



CHAPTER 2

The effects of workplace stressors on muscle activity in the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles during computer work: a systematic review and meta-analysis

B.H.W. Eijkelhof, M.A. Huysmans,
J.L. Bruno Garza, B.M. Blatter,
J.H. van Dieën, J.T. Dennerlein,
A.J. van der Beek

Eur J Appl Physiol. 2013;113(12):2897-912.
doi: 10.1007/s00421-013-2602-2.

ABSTRACT

Background. Workplace stressors have been indicated to play a role in the development of neck and upper extremity pain possibly through an increase of sustained (low-level) muscle activity.

Objective. The aim of this review was to study the effects of workplace stressors on muscle activity in the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles. An additional aim was to find out whether the muscles of the neck-shoulder and the forearm are affected differently by different types of workplace stressors.

Methods. A systematic literature search was conducted on studies investigating the relation between simulated or realistic workplace stressors and neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity. For studies meeting the inclusion criteria, a risk of bias assessment was performed and data were extracted for synthesis. Results were pooled when possible and otherwise described.

Results. Twenty-eight articles met the inclusion criteria, reporting data of 25 different studies. Except for one field study, all included studies were laboratory studies. Data of 19 articles could be included in the meta-analysis and revealed a statistically significant, medium increase in neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity as a result of workplace stressors. A sensitivity analyses revealed a larger effect for studies with a higher risk of bias. In subgroup analyses, we found an equal effect of different stressor types (i.e. cognitive/emotional stress, work pace, and precision) on muscle activity in both body regions.

Conclusion. Simulated workplace stressors result in an increase in neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity. No indications were found that different types of stressors affect these body regions differently.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

Computer work has become a key element in daily work for many people and is still growing. Neck and upper extremity pain is a common health problem among computer workers with prevalence rates of 25% for the neck-shoulder and 15% for the forearm region in Europe (1). Neck and upper extremity pain not only has serious consequences for the individual involved, but is also associated with high costs for societies and employers, because of productivity loss and medical consumption. In the Netherlands total yearly costs are estimated at 2.1 billion euro (2).

Neck and upper extremity pain has a multifactorial origin. One category of risk factors for neck and upper extremity pain is workplace stress (3;4), which are common in computer work. Workplace stressors include a wide variety of stressors, such as high work demands, high mental processing, high memory demands, performing multiple tasks at the same time, time pressure, low decision authority, low reward, and high efforts (e.g. 5;6). The etiological mechanisms of workplace stressors are not yet understood, but one of the mechanisms proposed is that these stressors increase sustained (low-level) muscle activity (3) which in turn may lead to injury via overexertion. Two pathways may play a role. Firstly, muscle activity may be affected indirectly through a changed work style due to these stressors (e.g. increased work pace, high forces on the keyboard and mouse, and more awkward and sustained postures) (7). Secondly, muscle activity may be affected directly without an obvious biomechanical purpose (8-10) due to increased arousal or due to more specific psychogenic mechanisms.

Indications have been found that the underlying mechanisms for developing neck-shoulder or forearm symptoms may be different (11), related to the different pathways described above. Bloemsaat and co-workers (8) found that an increased work pace resulted in higher muscle activity in the distal hand-arm region, whereas increased mental demands resulted in higher muscle activity in the proximal arm-shoulder region. Workplace stressors, such as time pressure, are likely to interfere with the task performance by increasing work pace, which in turn is likely to enhance the activity of the muscles controlling the operating hand. Stressors without this task-interfering component, such as high mental processing, may be more likely to enhance muscle activity of the posture controlling muscles of the neck and shoulders.

Many experimental laboratory studies have been conducted on this topic. Several found that a higher level of the simulated or realistic workplace stressors resulted in a higher muscle activity (e.g. 12-14). However, other studies did not find this relationship (e.g. 15;16). Conflicting results may have arisen because different types of stressors were used, some interfering with the task while others did not. Other reasons may be that different body regions were studied or that different sample sizes were used. Therefore, studying the effects of different types of workplace stressors separately, may provide a better understanding whether these stressors lead to increased muscle activity in the neck-shoulder muscles and/or the forearm muscles. To our knowledge, no systematic review on

this topic has been published so far. The aim of our review is to answer the following two questions:

- Do workplace stressors increase muscle activity during simulated or realistic computer work?
- Do different types of workplace stressors affect neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity differently during simulated or realistic computer work?

2. METHODS

Literature search

To identify relevant articles providing information about the effects of workplace stressors on neck and upper extremity muscle activity, we performed systematic searches in the bibliographic databases PubMed, EMBASE.com, PsycINFO and The Cochrane Library from inception to April 04, 2011. A search strategy was developed for PubMed (see Appendix A) and adapted for other databases. Search terms included controlled terms from MeSH in PubMed, EMtree in EMBASE.com and Thesaurus terms in PsycINFO as well as free text terms. In The Cochrane library, we only used free text terms. Different blocks of search terms comprising 'computer use', 'neck and upper extremity', 'biomechanics', and 'psychosocial stress' were composed and used in AND combination (Appendix A). Additionally, the references of the included articles, based on the selection criteria below, were checked for relevant titles that were not indicated by the electronic search.

Selection of studies

The focus of the final literature review is smaller than that of the initial systematic search of articles. Given the large amount of articles identified and the large variability between outcome measures in these studies, we decided to narrow down our research question to the effect on muscle activity alone. Since muscle activity can be influenced by the presence of pain (e.g. 17), we decided to only include data of healthy subjects. To obtain results that can be generalized to computer work, only studies involving computer work or a realistic simulation of computer work were included.

Articles were eligible for inclusion if they met the following criteria:

- Peer-reviewed full text paper written in English, Dutch, German or French.
- Reported on muscle activity in the neck-shoulder or forearm muscles, measured by EMG, during a computer task with versus without induced workplace stressors.
 - › A computer mouse, keyboard or simulated keys were used as input device.
 - › The stressful condition was either induced by an experimenter or it covered realistic (occupational) stressors, indicated by self-report.
 - › As outcome measure for muscle activity, mean or median EMG amplitudes were reported.

- Participants were free of pain and musculoskeletal symptoms in the neck and upper extremities or data was separately reported for symptom free participants.

To identify relevant articles, two reviewers (LE and JB) independently screened the studies resulting from the literature search. In a first selection round, screening was based on title only. Only when a title indicated that it was absolutely certain that the study concerned a topic different from the interest of this review, the study was excluded. In case the reviewers disagreed or were in doubt, the article remained included. Secondly, selection on title and abstract was carried out, while in a third selection round all remaining full text articles were checked for eligibility. After every selection round the results of both reviewers were compared and disagreements were discussed. If disagreement remained, a third reviewer (MH) was consulted in order to reach consensus.

Risk of bias assessment

To assess whether the results of some studies were more likely to be affected by bias than others, two reviewers (LE and JB) independently performed a risk of bias assessment on the included studies. Before the actual assessment was carried out, a pilot assessment was performed on a closely related (but not included) article and disagreement was discussed.

A checklist with assessment criteria relevant for (small) experimental trials was composed, including both internal validity aspects, such as randomization, baseline muscle activity measurements, reliability, and confounding, and external validity aspects concerning generalizability (table 1). Item 4 evaluated whether unintentionally an extra motor component was introduced by the experimental manipulation that could have influenced the EMG outcomes, such as for example verbally answering to a memory task. Please note that this extra motor component does not refer to motor changes as part of the experimental manipulations, such as increased work pace or precision. Items scored either a full point (1, no potential bias), half a point ($\frac{1}{2}$, some potential bias), or no point (0, potential bias). If insufficient information on a particular item was provided in the paper, then it was scored with a question mark (? , don't know). If an item was not relevant, then it was scored as not applicable (NA).

