Prevalence and Risk Factors of Low Back Pain Related to Health Cost Among Health Workers: A Cross Sectional Study

Drood Ceerwan Usf[1*], Shelan Mustafa Ali[2]

[1]School of Management and Economics, University of Kurdistan, Hawler, Erbil, Iraq.
[2]General Directorate of Health Department, Ministry of Health, Erbil, Iraq.
*Correspondence to: Drood Ceerwan Usf (E-mail: dcng2d88@gmail.com)

Abstract

Objective: Healthcare workers (HCWs) experience more individual and occupational health problem than other professional groups, the most common being low back pain (LBP). Furthermore, nurses are the majority of victims who worked in different aspects at hospital which have experience with LBP. The aim of this study is to find out the prevalence of low back pain related to health cost and its associated risk factors among healthcare workers at hospitals.

Methods: Cross sectional study, a convenience sampling technique was used comprising of 302 of hardcopy questionnaires that were distributed to healthcare workers in two tertiary hospitals in Erbil, Kurdistan Region of Iraq between March 2021 to June 2021. The data were analyzed by using descriptive analytical method and Chi-square.

Results: The result showed that most of the respondents (59.3%) had experienced low back pain, with (47%) reporting LBP in present and (55.3%) revealed LBP in past 12 months. The highest prevalence was reported by nurses and the lowest amongst physiotherapist. Prolonged bad posture and lifting heavy weights were the most contributing factors of LBP. Furthermore, cost of treatment (direct cost) was significantly association with LBP.

Conclusion: Preventive and control measures should be taken to reduce the risk of lower back pain, and also taking forward steps to diminish the incidence of occupational hazards. Therefore, our findings can help to establish policies, strategies, and appropriate interventions aimed to reduce the risk onset of LBP among health care professionals.

Keywords: Low back pain, risk factors, health cost, health workers

Introduction

Healthcare workers (HCWs) are people who are engaged in actions whose primary intent is to enhance health. They make important contributions and are critical to the functioning of the most health system. Health care workers face a vast range of occupational hazard including needle stick injuries, back injuries, latex allergy, violence, and stress. HCWs are often viewed as "immune" to injury or illness. Their patients come first and they are often expected to sacrifice their own well-being for the sake of their patients. Indeed, health protecting health-care workers has the added benefit to contribute to quality patient care and health system strengthening.[1] As the health sector is one of the most unsafe sectors with regards to occupational accident and illness, the World Health Organization has stressed on the fact that home care is the main priority when it comes to preventing workplace risks.[2] A cost-of-illness (COI) study is regarded to be the most common method for estimating the burden pertaining to a specific disease on a society, COI studies can help identify as well as measure all the costs associated with a disease: indirect, direct and intangible cost.[3]

Methods

Study Design and Participant

A cross sectional study, the convenient sampling method was conducted of 302 health workers in two tertiary hospitals in Erbil city, Iraq. The study was carried out from 15th March to 1st of June 2022. The population of study consisted health workers who were currently working at Erbil cardiac center and PAR hospital included nurses, lab technicians, physiotherapist, radiology technicians, and anesthesia technicians).

Data Collection

A structured questionnaire was used for data collection by using hard copies were distributed by hand delivery to study participants who were met study inclusion criteria. The 302 hardcopy questionnaires were collected within few days then the participants had been measured their height and weight with SECA scale. The questionnaire consisted of three parts; the first part was related to demographic characteristics of HCWs, the second part was related to LBP and its associated factors and third was related to health cost. Once the questionnaires were collected from two tertiary hospitals, then questionnaires were merged togethers and entered to SPSS.

Statistical Analysis

Data analysis was carried out by using SPSS (Version 25.0) and the data was entered, coded, and checked for normality and categorized. Descriptive analysis was carried out to measure percentages and frequencies for dependent variables, Chi square was used for statistical analysis to test the relationship between dependent and independent variables.

Ethical Consideration

The study was approved from University of Kurdistan-Hawler (UKH) research ethic committee. Respondents were also informed of the objective of study and participation is voluntary and their answers will be used for the purpose of this study only.

