Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation (2019) 29:175–193
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-018-9777-7

Workplace-Based Rehabilitation of Upper Limb Conditions: A Systematic Review

Munira Hoosain[1] · **Susan de Klerk**[1] · **Marlette Burger**[2]

Published online: 23 May 2018

Abstract

Purpose The objective of this systematic review was to identify, collate and analyse the current available evidence on the effectiveness of workplace-based rehabilitative interventions in workers with upper limb conditions on work performance, pain, absenteeism, productivity and other outcomes. *Methods* We searched Medline, Cochrane Library, Scopus, Web of Science, Academic Search Premier, Africa-Wide Information, CINAHL, OTSeeker and PEDro with search terms in four broad areas: upper limb, intervention, workplace and clinical trial (no date limits). Studies including neck pain only or musculoskeletal pain in other areas were not included. *Results* Initial search located 1071 articles, of which 80 were full text reviewed. Twenty-eight articles were included, reporting on various outcomes relating to a total of seventeen studies. Nine studies were of high methodological quality, seven of medium quality, and one of low quality. Studies were sorted into intervention categories: Ergonomic controls (n = 3), ergonomic training and workstation adjustments (n = 4), exercise and resistance training (n = 6), clinic-based versus workplace-based work hardening (n = 1), nurse case manager training (n = 1), physiotherapy versus Feldenkrais (n = 1), and ambulant myofeedback training (n = 1). The largest body of evidence supported workplace exercise programs, with positive effects for ergonomic training and workstation adjustments, and mixed effects for ergonomic controls. Ambulant myofeedback training had no effect. The remaining three categories had positive effects in the single study on each intervention. *Conclusion* While there is substantial evidence for workplace exercise programs, other workplace-based interventions require further high quality research. *Systematic review registration* PROSPERO CRD42017059708.

Keywords Workplace rehabilitation · Upper extremity · Occupational health

Background

Upper limb conditions, whether work related or not, continue to pose significant challenges in the workplace. Repetitive strain injury (RSI) is the most common cause of work-related ill health internationally [1]. In high income economies such as the United States of America (USA), Canada and West Europe, upper limb and lower back disorders are among the leading occupational injuries and diseases, and considered a growing problem [2]. Similarly, in middle and lower income economies, musculoskeletal disorders are among the most commonly reported work-related diseases [3].

Workplace-based rehabilitation services may be offered by a variety of healthcare providers, including occupational therapists, physiotherapists and ergonomists. Services may include workplace-based exercise programs [4, 5], education of workers [6], modifications to work stations or work

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-018-9777-7) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Munira Hoosain
munirahoosain@gmail.com

Susan de Klerk
sdk@sun.ac.za

Marlette Burger
mbu@sun.ac.za

[1] Division Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Cape Town, South Africa

[2] Division Physiotherapy, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Cape Town, South Africa

process [4], rest breaks [4], and training of supervisors or case managers [4].

Rehabilitation services based at the workplace may have specific advantages over traditional rehabilitation, based at hospitals and rehabilitation centres. Some of these advantages include reduced time off work, earlier return to work, improved quality of life and reduced cost of injuries [4]. Situating rehabilitation services onsite allows injured workers earlier access to rehabilitation, with the potential for better outcomes [7, 8]. The role of workplace supervisors in work rehabilitation is well recognised. Early contact between healthcare workers and the workplace has been found to facilitate a reduction in the duration of work disability [6, 8]. Healthcare workers based at the workplace may be better placed to train supervisors and negotiate work accommodations; factors which are associated with improved rehabilitation outcomes [8].

A systematic review investigating the effectiveness of workplace-based rehabilitation interventions in the treatment of work-related upper extremity disorders (WRUEDs) was conducted in 2004 (n = 8) [4]. Eight studies met the review's inclusion criteria. These included four randomised controlled trials (RCTs), three cohort studies and one case series. Interventions included individual physiotherapy at a local clinic, group exercise at the workplace, physiotherapy based at the workplace, worksite analysis, a training program for nursing case managers on workplace accommodations, ergonomic modifications, as well as rest and exercise breaks. The review concluded that although some positive findings supported the effectiveness of workplace-based interventions in rehabilitating WRUEDs, poor study design affected the reliability of these findings. The flaws in study design included small sample sizes, lack of standardised outcome measures and statistical analyses, poor reporting of interventions and results, and failure to include control groups. The researchers acknowledged the difficulty in performing workplace-based interventions, and considering this, felt that the risk of bias assessments utilised in the review (Sackett's levels of evidence [9] and the Evaluation Guidelines for Rating the Quality of an Intervention Study Form [10]) may have been overly rigorous. Recommendations included the development of a set of core outcome measures with tested psychometric properties, development of sound methodology for conducting workplace studies, and improved reporting of interventions and study designs [4]. A more recent systematic review was published in 2010, with an update in 2016, on the effectiveness of workplace-based interventions in the prevention of upper limb conditions [2, 11]. The initial review included 36 studies of medium to high quality; of which 23 were RCTs, eight were non-randomised trials, and five were cross-over designs [11]. The 2016 update identified an additional 26 medium to high quality studies, of which nine were RCTs, 12 were cluster RCTs and five were non-randomised trials with a control group [2]. Data from the two reviews were combined and grouped into intervention categories. Meta-analysis was not conducted due to differences between comparison/control groups, varied outcome measures and insufficient data reported. Strong evidence was found to support workplace-based resistance training exercise programs; while moderate evidence of positive effect was found for forearm supports, vibration feedback on static mouse use and stretching exercise programs. There was moderate evidence of no effect for EMG biofeedback, job stress management training and office workstation adjustment. Insufficient or conflicting evidence was found for the remaining 23 intervention groups. The updated review found a large number of studies over a shorter period of time than the initial review, and a larger proportion of the more recent studies (from 2008 onward) were of higher quality. Limitations of the review include the inability to include a meta-analysis and the risk of publication bias, as grey literature was not included [2].

While legislation supports workplace-based rehabilitation, a systematic review of existing research on the topic would be beneficial in determining effectiveness of this type of intervention. An up to date systematic review of workplace-based rehabilitative interventions for upper limb conditions would be valuable in accounting for all subsequent literature in this field, particularly considering the value of the 2016 updated review on preventative interventions for upper limb conditions. This review would serve to guide evidence based practice amongst occupational therapists and other rehabilitation professionals working with upper limb conditions in the workplace.

The objective of this review was to determine the effectiveness of workplace-based rehabilitative interventions in workers with upper limb conditions on work performance, pain, absenteeism, productivity and other outcomes, including ergonomic risk and mental health.

Methods

Protocol and Registration

This review adheres to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA-P) [12, 13]. The review protocol was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO: CRD42017059708).

Eligibility Criteria

Type of Studies

All clinical intervention studies were considered, including randomised and non-randomised clinical trials published from inception of the databases until April 2017.

Type of Participants

Adults aged 18 years or older who are actively employed, with any upper limb condition, including WRUEDs, traumatic injury, degenerative conditions and non-specific or undiagnosed upper limb pain.

Type of Interventions

Rehabilitation programs that included any workplace-based interventions were included in the review. Interventions were all at least partly based at the workplace. Interventions based at occupational health clinics were included, as these are commonly situated at the workplace. Studies on off-site work rehabilitation interventions only (e.g. based at rehabilitation centres, hospitals, therapy clinics, work hardening programs) were excluded.

Examples of workplace-based interventions included job task adaptations, job rotation or alternate placement, work environment/work station or alternate ergonomic modifications, stretching/exercise programs, implementation of rest breaks at work, work hardening, negotiation with supervisors or managers, splint application at work, worker education and supervisor or manager education. Interventions with or without controls were included.

