

Manual patient handling in the healthcare setting: a scoping review.

JOHNSON, K., SWINTON, P., PAVLOVA, A. and COOPER, K.

2023

© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Chartered Society of Physiotherapy.
Supplementary materials are appended after the main text of this document.



Manual patient handling in the healthcare setting: a scoping review

Katharine Johnson^{a,*}, Paul Swinton^a, Anastasia Pavlova^{a,b},
Kay Cooper^{a,b}

^a School of Health Sciences, Robert Gordon University, Garthdee Road, Aberdeen AB10 7QE, UK

^b Scottish Centre for Evidence-based, Multi-professional Practice: A JBI Centre of Excellence, UK

Abstract

Background Manual patient handling is the most frequently reported risk factor for work related musculoskeletal disorders in healthcare. Patient handling tasks are routinely performed manually without assistive devices and can create awkward postures and high loads for nurses and allied health professionals (AHPs). However, AHPs, notably physiotherapists, also utilize therapeutic handling to facilitate patient movement during rehabilitation.

Objectives To comprehensively map the literature surrounding manual patient handling (without assistive devices) by healthcare practitioners.

Methods AMED, CINAHL, MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, and EMBASE databases were searched. Grey literature was sourced from Google Scholar, EThOS, Open Grey, Health and Safety Executive, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health and Work Safe Australia. Literature published in English between 2002 and 2021 was included.

Results Forty-nine records were included: 36 primary research studies, 1 systematic review and 12 ‘other’ including narrative and government reports. Primary research was predominantly observational cross-sectional ($n = 21$). The most common settings included laboratories ($n = 13$) and hospitals ($n = 13$). Seven research questions were identified, with patient handling practices ($n = 13$) the most common. Nurses formed the largest practitioner population ($n = 13$) and patients were often simulated ($n = 12$). Common outcomes included tasks performed ($n = 13$) and physical demands during patient handling ($n = 13$).

Conclusion and implications of key findings This comprehensive scoping review identified that most research was observational, investigating nurses in hospitals or laboratories. More research on manual patient handling by AHPs and investigation of the biomechanics involved in therapeutic handling is needed. Further qualitative research would allow for greater understanding of manual patient handling practices within healthcare.

Contribution of the paper

- Much of the research remains observational cross-sectional, investigating patient handling tasks, movement and loading in laboratory settings. Although, the number of studies being performed in hospital settings has increased recently to equal the number performed in controlled laboratory environments.
- Manual handling has been identified as a significant biomechanical factor in development of WRMSD, however, this scoping review identified a lack of literature investigating the relationship between the effect of staff training on incidence of WRMSD.
- This review identified a need for more qualitative research related to moving and handling of patients, to facilitate a deeper understanding of the topic.

© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Chartered Society of Physiotherapy. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Allied health personnel; Delivery of health care; Lifting; Moving and lifting patients; Musculoskeletal diseases; Posture

Background

Healthcare practitioners routinely assist patients through manual handling across tasks including transferring from bed to chair, personal care tasks, repositioning or rolling in

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: k.johnson6@rgu.ac.uk (K. Johnson).

bed, and walking [1]. Nursing staff, support workers, physiotherapists and occupational therapists are among the healthcare practitioners (HCPs) involved with assisting patients within healthcare [1–3]. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WRMSDs) are multifactorial, they have a whole range of personal, psychosocial, environmental and biomechanical contributing factors. Psychological behaviours have been highlighted as an important aspects to consider together with biomechanical factors in relation to pain. Unclear messages relating to movement, as a result of uncertainty in the literature, are suggested to result in damaging behaviours such as hypervigilance, fear-avoidance and catastrophising [4–6]. Biomechanically, patient handling is frequently documented as the largest risk factor for WRMSDs within HCPs, with low back pain one of the most common complaints [4].

In the UK it is reported that 9.5 million working days are lost to WRMSDs each year with a financial burden of £400 million per annum to the United Kingdom's (UK) National Health Service (NHS) [7]. The United States (US) reported the cost of healthcare workers' related compensation losses as \$2 billion per annum [8], with Australia reporting the cost of serious workplace injuries (1 week or more off work) as A\$14 million within healthcare settings [9]. Investigation of the prevalence of WRMSD within HCPs internationally has reported rates ranging from 28% to 96% in nursing and allied health populations [9,10]. One-year prevalence of WRMSDs within physiotherapists has been reported as 58–67%, with therapeutic handling identified as an associated risk factor [11,12]. However, there is a lack of evidence investigating the risk of injury related to a flexed lifting posture [13].

Legislation on manual patient handling and associated training varies across geographical locations. Staff involved in patient handling within the NHS are required to complete annual online theory and in-person training sessions to learn recommended moving and handling principles to reduce their risk of injury [3]. Within the US, safe patient handling and mobility (SPHM) programs have been implemented in 11 states. These programs aim to improve safety of HCPs by encouraging the use of assistive devices during patient handling [14]. The majority of states, however, have not implemented SPHM programs [14].

Lifting aids and equipment can be used to improve safety of manual patient handling through decreasing the loading experienced by HCPs [14]. There are situations, however, that require nurses and AHPs to manually facilitate patient movement [1]. For example, assistive devices often require use of a sling where placement and removal can be a physically demanding task, involving moving and rolling of the patient. These patient movement tasks are completed manually by HCPs as there are no mechanical devices to aid with these steps [2]. In addition, AHPs, notably physiotherapists use therapeutic handling to aid a patient's rehabilitation. Therapeutic handling is when therapists use their own body in "guiding, facilitating, manipulating or providing resistance" to the patient [3]. The

therapist will manually move and handle the patient to achieve therapeutic benefit [3].

Given the growing body of literature investigating manual patient handling undertaken without the use of assistive devices, this scoping review aimed to map that literature and identify gaps for future research. Further research could benefit HCPs by providing a more comprehensive understanding of manual patient handling. Patient handling techniques could then be improved to reduce risk of injury to HCPs. Manual patient handling in this scoping review was defined as any patient handling task that was completed without the use of an assistive aid including assisting with transfers, moving patients for care tasks or dressing, and placing of slings or sheets under patients. This scoping review forms the first step in a programme of research on manual patient handling.

A preliminary search of MEDLINE, CINAHL, JBI Evidence Synthesis, Open Science Framework, Cochrane library and PROSPERO did not identify any published or in-progress scoping or systematic reviews on the topic.

Review questions

The objective of this scoping review was to map what information sources were available relating to manual patient handling in healthcare without assistive devices. Two broad review questions related to the primary research identified by the scoping review were: 1) What is the current evidence-base on moving and handling of patients by healthcare practitioners? and 2) What primary research has been conducted on moving and handling of patients by healthcare practitioners? In particular we wanted to answer the following further sub-questions: what questions has the research addressed?; which populations has the research been conducted on?; which settings has the research been conducted in?; which aspects of patient moving and handling have been explored?; and which outcome measures/techniques/technologies have been used?

Methods

This scoping review was conducted in accordance with JBI guidance for scoping reviews [15] and followed an a priori registered open access protocol [16]. The full inclusion and exclusion criteria for the scoping review are outlined in Table 1. Qualified and unqualified staff were included as in some geographical locations (e.g., UK) both staff groups are required to undertake manual handling training and perform patient handling. Literature from any setting was included where it involved HCPs manually assisting patients (real or simulated by healthy volunteers) for tasks or transfers, including in laboratory settings. Guidelines for moving and handling differ across geographical locations. We included literature from any of the

Table 1
Inclusion criteria for scoping review.

	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Qualified or unqualified healthcare staff – Healthcare staff who are involved with manual patient handling tasks (e.g. nurses, AHPs and support staff within nursing and allied health) – Over 18 years of age 	Patient handling performed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Students – Healthy volunteers (considered where these participants formed less than 50% of sample size and results presented separately from staff)
Concept	Manual patient handling by HCPs in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Healthcare settings – Laboratory settings 	Literature solely focused on using mechanical devices (e.g. hoists, stand aids)
Context	Legislation for correct patient handling Any healthcare setting where manual patient handling is performed Laboratory settings included where the research objectives could be addressed Literature from highly developed nations (as per HDI)	Literature solely investigating epidemiology or prevalence of WRMSD
Type of Source	Primary research of any type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods Literature reviews of any type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Narrative texts, systematic reviews, scoping reviews Conference abstracts if research questions could be answered from abstract Guidelines/legislation around manual patient handling Opinion and text pieces Educational resources for HCPs	Protocols only

62 very highly developed nations as defined by the Human development Index (HDI) [17] to ensure the findings would be relevant to the UK context.

Search strategy

The search strategy aimed to locate published and unpublished primary literature, systematic reviews, text and opinion articles and educational resources. An initial limited search of AMED (EBSCOhost), CINAHL (EBSCOhost) and MEDLINE (PubMed) was undertaken using the keywords (TX moving and handling OR TX manual handling) AND (MH nurse OR TX nurs* OR TX physiotherap* OR TX allied health*). The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles, and the index terms used to describe the articles were used to develop a full search strategy. The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms, was adapted for each included information source and a second comprehensive search was undertaken on 12th August 2020, and updated on 10th November 2021. Literature published in English from 2002 was included, as the influential Manual Handling Operations regulations 1992 was amended in 2002 [18]. The databases that were searched included: AMED, CINAHL, MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus (all via EBSCOhost) and EMBASE (via Ovid). Sources of unpublished and grey literature included: Google Scholar, EThOS, Open Grey, Health and Safety Executive (HSE), National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Safe Work Australia, Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, and Worksafe New Zealand. The full search strategy is provided in [supplementary material](#).

Source of evidence selection

Following the searches, all identified records were collated and uploaded into Covidence (v2477; Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia) and duplicates removed. Titles and abstracts were initially screened independently by three reviewers (KJ, KC, AP) against the inclusion criteria for the scoping review. Good agreement was found after 10% title and abstract screening. As this scoping review formed part of a doctoral research programme, after good agreement was established, one researcher (KJ) conducted the remainder of title and abstract screening. Three reviewers (KJ, KC, AP) were initially involved in full-text screening, however after good agreement was found following 30% of the screening, one reviewer (KJ) completed full-text screening. Regular review and discussion with the review team was maintained throughout evidence selection. Full-text records that did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded, and reasons for exclusion are provided in [supplementary material](#).

Data extraction

Following JBI methodological guidance, a charting table was created to record key information from the included records. The information extracted is presented in the [supplementary material](#). Data were initially extracted independently from 10% of the included articles by two reviewers (KJ, KC), extractions were consistent, therefore, one reviewer (KJ) completed the remaining data extraction with regular team consultation. Authors of articles were

contacted to request missing or additional data where required; at the time of writing no authors have responded.

Different study types of the included records were charted. The study types included observational cross-sectional, observational cohort, pilot, and qualitative. Observational cross-sectional research included data collected at one point in time, with observational cohort data collected over a period of time. Pilot studies were defined as such by study authors and included feasibility studies and a number of studies where the type was not clearly defined (pilot-undefined).

Data analysis and presentation

Search results and included records are summarized in a PRISMA flow diagram [19] (Fig. 1). Summaries of data from all included literature are displayed in Table 2. Previously reported research and populations investigated are grouped into umbrella terms and displayed in tables. Research questions, settings and outcome measures are displayed graphically. A narrative summary accompanies each of the displayed results. The findings are reported aligned to the two research questions. The first broad review question included all the literature ($n = 49$), the second broad review question included primary research only ($n = 36$).

Results

Study inclusion

Initial screening of databases retrieved 8638 records, with an additional 31 records identified from grey sources. Following removal of duplicates, 6956 records remained for title and abstract screening. Of these, 430 records proceeded to full text screening. Forty-nine records met the inclusion criteria and are included in the review (Fig. 1).

Characteristics of included studies

A summary of general characteristics of all included records are reported in Table 3. The scoping review included 49 records; one systematic review, 36 primary research studies and 12 other evidence types. The systematic review, published in the US in 2010, included 19 articles and aimed to investigate the effectiveness of health and safety interventions on WRMSDs [18]. The most frequent primary research study design found in this scoping review was observational ($n = 24$) [2,21–41]. Most of the primary research was published in the US ($n = 12$) [2,20,24,28,34,41,42,44,46,49,52,53] followed by Canada.




Fig. 1. Search results and study selection and inclusion process [16].

Table 2
Summary of included literatureKey: NR – Not reported, MSK - musculoskeletal.

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
Systematic reviews							
[17] Tullar, 2010, US	Do occupational safety and health interventions in health care settings have an effect on musculoskeletal health status?	Systematic review	NA	NA	NA, 19 studies included	NA	Effects of interventions in healthcare settings on MSK health. Evidence quality appraisal and data extraction and synthesis
Observational [2] Baptiste, 2011, US	To objectively determine the physical demands of patient transfer tasks performed by nurses	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Caregiver	age NR, all male, years exp NR, caregiver represented by 1 male (approx. 6 feet tall and 200lbs), sample size 1	3 mannequins of 3 different weights	Peak force and total impulse. tri-axial load cells
[18] Brusco, 2007, Australia	To develop and implement an allied health OH&S package, based on a risk assessment model, which incorporated clinicians' clinical judgement to minimize manual handling risks, while maximizing the therapeutic benefits for the patient	Observational - cohort	Hospital	5 Physiotherapists, 5 Occupational therapists, manual handling coordinator, allied health assistant	age NR, gender NR, years experience NR, description NA, 200	All health/social care patients	Training completion, MSK injury incidence rate. Staff attendance rates, staff evaluation, incidence rate of injury
[19] Cantarella, 2020, Italy	To validate the effectiveness of MAPO method (Movement and Assistance of Hospital Patient) after the introduction of some changes to improve assessment objectivity	Observational cohort, multi-centre study	Hospital	Health and safety professionals, caregivers	< 35 = 141, 35–44 = 593, 44–54 = 801, > 55 = 463, majority female, 0–9 = 287, 10–19 = 697, 20–29 = 642, > 30 = 372, 1998 participants	Various inpatient	Incidence of back pain, risk exposure. BORG scale, staff training. MAPO risk assessment
[20] Carneiro, 2015, Portugal	To identify the main risk factors of WRMSDs for home care nurses and to perform an objective assessment of the risk for these professionals	Observational cross-sectional	Other	Home care nurses	age NR, gender NR, years experience NR, description NA, 5	Home care patients	Risk of WRMSDs. Video footage, photographs
[21] Chen, 2014, US	How are nursing work activities distributed over a 12 h day shift? And how does heart rate level differ across nursing work activities?	Observational cross-sectional	Hospital	Nurses	43.4 (SD 8.8), gender NR, 10.6 (SD 6.1), staff nurses, 8	Telemetry unit patients	Heart rate, nursing activities. Heart rate monitor, observation

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[22] Hodder, 2010, Canada	To chronicle trunk posture and work tasks of long-term healthcare professionals	Observational cross-sectional	Care home	Personal support workers	46.7 (SD 8.6), All female, all 19.5 (SD 9.3) observed 13.3 (SD 8.6), description NA, 27	Long term care residents	Trunk kinematics and tasks performed. Inclinometer and observation
[23] Hodder, 2010, Canada	To quantify the postural changes that occur with Back Injury Prevention Program (BIPP)	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Nurses, untrained volunteers	41.6 (SD 10.2), All female, 11.3 (SD 9.5), Completed BIPP training in last 2 years, 12 untrained 10 nurses	Healthy volunteer patient (175 cm 81 kg, varying levels of passiveness, weight bearing and following of verbal cues)	Muscle activity, 3D thoracolumbar kinematics. EMG, lumbar motion monitor
[24] Holmes, 2010, Canada	To evaluate peak and cumulative lumbar spine loads experienced by personal support workers	Observational cross-sectional	Care home	Personal support workers	47.2 (SD 9.4), All female, 19.6 (SD 9.3), description NA, 20	Long term care patients	Trunk posture, activities completed by each PSW. Observation, inclinometer
[25] Howard, 2013, US	To compare the muscle activity of 5 muscle groups of the back, shoulder, and upper extremity between 4 bed-to-wheelchair transfer types. Comparisons are made across the transfer as a whole and between the common components of the transfers. 2. To compare the duration of the components (tasks) of each transfer type	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	1 Occupational therapist, 1 physiotherapist	55 (SD1), All female, 19.5 (SD 13.5), description NA, 2	Volunteer patients simulating varied levels of physical ability	Bilateral muscular effort, duration of task. EMG, video recording
[26] Hye-Knudsen, 2004, Denmark	To investigate the kinematics of the thoracolumbar spine during commonly used patient handling tasks	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Health care workers	43, All female, 19, description NA, 10	Stroke patient, left sided paralysis	Kinematic data, muscle activity. Lumbar motion monitor, EMG, triaxial electrogoniometer
[27] Jordan, 2011, Germany	To perform a detailed investigation on the load of the lumbar spine during manual patient handling	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Health care workers	43, All female, 19, description NA, 10 age NR, All female, Years experience NR, professionally experienced healthcare workers, 2	Two healthcare workers alternating as simulated partially cooperating patient	Load at IVD L5-S1, considering for posture and action force data. OPTOTRAK

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[28] Kang, 2013, Republic of Korea	To investigate the effects of the application of postural taping on the kinematics of the lumbar spine, pelvis, and hips, EMG activity of the erector spinae, and RPE in the low back during patient transfer in physical therapists with chronic LBP	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Physiotherapists	30.68 (SD 4.23), All male, years experience NR, chronic LBP, 19	Healthy volunteer simulated patients	Peak angle and ROM of lumbo-pelvic-hip complex, muscle activity, RPE. VICON motion capture system, EMG, Borg scale
[29] Kim, 2014, Republic of Korea	To analyze, through ergonomic analyses, those motions most used by radiological technologists that cause musculoskeletal disorders	Observational cross-sectional	Hospital	Radiological technologist	age NR, gender NR, > 5 years experience, description NA, 7	NR	Working postures. Video footage, REBA, RULA, NLE, SI
[30] Kjellberg, 2003, Sweden	To explore the work technique applied by nursing personnel in patient transfer tasks and to determine whether different personal factors were associated with work technique	Observational cross-sectional	Hospital	Nurses, enrolled nurses	35 (SD 10), Majority female, 11 (SD 8.7), mix of participants with and without low-back, neck, shoulder pain, 102	Three healthy women simulated patients	Work technique score, personal factors. Video recordings, observation, questionnaire
[31] Kurowski, 2014, US	To obtain a comprehensive analysis of the physical workload of clinical staff in long-term care facilities, before and after a safe resident handling program (SRHP)	Observational cohort	Care home	Nurse, nursing assistants	age NR, Majority female, 3.03–6.44, description NA, 58–123	Nursing home residents	Average compressive forces on the spine, body postures, manual handling frequencies, biomechanical index. Observation, physical workload index
[32] Kyriakidis, 2021, Denmark	The purpose of our study was to investigate which organizational levels and factors determine the number of resident handlings in eldercare	Observational cross-sectional	Care home	Eldercare workers	Day shift = 44.4 (SD 10.8), night shift = 47.3 (SD 11), majority female, 15.1 (SD 11.1), 619 staff	Nursing home residents	Factors affecting number of patient handling. Staff seniority level, personal factors, number of patient handling incidences per shift