Results

The total of 302 healthcare workers who worked the selected tertiary hospitals were included in this study. One hundred fifty-two (50.3%) of HCWs were in the age group 30–39 years old. One hundred seventy-seven (58.6%) HCWs were male. Two hundred six (68.2%) of participants were married. One hundred sixty-five (54.6%) of participants were completed medical institute. One hundred sixty-nine (56%) were suffering obese, and more than half of HCWs (69.9%) had 500,000 to 1,000,000 IQD monthly income, as shown in Table 1.

The majority of HCWs were ward nurses (24.5%) followed by operation nurse (20.9%) and ICU nurse (15.6%). More than half of HCWs (53.3%) were permanent employee. One hundred ten (36.4%) had more than 10 years of work experience. In terms of working hours per day, the highest percentage (88.7) were working more 8 hours a day, as shown in Table 2.

Based on Figure 1, it was shown that among 302 self-administered questionnaires respondents. The overall prevalence of low back pain among healthcare workers was 179 (59.3%), and 123 (40.7%) did not complain having low back pain. Therefore, one hundred forty-two (47%) of HCWs were suffering LBP in present while one hundred sixty-seven (55.3%) were complained LBP in last 12 months, as shown in Table 3.

The HCWs reported different causes of low back pain in present, prolonged bad posture (37.3%) was the major cause of LBP among HCWs. Lifting heavy weights (22.5%) was the second major cause of LBP followed by sudden movement (10.6%), lifting heavy weights and prolonged bad posture (10.6%), as depicted in Table 4. Therefore, Pain (45.8%) was the major characteristics of LBP in present among HCWs, cramps/spasm and pain/stiffness were the second and third characteristics (9.9%), (9.9%) respectively, showed in Table 5.

The association of prevalence of LBP and socio-demographic characteristics was summarized in Table 6, Age groups were more likely to complain LPB among HCWs, there was a statistically significant association found LBP in present and last 12 months ($P = 0.003$), ($P = 0.008$) respectively. Male HCWs were having LBP more than female; however, this was not statistically significant. The result also showed that married HCWs are more affected, it was statistically significant ($P = 0.001$) LBP in present ($P = 0.003$) LBP last 12 month. Although obese was more influenced than those who were normal, there was not a statistically significant ($P = 0.419$), ($P = 0.202$). Moreover, there was not statistically significant regarding the Level of education and income as well.

Although nurses were the majority of healthcare workers who worked in hospitals seemed to be more affected by LBP, there was no statistically significant found. Study also showed that permanent employee had higher proportion of LBP but both type of employee had a significant relationship with LBP in present and last 12 months ($P = 0.003$), ($P = 0.004$) respectively. Moreover, the duration of employee had a great influence amongst HCWs specially those who worked more than 5 years and above, the highest statistically significant was found in both time period ($P = <0.001$). Therefore, three quarters of HCWs had worked 8 hours and less, there was not significant relationship detected, as demonstrated in Table 7.

As clearly shown in Table 8, even though the majority 57 (31.8%) of healthcare workers did not spend expenditure for their back pain in present but there was a significant associated

observed between cost treatment and LBP. Meanwhile, there was no statistically significant association found between cost of treatment and LBP in the last 12 months ($P = 0.364$). However, majority of health workers with LPB in present 119 (66.5%), and LBP in last 12 months 144 (80.4%) from total of 179 HCWs had lost no expenditure due to low back pain. Statistical analysis showed no significant association was found between cost of absenteeism and LBP.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of HCWs

Variables	No.	(%)
Age groups (years)		
20–29	109	(36.1)
30–39	152	(50.3)
40–49	32	(10.6)
50 and older	9	(3.0)
Gender		
Male	177	(58.6)
Female	125	(41.4)
Marital Status		
Single	96	(31.8)
Married	206	(68.2)
Level of Education		
Nursing high school	8	(2.6)
Medical institute	165	(54.6)
Bachelor degree	119	(39.4)
Postgraduate degree	10	(3.3)
Body Mass Index		
Non-obese (≤ 24.9 kg/m^2)	133	(44)
Obese (≥ 25 kg/m^2)	169	(56)
Monthly Income (IQD)		
< 500,000	40	(13.2)
500,000–1,000,000	210	(69.9)
1,000,001–1,500,000	48	(15.9)
> 1,500,000	3	(1.0)
Total	**302**	**(100)**

Exchange rate 136,000 IQD = 100$.

