## Latest and Greatest in Ergonomics: Trends, Issues & Evidence-Based Practices December 5, 2019

### Facilitated by: Melanie Alexandre, MS, OTR, CPE

EHS Ergonomics Subject Matter Expert





Office of Science



### Ergo-related injuries are still prevalent in the workspace

Non-fatal work injuries/year



Office of

Science

400,000 worker injuries/year





Estimated to cost between \$45-54 billion/year

### **Ergo Headlines**







Lab

### **Material Handling**



## Hazard Analysis



### **Ergo Gadget Overload!**





### **Recommendations for managing gadget overload**







**Research & Evidence** 



Keep it simple



### Sitting is evil... well kind of



### https://www.startstanding.org/sitting-new-smoking/#



Next position is your best position



### **Recommendations to improve movement**



 Move or stretch at least 3-4 minutes every hour, change your posture, and move often. Drink water to stay hydrated and move throughout the day.

 Have a walking meeting or walk to meeti instead of taking a car/shuttle.

locations with great views.

5. Talk in person instead of calling, emailing, o

6. Take the stairs to another floor's restr

 Use RSI Guard stretch break software to remind you to stretch and/or move.
Stretch/move into the 'opposite' position yo are working. (i.e., if you are sitting then stand: if you are learning forward. then lean

 Walk or stand instead of sitting while you ar waiting. Stand or march in place while on th ohone sense inly during understoart and

9. Join a fitness class at Junch. Start or join a

walking club.

11. Wear a pedometer and set daily step goals.

#### entr: transferences handh, koof flow, ad circulator war ahrense gan artenanis and how bak teason and h

Make it easy <u>and</u> acceptable to move



### ' Sell' benefits of movement



Utilize cueing devices for when we get in the 'zone'





8

### **Risk Factors**

-Since the laptop keyboard and the screen are integrated, either the keyboard is too high, causing risk to the shoulders and wrists or the monitor too low, causing risk to the neck (Asundi et al., 2010; Chandra et al., 2009; Ellison, 2012)

-Laptop use compared to desktop use increases head forward posture (Straker, Jones & Miller, 1997; Sommerich et al., 2002, Yu et al., 2018) a major contributor to neck pain (Szeto et al., 2005; Chiou et al., 2012)

-Compact laptop designs with small input devices increases ulnar deviation (Rempel et al., 2007; Yu et al., 2018) and internal rotation and variability of the shoulder (Sommerich et al. 2002)



Fig. 1. Device placement for each experimental condition: (A) tablet, (B) laptop, (C) desktop, sitting, and (D) desktop, standing, with retro-reflective marker configuration.

Office of

Science

#### Source: Yu et al., 2018



#### References

Asundi, K., Odell, D., Luce, A., & Dennerlein, J. T. (2010). Notebook computer use on a desk, lap and lap support: effects on posture, performance and comfort. Ergonomics, 53(1), 74-82

Berkhout, A. L., Hendriksson-Larsen, K., & Bongers, P. (2004). The effect of using a laptopstation compared to using a standard laptop PC on the cervical spine torque, perceived strain and productivity. Applied ergonomics, 35(2), 147-152.

Rempel, D., Barr, A., Brafman, D., & Young, E. (2007). The effect of six keyboard designs on wrist and forearm postures. Applied ergonomics, 38(3), 293-298.

Sommerich, C. M., Starr, H., Smith, C. A., & Shivers, C. (2002). Effects of notebook computer configuration and task on user biomechanics, productivity, and comfort. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 30(1), 7-31.

Straker, L., Jones, K. J., & Miller, J. (1997). A comparison of the postures assumed when using laptop computers and desktop computers. Applied ergonomics, 28(4), 263-268.

Szeto, G. P., Straker, L. M., & O'Sullivan, P. B. (2005). A comparison of symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers performing monotonous keyboard work–2: neck and shoulder kinematics. Manual therapy, 10(4), 281-291.

Toh, S. H., Coenen, P., Howie, E. K., & Straker, L. M. (2017). The associations of mobile touch screen device use with musculoskeletal symptoms and exposures: A systematic review. PloS one, 12(8), e0181220.

Werth, A. J., & Babski-Reeves, K. (2012, September). Assessing posture while typing on portable computing devices in traditional work environments and at home. In Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting (Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 1258-1262). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Yu, Z., James, C., Edwards, S., & Snodgrass, S. J. (2018). Differences in posture kinematics between using a tablet, a laptop, and a desktop computer in sitting and in standing. Work, (Preprint), 1-1



1 Minute

4 Safety

### **Best Practices**

- Avoid conventional laptop use
  - Option 1: Use external monitor AND external mouse/keyboard
  - Option 2: Raise height of laptop (Ex. Use laptop station/riser) and use external mouse/keyboard
- If you MUST use laptop conventionally...
  - Avoid unconventional work postures such as working with laptop on your lap (Asundi, Odell, Luce, & Dennerlein, 2010; Werth, A. J., & Babski-Reeves, K., 2012)
  - Tilt screen 115-130deg to decrease head forward posture (Chandra et al., 2009; Chiou et al., 2012)
  - Alternate trackpad use R/L hands
  - Increase font size
  - <u>http://ergo.human.cornell.edu/ergoguide.html</u>... 1 hour max

### Three Key Takeaways

- Laptop use causes increased neck, shoulder and wrist injuries compared to standard desktop computer use
  MicroBreak - Pause for 5 seconds
- 2. There is no safe ergonomic way to use a laptop
- 3. Use external monitors and input devices with your laptop whenever possible



You've use the builtin keyboard and/or pointer on your notebook for 41 minutes!

