



form function flow™

Recent Scientific Papers on the Impact of Poor Ergonomics in the Radiology Reading Room

Musculoskeletal Injuries Affecting Radiologists According to the 2017 ACR Human Resources Commission Workforce Survey

Jay Parikh, MD, Claire Bender, MD, MPH, et. al., *J Am Coll Radiol* 2018;15: 803-808

Practice leaders surveyed in the 2017 ACR Human Resources Commission workforce survey reported that 25% of the radiologists or radiation oncologists they supervised had neck pain, 32% had low back pain, and 16% were dealing with a repetitive stress injury. The prevalence rates of these musculoskeletal ailments among radiologists and radiation oncologists were consistent with those reported in the literature in other populations. However, these prevalence rates may be underestimated because practice leaders, not the radiologists themselves, were surveyed, and the leaders may not be aware of all injuries.

Work-Related Injuries of Radiologists and Possible Ergonomic Solutions: Recommendations From the ACR Commission on Human Resources

Gordon Sze, MD, Edward I. Bluth, MD, et. al., *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1353-1358

Use of PACS and digital imaging technologies can lead to repetitive strain injuries, many of which can be exacerbated by specific features of a radiology practice environment. Ergonomic approaches, such as proper reading room structure, lighting, temperature, noise, and equipment setup, can help decrease the frequency and severity of repetitive strain injuries and improve radiologist productivity. However, ergonomic approaches are complex, include all aspects of the radiology practice environment, and are best implemented along with proper training of the practicing radiologists.

The Agony of It All: Musculoskeletal Discomfort in the Reading Room

Rebecca L. Seidel, MD, Elizabeth A. Krupinski, PhD, *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1620-1625

The survey was completed by 99 radiologists. The majority of respondents spent greater than 7 hours per workday at a diagnostic workstation. The neck, lower back, upper back, right shoulder, and right wrist were the areas where radiologists most frequently reported ache, pain, or discomfort at least once per week. More than 7 hours per day at a computer workstation was significantly associated with higher total pain.

Tired in the Reading Room: The Influence of Fatigue in Radiology

Waite, S., Kolla, S., et. al., *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:191-197

Fatigue in health care providers and any secondary effects on patient care are an important societal concern. As medical image interpretation is highly dependent on visual input, visual fatigue is of particular interest to radiologists.

Factors Associated with Repetitive Strain, and Strategies to Reduce Injury Among Breast-Imaging Radiologists

Thompson, A., Kremer, M. et. al., *J Am Coll Radiol* 2014;11:1074-1079

In the survey 60.2% of respondents reported RSI symptoms, and 33.3% reported prior diagnosis/treatment. Results showed a statistically significant trend for the odds of RSI symptoms to increase with decreasing age or increasing number of daily hours spent working, especially in an awkward position. Respondents recalled a significant increase in pain level after implementation of PACS, and a decrease in pain after ergonomic training or initiating use of an ergonomic mouse, adjustable chair, or adjustable table.

Musculoskeletal Injuries Affecting Radiologists According to the 2017 ACR Human Resources Commission Workforce Survey

Jay R. Parikh, MD^a, Claire Bender, MD, MPH^b, Edward Bluth, MD^c

Abstract

Practice leaders surveyed in the 2017 ACR Human Resources Commission workforce survey reported that 25% of the radiologists or radiation oncologists they supervised had neck pain, 32% had low back pain, and 16% were dealing with a repetitive stress injury. The prevalence rates of these musculoskeletal ailments among radiologists and radiation oncologists were consistent with those reported in the literature in other populations. However, these prevalence rates may be underestimated because practice leaders, not the radiologists themselves, were surveyed, and the leaders may not be aware of all injuries.

Key Words: Radiologist, occupational injury, work-related illness, repetitive stress injury, back pain, neck pain

J Am Coll Radiol 2018;15:803-808. Copyright © 2018 American College of Radiology

INTRODUCTION

During the past 3 decades, radiologists in the United States have steadily transitioned from a film environment to a digital environment with PACS [1]. Compared with the film environment, the PACS environment has inherent potential benefits for radiologists and patients, including more efficient scheduling and workflow, less space required for data storage, greater ease of standardization of structured reporting, and improved billing [1,2]. However, the PACS transition also has drawbacks for radiologists, including reducing the time radiologists spend in direct interactions with referring clinicians [3]. Recently, studies have raised the possibility that the

PACS work environment may also contribute to musculoskeletal ailments among radiologists [4].