The results of both reviewers on all items were compared to identify disagreements. During a consensus meeting disagreements were solved. Finally, sub-scores for internal and external validity (% of maximum number of points scored per category), and a total score (% of maximum number of points scored of all items) were calculated per study as an indication of differences in the risk of bias across studies.

Table 1. Risk of bias checklist

Internal validity (measurements)		Scoring
1	Was muscle activity before the control and experimental condition comparable (i.e. an equal baseline)?	A full point (1) was assigned if muscle activity was equal at baseline.
2	Were the control and experimental conditions randomized?	A full point (1) was assigned if the control and experimental conditions were randomly assigned to the participants or balanced across participants.
Internal validity (intervention)		Scoring
3a	Did the experimental manipulation result in the intended increased stress level?	A full point (1) was assigned if the effect of the stress intervention was tested in the study and showed an increase. Half a point (½) was assigned if a reference to a study that did was provided. Half a point (½) was assigned if more than one intervention was performed and only in one of the two the effect of the stress intervention was tested in the study and showed an increase.
3b	Do the stressful manipulations offer escape possibilities?	A full point (1) was assigned if it was <u>not</u> possible to ignore the stressful manipulation, and compensate by e.g. a decreased work pace. Half a point (½) was assigned if more than one intervention was performed and only in one of the two it was not possible to ignore the stressful manipulation, and compensate by e.g. a decreased work pace.
4	Did the experimental manipulation introduce an unintended extra motor component, influencing EMG outcomes?	A full point (1) was assigned if the experimental manipulation did <u>not</u> introduce an unintended extra motor component that influences the EMG outcomes.
External validity		Scoring
5a	Is the study population representative for computer workers?	A full point (1) was assigned if the study population was completely relevant for computer workers. Half a point (½) was assigned if the study population was representative for subgroup of computer workers (e.g. only students or only men/women).
5b	Are the studied tasks representative for computer work?	A full point (1) was assigned if the studied task reflected realistic computer work.
5c	Is the stress intervention representative for stressors in a realistic occupational setting?	A full point (1) was assigned if the intervention reflected realistic stressors.

Data extraction

From the included articles, information about the following aspects was extracted and summarized in a data extraction table (table 2): study population, study design, computer task, induced stressor(s), wash-out period, and muscles measured. Besides the data reported in the data extraction table, EMG data were extracted from the articles to be able to perform a meta-analysis. From presented tables and figures, the mean or median EMG levels of muscles active during task performance were extracted. Muscles of interest in the neck-shoulder region were the upper trapezius muscle and neck extensors. Muscles of interest in the forearms were the wrist and finger extensors and flexors.

Data synthesis

Meta-analysis

To evaluate the effect of workplace stressors on neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity, all available EMG data from the included studies were synthesized in a meta-analysis. If multiple experimental conditions or muscle groups were reported in a single article, then data for each condition or muscle group were included separately in the analyses instead of combining them into a single mean or selecting only one intervention or muscle group per study (cf. 18).

Effect size

Since EMG outcomes were expressed in different units, a standardized mean difference was used as effect size. In most cases EMG was expressed as a percentage of the maximal voluntary contraction (%MVC). In one case EMG was expressed as the percentage of a reference contraction in which a 1 kg dumb-bell was lifted for 2 seconds (14), in one case EMG was expressed in micro volts (μV) (19), and in one case the expression of EMG was unclear (20).

Because sample size was expected to be small in many studies, Hedges' g was chosen as the best effect size, since it corrects for possible slight overestimations in small samples (21). The effect size was defined as small if Hedges' $g < 0.33$, medium if $0.33 \leq \text{Hedges' } g \leq 0.55$, and large if Hedges' $g > 0.55$, based on Cohen's d interpretations (22). Mean effect sizes were calculated using meta-analysis software (Comprehensive Meta-Analysis, Biostat, 14 North Dean Street, Englewood, NJ 07631, USA). In the meta-analysis, we used a random-effects model within (sub)groups. An increased muscle activity in the stress condition compared to the control condition was set as a positive effect size.

In addition, we expected to include many studies with a cross-over design. Then a pre-post correlation coefficient is needed for calculating the effect size; Hedges' g . A pre-post correlation coefficient of 0.65 was chosen, based on Mathiassen and co-workers (23). They found a correlation coefficient of 0.60 for comparable EMG measurements, performed on different days. When measurements are performed on the same day, a higher correlation coefficient is expected, because electrodes are mounted only once. Almost all included articles in this review reported data of repeated measures, collected on the same day.

Table 2. Data extraction table

Study	Study population	Study design	Control condition	Intervention	Wash-out period	Measured muscles	Meta-analysis			
	Number of participants		Task	Added stressor	Time between control and intervention session	Duration of sessions	Inclusion	Subgroup category	Adaptation strategy to induced stressor(s), e.g. DMV	Inclusion subgroup analysis cognitive / emotional stressors without DMV
Alkjaer et al. 2005	28F experienced computer workers	lab exp CO	mouse clicks at predefined pace	CWT, answer as quickly and correctly as possible (same predefined cue rate as in COIN), performance feedback	30 min	30 min	Y	cognitive load	DMV: Y clicking frequency number of correct answers: Y response time: Y	N
Blangsted et al. 2003**	24F	field obs	participants' own computer work	Realistic time pressure and work load	NA	NA	N	NA	NA	NA
Blangsted et al. 2004	12F experienced computer workers	lab exp CO	keying numbers with dominant hand on numerical part of the keyboard	MT, lack of support, surveillance of worker	8 min	12 min	Y	cognitive load, emotional stress	DMV: N number of errors: N	Y
Bloemsaat et al. 2005	9F, 5M mean age 26, experienced computer workers	lab exp CO	perform rapid tapping movements with dominant index finger	1.MT 2.increased tapping rate	1. 1 min 2. no pause	1. ±.9 min 2. ±.4,5 min	N	NA	1: DMV: N predefined	NA
							missing data		2: DMV: N (= intervention)	

Ekberg et al. 1995 (pilot)	10M	mean age 25 (20-34), students	lab	exp CO	data entry task on numerical part of the keyboard with dominant hand; self-selected pace, as correct as possible	1.MA, as quick and correct as possible 2.CWT, at predetermined pace as correct as possible	40 sec	80 sec	TRAP	1. Y 2. N task differed from control condition	1.cognitive load 2.cognitive load	1. DMV: Y 2. DMV: Y	1.N 2.N
Ekberg et al. 1995 (main)	20F	mean age 36 (19-56), professional computer workers	lab	exp CO	data entry task on numerical part of the keyboard with dominant hand; self-selected pace, as correct as possible	MA, as quick and correct as possible	different part of the day (morning-noon)	1 hour	TRAP	Y	cognitive load	DMV: Y	N
Finsen et al. 2001; Finsen et al. 2001*	9F	mean age 25 (20-35), regular computer users, students	lab	exp CO	mouse task with right hand, typing numbers on numerical part of the keyboard with left index finger, avoid errors	MT	?	CON: 7 min EXP: 1 hour	EDC, ECR, FDS	Y	cognitive load	DMV: N pre-terminated number of errors: Y	Y
Gerard et al. 2002	16F, 2M	mean age 34 (22-57), experienced 10-finger typists	lab	exp CO	copy typing with two hands, self paced	increased typing speed, 100% max	at least a day	30 min	Finger extensor, Finger flexor	N	NA	DMV: N (= intervention)	NA