To avoid poor posture, use an external keyboard, mouse, and eye-level monitor.







Risks

Keyboard and screen are in a fixed setting and therefore, can

•Screen can be too small to view which causes eye strain and

causes bad postures in the neck, back, and arms

forward head and neck leaning.

•Keys small in size

Laptop Ergonomics



Solutions
Use an external monitor or laptop riser for improved neck
positioning.

·Use external keyboard and mouse.

•Travel accessories are available to use with your laptop when on travel.

•Take breaks frequently when working on the laptop for a longer period of time.

#### For more information, contact the Ergo Team x6848 or ergo@lbl.gov





Science

Not sure what the future will bring...



... may pose new and challenging ergonomic risks







Lab

### Material Handling



Wearable Technology

### Workplace Design

## Hazard Analysis



### In labs people... do it all!



BERKELEY LAB

### In labs people... do it all!





## Ideas for lab ergonomics: Look for opportunities to align ergonomics early!

#### Diagram 1. Adjustable Height Work Bench



### **Design Guidelines**









Engage and align with employees



### **Equipment Procurement**



Lab

### **Material Handling**



Wearable Technology

## Hazard Analysis



### Material Handling More than just safe lifting



Avoid manual handling whenever possible



Hands-on practical experiential learning and reinforcement for 'doing things right'



Pushing, pulling and carrying has risks





Safe work planning should also consider pre and post tasks

### Material Handling More than just safe lifting

#### AN OBJECTIVE SET OF GUIDELINES FOR PUSHING AND PULLING

Eric B. Weston, Alex Aurand, Jonathan S. Dufour, Gregory G. Knapik, W. Gary Allread, William S. Marras Spine Research Institute, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH USA

#### Ergonomic Assessment Tool Use

Type of Task	Ergonomic Assessment Tool
Lifting / Lowering	WISHA Lifting Calculator or NIOSH Lifting Equation
Upper Body Posture	Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA)
Entire Body Posture	Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA)
Pushing / Pulling / Carrying	Snook Tables
Vibration	Hand-Arm Vibration Calculator

https://health.usf.edu/publichealth/tbernard/tebstonewheels

#### SUMMARY

Current guidelines related to pushing and pulling commonly used by practitioners were developed using subjective methods and may underestimate risk to the lower back and shoulders. This document describes the development of a new set of *objective* guidelines and how to implement them moving forward to help reduce the risk of workplace injury to the low back and shoulders.

#### BACKGROUND

Occupationally-related low back disorders (LBD) and shoulder musculoskeletal disorders are a leading cause of lost work days and are a costly occupational safety and health problem facing industry today. In the United States, treatment of low back pain costs over 550 billion annually in direct costs alone, while the direct cost of treating shoulder injury is over 57 billion (Meislin et al. 2005; Davis et al 2012).

As employers have recognized the risks associated with lifting, they have shifted the manual materials handling burden to interventions involving pushing and pulling (such as overhead hoists, carts, and articulating arms). However, pushing and pulling is also associated with its own risk of injury to the low back and shoulders as well.

Guidelines presented to practitioners have the potential to aid in workplace design and reduce the risk of low back and shoulder injuries. However, the only current pushing relying on the assumption that an individual's perception of maximum acceptable external forces corresponds to bomechanical risk to the low back and shoulders (Shook and Ciriello 1991). Prior literature shows this assumption is incorrect (corgensen et al. 1999; Davis et al. 2000; Le et al. 2012). Thus, objectively determined guidelines are necessary for pushing and pulling.

This study used biomechanical information collected from 62 human subjects in a laboratory to develop pushing and pulling guidelines for practitioners. This was achieved via establishing a relationship between the biomechanical loads induced onto the spine and hand forces generated by the participants. Risk limits were determined by investigating which hand forces or turning torques led to spinal loads over risk thresholds (Gallagher and Marras 2012; NIOSH 1981). Loads on the spine were predicted using a unique biomechanical model that is validated for pushing and pulling, dynamic, and accurately accounts for the way each person recruits their muscles to complete a task (Granata and Marras 1993; Hwang et al. 2016; Knapik and Marras 2009).

Subjects performed activities including 1 Handed Pulling, 2 Handed Pulling, and 2 Handed Pushing. They performed exertions at three different handle heights (32 in, 40 in, 48 in) and performed both straight and turning push/pull exertions.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WORKPLACE DESIGN

The results of this study suggest that the following be considered related to pushing and pulling.

 Higher handle heights (up to 48 in.) are generally preferable for all pushing and pulling exertions.

