



Prevalence of Body Area Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders among Healthcare Professionals: A Systematic Review

Julien Jacquier-Bret * D and Philippe Gorce

International Institute of Biomechanics and Occupational Ergonomics, Université de Toulon, CS60584, CEDEX 9, 83041 Toulon, France

* Correspondence: jacquier@univ-tln.fr

Abstract: Healthcare professionals perform daily activities that can lead to musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs). The objective of this review was to summarize these MSDs by body areas in relation to healthcare professions. The underlying question is, worldwide, whether there are areas that are more exposed depending on the occupation or whether there are common areas that are highly exposed to MSDs. This issue has been extended to risk factors and responses to reduce MSDs. The review was conducted according to the PRISMA guidelines between February and May 2022. Google scholar and Science Direct databases were scanned to identify relevant studies. Two authors independently reviewed, critically appraised, and extracted data from these studies. Overall and body area prevalence, risk factors, and responses to MSDs were synthetized by occupational activity. Among the 21,766 records identified, 36 covering six healthcare professions were included. The lower back, neck, shoulder and hand/wrist were the most exposed areas for all healthcare professionals. Surgeons and dentists presented the highest prevalence of lower back (>60%), shoulder and upper extremity (35-55%) MSDs. The highest prevalence of MSDs in the lower limbs was found for nurses (>25%). The main causes reported for all healthcare professionals were maintenance and repetition of awkward postures, and the main responses were to modify these postures. Trends by continent seem to emerge regarding the prevalence of MSDs by healthcare profession. Africa and Europe showed prevalence three times higher than Asia and America for lower back MSDs among physiotherapists. African and Asian nurses presented rates three times higher for elbow MSDs than Oceanians. It becomes necessary to objectively evaluate postures and their level of risk using ergonomic tools, as well as to adapt the work environment to reduce exposure to MSDs with regard to the specificities of each profession.

Keywords: musculoskeletal disorders; prevalence; body area; health professionals; nurses; dentists; physiotherapists; osteopaths; surgeons; midwives; risk factors; response and treatment; worldwide analysis

1. Introduction

Musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) are very common among healthcare professionals. The prevalence of MSDs among several healthcare professions was investigated. Prevalence of over 80% has been reported among physiotherapists [1], masseurs [2], nurses [3], midwives [4], dentists [5] and surgeons [6]. The high exposure to MSDs is directly related to their practice, which requires varied tasks and a high physical load. Numerous studies have highlighted the use of repeated awkward postures that are often static, particularly among surgeons [7] and physiotherapists [8].

Patient handling or transfers have also been observed in nurses [9] and physiotherapists [10]. Accuracy is also a factor in the origin of MSDs, as has been shown in dentists [11] and surgeons [12].

Understanding the mechanisms that lead to the appearance of MSDs requires knowledge of the most exposed body areas. A large number of studies have reported that



Citation: Jacquier-Bret, J.; Gorce, P. Prevalence of Body Area Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders among Healthcare Professionals: A Systematic Review. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2023, 20, 841. https://doi.org/10.3390/ ijerph20010841

Academic Editor: Paul B. Tchounwou

Received: 28 October 2022 Revised: 27 December 2022 Accepted: 27 December 2022 Published: 2 January 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). the lower back was a highly exposed area in physiotherapists [13], nurses [14], and surgeons [15]. Neck and shoulder have also been reported as exposed areas in healthcare professionals [8,16–19]. More specific studies, such as on the thumbs of masseurs [20,21], have also been carried out to evaluate the prevalence of MSDs. Risk factors and responses/treatment implemented to reduce symptoms have also been used to further study MSDs in healthcare professionals. Muaidi and Shanb [22] reported this information for physiotherapists, Tinubu et al. [23] for nurses, and Mohseni-Bandpei et al. [24] for surgeons.

In the literature, studies have presented syntheses through reviews that essentially reported the prevalence of MSDs in a given occupation, such as the work of Vieira et al. on physiotherapists [25], Saberipour et al. on nurses [26], and Epstein et al. on surgeons [27]. These reviews make it possible to draw conclusions about the measures to be implemented to reduce the impact of MSDs. These works were carried out either for a limited number of zones, a single country or by occupation. However, due to the importance of the MSD issue for health professionals, it would be interesting to summarize the prevalence by body area, including all health professions for which information is available worldwide. This review would provide a global view to better understand the MSD issue by taking into account healthcare professions and if there could be a trend induced by the continents in which the work has been carried out. The objective was to describe the prevalence of MSD for different body areas in different health professions and to assess potential differences. The underlying questions were: (1) Are there specific zones for each profession, or are there common zones that are highly exposed to MSDs? (2) Are there specific factors of risk and response to MSDs in relation to each occupational activity?

2. Materials and Methods

This study was reported according to PRISMA guidelines for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses [28]. It was conducted between February 2022 and May 2022.

2.1. Search Strategy and Eligibility Criteria

The search strategy was applied to Science Direct and Google Scholar databases. The following keywords were used: "Musculoskeletal disorders" AND "Healthcare professional" AND "Body area". The search focused exclusively on English language peerreviewed works that quantified the MSD prevalence by body area in healthcare professionals. The search was limited to articles published between 2000 and 2022. Reviews, systematic reviews, commentaries, case studies and case series were not retained. Articles were included if they were original research that studied the prevalence of work-related MSDs among healthcare professionals without any restriction. The search focused on work that addressed the prevalence of MSDs by body area (neck, back, upper and lower limbs). Studies were excluded if they:

- were not published in English,
- were not about healthcare professionals,
- mixed healthcare professions without the possibility of distinguishing between them,
- provided insufficient work-related MSD details,
- provided insufficient data about sampling,
- excluded or focused on only a limited number of body areas.

Results were imported from both databases and compiled to remove duplicates. Two reviewers (PG and JJB) separately screened all titles and abstracts of unique records for eligibility. Full-text manuscripts of all relevant titles/abstracts were obtained, and the relevance of each study was assessed according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria by the two reviewers separately. Studies that did not meet the criteria were excluded. All discrepancies were resolved by consensus and re-review of the articles.

2.2. Methodological Quality Assessment and Risk of Bias

The quality of the included articles was assessed independently by two reviewers using the modified CONSORT 2010 checklist (Table A1) [29]. The presence of each item (where

applicable) was checked, and the evaluation obtained by each reviewer was compared. The discrepancies were discussed for the final evaluation, involving a third reviewer where necessary. The quality appraisal was obtained using McFarland and Fischer [30] classification:

- at least 85% of the checklist items are high-quality articles,
- less than 50% of the checklist items are low-quality articles,
- otherwise, they are considered of medium quality.

2.3. Data Extraction

The following data were extracted from the included articles: number of participants, healthcare profession, response rate (survey), male and female distribution, age, country, overall MSD prevalence and MSD prevalence by body area. Any element related to work-related MSDs such as risk factors, their impact on work habits or the strategies used to respond to and treat them were also considered. Based on the information collected in each study, a synthesis was proposed by healthcare profession.

3. Results

3.1. Search Results

The searches identified 21,766 records. After duplicates were removed, 21,732 articles remained, and 21,610 were excluded from the title/abstract screening. Among the 122 remaining articles, 86 were excluded after full reading because either the data were mixed and did not meet the objective or the parameters studied were insufficient. Thirty-six articles were finally included in the present review. The search process is shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Chart.

3.2. Quality Appraisal

The quality appraisal of the 36 included articles revealed that 34 studies were of average quality (percentage of items present between 50 and 85%). The studies by Glover

High Quality Medium Quality Low Ouality Attar [31] Adams et al. [32] Adegoke et al. [33] Glover et al. [8] Alrowayeh et al. [34] Anap et al. [9] Anyfantis and Biska [35] Anton et al. [5] Asghari et al. [36] Ayers et al. [37] Campo et al. [38] Choobineh et al. [39] Chung et al. [10] Cromie et al. [17] Hayes et al. [40] Jang et al. [41] Kee and Seo [18] Khan and Yee Chew [42] Kierklo et al. [43] Knudsen et al. [44] Leggat and Smith [45] Liang et al. [6] McLeod et al. [46] Muaidi and Shanb [22] Munabi et al. [3] Okuyucu et al. [4] Okuyucu et al. [47] Pugh et al. [48] Rabiei et al. [49] Ribeiro et al. [50] Smith et al. [51] Szeto et al. [52] Szymańska [53] Tinubu et al. [23] Vieira et al. [54] Yeung et al. [55]

Table 1. Quality appraisal of the included studies according to the modified CONSORT 2010 checklist.

et al. [8] and Attar [31] were considered of high quality with 87% and 89% of items present,

3.3. Study Characteristics

respectively (Table 1).

All included articles were surveys based on questionnaires about healthcare professionals. Among the 36 included studies, six healthcare professions were identified. Professionals were dentists or dentist hygienists (8 studies), midwives (2 studies), nurses (11 studies), osteopaths (1 study), physiotherapists or physical therapists (10 studies), and surgeons (4 studies). Subjects were generally male or female aged between 20 and 55 years. Three studies focused on nurses were conducted with only females [18,51,55]. Two studies did not provide information about gender [5,9]. The samples in the different studies were heterogeneous, ranging from 32 surgeons [44] to 2688 physiotherapists [8].

The selected studies covered a wide range of countries from different continents. Participants mainly came from public, private and university hospitals.

Table 2 summarizes the objectives, the health profession and the general population characteristics, and the prevalence of MSD by body area of the 36 included studies. Ten areas were identified. Neck and shoulder MSDs were addressed in all 36 of the included studies. All studies also evaluated back MSD prevalence. However, the descriptions differed between studies. Most of them focused on the lower back (31 studies). Information about the upper back (27 studies) or the mid back (8 studies) was also available in several studies. Elbow/forearm and wrist/hand/finger areas were assessed in 34 studies, and the lower limb joints, i.e., hips/thighs, knees, and ankles/feet were covered in 32 studies.