Types of Outcome Measures

Primary Outcomes The primary outcome of interest was work performance, as measured by productivity, absenteeism, pain or comfort at work, satisfaction or motivation at work.

Secondary Outcomes Outcomes related to upper limb function which may not be directly related to work, including but not confined to the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (DASH) questionnaire, grip strength, range of motion; health-related quality of life measures, e.g. SF-36, WHODAS 2.0; or standardised measures of participation in activities of daily living, e.g. Barthel Index.

Information Sources and Search Strategy

With the help of an expert librarian we designed and conducted a search strategy through Stellenbosch University Library and Information Service to find eligible articles in a combination of generalist and specialist electronic databases from March to April 2017, including: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library; PubMed (Medline); Scopus; Web of Science; EBSCOhost (Academic Search Premier, Africa-Wide, CINAHL); OTSeeker and PEDro. No language exclusions or date limits were applied. Search strings were adapted by database, and included: exploded MeSH terms, free text, subheadings, synonyms and variant spellings, lay and medical terminology, truncation, Boolean operators, AND and OR. Search terms in four broad areas were used: "upper limb", "rehabilitation", "workplace" and "clinical trial". The PubMed/Medline search string is included as an example, as Additional File 1. The reference lists of included studies were hand searched for further studies. Full text articles were obtained for all potentially eligible titles. The search results were uploaded into the online software package, Covidence (http://www.covidence.org), for removal of duplicates (April 2017). Covidence was used for both abstract (April to May 2017) and full-text screening (June 2017). The total number of results before and after removal of duplicates were documented in a PRISMA flow diagram (See Fig. 1).

Selection Process

Articles were initially screened for relevance by title and abstract. Thereafter, the full text of potentially suitable studies was retrieved, and inclusion criteria applied. Inclusion criteria comprised articles based on primary empirical research, i.e. not a review, letter to a journal editor, opinion piece or editorial; clinical trials; articles reporting work rehabilitation interventions that were workplace-based, aimed at adult workers with pre-existing upper limb symptoms. Exclusion criteria comprised samples of workers with neck symptoms only; no clear evidence of pre-existing upper limb pain or dysfunction in the sample; other musculoskeletal conditions included in the sample. The reference lists of included articles were screened for additional titles. Title and abstract screening was conducted by the principal investigator (MH). Full text article screening was conducted independently by both MH and a second reviewer (SdK), in order to limit bias in the review (June to July 2017). Disagreements were resolved through discussion. Search dates were recorded. The process followed in screening and selection of studies was reported in a PRISMA flow diagram (Fig. 1) [14, 15].

Assessment of Methodological Quality in Included Studies

Included studies were assessed for methodological quality by the principal investigator (and first reviewer) (MH) and second reviewer (SdK), independently. Results of the independent reviews were correlated, with discussion to reach consensus on any differences. A third reviewer (MB) was available to resolve conflicts in case consensus could not be reached, but this was not needed.

Methodological quality was assessed using the question and rating system developed by the Institute for Work and Health (IWH) and used in their systematic review on



Fig. 1 PRISMA flow diagram

occupational health and safety interventions preventing upper limb symptoms [2, 11] (Table 1). As in the above review, a 3-point rating system was used to qualify the questions, ranging from "somewhat important" (1), to "very important" (3) (See Table 1).

Studies were rated on each of these 16 criteria, and assigned a score of 0 (not achieved) or 1 (achieved), with the exception of Question 3, on which studies could score up to 2 points for randomised allocation. The rating scores were then multiplied by the weighting (see Table 1), to make a maximum score of 41. As in the above IWH review, studies were grouped into three categories based on their quality ranking score: High quality (> 85%), Medium quality (50–85%) and low quality (< 50%) [2, 11].

Data Extraction and Management

Information was extracted from each study (including low quality studies) by the principal investigator and entered into electronic data collection tables on Microsoft Excel. Data was extracted on items including study methods; demographic information of participants; interventions in terms of type, provider, duration, amount of treatment sessions, location and controls; outcomes; conflicts of interest and funding sources. Data entry was double checked for accuracy by the principal investigator on two separate dates. Spot accuracy checks were conducted by the second reviewer (SdK) and third reviewer (MB) on 50% of included studies.

Data Synthesis

Results were organised by intervention type, and further by frequency/duration of intervention, intervention provider and outcome measure. These data categories were selected at protocol stage, prior to data extraction. Intervention categories were finalised after data extraction had been completed, with consideration to other similar systematic reviews.

Due to the heterogeneity of the interventions, comparisons used, reporting of outcome measures and statistical analyses in the included studies, statistical pooling of data in the form of a meta-analysis was not appropriate for this review. Results were subsequently summarized and tabulated in the narrative form.

Table 1 Assessing methodological quality

Question	Weighting
1. Is the research question clearly stated?	2
2. Were comparison group(s) used?	3
3. Was an intervention allocation described adequately?	3
4. Was recruitment/participation rate reported?	2
5. Were pre-intervention characteristics described?	2
6. Was attrition less than 35%?	2
7. Did the author examine for important differences between the remaining and drop-out participants after the intervention?	2
8. Was the intervention process adequately described to allow for replication?	3
9. Were the effects of the intervention on some exposure parameters documented?	1
10. Was the participation in the intervention documented?	2
11. Were the upper extremity musculoskeletal symptoms, signs, disorders, injuries, claims and/or lost time outcomes described at baseline and at follow-up?	3
12. Was the length of follow-up 3 months or greater?	2
13. Was there adjustment for pre-intervention differences (minimum threshold of three important covariates include age, gender and primary outcome at baseline)?	3
14. Were the statistical analyses optimized for the best results?	3
15. Were all participants' outcomes analysed by the groups to which they were originally allocated (intention-to-treat analysis)?	2
16. Was there a direct between-group comparison?	3

1 somewhat important, *2* moderately important, *3* very important

Results

Study Selection

A total of 1071 titles were found on the initial search, including 272 titles from Medline, 172 from OTSeeker, 97 from EBSCOhost, 50 from the Cochrane library, 49 from Web of Science, 420 from Scopus and 11 from PEDro (see Fig. 1). Of these, 155 were duplicates, leaving 916 titles for screening. The initial screening of titles and abstracts excluded 808 irrelevant titles. Three of these titles were not available in English (one Norwegian, one Lithuanian and one Afrikaans). Google Translate was used to translate the titles and abstracts. A second title and abstract screening step was conducted jointly by the principal investigator and second reviewer, through discussion. Inclusion criteria were discussed and clarified, and an additional 28 titles excluded.

Full text review was then conducted independently by the principal investigator and second reviewer on 80 studies, resulting in the exclusion of 55 studies. The main reason for exclusion was that participants were not exclusively workers with pre-existing upper limb conditions or pain - studies included asymptomatic workers, or workers with musculoskeletal pain in other regions. One study was excluded as the article was available in Polish only, and could not be translated. Twenty-five articles proceeded to inclusion, and an additional three articles were identified through scanning of reference lists. Several of these 28 articles related to the same research and authors, reporting on different outcomes for the same intervention and control groups, and were thus grouped into 17 studies for inclusion in this review. Protocols of included studies that were published separately were included, to ensure that all available information was used for the quality appraisal.

Quality Appraisal

Table 2 depicts the list of included studies, their quality appraisal and characteristics. Nine studies were classified as high quality (meeting > 85% of criteria) [16–32], seven studies were classified as medium quality (meeting 50–85% of criteria) [32–42], and one study was classified as low quality (< 50% of criteria met) [43]. Medium quality studies did not perform intention-to-treat analysis (n = 7) [32, 36–38, 40, 42, 43], did not document participation in the intervention adequately (n = 6) [33–37, 39–42], had a follow-up length that was less than 3 months or unclear (n = 5) [32, 36, 39–42], and did not report on important differences between dropouts and remaining participants after the intervention (n = 4) [36–38, 42]. The one low quality study [43] had no comparison group, pre-intervention characteristics were not adequately described, and statistical analyses were not optimised.