Table 2. Distribution of working status of HCWs

| Variables	No.	(%)
Nature of Job		
Ward nurse	74	(24.5)
Operation nurse	63	(20.9)
ICU nurse	47	(15.6)
Laboratory staff	36	(11.9)
Catheter Lab. nurse	21	(7)
Anesthesia technician	20	(6.6)
Radiology staff	14	(4.6)
Physiotherapy staff	5	(1.7)
Others	22	(7.3)
Type of Employees		
Permanent	161	(53.3)
Contract	141	(46.7)
Duration of Employment		
< 5 years	102	(33.8)
5–10 years	90	(29.8)
> 10 years	110	(36.4)
Working Hours/day		
$\leq$ 8 hours	268	(88.7)
> 8 hours	34	(11.3)
Total	**302**	**(100)**

Fig. 1   **Total prevalence of low back pain among HCWs ($n = 302$).**

Table 3.   **Prevalence of low back pain**

The Characteristics	Subgroups	No.	(%)
Low back pain (Present)	Yes	142	(47)
	No	160	(53)
Total		**302**	**(100)**
Low back pain (last 12 months)	Yes	167	(55.3)
	No	135	(44.7)
Total		**302**	**(100)**

Table 4.   **Common causes of LBP in present**

Causes of Back Pain	No.	(%)
Prolonged bad posture	53	(37.3)
Lifting heavy weights	32	(22.5)
Sudden movement	15	(10.6)
Lifting heavy weights & prolonged bad posture	15	(10.6)
Diseases	8	(5.6)
Sudden movement & lifting heavy weights	7	(4.9)
Sudden movement & prolonged bad posture	5	(3.5)
Trauma	4	(2.8)
Sudden movement, lifting heavy weights & prolonged bad posture	2	(1.4)
Others factors	1	(4.9)
Total	**142**	**(100%)**

Table 5.   **Common characteristics of LBP**

Characteristics of LBP	No.	(%)
Pain	65	(45.8)
Cramps/Spasm	14	(9.9)
Pain/Stiffness	14	(9.9)
Stiffness	13	(9.2)
Numbness	11	(7.7)
Tingling	4	(2.8)
Loss of Strength	7	(4.9)
Pain and Tingling	1	(0.7)
Pain and Numbness	3	(2.1)
Numbness and Tingling	1	(0.7)
Stiffness and Cramps/spasm	1	(0.7)
Pain and loss of strength	2	(1.4)
Pain, Stiffness and Cramps/spasm	4	(2.8)
Stiffness, Numbness and Tingling	2	(1.4)
Total	**142**	**(100%)**

Discussions

In the current study, the present prevalence and last 12 months prevalence of LBP were found 47% and 55.3%, respectively, which was similarly to another study that was conducted by Khudhir et al at Koya Technical Institute, reported that the prevalence of LBP was slightly higher among staff during the past 12 months was 61.4%, and another study is also reported the prevalence of LBP is much higher among nurses (73.5%) in Nigeria; as well as annual prevalence of LBP was 56.9% and life time prevalence was 72.5% in Malaysia.[4,5] Furthermore, the study indicated that the prevalence of lifetime LBP was 51% among adults in Afyon region in Turkey.[6] However, the result of study reported that the prevalence of LBP among hospital employees in South Africa was much lower 47%, compare to present study and prevalence of LBP among teachers in China was reported as 45.6%.[7,8] Similarly, the prevalence of LBP in past 12 months was quite lower 41.4 % among Adam Hospital Medical College employees in Ethiopia.[9]

In this study, the prevalence of LBP in male was higher compare to female with no significance association, this finding was contrary with another study reported the gender-associated risk of LBP.[10] While a survey demonstrated that LBP has been shown to be more common among female than male among public office workers in Greek with significance associated, and also in UK which showed the incidence of LBP in female were much higher than male.[11,12] Age in this study, 30–39 had more likely to have LBP compare to other age groups with significance associated similar to another study which was performed, noted that LBP was common among younger age group.[5] In contrast, in US reported that LBP were more common among older age groups. in this survey married workers were the most popular participants to have back pain with significant association while another study reported that single persons were significantly more likely than those married persons to report LBP.[13] In support to current study in Iran showed that married respondents were significantly higher than unmarried respondents to have LBP.[14] Level of education showed that medical institute graduation and bachelor degree were more likely to have backache with close to current study reported the majority of nurses (91%) had completed bachelor's degree, while another study revealed that lower educations were significantly more disabled due to back pain than people with high education backgrounds.[15,16]