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[33] Larouche, 2019, Canada	To create an overall risk index that takes account of several aspects of risk, such as awkward postures recorded by a dosimeter, a lifting index, perceived exertion and duration of the task, and to compare the risk associated with patient transfers in total assistance mode observed in real work situations and assigned to three families of transfers	Observational cross-sectional	Other	Paramedics	35 (SD 10), Majority male, 11 (SD 11), description NA, 45	Various	3D angular movements of their back, lifting index, overall risk index. Camcorder, observation, posture dosimeter
[34] Larouche, 2019, Canada	To identify factors that may favor or inhibit the application of safe patient handling principles by paramedics performing full-body transfers of patients from a chair to a stretcher	Observational cross-sectional	Other	Paramedics	31 (SD 9), Majority male, 8 (SD 9), description NA, 32	Various	Work activity analysis, difficulty of various tasks in the intervention, patient handling methods. Observation, video footage, semi-structured interview
[35] Maekawa, 2009, Japan	To quantify the load on the lumbar region, predict the risk, prevent LBP, and use information in education, based on nursing techniques learned in nursing basic education and nursing modality carried out in clinical experience	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Nurses	30 s, All female years experience NR, description NA, 2	Nursing staff volunteers	Twist angle of lumbar spine, muscle activity. Goniometer, EMG
[36] Skotte, 2008, Denmark	To investigate the low back load during repositioning of patients in bed and to assess the influence of patient's weight and disability	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Health care workers	46 (SD 9), All female, 5–30 years, description NA, 9	Volunteer patients, 1 paraplegic with the rest otherwise healthy volunteers simulating hemiplegia, paraplegia and near paralysis	Net torque, compression and shear forces at L4/5, ground reaction forces, reaction force of thighs on the bed. Digitized video, force platforms, force transducers
[37] Skotte, 2002, Denmark	To investigate the low back-loading during common patient-handling tasks	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Health care workers	43 (SD 8.7), All female, 19 (range 6–26), no special education of training on patient handling technique, 10	Stroke patient, male, 53 years old, 88 kg, left sided weakness	L4/L5 net moment, compression, shear forces, muscle activity, RPE, ground and bed reaction forces. EMG, Borg scale, video recording, force platforms, force transducers

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[38] Stringer, 2014, US	To investigate the influence that experience in performing manual patient transfers has on the ability to rate the assistance level required during a patient transfer	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Occupational therapist, physical therapist, occupational therapy students, physiotherapy students	50.5 (range 40–56), Majority female, 26.1 (range 15–32), description NA, 23	Volunteer patients	Ground reaction forces of participant and patient, perceived level of assistance the patient required after each pivot transfer. Force plates, VAS
[39] Theis, 2014, US	To evaluate the effectiveness of a safe patient handling program (STEPS) at an inpatient rehabilitation unit in reducing injury due to patient transfers	Observational cohort	Hospital	Nurses, therapy staff	62.7 (SD 16.4), Equal split, years experience NR, description NA, 55	Inpatient rehabilitation patients	Injury rates pre and post training. Assessment forms
[40] Vieira, 2009, Canada	To quantify physical demands of frequent nursing tasks and provide evidence-based recommendations to increase low back safety	Observational cross-sectional	Laboratory	Nurses	Orthopaedic 35 (SD 7) Intensive care 34 (SD 9), All female, years experience NR, description NA, 36	Same nursing participants simulating patients	Lumbar ROM, motion during nursing tasks, L5/S1 compression and shear forces estimated, sufficient torso strength estimated. Electrogoniometer, perpendicular marker photogrammetry
Pilot studies [41] Arias, 2017, US	To characterize the physical load of trunk flexion and physical activity of patient care unit (PCA) workers	Pilot - undefined	Hospital	Nurses, patient care assistants	42 (SD 13), Majority female, Years experience NA, description NA, 50	Thoracic intensive care, orthopedic, burn and trauma, cardiac and cardiac step down patients	Physical activity, trunk flexion. Accelerometer, tri-axial accelerometer
[42] Fiedler, 2012, Canada	To determine the feasibility of documenting all job-related nursing tasks performed during a typical shift in a hospital setting using video	Pilot - feasibility	Hospital	Nurses	40.6 (SD 13.3), 13.6 (SD 11.2), description NA, 10	Intensive care unit, inpatient rehabilitation, complex continuing care unit, acute care unit, outpatient surgery, ambulatory care	Patient handling tasks. Camcorder, observation
[43] Fragala, 2011, US	To quantify and objectively measure the risk reduction achieved with the gravity assist feature	Pilot - undefined	Laboratory	Caregivers	age NR, gender NR, years experience NR, description NR, sample NR	200 lb mannequin	Total force, peak force, total work, slope of the force curve. Force transducer
[44] Garzillo, 2020, Italy	To propose an MPH training model involving interdisciplinary aspects	Pilot - undefined	Hospital	Healthcare workers	men 49.4 (SD 7.2) women 45.9 (SD 8.8), equal split of gender, 24.6 (SD 8.1), 52 staff members	Various inpatient	Risk assessing tasks, staff training, effort required for tasks. Questionnaire, multidisciplinary training program, BORG scale

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[45] Newton, 2020, Australia	To ascertain the incidence of Australian private practice sonographers moving patients unassisted and determine what training these sonographers have in order to appropriately perform these procedures	Pilot - undefined	Other - sonography clinics	Sonographers	age NR, gender NR, < 5 = 24, 6–10 = 6, 11–20 = 4, > 21 = 1, 35 respondents	Outpatient	Incidence of manual assistance of patients, level of training. Survey
Qualitative [46] de Ruiter, 2011 US	To identify patient-handling practices in clinical practice	Qualitative	Hospital	Registered nurse, nursing assistant	age: < 24 = 7 24–36 = 13 40–59 = 9 60 + = 3, Majority female, < 1 = 3 1–3 = 9 4–10 = 10 11–20 = 7 21 + = 3	Neurology and rehabilitation patients	Patient handling practices and nurses' judgment of these practices, observation of caregivers and interviews
[47] Osborne, 2021, Australia	To investigate emergency nurses' beliefs and experiences with patient handling in the emergency department	Qualitative - phenomenological	Hospital	Nurses	age NR, majority female, mean 3.9 years (range 1–27), 40 participants	ED patients	Experiences of patient handling. Focus group interviews
[48] Wangbad, 2009, Sweden	To describe nurses' experiences of physical strain during person transfer tasks as dementia care units	Qualitative	Hospital	Nurses aids	43 (range 26–64), All female, 15 (range 2–31), description NA, 16	Dementia patients	Experiences, apprehensions, person transfer tasks. Focus groups
Survey [49] McKoskey, 2007, US	To describe patient-handling demands in inpatient units during a 24-hour period at a military health care facility	Survey	Hospital	Nurses, licensed practical nurses, nursing assistants, and nursing students	35 (SD 10.7), Majority female, Median 6 (range 0.5–38), description NA, 283	Military inpatients	Nature and impact of patient-handling tasks relative to a variety of nursing care units, patient characteristics, and transfer equipment. 24-hour population survey
Conference abstract [50] Lavender, 2016, US	To measure the compression and shear loads on the spine that are experienced as slings are (1) placed under patients prior to lifting, and (2) removed at the completion of the transfer	Conference abstract - repeated measures study	Laboratory	Nurses	age NR, gender NR, years experience NR, description NA, 12	simulated patients, 54 kg and 100 kg	Muscle activity, lumbar spine compression, shear forces. EMG, digitized video
[51] Nikolajsen, 2015, Denmark	To document and describe how manual patient handling may be carried out as part of everyday practice	Conference abstract - Mixed methods	Other	Health care providers	age NR, gender NR, years experience NR, description NA, 56	Various	Manual patient handling activities. Field notes and observation.

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[52] Wade, 2017, UK	To investigate healthcare staff perceptions surrounding manual handling and patient handling related injuries	Conference abstract - ethnographic study	Community	Physiotherapists, occupational therapists	age NR, gender NR, years experience NR, 8 participants for observation, 6 for interviews	Community	Manual patient handling factors, challenges/benefits, perceptions of training. Observation, focus groups
Other literature							
[53] Apple, 2021, US	To review published research and describe the ergonomic challenges of working in the OR	Other, narrative review	NA	NA	all NA	Peri-operative patients	Ergonomic challenges, safety recommendations. Data from literature
[54] Haney, 2003, US	To review various physical stressors as they relate to the capacity of the human body during handling (lifting, transferring, moving, and walking) of residents	Other, narrative review	NA	NA	all NA	NA	Force and repetition, dynamic lifting, posture, risk management. push/pull forces, philosophy of care. Data from literature
[55] Hignett, 2007, UK	To review the implementation of EU Health and Safety Directive on Manual Handling (90/269/EEC) for patient handling in 9 European countries and gather expert opinion on the residual problems (barriers) to safer patient handling	Other, Narrative summary of government statistics and expert opinion from a panel of manual handling experts	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Implementation of the EU manual handling directive, expert opinions. European of National Government statistics, expert opinion.
[56] Johnstone, 2020, UK	To discuss WRMSDs within Nursing focusing on legislation, regulations and risk-assessment	Other, narrative review	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	WRMSD in nursing related to moving and handling. Information from legislation and guidance materials
[57] Rinds, 2008, UK	To consider the importance of safe manual handling, risk assessment, the law and useful equipment designed to aid the care worker	Other, Narrative summary of law and guidance in manual handling in healthcare	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Safety during manual patient handling. Information and evidence from laws and guidance.
[58] Tofts, 2012, UK	To explain the legislation related to moving and handling, with particular application to community nurses	Other, Narrative summary of legislation surrounding moving and handling in the community	NA	NA	all NA	All community patients	Legislation surrounding moving and handling. Information from health and safety publications

Table 2 (Continued)

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant age, gender, years experience, description and sample size	Patient population	Outcomes: Domain. Measurement tool
[59] Vawani, 2017, US	To provide practical information and instruction for caregivers assisting individuals experiencing difficulty performing bed mobility tasks	Other, Educational short article	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Educational resources.
[60] Waters, 2007, US	To describe high-risk patient handling tasks performed frequently in critical care units, delineate the physical demands associated with each task, identify technologic solutions, and outline useful tips for making each task safer	Other, Ergonomic task force identified tasks with high risk for MSK disorders	Hospital	Nurses, nurse managers	all NR	NR	Critical care tasks that are high force, awkward posture, repetitive loading. Observation.
[61] Waters, 2011, US	To determine the best practices for safe lateral patient transfers	Other, Ergonomic tool for positioning	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Ergonomic tool development. Risk assessment tools.
[62] Waters, 2011, US	To determine the best practices for safe positioning and repositioning of the supine patient	Other, Ergonomic tool for positioning	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Safety during supine patient handling. Risk assessment tools.
[63] Weiner, 2015, Israel	To present current research about the risk factors, prevention strategies, and assistive devices that could reduce work-related musculoskeletal disorders caused by repositioning patients in bed	Other, Narrative summary	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Association between WRMSDs and repositioning patients in bed, risk factors for WRMSD during patient repositioning in bed. Published literature and data.
[64] Weinmeyer, 2016, US	Laws and programs to address the problem of nursing-specific musculoskeletal injuries.	Other, Narrative summary of laws and programs for safe patient handling for health care workers	NA	NA	all NA	All health/social care patients	Working conditions leading to injuries, patient handling related injuries, barriers to safe patient handling. Published laws, programs.

Table 3

Overview of reports included in scoping review (n=49) by study type, year of publication, country of origin and sample size of number of studies included presented as a percentage of total included reports.

Research – Type of study included (n = 37)		Other – Type of literature included (n = 12)	
Observational cross-sectional	20 (41%)	Narrative summaries of legislation or statistics	8 (16%)
Observational cohort	4 (8%)	Ergonomic tool	2 (4%)
Pilot – undefined	4 (8%)	Task force	1 (2%)
Conference abstract	3 (6%)	Educational page	1 (2%)
Qualitative	3 (6%)		
Pilot – feasibility	1 (2%)		
Survey	1 (2%)		
Systematic review	1 (2%)		
Year of publication		Year of publication	
2017–2021	9 (18%)	2017–2021	3 (6%)
2012–2016	11 (22%)	2012–2016	3 (6%)
2007–2011	14 (29%)	2007–2011	5 (10%)
2002–2006	3 (6%)	2002–2006	1 (2%)
Country of origin		Country of origin	
United States	12 (24%)	United States	7 (14%)
Canada	7 (14%)	United Kingdom	4 (8%)
Denmark	5 (10%)	Israel	1 (2%)
Australia	3 (6%)		
Sweden	2 (4%)		
Republic of Korea	2 (4%)		
Italy	2 (4%)		
Portugal	1 (2%)		
Japan	1 (2%)		
Germany	1 (2%)		
United Kingdom	1 (2%)		
Sample size and number of included studies			
< 10	10 (20%)		
10–19	9 (18%)		
20–29	2 (4%)		
30–39	4 (8%)		
40–49	4 (8%)		
> 50	9 (18%)		
Range	1–1998		
Median	23		
Interquartile range	41.5		
Systematic review	19		

Narrative literature

The ‘other’ literature included narrative text (n=8) [56–61,66,67] and educational pieces (n=4) [62–65]. Narrative texts described legislation, directives and previous research and were largely published in the US (n=7). Additionally, narrative texts and opinion pieces provided education materials and guidance for improving manual patient handling in settings ranging from the community to operating theatres.

The following sections of the scoping review are focused on the primary research identified (n=36) in order to address the review sub-questions.

Questions addressed by primary research

Aims and objectives of the included primary research were reviewed and multiple research questions were identified, with

some comprising sub-questions. The research questions included: 1) physical demands during manual patient handling (n=13) [2,22,24,28,31,34,36,41,43,44,47,51,52]; 2) patient handling practices and tasks performed (n=13) [24,25,27,32–36,45,48,49,52,54]; 3) improving safety of patient handling (n=7) [21,26,34,42,43,46,47]; 4) risk assessment of patient handling tasks (n=8) [21–23,32,36–38,46]; 5) investigation of kinetics (loading) experienced by the HCP (n=7) [2,27,30,38–40,53]; 6) investigation of kinematics (joint motion) (n=7) [25,26,29,31,32,36,44]; and 7) personal factors affecting patient handling (n=9) [31,33,35,37,39,41,50,51,55].

Populations

The summary of populations included in the review is displayed in Table 4. The largest staff population included in the review was nursing, with many studies investigating both qualified and unqualified staff (n=9)

Table 4

Healthcare staff groups, age, gender, years of experience and patient populations included in research (n=36).

Nursing	
Registered nurses	14 (39%)
Healthcare workers	13 (36%)
Nursing assistants	4 (11%)
Allied Health	
Physiotherapists	5 (14%)
Occupational therapists	4 (11%)
Paramedics	2 (5%)
Allied health assistants	1 (3%)
Therapy staff	1 (3%)
Radiological technologists	1 (3%)
Other	
Manual handling coordinators	1 (3%)
Health and safety professional	1 (3%)
Age range	
< 20–30	1 (3%)
31–40	9 (25%)
41–50	14 (39%)
51–60	4 (11%)
> 61	2 (5%)
Gender	
All female	2 (5%)
Majority female	15 (42%)
All male	2 (5%)
Majority male	6 (17%)
Equal split	2 (5%)
Years of experience	
< 1	1 (3%)
2–5	6 (17%)
6–10	7 (19%)
11–15	12 (33%)
16–20	9 (25%)
> 20	7 (19%)
Patient population	
Simulated by volunteers	12 (33%)
Inpatient	11 (31%)
Care home	4 (11%)
Community	4 (11%)
Mannequins	2 (5%)
Unspecified	2 (5%)
Outpatient	1 (3%)

[21,25,33,34,41,42,44,49,52]. There was substantial heterogeneity in terminology for staff populations across studies limiting the accuracy of extraction. Physiotherapists were investigated in 5 of the included primary research [21,28,31,41,55]. Most participants were aged between 31 and 50 years and typically comprised all-female or majority female cohorts. The most common patient population included in primary research were volunteer simulated patients (n = 12) [26,28–31,33,38–41,43,53].

Settings

Laboratory (n = 13) [2,26,28–31,38–41,43,46,53] and hospital (n = 13) [21,22,24,32,33,42,44,46,47,49–52] settings were the most common settings used in primary research. Investigations into kinetics and kinematics were most frequently performed in laboratory settings with observation of patient handling practices investigated more frequently in hospital settings.

Aspects of manual patient handling

Relevant information was extracted to address the seven specific research questions of the scoping review and are presented in Table 5. A broad range of aspects were investigated within each research question. Investigating the tasks performed and estimation of spinal forces were some of the most frequently identified aspects in the primary research. Personal factors largely investigated practitioners experiences, perceptions and how staff and patient factors impact patient handling practices.

Outcome measures

Outcome measures were separated into measurement domains and tools, with the measurement tools grouped according to the domain they were used to measure, and are displayed proportionately in Fig. 2. Physical demands and tasks performed were the most frequently investigated domains. Kinematics showed the most variation in measurement tool. Two primary research studies investigated staff training and its effect on incidence of reported WRMSD [21,42]. One study quantified the risk of WRMSD with associated with nursing tasks by using ergonomic assessment tools [22]. A table of all included outcomes and references are included in the [supplementary materials](#). Within primary research published in the last 5 years there has been an increase in use of qualitative measurement methods, especially to investigate practitioner perceptions and experiences.

Discussion

In this scoping review, the literature on manual patient handling in healthcare was identified and examined, providing a comprehensive map. This allowed for a focus on manual patient handling tasks that require manual assistance from HCPs or involve therapeutic handling. The literature comprised a range

Table 5
Summary of aspects of included literature.