Table 2. Objectives and characteristics of the 36 included studies by healthcare profession. MSD prevalence by body area was reported for each study (when available).

												Studied Para	meters				
						Preva-						Main Body	Area				
Autors	Objective		Study D	letails		lence	Neck	Upper Back	Mid Back	Lower Back	Shou- lders	Elbows/ Fore- arms	Wrists/ Hands/ Fingers	Hips/ Thighs	Knees	Ankles/ Feet	Whole Body
Adegoke	Investiagtion of MSD	Population	Physiotherapists	Male/female	63.5%/36.5%												
et al., 2008	and treatment among	N-participant	120	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	33.7 ± 6.8		31.1%	14.3%	-	69.8%	22.2%	5.6%	20.6%	6.3%	15.9%	9.5%	-
[33]	physiotherapists	Response rate	58%	Country	Nigeria												
Alrowayeh	Investigation of MSD	Population	Physical therapists	Male/female	53%/47%		20.20/	10.00/		22.09/	10 (0)	0.70/	10.00/	2.2%	10.00/	< 10/	
et al., 2010	prevalence among physical therapists in	N-participant	212	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	36.5 ± 9.1		20.2%	19.0%		32.0%	12.6%	3.7%	10.8%	3.3%	10.8%	6.1%	
[04]	the State of Kuwait	Response rate	63%	Country	State of Kuwait												
Anyfantis	Investiagtion of MSD	Population	Physical therapists	Male/female	52.4%/47.6%		41 20/	40.89/	_	62.0%	10 60/	26 59/	42 29/	27.00/	42.0%	22.20/	_
et al., 2017 [35]	factors among Greek	N-participant	252	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	42.18 ± 9.21		41.570	49.070		02.978	40.070	30.378	40.070	57.070	42.970	55.578	
	physiotherapists	Response rate	79.00%	Country	Greece												
Campo	Investigation of 1-year MSD prevalence and	Population	Physical therapists	Male/female	28.8%/71.2%		4 9%	2 4%	_	6.6%	3.7%	1.4%	5 3%	2.3%	2 1%	2.2%	20.7%
et al., 2008 [38]	effects of risk factors in	N-participant	881	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	40.3		4.970	2.470		0.070	5.270	1.1/0	5.576	2.370	2.170	2.270	20.7 /0
	United States	Response rate	67.00%	Country	United States												
Chung	Investiagtion of MSD prevalence, risk factors,	Population	Physiotherapists	Male/female	52.9%/47.1%		20 50/		50 50/		15.00/	15.00/	F 00/	22.0%	F (0)	0.00/	22.29/
et al. 2013 [10]	and treatment among Korean physical	N-participant	157	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	29.45 ± 4.14		28.7%	-	53.5%	-	15.9%	45.2%	7.0%	33.8%	7.6%	8.9%	22.3%
	therapists	Response rate	67.10%	Country	Korea												
Cromie	Investiagtion of MSDs prevalence_specialty	Population	Physiotherapists	Male/female	22%/78%	12	17 6%	-	62 5%	-	/11%	22.0%	13.7%	21 80%	33 60%	7 3%	11 7%
et al. 2000 [17]	areas, risk factors, and treatment among	N-participant	536	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	38	month	47.070		02.378		41/0	22.9 /0	13.270	21.00 /0	33.00 /8	7.370	11.2/0
	Australian therapists	Response rate	68%	Country	Australia												
Glover et al. 2005	Investiagtion of MSDs prevalence among physiotherapists,	Population	Physiotherapists	Male/female	14%/86%	12 months	25.7%	-	37.2%	-	18.4%	14.8%	5.5%	13%	17.80%	4.8%	7.8%
[8]	physiotherapy assistants and	N-participant	2688	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	39.50 ± 12.07												
	in the UK	Response rate	73%	Country	UK	Career	33%	-	48%	-	23%	20%	8%	17%	23.00%	6%	10%

											:	Studied Para	ameters				
	Objection		C11	h- D-(-1)-								Main Body	v Area				
Autors	Objective		Stud	ly Details		Prevalence	Neck	Upper Back	Mid Back	Lower Back	Shou- lders	Elbows/ Fore- arms	Wrists/ Hands/ Fingers	Hips/ Thighs	Knees	Ankles/ Feet	Whole Body
lang et al.	Investigation of 12-month MSD	Population	Massage therapists	Male/female	68.9%/31.1%												
2006 [41]	prevalence and risk factors among massage	N-participant	161	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	37.7 ± 10.7	12 months	25.5%	-	19.3%	11.2%	19.3%	31.7%	23.6%	28.60%	50.30%	6.8%	13%
	practitioners in Taiwan	Response rate	82%	Country	Taiwan												
Muaidi	Investigation of MSD prevalence, causes, and	Population	Physioth- erapists	Male/female	59.1%/40.9%	10 11	06 50	_	46 50/	_	0.000	12.0%	10.0%	16 400/	20.100/	00/	10.00/
et al. 2016 [22]	impact among physical therapists in the	N-participant	690	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	-	12 months	26.5%		46.5%		2.9%	12.2%	10.2%	16.40%	20.10%	8%	10.9%
	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	Response rate	69%	Country	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia												
Vieira et al. 2015	Investigation of MSD rates and characteritics among physical	4SD ritics Population d 19 to N-participant tates Response rate	Physioth- erapists	Male/female	32%/68%	12 months	61%	-	66%	-	35%	42%	15%	36%	-	23%	36%
[54]	therapists according to their specialty and setting in United States	N-participant	122	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	43 ± 12												
	setting in United States	Response rate	n/a	Country	United States												
Anap	Investigation of MSD prevalence, job risk	Population	Nurses	Male/female	n/a	10 1	01 10/	10 50/		40.0%	24 (9)	1.00/		1.60/	20.0%	F (0)	01.00/
et al., 2013 [9]	factors, and treatment among hospital nurses	N-participant	228	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	31.4	12 months	31.1%	10.5%	-	48.2%	34.6%	1.9%	-	1.6%	29.0%	7.6%	81.0%
	in India.	Response rate	89.10%	Country	India												
Asghari	Investigation of MSD	Population	Nurses	Male/female	19.7%/80.3%	12 months	44.09/	22.20/	-	61.09/	22.20/	10.0%	21 20/	22 00/	60 E9/	EE 00/	02 59/
[36]	factors among operator	N-participant	144	mean \pm SD)	34.6 ± 6.6	12 monuns	44.9%	33.270		01.9%	33.3 %	19.0%	51.5%	23.0 %	60.3%	33.0 %	92.3%
	room nurses in Iran	Response rate	100%	Country	Iran												
Attar et al.,	Investigation of MSD frequency and risk	Population	Nurses	Male/female	4.5%/95.5%	12 months	20.0%	_	5.0%	65 70/	20.0%	2.0%	10.0%	16 5%	21.0%	/1 5 9/	_
2014 [31]	factors among nursing personnel in Saudi	N-participant	200	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	34.9 ± 8.1	12 monuns	20.0 %		5.0%	03.7 %	29.0 %	3.0%	10.0 %	10.3 /0	21.0 %	41.5%	
	Arabia	Response rate	100.00%	Country	Saudi Arabia												
Choobineh	Investigation of MSD prevalence and relationship between	Population	Nurses	Male/female	15.3%/84.7%	12 months	26 19/	16 19/	_	54.0%	20.8%	17 0%	20.2%	20.2%	18 10/	52 1%	_
[39]	neh prevalence and relationship between perceived demands and reported MSDs among	N-participant	641	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	32.03 ± 8.02	12 monuls	JU. 1 /0	10.1 /0		JT.7 /0	37.070	17.970	07.070	27.370	10.1 /0	JZ.1 /0	
	hospital nurses in Iran	Response rate	100%	Country	Iran												
Kee and	Investigation of MSD	Population	Nurses	Male/female	0%/100%	12 months	17.3%	12.9%	-	23.4%	27.2%	7.4%	21.6%	9.9%	24.7%	17.3%	56.8%
Sao, 2007	prevalence based on intensity among Korean	N-participant	162	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	29.9 ± 6.3	12 months - Moderate	15.4%	10.5%	-	20.4%	25.3%	6.2%	17.9%	8.6%	22.8%	15.4%	53.7%
L1	nurses	Response rate	100%	Country	Korea	12 months - High	10.5%	4.9%	-	9.9%	17.3%	4.3%	11.7%	5.6%	15.4%	11.1%	45.7%