- Turning push/pull exertions should be avoided where possible because these exertions generally subjected participants to higher biomechanical loads than straight exertions.
- Two handed turning exertions (such as moving a cart) are recommended over one handed turning exertions (such as moving a pallet jack).
- The widely-accepted subjectively determined limits for hand force during pushing and pulling (Snook and Ciriello 1991) are not protective enough of injury risk. The objective, biomechanically-determined risk limits derived from our study are up to 30% lower than the limits reported previously.

#### GUIDELINES FOR OCCUPATIONAL PUSHING AND PULLING

- The objectively determined guidelines are presented in tables below. These limits and are expected to be protective of both the low back and shoulders.
- Note that the pushing and pulling guidelines proposed within this investigation *did not differ based on gender*.

https://www.bwc.ohio.gov/downloads /blankpdf/PushPullGuidelines.pdf

https://www.bwc.ohio.gov/employer/ programs/safety/PushPullGuide/Pus hPullGuide.aspx



 $\mathbb{Z}$ 





Lab

### **Material Handling**



Wearable Technology

## Hazard Analysis



### Wearable Technology Not sure if and how they will help worker safety





Exoskeletons do they... Reduce fatigue, transfer loads away from spine, ensure proper techniques?



Key ergo considerations for wearable technology:

- ✓ Ease of use
- ✓ Simplicity
- ✓ Satisfaction
- ✓ User Friendly
- ✓ Intuitiveness
- ✓ Functional



Lab

### **Material Handling**



Wearable Technology

## Hazard Analysis



# Workplace DesignThe way we work is changing: Wellness and employee centered



### THE WELL BUILDING STANDARD™

SEVEN CONCEPTS FOR HEALTHIER BUILDINGS





EQpc44 | Possible 1 point

Design work areas and tasks hard to do the wrong thing and easy to do the right thing





Lab

### **Material Handling**



Hazard Analysis



### Hazard Analysis: CAD Human Modeling & Risk Detection

Predictive Analytics Cloud based system with rapid early detection of ergonomic and injury risks for all types of work of large worker populations





CAD Human Modeling, Simulation, & Calculation Helpful tool to ensure a good match between human capabilities, posture and work tasks



## Hazard Analysis: How to predict and measure fatigue







Development and validation of an easy-to-use risk assessment tool for cumulative low back loading: The Lifting Fatigue Failure Tool (LiFFT)

Sean Gallagher A ⊠, Richard F. Sesek, Mark C. Schall Jr., Rong Huangfu

#### Highlights

- A practitioner friendly risk assessment tool for manual lifting activities based on fatigue failure theory is presented.
- The tool requires only load weight, horizontal distance to the load, and the daily number of repetitions for each task.
- The cumulative load associated with multiple lifting tasks can be easily summed to get a "daily dose" of exposure.
- The cumulative damage metric demonstrated dose-response relationships with low back outcomes from two epidemiology studies.
- The strong relationship between our fatigue failure metric and back outcomes suggests a fatigue failure based etiology.

#### The Lifting Fatigue Failure Tool

Task #	Lever Arm (inch)	Load (Ibs)	Moment (ft.lbs.)	Repetitions (per work day)	Damage (cumulative)	% Total (damage)	
1	14	10	11.7	420	0.0012	5.1	
2	18	44	66.0	75	0.0033	14.0	
3	24	54	108.0	50	0.019	80.9	
4			0.0		0.0	0.0	
5			0.0		0.0	0.0	
6			0.0		0.0	0.0	
7			0.0		0.0	0.0	
8			0.0		0.0	0.0	
9			0.0		0.0	0.0	
10			0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total Cumulative Damage:						0.0235	
Probability of High Risk Job * (%):					51.4		

ACGIH- Upper Limb Localized Fatigue TLV

New for 2016

#### ACGIH



Duty Cycle Range: 0.5% to 90%

For multiple tasks that are 2h or more each, none should exceed the TLV<sup>®</sup>

### ACGIH- HAL TLV Changed in 2018



2018 TLV NPF = 5.6 – 0.56 \* HAL 2018 AL NPF = 3.6 – 0.56 \* HAL



Lab

### **Material Handling**



Wearable Technology

## Hazard Analysis



### **Evidence Based Ergo Practices**



## FOCUS ON SYSTEM & ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES



### **CHAMPIONS & ALLIES**







Office of

Science

### **Evidence Based Ergo Practices** (Continued)







### **Evidence Based Ergo Practices** (Continued)

Have comprehensive program with a variety of resources



Risk rating tool and training



**Ergonomic Point-of-Contact** 



Convenient access to approved products/ one stop 'shop'



### Now it's time for a test...





### **Ergo Headlines**



### Key Takeaways

- Important to be in tune and adapt with latest trends, but base decisions on evidence
- Involve and integrate ergonomics early and often
- Thorough problem identification and appropriate intervention are key
- □ Promote movement... reduce fatigue
- Material handling is more than safe lifting



Melanie Alexandre Email:<u>mmalexandre@lbl.gov</u> Website: ergo.lbl.gov