Characteristics of Included Studies

The majority of the included studies were randomised controlled trials (n = 15), reported across 23 articles [16–33,

Table 2 Quality appraisal and characteristics of studies

Article [References]	Study design	Country	Industry/sector	Sample size	Methodological quality
Aaras [33] Aaras [34] Aaras [35]	Non-randomised prospective parallel group	Norway	Computer workers	I = 32 C = 35	Medium
Andersen [16] Andersen [17] Lidegaard [18]	RCT	Denmark	Office workers	I1 = 66 I2 = 66 C = 66	High
Andersen [19] Andersen [20]	RCT	Denmark	Office workers	I = 24 C = 23	High
Bernaards [27] Bernaards [28]	RCT	The Netherlands	Computer workers	I1 = 152 I2 = 156 C = 158	High
Camargo [43]	Single group	Brazil	Assembly line workers	I = 17	Low
Cheng [36]	RCT	Hong Kong	Varied Medium physical demand level of work	I = 51 C = 52	Medium
Dropkin [29]	RCT	USA	Computer workers	I = 56 C = 57	High
Esmaeilzadeh [37]	RCT	Turkey	Computer workers	I = 47 C = 47	Medium
Feuerstein [30]	RCT	USA	Professional office workers	I1 = 47 I2 = 46	High
Hagberg [38]	RCT	Sweden	Industrial workers	I1 = = 43 I2 = 34	Medium
Jay [31]	RCT	Denmark	Laboratory technicians and office workers	I1 = 19 I2 = 19	High
Lincoln [42]	RCT	USA	Varied: Managers, clerks, postal carriers, mechanical/electrical workers	I = 53 C = 48	Medium
Lundblad [32]	RCT	Sweden	Industrial workers	I1 = 32 I2 = 33 C = 32	High
Martimo [39] Shiri [41]	RCT	Finland	Varied: Nurses and other healthcare workers, clerical workers and secretaries, warehouse workers	I = 91 C = 86	Medium
Ripat [40]	RCT	Canada	Computer workers	I = 43 C = 25	Medium
Sundstrup [22] Sundstrup [23] Sundstrup [24] Sundstrup [25] Andersen [21]	RCT	Denmark	Slaughterhouse workers	I = 33 C = 33	High
Voerman [26]	RCT	Sweden & The Netherlands	Computer workers	I = 42 C = 37	High

P protocol, *I* intervention group, *C* control group, *RCT* randomised controlled trial

35–42]. The remaining two studies were: one of non-randomised prospective parallel group design, reported across three articles [33–35] and one of single group design [43] (see Table 2).

Studies originated in Denmark (n = 4) [16–25, 31], Sweden (n = 2) [32, 38], USA (n = 3) [29, 30, 42], Norway (n = 1) [33–35], the Netherlands (n = 1) [27, 28], both Sweden and the Netherlands (n = 1) [26], Finland (n = 1) [39, 41], Hong Kong (n = 1) [36], Canada (n = 1) [40], Turkey (n = 1) [37] and Brazil (n = 1) [43].

Study participants included office/computer workers (n = 9) [16–20, 26–30, 33–35, 37, 40], assembly line workers in the school supply industry (n = 1) [43], industrial workers (n = 2) [32, 38], slaughterhouse workers (n = 1) [21–25], and a combination of laboratory technicians and office workers (n = 1) [31]. The remaining three studies had participants with varied occupations; one of these had participants working in the medium category of physical demand [36], as classified by the Dictionary of Occupational Titles [44], the second included managers, clerks, postal carriers and

mechanical/electrical workers [42], and the third involved healthcare workers, clerical and warehouse workers [39, 41].

Sample sizes varied between 17 and 466. Attrition also varied greatly, from 0.04–40%. Only two of the studies had attrition rates above 35% [32, 39, 41].

Interventions

Based on the results of data extraction, interventions were grouped as far as possible into the following categories: (1) Ergonomic controls (n = 3) [29, 33–35, 40], (2) Ergonomic training and workstation adjustments (n = 4) [27, 28, 30, 37, 39, 41], (3) Exercise/resistance training (n = 6) [16–25, 31, 38, 43]. Four studies did not match any of these categories and thus will be discussed separately [26, 32, 36, 42] (see Table 3). Outcomes varied across studies, but mostly included symptom severity (notably pain), sick leave, postural/ergonomic changes, strength and general measures of health and upper limb-related disability.

Ergonomic Controls

The three studies on ergonomic controls investigated included a non-traditional mouse, which uses a more neutral wrist and forearm position [33–35]; an adjustable keyboard-mouse tray with a touch pad in the non-dominant hand [29]; and reduced-force keyboards [40]. One of these studies was rated as high quality [29], and the remaining two studies were of medium methodological quality [33–35, 40]. Results of the Aaras study [33–35], which assessed outcomes at 6, 12 and 36 months, suggest that use of a mouse enabling more neutral forearm and wrist position compared with a standard mouse may reduce pain, headache and musculoskeletal-related sick leave. The Dropkin study [29], which was of high quality, found that while some ergonomic postures improved with the intervention (adjustable keyboard/mouse tray with padded wrist rest and touch pad), hand activity in the distal non-dominant arm increased, possibly due to the 11 functions of the touch pad. The Ripat study [40] results were complicated by the use of a Microsoft Naturals keyboard in both intervention and control groups, while the intervention group's keyboards were adapted to also reduce activation force. Improvements were seen in symptom severity and functional status of both groups, with no significant between-group differences.

Ergonomic Training and Workstation Adjustments

Four studies were included in this category, of which two were high quality [27, 28, 30] and two medium quality [37, 39, 41]. Workstation adjustments were conducted by physiotherapists in two of the studies [37, 39, 41]. Alternately, interventions were offered by occupational health nurses, rehabilitation engineers and counsellors [27, 28, 30]. The Feuerstein study [30], which was of high quality, offered workstation adjustments and stretching exercises to both intervention groups, and found that improvement in outcomes were seen in both groups, with no significant between-group differences. Job stress management training, which was offered to the second intervention group, was thus not found to significantly enhance the effects of workstation adjustments and stretching exercises. Similarly, the high quality Bernaards [27, 28] study offered the same work style behaviour counselling to two intervention groups, while the second intervention group also received physical activity counselling. Both intervention groups showed significant improvements over a control group, which received usual care, but direct comparisons between the two intervention groups were not reported. The Esmaeilzadeh study [37], which offered no control intervention, found that ergonomic postures and musculoskeletal symptoms improved significantly more in the intervention group than the control group. The Martimo/Shiri study found that productivity loss was significantly lower in the intervention compared to the control group [39, 41].

Exercise/Resistance Training

This was the largest intervention category, with six studies included across 13 articles. Four of these studies were high quality [16–25, 31], with one medium quality study [38] and one low quality study (no control group) [43]. Three of the studies offered the intervention through physiotherapists [18–20, 38, 43], and in the remaining three studies the intervention providers were described as trainers or instructors [16, 17, 21–25, 31]. Results of all studies were positive, with improvements seen in pain [16–25, 31, 38, 43], strength [16–25, 38], functional ability [21–25, 43], work ability [21–25, 43], absenteeism [38] and medication use [38] in intervention groups. The Andersen/Lidegaard study [16–18] found that as little as two minutes of resistance training five times per week had a marked positive impact on pain, tenderness and muscle strength. Jay et al. [31] assessed errors in exercise execution between an intervention group using video-based training and a control group using personalised instruction, and found that the two groups had similar error scores, training frequency and pain improvements.