												Studied Para	ameters				
			61.1			Preva-						Main Body	v Area				
Autors	Objective		Study	Details		lence	Neck	Upper Back	Mid Back	Lower Back	Shou- lders	Elbows/ Fore- arms	Wrists/ Hands/ Fingers	Hips/ Thighs	Knees	Ankles/ Feet	Whole Body
Munabi	Investiagtion of MSD prevalence and risk	Population	Nurses	Male/female	14.3%/85.7%	12	2(00)	25.00/		(1.00)	22 (0)	1 = 40/	20.10/	25.00/	05.10/	20.10/	00.00/
et al., 2014 [3]	factors among nursing	N-participant	741	Age (year, mean + SD)	35.4 ± 10.7	months	36.9%	35.8%	-	61.9%	32.6%	15.4%	29.1%	27.9%	37.1%	38.1%	80.8%
	Uganda	Response rate	85.40%	Country	Uganda												
Pugh et al.,	Investigation of MSD severity from	Population	Nurses	Male/female	12%/88%	12 months	35.5%	11.3%	-	53.2%	32.3%	3.2%	16.1%	9.7%	17.7%	11.3%	-
2020 [48]	pre-registration to 12-month registered	N-participant	111	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	29.7 ± 11.2												
	nurses in Australia	Response rate	100%	Country	Australia	Career	44.0%	17.0%	-	63.0%	30.0%	7.0%	21.0%	12.0%	18.0%	28.0%	-
Ribeiro	Investigation of MSD nurses' self-reported	Population	Nurses	Male/female	16%/84%	12	50.1%	40.9%	_	62 1%	27 8%	7 2%	28 19/	Q 00/	25.2%	26 19/	_
[50]	., 2016 symptoms and risk 50] factors in primary health care	N-participant	409	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	39.5 ± 8.8	months	30.176	40.9 /0		03.1 /0	57.070	7.2/0	20.470	0.9 /0	23.270	20.470	
	health care	Response rate	5.4%	Country	Portugal												
Smith	Investigation of MSD prevalence and risk factors among Chinese	Population	Nurses	Male/female	0%/100%	12	12 80/	28.0%	_	56 7%	28 0%	10.0%	77 80/	22 80/	21 19/	24 49/	70.0%
[51]	profesionnal nurses by	N-participant	180	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	32.7 ± 7.9	months	42.070	30.9 /0		50.7 /0	30.9 /0	10.0 /8	27.070	22.070	51.1 /0	J4.4 /0	70.076
	department and body area	Response rate	84.10%	Country	China												
Tinubu	Investiagtion of MSD	Population	Nurses	Male/female	2.5%/97.5%	12											
et al., 2010 [23]	and treatment among	N-participant	118	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	36.4 ± 7.7	months	28.0%	16.8%	-	44.1%	12.6%	7.1%	16.2%	3.4%	22.4%	10.2%	-
	Nigerian nurses	Response rate	80%	Country	Nigeria												
Yeung	Investigation of MSD	Population	Nurses	Male/female	0%/100%	12	10 (0)	22 70/		10.00/	20 (0)	= 20/	15 50	20 (0)	20.00/	10 (0)	
et al., 2005 [55]	factors among nurses in	N-participant	97	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	35.0 ± 7.0	months	19.6%	22.7%	-	42.3%	20.6%	7.2%	17.5%	20.6%	29.9%	19.6%	-
	Hong Kong	Response rate	100%	Country	Hong Kong												
Anton et al 2002	Investigation of carpal tunnel syndrom and other MSD pervalence	Population	Dental hygienists	Male/female	n/a	12-	68 5%	67.4%	-	56.8%	60.0%	21.1%	69.5%	19.0%	13.7%	15.8%	-
[5]	11., 2002 other MSD pervalence [5] among dental	N-participant	95	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	$\textbf{37.6} \pm \textbf{7.9}$	months	00.070	07.470		50.070	00.070	21.170	07.570	17.070	13.7 /0	10.070	
	hygienists in United States	Response rate	100.00%	Country	United States												
Ayers	Investigation of MSD prevalence and	Population	Dentists	Male/female	68%/32%	12-	59.0%	30.0%	_	57.0%	45.0%	10.0%	25.0%	15.0%	21.0%	13.0%	_
[37]	occupational health status of New Zealand	N-participant	566	mean \pm SD)	n/a	months	59.070	50.070		57.070	±0.070	10.070	20.070	10.070	21.0 /0	13.070	
	dentists	Response rate	77.00%	Country	New Zealand												

												Studied Para	ameters				
	Objection		Ci., J., T	D-1-11-		Preva-						Main Body	v Area				
Autors	Objective		Study I	Jetalis		lence	Neck	Upper Back	Mid Back	Lower Back	Shou- lders	Elbows/ Fore- arms	Wrists/ Hands/ Fingers	Hips/ Thighs	Knees	Ankles/ Feet	Whole Body
Hayes	Investigation of MSD	Population	Dental Hygienist	Male/female	5.6%/94.4%		(4.20)	41.20/	_	FF 00/	40,40/	F 10/	40.10/	11.00/	26.2%	10 50/	_
et al., 2009 [40]	dental hygiene students in Australia	N-participant	126	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	26.4 ± 6.2		64.3%	41.3%	-	57.9%	48.4%	7.1%	42.1%	11.9%	26.2%	12.7%	-
		Response rate	71.60%	Country	Australia												
Khan and Yee Chew	Investigation of MSD	Population	Dental students	Male/female	26%/74%		87	0%	-	64.0%	26 0%	22 0%	42 0%	-	-	-	-
2013 [42]	dental students in	N-participant	575	mean \pm SD)	n/a		02	078		04.078	20.078	23.070	42.070				
	Malaysia	Response rate	81.00%	Country	Malaysia												
Kierklo	Investigation of MSD symptoms and	Population	Dentists	Male/female	11.8%/88.2%		47 00/	20.0%	_	22.09/	20.10/	15 10/	20.2%	22.29/	16.09/	15.00/	_
[43] et al., 2011	prevalence among dentists in northeast Poland]	N-participant	220	Age (year, mean $+$ SD)	n/a		47.0%	20.0%		32.9%	20.1%	15.1%	29.2%	23.3%	16.0%	15.0%	
	Poland	Response rate	100.00%	Country	Poland												
Leggat	Investigation of MSD	Population	Dentists	Male/female	73.3%/26.7%	12											
et al., 2006 [42]	impact among dentists in Australia	N-participant	283	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	45.2 ± 11.9	months	57.5%	34.4%	-	53.7%	53.3%	18.0%	33.7%	12.6%	18.9%	11.6%	-
		Response rate	73.10%	Country	Australia												
Rabiei	Investigation of MSD	Population	Dentists	Male/female	64.1%/35.9%	12	12 00/			25.00/	25.00/	(00/	25.00/	10.00/	10 (0)	0 70/	
et al., 2011 [49]	prevalence among dentists in Iran	N-participant	92	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	30.1 ± 8.7	months	43.0%	-	-	35.8%	25.0%	6.0%	25.0%	10.8%	19.6%	8.7%	-
		Response rate	58.00%	Country	Iran												
Szymanska	Investigation of MSD	Population	Dentists	Male/female	10.8%/89.2%	12-											
2002 [53]	and treatment among	N-participant	268	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	n/a	months	56.3%	-	-	60.1%	37.3%	25.4%	44.0%		47.8%		-
	Polish dentists	Response rate	n/a	Country	Poland												
Adams	Investigation of MSD	Population	Gynecologists	Male/female	50.3%/49.7%	12											
et al., 2013	prevalence in gynecologic surgeons	N-participant	495	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	47	months	72.9%	61.6%	-	75.6%	66.6%	-	60.9%	-	-	-	-
[32]	in United States	Response rate	7.90%	Country	United States												
Knudsen	Investigation of MSD prevalence and risk	Population	Orthopedists	Male/female	75%/25%	12-	50.40/	25.5%		54.00/	24.49/	2.10/	10.40/	0.5%	22.6%	22 (1)	
et al., 2014 [44]	factors among resident	N-participant	32	Age (year, \pm SD)	29.5 ± 2.5	months	59.4%	35.5%	-	54.8%	34.4%	3.1%	19.4%	9.7%	22.6%	22.6%	-
	in United States	Response rate	82.00%	Country	United States												
Liang	Investigation of MSD prevalence and role of	Population	Dermatologists	Male/female	71%/29%	12-											
et al., 2012 [6]	ergonomics among	N-participant	354	Age (year, \pm SD)	44.5 ± 9.0	months	65.2%	53.3%	-	63.1%	61.5%	13.8%	36.9%	-	24.8%	20.5%	-
L-3	United States	Response rate	43.00%	Country	United States												

												Studied Par	ameters				
			C(1 1			Preva-						Main Body	y Area				
Autors	Objective		Study	Details		lence	Neck	Upper Back	Mid Back	Lower Back	Shou- lders	Elbows/ Fore- arms	Wrists/ Hands/ Fingers	Hips/ Thighs	Knees	Ankles/ Feet	Whole Body
Szeto	Investigation of MSD prevalence and physical	Population	Surgeons	Male/female	82.2%/17.8%	12-											
et al 2009 [52]	and psychosocial factors among general	N-participant	135	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	35.2	months	82.9%	52.6%	-	68.1%	57.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	surgeons in Hong Kong	Response rate	27.00%	Country	Hong Kong												
Okuyucu et al., 2017	Investigation of MSD prevalencecharacteris- tics, and severity among amongst	Population	Obstetrics and gynaecology trainees	Male/female	n/a	12-	8.0%		30.0%		18.0%	18	.0%		13.0%		-
[4]	obstetrics and gynaecology	N-participant	59	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	32.7	monuis											
	practitioners in United Kingdom	Response rate	76.00%	Country	United Kingdom												
Okuyucu	Investigatation of MSD prevalence, severity	Population	Midwives	Male/female	3.5%/96.5%	12-						10.00/		2 2.22/	21 20/		
et al., 2019 [47]	and psychosocial risk factors among	N-participant	630	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	42.76 ± 11.4	months	45.3%	29.5%	-	71.4%	44.5%	12.3%	25.6%	28.9%	31.8%	22.9%	-
	midwives in United Kingdom	Response rate	n/a	Country	United Kingdom												
McLeod	Investigation of MSD	Population	Osteopaths	Male/female	38.7%/61.3%	10											
et al., 2017 [<mark>46</mark>]	prevalence, risk factors and treatment among	N-participant	160	Age (year, mean \pm SD)	36.4	months	6.7%	12.2%	-	13.3%	11.1%	12.2%	41.1%	2.2%	1.1%	-	-
	Australian osteopaths Response	Response rate	9.00%	Country	Australia												

3.4. Body Area Work-Related MSD Prevalence

Figures 2 and 3 summarize the work-related MSD prevalence by body area and occupation. Across all healthcare professions, the neck and lower back were the most exposed areas, with a high average prevalence ranging from 26.7% to 70.1%. For the neck, dentists and surgeons were the two professions with the highest prevalence (above 60%), with maximum values of over 80% [42,52]. Physiotherapists, nurses and midwives presented a lower average prevalence, of 32.0%, 33.1% and 26.7%, respectively, but with a significant range of 37–55% [4,18,38,47,54].