Table 2. Continued

Study	Study population	Study design	Control condition	Intervention	Wash-out period	Measured muscles	Meta-analysis			
	Number of participants	Characteristics	Task	Added stressor	Time between control and intervention session	Duration of sessions	Inclusion	Subgroup category	Adaptation strategy to induced stressor(s), e.g. DMV	Inclusion subgroup analysis cognitive / emotional stressors without DMV
Hughes et al. 2007	9F, 9M mean age 25.4 (± 6.4), 10-finger touch typists, students	lab exp CO	copy typing, errors no issue	1.verbal MA 2.increased typing speed	3 min	5 min	1.Y 2.Y	1.cognitive load 2.work pace	1. DMV: Y 2. DMV: N (=intervention) typing errors: Y	1.N 2.NA
Johnston et al. 2008	55F 33 working, 22 non-working, competent typists	lab exp	copytyping at comfortable pace	type as fast and accurately as possible with superimposed stress (surveillance of worker, performance feedback)	a few minutes (or long enough for HR to return to baseline level)	5 min	N not possible to extract data accurately from the presented figure	NA	DMV: Y error rate: Y	NA

Kristiansen et al. 2009	10F	mean age 34,7 (25-51); experienced computer workers	lab	exp CO	1. mouse work 2. order judgment task, answer by key press with index finger of the dominant hand	simulated office noise	12 min	20 min (task 1+2 together; 10 min per task)	TRAP	1.N no valid intervention for our comparison 2.N no valid intervention for our comparison	1.NA 2.NA	DMV: N response time: N number of errors: N	1.NA
Laursen et al. 2000; Laursen et al. 2001*	17F	mean age young group: 25 (22-28), elderly group: 63 (56-70), experienced computer workers	lab	exp CO	mouse tasks at predefined speed	reduced target size	1 hour (10 min break, 50 min performing mouse work)	100 sec	ECR, FCR, ED TRAP, NECK	Y	precision	DMV: N predefined speed, error rate: Y	NA
Laursen et al. 2002	12F	mean age 32 (27-41), experienced computer users	lab	exp CO	key presses and mouse clicks, predefined reaction time	CWT, as quickly (within same reaction time as in control condition) and as correctly as possible, performance feedback	2 min	8 min	ECR, ED, ECU, FCU TRAP, NECK	Y	cognitive load	DMV: N response time for correct answer: Y	Y
Leyman et al. 2004	4F, 9M	mean age 33 (22-44), touch typists	lab	exp CO	copytyping	MT	3 min	±1 min	TRAP, CES	N missing data	NA	DMV: N number of characters typed correctly: Y	NA

Table 2. Continued

Study	Study population	Study design	Control condition	Intervention	Wash-out period	Measured muscles	Meta-analysis
	Number of participants		Task	Added stressor	Time between control and intervention session	Duration of sessions	Inclusion
	Characteristics					Forearm, neck-shoulder	Adaptation strategy to induced stressor(s), e.g. DMV
							Inclusion subgroup analysis cognitive / emotional stressors without DMV
McLean and Urquhart 2002	6F, 4M mean age 23 (± 2), experienced computer users	exp CO	1. copytyping at comfortable pace	1.1 maximal typing speed 1.2.maximal typing speed, environmental distraction, surveillance of worker, performance feedback	30 min	30 min	Y
						TRAP	1.1. DMV: N (= intervention) 1.1.N 1.1.A
							1.1 work pace 1.2 work pace, emotional stress
							1.2. DMV: N (= part of intervention), stressor as but lower than in first intervention (1.1.) 2.Y
							2. emotional stress
Rietveld et al. 2007	20 mean age 38 (23-49)	exp CO	copytyping after relaxation break	copytyping after superimposed stress	15 min	9 min	Y
						ED	DMV: N DMV: Y
							emotional stress

Sandfeld and Jensen 2005	17F, 16M	mean age young group: 26,5 (± 2,5), elderly group: 64,9 (± 3,6), experienced computer users	lab	exp CO	mouse pointing task at constant (predefined) clicking frequency, errors are no issue	increased mouse gain across different target sizes	3 min	3,5 min	ECR, ED, ECU, FCR TRAP, NECK	N no valid intervention for our comparison	NA	DMV: N % correct hits: Y	NA
Schnoz et al. 2000	2F, 7M	mean age 29 (± 4)	lab	exp CO	key tapping with index finger of the dominant hand	increased tapping rate	?	8 sec	ED, FD TRAP	N only static EMG values presented	NA	DMV: N (= intervention)	NA
Szeto et al. 2005**	20F	mean age 30,4 (22-42), office workers	lab	Exp CO	copy typing at normal typing speed, correct typing errors (>10% errors not corrected, program would stop)	Increased typing speed (at least 20%)	?	20 min	TRAP, CES	Y	work pace	DMV: N (= intervention)	NA
Szeto and Lin 2011**	8F	mean age 26,5 (23-30), experienced typists, office workers	lab	exp CO	mouse tasks 1.comfortable clicking speed, precision was set at medium level 2.low level of clicking accuracy, self-selected work pace	1.maximal clicking speed, precision was set at medium level 2.high level of clicking accuracy, self-selected work pace	3 min	5 min	ECU, ECR, FCU, FCR	Y	1.work pace 2.precision	1. DMV: N (= intervention) 2. DMV: Y	1.NA 2.NA

Table 2. Continued

Study	Study population	Study design	Control condition	Intervention	Wash-out period	Measured muscles	Meta-analysis				
	Number of participants	Characteristics	Task	Added stressor	Time between control and intervention session	Duration of sessions	Forearm, neck-shoulder	Inclusion	Subgroup category	Adaptation strategy to induced stressor(s), e.g. DMV	Inclusion subgroup analysis cognitive / emotional stressors without DMV
Visser et al. 2004	6F, 4M	age 23-58, experienced computer workers	mouse tasks: tracking and aiming. low level of clicking accuracy, low mental pressure	1. high level of clicking accuracy 2. high mental pressure; perform as fast (in aiming task) correct (in tracking task) as possible, performance feedback 3. high level of clicking accuracy, high mental pressure	? 2 min	2 min	ED, FD TRAP	1. Y	1. precision	1. aiming: DMV: Y error rate: Y tracking: DMV: ? error rate: Y	1. aiming: NA tracking: NA
								2. Y	2. emotional, work pace, precision	2. aiming: DMV: N (= part of intervention) error rate N tracking: DMV: ? error rate: N	2. aiming: N emotional stress not an individual stressor tracking: N emotional stress not an individual stressor
								3. Y	3. precision, emotional, work pace	3. aiming: DMV: N (= intervention) error rate N tracking: DMV: ? error rate: Y	3. aiming: N emotional stress not an individual stressor tracking: N emotional stress not an individual stressor

Author	Study ID	Participant Characteristics	Task Description	Duration	Stimulus	Response	Measurements	Stressors	Intervention	Notes
Waersted et al. 1991	17F, 11M	median age 24 (21-31)	lab exp CO	±5 min	±30 sec (to start the next task)	complex RT, constant response-stimulus interval 1,5 sec, respond as fast and correctly as possible	TRAP	NA	DMV: Y	NA
Waersted et al. 1994***	13F	median age 22 (19-30), students	lab exp CO	6 min	90 sec	key presses with right index finger speed in complex two-choice reaction time task, instructed to work fast and make few mistakes	TRAP	Cognitive load	DMV: N (= part of intervention)	Y
Wahiström et al. 2002	7F, 8M	mean age 30 (18-48), experienced computer mouse users	lab exp CO	?	?	work as fast as possible, 4 pages, time constraint, verbal provocation	ED TRAP	emotional stress, work pace	DMV: N (= intervention)	N
Wang et al. 2011	7F, 7M	mean age 23,2 (± 3), experienced typists, university students	lab exp CO	5 min	no pause	copytyping with increased speed: 180 Hz	ECR, FCU TRAP, CES	work pace	DMV: N (= intervention)	NA

Table 2. Continued

Study	Study population	Study design	Control condition	Intervention	Wash-out period	Measured muscles	Meta-analysis
	Number of participants	Characteristics	Task	Added stressor	Time between control and intervention session	Duration of sessions	Inclusion subgroup analysis cognitive / emotional stressors without DMV
Westad et al. 2004; Westgaard et al. 2006*	11F, 9M age 20-56	lab exp CO	copy typing	copytyping with 10% increased speed while maintaining or improving error rate	2 min	10 min TRAP	Inclusion subgroup analysis cognitive / emotional stressors without DMV Adaptation strategy to induced stressor(s), e.g. DMV Subgroup category work pace DMV: ? NA

