and
5
6 retrospective questionnaires. Therefore, it is inevitable to suffer from measurement
7
8 bias. The cross-sectional design of the study precluded causal conclusions, and a
9
10 prospective cohort study might be needed in the future. Some of the 158 subjects who
11
12 failed to participate in the study might suffer from LBP, and the subjects who had left
13
14 their ambulance position due to serious LBP were not included in the study. Therefore,
15
16 the prevalence of LBP and the extent of its risk factors might be underestimated
17
18 accordingly.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Conclusions

29
30 This study suggests a relatively higher prevalence of LBP among ambulance nurses
31
32 than ambulance doctors and drivers. Psychosocial factors, such as occupational stress
33
34 and psychological fatigue, and ergonomic factors, such as the frequent bending of the
35
36 trunk and heavy or awkward lifting, played important roles in the development of
37
38 chronic LBP. Comprehensive intervention measures, including ergonomic and
39
40 occupational health intervention measures, might be suggested for LBP prevention.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Contributors

49
50 HD designed the study, participated in the data collection, and drafted and revised
51
52 the manuscript. QZ participated in the design of the work, data collection, data
53
54 analysis, interpretation of findings and revising the manuscript. CZ and GL
55
56 contributed to data collection, interpretation of findings, and revisions. All authors
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 contributed to the paper revising and final approval of the version to be published.
5

6 Competing interests None declared.
7

8
9 Patient consent Obtained.
10

11 Ethics approval
12

13
14 The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Shouguang People's Hospital
15
16
17 (2016SD02011).
18

19 Data sharing statement
20

21
22 The raw data used in the study are not publicly available due to ethical restrictions
23
24 and privacy protection but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable
25
26
27 request.
28
29

30
31
32 References
33

- 34
35
36
37
38
39
40 1. Sterud T, Ekeberg O, Hem E. Health status in the ambulance services: a systematic review. *BMC*
41 *Health Serv Res* 2006;6:82. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-6-82 [published Online First:
42 2006/07/05]
43
44 2. Broniecki M, Esterman A, May E, et al. Musculoskeletal disorder prevalence and risk factors in
45 ambulance officers. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil* 2010;23(4):165-74. doi:
46 10.3233/bmr-2010-0265 [published Online First: 2010/11/17]
47
48 3. Sterud T, Hem E, Ekeberg O, et al. Health problems and help-seeking in a nationwide sample of
49 operational Norwegian ambulance personnel. *BMC Public Health* 2008;8:3. doi:
50 10.1186/1471-2458-8-3 [published Online First: 2008/01/08]
51
52 4. Xia T, Collie A. Work-related injury and illness in the Victorian healthcare sector: a retrospective
53 analysis of workers. *Aust Health Rev* 2018 doi: 10.1071/ah18017 [published Online First:
54 2018/12/06]
55
56 5. Hansen CD, Rasmussen K, Kyed M, et al. Physical and psychosocial work environment factors and
57 their association with health outcomes in Danish ambulance personnel - a cross-sectional
58 study. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:534. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-534 [published Online
59 First: 2012/07/25]
60