Clinic-Based vs Workplace-Based Work Hardening

The Cheng study [36], based in Hong Kong, investigated the effect of a workplace-based work hardening program on workers with work-related rotator cuff tendonitis. This was a medium quality study. A job coach contacted the worksites to arrange for the workers' actual work tasks to be used as treatment media. A control group of conventional

Table 3 Description of interventions, main outcomes and findings

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Ergonomic controls									
Aaras [33] Aaras [34] Aaras [35]	I = Adapted mouse (more neutral wrist and forearm position) C = Traditional mouse (pronated forearm)	Not applicable	Daily use	Pain	I: Significant improvements in wrist/hand, forearm, shoulder and neck pain intensity, frequency and duration at 6 months, maintained at 12 and 36 months	C: No significant improvement in wrist/hand, forearm, shoulder and neck pain intensity, frequency and duration at 6 months. Control group given the intervention after 6 months	Significant BG differences in all outcomes, in favour of I group	Anir mouse use showed overwhelmingly positive outcomes in terms of pain, headache, MS sick leave	6 months (1999) 12 months (2001) 36 months (2002)
				Headache	I: Significant improvement in headache at 6 months. Maintained at 12 and 36 months	C: No significant improvement in headache at 6 months			
				Musculoskeletal sick leave	I: Significant decrease in MS sick leave at 6 months. Maintained at 12 and 36 months	C: Increase in MS sick leave at 6 months			
Dropkin [29]	I = Adjustable keyboard/mouse tray with padded wrist rest and touch pad, training on keyboard shortcuts C = Training on keyboard shortcuts	Unclear	Daily use	Pain	I: Pain severity reduced in all areas, SS in dominant and non-dominant proximal UE	C: Pain severity reduced in all areas, SS in dominant and non-dominant proximal UE	No significant BG differences in pain severity, slight protective effect in dominant side and increase in pain on non-dominant side of intervention group (not statistically significant)	Intervention resulted in positive changes to postures on RULA, but negative changes on HAL (non-dominant hand activity)	7 months
				Upper limb postures (modified RULA)	I: Reduced non-neutral postures on modified RULA in 4/5 domains	C: Increased non-neutral postures on RULA in the same 4/5 domains	Statistically significant improvement on RULA in 2/5 domains in favour of I group		
				Hand activity (HAL test)	I: Non-dominant hand activity increased (HAL test)	C: No significant changes in hand activity	Non-dominant hand activity increased in I group (significant), no other significant BG findings in hand activity level		

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Ripat [40]	I = Adapted Microsoft Natural keyboards (reduced activation force) C = Unadapted Microsoft Natural keyboards	Not applicable	Daily use	Symptom Severity Scale (SSS)	I: Significant improvement on SSS at 12 weeks, maintained at 24 weeks	C: Significant improvement on SSS at 12 weeks, maintained at 24 weeks	Similar patterns of reduction in symptom severity and improvement in functional status in I and C groups Non-significant trends towards improved function in I group	Positive results in symptoms and function found with both keyboards. Trend towards improved function with light-touch keyboard (not SS)	24 weeks
				Functional Status Scale (FSS)	I: Significant improvement on FSS at 12 weeks	C: Significant improvement on FSS at 12 weeks			
Ergonomic training and workstation adjustments									
Bernaards [27] Bermaards [28]	I1 = Work style (ergonomics, stress) behaviour counselling I2 = Work style and physical activity counselling C = Usual care	Trained counsellor	I1 and I2 = 6 group meetings in a 6-month period	Body posture & workstation adjustment	I1: Significant improvements on 5/14 items	I2: Significant improvements 4/14 items	Both I1 and I2 groups showed significant improvements in some elements of body posture and workstation adjustment, and use of breaks, over the control/usual care group Comparisons between I1 and I2 were not reported	Work style intervention had some positive impact on body posture, WS adjustment and use of rest breaks. No effect on work stress	12 months
				Use of breaks	I1: Significant improvement in use of breaks software, and taking breaks after every hour of computer work	I2: Significant improvement in use of breaks software, use of short breaks, and changing position or taking breaks after every hour of computer work			
				Work stress	I1: No significant change	I2: No significant change			

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Esmaeilzadeh [37]	I = Ergonomic training, ergonomic brochure, workstation adjustment C = No intervention	Physiotherapists with ergonomics training	2 × 90-min training sessions, training brochure, monthly workstation evaluations and adjustments	Ergonomic exposure (Ergonomic Questionnaire)	I: Self-reported postural abnormalities and improper equipment locations significantly decreased	C: Self-reported postural abnormalities and improper equipment locations increased (not significant)	Significant BG differences in postural abnormalities and improper equipment locations, in favour of I group	Multi-component ergonomic intervention had a positive effect on ergonomic risk factors and musculoskeletal symptoms	6 months
				Musculoskeletal symptoms (Modified NMQ, VAS)	I: Intensity, duration and frequency of symptoms decreased significantly	C: Intensity of symptoms increased significantly. No significant change in duration and frequency of symptoms	Statistically significant BG differences in intensity, duration and frequency of symptoms, in favour of I group		
				Medical care, medication use	I: No significant change, tendency to decrease	C: No significant change	No significant BG differences		
Feuerstein [40]	I1 = Ergonomic workstation assessment and adjustments, stretching exercises I2 = As above + job stress management training	Occupational Health Nurse and Rehabilitation Engineer	I1 & I2: Workstation adjustments at start, 3 months and 12 months I2: 2 × 70 min stress management meetings	Symptoms (Pain—VAS, DASH symptom severity)	I1: Pain and DASH symptom severity significantly decreased at 3 months, maintained at 12 months	I2: Pain and DASH symptom severity significantly decreased at 3 months, maintained at 12 months	No significant BG differences in pain and symptom severity	Ergonomic workstation adjustments with stretching exercises had a positive effect on pain, ergonomic risk and work stress. The additional job stress management training did not significantly enhance these effects	12 months
				Ergonomic risk assessment	I1: Significant improvements at 3 months, maintained at 12 months	I2: Significant improvements at 3 months, maintained at 12 months	No significant BG differences		
				Work stress	I1: Significant improvements at 3 months, maintained at 12 months	I2: Significant improvements at 3 months, maintained at 12 months	No significant BG differences		

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Martimo [39] Shiri [41]	I = Usual care plus work visit by a physiotherapist (suggested and negotiated ergonomic improvements with employee and supervisor) C = Usual care by an occupational health doctor	I = Physiotherapist C = Occupational health doctor	I = One work visit	Productivity loss at work (self-assessed)	I: Proportion and magnitude of productivity loss lower at 12 weeks	C: Proportion and magnitude of productivity loss higher at 12 weeks	Statistically significant BG differences in proportion and magnitude of productivity loss, in favour of I group	Ergonomic intervention had a positive effect on productivity at 12 weeks No significant effect on pain intensity and pain interference with work as well as sickness absence at 12 weeks and 12 months	12 weeks 12 months
				Pain intensity and pain interference with work	I: Significant decrease over time (12 weeks and 12 months)	C: Significant decrease over time (12 weeks and 12 months)	No significant BG differences, tendencies in favour of I group at 12 weeks and 12 months, especially for pain interference with work		
				Sickness absence	I: Similar percentage of participants with sickness absence due to UED at 3 months and 12 months	C: Higher percentage of participants with sickness absence due to UED at 12 months	No significant BG differences		
Exercise/resistance training									
Andersen [16] Andersen [17] Lidegaard [18]	I1 = 2-min PRT with elastic tubing I2 = 12-min PRT with elastic tubing C = Weekly email with general health information	Physiotherapists	5 sessions per week (total of 10–60 min) for 10 weeks	Pain	I1: Significant decrease in neck/shoulder pain intensity	I2: Significant decrease in neck/shoulder pain intensity	No significant differences between I1 and I2 in pain intensity, tenderness and muscle strength. Both groups showed significant improvement over control group in all 3 outcomes	Strength training had a positive effect on pain, tenderness and muscle strength. No significant difference between 2-min and 12-min training	10 weeks
				Tenderness	I1: Significant decrease in neck/shoulder tenderness	I2: Significant decrease in neck/shoulder tenderness			
				Muscle strength	I1: Significant increase in muscle strength	I2: Significant increase in muscle strength			
Andersen [19] Andersen [20]	I = Shoulder function exercises C = Advised to stay physically active	Instructors	3 × 20-min sessions per week for 10 weeks	Pain	I: Pain intensity decreased	C: Slight increase in pain intensity	Significant BG difference in pain intensity, in favour of I group	Shoulder function exercises had a positive effect on pain and shoulder elevation strength	10 weeks
				Muscle strength	I: Shoulder elevation and scapula protraction strength increased	C: Unclear - only BG differences reported	Significant BG difference in shoulder elevation strength, in favour of I group. No significant BG difference in scapula protraction strength, tendency in favour of I group		