*: data in the two publications concern the same study population and the same experiment and are therefore combined; **, subgroup of total study population that is of interest; ***: experiment 1 included only; F: female; M: male; lab: laboratory; exp: experimental; obs: observational; CO: cross-over design; MT: memory task; MA: mental arithmetic task; CWT: color word test; RT: (two choice) reaction time task; min: minutes; ED: extensor digitorum; ECR: extensor carpi radialis; ECU: extensor carpi ulnaris; EDC: extensor digitorum communis; FCR: flexor carpi radialis; FDS: flexor digitorum superficialis; TRAP: trapezius; NECK: neck extensor muscle group; CES: cervical extensor spinae; DELT: deltoideus; BI: biceps brachii; TRI: triceps brachii; DMV: decreased movement velocity; Y: yes; N: no; ?: don't know; NA: not applicable

Subgroup analyses

To examine whether different types of workplace stressors affect neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity differently (our second research question), subgroup analyses were performed with a minimum of three studies within a subgroup. These subgroup analyses are depicted schematically below (figure 1).

In the first level, analyses were stratified into two subgroups based on muscle location: neck-shoulder or forearm. Then, a second level of stratification within these two subgroups (neck-shoulder and forearm) was applied, based on the type of stressor in the experimental condition. The stress interventions were categorized into interventions that: 1) increase cognitive loading and/or emotional stress, 2) increase work pace, and 3) increase precision demands. The first category involves stressor types that do not interfere with the computer task directly and the latter two categories involve stressor types that do. Examples of stressors assigned to the category cognitive loading/emotional stress are the STROOP colour word test, memory tests, mental arithmetic tests, complex reaction time tasks, mental pressure on good performance, lack of support, and simulated office noise/environmental distraction. Examples of stressors in the second category, i.e. increased work pace, are increased typing speed, increased key tapping rate, increased mouse clicking speed, and the instruction to work as quickly as possible. In the third category, i.e. increased precision demands, stressors such as high clicking accuracy (provoked by a reduced target size) and increased mouse gain are included. In some studies, the experimental condition included a combination of stressors from different categories. Studies in which the experimental condition involved a combination of subgroups were not included at this level of the subgroup analyses.

In order to answer our second research question properly, we decided to perform a cognitive/emotional stressor subgroup analysis, including only studies in which movement velocity did not decrease in the experimental condition. Decreasing movement velocity can be seen as an adaptation strategy to cope with the induced stressor. However, since it influences muscle activity (24), it is also a confounding variable for our research question. In the data extraction table (table 2), it is reported whether this adaptation strategy occurred in a study, and whether the study was included in this subgroup analysis.

Furthermore, a sensitivity analysis based on results of the risk of bias assessment (table 3) was performed to evaluate whether studies with a high risk of bias compared to studies with a low risk of bias showed a different effect of the induced stressor on muscle activity.




Figure 1. Overview of the different subgroup analyses that were conducted in the meta-analyses. DMV: Decreased movement velocity

Assessment of heterogeneity

To determine the degree of variation in the true effect sizes and the proportion of the observed variance at each level of analyses, heterogeneity was identified with the Q-test and I^2 index, respectively. The degree of heterogeneity was defined as low if $I^2 \leq 33\%$, moderate if $33\% < I^2 < 67\%$, and high if $I^2 \geq 67\%$ (Avin and Frey Law 2011), based on previous suggestions (25). Significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

Publication bias

A funnel plot (26), consisting of all studies that were included in the meta-analysis, was visually inspected to assess potential publication bias.

3. RESULTS

Search results

The literature search generated a total of 6484 references: 2673 in PubMed, 2698 in EMBASE.com, 995 in PsycINFO, and 118 in The Cochrane Library. After removing duplicates of references that were retrieved from more than one database, 5390 papers remained. Out of these 5390 papers, 1113 met the inclusion criteria at first screening based on title, and 66 based on title and abstract. The full-text of these 66 remaining articles was read to assess for eligibility. From the additional citation search another 22 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility, but no extra studies were included.

Several field studies had to be excluded because muscle activity was only reported on a group-level, including both subjects with and without pain. The final set of 28 included articles consisted of 27 laboratory studies and 1 field study (8;12-16;19;20;27-46). Of the 28 included articles, 19 articles could be included in the quantitative meta-analysis. A flow chart of the search and selection procedure is presented in figure 2.

Risk of bias assessment

The results of the risk of bias assessment are provided in table 3. Some criteria did not appear to distinguish between studies, i.e. item 1, whether the level of muscle activity before the control and experimental conditions were comparable (i.e. an equal baseline) and item 4, whether unintentionally an extra motor component was introduced by the experimental manipulation. Regarding item 1, none of the articles reported whether there were differences in baseline EMG measurements (even though it was measured in one study). This could have biased the results in these studies. Regarding item 4, none of the studies unintentionally introduced an extra motor component in the experimental manipulation. This issue has not influenced the results.

Thirteen studies had a total score below 60% of the maximum score and in 12 studies the total score was above 60%, indicating a low risk of bias that could have affected the results in these studies.

Meta-analysis

Nine articles could not be included in the meta-analysis, for several reasons. Data from the field study could not be used in the meta-analysis, because the level of stress was not a dichotomous variable but expressed on a scale, ranging from 0-100 (28). Four laboratory studies were excluded from the meta-analysis because insufficient information on standard deviations, standard errors, 95% confidence intervals or p-values was reported for pooling. Four other studies were excluded for other reasons: 1) only static EMG values (i.e. 5th percentile) were reported (38), 2) data could not be read accurately from the figure presented (34), and 3) the experimental manipulation was not valid for our comparison (16;19). As to the latter reason, one of the experimental manipulations concerned increased mouse gain (across different target sizes), to enhance movement precision, but this resulted in reduced mouse movement at the same time. The other experimental manipulation (i.e. simulated office noise) had an opposite effect as intended; during office noise participants reported a lower level of perceived stress and were more in control. Also, their level of arousal seemed lower compared to the control condition, based on measurements of heart rate, blood pressure, and cortisol. In the data extraction table (table 2), inclusion in the meta-analysis or reason for exclusion is reported.

Finally, laboratory data of 16 studies, reported in 19 different articles, were included in the meta-analysis (12-15;19;20;27;29-31;33;35;36;39-41;43-46). In three cases, two articles were combined because the reported EMG data concerned the same study population and the same experiment.




Figure 2. Flow-chart of the search and selection procedure of the studies

Table 3. Results risk of bias assessment, in which 1 is a full point, ½ is half a point, 0 is no point, and NA is not applicable