This study also found no significant association between BMI and LBP, though the majority of respondents were obese. In comparison, the study reported that obesity positively associated with presence of LBP in adult.[14] Likewise, a researcher have revealed that obesity is a risk dominant risk factor for LBP.[17] Similarly, another study indicated that obesity has been shown as risk factor for disc degeneration and may increase the prevalence of LBP.[18] Regarding to monthly income, in present study most of the HCWs received low to middle income per month with no significant association to LBP, in parallel with another study done in Japan showed that lower socioeconomic were more likely to suffer from LBP compared with that for the highest.[19]

Nurses in this survey were the majority of HCWs with a significant associated with LBP similar to a study, showed

Table 6. **Association between socio-demographic characteristics and LBP**

Variables	Total	LBP in Present		P value	LBP last 12 months		P value
	No. (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)		Yes (%)	No (%)	
Age groups (years)							
20–29	109 (36.1)	36 (12.0)	73 (24.1)		46 (15.2)	63 (20.8)	
30–39	152 (50.3)	83 (27.5)	69 (22.8)		95 (31.4)	57 (18.8)	
40–49	32 (10.6)	17 (5.6)	15 (5.0)	0.003	20 (6.6)	12 (4.0)	0.008
≥ 50	9 (3.0)	6 (1.2)	3 (1.0)		6 (2.0)	3 (1.0)	
Gender							
Male	177 (58.6)	84 (27.8)	93 (30.7)		93 (30.8)	84 (27.8)	
Female	125 (41.4)	58 (19.2)	67 (22.2)	0.907	74 (24.5)	51 (16.9)	0.291
Marital Status							
Single	96 (31.8)	32 (10.6)	64 (21.1)		41 (13.6)	55 (18.2)	
Married	206 (68.2)	110 (36.4)	96 (31.7)	0.001	126 (41.7)	80 (26.4)	0.003
Level of Education							
Nursing high school	8 (2.6)	2 (0.6)	6 (2.0)		3 (1.0)	5 (1.6)	
Medical institute	165 (54.6)	82 (27.1)	83 (27.4)		93 (30.7)	72 (23.8)	
Bachelor degree	119 (39.4)	55 (18.2)	64 (21.2)	0.358	67 (22.1)	52 (17.2)	0.553
Postgraduate degree	10 (3.3)	3 (1.0)	7 (2.3)		4 (1.3)	6 (2.0)	
BMI							
Non-Obese	133 (44%)	59 (19.5)	74 (24.5)		68 (22.5)	65 (21.5)	
Obese	169 (56%)	83 (27.5)	86 (28.5)	0.419	99 (32.8)	70 (23.2)	0.202
Income (IQD)							
< 500,000	40 (13.2)	15 (5.0)	25 (8.3)		20 (6.6)	20 (6.6)	
500,000–1,000,000	211 (69.9)	101 (33.4)	110 (36.4)		117 (38.7)	94 (31.1)	
1,000,000–1,500,000	48 (15.9)	25 (8.3)	23 (7.6)	0.525	28 (9.2)	20 (6.6)	0.851
> 1,500,000	3 (1.0)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.6)		2 (0.6)	1 (0.3)	
Total	302 (100%)	142 (47)	160 (52.9)		167 (55.3)	135 (44.7)	