Question	Aspect
Physical demands	Trunk position/loading [40,41] Fatiguing/straining tasks for HCPs [2,31,48] Potential solution for demanding tasks [2,48] Muscular effort [25] Perceived exertion [19,33,44,49] Level of assistance provided by HCPs [38,44] Heart rate [21]
Patient handling practices	Tasks performed by HCPs [21,24,32,42,45,46,49,51] Time taken for tasks [29,42,46,49] Staff positioning [21,29] Number of staff used [23,49] Patient factors (e.g. weight) [23,49] Ergonomic assessment [29–31]
Improving safety	Staff training [18,22,39,44] Identification of high risk tasks [40]
Risk assessment	Creation of staff training package [18] Risk assessing tasks [19,20,29,33,34] Risk reduction measurement [43] Risk prediction [35]
Kinetics	Estimation of spinal forces [2,24,27,35–37,50] Ground reaction forces [27,36] Action forces at hands/thighs [27]
Kinematics	Trunk movement during patient handling [23,26,33,41] Effect of training on trunk movement [22] Effect of taping on trunk movement [28] Analysis of full body postures [29]
Personal factors	Impact of patient factors (e.g. weight/level of disability) [36,48] Staff knowledge and impact on patient handling [48] Staff age, gender, experience level and impact on patient handling [28,30,32,38] Physical constraints experienced [34] Experiences of patient handling [47,48] Perceptions of moving and handling [44,46,52]

of records with a variety of outcome measurement tools. Primary research studies incorporated a variety of outcome tools to address their specific research question.

Research

This scoping review included 49 records, of which only one was a systematic review published in 2010. This suggests a need for further robust evidence synthesis, which can inform practice within healthcare. As will be highlighted further in the discussion, potential systematic reviews for which there may be adequate evidence include HCPs movement during manual patient handling tasks. The most common study design was observational cross-sectional. These studies are generally time efficient and inexpensive to perform and allow for investigation of multiple outcomes [68]. Observational studies, however, are generally unable to establish cause and effect and may identify a range of spurious factors that would lead to ineffective interventions if developed [68]. Further well-designed research



Fig. 2. Outcome measures from the primary research (n = 36) separated into measurement tools (outer ring) and the domain that they were used to collect data for (inner ring)(size of sections based on relative count for each measurement tool). Key: LMM – Lumbar motion monitor; Posture D – Posture dosimeter; TG – Tri-axial goniometer; TA – Tri-axial accelerometer; PWI – Physical workload index; TLC – Tri-axial load cells; Erg Assessment – Ergonomic assessment; 24-h – 24-h Survey.

including therapeutic handling, handler movement and handler perceptions is required to better establish the factors that increase risk of injury and to provide appropriate targets for interventions.

The evidence base investigating AHPs is small in comparison to nurses. Nursing forms the largest occupational group within healthcare globally [69] and a high rate of WRMSDs has been found within the profession [70]. However, AHPs perform many of the same tasks, in addition to therapeutic handling to aid patients' rehabilitation. Therapeutic handling can be manually intensive with little research exploring how these tasks are performed, how manually intensive they are, and the potential risks associated with performing them regularly. Within the five included records that investigated physiotherapists, three investigated patient transfers with only one investigating therapeutic handling.

This scoping review found that it is more common to explore which tasks are performed during manual patient handling than to investigate how they are performed and

their burden through exploration of biomechanics including the joint angles and internal forces experienced. Research conducted more recently investigated personal factors, experiences and perceptions of patient handling with a variety of observational and qualitative methods. Many studies used healthy volunteers as simulated patients, especially in laboratory-based research. Volunteers enable laboratory investigations to occur where more detailed measurements can be made, but may lack ecological validity where they do not accurately represent patients with physical or cognitive deficits. There is a lack of research conducted within outpatient and community settings, where healthcare practitioners need to adapt their practice to each patient's environment and the equipment they have available [61], and this needs to be addressed. Research conducted outside a laboratory environment can provide a more realistic and comprehensive account of the movements involved. However, there is less control over variables with a risk of losing some of the precision laboratory settings can provide. A limitation of research in clinical settings, especially for

kinematic analysis, is the lack of access to gold-standard measurement tools such as Vicon or OPTOTRAK [71]. Instead, research frequently used 2-D video, photographs and inclinometers. On balance, the findings from this scoping review identify there is a need for both research with the tools and control of the laboratory as well as the naturalistic setting of hospitals and the community.

Narrative literature

The remaining literature sources included within this scoping review mostly comprised narrative summaries of legislation and government statistics. The legislation surrounding moving and handling in the UK was last updated in 2002. NHS staff involved in moving and handling are required to complete training following principles of safe manual handling, however, the evidence behind the training is unclear [72]. In addition, there is no specific AHP training for correct moving and handling of patients in a therapeutic manner.

Literature originating from the US has a focus on SPHM programs with an emphasis placed on using assistive devices to aid manual patient handling. Programs based on assistance devices are not found universally across the US, however, with HCPs still required to manually move and handle patients for certain tasks or movements.

Gaps in the literature

Few studies have focused on AHPs performing manual patient handling despite these staff groups being likely to be involved with therapeutic handling practices which are manually intensive. There are no current guidelines or formal training provided to AHPs within the UK for correct therapeutic handling, and this review found no evidence that such training occurs in other geographical locations. This is therefore a priority area for future research. Despite manual handling being identified as a significant factor involved in development of WRMSD, a lack of research was identified within this scoping review.

The records identified in this scoping review demonstrate that there is a lack of detailed measurement of manual patient handling in healthcare settings with real patients, with many articles measuring trunk position or using video or photos for full body analysis. Measuring patient handling in laboratory settings is more accurate via access to 3D motion analysis systems. However, these often involve simulated patients and thus may not accurately reflect how healthcare practitioners move and handle real patients in the healthcare environment. Technology used to collect data in healthcare settings does not allow for the recording accuracy of laboratory-based systems, however, due to recent advances in technology this is an area that could now be explored further.

Few studies qualitatively assessed moving and handling of patients in healthcare. Ethnographic research and further

investigation into perceptions and experiences of patient handling could allow for improvement of staff training and guidance to reduce risk of injury.

Of the records included in this scoping review, one primary research study was conducted within the UK. More research is required internationally, and especially in the UK, to inform this local context and to allow relevant evidence to help guide and improve staff training content or methods of teaching to reduce the risk of injury on HCPs.

Strengths and limitations

This scoping review followed a comprehensive search strategy and protocol that was reviewed by an experienced research team with previous experience in scoping reviews. There remains the possibility that some relevant articles were not included which is also likely to be the case as the search was restricted to the English language. The methodological quality of literature included in this scoping review was not assessed in keeping with methodological guidance for scoping reviews where the aim was to map the available literature rather than to assess its quality or the implication of study findings. Most of the included research was conducted in the US and Canada, therefore there may be difficulty with generalizing findings to other healthcare contexts.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Susan Simpson, moving and handling facilitator for NHS Grampian for her expertise in legislation related to moving and handling in the UK. This scoping review was completed as part of a Doctorate of Physiotherapy degree and formed the first step in a program of research on manual patient handling in the UK.

Ethical approval: Ethical approval was not required for this study.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A. Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at [doi:10.1016/j.physio.2023.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physio.2023.06.003).

References

- [1] Schoenisch AL, Kucera KL, Lipscomb HJ, McIlvaine J, Becherer L, James T, *et al.* Use of assistive devices to lift, transfer, and reposition hospital patients. *Nurs Res* 2019;68(1):3–12.
- [2] Baptiste A. An evaluation of nursing tasks. *Work*. 2011;40(2):115–24.
- [3] Smith J, Alexander P, Johnson C, Nelson V. Guidance on manual handling in physiotherapy: 4th Edition. Chartered Society of Physiotherapy [Internet]. London: CSP; 2014. Available from: https://www.csp.org.uk/system/files/guidance_manual_handling_physiotherapy_4thed_2014.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2020].
- [4] Health and Safety Executive. Work related musculoskeletal disorders in Great Britain (WRMSD). Health and Safety Executive [Internet]. Merseyside: HSE; 2019. Available from: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/causdis/msd.pdf> [Accessed 10 June 2020]
- [5] O'Sullivan P. It's time for change with the management of non-specific chronic low back pain. *Br J Sports Med* 2012;46:224–7.
- [6] Bernal D, Campos-Serna J, Tobias A, Vargas-Prada S, Benavides FG, Serra C. Work-related psychosocial risk factors and musculoskeletal disorders in hospital nurses and nursing aides: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2015;52(2):635–48.
- [7] Chartered Society of Physiotherapy. Fitness for Work: Physiotherapy Works. Chartered Society of Physiotherapy [Internet]. London: CSP; 2016. Available from: https://www.csp.org.uk/system/files/fitness_for_work_physiotherapy_works.pdf [Accessed 10 March 2021].
- [8] Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Worker Safety in Your Hospital: Know the Facts. Occupational Safety and Health Administration [Internet]. Washington: OSHA; 2013. Available from: https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/1.1_Data_highlights_508.pdf [Accessed 12 May 2021].
- [9] Anderson S, Stuckey R, Fortington LV, Oakman J. Workplace injuries in the Australian allied health workforce. *Aust Health Rev* 2019;43(1):49–54.
- [10] Ribeiro T, Serranheira F, Loureiro H. Work related musculoskeletal disorders in primary health care nurses. *Appl Nurs Res* 2017;33:72–7.
- [11] McCrory B, Burnfield JM, Darragh AR, Meza JL, Irons SL, Chernyavskiy P, *et al.* Work injuries among therapists in physical rehabilitation. *Proc Hum Factors Ergon Soc Annu Meet* 2014;58(1):1072–6.
- [12] Glover W, McGregor A, Sullivan C, Hague J. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders affecting members of the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy. *Physiotherapy*. 2005;91(3):138–47.
- [13] Saraceni N, Kent P, Ng L, Campbell A, Straker L, O'Sullivan P. To flex or not to flex? Is there a relationship between lumbar spine flexion during lifting and low back pain? A systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Orthopaed Sports Phys Ther* 2020;50(3):121–30.
- [14] National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Safe patient handling and mobility (SPHM). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Atlanta: CDC; 2013. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/safepatient/default.html> [Accessed 8 March 2021].
- [15] Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Munn Z, Tricco AC, Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews (2020 version). In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. Adelaide: JBI; 2020. Available from: <https://synthesismanual.jbi.global> [Accessed 29 August 2020].
- [16] Johnson KS, Cooper K, Swinton S, Pavlova A. Moving and handling of people in the healthcare setting: a scoping review protocol. Centre for Open Science [Internet]. Charlottesville: OSF; 2021. Available from: <https://osf.io/rh9tj/> [Accessed 8 April 2022].
- [17] United Nations Development Programme. Latest Human Development Index Rating. United Nations Development Programme. United Nations Development Programme [Internet]. New York: UNDP; 2020. Available from: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/latest-human-development-index-ranking> [Accessed 18 August 2020].
- [18] Health and Safety Executive. The Manual Handling Operations Regulations 1992 (as amended) (MHOR). Health and Safety Executive [Internet]. Merseyside: HSE; 2020. Available from: https://www.hse.gov.uk/foi/internalops/ocs/300-399/313_5.htm [Accessed 2021 03 08].
- [19] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:71.
- [20] Tullar JM, Brewer S, Amick III BC, Irvin E, Mahood Q, Pompeii LA, *et al.* Occupational safety and health interventions to reduce musculoskeletal symptoms in the health care sector. *J Occup Rehabil* 2010;20(2):199–219.
- [21] Brusco NK, Taylor N, Stevens JA, Butler M, Searle A. Development of a manual handling programme for allied health. *Int J Ther Rehabil* 2007;14(5):204–9.
- [22] Cantarella C, Stucchi G, Menoni O, Consonni D, Cairolì S, Manno R, *et al.* MAPO method to assess the risk of patient manual handling in hospital wards: a validation study. *Hum Factors* 2020;62(7):1141–9.
- [23] Carneiro P, Martins J, Torres M. Musculoskeletal disorder risk assessment in home care nurses. *Work*. 2015;51(4):657–65.
- [24] Chen J, Daraiseh NM, Davis KG, Pan W. Sources of work-related acute fatigue in United States hospital nurses. *Nurs Health Sci* 2014;16(1):19–25.
- [25] Hodder JN, MacKinnon SN, Ralhan A, Keir PJ. Effects of training and experience on patient transfer biomechanics. *Int J Ind Ergonomics* 2010;40(3):282–8.
- [26] Hodder JN, Holmes MW, Keir PJ. Continuous assessment of work activities and posture in long-term care nurses. *Ergonomics* 2010;53(9):1097–107.
- [27] Holmes MWR, Hodder JN, Keir PJ. Continuous assessment of low back loads in long-term care nurses. *Ergonomics* 2010;53(9):1108–16.
- [28] Howard NL, Bao S, Kim H, Silverstein B. Comparison of Muscle Activity of Four Types of Bed-To-Wheelchair Transfers. *Am J Safe Patient Handl Mov* 2013;3(1):16–29.
- [29] Hye-Knudsen CT, Schibye B, Hjortskov N, Fallentin N. Trunk motion characteristics during different patient handling tasks. *Int J Ind Ergon* 2004;33(4):327–37.
- [30] Jordan C, Luttmann A, Theilmair A, Kuhn S, Wortmann N, Jager M. Characteristic values of the lumbar load of manual patient handling for the application in workers' compensation procedures. *J Occup Med Toxicol* 2011;6(1):1–13.
- [31] Kang M, Jung D, An D, Yoo W, Oh J. Acute effects of hamstring-stretching exercises on the kinematics of the lumbar spine and hip during stoop lifting. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil* 2013;26(3):329–36.
- [32] Kim T, Roh H. Analysis of risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders in radiological technologists. *J Phys Ther Sci* 2014;26(9):1423–8.
- [33] Kjellberg K, Lagerstrom M, Hagberg M. Work technique of nurses in patient transfer tasks and associations with personal factors. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2003;29(6):468–77.
- [34] Kuroski A, Buchholz B, Punnet L, ProCare, Research T. A physical workload index to evaluate a safe resident handling program for nursing home personnel. *Hum Factors* 2014;56(4):669–83.
- [35] Kyriakidis S, Stevens ML, Karstad K, Sogaard K, Holtermann A. The influence of nursing home, ward, and eldercare workers on the number of resident handlings performed per shift in eldercare. *Int J Env Res Public Health* 2021;18(21). Arte Number: 11040. atc of Pubaton: Noember-1 2021.
- [36] Larouche D, Bellemare M, Prairie J, Hegg-Deloye S, Corbeil P. Overall risk index for patient transfers in total assistance mode executed by medical technician-paramedics in real work situations. *Appl Ergon* 2019;74:177–85.
- [37] Larouche D, Corbeil P, Bellemare M, Authier M, Prairie J, Hegg-Deloye S. To what extent do paramedics apply safe patient handling principles when transferring patients from stair chairs to stretchers? *Ergonomics*. 2019;62(10):1313–26.
- [38] Maekawa Y, Shiozaki A, Majima Y. Investigation of the load on the lumbar region in nursing technique's movements – relation between twist and surface electromyogram. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2009;146:460–4.
- [39] Skotte J, Fallentin N. Low back injury risk during repositioning of patients in bed: the influence of handling technique, patient weight and disability. *Ergonomics* 2008;51(7):1042–52.
- [40] Skotte JH, Essendrop M, Hansen AF, Schibye B. A dynamic 3D biomechanical evaluation of the load on the low back during different patient-handling tasks. *J Biomech* 2002;35(10):1357–66.
- [41] Stringer EJ, Rice MS. Perception, Experience, and Ground Reaction Forces when Performing and Assessing Pivot Transfers. *Am J Safe Patient Handl Mov* 2014;4(3):76–85.
- [42] Theis JL, Finkelstein MJ. Long-term effects of safe patient handling program on staff injuries. *Rehab Nurs* 2014;39(1):26–35.
- [43] Veira E, Kumar S. Safety analysis of patient transfers and handling tasks. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2009;18(5):380–4.
- [44] Arias OE, Umukoro PE, Stoffel SD, Hopcia K, Sorensen G, Dennerlein JT. Associations between trunk flexion and physical activity of patient care workers for a single shift: a pilot study. *Work*. 2017;56(2):247–55.
- [45] Fiedler KM, Weir PL, van Wyk PM, Andrews DM. Analyzing what nurses do during work in a hospital setting: a feasibility study using video. *Work*. 2012;43(4):515–23.
- [46] Fraga LA. Facilitating repositioning in bed. *AAOHN J* 2011;59(2):63–8.
- [47] Garzillo EM, Monaco MGL, Corvino AR, D'ancico F, Feola D, Ventura DD, *et al.* Healthcare workers and manual patient handling: A pilot study for interdisciplinary training. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:1–14.
- [48] Newton K, Quinton A, Childs J. The incidence of Australian private practice sonographers moving patients unassisted and their level of training: A pilot study. *Sonography* 2020;7(2):48–54.
- [49] de Ruiter HP, Liaschenko J. To lift or not to lift: patient-handling practices. *AAOHN J* 2011;59(8):337–43.
- [50] Osborne ARH, Connell C, Morphet J. Investigating emergency nurses' beliefs and experiences with patient handling in the emergency department. *Australas Emerg Care* 2021;24(1):49–54.
- [51] Wängblad C, Ekblad M, Wijk H, Ivanoff SD. Experiences of physical strain during person transfer situations in dementia care units. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2009;23(4):644–50.
- [52] McCoskey KL. Ergonomics and patient handling. *AAOHN J* 2007;55(11):454–62.
- [53] Lavender SA, Nagavara S, Marras WS. Biomechanical loads on the spine as patients are prepared for mechanical transfers: have patient lifts completely solved the problem? *J Orthop Res Conf* 2016;34(1):1.
- [54] Nikolajsen H, Nielsen CA. Manual patient handling and rehabilitation in health care settings: an observational study. *Physiotherapy* 2015;101:eS1092.
- [55] Wade H, Kneafsey R, Carpenter C. An ethnographic study of physiotherapists and occupational therapists experiences of implementing guidance on safe manual handling practice in a community setting. *Clin Rehabil* 2017;31(3):417–8.
- [56] Apple B, Letvak S. Ergonomic challenges in the perioperative setting. *AORN J* 2021;113(4):339–48.
- [57] Haney LL. Physical stresses related to the safe handling of residents. *Director* 2003;11(4):151–3.
- [58] Hignett S, Fray M, Rossi MA, Tamminen PL, Hermann S, Lomi C, *et al.* Implementation of the Manual Handling Directive in the healthcare industry in the European union for patient handling tasks. *Int J Ind Ergonomics*. 2007;37(5):415–23.
- [59] Johnstone J. Manual handling: the challenges of different care environments. *Br J Nurs* 2020;29(6):358–63.
- [60] Rinds G. Manual handling in healthcare support work. *BJHCA* 2008;2(1):11–6.
- [61] Tofts D, Arnold M. Moving and handling in the community: update on legislation and best practice. *Br J Community Nurs* 2012;17(2):50–7.
- [62] Vatvani A. Caregiver guide and instructions for safe bed mobility. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2017;98(9):1907–10.
- [63] Waters T, Baptiste A, Short M, Plante-Mallon L, Nelson A. AORN ergonomic tool 1: Lateral transfer of a patient from a stretcher to an OR bed. *AORN J* 2011;93(3):334–9.
- [64] Waters T, Short M, Lloyd J, Baptiste A, Butler L, Petersen C, *et al.* AORN ergonomic tool 2: positioning and repositioning the supine patient on the OR bed. *AORN J* 2011;93(4):445–9.