Authors	Internal validity (measurements)		Internal validity (intervention)			Sub-score (%) [§]	External validity			Sub-score (%) [§]	Total score (%) ^{§§}
	1	2	3a	3b	4		5a	5b	5c		
Blangsted et al. 2003**	?	NA	NA	1	1	67	½	1	1	83	75
Leyman et al. 2004	?	1	1	0	1	60	1	1	1	100	75
Rietveld et al. 2007	?	0	1	1	1	60	1	1	1	100	75
Ekberg et al. 1995 (main)	?	1	1	0	1	60	½	1	1	83	69
Gerard et al. 2002	?	1	1	0	1	60	½	1	1	83	69
Hughes et al. 2007	?	1	1	0	1	60	½	1	1	83	69
Szeto et al. 2005**	?	0	1	1	1	60	½	1	1	83	69
Wahlström et al. 2002	?	0	1	1	1	60	½	1	1	83	69
Wang et al. 2011	?	0	1	1	1	60	½	1	1	83	69
Alkjaer et al., 2005	?	1	1	0	1	60	½	1	½	67	63
Blangsted et al. 2004	?	0	½	1	1	50	½	1	1	83	63
Ekberg et al. 1995 (pilot)	?	1	1	0	1	60	½	1	½	67	63
Visser et al. 2004	?	1	½	½	1	60	1	0	1	67	63
Kristiansen et al. 2009	?	1	0	1	1	60	½	0	1	50	56
Laursen et al. 2002	?	1	½	1	1	70	½	½	0	33	56
McLean and Urquhart 2002	?	0	1	0	1	40	½	1	1	83	56
Schnoz et al. 2000	?	0	1	1	1	60	½	0	1	50	56
Szeto and Lin 2011**	?	1	½	½	1	60	½	0	1	50	56
Waersted et al. 1994***	?	1	1	0	1	60	½	0	1	50	56
Westad et al. 2004; Westgaard et al. 2006*	?	0	1	0	1	40	1	½	1	83	56
Bloemsaat et al. 2005	?	1	½	0	1	50	½	0	1	50	50
Finsen et al. 2001;2001*	?	0	1	0	1	40	½	½	1	67	50
Johnston et al. 2008	?	0	1	0	1	40	½	½	1	67	50
Sandfeld and Jensen 2005	?	1	?	0	1	40	1	0	½	50	44
Laursen et al. 2000;2001*	?	1	?	0	1	40	½	0	0	17	31
Waersted et al. 1991	?	0	½	0	1	30	½	0	0	17	25

§: (number of points scored divided by the maximum number of points for the particular category)*100%

§§: (number of points scored on all items divided by the maximum number of points)*100%

*: data in the two publications concern the same study population and the same experiment and are therefore combined

** : subgroup of total study population that is of interest

***: experiment 1 included only

Effects of workplace stressors on muscle activity

Overall effect of the combined stressor categories on neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity (Level 1 analysis)

In the overall meta-analysis, all stressor categories were combined. Ninety five (95) individual effect sizes were synthesized, yielding a statistically significant, medium increase in muscle activity of the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles; Hedges' $g = 0.35$ ($p=0.00$) (figure 3). The level of heterogeneity was high and significant ($I^2=80\%$, $Q=73.46$, $p=0.00$), indicating that moderating variables are present within this group of experimental manipulations, and implying that additional subgroup analyses would be relevant.

All laboratory studies that could not be included in the meta-analyses found an increased muscle activity as a result of induced stress, while in the only field study this effect was not confirmed.

Subgroup effect of the combined stressor categories stratified for neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity (Level 2 analysis)

When examining the effect of all stressor categories on muscle activity stratified to body region (i.e. neck-shoulder muscles and forearm muscles), the effect remained medium; Hedges' $g = 0.39$ ($p=0.00$) and 0.33 ($p=0.00$) for the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles, respectively (figure 3). Heterogeneity decreased to moderate in the neck-shoulder subgroup ($I^2=42\%$), and was not significant according to the Q-test ($Q=19.05$, $p=0.06$). In the forearm subgroup heterogeneity remained high ($I^2=84\%$, $Q=56.27$, $p=0.00$).

One study that could not be included in the meta-analysis examined the effect of precision on both neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity, and found a positive effect on forearm muscle activity only.

Subgroup effect of stratified stressor categories on neck-shoulder muscle activity (Level 3a analyses)

The data extraction table (table 4) reports what stressor category a study was assigned to. The effect of stress on neck-shoulder muscle activity was somewhat smaller for non-task interfering cognitive and emotional stressors than for task interfering work pace stressors; Hedges' g of 0.32 ($p=0.00$) and 0.40 , ($p=0.00$), respectively (figure 4). A difference in level of heterogeneity was found for both subgroups, moderate but not significant in the cognitive/emotional stress subgroup ($I^2=54\%$, $Q=10.77$, $p=0.06$), and absent in the subgroup with work pace stressors ($I^2=0\%$, $Q=1.70$, $p=0.64$). Performing a subgroup analysis of the neck-shoulder subgroup involving precision as stressor was not possible, because only two studies were included.

When including only those studies in which movement velocity was not decreased during the cognitive and emotional stress interventions, the Hedges' g slightly increased from 0.32 ($p=0.03$) to 0.37 ($p=0.02$) (figure 4). Heterogeneity was high, $I^2 = 69\%$ ($Q=9.74$, $p=0.02$).




Figure 3. Overall effect of stress on muscle activity of the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles, and the effect on the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles separately. *: data in the two publications concern the same study population and the same experiment and are therefore combined; **: experiment 1 included only




Figure 4. Effect of cognitive/emotional stress and increased work pace on neck-shoulder muscle activity. *: data in the two publications concern the same study population and the same experiment and are therefore combined; **: experiment 1 included only

Four studies that could not be included in the meta-analysis examined the effect of cognitive/emotional stress on neck-shoulder muscle activity. All four studies found an increased muscle activity as a result of the stressor. The one field study that could not be included in the meta-analysis, did not find a statistically significant effect on neck-shoulder muscle activity in workers with high workplace stress.

Subgroup effect of stratified stressor categories on forearm muscle activity (Level 3b analyses)

A small, but not significant, effect of cognitive and emotional stressors was found on forearm muscle activity, Hedges' $g = 0.18$ ($p=0.22$), whereas for work pace and precision stressors medium effects were found with Hedges' g of 0.40 ($p=0.09$) and 0.39 ($p=0.00$), respectively (figure 5). Except for the subgroup with precision as stressor, heterogeneity was high (cognitive/emotional stress $I^2=87\%$, $Q=31.57$, $p=0.00$; work pace $I^2=92\%$, $Q=24.91$, $p=0.00$; precision $I^2=41\%$, $Q=3.38$, $p=0.19$).

When selecting only those studies in which movement velocity did not decrease as a result of the cognitive and emotional stress intervention, the Hedges' g changed from 0.18 ($p=0.22$) in the overall analyses into 0.36 ($p=0.00$) in the analyses in which only studies were selected in which this adaptation strategy did not occur. Also, heterogeneity decreased and was not present in this latter subgroup analysis, I^2 was 87% and changed into 0% ($Q=1.62$, $p=0.44$).

Two studies that could not be included in the meta-analysis, examined the effect of increased work pace on forearm muscle activity. Both studies found an increased muscle activity.

Sensitivity analysis

To assess whether the results of the meta-analysis were affected by bias, we compared the results of studies with a relatively low risk of bias (i.e. a total score $\geq 60\%$ in the risk of bias assessment) to the results of studies with a higher risk of bias (total score $< 60\%$). This sensitivity analysis revealed a smaller effect size for the studies with a relatively low risk of bias (9 studies) than for the studies with a higher risk of bias (7 studies), Hedges' g of 0.24 ($p=0.01$) and 0.53 ($p=0.00$), respectively.

Publication bias

From the visual inspection of a funnel plot, it was concluded that the results were unlikely to be adversely affected by publication bias, indicated by a symmetrical distribution of the studies and the unchanged effect size when adjusted for missing studies.




Figure 5. Effect of cognitive/emotional stress, increased work pace, and increased precision on forearm muscle activity. *: data in the two publications concern the same study population and the same experiment and are therefore combined

4. DISCUSSION

Summary of main results




Figure 6. Summary of effect sizes and heterogeneity per subgroup. H'g: Hedges' *g*; DMV: Decreased movement velocity; *: Significant difference $p < 0.05$

The aim of this review was to summarize the evidence for the relationship of workplace stressors and an increased muscle activity in the neck-shoulder and forearm region during (simulated) computer work. The meta-analysis, combining the effects of all types of stress interventions, yielded a medium significant effect on muscle activity of the neck-shoulder and forearm muscles. In line with this finding, all 8 laboratory studies that were not included in the meta-analyses found an increased muscle activity as a result of induced stress. However, the only field study, which was not included in the meta-analyses, did not confirm this effect.