Table 7. **Association between working status and LBP**

Variables	Total	LBP in Present		P value	LBP last 12 months		P value
	No. (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)		Yes (%)	No (%)	
Nature of Job							
Intensive care nurse	47 (15.6)	26 (8.6)	21 (6.9)		28 (9.2)	19 (6.2)	
Operation nurse	63 (20.9)	32 (10.5)	31 (10.2)		42 (13.9)	21 (6.9)	
Ward nurse	74 (24.5)	29 (9.6)	45 (14.9)	0.370	27 (8.9)	47 (15.5)	0.032
Cath. lab nurse	21 (7.0)	11 (3.6)	10 (3.3)		13 (4.3)	8 (2.6)	
Laboratory staff	36 (11.9)	13 (4.3)	23 (7.6)		21 (6.9)	15 (4.9)	
Physiotherapist	5 (1.7)	4 (1.3)	1 (0.3)		4 (1.3)	1 (0.3)	
Radiology staff	14 (4.6)	8 (2.6)	6 (1.9)		9 (2.9)	5 (1.6)	
Anesthesia assistant	20 (6.6)	8 (2.6)	12 (3.9)		12 (3.9)	8 (2.6)	
Others	22 (7.3)	11 (3.6)	11 (3.6)		11 (3.6)	11 (3.6)	
Type of Employees							
Permanent	161 (53.3)	89 (29.4)	72 (23.8)		102 (33.7)	59 (19.5)	
Contract	141 (46.7)	53 (17.5)	88 (29.r 1)	0.003	65 (21.5)	76 (25.1)	0.004
Duration of Employment							
< 5 years	102 (33.8)	30 (9.9)	72 (23.8)		41(13.5)	61 (20.1)	
5–10 years	90 (29.8)	46 (15.2)	44 (14.5)	< 0.001	50 (16.5)	40 (13.2)	<0.001
> 10 years	110 (36.4)	66 (21.8)	44 (14.5)		76 (25.1)	34 (11.2)	
Working hours/day							
≤ 8 hours	268 (88.7)	130 (43.0)	138 (45.6)		151 (50.0)	117 (38.7)	
> 8 hours	34 (11.3)	12 (4.0)	22 (7.3)	0.201	16 (5.3)	18 (5.9)	0.361
Total	302 (100%)	142 (47)	160 (52.9)		167 (55.3)	135 (44.7)	

among six professional groups, the highest prevalence was in nurses, and also Omokhodion, Umar and Ogunnowo mentioned that nurses experience more LBP than other hospital workers.[20,21] Duration of employment in present study showed that workers who worked > 10 years have more likely to obtain LBP in addition with highly significant association, as well as a study by Alshahrani indicated that 58.8% of nurses had a work experience of < 10 years, whereas only 10.2% had a work experience of more than 19 years who had LBP. In contrast, based on Mukhtad and Mohamed in Libya, reported that 40% of HCWs had work experience less than or equal to 5 years related to LBP.[15,22] Working hours per a day, results of present study revealed that the majority of HCWs worked equal and less than 8 hours a day and no significant relationship was noted and likewise Atlas et al stated that 69.8% of school workers had experienced with low back pain who worked for 5–6 hours a day.[23]

Table 8. **Association between LBP in present and last 12 months with cost of illness of HCWs (*n* = 179)**

Cost of Illness (IQD)	BP in Present Yes (%) No (%)	*P* value	BP last 12 months Yes (%) No (%)	*P* value
Cost of treatment				
Nothing spent	57 (31.8) 27 (15.1)		75 (41.9) 9 (5.0)	
< 100,000	49 (27.3) 10 (5.5)		55 (30.7) 4 (2.2)	
100,000–500,000	23 (12.8) 0 (0.0)	0.005	23 (12.8) 0 (0.0)	0.364
500,000–1,000,000	6 (3.3) 0 (0.0)		6 (3.3) 0 (0.0)	
> 1,000,000	6 (3.3) 1 (0.5)		7 (3.9) 0 (0.0)	
Cost of absenteeism				
Nothing spent	119 (66.5) 37 (20.7)		144 (80.4) 12 (6.7)	
< 100,000	14 (7.8) 1 (0.5)		14 (7.8) 1 (0.5)	
100,000–200,000	3 (1.7) 0 (0.0)	0.327	3 (1.6) 0 (0.0)	0.954
200,001–500,000	1 (0.5) 0 (0.0)		1 (0.5) 0 (0.0)	
> 500,000	4 (2.2) 0 (0.0)		4 (2.2) 0 (0.0)	
Total	**141 (78.7) 38 (21.2)**		**166 (92.7) 13 (7.3)**	