- [65] Waters TR, Nelson A, Proctor C. Patient Handling Tasks with High Risk for Musculoskeletal Disorders in Critical Care. *Crit Care Nurs Clin North Am* 2007;19(2):131–43.
- [66] Weiner C, Alperovitch-Najenson D, Ribak J, Kalichman L. Prevention of nurses' work-related musculoskeletal disorders resulting from repositioning patients in bed: comprehensive narrative review. *Workplace Health Saf* 2015;63(5):226–32.
- [67] Weinmeyer R. Safe patient handling laws and programs for health care workers. *AMA J Ethics* 2016;18(4):416–21.
- [68] Mann CJ. Observational research methods. Research design II: cohort, cross sectional, and case-control studies. *Emerg Med J* 2003;20(1):54–60.
- [69] Corazza S, Mündermann L, Gambaretto E. Markerless motion capture through visual hull, articulated icp and subject specific model generation. *Int J Comput Vis* 2010;87:156–69.
- [70] Serranheira F, Sousa-Uva M, Sousa-Uva A. Hospital nurses tasks and work-related musculoskeletal disorders symptoms: a detailed analysis. *Work*. 2010;15:401–9.
- [71] Cuesta-Vargas A, Galán-Mercant A, Williams JM. The use of inertial sensors system for human motion analysis. *Phys Ther Rev* 2010;15(6):462–73.
- [72] Haslam C, Clenes S, McDermott. Manual handling training: Investigation of current practices and development of guidelines. Health and Safety Executive [Internet]. Merseyside: HSE; 2007. Available from: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr583.pdf> [Accessed 14 May 2021].

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

1 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for
2 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	Title page
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	1-2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	2
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	3-4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	3-4
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	4
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Supplementary materials
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	4
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	4-5
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	5
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	N/A

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	6-8
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	6
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	6
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	N/A
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	6-8
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	6-8
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	8-11
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	12
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	10-12
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	12

3 JBI = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-
4 Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

5 * Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social
6 media platforms, and Web sites.

7 † A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g.,
8 quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping
9 review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

10 ‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to
11 the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

12 § The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before
13 using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more
14 applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence
15 that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy
16 document).
17
18

19 From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping
20 Reviews (PRISMAScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169:467-473. doi: 10.7326/M18-
21 0850.

23 **Supplementary material – Full search strategy**

24 Key: TX – All Text, KW - Keyword, MH – Exact Subject Heading

25 AMED (via EBSCOhost)

26 Search conducted 12 August 2020

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	TX moving and handling OR KW manual handling OR TX manual handling OR KW (moving and lifting patients) OR TX (moving and lifting patients) OR TX patient handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR TX patient positioning	399
#2	KW nurse OR TX nurs* OR KW physiotherapy OR KW physiotherapist TX physiotherap* OR KW physical therapy OR TX physical therap* OR KW allied health personnel OR TX allied health* OR TX support staff OR KW rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR KW occupational therapist OR KW occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	127601
#3	#1 AND #2	319
Limited to English language		

27

- 28 AMED (via EBSCOhost)
- 29 Updated search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	TX moving and handling OR KW manual handling OR TX manual handling OR KW (moving and lifting patients) OR TX (moving and lifting patients) OR TX patient handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR TX patient positioning	408
#2	KW nurse OR TX nurs* OR KW physiotherapy OR KW physiotherapist TX physiotherap* OR KW physical therapy OR TX physical therap* OR KW allied health personnel OR TX allied health* OR TX support staff OR KW rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR KW occupational therapist OR KW occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	131747
#3	#1 AND #2	347
#4	#1 AND #2 (Limited to literature since August 2020)	0
Limited to English language		

- 30
- 31
- 32

33 CINAHL (via EBSCOhost)

34 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	TX moving and handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR MH patient positioning OR TX patient positioning OR TX transfer* technique* OR TX manual handling OR TX moving and lifting patients	24460
#2	MH nurses OR TX nurs* OR TX physiotherap* OR MH physical therapy OR TX physical therap* OR MH rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR MH allied health personnel OR TX allied health* OR TX support staff OR MH occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	3052157
#3	#1 AND #2	17814
#4	TX guidance OR TX guidelines OR TX practice guidelines OR TX clinical practice guidelines OR TX protocol OR TX regulation	800153
#5	#3 AND #4	8317
#6	MH ergonomics OR TX ergonomic* OR TX human factors	19336
#7	#5 AND #6	1304
Limited to English language		

35

36

37 EMBASE (via Ovid)

38 Search conducted 12 August 2020

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	KW moving and handling OR TX moving and handling OR KW moving and lifting patients OR TX moving and lifting patients OR KW manual handling OR TX manual handling OR KW patient handling OR TX patient handling OR KW patient moving and handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR KW patient positioning OR TX patient positioning	9542
#2	KW nurse OR TX nurs* OR KW physiotherapist OR KW physiotherapy OR TX physiotherap* OR KW physical therapy OR KW physical therapist OR TX physical therap* OR KW allied health personnel OR KW allied health professional OR TW allied health* OR KW support staff OR TX support staff OR KW rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR KW occupational therapist OR KW occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	805052
#3	#1 AND #2	892

39

40 EMBASE (via Ovid)

41 Updated search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	KW moving and handling OR TX moving and handling OR KW moving and lifting patients OR TX moving and lifting patients OR KW manual handling OR TX manual handling OR KW patient handling OR TX patient handling OR KW patient moving and handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR KW patient positioning OR TX patient positioning	7765
#2	KW nurse OR TX nurs* OR KW physiotherapist OR KW physiotherapy OR TX physiotherap* OR KW physical therapy OR KW physical therapist OR TX physical therap* OR KW allied health personnel OR KW allied health professional OR TW allied health* OR KW support staff OR TX support staff OR KW rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR KW occupational therapist OR KW occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	879357
#3	#1 AND #2	881
#3	#1 AND #2 (Limited to literature since August 2020)	112

42

43

44 MEDLINE (via EBSCOhost)

45 Search conducted 12 August 2020

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	TX moving and handling OR TX moving and lifting patients OR TX manual handling OR TX patient handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR MH patient positioning OR TX patient positioning	16766
#2	MH nurses OR TX nurs* OR TX physiotherap* OR TX physical therap* OR MH allied health personnel OR TX allied health* OR TX support staff OR MH rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR MH occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	1773156
#3	#1 AND #2	2735
Limited to English language		

46

47 MEDLINE (via EBSCOhost)

48 Updated search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	TX moving and handling OR TX moving and lifting patients OR TX manual handling OR TX patient handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR MH patient positioning OR TX patient positioning	19413
#2	MH nurses OR TX nurs* OR TX physiotherap* OR TX physical therap* OR MH allied health personnel OR TX allied health* OR TX support staff OR MH rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR MH occupational therapy OR TX occupational therap*	1979659
#3	#1 AND #2	3725
#3	#1 AND #2 (Limited to literature since August 2020)	551
Limited to English language		

49

50 SPORTDiscus (via EBSCOhost)

51 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	KW moving and handling OR TX moving and handling OR KW patient moving and handling OR TX patient moving and handling OR KW moving and lifting patients OR TX moving and lifting patients OR KW manual handling OR TX manual handling OR KW patient handling OR TX patient handling OR KW patient positioning OR TX patient positioning OR TX transfer* technique*	8977

#2	KW nurse OR TX nurs* OR KW physiotherapist OR KW physiotherapy OR TX physiotherap* OR KW physical therapist OR KW physical therapy OR TX physical therap* OR KW allied health personnel OR KW allied health professional OR TX allied health* OR KW support staff OR TX support staff OR KW rehabilitation OR TX rehabilitation OR KW occupational therapy OR KW occupational therapist OR TX occupational therap*	242724
#3	#1 AND #2	3144
#3	#1 AND #2 (Limited to literature published after 2002)	2725
Limited to English language		

52

53 Google Scholar

54 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	"Patient handling" AND "healthcare"	150
#2	"Moving and handling" AND "healthcare"	150
#3	"Moving and handling" AND "patients"	150
#4	"Manual handling" AND "healthcare"	150
#5	"Manual handling" AND "patients"	150
Records hand selected for screening		

55

56 ETHOS

57 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	10
#2	Moving and handling of patients	14
#3	Manual handling in healthcare	12
#4	Manual handling of patients	7
Records hand selected for screening		

58

59 Open Grey

60 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	1
#2	Moving and handling of patients	2
#3	Manual handling in healthcare	1
#4	Manual handling of patients	1

61

62 HSE

63 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	260

Records hand selected for screening	
-------------------------------------	--

64

65 NIOSH

66 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	390
Records hand selected for screening		

67

68 Safe Work Australia

69 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	236
#2	Safe patient handling	715
#3	Moving and handling of patients	234
Records hand selected for screening		

70

71 Canadian Centre of Occupational Health and Safety

72 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	3986

#2	Safe patient handling	3014
#3	Moving and handling of patients	3983
Records hand selected for screening		

73

74 Worksafe New Zealand

75 Search conducted 10 November 2021

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	Moving and handling in healthcare	1000
#2	Safe patient handling	1000
#3	Moving and handling of patients	1000
Records hand selected for screening		

76

77

Excluded studies

1. Parkes KR, Carnell S, Farmer E. Musculo-skeletal disorders, mental health and the work environment. Health and Safety Executive [Internet]. Merseyside: HSE; 2005 [cited 2020 08 24]. [Available from: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr316.pdf>].
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible setting.
2. Gillanders T. Upper Limb Disorders in the Workplace. Health & Safety at Work. 2004;26(2):33.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible setting.
3. Health and Safety Executive. Manual handling at work: A brief guide. Health and Safety Executive [Internet]. Merseyside: HSE; 2020 [cited 2020 08 24]. [Available from: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg143.pdf>].
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
4. Munro KD. Clinical reasoning for manual handling risk assessments in community settings: moving from rule based to intuitive reasoning [dissertation]. University of Strathclyde; 2017.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
5. Holtermann A, Clausen T, Jørgensen MB, Burdorf A, Andersen LL. Patient Handling and Risk for Developing Persistent Low-Back Pain among Female Healthcare Workers. Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health. 2013;39(2):164-169.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
6. Dorothée M, Benckekroun TH, Falzon P, Vidal-Gomel C. Patient handling as an healthcare activity : a simulation-based training methodology. HEPS 2016. 2016;1-9.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
7. Hignett S, Fray M. Manual handling in healthcare. Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Federation of the European Ergonomics Societies [FEES]. 2010;1-10.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
8. Waters TR. Introduction to Ergonomics for Healthcare Workers. Rehabilitation Nursing. 2010;(5):185-191.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 112 9. Owen BD, Keene K, Olson S. An ergonomic approach to reducing
113 back/shoulder stress in hospital nursing personnel: a five year follow up.
114 Int J Nurs Stud. 2002;39(3):295-302.
115 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 116 10. Smedley J, Inskip H, Trevelyan F, Buckle P, Cooper C, Coggon D. Risk
117 factors for incident neck and shoulder pain in hospital nurses. Occup
118 Environ Med. 2003;60(11):864-869.
119 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 120 11. Smedley J, Trevelyan F, Inskip H, Buckle P, Cooper C, Coggon D. Impact
121 of ergonomic intervention on back pain among nurses. Scandinavian
122 Journal of Work, Environment and Health. 2003;29(2):117-123.
123 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 124 12. De Castro AB. Handle with care: The American nurses association's
125 campaign to address work-related musculoskeletal disorders. Orthop
126 Nurs. 2006;25(6):356-365.
127 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 128 13. Guthrie PF, Westphal L, Dahlman B, Berg M, Behnam K, Ferrell D. A
129 patient lifting intervention for preventing the work-related injuries of
130 nurses. Work. 2004;22(2):79-88.
131 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 132 14. Radovanovic CAT, Alexandre NMC. Validation of an instrument for patient
133 handling assessment. Appl Ergon. 2004;35(4):321-328.
134 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 135 15. Hignett S. Systematic review of patient handling activities starting in
136 lying, sitting and standing positions. J Adv Nurs. 2003;41(6):545-552.
137 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 138 16. Mutch K. Changing manual-handling practice in a stroke rehabilitation
139 unit. Prof Nurse. 2004;19(7):374-378.
140 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 141 17. Menzel NN, Brooks SM, Bernard TE, Nelson A. The physical workload of
142 nursing personnel: Association with musculoskeletal discomfort. Int J
143 Nurs Stud. 2004;41(8):859-867.
144 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 145 18. Trossman S. Protecting the next generation: ANA, nursing partners work
146 to educate students on safe patient handling techniques. Am Nurse.

2004;36(5):1, 7-9.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

19. Yip VYB. New low back pain in nurses: Work activities, work stress and sedentary lifestyle. *J Adv Nurs*. 2004;46(4):430-440.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

20. Kjellberg K, Lagerstrom M, Hagberg M. Patient safety and comfort during transfers in relation to nurses' work technique. *J Adv Nurs*. 2004;47(3):251-259.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

21. Menzel NN. Back pain prevalence in nursing personnel: measurement issues. *AAOHN J*. 2004;52(2):54-65.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

22. Hartvigsen J, Lauritzen S, Lings S, Lauritzen T. Intensive education combined with low tech ergonomic intervention does not prevent low back pain in nurses. *Occup Environ Med*. 2005;62(1):13-17.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

23. Pellatt GC. The safety and dignity of patients and nurses during patient handling. *Br J Nurs*. 2005;14(21):1150-1156.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

24. Mitchell EA, Conlon AM, Armstrong M, Ryan AA. Towards rehabilitative handling in caring for patients following stroke: A participatory action research project. *J Clin Nurs*. 2005;14(3):3-12.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

25. Tabone S. Safe patient handling. *Tex Nurs*. 2005;79(3):10-11.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

26. Nelson A, Matz M, Chen F, Siddharthan K, Lloyd J, Fragala G. Development and evaluation of a multifaceted ergonomics program to prevent injuries associated with patient handling tasks. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2006;43(6):717-733.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

27. Waters T, Collins J, Galinsky T, Caruso C. NIOSH research efforts to prevent musculoskeletal disorders in the healthcare industry. *Orthop Nurs*. 2006;25(6):380-389.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 181 28. Castledine G. Nurse's poor moving and handling technique put patients
182 at risk. *Br J Nurs*. 2006;15(6):307.
183 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 184 29. McKeon E. The ANA seeks investment in nursing workforce development:
185 Safe patient handling and staffing at the forefront. *Am J Nurs*.
186 2006;106(5):79.
187 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 188 30. Smith DR, Mihashi M, Adachi Y, Koga H, Ishitake T. A detailed analysis of
189 musculoskeletal disorder risk factors among Japanese nurses. *J Saf Res*.
190 2006;37(2):195-200.
191 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept,
- 192 31. Dawson AP, McLennan SN, Schiller SD, Jull GA, Hodges PW, Stewart S.
193 Interventions to prevent back pain and back injury in nurses: A
194 systematic review. *Occup Environ Med*. 2007;64(10):642-650.
195 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 196 32. Pompeii LA, Lipscomb HJ, Dement JM. Surveillance of musculoskeletal
197 injuries and disorders in a diverse cohort of workers at a tertiary care
198 medical center. *Am J Ind Med*. 2008;51(5):344-356.
199 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 200 33. Warming S, Ebbehøj NE, Wiese N, Larsen LH, Duckert J, Tonnesen H.
201 Little effect of transfer technique instruction and physical fitness training
202 in reducing low back pain among nurses: A cluster randomised
203 intervention study. *Ergonomics*. 2008;51(10):1530-1548.
204 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 205 34. Alexander P. The changing face of manual handling in the community. *Br*
206 *J Community Nurs*. 2008;13(7):316-322.
207 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 208 35. Hignett S, Crumpton E. Competency-based training for patient handling.
209 *Appl Ergon*. 2007;38(1):7-17.
210 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 211 36. Haney LL, Wright L. Sustaining Staff Nurse Support for a Patient Care
212 Ergonomics Program in Critical Care. *Crit Care Nurs Clin North Am*.
213 2007;19:197-204.
214 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 215 37. Knibbe HJJ, Knibbe NE, Klaassen, A. J. W. M. Safe Patient Handling
216 Program in Critical Care Using Peer Leaders: Lessons Learned in The
217 Netherlands. Crit Care Nurs Clin North Am. 2007;19:205-211.
218 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 219 38. Pellatt GC. Clinical skills: bed making and patient positioning. Br J Nurs.
220 2007;16(5):302-305.
221 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 222 39. Morse T, Fekieta R, Rubenstein H, Warren N, Alexander D, Wawzyniecki
223 P. "Doing the heavy lifting: health care workers take back their backs".
224 New solutions: a journal of environmental and occupational health policy.
225 2008;18(2):207-219.
226 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 227 40. Pompeii LA, Lipscomb HJ, Schoenfisch AL, Dement JM. Musculoskeletal
228 injuries resulting from patient handling tasks among hospital workers.
229 Am J Ind Med. 2009;52(7):571-578.
230 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 231 41. Akebi T, Inoue M, Harada N. Effects of educational intervention on joint
232 angles of the trunk and lower extremity and on muscle activities during
233 patient-handling tasks. Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine.
234 2009;14(2):118-127.
235 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 236 42. Svensson AL, Stroyer J, Ebbehøj NE, SchultzLarsen K, Marott JL,
237 Mortensen OS, et al. Multidimensional intervention and sickness absence
238 in assistant nursing students. Occup Med. 2009;59(8):563-569.
239 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 240 43. Sedlak CA, Doheny MO, Nelson A, Waters TR. Development of the
241 National Association of Orthopaedic Nurses guidance statement on safe
242 patient handling and movement in the orthopaedic setting. Orthop Nurs.
243 2009;28(2):2-8.
244 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 245 44. Kutash M, Short M, Shea J, Martinez M. The lift team's importance to a
246 successful safe patient handling program. J Nurs Adm. 2009;39(4):170-
247 175.
248 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 249 45. Barnes AF. Reducing the incidence of back pain: student nurses'
250 recommendations. *Br J Nurs*. 2009;18(21):1334-1338.
251 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 252 46. Knoblauch MD, Bethel SA. Safe patient-handling program "UPLIFTS"
253 nurse retention. *Nursing*. 2010;40(2):67-68.
254 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 255 47. Zadvinskis IM, Salsbury SL. Effects of a multifaceted minimal-lift
256 environment for nursing staff: Pilot results. *West J Nurs Res*.
257 2010;32(1):47-63.
258 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 259 48. Sachs A. Nurses, patients alike benefit from safe patient handling. *Am*
260 *Nurse*. 2010;42(5):9.
261 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 262 49. Cornish J, Jones A. Factors affecting compliance with moving and
263 handling policy: Student nurses' views and experiences. *Nurse Education*
264 *in Practice*. 2010;10(2):96-100.
265 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 266 50. Lee SJ, Faucett J, Gillen M, Krause N, Landry L. Factors associated with
267 safe patient handling behaviors among critical care nurses. *Am J Ind*
268 *Med*. 2010;53(9):886-897.
269 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 270 51. Waters TR, Rockefeller K. Safe patient handling for rehabilitation
271 professionals. *Rehabilitation nursing : the official journal of the*
272 *Association of Rehabilitation Nurses*. 2010;35(5):216-222.
273 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 274 52. Szeto PYG, Law RKY, Lee EWC, Chan SY, Lau TFO, Law SW. Effectiveness
275 of an ergonomic intervention program for reducing work-related
276 musculoskeletal disorders in community nurses. *Physiotherapy (United*
277 *Kingdom)*. Conference: World Physical Therapy 2011. Amsterdam
278 Netherlands. Conference Publication. 2011;97 (SUPPL. 1):eS1201.
279 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 280 53. Genevay S, Cedraschi C, Courvoisier DS, Perneger TV, Grandjean R,
281 Griesser AC, et al. Work related characteristics of back and neck pain
282 among employees of a Swiss University Hospital. *Joint Bone Spine*.