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Camargo [43]	I = Cryotherapy, stretching and strengthening exercises	Physiotherapist	Twice weekly for 8 weeks	Upper limb function (DASH)	I: Significant improvement in DASH overall and work module scores	No C group	Not applicable	I group (Cryotherapy, stretching and strengthening exercises) showed positive results in terms of pain and upper limb function. No C group in study	8 weeks
				Pain (McGill Pain Questionnaire)	I: Significant decrease in pain intensity				
Hagberg [38]	I1 = Isometric shoulder endurance training I2 = Isometric shoulder strength training	Physiotherapists and home program	3 times per week for 12 weeks	Pain (VAS)	I1: Decrease in pain intensity	I2: Decrease in pain intensity	No significant BG differences	Isometric shoulder endurance and shoulder strength exercises had a positive effect on pain, muscle strength and endurance No significant difference between endurance and strength training No control group	24 weeks
				Muscle strength	I1: Significant increase in shoulder muscle strength No significant effect on grip strength	I2: Significant increase in shoulder muscle strength No significant effect on grip strength	No significant BG differences		
				Endurance	I1: Significant improvement in shoulder forward flexion endurance	I2: Significant improvement in shoulder forward flexion endurance	No significant BG differences		
Jay [31]	Elastic tubing exercises I1 = 4 short instructional videos with audio and written instructions with pictures I2 = As above + option to attend personalised instruction sessions as needed	Trainer	I2: Up to 10 min, 5 days per week	Errors in exercise execution	Not applicable	Not applicable	No significant BG differences in ¾ exercises Higher error score in I1 for unilateral shoulder external rotation	Video-based instruction and personalised instruction resulted in similar performance of exercises and similar pain improvement	2 weeks
				Pain	I1: Decrease in pain intensity at 2 weeks	I2: Decrease in pain intensity at 2 weeks	No significant BG differences		

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Sundstrup [22] Sundstrup [23] Sundstrup [24] Sundstrup [25] Andersen [21]	I = Strength training C = Participatory ergonomics	I = Training instructor C = Ergonomists	I = 3 × 10 min per week	Pain (VAS)	I: Decrease in pain intensity at 10 weeks	C: Decrease in pain intensity at 10 weeks	Significant BG difference in pain intensity, in favour of I group	Strength training was more effective than ergonomic training at reducing pain and work disability, increasing muscle strength and maintaining work ability. No significant impact on mental health, with moderate positive effect on vitality and social climate	10 weeks
				Work disability (DASH work module)	I: Work disability reduced at 10 weeks	C: Work disability increased at 10 weeks	Significant BG difference in work disability, in favour of I group		
				Muscle strength	I: Shoulder rotation and wrist extension strength increased at 10 weeks	C: Shoulder rotation and wrist extension strength decreased at 10 weeks	Significant BG difference in muscle strength, in favour of I group		
				Work ability index (WAI)	I: No significant change in WAI at 10 weeks	C: Significant decrease in WAI at 10 weeks	Significant BG difference in work ability, in favour of I group		
				Mental health (SF-36)	I: Decline in mental health at 10 weeks	C: Improvement in mental health at 10 weeks	No significant BG differences		
				Social climate (QPS Nordic)	I: Social climate improved at 10 weeks	C: Social climate deteriorated at 10 weeks	Significant BG difference in favour of I group, moderate effect size		
				Vitality (SF-36)	I: Vitality improved at 10 weeks	C: Vitality decreased at 10 weeks	Significant BG difference in favour of I group, moderate effect size		
Clinic-based Vs workplace-based work hardening									
Cheng [36]	I = Workplace-based work hardening training C = Clinic-based work hardening training	Unclear	3 sessions per week for 4 weeks	Self-perceived shoulder pain and disability (SPADI)	I: Decrease in SPADI at 4 weeks	C: Decrease in SPADI at 4 weeks	Significant BG difference in SPADI, in favour of I group	Workplace-based work hardening had a significantly higher positive effect on shoulder pain and disability, FCE and return to work	4 weeks
				FCE	I: Improvement in FCE at 4 weeks	C: Improvement in FCE at 4 weeks	Significant BG differences in shoulder flexion, arm lifting force, high-near lifting force, carrying force, overhead tolerance; in favour of I group		
				Return to work	I: 72% of workers returned to normal or modified duties	C: 38% of workers returned to normal or modified duties	Significant BG difference in favour of I group		

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Nurse case manager training									
Lincoln [42]	I = Training program for nurse case managers on ergonomic assessment, worksite accommodations and problem-solving C = Usual care—Nurse case managers without the additional ergonomic training	Unclear	I = Once-off training for 2 days, training manual, option to contact instructors for further support	Recommended accommodations	I: Variety in type of accommodations recommended (workstation layout, computer -related improvements, furnishings, accessories, lifting/carrying aids)	C: Mostly administrative accommodations recommended (lifting restrictions, modified or light duty, increased work breaks)	Significant BG differences number and type of accommodations recommended and implemented, in favour of I group Implementation rates similar between groups	Training program had a positive effect on amount of accommodations recommended and implemented	Observed until completion of case management (varying time periods)
Physiotherapy vs feldenkrais									
Lundblad [32]	I1 = Group-based physiotherapy I2 = Group-based and individual Feldenkrais C = No intervention	I1 = Physiotherapists I2 = Unclear	I1 = 50 min twice weekly for 16 weeks I2 = 50 min per week: 4 individual and 12 group sessions	Symptoms Neck complaints Shoulder complaints Neck Index Shoulder Index Neck-Shoulder Index Usual pain Worst pain	I1: No significant changes in any symptom-outcomes	I2: Significant improvements in neck complaints, shoulder complaints, Neck-Shoulder Index and usual pain intensity. No significant change in Neck Index, shoulder index and worst pain	Significant differences between I1 and I2 in Neck Index, Neck-Shoulder Index, in favour of I2 Significant decrease in usual pain in I2 and C groups, most pronounced in I2 group	Feldenkrais had a positive effect on neck complaints, neck-shoulder complaints and usual pain intensity Physiotherapy had no significant effect	12 months
				Disability	I1: No significant changes in sick leave (tendency to decrease) or disability during work	I2: No significant changes in sick leave of disability during work (both showed tendency to decrease)	No significant BG differences. I2 showed a tendency to decrease and C showed a tendency to increase sick leave		

Table 3 (continued)