- 1
2
3 6. Roberts MH, Sim MR, Black O, et al. Occupational injury risk among ambulance officers and
4 paramedics compared with other healthcare workers in Victoria, Australia: analysis of
5 workers' compensation claims from 2003 to 2012. *Occup Environ Med* 2015;72(7):489-95.
6 doi: 10.1136/oemed-2014-102574 [published Online First: 2015/03/18]
7
- 8 7. McDonald M, DiBonaventura M, Ullman S. Musculoskeletal pain in the workforce: the effects of
9 back, arthritis, and fibromyalgia pain on quality of life and work productivity. *J Occup
10 Environ Med* 2011;53(7):765-70. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e318222af81 [published Online
11 First: 2011/06/21]
12
- 13 8. Hignett S, Griffiths P, Murdey ID, et al. Assessing management of musculoskeletal disorders in the
14 ambulance service. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2007;57(4):270-6. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqm007
15 [published Online First: 2007/03/06]
16
- 17 9. Shiri R, Falah-Hassani K, Heliovaara M, et al. Risk Factors for Low Back Pain: A Population-Based
18 Longitudinal Study. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2019;71(2):290-99. doi: 10.1002/acr.23710
19 [published Online First: 2018/07/26]
20
- 21 10. Stanislawska I, Mincewicz M, Cabak A, et al. Epidemiological Aspects of Low Back Pain. *Adv Exp
22 Med Biol* 2019 doi: 10.1007/5584_2019_383 [published Online First: 2019/05/06]
23
- 24 11. Vlaeyen JWS, Maher CG, Wiech K, et al. Low back pain. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* 2018;4(1):52. doi:
25 10.1038/s41572-018-0052-1 [published Online First: 2018/12/14]
26
- 27 12. da Costa BR, Vieira ER. Risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders: A systematic
28 review of recent longitudinal studies. *Am J Ind Med* 2010;53(3):285-323. doi:
29 10.1002/ajim.20750 [published Online First: 2009/09/16]
30
- 31 13. Ghaffari M, Alipour A, Farshad AA, et al. Effect of psychosocial factors on low back pain in
32 industrial workers. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2008;58(5):341-7. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqn006
33 [published Online First: 2008/02/26]
34
- 35 14. Coskun Cenk S. An analysis of the exposure to violence and burnout levels of ambulance staff.
36 *Turk J Emerg Med* 2019;19(1):21-25. doi: 10.1016/j.tjem.2018.09.002 [published Online First:
37 2019/02/23]
38
- 39 15. Durand AC, Bompard C, Sportiello J, et al. Stress and burnout among professionals working in the
40 emergency department in a French university hospital: Prevalence and associated factors.
41 *Work* 2019;63(1):57-67. doi: 10.3233/wor-192908 [published Online First: 2019/05/28]
42
- 43 16. Gorman VL. Future Emergency Nursing Workforce: What the Evidence Is Telling Us. *J Emerg
44 Nurs* 2019;45(2):132-36. doi: 10.1016/j.jen.2018.09.009 [published Online First: 2018/12/12]
45
- 46 17. Maguire BJ. Violence against ambulance personnel: a retrospective cohort study of national data
47 from Safe Work Australia. *Public Health Res Pract* 2018;28(1) doi: 10.17061/phrp28011805
48 [published Online First: 2018/03/28]
- 49 18. Maguire BJ, O'Meara P, O'Neill BJ, et al. Violence against emergency medical services personnel:
50 A systematic review of the literature. *Am J Ind Med* 2018;61(2):167-80. doi:
51 10.1002/ajim.22797 [published Online First: 2017/11/28]
52
- 53 19. Kuorinka I, Jonsson B, Kilbom A, et al. Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of
54 musculoskeletal symptoms. *Appl Ergon* 1987;18(3):233-7. [published Online First:
55 1987/09/01]
56
- 57 20. Hildebrandt VH, Bongers PM, van Dijk FJ, et al. Dutch Musculoskeletal Questionnaire: description
58 and basic qualities. *Ergonomics* 2001;44(12):1038-55. doi: 10.1080/00140130110087437
59 [published Online First: 2002/01/10]
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 21. Li J, Yang W, Liu P, et al. Psychometric evaluation of the Chinese (mainland) version of Job
- 5 Content Questionnaire: a study in university hospitals. *Ind Health* 2004;42(2):260-7.
- 6 [published Online First: 2004/05/07]
- 7
- 8 22. van Tulder M, Becker A, Bekkering T, et al. Chapter 3. European guidelines for the management of
- 9 acute nonspecific low back pain in primary care. *Eur Spine J* 2006;15 Suppl 2:S169-91. doi:
- 10 10.1007/s00586-006-1071-2 [published Online First: 2006/03/22]
- 11
- 12 23. Yang L, Hildebrand V, Yu S, et al. The introduction of a musculoskeletal disorders
- 13 questionnaire-the questionnaire attached. *Industrial health and occupational diseases*
- 14 2009;1:25-31.
- 15
- 16 24. Du WW, Wang S, Wang JX, et al. [The assessment of reliability and validity of musculoskeletal
- 17 questionnaire]. *Zhonghua Lao Dong Wei Sheng Zhi Ye Bing Za Zhi* 2012;30(5):335-8.
- 18 [published Online First: 2012/07/19]
- 19
- 20 25. Yu S, Lu ML, Gu G, et al. Musculoskeletal symptoms and associated risk factors in a large sample
- 21 of Chinese workers in Henan province of China. *Am J Ind Med* 2012;55(3):281-93. doi:
- 22 10.1002/ajim.21037 [published Online First: 2011/11/30]
- 23
- 24 26. Alexopoulos EC, Burdorf A, Kalokerinou A. A comparative analysis on musculoskeletal disorders
- 25 between Greek and Dutch nursing personnel. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2006;79(1):82-8.
- 26 doi: 10.1007/s00420-005-0033-z [published Online First: 2005/09/01]
- 27
- 28 27. Sharma S, Shrestha N, Jensen MP. Pain-related factors associated with lost work days in nurses
- 29 with low back pain: A cross-sectional study. *Scand J Pain* 2016;11:36-41. doi:
- 30 10.1016/j.sjpain.2015.11.007 [published Online First: 2016/04/01]
- 31
- 32 28. Feng CK, Chen ML, Mao IF. Prevalence of and risk factors for different measures of low back pain
- 33 among female nursing aides in Taiwanese nursing homes. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*
- 34 2007;8:52. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-8-52 [published Online First: 2007/06/27]
- 35
- 36 29. Coluci MZ, Alexandria NM. Job factors related to musculoskeletal symptoms among nursing
- 37 personnel--a review. *Work* 2012;41 Suppl 1:2516-20. doi: 10.3233/wor-2012-0492-2516
- 38 [published Online First: 2012/02/10]
- 39
- 40 30. Sadeghian F, Hosseinzadeh S, Aliyari R. Do Psychological Factors Increase the Risk for Low Back
- 41 Pain Among Nurses? A Comparing According to Cross-sectional and Prospective Analysis.
- 42 *Saf Health Work* 2014;5(1):13-6. doi: 10.1016/j.shaw.2013.11.004 [published Online First:
- 43 2014/06/17]
- 44
- 45 31. Scott NA, Moga C, Harstall C. Managing low back pain in the primary care setting: the know-do
- 46 gap. *Pain Res Manag* 2010;15(6):392-400. [published Online First: 2010/12/18]
- 47
- 48 32. European guidelines for the management of low back pain. *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl*
- 49 2002;73(305):20-5. [published Online First: 2003/01/28]
- 50
- 51 33. Jager M, Jordan C, Theilmeyer A, et al. Lumbar-load analysis of manual patient-handling activities
- 52 for biomechanical overload prevention among healthcare workers. *Ann Occup Hyg*
- 53 2013;57(4):528-44. doi: 10.1093/annhyg/mes088 [published Online First: 2012/12/21]
- 54
- 55 34. Sterud T, Tynes T. Work-related psychosocial and mechanical risk factors for low back pain: a
- 56 3-year follow-up study of the general working population in Norway. *Occup Environ Med*
- 57 2013;70(5):296-302. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2012-101116 [published Online First: 2013/01/17]
- 58
- 59 35. Hodder JN, MacKinnon SN, Ralhan A, et al. Effects of training and experience on patient transfer
- 60 biomechanics. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 2010;40(3):282-88. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2010.01.007>