In answer to our second research question, neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity were not differently affected by non-task interfering stressors, such as cognitive and/or emotional demands, and task interfering stressors, such as an increased work pace and/or precision.

Interpretation of results

We expected that neck-shoulder muscle activity would be less affected by task-interfering stressors than forearm muscles, because the main function of these muscles is to control posture and they are not directly involved in the operational movements during computer

work. However, it can be argued that having people work fast or precisely, would also have effects that are not directly task related. It is likely that instructing people to increase their work pace or level of precision would simultaneously increase their level of arousal, which was also suggested by Visser and co-workers (41). Two of the four studies included in the work pace subgroup, reported the level of arousal (measured by heart rate and blood pressure), and indeed found it to be increased in the experimental condition (44-46). Possibly both stress types induce a similar increase in arousal. This could explain the medium increase in neck-shoulder muscle activity as a result of task interfering stress that we found, which was comparable to the effect of the non-task interfering stress.

Furthermore, we hypothesized that forearm muscle activity would be mainly increased by task interfering stressors, because the forearm muscles are controlling the operating hands during the performance of a computer task. As expected, task interfering stress led to a medium increase in forearm muscle activity. Unexpectedly, non-task interfering stressors also revealed a medium increase in forearm muscle activity. This could be explained by the neuromotor noise theory (47). It has been suggested that cognitive and emotional stressors increase neuromotor noise, resulting in a larger kinematic variability during task performance. In order to meet task demands, such as higher precision, this kinematic variability needs to be suppressed, which can be done by increasing limb stiffness through co-contraction of the agonist and antagonist muscles (48). In this way, higher forearm muscle activity may not only be the result of task interfering stressors, but may also indirectly be the result of higher cognitive and emotional stressors.

The level of statistical heterogeneity of our main result was high according to the I^2 index ($I^2=80\%$), indicating that the effects on muscle activity differed across studies. In our main analysis, all different stressor types, computer tasks, and muscles (e.g. neck-shoulder muscles, forearm extensors, and flexors) from the individual studies were grouped together. It is likely that there are still underlying variables present within this group, that are responsible for increasing or reducing the effect on muscle activity. We tried to eliminate the effects of such potential underlying, moderating variables by performing additional subgroup analyses. This was successful in some cases. For example, the subgroup analysis of work pace stressors on neck-shoulder muscle activity resulted in a statistically homogeneous group. All four studies that we included in this group examined a highly comparable stress intervention and computer task (i.e. an increased typing speed during copy typing). Additionally, selecting only studies in which movement velocity was not decreased as an adaptation strategy for cognitive and emotional stressors, resulted in a large drop of heterogeneity (from 87% to 0%) for forearm muscle activity.

Bias of included studies

Overall, the risk of bias of the included studies was rather low, since more than half of the studies scored more than 60% in the risk of bias assessment. When comparing the results of studies with a high and lower quality of evidence (i.e. low and higher risk of bias), we saw a decrease of our overall effect for the studies with a high quality of evidence (Hedges' g 0.35 \rightarrow 0.24) and an increase of the overall effect for the studies with a lower quality of

evidence (Hedges' g 0.35 \rightarrow 0.53). The two groups mainly differed on one item, i.e. the computer task performed. The group of studies with a lower risk of bias, examined more realistic and complex computer tasks (e.g. copy typing with ten fingers, data-entry on numerical part of the keyboard with dominant hand, and realistic mouse tasks). In the group of studies with a higher risk of bias more simple and constrained computer tasks were used (e.g. key presses with one finger, data-entry with one finger, and structured mouse tasks at predefined speed). As a result, in the first group participants had more freedom in task performance and thereby more possibilities to adapt their task performance to cope with the stressor. Given the above results, the results reported in this review may be an overestimation of the effect of workplace stressors on muscle activity in real life.

Strengths and limitations

Several strengths of the present review are noteworthy. To our knowledge, this is the first review to summarize the evidence of the effect of workplace stressors, mostly simulated in a laboratory setting, on neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity. Furthermore, to avoid sources of bias in the review process, two reviewers independently selected studies for inclusion, performed the risk of bias assessment, and extracted the data that were used in the meta-analyses. Especially data extraction was not always straightforward, because different choices to define the reference and experimental conditions could be made. Sometimes multiple stress levels or multiple interventions were tested in one study. Only in 8 cases of in total 95 cases, different reference and experimental conditions were defined by the two reviewers. Agreement was reached in a consensus meeting. Overall, agreement on selection, risk of bias assessment, and data extraction was high and therefore we do not expect that this biased our results much. Moreover, the criteria for including studies in this review were strict. In this way the studies that were grouped together in the meta-analyses can be considered as homogeneous in terms of experimental design. Therefore, despite a high level of statistical heterogeneity in some analyses, we are of the opinion that the observed effect can still be interpreted as relevant.

A first limitation in this review concerns our inability to include all studies in the meta-analyses because insufficient information on muscle activity data was reported. Also, in four articles muscle activity needed to be read from figures, which was somewhat inaccurate. However, as mentioned above, data extraction was done independently by both reviewers and differed little between the two. Furthermore, data of field studies are lacking in this review. Only one field study could be included, which may negatively have influenced the generalizability of our results to the actual workplace. A last limitation is that this review mainly reports effects of individual stressors, whereas in a realistic work setting most often a combination of stressors will be present.

Unfortunately, the clinical relevance of the increase in muscle activity remains unclear, since the effect size (Hedges' g) can not be transformed into physiologically interpretable units (such as %MVC). However, following the Cinderella hypothesis (49), even small increases in muscle activity could lead to a serious burden for small muscle fibers that are continuously active. The overload of muscle fibers can cause muscle damage and eventually chronic pain (50).

Based on the current findings, it is difficult to predict the effect of workplace stressors in a realistic work setting, since only one field study was included. In the sensitivity analysis we found that for laboratory studies with more realistic work tasks the effect size was lower than for laboratory studies using more constrained work tasks. Realistic computer tasks are likely to provide more possibilities to cope with stressors, therefore resulting in a lower increase of muscle activity. However, it can be questioned whether it is possible to adapt task performance to cope with the stressors in the real work setting. For example, in the case of high time pressure, decreasing work pace might not be an appropriate adaptation strategy, and muscle activity may be even higher than found in this review. Because results from field studies are lacking, future field studies on this topic are needed.

Moreover, large inter-individual differences in muscle activity as a response to stressors have been found (13;42;51). It has been indicated that high motivation increases the effect of workplace stressors on muscle activity (9;43), making it plausible that the increase in muscle activity will be larger for people with high motivation for their job compared to people with low motivation. This would mean that our findings might be an underestimation for highly motivated individuals. However, hardly any of the included studies studied motivational aspects or personality traits, and therefore, determining the moderating effect of motivation to perform well or personality on the effect of workplace stressors on muscle activity is currently impossible. Therefore, it is recommended that future field studies include the aspect of motivation and participants with different personality traits.

Conclusion

Simulated workplace stressors resulted in a medium increase in neck-shoulder and forearm muscle activity. No indications were found that different types of stressors affect muscle activity in these body regions differently.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the EMGO⁺ Travel Grant of the EMGO⁺ institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, and was funded in part by the CDC/NIOSH grant R01-OH-08781 (PI: Dennerlein).