283 2011;78(4):392-397.
284 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

285 54. Ogg MJ. Introduction to the Safe Patient Handling and Movement Series.
286 AORN J. 2011;93(3):331-333.
287 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

288 55. Schoenfisch AL, Lipscomb HJ, Myers DJ, Fricklas E, James T. A lift assist
289 team in an acute care hospital-prevention of injury or transfer of risk
290 during patient-handling tasks?. AAOHN J. 2011;59(8):329-334.
291 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

292 56. Mason MC. Back support. Nursing standard. 2011;25(30):23.
293 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

294 57. Black TR, Shah SM, Busch AJ, Metcalfe J, Lim HJ. Effect of transfer,
295 lifting, and repositioning (TLR) injury prevention program on
296 musculoskeletal injury among direct care workers. Journal of
297 Occupational and Environmental Hygiene. 2011;8(4):226-235.
298 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

299 58. Kay K, Glass N. Debunking the manual handling myth: An investigation
300 of manual handling knowledge and practices in the Australian private
301 health sector. Int J Nurs Pract. 2011;17(3):231-237.
302 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

303 59. Griffiths H. Adverse risk: A 'dynamic interaction model of patient moving
304 and handling'. J Nurs Manag. 2012;20(6):713-736.
305 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

306 60. Callison MC, Nussbaum MA. Identification of physically demanding
307 patient-handling tasks in an acute care hospital. Int J Ind Ergonomics.
308 2012;42(3):261-267.
309 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

310 61. Krill C, Staffileno BA, Raven C. Empowering staff nurses to use research
311 to change practice for safe patient handling. Nurs Outlook.
312 2012;60(3):157-162.
313 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

314 62. Garg AG, Kapellusch JMK. Ergonomic interventions in nursing facilities:
315 Long-term effectiveness of a comprehensive program. Occupational and
316 Environmental Medicine. Conference: 23rd Conference on Epidemiology
317 in Occupational Health, EPICOH 2013: Improving the Impact. Utrecht

Netherlands. Conference Publication. 2013;70 (SUPPL. 1):114.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

63. Burnfield JM, McCrory B, Shu Y, Buster TW, Taylor AP, Goldman AJ. Comparative kinematic and electromyographic assessment of clinician- and device-assisted sit-to-stand transfers in patients with stroke. *Phys Ther*. 2013;93(10):1331-1341.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

64. Lee SJ, Faucett J, Gillen M, Krause N. Musculoskeletal pain among critical-care nurses by availability and use of patient lifting equipment: An analysis of cross-sectional survey data. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2013;50(12):1648-1657.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

65. AlEisa E, AlAbbad H. Occupational back pain among rehabilitation nurses in Saudi Arabia: The influence of knowledge and awareness. *Workplace Health and Safety*. 2013;61(9):401-407.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

66. Geiger JS. Establishing a physical therapist-driven model of safe patient handling and movement programs in a general hospital. *Work*. 2013;45(2):147-160.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

67. Campo M, Shiyko MP, Margulis H, Darragh AR. Effect of a safe patient handling program on rehabilitation outcomes. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2013;94(1):17-22.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

68. Belbeck A, Cudlip AC, Dickerson CR. Assessing the interplay between the shoulders and low back during manual patient handling techniques in a nursing setting. *JOSE*. 2014;20(1):127-137.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

69. Mayeda-Letourneau J. Safe patient handling and movement: A literature review. *Rehabil Nurs*. 2014;39(3):123-129.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

70. Anderson MP, Carlisle S, Thomson C, Ross C, Reid HJ, Hart ND, et al. Safe moving and handling of patients: an interprofessional approach. *Nursing standard*. 2014;28(46):37-41.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

71. Beauvais A, Frost L. Saving our backs: safe patient handling and mobility for home care. *Home Healthc Nurse*. 2014;32(7):430-6.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
72. Vroonland C, Baank S, Stokkel M. To manual handle, or to NOT manual handle? *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*. Conference: 28th Annual Congress of the European Association of Nuclear Medicine, EANM 2015. Hamburg Germany. Conference Publication. 42(1 SUPPL. 1):S847-S848.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
73. Sundelin G, HarmsRingdahl K, Oberg B, Hansson SO, Hagg O, Lundberg U, et al. The significance of occupational exposure for low back pain-a systematic review. *Physiotherapy (United Kingdom)*. Conference: World Confederation for Physical Therapy Congress 2015. Singapore Singapore. Conference Publication. 101(SUPPL. 1):eS1456-eS1457.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
74. Bartley C, Webb JA, Bayly J. Multidisciplinary approaches to moving and handling for formal and informal carers in community palliative care. *Int J Palliat Nurs*. 2015;21(1):17-23.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
75. Kay K, Evans A, Glass N. Moments of speaking and silencing: Nurses share their experiences of manual handling in healthcare. *Collegian*. 2015;22(1):61-70.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
76. Abedini R, Choobineh AR, Hasanzadeh J. Patient manual handling risk assessment among hospital nurses. *Work*. 2015;50(4):669-675.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible context.
77. Aslam I, Davis SA, Feldman SR, Martin WE. A Review of Patient Lifting Interventions to Reduce Health Care Worker Injuries. *Workplace health & safety*. 2015;63(6):267-276.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
78. Bhimani R. Understanding Work-related Musculoskeletal Injuries in Rehabilitation from a Nursing Perspective. *Rehabilitation nursing: the official journal of the Association of Rehabil Nurs*. 2016;41(2):91-100.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 387 79. Boniface G, Ghosh S, Robinson L. District nurses' experiences of
388 musculoskeletal wellbeing: a qualitative study. *Br J Community Nurs.*
389 2016;21(7):350-355.
390 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 391 80. Choi J, Cramer E. Reports From RNs on Safe Patient Handling and
392 Mobility Programs in Acute Care Hospital Units. *J Nurs Adm.*
393 2016;46(11):566-573.
394 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 395 81. Freiberg A, Girbig M, Euler U, Scharfe J, Nienhaus A, Freitag S, et al.
396 Influence of the Kinaesthetics care conception during patient handling on
397 the development of musculoskeletal complaints and diseases - A scoping
398 review. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology.* 2016;11(1):1-
399 14.
400 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 401 82. Kuipers DA, Wartena BO, Dijkstra BH, Terlouw G, van t Veer, J. T. B.,
402 van Dijk HW, et al. iLift: A health behavior change support system for
403 lifting and transfer techniques to prevent lower-back injuries in
404 healthcare. *Int J Med Inf.* 2016;96:11-23.
405 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 406 83. Coales P. Physiotherapists' perceptions of contributory and risk reduction
407 factors for work-related spinal disorders in the profession. *Physiotherapy*
408 (United Kingdom). Conference: Physiotherapy UK Conference 2017.
409 2017;103(Supplement 1):e90.
410 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 411 84. Nagavarapu S, Lavender SA, Marras WS. Spine loading during the
412 application and removal of lifting slings: the effects of patient weight,
413 bed height and work method. *Ergonomics.* 2017;60(5):636-648.
414 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 415 85. WhiteHeisel R, Canfield JP, YoungHughes S. Examining the Factor
416 Structure and Reliability of the Safe Patient Handling Perception Scale:
417 An Initial Validation Study. *Rehabil nurs.* 2017;42(3):164-171.
418 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 419 86. Lee SJ, Lee JH. Safe patient handling behaviors and lift use among
420 hospital nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2017;74:53-

60.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

87. Gold JE, Punnett L, Gore RJ. Predictors of low back pain in nursing home workers after implementation of a safe resident handling programme. *Occup Environ Med.* 2017;74(6):389-395.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

88. Contrada E. 1.5 CE Test Hours: Original Research: Patient Handling and Mobility Course Content: A National Survey of Nursing Programs. *Am J Nurs.* 2018;118(11):32-45.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

89. Gold JE, Kurowski A, Gore RJ, Punnett L. Knee pain in nursing home workers after implementation of a safe resident handling program. *Am J Ind Med.* 2018;61(10):849-860.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

90. PowellCope G, Rugs D, Ialynytchev A, Devine D, McCoskey K, Zhang Y, et al. CE: Original Research: Patient Handling and Mobility Course Content: A National Survey of Nursing Programs. *Am J Nurs.* 2018;118(11):22-31.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

91. Richardson A, McNoe B, Derrett S, Harcombe H. Interventions to prevent and reduce the impact of musculoskeletal injuries among nurses: A systematic review. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2018;82:58-67.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

92. Hurtado DA, Dumet LM, Greenspan SA, Rodriguez YI. Social Network Analysis of peer-specific safety support and ergonomic behaviors: An application to safe patient handling. *Appl Ergon.* 2018;68:132-137.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

93. Havey R, Aebersold C, Terrasi J. "Add it to the Parking Lot": Safe Patient Handling and Mobility in the Emergency Department. *Crit Care Nurs Q.* 2018;41(3):302-311.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

94. Karstad K, Jorgensen AFB, Greiner BA, Burdorf A, Sogaard K, Rugulies R, et al. Danish Observational Study of Eldercare work and musculoskeletal disorderS (DOSES): A prospective study at 20 nursing homes in

Denmark. BMJ Open. 2018;8(2):e019670.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

95. Totzkay DL. Multifactorial Strategies for Sustaining Safe Patient Handling and Mobility. Crit Care Nurs Q. 2018;41(3):340-344.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

96. Worobey LA, Zigler CK, Huzinec R, Rigot SK, Sung J, Rice LA. Reliability and validity of the revised transfer assessment instrument. Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation. 2018;24(3):217-226.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

97. Nolan D, O'Sullivan K, Stephenson J, O'Sullivan P, Lucock M. What do physiotherapists and manual handling advisors consider the safest lifting posture, and do back beliefs influence their choice?. Musculoskeletal Science and Practice. 2018;33:35-40.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible setting.

98. Hegewald J, Berge W, Heinrich P, Staudte R, Freiberg A, Scharfe J, et al. Do technical aids for patient handling prevent musculoskeletal complaints in health care workers?-A systematic review of intervention studies. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2018;15(3):1-19.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

99. Dias A, Bernardes JM. Low back pain and manual patient handling among healthcare workers: A cross-sectional study. Occupational and Environmental Medicine. Conference: 27th Epidemiology in Occupational Health Conference, EPICOH 2019. New Zealand. 2019;76(Supplement 1):97-A98.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

100. Johnstone J. Manual handling: the challenges of different care environments. Br J Nurs. 2020;29(6):358-363.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

101. Naidoo D, Govender P, Naidoo SN, Ngubane N, Nkosi Z, Mulla A. Occupational Risks in Occupational Therapy Service Learning: A Single-Site "Fear Factor" Study in South Africa. Occup Ther Int. 2020. 2020:e4746813.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible rank HDI.

102. Rugs D, Powell Cope G, Campo M, Darragh A, Harwood K, Kuhn J, et al. The use of safe patient handling and mobility equipment in rehabilitation. *Work*. 2020;66(1):31-40.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
103. Gilthorpe J, Fairbairn S, Taylor S, Hutchinson A, Ford C, Tweedlie J. Interprofessional education for practice: moving and handling for people with complex needs in contemporary healthcare. *Physiotherapy (United Kingdom)*. Conference: Physiotherapy UK Conference 2019. 2019;107(Supplement 1):e170-e171.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
104. Garzillo EM, Monaco MGL, Corvino AR, D'ancicco F, Feola D, Ventura DD, et al. Healthcare workers and manual patient handling: A pilot study for interdisciplinary training. *Int J Env Res Pub He*. 2020;17(14):1-14.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
105. Lecca LI, Fabbri D, Portoghese I, Pilia I, Meloni F, Marcias G, et al. Manual handling of patients: role of kinesiophobia and catastrophizing in health workers with chronic low back pain. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2020;56(3):307-312.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
106. Tang K, Diaz J, Lui O, Proulx L, Galle E, Packham T. Do active assist transfer devices improve transfer safety for patients and caregivers in hospital and community settings? A scoping review. *Disability and rehabilitation. Assist technol*. 2020;15(6):614-624.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
107. Campo M, Weiser S, Koenig KL, Nordin M. Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders in Physical Therapists: A Prospective Cohort Study With 1-Year Follow-up. *Phys Ther*. 2008;88(5):608-619.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
108. Cromie JE, Robertson VJ, Best MO. Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders and the Culture of Physical Therapy. *Phys Ther*. 2002;82(5):459-472.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
109. Vieira ER, Kumar S. Working postures: a literature review. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2004;14(2):143-159.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

110. Mani S, Sharma S, Omar B, Ahmad K, Muniandy Y, Singh DKA. Quantitative measurements of forward head posture in a clinical settings: a technical feasibility study. *Eur J Physiother.* 2017;19(3):119-123.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
111. Thomas K. Pondering Posture. *Co-Kinetic Journal.* 2020(84):24-29.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
112. Tam GYT, Yeung SS. Perceived effort and low back pain in non-emergency ambulance workers: Implications for rehabilitation. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2006;16(2):231-240.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
113. Dewey AJ, Olkowski BF, Stolfi AM. On "Safe patient handling perceptions and practices . . . ". *Phys Ther.* 2014;94(7):1054-1055.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
114. Cooklin A, Joss N, Husser E, Oldenburg B. Integrated Approaches to Occupational Health and Safety: A Systematic Review. *Am J Health Promot.* 2017;31(5):401-412.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
115. Campo M, Darragh AR. Impact of Work-Related Pain on Physical Therapists and Occupational Therapists. *Phys Ther.* 2010;90(6):905-920.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
116. Kurowski A, Pransky G, Punnett L. Impact of a Safe Resident Handling Program in Nursing Homes on Return-to-Work and Re-injury Outcomes Following Work Injury. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2019;29(2):286-294.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
117. Roussel NA, Kos D, Demeure I, Heyrman A, De Clerck M, Zinzen E, et al. Effect of a multidisciplinary program for the prevention of low back pain in hospital employees: A randomized controlled trial. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil.* 2015;28(3):539-549.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
118. Mustard C, Kalcevich C, Steenstra I, Smith P, Amick B. Disability Management Outcomes in the Ontario Long-Term Care Sector. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2010;20(4):481-488.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
119. Ferguson SA, Marras WS, Burr DL. Differences Among Outcome Measures in Occupational Low Back Pain. *J Occup Rehabil.*

2005;15(3):329-341.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

120. Frings-Dresen M, Sluiter JK. Development of a Job-Specific FCE Protocol: The Work Demands of Hospital Nurses as an Example. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2003;13(4):233-248.

Reason for exclusion: Protocol only.

121. Reesink D, Jorritsma W, Reneman M. Basis for a Functional Capacity Evaluation Methodology for Patients with Work-related Neck Disorders. *J Occup Rehabil.* 2007;17(3):436-449.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

122. Darragh AR, Campo M, King P. Work-related activities associated with injury in occupational and physical therapists. *Work.* 2012;42(3):373-384.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

123. Lapane KL, Dubé C, E., Jesdale BM. Worker Injuries in Nursing Homes: is Safe Patient Handling Legislation the Solution? *J Nurs Home Res Sci.* 2016;2:110-117.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

124. Clemes SA, Haslam CO, Haslam RA. What constitutes effective manual handling training? A systematic review. *Occup Med.* 2010;60(2):101-107.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

125. Alberto R, Draicchio F, Varrecchia T, Silvetti A, Iavicoli S. Wearable Monitoring Devices for Biomechanical Risk Assessment at Work: Current Status and Future Challenges-A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2018;15(9).

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible setting.