Article [References]	Intervention description	Intervention provider	Frequency and duration of intervention	Main outcomes	Findings: intervention group/I1 group	Findings: control group/I2 group	Findings: between group comparisons	Conclusion	Length of observation
Ambulant myofeedback training									
Voerman [26]	I = Ambulant myofeedback training and ergonomic training C = Ergonomic training only	Physiotherapist and health scientists	I = 8 h per week for 4 weeks, plus weekly visits by therapist C = 4 weekly visits by therapist	Pain (VAS)	I: Significant decrease in neck/shoulder pain intensity	C: Significant decrease in neck/shoulder pain intensity	No significant BG differences	Both ergonomic counselling and ambulant myofeedback had positive effects on pain and disability. No significant differences in effects between the interventions	6 months
				Pain disability index	I: Significant decrease in disability levels	C: Significant decrease in disability levels	No significant BG differences		

I intervention group, *C* control group, *BG* between group, *MS* musculoskeletal, *RULA* rapid upper limb assessment, *HAL* hand activity level, *UE* upper extremity, *SSS* symptom severity scale, *FSS* functional status scale, *SS* statistically significant, *APB* abductor pollicis brevis, *NMQ* nordic musculoskeletal questionnaire, *VAS* visual analogue scale, *UEFS* upper extremity functional scale, *UED* upper extremity disorders, *DASH* disabilities of the arm, shoulder and hand questionnaire, *PRT* progressive resistance training, *RPE* rating of perceived exertion, *WAI* work ability index, *SPADI* shoulder pain and disability index, *QPS Nordic* general nordic questionnaire for psychological and social factors at work, *FCE* functional capacity evaluation, *ROM* range of motion

clinic-based work hardening was used. It was found that the intervention group had significantly higher improvements on the functional capacity evaluation, lower Shoulder Pain and Disability Index (SPADI) scores, and a higher percentage of the group successfully returned to work.

Nurse Case Manager Training

An RCT of medium quality, based in the USA, involved training randomly selected nurse case managers in Integrated Case Management for two days [42]. The training program included ergonomic assessment, worksite accommodations and problem-solving. The nurses' approach to case managing workers with WRUEDs was then compared with usual care (nurses who had not undergone the specialised training) in the same population. The intervention group was found to make more recommendations, with more variety in the types of accommodations recommended, compared with the control group. Trained nurses also had a higher number of accommodations implemented, although implementation rates were the same between intervention and control groups.

Physiotherapy vs Feldenkrais

One high quality study investigated the difference between group-based physiotherapy and Feldenkrais interventions amongst female industrial workers at an automotive factory with neck/shoulder complaints [32]. Interventions took the form of 50-min weekly sessions for 16 weeks. Feldenkrais interventions aimed to increase sensory awareness, investigate common movement and postural patterns, break stereotyped movement patterns, and enable self-care for neck, shoulder and back complaints through guided movement sequences [32]. Physiotherapy sessions aimed to increase knowledge of body and pain, learn back stabilising exercises and improve postural awareness by practicing work-related lift and movement techniques in a group exercise program. The Feldenkrais group showed a significant decrease in neck/shoulder complaints, compared with the physiotherapy and control groups, while no significant changes were found in any outcomes in the physiotherapy group.

Ambulant Myofeedback Training

Voerman et al. [26], in a high quality study, investigated the effect of a myofeedback system with harness worn by participants for 4 weeks. The device assessed and recorded muscle activity in the upper trapezius, and provided sound and vibration feedback to participants at intervals, prompting them to relax. Both intervention and control groups also received ergonomic counselling, with weekly visits from their therapists. Both groups experienced significant

improvements in pain and disability, with no significant difference between groups.

Discussion

This systematic review aimed to determine the effectiveness of workplace-based rehabilitative interventions in workers with upper limb conditions on work performance, pain, absenteeism, productivity and other outcomes. Twenty-eight suitable articles were found, which were grouped into 17 studies and seven intervention categories (see Table 3). The largest body of evidence was found to support workplace exercise programs, of which four out of six were high quality studies. Positive effects were also found for use of ergonomic controls, ergonomic training and workstation adjustments, although these intervention categories had fewer high quality studies. No significant effect was found for job stress management training. The remaining intervention categories (work hardening, myofeedback training, Feldenkrais, nurse case manager training) only had one study each. While results of three of these studies were encouraging, with interventions showing significant positive effects, recommendations for practice should be made with caution as there is only one medium or high quality study per intervention.

Four high quality studies [16–25, 31], one medium quality study [38] and one low quality study [43] supported workplace exercise programs. The research suggests that these programs may be effective whether including strength or endurance training programs [38], using as little as two minutes of regular exercise [16–18], or basing them on high quality video instruction rather than a personalised trainer [31]. In the case of ergonomic controls, it is difficult to draw conclusions. Studies finding that an adapted mouse (Anir mouse) significantly reduced pain, headaches and musculoskeletal sick leave at 6 months and were maintained at 12 and 36 months, were of medium quality [33–35]; while keyboard adjustments and shortcuts had mixed results [29, 40]. The two high quality studies on workstation adjustments [27, 28, 30] offered ergonomic training or workstation adjustments to both intervention groups, although the Bernaards study [27, 28] also included a control group which received usual care. The Feuerstein study [30] included job stress management training as an additional intervention in the second group. In the Feuerstein study [30], both intervention groups showed significant improvements, but there were no significant between group differences, suggesting that job stress management training had no significant effect. Inclusion of a third (control) group that did not receive any workstation adjustments or ergonomic training, as in the Bernaards study [27, 28], may have more clearly highlighted the effects of the ergonomic intervention offered to both groups. The remaining two studies on workstation adjustment and ergonomic training [37, 39, 41] found statistically significant improvements in use of breaks and some elements of body posture, as well as productivity loss at work.

The Cheng study [36] supports work hardening that has a workplace-based component, rather than clinic-based work hardening. While the workplace-based group showed significantly better outcomes than the clinic-based group, the authors cautioned that the process of change is not well understood: the improvements in intervention group could be due to a number of factors, including the presence of the job coach or the provision of modified work duties. Further study in smaller organisations and considering longer term effects was recommended.

Feldenkrais was found to be more effective than physiotherapy in the Lundblad study [32]. The authors postulated that this could be because Feldenkrais has a stronger focus on participants' perceptions and experiences than physiotherapy, and that Feldenkrais has some features in common with relaxation and biofeedback techniques, which have been found to be effective at reducing pain [32].

In the Voerman study [26], the ambulant myofeedback training group did not have significantly different outcomes to the control group. The researchers attributed this to the presence of subgroups in which the intervention was more beneficial (e.g. workers with certain cognitive-behavioural characteristics), the use of too generic outcomes (pain and disability were used instead of outcomes responsive to the specific working mechanisms of the intervention), and the low initial pain and disability levels, resulting in a smaller potential for improvement.

As expected, the present review identified more relevant studies than the 2004 review on workplace-based rehabilitative interventions with work related upper extremity disorders [4], which included eight studies. Intervention categories were similar across the two reviews. The Williams review [4] concluded that there was insufficient evidence to identify and make recommendations regarding effective workplace-based rehabilitative interventions for upper limb conditions. Our conclusions regarding the one study common to both reviews [42] are similar, but we are able to make more recommendations regarding workplace exercise, ergonomic controls and adjustments due to research published subsequent to the 2004 review.

Six studies [26, 30, 32, 34, 40, 41] included in our review were also included in the reviews on preventative workplace interventions with upper limb conditions [2, 11], as these reviews included secondary and tertiary preventative interventions which also qualify as rehabilitative interventions. Quality assessment and data extraction matched between the reviews. One more study [36] was also included in a recent IWH review on workplace-based return-to-work interventions for musculoskeletal, pain-related and mental health conditions [45]. The authors of this review similarly

concluded that there was insufficient evidence to draw conclusions and make recommendations regarding the effectiveness of work hardening programs, as too few high and medium quality studies with positive results were available.