Figure 2. Synthesis of MSD prevalence by body area for each healthcare profession. Boxplots represent lower, median and upper quartile values. Whiskers correspond to the most extreme values within 1.5 times the interquartile range. PT = Physiotherapists/Physical therapists; N = Nurses; D = Dentists; S = Surgeons; M = Midwives; O = Osteopaths.



Figure 3. Body mapping of MSD prevalence by body areas and by healthcare profession. PT = Physiotherapists/Physical therapists.

About the lower back, MSD prevalence was higher than 50% for nurses, dentists, surgeons, and midwives, with maximum values of 65.7% [31], 64.0% [42], 75.6% [32], and 71.4% [47] respectively. Physiotherapists had a lower average rate (36.5%) but with a large

range that highlighted a large disparity in the results proposed in the literature, with values ranging from 6.6% [38] to 69.8% [33].

The least exposed areas were the elbow/forearm and the lower limb joints, i.e., hip/thigh, knee/leg and ankle/foot, with a mean MSD prevalence of 14.9%, 17.8%, 25.0% and 20.0%, respectively.

The shoulder and wrist were differentially exposed depending on the profession. Dentists and surgeons demonstrated the highest prevalence, of 55.1% and 39.4%, respectively, for the shoulder and 39.1% and 38.8%, respectively, for the wrist, with maximum values above 60% [5,32]. For physiotherapists, nurses and midwives, the average rates were between 15.7% and 31.3%.

In four high-risk areas, i.e., neck, lower back, shoulders and wrists, surgeons and dentists appeared to be the healthcare professionals most exposed to MSDs, and physiotherapists, midwives, and nurses to a lesser extent. Nurses were the professionals whose lower limbs were the most exposed, with an average prevalence of over 25%, compared with 18% for the others.

The study on osteopaths showed that the wrist was the most exposed area, with MSD risks that were the highest (41.1%) in comparison to the other healthcare professions [46].

Regardless of the affected areas, Table 3 summarizes the overall MSD prevalence for 26 of the 36 studies included in the review. Nurses, midwives, dentists and surgeons demonstrated prevalence above 80%. Physiotherapists had an average prevalence of 55%, but with a wide range. Four studies ([10,17,33,54]) reported rates above 80% for the other health professions listed above, while three others ([22,34,38]) evidenced significantly lower MSD prevalence (<50%).

Table 4 presents the MSD prevalence by body area and healthcare profession in relation to each continent. Concerning physiotherapists, Africa (20.6%) and Europe (24.4%) showed prevalence rates twice as high as those for the other continents for wrist/hands (10.2 to 13.2%) and at least three times higher than Asia and America for lower back (69.8% and 62.9% vs. 21.6% and 6.6%, respectively). America (66.0%) and Oceania (62.5%) presented prevalence rates two times higher than those for Asia (39.8%) and Europe (37.2%) for mid back MSDs, while Oceania (41.0%) and Europe (33.5%) presented prevalence rates two times higher three continents for shoulder (Africa 22.2%, Asia 12.7%, and America 19.1%). Finally, Africa (5.6% for elbow and 6.3% for hip/thigh) had three to four times lower prevalence than other continents for elbow and hip/thigh, while Europe had the highest rates for the lower limbs.

Concerning nurses, Europe (neck: 50.1%, upper back: 40.9%) had a prevalence 1.5 times higher than that of the other continents for neck (30.3% to 35.5%) and upper back (11.3% to 27.4%). Africa (11.3%) and Asia (9.5%) presented rates three times higher for elbow than Oceania (3.2%), which also had prevalence twice as low as the other continents for ankle/feet (11.3% compared to 24.2–32.6%).

Finally, among dentists, America (60.0%) had the highest prevalence of shoulder MSDs compared to the other continents (from 26.0% for Asia to 48.9% for Oceania). Asia (82.0%) and America (67.4%) had prevalence two times higher than that of Europe (20.0%) and Oceania (35.2%) for the upper back.

				Overall MSD F	Prevalence	by Healthcare Profes	sion				
Dentists		Midwives		Nurses		Osteopaths	6	Physiotherapi	sts	Surgeons	
Anton et al. [5]	93.0%	Okuyucu et al. [4]	90.0%	Anap et al. [9]	81.0%	McLeod et al. [46]	58.0%	Adegoke et al. [33]	91.3%	Liang et al. [6]	90.0%
Kierklo et al. [43]	92.0%	Okuyucu et al. [47]	92.0%	Asghari et al. [36]	92.5%			Alrowayeh et al. [34]	47.6%	Szeto et al. [52]	83.0%
Leggat and Smith [45]	87.2%			Choobineh et al. [39]	84.4%			Campo et al. [38]	28.0%		
				Kee and Seo [18]	56.8%			Chung et al. [10]	92.4%		
				Munabi et al. [3]	80.8%			Cromie et al. [17]	91.0%		
				Pugh et al. [48]	75.8%			Glover et al. [8]	68.0%		
				Ribeiro et al. [50]	89.0%			Jang et al. [41]	71.4%		
				Smith et al. [51]	70.0%			Muaidi and Shanb [22]	47.7%		
				Tinubu et al. [23]	84.4%			Vieira et al. [54]	96.0%		

 Table 3. Overall MSD prevalence by healthcare profession.

							Main Body Area				
		Neck	Upper Back	Mid Back	Lower Back	Shoulders	Elbows/Forearms	Wrists/Hands/Fingers	Hips/Thighs	Knees	Ankles/Feet
	Africa *	31.1%	14.3%	-	69.8%	22.2%	5.6%	20.6%	6.3%	15.9%	9.5%
	Asia	25.2%	19,0%	39.8%	21.6%	12.7%	23.2%	12.9%	20.5%	22.2%	7.5%
Physiotherapists	America	33.0%	2.4%	66,0%	6.6%	19.1%	21.7%	10.2%	19.2%	2.1%	12.6%
	Oceania *	47.6%	-	62.5%	-	41.0%	22.9%	13.2%	21.8%	33.6%	7.3%
	Europe	33.5%	49.8%	37.2%	62.9%	33.5%	25.7%	24.4%	25.2%	30.4%	19.1%
	Africa	32.5%	26.3%	-	53,0%	22.6%	11.3%	22.7%	15.7%	29.8%	24.2%
	Asia	30.3%	27.4%	5.0%	50.4%	31.9%	9.5%	24.6%	17.8%	34.9%	32.6%
Nurses	America	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Oceania *	35.5%	11.3%	-	53.2%	32.3%	3.2%	16.1%	9.7%	17.7%	11.3%
	Europe *	50.1%	40.9%	-	63.1%	37.8%	7.2%	28.4%	8.9%	25.2%	26.4%
	Africa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Asia	62.5%	82,0%	-	64.0%	26.0%	23.0%	42.0%	-	-	-
Dentists	America *	68.5%	67.4%	-	56.8%	60.0%	21.1%	69.5%	19.0%	13.7%	15.8%
	Oceania	60.3%	35.2%	-	56.2%	48.9%	11.7%	33.6%	13.2%	22.0%	12.4%
	Europe	51.7%	20,0%	-	46.5%	28.7%	20.3%	36.6%	35.6%	31.9%	31.4%
Surgoons	Asia *	82.9%	52.6%	-	68.1%	57.8%	-	-	-	-	-
Jurgeons	America	70.1%	50.8%	-	65.4%	55.1%	8.5%	39.1%	9.7%	23.7%	21.6%

 Table 4. MSD prevalence by body area and healthcare profession, summarized by continent.

Midwives and osteopaths are not included in this table due to the small number of studies. *: indicates the continents for which only one study was available.

3.5. Job Risk Factors

Ten articles on four of the health professions—two for nurses [9,23], one for osteopaths [43], five for physiotherapists [8,10,22,33,35], and two for surgeons [6,52]—associated risk factors with MSDs (Table A2). No work on midwives and dentists included in the review addressed this aspect. Eighteen risk factors common to all healthcare professions were identified. Seventeen of them were mentioned in at least six of the studies that addressed risk factors among the different health professions. Nine had a reported rate of over 50% and were listed in the majority of studies (7–8 of the 10 studies). "Working in a same position for a long time", "Working in an Awkward/Cramped Position", "Working when physically fatigued/in an injured state", and "Performing the same task over and over" were the most reported factors in the literature (in nine of 10 studies) with significant average prevalence rates of 62.5%, 61.2%, 51.6%, and 56.0%, respectively. "Treating a large number of patients in a 1 day" reported in six studies was the factor with the highest prevalence (65.9%).

3.6. Responses and Treatment to Reduce the Symptoms of MSDs

Eleven articles related to all professions except dentists, including two for nurses [9,23], one for midwives [4], one for osteopaths [46], six for physiotherapists [8,10,17,22,33,35], and one for surgeons [6], reported a total of 21 responses/treatments used to reduce MSD symptoms (Table A3). "Modify patient's position/my position", "select techniques/procedure that will not cause or aggravate discomfort", and "pause regularly to stretch and change posture" were the three most reported responses in the majority of works (8–9 of 11 studies). These were performed, respectively, by 54%, 52% and 38% of the practitioners. Four criteria were also cited in half of the studies for the majority of professions: "I use other body part in order to perform manual treatment/nurse procedure", "I adjust plinth/bed height prior to the treatment of a patient", "I warm up and stretch before performing my work manual techniques, nurse duties", and "I stop a treatment if it causes or aggravates my discomfort", with reported frequencies of 53%, 58%, 30%, and 48%, respectively. "I get someone else to help me handle a heavy patient" had the highest rate (67%) but was only reported by physiotherapists [17,22,33] and nurses [9,23].

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to identify the prevalence of MSDs among healthcare professionals and to determine whether all were affected in the same way or whether specific areas were more exposed depending on the profession. Thirty-six studies were included in the analysis, covering six healthcare professions from different countries: nurses, midwives, physiotherapists, osteopaths, dentists, and surgeons.