126. Gusenius TM, Decker MM, Weidemann AG. Using shared governance to achieve a culture change in safe patient handling. *Int J Orthop Trauma Nurs.* 2018;31:35-39.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

127. Carta A, Parmigiani F, Roversi A, Rossato R, Milini C, Parrinello G, et al. Training in safer and healthier patient handling techniques. *Br J Nurs.* 2010;19(9):576-582.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 128.Lin F, Wang A, Cavuoto L, Xu W. Toward Unobtrusive Patient Handling Activity Recognition for Injury Reduction Among At-Risk Caregivers. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform. 2017;21(3):682-695.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 129.Jones S. The nurse who could lift. Nursing. 2017;47(5):42-44.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 130.Koppelaar E, Knibbe HJJ, Miedema HS, Burdorf A. The influence of ergonomic devices on mechanical load during patient handling activities in nursing homes. Ann Occup Hyg. 2012;56(6):708-718.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 131.Eitzen D, Byard RW. The handling of bariatric bodies. J Forensic Leg Med. 2013;20(1):57-59.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 132.Peterson EL, McGlothlin JD, Blue CL. The development of an ergonomics training program to identify, evaluate, and control musculoskeletal disorders among nursing assistants at a state-run veterans' home. J Occup Environ Hyg. 2004;1(1):10-16.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 133.Trossman S. Taking safe patient handling to the home front. Am Nurse. 2009;41(6):14.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 134.Gilbert JH, Vermillion B, Chase LK. Stop the pain: Reinforcing a successful ergonomics program. Nurs Manage. 2012;43(7):18-20.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 135.Cimolin V, Cau N, Tacchini E, Galli M, Rigoldi C, Rinolfi M, et al. Spinal load in nurses during emergency lifting of obese patients: preliminary results. Med Lav. 2016;107(5):356-363.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 136.Douglas B, Fitzpatrick D, Golub-Victor A, Lowe SM. Should my patient use a mechanical lift? Part 2: algorithm and case application. Home Healthc Nurse. 2014;32(3):172-180.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 137.Bacharach DW, Miller K, von Duvillard S,P. Saving your back: How do horizontal patient transfer devices stack up? Nursing. 2016;46(1):59-64.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

- 138.Dunning E. Safer patient handling in your grasp. Nurs Manage. 2009;40(2):33-37.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 139.Wilson CB. Safer handling practice: influence of staff education on older people. Br J Nurs. 2002;11(20):1332-1339.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 140.Bunke JF. Safe strategies for lifting large patients. Nursing. 2008;38:4-6.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 141.Watters C. Safe patient handling: are we doing it yet? Orthop Nurs. 2008;27(1):38-41.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 142.Kennedy B, Kopp T. Safe patient handling protects employees too. Nursing. 2015;45(8):65-67.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 143.Dieker E, Steffes A, Tidwell S. Safe patient handling curriculum content. Kans Nurse. 2007;82(3):8-9.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 144.Durham CF. Safe patient handling and movement: time for a culture change. Tar Heel Nurse. 2007;69(4):16-18.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 145.Nelson A, Owen B, Lloyd JD, Fragala G, Matz MW, Amato M, et al. Safe patient handling and movement. Am J Nurs. 2003;103(3):32-43.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 146.Spruce L. Safe Patient Handling and Movement. AORN J. 2020;112(1):63-71.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 147.Restrepo TE, Schmid FA, Gucer PW, Shuford HL, Shyong CJ, McDiarmid MA. Safe lifting programs at long-term care facilities and their impact on workers' compensation costs. J Occup Environ Med. 2013;55(1):27-35.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 148.Relias Media. Safe lifting becomes standard practice. Hosp Case Manag. 2013;21(2):26-28.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

149. Patrick G. Risks of moving and handling. Nurs Stand. 2016;30(52):64-65.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

150. Ngan K, Drebit S, Siow S, Yu S, Keen D, Alamgir H. Risks and causes of musculoskeletal injuries among health care workers. Occup Med. 2010;60(5):389-394.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

151. Lee S, Faucett J, Gillen M, Krause N, Landry L. Risk perception of musculoskeletal injury among critical care nurses. Nurs Res. 2013;62(1):36-44.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

152. Holtermann A, Clausen T, Aust B, Mortensen OS, Andersen LL. Risk for low back pain from different frequencies, load mass and trunk postures of lifting and carrying among female healthcare workers. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2013;86(4):463-470.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

153. Caspi CE, Dennerlein JT, Kenwood C, Stoddard AM, Hopcia K, Hashimoto D, et al. Results of a pilot intervention to improve health and safety for health care workers. J Occup Environ Med. 2013;55(12):1449-1455.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

154. Makhoul PJ, Sinden KE, MacPhee RS, Fischer SL. Relative Contribution of Lower Body Work as a Biomechanical Determinant of Spine Sparing Technique During Common Paramedic Lifting Tasks. J Appl Biomech. 2017;33(2):137-143.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

155. Nam S, Song M, Lee S. Relationships of Musculoskeletal Symptoms, Sociodemographics, and Body Mass Index With Leisure-Time Physical Activity Among Nurses. Workplace Health Saf. 2018;66(12):577-587.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

156. Kitagawa K, Uezono T, Nagasaki T, Nakano S, Wada C. Relationship between surface electromyography of the spinae erector muscles and subjectively adjusted step length in the supporting standing-up motion. J Phys Ther Sci. 2019;31(11):869-872.

Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

157. Alperovitch-Najenson D, Sheffer D, Treger I, Finkels T, Kalichman L. Rehabilitation versus Nursing Home Nurses' Low Back and Neck-Shoulder Complaints. *Rehabil Nurs*. 2015;40(5):286-293.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
158. Davies N. Reducing your risk of back injury at work. *Nurs Stand*. 2015;29(25):73.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
159. Resnick ML, Sanchez R. Reducing patient handling injuries through contextual training. *J Emerg Nurs*. 2009;35(6):504-508.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
160. Fragala G. Reducing Occupational Risk to Ambulatory Caregivers. *Workplace Health Saf*. 2016;64(9):414-419.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
161. Owlia M, Kamachi M, Dutta T. Reducing lumbar spine flexion using real-time biofeedback during patient handling tasks. *Work*. 2020;66(1):41-51.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
162. Ann Adamczyk M. Reducing Intensive Care Unit Staff Musculoskeletal Injuries With Implementation of a Safe Patient Handling and Mobility Program. *Crit Care Nurs Q*. 2018;41(3):264-271.
Reason for exclusion: Unable to access paper.
163. Lipley N. Progress slow on safe handling policies. *Emerg Nurse*. 2002;10(1):2.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
164. Rugs D, Toyinbo P, Patel N, Powell-Cope G, Hahm B, Elnitsky C, et al. Processes and outcomes of the veterans health administration safe patient handling program: study protocol. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2013;2(2):e49.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
165. de Castro A,B., Hagan P, Nelson A. Prioritizing safe patient handling: The American Nurses Association's Handle With Care Campaign. *J Nurs Adm*. 2006;36(7-8):363-369.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

166. Bhimani R. Prevention of Work-related Musculoskeletal Injuries in Rehabilitation Nursing. *Rehabil Nurs*. 2016;41(6):326-335.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
167. Spruce L. Preventing Staff Member Injury Through Safe Patient Handling and Movement. *AORN J*. 2020;111(5):567-568.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
168. Brown MR, Personeus K, Langan J. Preventing lower back pain among caregivers. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2015;96(7):1365-1366.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
169. Homsted L. Preventing back injuries: safe patient handling and movement. *Fla Nurse*. 2004;52(3):3.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
170. Bell J, Collins J, Galinsky TL, Waters TR. Preventing back injuries. *Ala Nurse*. 2009;36(2):16.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
171. Blocks M. Practical solutions for safe patient handling. *Nursing*. 2005;35(10):44-45.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
172. Chan F, Hsu C, Lin H, Wang J, Su S, Huang C, et al. Physicians as well as nonphysician health care professionals in Taiwan have higher risk for lumbar herniated intervertebral disc than general population. *Medicine*. 2018;97(1):e9561.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
173. Alperovitch-Najenson D, Treger I, Kalichman L. Physical therapists versus nurses in a rehabilitation hospital: comparing prevalence of work-related musculoskeletal complaints and working conditions. *Arch Environ Occup Health*. 2014;69(1):33-39.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
174. Andersen LL, Vinstrup J, Villadsen E, Jay K, Jakobsen MD. Physical and Psychosocial Work Environmental Risk Factors for Back Injury among Healthcare Workers: Prospective Cohort Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;16(22).
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
175. Vinstrup J, Madeleine P, Jakobsen MD, Jay K, Andersen LL. Patient Transfers and Risk of Back Injury: Protocol for a Prospective Cohort

- Study With Technical Measurements of Exposure. JMIR Res Protoc. 2017;6(11):e212.
Reason for exclusion: Protocol only.
176. Blair S, Bratton M. Patient handling and time outs: The way to sustain safety. Nurs Manage. 2015;46(6):46-50.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
177. Lee J, Kim S, Jung H, Koo J, Woo K, Kim MT. Participatory action oriented training for hospital nurses (PAOTHN) program to prevent musculoskeletal disorders. J Occup Health. 2009;51(4):370-376.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
178. Tideiksaar R. Part I: Achieving safe resident handling. Director. 2008;16(2):27-29.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
179. Rodríguez-Acosta RL, Richardson DB, Lipscomb HJ, Chen JC, Dement JM, Myers DJ, et al. Occupational injuries among aides and nurses in acute care. Am J Ind Med. 2009;52(12):953-964.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
180. Zubair A. Nurses at risk of injuries. Aust Nurs Midwifery J. 2015;23(2):26-28.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
181. NJSNA. NJSNA members participate in multi-state study to assess safe patient handling. N J Nurse. 2002;32(5):20.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
182. Cameron SJ, Armstrong-Stassen M, Kane D, Moro FBP. Musculoskeletal problems experienced by older nurses in hospital settings. Nurs Forum. 2008;43(2):103-114.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
183. Caponecchia C, Coman RL, Gopaldasani V, Mayland EC, Campbell L. Musculoskeletal disorders in aged care workers: a systematic review of contributing factors and interventions. Int J Nurs Stud. 2020;110:103715.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
184. Gillespie T, Lane S. Moving the Bariatric Patient. Crit Care Nurs Q. 2018;41(3):297-301.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

185. Warren G. Moving and handling: reducing risk through assessment. *Nurs Stand.* 2016;30(40):49-58.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
186. Wanless S, Page A. Moving and handling education in the community: technological innovations to improve practice. *Br J Community Nurs.* 2009;14(12):530-532.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
187. Theilmeier A, Jordan C, Luttmann A, Jäger M. Measurement of action forces and posture to determine the lumbar load of healthcare workers during care activities with patient transfers. *Ann Occup Hyg.* 2010;54(8):923-933.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
188. Winkelman C, Chiang L. Manual turns in patients receiving mechanical ventilation. *Crit Care Nurse.* 2010;30(4):36-44.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
189. Cowley SP, Leggett S. Manual handling risks associated with the care, treatment and transportation of bariatric (severely obese) clients in Australia. *Work.* 2011;39(4):477-483.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
190. Thompson S, Jevon P. Manual handling 1--assisted stand. The manual handling procedure to help a seated patient into a standing position. *Nurs Times.* 2008;104(50-51):36-37.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
191. Dennerlein JT, O'Day ET, Mulloy DF, Somerville J, Stoddard AM, Kenwood C, et al. Lifting and exertion injuries decrease after implementation of an integrated hospital-wide safe patient handling and mobilisation programme. *Occup Environ Med.* 2017;74(5):336-343.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
192. Stevenson A. Learning to handle patients safely. *Nurs N Z.* 2009;15(4):24-25.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
193. Thomas DR, Thomas YLN. Interventions to reduce injuries when transferring patients: a critical appraisal of reviews and a realist synthesis. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2014;51(10):1381-1394.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

194. Hignett S. Intervention strategies to reduce musculoskeletal injuries associated with handling patients: a systematic review. *Occup Environ Med.* 2003;60(9):E6.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
195. Wyatt S, Meacci K, Arnold M. Integrating Safe Patient Handling and Early Mobility: Combining Quality Initiatives. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 2020;35(2):130-134.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
196. Dickinson S, Taylor S, Anton P. Integrating a Standardized Mobility Program and Safe Patient Handling. *Crit Care Nurs Q.* 2018;41(3):240-252.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
197. Przybysz L, Levin PF. Initial Results of an Evidence-Based Safe Patient Handling and Mobility Program to Decrease Hospital Worker Injuries. *Workplace Health Saf.* 2017;65(2):83-88.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
198. Wanless S, Wanless SG. Improving training and education in patient handling. *Nurs Times.* 2011;107(23):17-19.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
199. Fragala G, Fragala M. Improving the safety of patient turning and repositioning tasks for caregivers. *Workplace Health Saf.* 2014;62(7):268-273.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
200. Park RM, Bushnell PT, Bailer AJ, Collins JW, Stayner LT. Impact of publicly sponsored interventions on musculoskeletal injury claims in nursing homes. *Am J Ind Med.* 2009;52(9):683-697.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
201. Varnam W. How to mobilise patients with dementia to a standing position. *Nurs Older People.* 2011;23(8):31-36.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
202. Taylor J. How to assist patients with sit-stand transfers. *Nurs Stand.* 2017;31(37):41-45.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
203. Serranheira F, Sousa-Uva M, Sousa-Uva A. Hospital nurses tasks and work-related musculoskeletal disorders symptoms: A detailed analysis.

- 869 Work. 2015;51(3):401-409.
- 870 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 871 204.Enos L. Hidden costs: the case for ergonomics and safe patient handling.
- 872 Oreg Nurse. 2010;5.
- 873 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 874 205.Worthington KA. Handling and moving patients--safely: protect patients
- 875 and lighten your load. Am J Nurs. 2002;102(6):112.
- 876 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 877 206.Allen LK, Durham CE. Handle with care: a new curriculum for safe patient
- 878 handling and movement at the University of North Carolina at Chapel
- 879 Hill. Tar Heel Nurse. 2006;68(2):21-23.
- 880 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 881 207.Carlson AH. Handle with care. Rehab Manag. 2008;21(9):33-35.
- 882 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 883 208.AORN. Guideline Quick View: Safe Patient Handling and Movement.
- 884 AORN J. 2018;108(2):223-227.
- 885 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 886 209.Link T. Guideline Implementation: Safe Patient Handling and Movement:
- 887 1.8 www.aornjournal.org/content/cme. AORN J. 2018;108(6):663-674.
- 888 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 889 210.Hauk L. Guideline for safe patient handling and movement. AORN J.
- 890 2018;107(6):10-12.
- 891 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 892 211.AORN. Guideline at a Glance: Positioning. AORN J. 2017;106(5):460-
- 893 465.
- 894 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 895 212.Trossman S. Getting a lift. ANA, CMA and RN efforts continue to build
- 896 momentum for safe patient handling movement. Am Nurse.
- 897 2007;39(4):1.
- 898 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 899 213.Thiede M, Liebers F, Seidler A, Gravemeyer S, Latza U. Gender specific
- 900 analysis of occupational diseases of the low back caused by carrying,
- 901 lifting or extreme trunk flexion--use of a prevention index to identify
- 902 occupations with high prevention needs. Am J Ind Med. 2014;57(2):233-

244.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 214.Kayser SA, Wiggermann NE, Kumpar D. Factors associated with safe patient handling practice in acute care and its relationship with patient mobilization: A cross-sectional study. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2020;104:103508.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 215.Jootun D, MacInnes A. Examining how well students use correct handling procedures. *Nurs Times.* 2005;101(4):38-40.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.
- 216.Hignett S, Crumpton E, Ruzsala S, Alexander P, Fray M, Fletcher B. Evidence-based patient handling: systematic review. *Nurs Stand.* 2003;17(33):33-36.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 217.Johnsson C, Carlsson R, Lagerström M. Evaluation of training in patient handling and moving skills among hospital and home care personnel. *Ergonomics.* 2002;45(12):850-865.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 218.Hallmark B, Mechan P, Shores L. Ergonomics: safe patient handling and mobility. *Nurs Clin North Am.* 2015;50(1):153-166.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 219.Brusin JH. Ergonomics in radiology. *Radiol Technol.* 2011;83(2):141-157.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 220.Ergonomic principles of safe patient handling. *Healthc Hazard Manage Monit.* 2003;16(5):1-7.
Reason for exclusion: Unable to access paper.
- 221.Dawson JM, Harrington S. Embracing safe patient handling. *Nurs Manage.* 2012;43(10):15-17.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 222.Martin PJ, Harvey JT, Culvenor JF, Payne WR. Effect of a nurse back injury prevention intervention on the rate of injury compensation claims. *J Safety Res.* 2009;40(1):13-19.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
- 223.Price C, Sanderson LV, Talarek DP. Don't pay the price: utilize safe patient handling. *Nursing.* 2013;43(12):13-15.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

224. Holtermann A, Clausen T, Jørgensen MB, Aust B, Mortensen OS, Burdorf A, et al. Does rare use of assistive devices during patient handling increase the risk of low back pain? A prospective cohort study among female healthcare workers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2015;88(3):335-342.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
225. D'Arcy L, P., Sasai Y, Stearns SC. Do assistive devices, training, and workload affect injury incidence? Prevention efforts by nursing homes and back injuries among nursing assistants. *J Adv Nurs*. 2012;68(4):836-845.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
226. Edlich RF, Hudson MA, Buschbacher RM, Winters KL, Britt LD, Cox MJ, et al. Devastating injuries in healthcare workers: description of the crisis and legislative solution to the epidemic of back injury from patient lifting. *J Long Term Eff Med Implants*. 2005;15(2):225-241.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
227. McKinney M. Curbing injuries from moving patients. *Mod Healthc*. 2015;45(13):28.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
228. Stevens L, Rees S, Lamb KV, Dalsing D. Creating a culture of safety for safe patient handling. *Orthop Nurs*. 2013;32(3):155-164.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
229. Stenger K, Montgomery LA, Briesemeister E. Creating a culture of change through implementation of a safe patient handling program. *Crit Care Nurs Clin North Am*. 2007;19(2):213-222.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
230. Kotejoshy R, Punnett L, Dybel G, Buchholz B. Claim Costs, Musculoskeletal Health, and Work Exposure in Physical Therapists, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapist Assistants, and Occupational Therapist Assistants: A Comparison Among Long-Term Care Jobs. *Phys Ther*. 2019;99(2):183-193.
Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
231. Black JM, Salsbury S, Vollman KM. Changing the Perceptions of a Culture of Safety for the Patient and the Caregiver: Integrating Improvement Initiatives to Create Sustainable Change. *Crit Care Nurs Q*.