Strengths and Limitations of this Review

A meta-analysis could not be conducted in this review, due to the heterogeneity of outcomes. This is consistent with other reviews in the field [2, 4, 11, 45]. Instead, a critical analysis and narrative synthesis was provided, in order to provide practitioners with the opportunity to draw from studies most relevant to their needs, at varying levels of evidence.

The quality appraisal of studies was optimised through inclusion of all articles related to the studies, e.g. study protocols. This enabled access to all published information on the study methodology, which is not always available in articles reporting primary outcomes.

During the article selection process, title and abstract screening was conducted only by the principal investigator. This could have introduced bias, as articles were excluded at this stage by a single reviewer. Likewise, data extraction was conducted by the principal investigator. In order to reduce bias, data extraction was double checked by the principal investigator on two separate dates, and spot checks were conducted by second and third reviewers on 50% of the included studies.

Publication bias was not addressed, as grey literature was not included. This means that studies with positive results were more likely to be included in our review. We attempted to be as inclusive as possible by seeking expert advice, utilising a wide range of search terms and including multiple databases in our literature search. We also included all languages in our initial search, only excluding one article at full text review stage due to difficulty translating. In spite of this, our search did not yield all of the studies expected. Notably, seven of the eight studies included in the Williams review [4] were not retrieved in our literature search, despite using more databases, wider inclusion criteria (all upper limb conditions were included, rather than only WRUEDs) and searching the reference lists of included articles for further studies. One of the databases used in the Williams review (EMBASE) could not be included in our review, as we did not have access to this database through the library service of Stellenbosch University. It may also be related to changes in database content and MeSH terms over time, differences in use of Boolean operators between the two reviews or the structure of our search strategy. Relevant studies could possibly have been excluded in our search, as we limited to MeSH headings or title searches in certain databases, and included a filter for study design.

Recommendations for Future Research

Several of the included studies showed positive effects with no significant between-group results, likely due to insufficient difference between intervention and control group. It is recommended that when two differing interventions are studied, an additional “no treatment” or “placebo” control group is included, which may be more likely to highlight intervention effects.

Quality appraisal of included studies was hampered by unclear reporting or inadequate statistical analyses. Future studies should clearly report on the details of and participation in intervention, examine and adjust for pre-intervention differences, examine for differences between dropout and remaining participants, perform intention-to-treat analyses, and always perform direct between-group comparisons. It is also recommended that a follow-up assessment after 3 months or more is included in the study, to assess long term effects of the intervention. These factors will reduce the risk of bias in individual studies and enable clearer interpretation of results.

Most studies included pain as an outcome, assessed through the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). More standardised reporting may have enabled meta-analyses in different categories of intervention. The continued use of outcome measures such as the VAS, DASH, UEFS and RULA is encouraged, to ensure valid and reliable data and improve the potential for homogeneity between studies.

In future studies, researchers should pre-determine the minimum effect size that would demonstrate clinical significance for participants, as statistical significance is not necessarily indicative of clinical significance [46].

Recommendations for Practice

The use of workplace exercise programs in rehabilitation of upper limb conditions is well supported by the evidence. Clinicians may consider implementing regular strength or endurance training programs of short duration. Larger populations of workers may be reached through use of high quality instructional videos. Group programs appear to be effective at reducing upper limb symptoms and improving function.

Workstation adjustment and ergonomic training appear to be beneficial in reducing ergonomic risk, improving musculoskeletal symptoms and productivity. Job stress management training had no significant effect and is therefore not recommended.

Ergonomic controls vary significantly and should therefore be evaluated by their individual merit. An adapted computer mouse enabling more neutral wrist and forearm postures may be beneficial in reducing upper limb pain, headaches and musculoskeletal sick leave, with the effect

maintained at 12 and 36 months. Adjustable keyboard/mouse trays and ergonomically adapted keyboards may be beneficial, but care should be taken to assess whether these adaptations shift hand activity or non-neutral postures to the non-dominant hand.

Workplace-based work hardening, case manager training and Feldenkrais should be implemented with caution, as only one study supported each of these interventions. Ambulant myofeedback training and job stress management training are not recommended at this stage, as the single study including each of these interventions showed no significant effect.

Conclusions

High quality evidence was found in favour of workplace exercise programs in a variety of employment settings. Positive effects included reduced pain, increased muscle strength and endurance, maintenance of work ability, improved upper limb function and reduction in work disability. Mixed evidence was found for ergonomic controls: medium quality evidence with strong positive results for an adapted mouse using more neutral forearm and wrist positions; mixed results for an adjustable keyboard-mouse tray with touch pad in the non-dominant hand; and positive effects for Microsoft Naturals keyboards, with no significant improvement with use of reduced force keyboards. Workplace adjustments, ergonomic training and work style behaviour counselling also showed positive effects, while job stress management training had no significant additional effect. Positive effects were seen for workplace-based work hardening, Feldenkrais and case manager training, but more research needs to be conducted on these interventions. Ambulant myofeedback training had no significant effect compared with ergonomic training.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Research Involving Human and Animal Participants This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

1. Schultz G, Mostert K, Rothmann I. Repetitive strain injury among South African employees: the relationship with burnout and work engagement. Int J Ind Ergon. 2012;42(5):449–456.
2. Van Eerd D, Munhall C, Irvin E, Rempel D, Brewer S, Van Der Beek AJ, Dennerlein JT, Tullar J, Skivington K, Pinion C, Amick B. Effectiveness of workplace interventions in the prevention of upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders and symptoms: an update of the evidence. Occup Environ Med. 2016;73(1):62–70.
3. Kielkowski D, Rees D, Bradshaw D. Burden of occupational morbidity in South Africa: two large field surveys of self-reported work-related and work-aggravated disease. S Afr J Sci. 2004;100(7–8):399–402.
4. Williams RM, Westmorland MG, Schmuck G, MacDermid JC. Effectiveness of workplace rehabilitation interventions in the treatment of work-related upper extremity disorders: a systematic review. J Hand Ther. 2004;17(2):267–273.
5. Edries N, Jelsma J, Maart S. The impact of an employee wellness programme in clothing/textile manufacturing companies: a randomised controlled trial. BMC Public Health. 2013;13(1):1–9.
6. Franche RL, Cullen K, Clarke J, Irvin E, Sinclair S, Frank J, Institute for Work & Health (IWH) Workplace-Based RTW Intervention Literature Review Research Team. Workplace-based return-to-work interventions: a systematic review of the quantitative literature. J Occup Rehabil. 2005;15(4):607–631.
7. Schiller J. Bringing in treatment: establishing a workplace rehabilitation program. Risk Manag. 1996;43(5):49–51.
8. Cancelliere C, Donovan J, Stochkendahl MJ, Biscardi M, Ammendolia C, Myburgh C, Cassidy JD. Factors affecting return to work after injury or illness: best evidence synthesis of systematic reviews. Chiropractic Manual Ther. 2016;24(1):1–23.
9. Burns PB, Rohrich RJ, Chung KC. The levels of evidence and their role in evidence-based medicine. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;128(1):305–310.
10. MacDermid JC. An introduction to evidence-based practice for hand therapists. J Hand Ther. 2004;17(2):105–117.
11. Kennedy CA, Amick BC III, Dennerlein JT, Brewer S, Catli S, Williams R, Serra C, Gerr F, Irvin E, Mahood Q, Franzblau A. Systematic review of the role of occupational health and safety interventions in the prevention of upper extremity musculoskeletal symptoms, signs, disorders, injuries, claims and lost time. J Occup Rehabil. 2010;20(2):127–162.
12. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1–9.
13. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015;349:1–25.
14. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, Clarke M, Devereaux PJ, Kleijnen J, Moher D. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. PLoS Med. 2009;6(7):1–28.
15. American Occupational Therapy Association. Guidelines for systematic reviews. 2014. https://ajot.submit2aota.org/journals/ajot/forms/systematic_reviews.pdf.
16. Andersen LL, Saervoll CA, Mortensen OS, Poulsen OM, Hannerz H, Zebis MK. Effectiveness of small daily amounts of progressive resistance training for frequent neck/shoulder pain: randomised controlled trial. PAIN® 2011;152(2):440–446.
17. Andersen LL, Zebis MK. Process evaluation of workplace interventions with physical exercise to reduce musculoskeletal disorders. Int J Rheumatol. 2014;2014:761363. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/761363.
18. Lidegaard M, Jensen RB, Andersen CH, Zebis MK, Colado JC, Wang Y, Heilskov-Hansen T, Andersen LL. Effect of brief daily resistance training on occupational neck/shoulder muscle activity in office workers with chronic pain: randomized controlled trial. Biomed Res Int. 2013;2013:262386. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/262386.