The general prevalence showed very high rates of MSDs in all health professions with values above 75% for the majority of the jobs considered. Four body areas, i.e., the neck, the back (mainly the lower back but in some cases also the upper back), the shoulders and the upper extremities (wrists, hands, fingers), were widely exposed to MSDs, with significant prevalence for all of the different jobs. The neck area and back were widely considered in the different studies [4,16,47,56–59]. The results of these numerous works showed that regardless of the profession, the MSD prevalence rates were high [46,60,61].

This was mainly due to the awkward postures adopted by the professionals. Among nurses and physiotherapists, handling or transferring heavy materials/patients and prolonged static postures were the predominant situations [62–64].

Shoulders and extremities also showed significant rates, particularly among dentists and surgeons. This can be explained by the precision required and the constraints related to the interventions, such as unique accesses (to the mouth in particular) and the risks incurred when handling tools [11,12]. Physiotherapists and nurses perform many manual therapies or wound care procedures that place greater demands on the wrists and hands [21,50].

The least exposed areas were located in the lower limbs for all occupations, ranging from 15 to 25%. Nurses, however, had higher rates of MSD prevalence than other occupa-

tions. This result is in agreement with Reed's work on the prevalence of lower limb MSDs in nurses [20]. This is related to the fact that their daily practice involves sequences of many static postures and many movements with many manipulations [50,65].

Numerous studies including risk factors have been carried out in particular among physiotherapists and nurses, as reported in this review (Table A2). A list of 17 common items was documented for the different included studies (including five for physiotherapists and two for nurses). "Working in a same position for a long time", "Working in an Awkward/Cramped Position", "Working when physically fatigued/in an injured state", and "Performing the same task over and over" were the factors most reported in the literature on all professions (9/10 articles), with significant average prevalence rates of 62. 5%, 61.2%, 51.6%, and 56.0%, respectively, consistent with the results of studies on these different healthcare professions [7,66,67].

The review highlighted that these aspects were little considered in dentists, for whom no risk factors were identified in the eight articles included. These aspects were also little addressed in surgeons, who mainly reported risk factors related to workload such as lack of breaks and perseverance in work despite fatigue or injury, which were also found in other professions [6,52].

Healthcare professionals reported several responses to the presence of MSDs to reduce symptoms. "Modify patient's position/my position," "select techniques/procedure that will not cause or aggravate discomfort," and "pause regularly to stretch and change posture" were the three most articulated responses regardless of occupation. Physiotherapists were the healthcare professionals with the most information, with numerous works and considered items (19 items) [66,68,69]. Nurses addressed these aspects to a lesser extent, with two studies and nine items [9,23]. For the other professions, this problem was studied to a limited extent, or not studied at all.

This literature review showed that healthcare professions involving specific tasks, such as dentists and surgeons, were the most exposed to MSDs, particularly in the neck, back, shoulders and wrists/hands. Occupations with more displacements, such as nurses and physiotherapists, presented lower but significant risks, with more exposed areas due to the heterogeneity of their activities. In particular, the risk of MSDs in the lower limbs was higher for nurses who walk a lot.

More generally, for both the risk factors and the solutions proposed to reduce MSDs, the redundant element that appeared, whatever the profession or continent, was posture. The daily activities performed in uncomfortable postures, repeated and maintained over time, are the cause of MSD risks. These risk factors must be analyzed by respecting general ergonomic principles such as adopting postures close to joint neutrality in order to reduce joint and muscle constraints.

In this context, ergonomic tools such as RULA [70], LUBA [71] and REBA [72] have been developed to quantify the risk of MSDs associated with a posture and thus evaluate the need to make changes in a given situation. They take into account the distance from the neutral position of the joint angles, for which the risk of MSDs is known to increase considerably, as well as handling of heavy loads, static postures or repetition of the same movement. These assessments allow us to objectively identify the areas at risk. Recent work among physiotherapists has shown that significant flexion of the neck and lower back, as well as significant flexion and abduction of the shoulders during massage, make these areas particularly exposed to MSD risks [73]. This result is consistent with the results proposed in this review and, therefore, appears to be generalizable to all health care professions.

These quantitative evaluations in healthcare professionals are very rarely performed. This is an approach that should be developed in order to reduce the risks of MSD occurrence [74].

At the same time, the working environment of healthcare professionals should be analyzed. Many devices are used to care for their patients. All practitioners work mainly in a static position, standing or sitting on stools, and often use treatment tables or beds to perform their interventions (operations, massages, manipulation, care, etc.) [75]. The adjustment of these devices, such as table heights, patient or screen positioning, are factors that could affect posture and, therefore, the MSD risk, particularly by increasing flexion and rotation. This was particularly apparent among professionals who reported that they change their position or their patient's position in response to MSDs in different professions.

Limitations

Some limitations should be addressed. The first concerns the method used in the different included studies. Indeed, the questionnaires proposed were not all the same, even though the common objective was to assess the prevalence of MSDs in the healthcare professions. These differences could lead to variability in the responses and cause MSD prevalence rates to vary. Differences in rates may also arise depending on how the responses are considered. Reporting responses of the entire sample or only of those who reported MSDs (thus excluding those who were healthy) could significantly alter the prevalence of MSDs. A harmonization of the survey methodologies conducted in the different countries and for the different professions would strengthen the present results.

A second limitation concerns the populations studied. Independently of the different healthcare professions considered, the nature of the respondents may also influence the results. Indeed, age, gender, status and years of experience (e.g., students, trainees versus experienced workers), and place of practice (private or hospital practice) are all factors to be considered when assessing the prevalence of MSDs. Inference by continent is only a tendency that must be limited due to the small number of studies for certain areas (lower limbs in particular) and professions (osteopaths and midwives). The analysis could not be carried out for risk factors and responses to reduce MSDs due to the small number of studies that addressed this issue. For the large majority, only one or two studies per continent were identified (Tables A2 and A3).

Another limitation concerns the PRISMA selection method. First, the inclusion criteria for the articles led to the exclusion or potential omission of works that could have completed and supported the results of this literature review. Secondly, the choice of the three coupled keywords without using synonyms or multiples terms using AND/OR could have excluded, in spite of the more than 21,700 found, some relevant works with regard to the objective.

5. Conclusions

All healthcare professions are significantly exposed to MSDs. Four areas common to all professions are highly exposed: back, neck, shoulder, and hand/wrist. Some professions have areas more specifically affected according to their specificity, such as the shoulder and upper extremities for surgeons and dentists (35–55%) or the lower limbs for nurses (>25%). Surgeons and dentists presented the highest prevalence of lower back MSDs (>60%). The main causes reported for all health professionals are related to maintaining and repeating awkward postures. It is important to assess postures and associated MSD risks in various practices using ergonomic tools to identify the most exposed joints and body areas. Future works could be focused on work environment design, particularly the positioning and adjustment of equipment, and on postural analysis to reduce the occurrence of MSDs.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Methodology, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Software, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Validation, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Formal Analysis, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Investigation, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Resources, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Data Curation, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Writing—Original Draft Preparation, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Writing—Review and Editing, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Visualization, P.G. and J.J.-B.; Supervision, P.G.; Project Administration, P.G.; Funding Acquisition, P.G. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

							-																				
			Introd	luction					Μ	ethods								Res	ults			I	Discussior	ı		Tot	tal
		Title and Ab- stract	Backg ar Obje	round d ctive	Tr Des	ial sign	Partici- pants	Interv- ention	O or	utc- nes	San Si	nple ze	Ran izatoi Sequ Gei tio	dom- in and ience iera- on	Stati- stical Meth- ods	Partic- ipant Flow	Base- line Data	Num- bers Ana- lyzed	Outc- omes and Esti- mation	Anci- llary Anal- yses	Har- ms	Limit- ations	Gene- raliza- bility	Inter- preta- tion	Fun- ding	Score/ 19	% Pre- sent Cri- teria
		1	2A	2B	3A	3B	4	5	6A	6B	7A	7 B	8A	8B	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	18		
PT	Adegoke et al. 2008 [33]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	0	1	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	10	53%
РТ	Alrowayeh et al. 2010 [34]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	0	1	1	0	0	-	1	1	1	0	12	63%
РТ	Anyfantis and Biska 2017 [35]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	10	61%
РТ	Campo et al. 2008 [38]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	0	13	71%
РТ	et al. 2013 [10]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	0	0	-	0	1	0.5	0	11	61%
РТ	et al. 2000 [17]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	-	1	1	1	0	15	82%
PT	et al. 2005 [8]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	-	1	1	1	1	16	87%
РТ	Jang et al. 2006 [41] Muaidi	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	0.5	1	15	82%
РТ	and Shanb 2016 [22]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	-	0	1	0.5	0	11	63%
РТ	Vieira et al. 2015 [54]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	0.5	1	1	1	0	0.5	-	1	1	0.5	1	12	71%
Nurse	Pugh et al. 2020 [48]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	-	1	1	1	1	14	76%
Nurse	Kibeiro et al. 2016 [50]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	-	1	0.5	1	0	12	68%

Table A1. Detailed quality appraisal of the 36 articles included in review using the modified CONSORT 2010 checklist [29].

Table A1. Cont.