973 2018;41(3):226-239.
974 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

975 232.Rose MA, Drake DJ, Baker G, Watkins FR, Waters W, Pokorny M. Caring
976 for morbidly obese patients: safety considerations for nurse
977 administrators. Nurs Manage. 2008;39(11):47-50.
978 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

979 233.Alberta RN. Care for your back and it will love you back. Alta RN.
980 2013;68(4):26-27.
981 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

982 234.Knibbe JJ, Knibbe NE, Waaijer E. Assessments of patients with a 5-
983 category or a 3-category practical classification system: validity and
984 practicality. Work. 2012;41 Suppl 1:5655-5656.
985 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

986 235.Burdorf A, Koppelaar E, Evanoff B. Assessment of the impact of lifting
987 device use on low back pain and musculoskeletal injury claims among
988 nurses. Occup Environ Med. 2013;70(7):491-497.
989 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

990 236.Hwang J, Ari H, Matoo M, Chen J, Kim JH. Air-assisted devices reduce
991 biomechanical loading in the low back and upper extremities during
992 patient turning tasks. Appl Ergon. 2020;87:103121.
993 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

994 237.Nathenson P. Adapting OSHA ergonomic guidelines to the rehabilitation
995 setting. Rehabil Nurs. 2004;29(4):127-130.
996 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

997 238.Stutzman S. A rehabilitation hospital approach to safe patient
998 movement. Nebr Nurse. 2010;43(3):12.
999 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1000 239.Johnson CL, Demass Martin S,L., Markle-Elder S. A national solution to
1001 patient handling injuries. Am J Nurs. 2007;107(9):73-75.
1002 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1003 240.Lees L. A guide for HCAs on safe patient transfers. Nurs Times.
1004 2013;109(26):20-22.
1005 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1006 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1007 241.Dutta T, Holliday PJ, Gorski SM, Baharvandy MS, Fernie GR. A
1008 biomechanical assessment of floor and overhead lifts using one or two
1009 caregivers for patient transfers. Appl Ergon. 2012;43(3):521-531.
1010 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1011 242.Choi SD, Brings K. Work-related musculoskeletal risks associated with
1012 nurses and nursing assistants handling overweight and obese patients: A
1013 literature review. Work. 2016;53(2):439-448.
1014 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1015 243.Bolin M. Workplace safety in the surgical suite: OSHA's effect. AORN J.
1016 2012;96(1):1.
1017 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1018 244.Spratt D, Cowles Jr C,E., Berguer R, Dennis V, Waters TR, Rodriguez M,
1019 et al. Workplace safety equals patient safety. AORN J. 2012;96(3):235-
1020 244.
1021 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1022 245.Peled K. Workplace safety assessment and injury prevention in hospital
1023 settings. Work. 2005;25(3):273-277.
1024 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1025 246.Converso A, Murphy C. Winning the battle against back injuries. RN.
1026 2004;67(2):52-82.
1027 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1028 247.Stetler CB, Burns M, Sander-Buscemi K, Morsi D, Grunwald E. Use of
1029 evidence for prevention of work-related musculoskeletal injuries. Orthop
1030 Nurs. 2003 Jan;22(1):32-41.
1031 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1032 248.Jabłońska R, Gralik M, Królikowska A, Haor B, Antczak A. The Problem of
1033 Back Pain Among Nurses of Neurology and Neurosurgery Wards. J Neurol
1034 Neurosurg Nurs. 2016;5(3):84-91.
1035 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1036 249.Bakola H, Zyga S, Stergioulas A, Kipreos G, Sheikhzadeh A,
1037 Panoutsopoulos G. The "Perception of Musculoskeletal Risk Factors
1038 (PMRF)" for Operating Room Nurses (ORN): Translation and Cultural
1039 Adaption of the Questionnaire in the Greek Language. Int J Caring Sci.
1040 2017 May;10(2):834-841.
1041 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1042 250.Jarus T, Ratzon NZ. The implementation of motor learning principles in
1043 designing prevention programs at work. Work. 2005;24(2):171-182.
1044 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1045 251.Gallagher AM, Gilligan R, McGrath M. The effect of DVD training on the
1046 competence of occupational therapy students in manual handling: A pilot
1047 study. Int J Ther Rehabil. 2014;21(12):575-583.
1048 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1049 252.Ratzon NZ, Bar-Niv N, Froom P. The effect of a structured personalized
1050 ergonomic intervention program for hospital nurses with reported
1051 musculoskeletal pain: An assigned randomized control trial. Work.
1052 2016;54(2):367-377.
1053 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1054 253.Chadwick M. Test your manual handling knowledge: answers. Nurs
1055 Residential Care. 2008;10(11):561-563.
1056 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1057 254.Chadwick M. Test your manual handling knowledge. Nurs Residential
1058 Care. 2008;10(10):503-507.
1059 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1060 255.Cabeças J,Martin Miquel. Taxonomy to characterize occupational hazards
1061 (risk factors) at the workplace level. Work. 2015;51(4):703-713.
1062 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1063 256.Kennedy CA, III AB, Dennerlein JT, Brewer S, Catli S, Williams R, et al.
1064 Systematic review of the role of occupational health and safety
1065 interventions in the prevention of upper extremity musculoskeletal
1066 symptoms, signs, disorders, injuries, claims and lost time. J Occup
1067 Rehabil. 2010;20(2):127-162.
1068 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1069 257.American Association for Safe Patient Handling and Movement. Spotlight
1070 On: American Association for Safe Patient Handling & Movement United
1071 States of America. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2014;4(2):62-
1072 63.
1073 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1074 258.Walker L, Docherty T, Hougendobler D, Guanowsky C, Rosenthal M.
1075 Sharing the Lessons: the 10-Year Journey of a Safe Patient Movement

1076 Program. Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil. 2017;7(1):20-28.
1077 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1078 259.Monaghan HM. Selecting Effective Training and Education Strategies as
1079 Part of a Safe Patient Handling and Movement Program. Am J Safe
1080 Patient Handling Movement. 2011;1(4):17-21.
1081 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1082 260.Scalzitti DA, Harwood KJ, Campo M. Searching the Literature for Safe
1083 Patient Handling and Mobility Evidence. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1084 Movement. 2016;6(1):10-15.
1085 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1086 261.Nelson AL, Collins J, Knibbe H, Cookson K, Castro AB, Whipple KL. Safer
1087 patient handling. Nurs Manage. 2007;38(3):26-33.
1088 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1089 262.Way H. Safe Patient Handling Initiative in Level I Trauma Center Results
1090 in Reduction of Hospital-Acquired Pressure Injury and Fewer Patient
1091 Handling Injuries. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1092 2016;6(4):160-165.
1093 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1094 263.Murray E. Safe Patient Handling in the Morgue. Am J Safe Patient
1095 Handling Movement. 2012;2(2):48-53.
1096 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1097 264.Capewell RA. Safe Patient Handling in Home Health Care: a Review of
1098 the Literature. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2011;1(2):25-34.
1099 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1100 265.Matz MW. Safe Patient Handling Building Design Guidance: an Overview
1101 of the Patient Handling and Movement Assessment. Am J Safe Patient
1102 Handling Movement. 2011;1(2):13-18.
1103 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1104 266.Enos L. Safe Patient Handling and Patient Safety: Identifying the Current
1105 Evidence Base and Gaps in Research. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1106 Movement. 2013;3(3):94-102.
1107 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1108 267.Nelson K. Safe Patient Handling and Health Care Reform: an Opportunity
1109 to Link Patient and Worker Safety. Am J Safe Patient Handling

1110 Movement. 2015;5(1):9-12.
1111 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1112 268.Monaghan HM, Murray E, Severson L, Kissing J. Safe Patient Handling &
1113 Movement: Long Term Care. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1114 2013;3:S1-S19.
1115 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1116 269.Monaghan HM. Safe Patient Handling & Movement: Legislation,
1117 Accreditation, Quality, and Recognition. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1118 Movement. 2013;3(3):103-109.
1119 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1120 270.Gallagher S, Hilton T, Monaghan HM, Muir M, Dye A. Safe Patient
1121 Handling & Movement: Bariatric Considerations. Am J Safe Patient
1122 Handling Movement. 2014:1-16.
1123 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1124 271.Monaghan HM. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World:
1125 United States of America-Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient
1126 Handling Movement. 2012;2(2):58-60.
1127 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1128 272.Knibbe HJJ. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World: the
1129 Netherlands--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1130 Movement. 2011;1(4):37-39.
1131 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1132 273.Kuo W, Chang J. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World:
1133 Taiwan--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1134 Movement. 2013;3(1):38-39.
1135 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1136 274.Lindahl O. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World:
1137 Scandinavia--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1138 Movement. 2011;1(3):36-37.
1139 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1140 275.Carton M. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World: Saudi
1141 Arabia--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1142 Movement. 2013;3(2):74-75.
1143 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1144 276.Menoni O, Battevi N. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the
1145 World: Italy--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1146 Movement. 2012;2(3):100-101.
1147 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1148 277.Geiger JS. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World: Israel--
1149 Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1150 2012;2(1):33-35.
1151 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1152 278.Monaghan HM. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World:
1153 Editorial. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2012;2(4):138-139.
1154 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1155 279.O'shea L. Safe Patient Handling & Movement Around the World:
1156 Australia--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1157 Movement. 2011;1(2):35-37.
1158 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1159 280.Blood R. Safe moving and handling of individuals. Nurs Residential Care.
1160 2005;7(10):439-441.
1161 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1162 281.Wardell H. Reduction of injuries associated with patient handling. AAOHN
1163 J. 2007;55(10):407-412.
1164 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1165 282.Punchihewa HKG, Gyi DE. Reducing work-related Musculoskeletal
1166 Disorders (MSDs) through design: Views of ergonomics and design
1167 practitioners. Work. 2016;53(1):127-142.
1168 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1169 283.Sampath SL, Wilson K, Davis K, Kotowski S. Reality of Safe Patient
1170 Handling Policies and Programs in Hospitals Across the United States. Int
1171 J Safe Patient Handl Mobil. 2019;9(2):69-76.
1172 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1173 284.Jaklic A, Jagodic V. Quantitative assessment of nurses' work in intensive
1174 care units: comparison of the TISS-28 scoring system with the
1175 classification system used in Slovenia. Connect World Crit Care Nurs.
1176 2005;4(3):122.
1177 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1178 285.Zontek TL, Isernhagen JC, Ogle BR. Psychosocial factors contributing to
 1179 occupational injuries among direct care workers. AAOHN J.
 1180 2009;57(8):338-347.
 1181 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1182 286.Nelson A, Lloyd JD, Menzel N, Gross C. Preventing nursing back injuries:
 1183 redesigning patient handling tasks. AAOHN J. 2003;51(3):126-134.
 1184 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1185 287.White KM. Policy spotlight: patient care ergonomics: are we moving in
 1186 the right direction? Nurs Manage. 2007;38(4):26-30.
 1187 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1188 288.Franklin J, Yeung Y. Play it safe: use proper ergonomics to protect
 1189 patients and staff. Crit Care Nurse. 2008;28(2):40.
 1190 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1191 289.Kim I, Geiger-Brown J, Trinkoff A, Muntaner C. Physically demanding
 1192 workloads and the risks of musculoskeletal disorders in homecare
 1193 workers in the USA. Health Soc Care Community. 2010;18(5):445-455.
 1194 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1195 290.Chadwick M, Titcomb P. Patient handling: getting the training right. Nurs
 1196 Residential Care. 2007;9(10):490-492.
 1197 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1198 291.Sabbath EL, Yang J, Dennerlein JT, Boden LI, Hashimoto D, Sorensen G.
 1199 Paradoxical Impact of a Patient-Handling Intervention on Injury Rate
 1200 Disparity Among Hospital Workers. Am J Public Health.
 1201 2019;109(4):618-625.
 1202 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1203 292.Sedlak CA. Overview and summary: nurse safety: have we addressed
 1204 the risks? Online J Issues Nurs. 2004;9(3):4.
 1205 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1206 293.Teeple E, Collins JE, Shrestha S, Dennerlein JT, Losina E, Katz JN.
 1207 Outcomes of safe patient handling and mobilization programs: A meta-
 1208 analysis. Work. 2017;58(2):173-184.
 1209 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1210 294.Yoder A, Coley K, Harrison D, Wright K. Outcomes of a Safe Patient
 1211 Handling Program Implementation. Am J Safe Patient Handling

1212 Movement. 2014;4(4):111-117.
1213 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1214 295.Larsen AK, Holtermann A, Mortensen OS, Punnett L, Rod MH, Jørgensen
1215 MB. Organizing workplace health literacy to reduce musculoskeletal pain
1216 and consequences. BMC Nurs. 2015;14(1):1-13.
1217 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1218 296.Alnaser MZ. Occupational musculoskeletal injuries in the health care
1219 environment and its impact on occupational therapy practitioners: a
1220 systematic review. Work. 2007;29(2):89-100.
1221 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1222 297.Filek S, Brims M. Nurssafe Patient Handling & Movement Around the
1223 World: British Columbia (Canada)--Past, Present, and Future. Am J Safe
1224 Patient Handling Movement. 2013;3(3):110-112.
1225 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1226 298.van Wyk PM, Andrews DM, Weir PL. Nurse perceptions of manual patient
1227 transfer training: implications for injury. Work. 2010;37(4):361-373.
1228 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1229 299.Krill C, Raven C, Staffileno BA. Moving from a Clinical Question To
1230 Research: The Implementation Of a Safe Patient Handling Program.
1231 Medsurg Nurs. 2012 Mar;21(2):104-116.
1232 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1233 300.Rinds G. Moving and handling: part one. Nurs Residential Care.
1234 2007;9(6):260-262.
1235 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1236 301.Sturman-Floyd M. Moving and handling: assessing the handler. Nurs
1237 Residential Care. 2013;15(2):98-101.
1238 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1239 302.Chadwick M. More principles for a positive approach to manual handling.
1240 Nurs Residential Care. 2008;10(3):151-153.
1241 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1242 303.van Wyk PM, Weir PL, Andrews DM. Manual patient transfers used most
1243 often by student and staff nurses are consistent with their perceptions of
1244 transfer training, and performance confidence. Work. 2015;50(2):249-
1245 260.
1246 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1247 304.Enos L. Making the Business Case to Initiate, Evaluate, and Sustain Safe
1248 Patient Handling Programs: Part 2. Am J Safe Patient Handling
1249 Movement. 2011;1(4):22-30.
1250 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1251 305.Enos L. Making the Business Case to Initiate, Evaluate, and Sustain Safe
1252 Patient Handling Programs. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1253 2011;1(3):8-15.
1254 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1255 306.Hanson H, Wagner M, Monopoli V, Keysor J. Low back pain in physical
1256 therapists: a cultural approach to analysis and intervention. Work.
1257 2007;28(2):145-151.
1258 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1259 307.Stevenson JM. Looking forward by looking back: Helping to reduce work-
1260 related musculoskeletal disorders. Work. 2014;47(1):137-141.
1261 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1262 308.Kane J. Intervention needed for manual handling safety. Kai Tiaki Nurs
1263 NZ. 2015;21(10):18-20.
1264 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1265 309.Enos L, Monaghan HM, Odum M. International Round Table Discussion:
1266 Safe Patient Handling & Mobility: what is Working, what Needs to
1267 Change, and Where does the Future Lie? Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil.
1268 2019;9(3):122-127.
1269 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1270 310.Gallagher A, Dube J, Wawzyniecki P. International Round Table
1271 Discussion: Engaging Patients and Family in Safe Patient Handling and
1272 Early Mobility Decision-Making. Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil.
1273 2019;9(1):42-46.
1274 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1275 311.Francis R, Fray M, Morley S. International Round Table Discussion: Does
1276 Federal, Government, or State Legislation Mandating SPHM Make a
1277 Difference to Compliance? Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil. 2019;9(4):149-
1278 153.
1279 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1280 312.Costa-Black KM, Durand M, Imbeau D, Baril R, Loisel P. Interdisciplinary
1281 team discussion on work environment issues related to low back

1282 disability: a multiple case study. Work. 2007;28(3):249-265.
1283 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1284 313.Soures MM, Jacobs K, Selis K, Vanacker H, Hermans V, Mylle G, et al.
1285 Integration of ergonomics in the prevention policy of a large university
1286 hospital. Work. 2012;41:5917-5920.
1287 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1288 314.Perlow E, Tunney N, Lucado A. Integrating Safe Patient Handling Into
1289 Physical Therapist Education: Reducing the Incidence of Physical
1290 Therapist Injury and Improving Patient Outcomes. J Phys Ther Educ.
1291 2016;30(2):32-37.
1292 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1293 315.Soures MM, Jacobs K, Sharan D, Ajeesh P. Injury prevention in
1294 physiotherapists - a scientific review. Work. 2012;41:1855-1859.
1295 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1296 316.Szeto G, Cheng A, Lee E, Schonstein E, Gross D. Implementing the Work
1297 Disability Prevention Paradigm Among Therapists in Hong Kong:
1298 Facilitators and Barriers. J Occup Rehabil. 2011;21(1):76-83.
1299 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1300 317.Sofie J, Belza B, Young H. Health and safety risk at a skilled nursing
1301 facility: nursing assistants' perceptions. J Gerontol Nurs. 2003;29(2):13-
1302 21.
1303 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1304 318.Powell-Cope G, Hughes NL, Sedlak C, Nelson A. Faculty perceptions of
1305 implementing an evidence-based safe patient handling nursing
1306 curriculum module. Online J Issues Nurs. 2008;13(3):13p.
1307 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1308 319.Kotowski S, Davis K. Factors Impacting the Patient Migration in Hospital
1309 Beds: Pathway to Reduce Patient Handling Injuries. Int J Safe Patient
1310 Handl Mobil. 2019;9(3):102-110.
1311 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1312 320.Adams J. Factors Associated with Manual Handling Injuries: a Case-
1313 Control Study Employing the Health Belief Model. Am J Safe Patient
1314 Handling Movement. 2013;3(3):84-93.
1315 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1316 321.Gallagher SM. Exploring the Relationship between Obesity, Patient
1317 Safety, and Caregiver Injury. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1318 2011;1(2):8-12.
1319 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1320 322.Rinds G. Exploring recent developments in manual handling. Nurs
1321 Residential Care. 2009;11(6):312-315.
1322 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1323 323.Nelson A, Baptiste AS. Evidence-based practices for safe patient handling
1324 and movement. Orthop Nurs. 2006;25(6):366-379.
1325 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1326 324.Egerod I. Evidence-based practice among Danish critical care nurses.
1327 Connect World Crit Care Nurs. 2005;4(3):103-104.
1328 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1329 325.Knibbe Hjj, Knibbe Ne, Heitink, Diede E. B. L. Evaluating Different
1330 Methods of Showering and Washing Patients: Assessing Ergonomic,
1331 Time, and Quality Aspects. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1332 2016;6(2):49-64.
1333 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1334 326.Potter M, Jones S. Entry-level physiotherapists' strategies to lower
1335 occupational injury risk in physiotherapy: a qualitative study. Physiother
1336 Theory Pract. 2006;22(6):329-336.
1337 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1338 327.Enos L, Eldredge D, Rockefeller K. Educational Case Report: a Safe
1339 Patient Handling and Mobilization Training Program in an Academic
1340 Medical Center. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2016;6(3):120-
1341 129.
1342 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1343 328.Hignett S, Crumpton E. Development of a patient handling assessment
1344 tool. Int J Ther Rehabil. 2005;12(4):178-181.
1345 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1346 329.Powell-Cope G, Haun J, Rugs D. Description of a Social Marketing
1347 Framework for Implementing an Evidence-Based Safe Patient Handling
1348 Program. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2013;3(2):64-72.
1349 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1350 330.Mansour M. Current assessment of patient safety education. Br J Nurs.
1351 2012;21(9):536-543.
1352 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1353 331.Hooper J, Charney W. Creation of a safety culture: reducing workplace
1354 injuries in a rural hospital setting. AAOHN J. 2005;53(9):394-398.
1355 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1356 332.Knibbe Hjj, Waaijer E. Covid-19 and Safe Patient Handling and Mobility in
1357 the Netherlands. Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil. 2020;10(2):80-82.
1358 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1359 333.Monaghan HM. Considering Hospital Transporters in a Safe Patient
1360 Handling Program. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2014;4(3):93-
1361 96.
1362 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1363 334.Soures MM, Jacobs K, Macdonald W. Conceptual framework for
1364 development of a toolkit for prevention of work-related musculoskeletal
1365 disorders. Work. 2012;41:3933-3936.
1366 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1367 335.Enos L, Monaghan HM, Thomas S. Comprehensive Review of SPHM
1368 Articles from 2005-2016. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.
1369 2016;6:1-28.
1370 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1371 336.Surrey LR, Fineran B, Howerton B, Mock A, Naylor D, Wiegand-Swihart T.
1372 Comparison of a simulated versus work environment lifting task on L5/S1
1373 compression forces. Work. 2003;21(3):265-270.
1374 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1375 337.Haas AD, Hunter DA, Howard NL. Bringing a structural perspective to
1376 work: Framing occupational safety and health disparities for nursing
1377 assistants with work-related musculoskeletal disorders. Work.
1378 2018;59(2):211-229.
1379 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1380 338.Harwood KJ. Blazing a New Trail: Advocacy for Safe Patient Handling and
1381 Mobility. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2015;5(1):21-26.
1382 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1383 339.Nouroollahi M, Afshari D, Dianat I. Awkward trunk postures and their
1384 relationship with low back pain in hospital nurses. Work.