19. Andersen CH, Sjøgaard G, Andersen LL, Zebis MK, Mortensen OS. Protocol for shoulder function training reducing musculoskeletal pain in shoulder and neck: a randomized controlled trial. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2011;12(1):1–5.
20. Andersen CH, Andersen LL, Zebis MK, Sjøgaard G. Effect of scapular function training on chronic pain in the neck/shoulder region: a randomized controlled trial. J Occup Rehabil. 2014;24(2):316–324.
21. Andersen LL, Persson R, Jakobsen MD, Sundstrup E. Psychosocial effects of workplace physical exercise among workers with chronic pain: randomized controlled trial. Medicine. 2017;96(1):e5709.
22. Sundstrup E, Jakobsen MD, Andersen CH, Jay K, Persson R, Aagaard P, Andersen LL. Participatory ergonomic intervention versus strength training on chronic pain and work disability in slaughterhouse workers: study protocol for a single-blind, randomized controlled trial. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2013;14(1):1–9.
23. Sundstrup E, Jakobsen MD, Brandt M, Jay K, Persson R, Aagaard P, Andersen LL. Workplace strength training prevents deterioration of work ability among workers with chronic pain and work disability: a randomized controlled trial. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2014;40(3):244–251.
24. Sundstrup E, Jakobsen MD, Andersen CH, Jay K, Persson R, Aagaard P, Andersen LL. Effect of two contrasting interventions on upper limb chronic pain and disability: a randomized controlled trial. Pain Physician. 2014;17(2):145–154.
25. Sundstrup E, Jakobsen MD, Brandt M, Jay K, Aagaard P, Andersen LL. Strength training improves fatigue resistance and self-rated health in workers with chronic pain: a randomized controlled trial. Biomed Res Int. 2016;2016:1–11.
26. Voerman GE, Sandsjö L, Vollenbroek-Hutten MM, Larsman P, Kadefors R, Hermens HJ. Effects of ambulant myofeedback training and ergonomic counselling in female computer workers with work-related neck-shoulder complaints: a randomized controlled trial. J Occup Rehabil. 2007;17(1):137–152.
27. Bernaards CM, Ariëns GA, Hildebrandt VH. The (cost-) effectiveness of a lifestyle physical activity intervention in addition to a work style intervention on the recovery from neck and upper limb symptoms in computer workers. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2006;7(1):1–11.
28. Bernaards CM, Ariëns GA, Simons M, Knol DL, Hildebrandt VH. Improving work style behavior in computer workers with neck and upper limb symptoms. J Occup Rehabil. 2008;18(1):87–101.
29. Dropkin J, Kim H, Punnett L, Wegman DH, Warren N, Buchholz B. Effect of an office ergonomic randomised controlled trial among workers with neck and upper extremity pain. Occup Environ Med. 2015;72(1):6–14.
30. Feuerstein M, Nicholas RA, Huang GD, Dimberg L, Ali D, Rogers H. Job stress management and ergonomic intervention for work-related upper extremity symptoms. Appl Ergon. 2004;35(6):565–574.
31. Jay K, Brandt M, Andersen LL. Effect of video-based versus personalized instruction on errors during elastic tubing exercises for musculoskeletal pain: a randomized controlled trial. Biomed Res Int. 2014;2014:1–7.
32. Lundblad I, Elert J, Gerdle B. Randomized controlled trial of physiotherapy and Feldenkrais interventions in female workers with neck-shoulder complaints. J Occup Rehabil. 1999;9(3):179–194.
33. Aaras A, Ro O, Thoresen M. Can a more neutral position of the forearm when operating a computer mouse reduce the pain level for visual display unit operators? A prospective epidemiological intervention study. Int J Hum Comput Interact. 1999;11(2):79–94.
34. Aarås A, Dainoff M, Ro O, Thoresen M. Can a more neutral position of the forearm when operating a computer mouse reduce the pain level for visual display unit operators? A prospective epidemiological intervention study: part II. Int J Hum Comput Interact. 2001;13(1):13–40.
35. Aarås A, Dainoff M, Ro O, Thoresen M. Can a more neutral position of the forearm when operating a computer mouse reduce the pain level for VDU operators? Int J Ind Ergon. 2002;30(4):307–324.
36. Cheng AS, Hung LK. Randomized controlled trial of workplace-based rehabilitation for work-related rotator cuff disorder. J Occup Rehabil. 2007;17(3):487–503.
37. Esmaeilzadeh S, Ozcan E, Capan N. Effects of ergonomic intervention on work-related upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders among computer workers: a randomized controlled trial. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2014;87(1):73–83.
38. Hagberg M, Harms-Ringdahl K, Nisell R, Hjelm EW. Rehabilitation of neck-shoulder pain in women industrial workers: a randomized trial comparing isometric shoulder endurance training with isometric shoulder strength training. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2000;81(8):1051–1058.
39. Martimo KP, Shiri R, Miranda H, Ketola R, Varonen H, Viikari-Juntura E. Effectiveness of an ergonomic intervention on the productivity of workers with upper-extremity disorders-a randomized controlled trial. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2010;36(1):25–33.
40. Ripat J, Scatliff T, Giesbrecht E, Quanbury A, Friesen M, Kelso S. The effect of alternate style keyboards on severity of symptoms and functional status of individuals with work related upper extremity disorders. J Occup Rehabil. 2006;16(4):707–718.
41. Shiri R, Martimo KP, Miranda H, Ketola R, Kaila-Kangas L, Liira H, Karppinen J, Viikari-Juntura E. The effect of workplace intervention on pain and sickness absence caused by upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorders. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2011;37(2):120–128.
42. Lincoln AE, Feuerstein M, Shaw WS, Miller VI. Impact of case manager training on worksite accommodations in workers' compensation claimants with upper extremity disorders. J Occup Environ Med. 2002;44(3):237–245.
43. Camargo PR, Haik MN, Ludewig PM, Filho RB, Mattiello-Rosa SM, Salvini TF. Effects of strengthening and stretching exercises applied during working hours on pain and physical impairment in workers with subacromial impingement syndrome. Physiother Theory Pract. 2009;25(7):463–475.
44. United States Department of Labor. Dictionary of occupational titles. (Revised 4th ed.). Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor; 1991.
45. Cullen KL, Irvin E, Collie A, Clay F, Gensby U, Jennings PA, Hogg-Johnson S, Kristman V, Laberge M, McKenzie D, Newnam S. Effectiveness of workplace interventions in return-to-work for musculoskeletal, pain-related and mental health conditions: an update of the evidence and messages for practitioners. J Occup Rehabil. 2017;28(1):1–15.
46. Burger M, Kriel R, Damon A, Abel A, Bansda A, Wakens M, Ernstzen D. The effectiveness of low-level laser therapy on pain, self-reported hand function, and grip strength compared to placebo or "sham" treatment for adults with carpal tunnel syndrome: a systematic review. Physiother Theory Pract. 2017;33(3):184–197.