Although the majority of respondent had spent nothing for medication and treatment for LBP, there was significant association between LBP and cost of treatment. A study showed that direct costs were determined to back pain related to healthcare utilizations, back pain related to hospital admission, back pain related to specialty care visits, and back pain related to radiologic procedure.[24] Whilst current findings are contrary with other studies for instance, Hong et al showed that patients with chronic LBP had a significantly higher level of 12 months drug prescription compared with those without CLBP, NSAIDs and opioids were the most common prescribed medications in the treatment of CLBP.[25] Another study revealed significantly higher resources utilization among patients with CLBP in terms of hospitalization, outpatient visits, and pharmacy prescription, meantime Zemedikun et al identified that outpatient cost was the most important cost driver in the majority of the study.[26,27] Indirect cost, this study presented that majority of HCWs did not loss any expenditure due to back pain. However, another finding was disagreed with current study findings, a study done by Tymecka-Woszczerowicz et al in Switzerland revealed that 4.4% of participants were not attend from work and 19.7% of participants claimed LBP-related presenteeism, which made up an important part of production loss, in a favor of above study Baumeister, Knecht and Hutter also assessed that chronic back pain has contributed to failure of return to work, work absence, and work related to disability.[3,24]

Limitation

In the current study, the data were self-administrated; hence, it may affect the precision of answers to the retrospective questions regarding the time and frequency of LBP. This study was conducted among healthcare workers field including nurses, laboratory staffs, anesthesia technicians and radiology staffs only, and the findings of this study may not be applicable to workers in other sectors such banking, administrative staffs and factories.

Conclusion

Lower back pain significantly affects work performance, often results in work absence, and it is quite common amongst healthcare field. The present study concentrated on particular healthcare personnel demonstrating that LBP has affected 59.3% of them. Furthermore, statistical tests showed that there was significant association between age groups, marital status, job nature in past 12 months, type of employee, duration of employment as well as cost of treatment. The variety of factors which have contributed to the prevalence of low back pain. To reduce such prevalence, it is proposed that there be educate the workers to reduce BMI, do regular exercise, reduction of the incidence of back pain through redesigning workstation according to anthropometric measure for each worker.

Declaration

Ethics Approval

The study was approved by school of management and economics at university of Kurdistan-Hawler.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding

Acknowledgement

References

1. Ghosh T. Occupational health and hazards among health care workers. International Journal of Occupational Safety and Health. 2013 Nov 4;3(1):1–4.

2. Eyi S, Eyi İ. Nursing students' occupational health and safety problems in surgical clinical practice. SAGE Open. 2020 Jan;10(1):2158244020901801. doi.org/10.1177/2158244020901801.

3. Tymecka-Woszczerowicz A, Wrona W, Kowalski PM, Hermanowski T. Indirect costs of back pain–Review. Polish Annals of Medicine. 2015 Sep 1;22(2):143–8. doi.org/10.1016/j.poamed.2015.07.003.

4. Khudhir KM, Mahmood KA, Saleh KK, Hossain M. A cross sectional study to determine the prevalence and risk factors of low back pain among public technical institute staff in Kurdistan Region, Iraq. F1000Research. 2017 Feb 23;6:182. doi.org/10.12688/f1000 research.10806.1.

5. Wong TS, Teo N, Kyaw M. Prevalence and risk factors associated with low back among health care providers in a District Hospital. Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal. 2010;4(2):23–8. doi.org/10.5704/moj.1007.004.

6. Altinel L, Kose KC, Ergan V, Isik C, Aksoy Y, Ozdemir A, Toprak D, Dogan N. The prevalence of low back pain and risk factors among adult population in Afyon region, Turkey. Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc. 2008 Nov 1;42(5):328–3. doi.org/10.3944/AOTT.2008.328.

7. Naude B. Factors associated with low back pain in hospital employees (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2008). doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28753-4_100788.

8. Yue P, Liu F, Li L. Neck/shoulder pain and low back pain among school teachers in China, prevalence and risk factors. BMC Public Health. 2012 Dec;12:1–8. doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-789.

9. Abebe AD, Gebrehiwot EM, Lema S, Abebe TW. Prevalence of low back pain and associated risk factors among Adama Hospital Medical College Staff, Ethiopia. European Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2015 Nov 20;3(6):188–92. doi.org/10.11648/j.ejpm.20150306.15.

10. Chou YC, Shih CC, Lin JG, Chen TL, Liao CC. Low back pain associated with sociodemographic factors, lifestyle and osteoporosis: a population-based study. Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine. 2013;45(1):76–80. doi.org/10.2340/16501977-1070.