1385 2018;59(3):317-323.
1386 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible setting.
1387 340.Rockefeller K. Appraising Evidence about Safe Patient Handling and
1388 Mobility. Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement. 2016;6(1):33-38.
1389 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1390 341.Wanless S. Applying Theories of Health Behavior and Change to Moving
1391 and Handling Practice. Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil. 2017;7(3):105-
1392 109.
1393 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1394 342.AORN. ANA releases national standards for safe patient handling and
1395 mobility. AORN J. 2013;98(2):4.
1396 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1397 343.Trossman S. ANA leads initiative to develop national safe patient
1398 handling standards. Am Nurse. 2012;44(5):4.
1399 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1400 344.ANA. ANA leading the effort to develop national safe patient handling
1401 standards. Am Nurse. 2012;44(3):14.
1402 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1403 345.Shaw L, Domanski S, Freeman A, Hoffele C. An investigation of a
1404 workplace-based return-to-work program for shoulder injuries. Work.
1405 2008;30(3):267-276.
1406 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1407 346.Souares MM, Jacobs K, Knibbe JJ, Knibbe NE. An international validation
1408 study of the care thermometer: a tool supporting the quality of
1409 ergonomic policies in health care. Work. 2012;41:5639-5641.
1410 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1411 347.Roll S, Roll SC, Evans KD, Hutmire CD, Baker JP. An analysis of
1412 occupational factors related to shoulder discomfort in diagnostic medical
1413 sonographers and vascular technologists. Work. 2012;42(3):355-365.
1414 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.
1415 348.Tompa E, Dolinschi R, de Oliveira C, III AB, Irvin E. A systematic review
1416 of workplace ergonomic interventions with economic analyses. J Occup
1417 Rehabil. 2010;20(2):220-234.
1418 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1419 349.Harwood KJ, Darragh AR, Campo M, Rockefeller K, Scalzitti DA. A
 1420 Systematic Review of Safe Patient Handling and Mobility Programs to
 1421 Prevent Musculoskeletal Injuries in Occupational and Physical Therapists
 1422 and Assistants. *Int J Safe Patient Handl Mobil.* 2018;8(1):46-56.
 1423 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1424 350.Harwood KJ, Scalzitti DA, Campo M, Darragh AR. A Systematic Review of
 1425 Safe Patient Handling and Mobility Programs to Improve Patient
 1426 Outcomes in Rehabilitation. *Am J Safe Patient Handling Movement.*
 1427 2016;6(4):141-150.
 1428 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1429 351.Deen M, Gibson L, Strong J. A survey of occupational therapy in
 1430 Australian work practice. *Work.* 2002;19(3):219-230.
 1431 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1432 352.Dropkin J, Moline J, Power PM, Kim H. A qualitative study of health
 1433 problems, risk factors, and prevention among Emergency Medical Service
 1434 workers. *Work.* 2015;52(4):935-951.
 1435 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1436 353.Rue CA, Rayson MP, Walker EF, Doherty J, Thompson J, Myers SD, et al.
 1437 A job task analysis to describe the physical demands of specialist
 1438 paramedic roles in the National Ambulance Resilience Unit (NARU). *Work.*
 1439 2019;63(4):547-557.
 1440 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1441 354.Noonan J, Wagner SL. A biopsychosocial perspective on the management
 1442 of work-related musculoskeletal disorders. *AAOHN J.* 2010;58(3):105-
 1443 114.
 1444 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1445 355.Kurowski A, Boyer J, Fulmer S, Gore R, Punnett L. Changes in ergonomic
 1446 exposures of nursing assistants after the introduction of a safe resident
 1447 handling program in nursing homes. *Int J Ind Ergon.* 2012;42(6):525-
 1448 32.
 1449 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1450 356.Kneafsey R, Haigh C. Moving and handling rehabilitation patients: A
 1451 survey of nurses' views. *Int J Ther Rehabil.* 2009;16(8):431-41.
 1452 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1453 357.Prairie J, Corbeil P. Paramedics on the job: Dynamic trunk motion
1454 assessment at the workplace. *Appl Ergon.* 2014;45(4):895-903.
1455 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1456 358.Treadwell L. Safe manual handling practices in the UK and USA: More
1457 than just a training exercise. *Int J Ther Rehabil.* 2013;20(7):326-7.
1458 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1459 359.Taylor J, Sims J, Haines TP. The emergent relevance of care staff
1460 decision-making and situation awareness to mobility care in nursing
1461 homes: an ethnographic study. *J Adv Nurs.* 2014;70(12):2767-78.
1462 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1463 360.Darragh AR, Shiyko M, Margulis H, Campo M. Effects of a safe patient
1464 handling and mobility program on patient self-care outcomes. *Am J of*
1465 *Occup Ther.* 2014;68(5):589-96.
1466 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1467 361.Piccenna L, Lannin NA, Scott K, Bragge P, Gruen R. Guidance for
1468 community-based caregivers in assisting people with moderate to severe
1469 traumatic brain injury with transfers and manual handling: Evidence and
1470 key stakeholder perspectives. *Health Soc Care Community.*
1471 2017;25(2):458-65.
1472 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1473 362.Risor BW, Casper SD, Andresen LL, Sorensen J. A multi-component
1474 patient-handling intervention improves attitudes and behaviors for safe
1475 patient handling and reduces aggression experienced by nursing staff: A
1476 controlled before-after study. *Appl Ergon.* 2017;60:74-82.
1477 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1478 363.Fragala G. Bed care for patients in palliative settings: Considering risks
1479 to caregivers, and bed surfaces. *Int J Palliat Nurs.* 2015;21(2):66-70.
1480 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1481 364.Rodrigues FF, de Oliveira Sato T. Effectiveness of ergonomic training to
1482 reduce physical demands and musculoskeletal symptoms - An overview
1483 of systematic reviews. *Int J Ind Ergon.* 2019;74.
1484 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1485 365.Rinds G. Moving and handling, part two: Risk management. *Nurs*
1486 *Residential Care.* 2007;9(7):306-9.
1487 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1488 366.Hall N, Bryer M. Moving and handling education: Educating the
1489 experienced practitioner. *Int J Ther Rehabil.* 2005;12(10):449-53.
1490 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1491 367.Rice MS, Dusseau JM, Kopp Miller B. A questionnaire of musculoskeletal
1492 injuries associated with manual patient lifting in occupational therapy
1493 practitioners in the state of Ohio. *Occup Ther Health Care.* 2011;25:95-
1494 107.
1495 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1496 368.Nelson A, Harwood KJ, Tracey CA, Dunn KL. Myths and Facts About Safe
1497 Patient Handling in Rehabilitation. *Rehabil Nurs.* 2008;33(1):10-7.
1498 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1499 369.Donnelly C, Macmillan MS. Devising and evaluating a model for teaching
1500 therapeutic handling and moving skills to complementary therapists.
1501 *Complement Ther Clin Pract.* 2007;13(3):201-9.
1502 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1503 370.Habibi E, Pourabdian S, Atabaki AK, Hoseini M. Evaluation of work-
1504 related psychosocial and ergonomics factors in relation to low back
1505 discomfort in emergency unit nurses. *Int J Prev Med.* 2012;3(8):564-8.
1506 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1507 371.Olson DL, King PM. Estimated energy expenditure of nursing assistants in
1508 long term care. *Work.* 2012;42(3):331-40.
1509 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1510 372.Darragh AR, Campo MA, Frost L, Miller M, Pentico M, Margulis H. Safe-
1511 patient-handling equipment in therapy practice: Implications for
1512 rehabilitation. *Am J Occup Ther.* 2013;67(1):45-53.
1513 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1514 373.Dyrkacz AR, Mak LY, Heck CS. Work-related injuries in Canadian
1515 occupational therapy practice. *Can J Occup Ther.* 2012;79(4):237-47.
1516 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1517 374.Mawston GA, Boocock MG. The effect of lumbar posture on spinal loading
1518 and the function of the erector spinae: Implications for exercise and
1519 vocational rehabilitation. *N Z J Physiother.* 2012;40(3):135-40.
1520 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1521 375.Nelson A. Promoting Safe Patient Handling. Rehabil Nurs.
1522 2008;33(1):42-43.
1523 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1524 376.Parry JS. Guidance on manual handling in physiotherapy. Aqualines News
1525 Hydro Assoc Chart Physiother. 2008;2:15-6.
1526 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1527 377.Arnold M, Radawiec S, Campo M, Wright LR. Changes in functional
1528 independence measure ratings associated with a safe patient handling
1529 and movement program. Rehabil Nurs. 2011;36(4):138-44.
1530 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1531 378.Collins JW, Bell JL, Gronqvist R. Developing evidence-based interventions
1532 to address the leading causes of workers' compensation among
1533 healthcare workers. Rehabil Nurs. 2010;35(6):225-35.
1534 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1535 379.Haladay DE, Blorstad AL, McBrief NM, Denegar CR, Lengerich EJ. Back
1536 pain among health care workers in Pennsylvania 2002-2006. Work.
1537 2012;41(1):93-8.
1538 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1539 380.White J, Gray H. Factors influencing the effectiveness of manual handling
1540 education. Int J Ther Rehabil. 2004;11(5):226-31.
1541 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1542 381.van Zoest GG, van den Berg, H. T., Holtkamp FC. Three-dimensionality
1543 of contact forces during clinical manual examination and treatment: a
1544 new measuring system. Clin Biomech. 2002;17:719-22.
1545 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1546 382. Li J, Sommerich CM, Chipps E, Lavender SA, Stasny EA. A framework for
1547 studying risk factors for lower extremity musculoskeletal discomfort in
1548 nurses. Ergonomics 2020;63(12):1535-1550.
1549 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1550 383. Brooker KJ, Vikan M, Thyli B. A Qualitative Exploratory Study of
1551 Norwegian OR Nurses' Patient Positioning Priorities. AORN J
1552 2020;111(2):211-220.
1553 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1554 384. Storey BJ, Verkerk MM, Hashtroudi A, GoldingWood D. A systematic
1555 review of interventions to prevent work-related musculoskeletal

1556 disorders in ENT surgeons. J Laryngol Otol 2021.
1557 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1558 385. Muller A, Corbeil P. Back loading estimation during team handling: Is
1559 the use of only motion data sufficient? PloS one 2020;15(12).
1560 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1561 386. XU H, SHI J, NI W, Xin Z, WANG A, ZHENG X. Biomechanical Analysis on
1562 Optimization of Manual Handling Technique in Manual Lifting and
1563 Lowering Tasks. Journal of Beijing Sport University 2013;36(11):76-36.
1564 Reason for exclusion: Not English Language.

1565 387. Callihan ML, Eyer JC, McCoy CJ, Dailey AM, Diket KM, Robinson AT, et al.
1566 Development and Feasibility Testing of a Contextual Patient Movement
1567 Intervention. Journal of emergency nursing 2021;47(1):101.
1568 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1569 388. Claycomb M. Guidelines to Safe Patient Transfers. Rehab Management:
1570 The Interdisciplinary Journal of Rehabilitation 2015;28(1):14-17.
1571 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1572 389. Bernardes JM, MonteiroPereira PE, GomezSalgado J, RuizFrutos C, Dias
1573 A. Healthcare workers' knowledge for safe handling and moving of the
1574 patient. International journal of occupational safety and ergonomics :
1575 JOSE 2021:1-20.
1576 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1577 390. Kurowski A, Pransky G, Punnett L. Impact of a Safe Resident Handling
1578 Program in Nursing Homes on Return-to-Work and Re-injury Outcomes
1579 Following Work Injury. J Occup Rehabil 2019;29(2):286-294.
1580 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1581 391. Lee SJ, Stock L, Michalchuk V, Adesoye K, Mullen K. Impact of California
1582 Safe Patient Handling Legislation: Health Care Workers' Perspectives.
1583 Workplace health & safety 2021;69(3):124-133.
1584 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1585 392. Improving patient and health care provider safety: task force develops
1586 recommendations on patient handling. PT: Magazine of Physical Therapy
1587 2005;13(4):48-52.
1588 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1589 393. Alghadir AH, AlAbbad H, Buragadda S, Iqbal A. Influence of work-related
1590 safety and health guidelines on knowledge and prevalence of

1591 occupational back pain among rehabilitation nurses in saudi arabia: A 6-
1592 month follow-up study. International Journal of Environmental Research
1593 and Public Health 2021;18(16).

1594 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1595 394. Gilthorpe J, Fairbaurn S, Taylor S, Hutchison A, Ford C, Tweedlie J.
1596 Interprofessional education for practice: moving and handling for people
1597 with complex needs in contemporary healthcare. Physiotherapy (United
1598 Kingdom). Conference: Physiotherapy UK Conference 2019. Birmingham
1599 United Kingdom. 107(Supplement 1) (pp e170-e171); Elsevier Ltd;
1600 2020.

1601 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1602 395. Schroder C, Nienhaus A. Intervertebral disc disease of the lumbar spine
1603 in health personnel with occupational exposure to patient handling-a
1604 systematic literature review and meta-analysis. International Journal of
1605 Environmental Research and Public Health 2020;17(1-20).

1606 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1607 396. Horgan D, Purtill H, O'Sullivan P, Dankaerts W, O'Sullivan K.
1608 Investigation of the impact of people manual handling training on back
1609 beliefs. Man Ther 2016;25.

1610 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1611 397. Lecca LI, Fabbri D, Portoghese I, Pilia I, Meloni F, Marcias G, et al.
1612 Manual handling of patients: role of kinesiophobia and catastrophizing in
1613 health workers with chronic low back pain. European journal of physical
1614 and rehabilitation medicine 2020;56(3):307-312.

1615 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1616 398. Tullar JM, Brewer S, Amick III BC, Irvin E, Mahood Q, Pompeii LA, et al.
1617 Occupational Safety and Health Interventions to Reduce Musculoskeletal
1618 Symptoms in the Health Care Sector. J Occup Rehabil 2010;20(2):199-
1619 219.

1620 Reason for exclusion: Duplicate.

1621 399. Dewey AJ, Olkowski BF, Stolfi AM. On "Safe patient handling perceptions
1622 and practices . . . ". Phys Ther 2014;94(7):1054-1055.

1623 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible study design.

1624 400. Wyatt D. Our Shared Purpose: Workplace Safety. AORN J
1625 2020;112(4):325-326.
1626 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1627 401. SAFE LIFTING TECHNIQUES. Rehab Management: The Interdisciplinary
1628 Journal of Rehabilitation 2010;23(6):32.
1629 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1630 402. Silberstein N. Safe Patient Handling. Physical Therapy Products
1631 2009;20(6):12-15.
1632 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1633 403. Satusky MJ. Safe Patient Handling and Mobility in the Orthopaedic
1634 Setting. Orthopedic nursing 2021;40(2):60-63.
1635 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1636 404. Lee SJ, Kang KJ, Lee JH. Safe patient handling legislation and changes
1637 in programs, practices, perceptions, and experience of musculoskeletal
1638 disorders by hospital characteristics: A repeated cross-sectional survey
1639 study. Int J Nurs Stud 2021;113:103791.
1640 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1641 405. Olkowski BF, Stolfi AM. Safe Patient Handling Perceptions and Practices:
1642 A Survey of Acute Care Physical Therapists. Phys Ther 2014;94(5):682-
1643 695.
1644 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1645 406. Boninger ML. Safe Transfer Technique. Archives of Physical Medicine &
1646 Rehabilitation 2013;94(12):2579-2580.
1647 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1648 407. Long F. Safer Patient Handling: Stat! Rehab Management: The
1649 Interdisciplinary Journal of Rehabilitation 2019;32(6):32-35.
1650 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1651 408. Zhou J, Wiggermann N. The effects of hospital bed features on physical
1652 stresses on caregivers when repositioning patients in bed. Appl Ergon
1653 2021;90.
1654 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible concept.

1655 409. Vieira ER, Kumar S. Working Postures: A Literature Review. J Occup
1656 Rehabil 2004;14(2):143-159.
1657 Reason for exclusion: Ineligible population.

1658 Data extraction instrument

Author, Year, Country of origin	Aims/ purpose	Study type	Setting	Participant profession	Participant: Age, Gender, Years of experience, Sample size	Patient population	Outcome measure: Domain, Measurement tools	Date of extraction
---------------------------------------	------------------	------------	---------	---------------------------	--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------

1659

1660 Outcome measure count and references

Outcome measure	Measurement tool	Relative Count
Kinematics	Video	3 [29,33,40]
	Goniometer	3 [26,35,40]
	Inclinometer	2 [22,24]
	Observation	2 [31,33]
	Lumbar motion monitor	2 [23,26]
	OPTOTRAK	1 [27]
	Tri-axial accelerometer	1 [41]
	Tri-axial goniometer	1 [26]
	Vicon	1 [28]
	Posture Dosimeter	1 [33]
	Photo	1 [40]
Physical demands	EMG	7 [23,25,26,28,35,37,50]
	Borg scale	3 [19,37,44]
	Video	1 [25]
	Accelerometer	1 [41]
	Interviews	1 [33]
	Heart rate	1 [21]
	VAS	1 [38]
Tasks performed	Observation	7 [21,22,33,46,51,52]
	Videos	2 [33,42]
	Survey	2 [45,49]
	Ergonomic Assessment	1 [29]
Kinetics	Digitised video	5 [27,36,37,40,50]
	Force platforms	3 [36-38]
	Force transducers	3 [36,37,43]
	Tri-axial load cell	1 [2]
	Physical workload index	1 [31]
Safety	Observation	4 [19,30,33,52]
	Staff training	2 [18,44]
	Video	2 [20,30]
	Photo	1 [20]
	Survey	1 [45]
WRMSD	Incidence	3 [18,19,39]
	Risk factors	1 [20]
Staff perceptions/ opinions	Focus groups	3 [47,48,52]
	Interviews	2 [34,46]
	Questionnaire	1 [30]
	24-h survey	1 [49]