REFERENCES

- (1) De Kraker H, Blatter BM. Prevalentcijfers van RSI-klachten en het voorkomen van risicofactoren in 15 Europese landen. (*Prevalence of RSI-complaints and the occurrence of risk factors in 15 European countries*). Tijdschrift voor Gezondheidswetenschappen 2005;83:25-35.
- (2) Blatter BM, Houtman I, Van den Bossche S, Kraan K, van den Heuvel S. Health damage and costs of RSI and psychosocial work load in The Netherlands: Report on demand of The Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. 2005.
- (3) Bongers PM, Ijmker S, van den Heuvel S, Blatter BM. Epidemiology of work related neck and upper limb problems: psychosocial and personal risk factors (part I) and effective interventions from a bio behavioural perspective (part II). J Occup Rehabil 2006 Sep;16(3):279-302.
- (4) Bongers PM, Kremer AM, ter Laak J. Are psychosocial factors, risk factors for symptoms and signs of the shoulder, elbow, or hand/wrist?: A review of the epidemiological literature. Am J Ind Med 2002 May;41(5):315-42.
- (5) Karasek R, Brisson C, Kawakami N, Houtman I, Bongers P, Amick B. The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. J Occup Health Psychol 1998 Oct;3(4):322-55.
- (6) Siegrist J, Klein D, Voigt KH. Linking sociological with physiological data: the model of effort-reward imbalance at work. Acta Physiol Scand Suppl 1997;640:112-6.
- (7) Harrington CB, Feuerstein M. Workstyle in office workers: ergonomic and psychological reactivity to work demands. J Occup Environ Med 2010 Apr;52(4):375-82.
- (8) Bloemsaat JG, Meulenbroek RGJ, van Galen GP. Differential effects of mental load on proximal and distal arm muscle activity. Exp Brain Res 2005 Dec;167(4):622-34.
- (9) Waersted M, Westgaard RH. Attention-related muscle activity in different body regions during VDU work with minimal physical activity. Ergonomics 1996 Apr;39(4):661-76.
- (10) Waersted M. Human muscle activity related to non-biomechanical factors in the workplace. Eur J Appl Physiol 2000 Oct;83(2-3):151-8.
- (11) Ijmker S, Huysmans MA, Blatter BM, van der Beek AJ, van Mechelen W, Bongers PM. Should office workers spend fewer hours at their computer? A systematic review of the literature. Occup Environ Med 2007 Apr;64(4):211-22.
- (12) Laursen B, Jensen BR, Garde AH, Jorgensen AH. Effect of mental and physical demands on muscular activity during the use of a computer mouse and a keyboard. Scand J Work Environ Health 2002 Aug;28(4):215-21.
- (13) Mclean L, Urquhart N. The influence of psychological stressors on myoelectrical signal activity in the shoulder region during a data entry task. Work Stress 2002;16(2):138-53.

- (14) Wahlstrom J, Hagberg M, Johnson PW, Svensson J, Rempel D. Influence of time pressure and verbal provocation on physiological and psychological reactions during work with a computer mouse. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2002 Jul;87(3):257-63.
- (15) Blangsted AK, Sogaard K, Christensen H, Sjogaard G. The effect of physical and psychosocial loads on the trapezius muscle activity during computer keying tasks and rest periods. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2004 Mar;91(2-3):253-8.
- (16) Sandfeld J, Jensen BR. Effect of computer mouse gain and visual demand on mouse clicking performance and muscle activation in a young and elderly group of experienced computer users. *Appl Ergon* 2005 Sep;36(5):547-55.
- (17) Westgaard RH. Muscle activity as a releasing factor for pain in the shoulder and neck. *Cephalalgia* 1999 Dec;19 Suppl 25:1-8.
- (18) Avin KG, Frey Law LA. Age-related differences in muscle fatigue vary by contraction type: a meta-analysis. *Phys Ther* 2011 Aug;91(8):1153-65.
- (19) Kristiansen J, Mathiesen L, Nielsen PK, Hansen AM, Shibuya H, Petersen HM, et al. Stress reactions to cognitively demanding tasks and open-plan office noise. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2009 Apr;82(5):631-41.
- (20) Rietveld S, van Beest I, Kamphuis JH. Stress-induced muscle effort as a cause of repetitive strain injury? *Ergonomics* 2007 Dec;50(12):2049-58.
- (21) Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to Meta-analysis*. Chichester, West Sussex, United Kingdom: John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2009.
- (22) Lipsey MW. *Design Sensitivity: Statistical Power for Experimental Research*. London, England: Sage Publications Ltd.; 1990.
- (23) Mathiassen SE, Burdorf A, van der Beek AJ. Statistical power and measurement allocation in ergonomic intervention studies assessing upper trapezius EMG amplitude. A case study of assembly work. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2002 Feb;12(1):45-57.
- (24) Birch L, Juul-Kristensen B, Jensen C, Finsen L, Christensen H. Acute response to precision, time pressure and mental demand during simulated computer work. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2000 Aug;26(4):299-305.
- (25) Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003 Sep 6;327(7414):557-60.
- (26) Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics* 2000 Jun;56(2):455-63.
- (27) Alkjaer T, Pilegaard M, Bakke M, Jensen BR. Effect of aging on performance, muscle activation and perceived stress during mentally demanding computer tasks. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2005 Apr;31(2):152-9.

- (28) Blangsted AK, Hansen K, Jensen C. Muscle activity during computer-based office work in relation to self-reported job demands and gender. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2003 May;89(3-4):352-8.
- (29) Ekberg K, Eklund J, Tuveesson MA, Ortengren R, Odenrick P, Ericson M. Psychological stress and muscle activity during data entry at visual display units. *Work Stress* 1995;9(4):475-90.
- (30) Finsen L, Sogaard K, Jensen C, Borg V, Christensen H. Muscle activity and cardiovascular response during computer-mouse work with and without memory demands. *Ergonomics* 2001 Nov 15;44(14):1312-29.
- (31) Finsen L, Sogaard K, Christensen H. Influence of memory demand and contra lateral activity on muscle activity. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2001 Oct;11(5):373-80.
- (32) Gerard MJ, Armstrong TJ, Martin BJ, Rampel DA. The effects of work pace on within-participant and between-participant keying force, electromyography, and fatigue. *Hum Factors* 2002;44(1):51-61.
- (33) Hughes LE, Babski-Reeves K, Smith-Jackson T. Effects of psychosocial and individual factors on physiological risk factors for upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders while typing. *Ergonomics* 2007 Feb;50(2):261-74.
- (34) Johnston V, Jull G, Darnell R, Jimmieson NL, Souvlis T. Alterations in cervical muscle activity in functional and stressful tasks in female office workers with neck pain. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2008 Jun;103(3):253-64.
- (35) Laursen B, Jensen BR. Shoulder muscle activity in young and older people during a computer mouse task. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2000;15 Suppl 1:S30-S33.
- (36) Laursen B, Jensen BR, Ratkevicius A. Performance and muscle activity during computer mouse tasks in young and elderly adults. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2001 Apr;84(4):329-36.
- (37) Leyman E, Mirka G, Kaber D, Sommerich C. Cervicobrachial muscle response to cognitive load in a dual-task scenario. *Ergonomics* 2004 May 15;47(6):625-45.
- (38) Schnoz M, Laubli T, Krueger H. Co-activity of the trapezius and upper arm muscles with finger tapping at different rates and trunk postures. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2000 Oct;83(2-3):207-14.
- (39) Szeto GPY, Straker LM, O'Sullivan PB. The effects of speed and force of keyboard operation on neck-shoulder muscle activities in symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers. *Int J Ind Ergon* 2005;35(5):429-44.
- (40) Szeto GPY, Lin JKM. A study of forearm muscle activity and wrist kinematics in symptomatic office workers performing mouse-clicking tasks with different precision and speed demands. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2011 Feb;21(1):59-66.