			Intro	ductio	on				Μ	ethods								Res	ults			I	Discussior	ı		Tot	tal
		Title and Ab- stract	Bac rou and ject	kg- nd Ob- ive	Tr De	rial sign	Partici- pants	Interv- ention	Or	utc- nes	Sam Si	iple ze	Ran izatoi Sequ Ger tie	dom- in and ience iera- on	Stati- stical Meth- ods	Partic- ipant Flow	Base- line Data	Num- bers Ana- lyzed	Outc- omes and Esti- mation	Anci- llary Anal- yses	Har- ms	Limit- ations	Gene- raliza- bility	Inter- preta- tion	Fun- ding	Score/ 19	% Pre- sent Cri- teria
		1	2A	2B	3A	3B	4	5	6A	6B	7A	7 B	8A	8B	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	18		
Nurse	Asghari et al. 2019 [36] Kao and	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	0.5	1	1	0	16	87%
Nurse	Seo 2007 [42]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	0	0	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	10	58%
Nurse	Tinubu et al. 2010 [23] Munahi	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	0.5	0.5	0	13	74%
Nurse	et al. 2014 [3]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	0	-	0.5	1	1	0	14	76%
Nurse	et al. 2006 [39]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	13	74%
Nurse	et al. 2004 [51]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	0	15	79%
Nurse	Anap et al. 2013 [9]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	0	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	8	53%
Nurse	Yeung et al. 2005 [55]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	-	1	0.5	0.5	0	11	66%
Nurse	Attar et al. 2014 [55]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	0	17	89%
Dentist	et al. 2011 [49]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	-	0	0.5	1	0	11	63%
Dentist	Hayes et al. 2009 [40]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	0.5	0.5	1	0	13	74%
Dentist	and Yee Chew 2013 [42]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	-	1	1	1	0	14	76%
Dentist	Kierklo et al. 2011 [43]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	0	1	0	1	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	10	58%
Dentist	Ayers et al. 2009 [37]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	0	1	-	0	1	0.5	1	14	76%

Table	A1.	Cont.
IUDIC		CUIIV.

			Intr	oducti	on				I	Method	ls							Res	sults			1	Discussion	ı		Toi	tal
		Title and Ab- stract	Ba gro and jec	ick- ound l Ob- tive	Ti De	rial sign	Part- icip- ants	Inter- vent- ion	O or	utc- nes	San Si	1ple ze	Ran izato Sequ Ger ti	dom- in and 1ence nera- on	Stati- stical Meth- ods	Partic- ipant Flow	Base- line Data	Num- bers Ana- lyzed	Outc- omes and Esti- mation	Anci- llary Anal- yses	Har- ms	Limit- ations	Gene- raliza- bility	Inter- preta- tion	Fun- ding	Score/ 19	% Pre- sent Cri- teria
		1	2A	2B	3A	3B	4	5	6A	6B	7A	7B	8A	8B	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	18		
Dentist	Leggat et al. 2006 [45]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	-	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	11	68%
Dentist	Szymanska 2002 [53]	1	1	1	0	-	0.5	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	8	53%
Dentist	et al. 2002 [5]	1	1	1	0	-	0.5	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	0.5	0.5	0	12	71%
Surgeron	Liang et al. 2012 [6]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	-	1	0.5	0.5	0	10	63%
Surgeron	Adams et al. 2013 [32]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	0.5	0.5	1	14	79%
Surgeron	et al. 2014 [44]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	0.5	1	1	1	0	0	-	1	0.5	0.5	1	11	66%
Surgeron	Szeto et al. 2009 [52]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	-	1	0.5	0.5	1	13	76%
Midwife	Okuyucu et al. 2017 [4]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.5	1	1	0	0	-	1	0.5	0.5	0	9	55%
Midwife	Okuyucu et al. 2019 [47]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	0	0.5	0.5	0	12	68%
Osteopath	McLeod et al. 2017 [46]	1	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	-	1	0.5	1	0	13	74%

PT = Physiotherapists/Physical therapists; Rating code: 1: the criterion is present; 0.5: the criterion is partially present; 0: the criterion is absent. Columns 3B, 6B, 7B, 8B, and 15 were not filled in because the criteria in the list were difficult to apply to the articles included in the review.

Job Risk Factor—Activity That Causes Injury	Anap et al. [9]	Tinubu et al. [23]	McLeod et al. [46]	Adegoke et al. [33]	Anyfantis and Biska [35]	Chung et al. [10]	Glover et al. [8]	Muaidi and Shanb [25]	Liang et al. [6]	Szeto et al. [52]
Profession	Nurses	Nurses	Osteopaths	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	Surgeons	Surgeons
Number of responders	N = 228	N = 118	N = 160	N = 120	N = 252	N = 157	N = 2688	N = 690	N = 354	N = 135
Number of responders with work-related MSD	N = 203	N = 100	N = 93	N = 114–115	N = 252	N = 157	N = 1515–1648	N = 690	N = 354	N = 135
Bending or twisting forward	48.5% (98)	45.8% (46)	3.3% (3)	62.6% (72)	-	77.7% (122)	56% (893)	61.3% (423)	-	-
Lifting or transferring dependent patients	52.4% (106)	50.8% (51)	5.5% (5)	67.8% (78)	-	80.3% (126)	56% (908)	48.8% (337)	-	-
Working in the same position for a long time	47.6% (97)	55.1% (55)	8.8% (8)	71.3% (82)	-	73.2% (115)	67% (1085)	87.8% (606)	-	88.9% (120)
Treating a large number of patients in 1 day	41% (83)	44.9% (45)	-	83.5% (96)	-	90.4% (142)	67% (1081)	68.7% (474)	-	-
Performing the same task over and over	22.4% (45)	14.4% (14)	53% (49)	52.2% (60)	90% (227)	86.6% (136)	73% (1203)	74.4% (513)	-	37.8% (51)
Working in an awkward/cramped position	35.2% (71)	33.1% (33)	-	64.6% (73)	70% (176)	81.5% (128)	44% (691)	72.3% (499)	-	88.9% (120)
Performing manual therapy techniques	32.7% (66)	40% (40)	23% (21)	67.8% (78)	-	72.0% (113)	49% (777)	69.3% (478)	-	-
Unanticipated sudden movement or fall by patient	21.8% (44)	28.8% (29)	-	40.9% (47)	-	66.9% (105)	39% (618)	42.0% (290)	-	-
Carrying or moving heavy materials/equipment/patient	42.4% (86)	42.4% (42)	-	55.7% (64)	-	64.3% (101)	30% (464)	42.0% (290)	-	-
Working when physically fatigued/in an injured state	29.6% (60)	32.2% (32)	38.2% (36)	52.2% (60)	-	77.7% (122)	52% (823)	72.6% (501)	58% (205)	-
Assisting patients with gait activities	17.2% (35)	12.7% (13)	-	35.7% (41)	-	61.1% (96)	37% (582)	72.3% (499)	-	-
Lack of rest breaks during the day	31.4% (64)	39% (39)	-	61.7% (71)	-	89.8% (141)	41% (644)	44.4% (306)	76% (269)	-
Working at or near physical limits	20.3% (41)	23.7% (24)	-	46.9% (54)	-	64.3% (101)	44% (686)	53.5% (369)	-	-
Working with confused or agitated patients	10% (20)	16% (16)	-	28.9% (33)	-	62.4% (98)	25% (384)	42.0% (290)	-	-
Inappropriate training in injury prevention	12.1% (25)	27.1% (27)	-	29.6% (34)	-	42.7% (67)	14% (212)	38.8% (268)	-	-
Reaching or working away from your body	41.2% (84)	31.6% (32)	-	17.4% (20)	-	56.1% (88)	51% (800)	55.8% (385)	-	-
Work scheduling (overtime, irregular shifts, length of workday)	26% (53)	33.9% (34)	43% (40)	3.5% (5)	-	62.4% (98)	18% (271)	47.4% (327)	-	-
Forceful exertion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44.4% (60)

Table A2. Job risk factors identified for all healthcare professionals (percentage of sample and corresponding number of participants in brackets.

	Okuyucu et al. [4]	Anap et al. [9]	Tinubu et al. [23]	McLeod et al. [46]	Chung et al. [10]	Muaidi and Shanb [22]	Cromie et al. [17]	Glover et al. [8]	Anyfantis and Biska [35]	Adegoke et al. [33]	Liang et al. [6]
Profession Number of responders	Midwives N = 59	Nurses N = 228	Nurses N = 118	Osteopaths N = 160	PT N = 157	PT N = 690	PT N = 536	PT N = 2688	PT N = 252	PT N = 120	Surgeons N = 354
Number of responders with work-related MSD	N = 50	N = 203	N = 100	N = 93	N = 157	N = 690	N = 298–512	N = 1100–1825	N = 252	N = 115	N = 354
Medication	62% (31)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22% (78)
Visiting a physician	38% (19)	-	-	-	-	-	-	39% (705)	33% (83)	-	-
Be rested due to injury	-	-	-	33.7% (31)	-	-	-	32% (580)	-	-	-
Officially reported the injury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16% (286)	-	-	-
Alteration of working habits	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9% (152)	-	-	-
Limitation of contact time with patients	-	-	-	28.2% (26)	-	-	-	10% (169)	3% (8)	-	-
Considering changing their job	-	-	-	9% (8)	-	-	-	1% (11)	-	-	-
Modified treatment technique	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59% (1057)	12% (30)	-	-
Sought PT formally or informally from a colleague	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61% (1087)	-	-	-
I get someone else to help me handle a heavy patient	-	57.1% (116)	50.4% (50)	-	-	64.2% (443)	86.9% (352)	-	-	76.5% (88)	-
I use physical therapist assistants to	-	-	-	-	-	-	32.9% (98)	-	-	-	-
I modify patient's position/my position	-	41.2% (84)	40.3% (40)	40.4% (38)	51.6% (81)	91.9% (634)	98.2% (503)	8% (146)	25% (63)	91.3% (165)	-
I use other body part in order to perform manual treatment/nurse procedure	-	19.2% (39)	20.2% (20)	-	51.6% (81)	94.6% (653)	80.9% (372)	-	-	50.4% (58)	-
I adjust plinth/bed height prior to the treatment of a patient	-	18.3% (37)	21.8% (22)	-	47.1% (74)	97.8% (675)	95.4% (455)	-	-	69.5% (80)	-
I select techniques/procedure that will not cause or aggravate discomfort	-	23.2% (47)	30.5% (30)	60.7% (56)	30.6% (48)	98.2% (678)	77.4% (366)	-	15% (38)	80% (92)	-
I warm up and stretch before performing my work manual techniques, nurse	-	16.2% (33)	32.8% (33)	-	14.0% (22)	68.2% (471)	20.5% (96)	-	-	28.7% (33)	-
duties											
I get someone else to help me handle a heavy patient	-	-	-	-	13.4% (21)	67.5% (528)	-	-	-	-	-
I pause regularly so I can stretch and change posture	-	10.2% (21)	14.3% (14)	27% (25)	7.0% (11)	84.2% (581)	78.0% (393)	-	10% (25)	75.7% (87)	-

Table A3. Response and treatment used to reduce symptoms of MSD identified for all healthcare professionals (percentage of sample and corresponding number of participants in brackets).