- 1
2
3 36. Huang GD, Feuerstein M, Sauter SL. Occupational stress and work-related upper extremity
4 disorders: concepts and models. *Am J Ind Med* 2002;41(5):298-314. doi: 10.1002/ajim.10045
5 [published Online First: 2002/06/20]
6
7 37. Jones AY, Lee RY. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation and back injury in ambulance officers. *Int Arch*
8 *Occup Environ Health* 2005;78(4):332-6. doi: 10.1007/s00420-004-0577-3 [published Online
9 First: 2005/04/14]
10
11 38. From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Ambulance crash-related injuries among
12 Emergency Medical Services workers--United States, 1991-2002. *JAMA* 2003;289(13):1628-9.
13 doi: 10.1001/jama.289.13.1628 [published Online First: 2003/04/04]
14
15 39. Gander P, O'Keeffe K, Santos-Fernandez E, et al. Fatigue and nurses' work patterns: An online
16 questionnaire survey. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2019;98:67-74. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.06.011
17 [published Online First: 2019/07/19]
18
19 40. Hatch DJ, Freude G, Martus P, et al. Age, burnout and physical and psychological work ability
20 among nurses. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2018;68(4):246-54. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqy033
21 [published Online First: 2018/03/29]
22
23 41. Barker LM, Nussbaum MA. The effects of fatigue on performance in simulated nursing work.
24 *Ergonomics* 2011;54(9):815-29. doi: 10.1080/00140139.2011.597878 [published Online First:
25 2011/08/23]
26
27 42. Silva T, Araujo WN, Stival MM, et al. Musculoskeletal discomfort, work ability and fatigue in
28 nursing professionals working in a hospital environment. *Rev Esc Enferm USP*
29 2018;52:e03332. doi: 10.1590/s1980-220x2017022903332 [published Online First:
30 2018/06/14]
31
32 43. Yip VY. New low back pain in nurses: work activities, work stress and sedentary lifestyle. *J Adv*
33 *Nurs* 2004;46(4):430-40. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03009.x [published Online First:
34 2004/05/01]
35
36 44. Louw QA, Morris LD, Grimmer-Somers K. The prevalence of low back pain in Africa: a
37 systematic review. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007;8:105. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-8-105
38 [published Online First: 2007/11/03]
39
40 45. Choobineh A, Soltanzadeh A, Tabatabaee H, et al. Health effects associated with shift work in
41 12-hour shift schedule among Iranian petrochemical employees. *Int J Occup Saf Ergon*
42 2012;18(3):419-27. doi: 10.1080/10803548.2012.11076937 [published Online First:
43 2012/09/22]
44
45 46. Eriksen W, Bruusgaard D, Knardahl S. Work factors as predictors of intense or disabling low back
46 pain; a prospective study of nurses' aides. *Occup Environ Med* 2004;61(5):398-404.
47 [published Online First: 2004/04/20]
48
49 47. Tullar JM, Brewer S, Amick BC, 3rd, et al. Occupational safety and health interventions to reduce
50 musculoskeletal symptoms in the health care sector. *J Occup Rehabil* 2010;20(2):199-219. doi:
51 10.1007/s10926-010-9231-y [published Online First: 2010/03/12]
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
60STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-8
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8-9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	9, 10, results
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8-9
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	6, 10
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	6, 10
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	no
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	10-11
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	10
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	10-11
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	10-14

		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	10-11, tables
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	no
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	14, 15
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	16-17
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	19-20
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	16-20
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	19-20
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1, title page

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.