- (41) Visser B, de Looze M, De Graaff M, van Dieen J. Effects of precision demands and mental pressure on muscle activation and hand forces in computer mouse tasks. *Ergonomics* 2004 Feb 5;47(2):202-17.
- (42) Waersted M, Bjorklund RA, Westgaard RH. Shoulder muscle tension induced by two VDU-based tasks of different complexity. *Ergonomics* 1991 Feb;34(2):137-50.
- (43) Waersted M, Bjorklund RA, Westgaard RH. The effect of motivation on shoulder-muscle tension in attention-demanding tasks. *Ergonomics* 1994 Feb;37(2):363-76.
- (44) Wang Y, Szeto GP, Chan CC. Effects of physical and mental task demands on cervical and upper limb muscle activity and physiological responses during computer tasks and recovery periods. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2011 Mar 16.
- (45) Westad C, Mork PJ, Westgaard RH. Firing patterns of low-threshold trapezius motor units in feedback-controlled contractions and vocational motor activities. *Exp Brain Res* 2004 Oct;158(4):465-73.
- (46) Westgaard RH, Bonato P, Westad C. Respiratory and stress-induced activation of low-threshold motor units in the human trapezius muscle. *Exp Brain Res* 2006 Nov;175(4):689-701.
- (47) Van Gemmert AW, Van Galen GP. Stress, neuromotor noise, and human performance: a theoretical perspective. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 1997 Oct;23(5):1299-313.
- (48) Selen LPJ, Beek PJ, van Dieen JH. Can co-activation reduce kinematic variability? A simulation study. *Biol Cybern* 2005 Nov;93(5):373-81.
- (49) Hagg GM. Comparison of different estimators of electromyographic spectral shifts during work when applied on short test contractions. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 1991 Sep;29(5):511-6.
- (50) Visser B, van Dieen JH. Pathophysiology of upper extremity muscle disorders. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2006 Feb;16(1):1-16.
- (51) Westgard RH, Jensen C, Nilsen K. Muscle coordination and choice-reaction time tests as indicators of occupational muscle load and shoulder-neck complaints. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1993;67(2):106-14.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A. Search strategy in PubMed

Search	PubMed 04-04-2011	Result
#10	Search #9 NOT (animals[mh] NOT humans[mh])	2673
#9	Search #8 NOT (“addresses”[Publication Type] OR “biography”[Publication Type] OR “comment”[Publication Type] OR “directory”[Publication Type] OR “editorial”[Publication Type] OR “festschrift”[Publication Type] OR “interview”[Publication Type] OR “lectures”[Publication Type] OR “legal cases”[Publication Type] OR “legislation”[Publication Type] OR “letter”[Publication Type] OR “news”[Publication Type] OR “newspaper article”[Publication Type] OR “patient education handout”[Publication Type] OR “popular works”[Publication Type] OR “congresses”[Publication Type] OR “consensus development conference”[Publication Type] OR “consensus development conference, nih”[Publication Type] OR “practice guideline”[Publication Type])	3060
#8	Search #6 OR #7	3065
#7	Search #1 AND #4 AND #5	840
#6	Search #1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #5	2673
#5	Search “Mental Competency”[Mesh] OR “Mental Health”[Mesh] OR “Mental Processes”[Mesh] OR “Personal Autonomy”[Mesh] OR “Psychology, Applied”[Mesh] OR “Psychophysiology”[Mesh] OR “Job Satisfaction”[Mesh] OR “job satisfaction”[tiab] OR “time pressure”[tiab] OR “verbal provocation”[tiab] OR “verbal provocations”[tiab] OR precision[tiab] OR cognitive[tiab] OR cognition[tiab] OR stroop[tiab] OR mental[tiab] OR multitask[tiab] OR “memory demand”[tiab] OR “decision demand”[tiab] OR “memory demands”[tiab] OR “decision demands”[tiab] OR pace[tiab] OR pacing[tiab] OR stressor[tiab] OR “Social Environment”[Mesh] OR “social environment”[tiab] OR “social environments”[tiab] OR “psychosocial environment”[tiab] OR “psychosocial environments”[tiab] OR “reaction time”[tiab] OR “reaction-time test”[tiab] OR “psychosocial factor”[tiab] OR “psychosocial factors”[tiab] OR “psychological factor”[tiab] OR “psychological factors”[tiab] OR “psychological stress”[tiab] OR “psychological stresses”[tiab]	1452775
#4	Search “Neck Muscles”[Mesh] OR trapezius[tiab] OR trapezii[tiab] OR “extensor carpi”[tiab] OR “Head Movements”[Mesh] OR “head movement”[tiab] OR “head movements”[tiab] OR “head tilt”[tiab] OR “head tilting”[tiab] OR “head flexion”[tiab] OR “head extension”[tiab] OR “neck flexion”[tiab] OR “neck extension”[tiab] OR “shoulder rotation”[tiab] OR abduction[tiab] OR adduction[tiab] OR “arm movement”[tiab] OR “arm movements”[tiab] OR ulnar[tiab] OR radial[tiab]	77281

Appendix A. Continued

Search	PubMed 04-04-2011	Result
#3	Search "Muscle Strength"[Mesh] OR muscle[tiab] OR muscles[tiab] OR muscular[tiab] OR electromyograph*[tiab] OR EMG[tiab] OR "forward bending"[tiab] OR "side bending"[tiab] OR "Muscle Tonus"[Mesh] OR "Muscle Fatigue"[Mesh] OR "Muscle Contraction"[Mesh] OR "Recruitment, Neurophysiological"[Mesh] OR "Physical Exertion"[Mesh] OR "Adaptation, Physiological"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Exercise Tolerance"[Mesh] OR "Biomechanics"[Mesh] OR biomechanic*[tiab] OR "Kinetics"[Mesh] OR "Mechanical Processes"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Task Performance and Analysis"[Mesh] OR "Pressure"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Musculoskeletal System"[Mesh] OR musculoskeletal[tiab] OR "Posture"[Mesh:NoExp] OR posture[tiab] OR postures[tiab] OR postural[tiab] OR "Postural Balance"[Mesh] OR "Range of Motion, Articular"[Mesh] OR "range of motion"[tiab] OR "Movement"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Motor Activity"[Mesh:NoExp] OR "Myography"[Mesh] OR myograph*[tiab] OR "Work Capacity Evaluation"[Mesh] OR "Stress, Mechanical"[Mesh] OR "mechanical stress"[tiab] OR "mechanical stresses"[tiab] OR "Workload"[Mesh] OR flexion[tiab] OR extension[tiab]	2166179
#2	Search "Upper Extremity"[Mesh] OR "Upper Extremity"[tiab] OR "Upper Extremities"[tiab] OR "Upper Limb"[tiab] OR "Upper Limbs"[tiab] OR shoulder[tiab] OR shoulders[tiab] OR arm[tiab] OR arms[tiab] OR elbow[tiab] OR elbows[tiab] OR forearm*[tiab] OR wrist[tiab] OR wrists[tiab] OR hand[tiab] OR hands[tiab] OR finger[tiab] OR fingers[tiab] OR "Neck"[Mesh] OR neck[tiab] OR necks[tiab] OR head[tiab] OR heads[tiab]	754420
#1	Search "Office Automation"[Mesh] OR office OR "Computers"[Mesh] OR computer*[tiab] OR "desk work"[tiab] OR VDU[tiab] OR VDT[tiab] OR pc[tiab] OR keyboard[tiab] OR mouse[tiab] OR mousing[tiab] OR typing[tiab] OR keying[tiab] OR "professional occupation"[tiab] OR "professional occupations"[tiab] OR sitting[tiab] OR "seated position"[tiab] OR "workplace"[Mesh] OR workplace[tiab] OR workplaces[tiab] OR "Employment"[Mesh] OR employment[tiab] OR employments[tiab] OR "repetitive work"[tiab] OR "assembly work"[tiab] OR "assembly worker"[tiab] OR "assembly workers"[tiab] OR cashier[tiab] OR cashiers[tiab] OR "supermarket employee"[tiab] OR "supermarket employees"[tiab] OR "white collar work"[tiab] OR "white collar worker"[tiab] OR "white collar workers"[tiab] OR "professional worker"[tiab] OR "professional workers"[tiab] OR "static work task"[tiab] OR "static work tasks"[tiab] OR "low force work"[tiab] OR "low force task"[tiab] OR "low force tasks"[tiab]	828621