Table Ho. Com	Table	A3.	Cont
---------------	-------	-----	------

	Okuyucu et al. [4]	Anap et al. [9]	Tinubu et al. [23]	McLeod et al. [46]	Chung et al. [10]	Muaidi and Shanb [22]	Cromie et al. [17]	Glover et al. [8]	Anyfantis and Biska [35]	Adegoke et al. [33]	Liang et al. [6]
I stop a treatment if it causes or aggravates my discomfort	-	28.1% (57)	33.6% (34)	-	7.0% (11)	82.8% (571)	71.9% (343)	-	-	67.5% (78)	-
I use electrical therapy instead of manual therapy to avoid stressing an injury	-	-	-	-	5.7% (9)	-	24.5% (96)	-	-	48.7% (56)	-
I modify my nursing procedure in order to avoid stressing an injury	-	50.2% (102)	45.4% (45)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

References

- 1. Kinaci, E.; AtaoĞLu, S. Work Related Musculoskeletal Disorders Among the Physiotherapists: Sample of a Region in Turkey. *Turk. Klin. J. Med. Sci.* 2020, *5*, 495–502. [CrossRef]
- 2. Głowiński, S.; Bryndal, A.; Grochulska, A. Prevalence and risk of spinal pain among physiotherapists in Poland. *PeerJ* 2021, *9*, e11715. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 3. Munabi, I.G.; Buwembo, W.; Kitara, D.L.; Ochieng, J.; Mwaka, E.S. Musculoskeletal disorder risk factors among nursing professionals in low resource settings: A cross-sectional study in Uganda. *BMC Nurs.* **2014**, *13*, 7. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Okuyucu, K.A.; Jeve, Y.; Doshani, A. Work-related musculoskeletal injuries amongst obstetrics and gynaecology trainees in East Midland region of the UK. *Arch. Gynecol. Obstet.* 2017, 296, 489–494. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 5. Anton, D.; Rosecrance, J.; Merlino, L.; Cook, T.M. Prevalence of musculoskeletal symptoms and carpal tunnel syndrome among dental hygienists. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* **2002**, *42*, 248–257. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 6. Liang, C.A.; Levine, V.J.; Dusza, S.W.; Hale, E.K.; Nehal, K.S. Musculoskeletal Disorders and Ergonomics in Dermatologic Surgery: A Survey of Mohs Surgeons in 2010. *Dermatol. Surg.* **2012**, *38*, 240–248. [CrossRef]
- Alexopoulos, E.; Stathi, I.-C.; Charizani, F. Prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders in dentists. BMC Musculoskelet. Disord. 2004, 5, 16. [CrossRef]
- 8. Glover, W.; McGregor, A.; Sullivan, C.; Hague, J. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders affecting members of the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy. *Physiotherapy* **2005**, *91*, 138–147. [CrossRef]
- 9. Anap, D.; Iyer, C.; Rao, K. Work related musculoskeletal disorders among hospital nurses in rural Maharashtra, India: A multi centre survey. *Int. J. Res. Med. Sci.* 2013, *1*, 101–107. [CrossRef]
- Chung, Y.C.; Hung, C.T.; Li, S.F.; Lee, H.M.; Wang, S.G.; Chang, S.C.; Pai, L.W.; Huang, C.N.; Yang, J.H. Risk of musculoskeletal disorder among Taiwanese nurses cohort: A nationwide population-based study. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2013, 14, 144. [CrossRef]
- Katano, K.; Nakajima, K.; Saito, M.; Kawano, Y.; Takeda, T.; Fukuda, K. Effects of Line of Vision on Posture, Muscle Activity and Sitting Balance During Tooth Preparation. *Int. Dent. J.* 2021, *71*, 399–406. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Droeze, E.; Jonsson, H. Evaluation of ergonomic interventions to reduce musculoskeletal disorders of dentists in the Netherlands. Work 2005, 25, 211–220. [PubMed]
- 13. Rugelj, D. Low back pain and other work-related musculoskeletal problems among physiotherapists. *Appl. Ergon.* **2003**, *34*, 635–639. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 14. Vieira, E.R.; Kumar, S.; Coury, H.J.C.G.; Narayan, Y. Low back problems and possible improvements in nursing jobs. *J. Adv. Nurs.* **2006**, *55*, 79–89. [CrossRef]
- 15. Meijsen, P.; Knibbe, H.J.J. Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders of Perioperative Personnel in the Netherlands. *AORN J.* 2007, *86*, 193–208. [CrossRef]
- 16. Wauben, L.S.G.L.; van Veelen, M.A.; Gossot, D.; Goossens, R.H.M. Application of ergonomic guidelines during minimally invasive surgery: A questionnaire survey of 284 surgeons. *Surg. Endosc.* **2006**, *20*, 1268–1274. [CrossRef]
- 17. Cromie, J.E.; Robertson, V.J.; Best, M.O. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders in physical therapists: Prevalence, severity, risks, and responses. *Phys. Ther.* 2000, *80*, 336–351. [CrossRef]
- 18. Kee, D.; Seo, S.R. Musculoskeletal disorders among nursing personnel in Korea. Int. J. Ind. Ergon. 2007, 37, 207–212. [CrossRef]
- Wazzan, K.; Almas, K.; Alshethri, S.; Al-Qahtani, M. Back & Neck Problems Among Dentists and Dental Auxiliaries. J. Contemp. Dent. Pract. 2001, 2, 17–30. [CrossRef]
- 20. Reed, L.; Battistutta, D.; Young, J.; Newman, B. Prevalence and risk factors for foot and ankle musculoskeletal disorders experienced by nurses. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* **2014**, *15*, 196. [CrossRef]
- Snodgrass, S.J.; Rivett, D.A. Thumb Pain in Physiotherapists: Potential Risk Factors and Proposed Prevention Strategies. J. Man. Manip. Ther. 2002, 10, 206–217. [CrossRef]
- 22. Muaidi, Q.; Shanb, A. Prevalence causes and impact of work related musculoskeletal disorders among physical therapists. *J. Back Musculoskelet. Rehabil.* **2016**, 29. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 23. Tinubu, B.M.S.; Mbada, C.E.; Oyeyemi, A.L.; Fabunmi, A.A. Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders among Nurses in Ibadan, South-west Nigeria: A cross-sectional survey. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* **2010**, *11*, 12. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Mohseni-Bandpei, M.A.; Ahmad-Shirvani, M.; Golbabaei, N.; Behtash, H.; Shahinfar, Z.; Fernández-de-las-Peñas, C. Prevalence and Risk Factors Associated with Low Back Pain in Iranian Surgeons. *J. Manip. Physiol. Ther.* 2011, 34, 362–370. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 25. Vieira, E.R.; Schneider, P.; Guidera, C.; Gadotti, I.C.; Brunt, D. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among physical therapists: A systematic review. *J Back Musculoskelet. Rehabil.* **2016**, *29*, 417–428. [CrossRef]
- 26. Saberipour, B.; Ghanbari, S.; Zarea, K.; Gheibizadeh, M.; Zahedian, M. Investigating prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders among Iranian nurses: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin. Epidemiol. Glob. Health* **2019**, *7*, 513–518. [CrossRef]
- Epstein, S.; Sparer-Fine, E.; Tran, B.; Ruan, Q.; Dennerlein, J.; Singhal, D.; Lee, B.T. Prevalence of Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders Among Surgeons and Interventionalists: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Surg.* 2017, 153, e174947. [CrossRef]
- Harris, J.D.; Quatman, C.E.; Manring, M.M.; Siston, R.A.; Flanigan, D.C. How to Write a Systematic Review. Am. J. Sport. Med. 2013, 42, 2761–2768. [CrossRef]