11. Spyropoulos P, Papathanasiou G, Georgoudis G, Chronopoulos E, Koutis H, Koumoutsou F. Prevalence of low back pain in Greek public office workers. Pain Physician. 2007;10(5):651. doi.org/10.36076/ppj.2007/10/651.

12. Mason VL, Mathias B, Skevington SM. Accepting low back pain: is it related to a good quality of life?. The Clinical Journal of Pain. 2008 Jan 1;24(1):22–9. doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0b013e318156d94f.

13. Strine TW, Hootman JM. US national prevalence and correlates of low back and neck pain among adults. Arthritis Care & Research. 2007 May 15;57(4):656-65. doi.org/10.10art.22684.

14. Biglarian A, Seifi B, Bakhshi E, Mohammad K, Rahgozar M, Karimlou M, Serahati S. Low back pain prevalence and associated factors in Iranian population: findings from the national health survey. Pain Research and Treatment. 2012;2012(1):653060. doi.org/10.1155/2012/653060.

15. Alshahrani A. Prevalence of low back pain among nursing staff in Najran, Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional study. Medical Sciences. 2020 Oct 30;8(4):45. doi.org/10.3390/medsci8040045.

16. Fliesser M, Huberts JD, Wippert PM. Education, job position, income or multidimensional indices? Associations between different socioeconomic status indicators and chronic low back pain in a German sample: a longitudinal field study. BMJ Open. 2018 Apr 1;8(4):e020207. doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020207.

17. Shiri R, Karppinen J, Leino-Arjas P, Solovieva S, Viikari-Juntura E. The association between obesity and low back pain: a meta-analysis. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2010 Jan 15;171(2):135–54. doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwp356.

18. Liuke M, Solovieva S, Lamminen A, Luoma K, Leino-Arjas P, Luukkonen R, Riihimäki H. Disc degeneration of the lumbar spine in relation to overweight. International Journal of Obesity. 2005 Aug;29(8):903–8. doi.org/10.1038/sj.ijo.0802974.

19. Ikeda T, Sugiyama K, Aida J, Tsuboya T, Watabiki N, Kondo K, Osaka K. Socioeconomic inequalities in low back pain among older people: the JAGES cross-sectional study. International Journal for Equity in Health. 2019 Dec;18:1–1. doi. org/10.1186/s12939-019-0918-1.

20. Karahan A, Kav S, Abbasoglu A, Dogan N. Low back pain: prevalence and associated risk factors among hospital staff. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2009 Mar;65(3):516–24. doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04905.x.

21. Omokhodion FO, Umar US, Ogunnowo BE. Prevalence of low back pain among staff in a rural hospital in Nigeria. Occupational Medicine. 2000 Feb 1;50(2):107–10. doi.org/10.1093/occmed/50.2.107.

22. Mukhtad AA, Mohamed HA. Lower back pain among health care workers in operating room at Al-Fateh children's hospital: Prevalence and risk factors. Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health. 2018;1(1):1–1. doi.org/10.9734/AJRNH/2018/43644.

23. Atlas AP, Bondoc RG, Garrovillas RA, Lo RD, Recinto J, Yu KJ. Prevalence of low back pain among public high school teachers in the City of Manila. Philippine Journal of Allied Health Sciences. 2007;2(1):34–40. doi.org/10.36413/pjahs.0201.004.

24. Baumeister H, Knecht A, Hutter N. Direct and indirect costs in persons with chronic back pain and comorbid mental disorders—a systematic review. Journal of Psychosomatic Research. 2012 Aug 1;73(2):79–85. doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2012.05.008.

25. Hong J, Reed C, Novick D, Happich M. Costs associated with treatment of chronic low back pain: an analysis of the UK General Practice Research Database. Spine. 2013 Jan 1;38(1):75–82. doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0b013e318276450f.

26. Gore M, Sadosky A, Stacey BR, Tai KS, Leslie D. The burden of chronic low back pain: clinical comorbidities, treatment patterns, and health care costs in usual care settings. Spine. 2012 May 15;37(11):E668–77. doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0b013e318241e5de.

27. Zemedikun DT, Kigozi J, Wynne-Jones G, Guariglia A, Roberts T. Methodological considerations in the assessment of direct and indirect costs of back pain: A systematic scoping review. PloS One. 2021 May 11;16(5):e0251406. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251406.