

## Work, a prognosis factor for upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders?

Alexis Descatha, Yves Roquelaure, Jean-François Chastang, Bradley Evanoff,  
Diane Cyr, Annette Leclerc

► **To cite this version:**

Alexis Descatha, Yves Roquelaure, Jean-François Chastang, Bradley Evanoff, Diane Cyr, et al.. Work, a prognosis factor for upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders?. *Occup Environ Med*, 2009, 66 (5), pp.351-2. <10.1136/oem.2008.042630>. <inserm-00390657>

**HAL Id: inserm-00390657**

**<http://www.hal.inserm.fr/inserm-00390657>**

Submitted on 2 Jun 2009

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Work, a prognosis factor for upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders?

Descatha Alexis<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Roquelaure Yves<sup>3</sup>, Chastang Jean-François<sup>2</sup>, Evanoff Bradley<sup>4</sup>, Cyr Diane<sup>2</sup>, Leclerc Annette<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Unité de pathologie professionnelle AP-HP, Hôpital Poincaré, Garches, F-92380,FR

<sup>2</sup> Santé publique et épidémiologie des déterminants professionnels et sociaux de la santé INSERM : U687, IFR69, Université Paris Sud - Paris XI, Université de Versailles-Saint Quentin en Yvelines, Hôpital Paul Brousse 16, av Paul Vaillant Couturier 94807 VILLEJUIF,FR

<sup>3</sup> LEEST, Laboratoire d'Ergonomie et d'Epidémiologie en Santé au Travail Université d'Angers, CHU Angers, IFR132, FR

<sup>4</sup> Division of General Medical Sciences Washington University School of Medicine, St Louis, MO 63110,US

\* Correspondence should be addressed to: Alexis Descatha <alexis.descatha@rpc.aphp.fr>

**Author Keywords** musculoskeletal diseases ; upper extremity ; work ; prognosis factor

Upper extremity musculoskeletal (UEMS) disorders are an important problem in industrial countries [1] There is strong evidence for an association between biomechanical exposures and UEMS disorders.[2–4] However, little is known about the occupational factors associated with recovery of these disorders.[5–7]

To determine if occupational factors were associated with the outcome in workers with UEMS symptoms or disorders, we used data from the repetitive task survey performed in 1993–1994 and again in 1996–1997. The design has been described in earlier publications. [8, 9] Each worker had a standardized medical examination at baseline and again in 1996–1997. The self-administered questionnaire filled out at baseline included personal variables, a psychological variable, postures and biomechanical constraints at work (self-assessed, but checked with the occupational physician), psychosocial work factors, and baseline severity of the disorders. Workers were also asked in 1996–1997 about changes in work tasks in the three year follow-up period.

Only workers with symptoms or UEMS disorders in 1993–1994 are considered here. Three categories of outcome in 1996–1997 were defined: no symptoms and no UEMS disorders, UEMS symptoms and no disorder, and one or more UEMS disorder diagnosed.

We analysed the 1993–1994 factors associated with outcomes (neither symptom nor disorder in 1996–1997 vs. symptoms only and vs. disorders), using multinomial non-ordinal logistic regression. Factors were included in the model if they reached a P level of 0.20 in bivariate analyses. If some prognosis factors were too strongly correlated, only the most appropriate one was included.

Of the initial 700 workers, 598 were followed completely during the 3-year period (85.4%). At baseline, 464 of them had UEMS symptoms or disorders and were included in this analysis (77.6% of the 598 workers). Most had a disorder (n=421, prevalence=70.4%), and only 43 had symptoms in isolation. No difference in outcome was found between those who reported their job as changed in the last three years (n=114) and those who declared that it had not (n=350, P>0.05). Factors associated with the three-year outcome in multivariate analyses were age, “work with force,” and pain intensity (adjusted for gender, presence of psychosomatic or depressive problem and presence of UEMS disorder diagnosed in 1993–1994, Table 1), with a stronger association for disorders than for symptoms only.

This study is one of the first to consider jointly occupational, personal, and pain factors associated with prognosis of UEMS symptoms or disorders, in a worker population performing highly repetitive tasks. Despite several limitations (no information on events during the years between examination, losses to follow-up, subjective self-assessment of risk factors, definition of UEMS disorders based on clinical examination), these results were consistent with the few existing studies on prognosis: older age is known to be related with a poor prognosis. [10–12] So are pain intensity and duration at baseline,[5,7,12–14] and presence of disorders at baseline.[10,15] The role of occupational factors in prognosis is still debated: some investigators have found that physical work factors are not associated with prognosis, [11,16] whereas others reported that they are.[5,7,17] Job control and satisfaction at work were not associated with outcome in our study.

In conclusion, we found that work with force was associated with a poorer prognosis, as were age and pain intensity at baseline. Further studies, however, are needed to clarify the role of personal and work-related factors in determining the prognosis of UEMS disorders in working populations.

## Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to the members of the Study Group on Repetitive Work who were involved in this survey, as well as to the occupational physicians who collected the data and made the physical examinations.

We thank Lawrence J Fine for his contribution to the preparation of the questionnaire in 1992.

## Footnotes:

## STUDY DESIGN: occupational cohort study

### References:

- 1. Buckle P , Devereux JJ Work-related neck and upper limb musculoskeletal disorders. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. 1999;
- 2. Hagberg M , Silverstein BA , Wells R Work related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs). A reference book for prevention. Bristol Taylor and Francis; 1995;
- 3. Roquelaure Y , Mariel J , Fanello S Active epidemiological surveillance of musculoskeletal disorders in a shoe factory. *Occup Environ Med.* 2002; 59: 452- 8
- 4. Bernard BP Musculoskeletal disorders and workplace factors: a critical review of epidemiologic evidence for work-related musculoskeletal disorders of the neck, the upper-limb, and low back. 1997; 97- 141
- 5. Cole DC , Hudak PL Prognosis of nonspecific work-related musculoskeletal disorders of the neck and upper extremity. *Am J Ind Med.* 1996; 29: 657- 68
- 6. Hagberg M Clinical assessment, prognosis and return to work with reference to work related neck and upper limb disorders. *G Ital Med Lav Ergon.* 2005; 27: 51- 7
- 7. Kuijpers T , van der Windt DA , van der Heijden GJ A prediction rule for shoulder pain related sick leave: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2006; 7: 97-
- 8. Leclerc A , Landre MF , Chastang JF Upper-limb disorders in repetitive work. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 2001; 27: 268- 78
- 9. Descatha A , Roquelaure Y , Evanoff B Do workers with self- reported symptoms have an elevated risk of developing upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders three year later? . *Occup Environ Med.* 2008; 65: 205- 7
- 10. Cassou B , Derriennic F , Monfort C Chronic neck and shoulder pain, age, and working conditions: longitudinal results from a large random sample in France. *Occup Environ Med.* 2002; 59: 537- 44
- 11. Bonde JP , Mikkelsen S , Andersen JH Prognosis of shoulder tendonitis in repetitive work: a follow up study in a cohort of Danish industrial and service workers. *Occup Environ Med.* 2003; 60: E8-
- 12. Kuijpers T , van der Windt DA , van der Heijden GJ Systematic review of prognostic cohort studies on shoulder disorders. *Pain.* 2004; 109: 420- 31
- 13. Feuerstein M , Huang GD , Hauffer AJ Development of a screen for predicting clinical outcomes in patients with work-related upper extremity disorders. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2000; 42: 749- 61
- 14. Lotters F , Burdorf A Prognostic factors for duration of sickness absence due to musculoskeletal disorders. *Clin J Pain.* 2006; 22: 212- 21
- 15. Burdorf A , Naaktgeboren B , Post W Prognostic factors for musculoskeletal sickness absence and return to work among welders and metal workers. *Occup Environ Med.* 1998; 55: 490- 5
- 16. Lassen CF , Mikkelsen S , Kryger AI Risk factors for persistent elbow, forearm and hand pain among computer workers. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 2005; 31: 122- 31
- 17. Silverstein B , Fine L , Stetson D Hand-wrist disorders among investment casting plant workers. *J Hand Surg [Am].* 1987; 12: 838- 44

**Table 1**

Multivariate analysis based on multinomial logistic model between the three-year outcome and the baseline variables (reference = workers with no symptom and no UEMS disorders in 1996–1997)

		Presence of UEMS symptoms alone in 1996–1997 (n=43)	Presence of at least one UEMS disorder in 1996–1997 (n=421)	p=*
		OR [95% CI]	OR [95% CI]	
<b>Gender</b>	Men	1	1	0,08
	Women	0,68 (0,27–1,72)	1,52 (0,80–2,86)	
<b>Age</b>	<30 years	1	1	0,02
	30–45 years	1,35 (0,48–3,82)	2,86 (1,42–5,73)	
	>45 years	1,45 (0,37–5,67)	3,31 (1,32–8,29)	
<b>Presence of psychosomatic or depressive problems</b>	No	1	1	0,12
	Yes	1,47 (0,27–7,95)	3,02 (0,89–10,23)	
<b>“Work with force”</b>	No	1	1	0,02
	Yes	1,92 (0,78–4,76)	2,31 (1,27–4,21)	
<b>Pain intensity in 1993–1994</b>	No strong pain	1	1	0,003
	Strong and unbearable pain	2,70 (1,05–5,00)	2,76 (1,52–6,91)	
<b>UEMS disorder in 1993–94</b>	No	1	1	0,01
	Yes	0,53 (0,17–1,63)	2,09 (0,89–4,93)	

The multiple UEMS disorders and duration of pain highly associated with pain intensity, were not included in the model.

\* difference between the outcomes and the reference group (Wald Chi<sup>2</sup> test).