- Schulz, K.F.; Altman, D.G.; Moher, D. CONSORT 2010 Statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMC Med.* 2010, *8*, 18. [CrossRef]
- McFarland, T.; Fischer, S. Considerations for Industrial Use: A Systematic Review of the Impact of Active and Passive Upper Limb Exoskeletons on Physical Exposures. *IISE Trans. Occup. Ergon. Hum. Factors* 2019, 7, 322–347. [CrossRef]
- 31. Attar, S.M. Frequency and risk factors of musculoskeletal pain in nurses at a tertiary centre in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia: A cross sectional study. *BMC Res. Notes* **2014**, *7*, 61. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 32. Adams, S.; Hacker, M.; McKinney, J.; Elkadry, E.; Rosenblatt, P. Musculoskeletal Pain in Gynecologic Surgeons. J. Minim. Invasive Gynecol. 2013, 20, 656–660. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Adegoke, B.O.A.; Akodu, A.K.; Oyeyemi, A.L. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among Nigerian Physiotherapists. BMC Musculoskelet. Disord. 2008, 9, 112. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Alrowayeh, H.N.; Alshatti, T.; Aljadi, S.; Fares, M.; Alshamire, M.; Alwazan, S. Prevalence, characteristics, and impacts of work-related musculoskeletal disorders: A survey among physical therapists in the State of Kuwait. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* 2010, 11, 116. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 35. Anyfantis, I.D.; Biska, A. Musculoskeletal Disorders Among Greek Physiotherapists: Traditional and Emerging Risk Factors. *Saf. Health Work* **2018**, *9*, 314–318. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Asghari, E.; Dianat, I.; Abdollahzadeh, F.; Mohammadi, F.; Asghari, P.; Jafarabadi, M.A.; Castellucci, H.I. Musculoskeletal pain in operating room nurses: Associations with quality of work life, working posture, socio-demographic and job characteristics. *Int. J. Ind. Ergon.* 2019, 72, 330–337. [CrossRef]
- Ayers, K.M.S.; Thomson, W.M.; Newton, J.T.; Morgaine, K.C.; Rich, A.M. Self-reported occupational health of general dental practitioners. Occup. Med. 2009, 59, 142–148. [CrossRef]
- Campo, M.; Weiser, S.; Koenig, K.L.; Nordin, M. Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders in Physical Therapists: A Prospective Cohort Study With 1-Year Follow-up. *Phys. Ther.* 2008, *88*, 608–619. [CrossRef]
- Choobineh, A.; Rajaeefard, A.; Neghab, M. Association Between Perceived Demands and Musculoskeletal Disorders Among Hospital Nurses of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences: A Questionnaire Survey. Int. J. Occup. Saf. Ergon. 2006, 12, 409–416. [CrossRef]
- 40. Hayes, M.J.; Smith, D.R.; Cockrell, D. Prevalence and correlates of musculoskeletal disorders among Australian dental hygiene students. *Int. J. Dent. Hyg.* 2009, 7, 176–181. [CrossRef]
- Jang, Y.; Chi, C.-F.; Tsauo, J.-Y.; Wang, J.-D. Prevalence and Risk Factors of Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders in Massage Practitioners. J. Occup. Rehabil. 2006, 16, 425–638. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 42. Khan, S.A.; Yee Chew, K. Effect of working characteristics and taught ergonomics on the prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders amongst dental students. *BMC Musculoskelet. Disord.* **2013**, *14*, 118. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Kierklo, A.; Kobus, A.; Jaworska, M.M.; Botuliński, B. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among dentists—A questionnaire survey. Ann. Agric. Environ. Med. 2011, 18, 79–84. [PubMed]
- 44. Knudsen, M.; Ludewig, P.; Braman, J. Musculoskeletal Pain in Resident Orthopaedic Surgeons: Results of a Novel Survey. *Iowa Orthop. J.* **2014**, *34*, 190–196.
- 45. Leggat, P.A.; Smith, D.R. Musculoskeletal disorders self-reported by dentists in Queensland, Australia. *Aust. Dent. J.* **2006**, *51*, 324–327. [CrossRef]
- McLeod, G.A.; Murphy, M.; Henare, T.M.; Dlabik, B. Work-related musculoskeletal injuries among Australian osteopaths: A preliminary investigation. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.* 2018, 27, 14–22. [CrossRef]
- Okuyucu, K.; Gyi, D.; Hignett, S.; Doshani, A. Midwives are getting hurt: UK survey of the prevalence and risk factors for developing musculoskeletal symptoms. *Midwifery* 2019, 79, 102546. [CrossRef]
- Pugh, J.D.; Gelder, L.; Cormack, K.; Williams, A.M.; Twigg, D.E.; Giles, M.; Blazevich, A.J. Changes in exercise and musculoskeletal symptoms of novice nurses: A one-year follow-up study. *Collegian* 2021, 28, 206–213. [CrossRef]
- 49. Rabiei, M.; Shakiba, M.; Dehgan-Shahreza, H.; Talebzadeh, M. Musculoskeletal Disorders in Dentists. *Int. J. Occup. Hyg.* **2012**, *4*, 36–40.
- 50. Ribeiro, T.; Serranheira, F.; Loureiro, H. Work related musculoskeletal disorders in primary health care nurses. *Appl. Nurs. Res.* **2017**, *33*, 72–77. [CrossRef]
- Smith, D.; Wei, N.; Kang, L.; Wang, R.-S. Musculoskeletal disorders among professional nurses in mainland China. J. Prof. Nurs. 2004, 20, 390–395. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 52. Szeto, G.P.Y.; Ho, P.; Ting, A.C.W.; Poon, J.T.C.; Cheng, S.W.K.; Tsang, R.C.C. Work-related Musculoskeletal Symptoms in Surgeons. *J. Occup. Rehabil.* **2009**, *19*, 175–184. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 53. Szymańska, J. Disorders of the musculoskeletal system among dentists from the aspect of ergonomics and prophylaxis. *Ann. Agric. Environ. Med.* **2002**, *9*, 169–173. [PubMed]
- 54. Vieira, E.R.; Svoboda, S.; Belniak, A.; Brunt, D.; Rose-St Prix, C.; Roberts, L.; da Costa, B.R. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among physical therapists: An online survey. *Disabil. Rehabil.* **2016**, *38*, 552–557. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 55. Yeung, S.S.; Genaidy, A.; Deddens, J.; Sauter, S. The relationship between protective and risk characteristics of acting and experienced workload, and musculoskeletal disorder cases among nurses. J. Saf. Res. 2005, 36, 85–95. [CrossRef]
- Moscato, U.; Trinca, D.; Rega, M.L.; Mannocci, A.; Chiaradia, G.; Grieco, G.; Ricciardi, W.; La Torre, G. Musculoskeletal injuries among operating room nurses: Results from a multicenter survey in Rome, Italy. J. Public Health 2010, 18, 453–459. [CrossRef]

- 57. Albert, W.J.; Currie-Jackson, N.; Duncan, C.A. A survey of musculoskeletal injuries amongst Canadian massage therapists. *J. Bodyw. Mov. Ther.* **2008**, *12*, 86–93. [CrossRef]
- 58. Yeung, S.; Genaidy, A.; Deddens, J.; Al-Hemoud, A.; Leung, P. Prevalence of Musculoskeletal Symptoms in Single and Multiple Body Regions and Effects of Perceived Risk of Injury Among Manual Handling Workers. *Spine* 2002, 27, 2166–2172. [CrossRef]
- Meh, J.; Bizovičar, N.; Kos, N.; Jakovljević, M. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among Slovenian physiotherapists. J. Health Sci. 2020, 10, 115–124. [CrossRef]
- 60. Åkesson, I.; Hansson, G.Å.; Balogh, I.; Moritz, U.; Skerfving, S. Quantifying work load in neck, shoulders and wrists in female dentists. *Int. Arch. Occup. Environ. Health* **1997**, *69*, 461–474. [CrossRef]
- 61. Oberg, T.; Oberg, U. Musculoskeletal complaints in dental hygiene: A survey study from a Swedish county. *J. Dent. Hyg.* **1993**, *67*, 257–261. [PubMed]
- 62. Al-Eisa, E.; Buragadda, S.; Shaheen, A.; Ibrahim, A.; Melam, G. Work related musculoskeletal disorders: Causes, prevalence and response among egyptian and saudi physical therapists. *Middle East J. Sci. Res.* **2012**, *12*, 523–529. [CrossRef]
- Khairy, W.A.; Bekhet, A.H.; Sayed, B.; Elmetwally, S.E.; Elsayed, A.M.; Jahan, A.M. Prevalence, Profile, and Response to Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders among Egyptian Physiotherapists. *Open Access Maced. J. Med. Sci.* 2019, 7, 1692–1699. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 64. Serranheira, F.; Cotrim, T.P.; Rodrigues, V.A.; Nunes, C.; Sousa-Uva, A. Nurses' working tasks and MSDs back symptoms: Results from a national survey. *Work* **2012**, *41* (Suppl. S1), 2449–2451. [CrossRef]
- 65. Sheikhzadeh, A.; Gore, C.; Zuckerman, J.D.; Nordin, M. Perioperating nurses and technicians' perceptions of ergonomic risk factors in the surgical environment. *Appl. Ergon.* **2009**, *40*, 833–839. [CrossRef]
- 66. West, D.J.; Gardner, D. Occupational injuries of physiotherapists in North and Central Queensland. *Aust. J. Physiother.* 2001, 47, 179–186. [CrossRef]
- 67. Long, M.H.; Johnston, V.; Bogossian, F.E. Helping women but hurting ourselves? Neck and upper back musculoskeletal symptoms in a cohort of Australian Midwives. *Midwifery* **2013**, *29*, 359–367. [CrossRef]
- 68. Bork, B.E.; Cook, T.M.; Rosecrance, J.C.; Engelhardt, K.A.; Thomason, M.E.; Wauford, I.J.; Worley, R.K. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among physical therapists. *Phys. Ther.* **1996**, *76*, 827–835. [CrossRef]
- Holder, N.; Clark, H.A.; DiBlasio, J.M.; Hughes, C.; Scherpf, J.W.; Harding, L.; Shepard, K.F. Cause, prevalence, and response to occupational musculoskeletal injuries reported by physical therapists and physical therapist assistants. *Phys. Ther.* 1999, 79, 642–652. [CrossRef]
- McAtamney, L.; Corlett, N.E. RULA: A survey method for the investigation of work-related upper limb disorders. *Appl. Ergon.* 1993, 24, 91–99. [CrossRef]
- Kee, D.; Karwowski, W. LUBA: An assessment technique for postural loading on the upper body based on joint motion discomfort and maximum holding time. *Appl. Ergon.* 2001, 32, 357–366. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 72. Hignett, S.; McAtamney, L. Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA). Appl. Ergon. 2000, 31, 201–205. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 73. Jacquier-Bret, J.; Gorce, P.; Rouviere, E. Ergonomic risk assessment during massage among physiotherapists: Introduction of Generic Postures notion. *Work* 2023, *in press*.
- 74. Jacquier-Bret, J.; Gorce, P. Six-Month work related musculoskeletal disorders assessment during manual lymphatic drainage: A physiotherapist case report. *Int. J. Health Sci. Res.* 2022, *12*, 148–153. [CrossRef]
- 75. Jacquier-Bret, J.; Gorce, P. Effect of stool movement on a physiotherapist MSD risk during manual lymphatic drainage: A case report. *Int. J. Health Sci. Res.* 2022, 12, 98–104. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.