Although the concept that musculoskeletal ailments affect radiologists may be intuitive, the ACR Human Resources Commission is unaware of any national survey that has specifically investigated the prevalence of musculoskeletal illnesses among radiologists across the US workforce. Because of its commitment to investigating and promoting radiologist wellness, the commission, as part of its annual 2017 workforce survey [5], asked practice leaders about musculoskeletal conditions affecting radiologists in their practices.

METHODS

Recently, the ACR Human Resources Commission published the results of its most recent annual workforce survey, conducted in 2017 [5]. The methodology of this annual survey of the radiology workforce in the United States has been consistent since 2012 and was previously described [5]. An electronic survey is e-mailed to the practice leaders in the ACR's Practice of Radiology Environment Database. For the survey, leaders are defined as the chair, vice chair, managing partner, or executive committee member.

^aDepartment of Radiology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas.

^bDepartment of Radiology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.

^cDepartment of Radiology, Ochsner Clinic Foundation and The University of Queensland School of Medicine, Ochsner Clinical School, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Corresponding author and reprints: Jay Parikh, MD, Department of Radiology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe, CPB5.3208, Houston, TX 77030; e-mail: jparikh@mdanderson.org.

Dr Bender is involved in the Kaiser Permanente Allied Health advisory board and CB Firm, LLC. All other authors have no conflicts of interest related to the material discussed in this article.

In 2017, the commission added questions to the survey to evaluate musculoskeletal injuries to the radiologist workforce. Specifically, practice leaders were asked to identify the numbers of radiologists or radiation oncologists they had supervised within the past 5 years in their practice who had experienced neck pain, back pain, or a repetitive stress injury. Leaders were asked to provide data separately for each type of musculoskeletal injury. Leaders were also asked to indicate the gender and age group of each injured radiologist (<35, 35-45, 46-55, 56-65 years, or >65 years).

RESULTS

Overall, 477 of the 1,811 identified practice leaders (26%) responded to the survey. These practice leaders led practices with a total of 11,056 radiologists, approximately 33% of all practicing radiologists in the United States [5]. The rate of survey response varied by injury type. Of the 349 practice leaders who responded to the questions about back pain, 113 (32%) responded that their practice had at least one radiologist or radiation oncologist with back pain, 151 (43%) responded that their practice had none, and 85 (24%) responded that they did not know. Of the 349 practice leaders who responded to the questions about neck injury, 88 (25%) responded that their practice had at least one radiologist or radiation oncologist with neck pain, 177 (51%) responded that their practice had none, and 84 (24%) responded that they did not know. Of the 346 practice leaders who responded to the questions about repetitive stress injuries, 55 (16%) responded that their practice had at least one radiologist or radiation oncologist with a repetitive stress injury, 196 (57%) responded that their practice had none, and 95 (27%) responded that they did not know. The distribution of these individuals by age and gender is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of radiologists and radiation oncologists with musculoskeletal injuries by age and gender

Age (y)	Neck Pain (n = 145)		Low Back Pain (n = 201)		Repetitive Stress Injury (n = 89)	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<35	0	1	6	0	1	1
35-45	13	3	27	6	10	7
46-55	45	13	58	5	24	6
56-65	48	10	73	8	32	7
>65	8	4	18	0	1	0
Total	114	31	182	19	68	21

Comparisons of the rate of the musculoskeletal injuries to the distribution of all radiologists were performed. Table 2 demonstrates a specific comparison by distribution by age of the three types of musculoskeletal injury rates to the age distribution of all radiologists and radiation oncologists. A χ^2 analysis produced a *P* value of .0029 for back pain, a *P* value of .000144 for neck pain, and a *P* value of .0002 for repetitive stress injuries, with all differences being statistically significant.

Table 3 demonstrates a specific comparison by distribution by gender of the three types of musculoskeletal injury rates with the gender distribution of all radiologists and radiation oncologists. A χ^2 analysis produced a *P* value of .0012 for back pain, a *P* value of .89 for neck pain, and a *P* value of .71 for repetitive stress injuries. The difference in distributions was found to be statistically significant only for back pain. No statistically significant difference in the distributions was found for either neck pain or repetitive stress injuries.

Table 4 demonstrates a specific comparison of the distribution of musculoskeletal injury rates by age and gender with the distribution of all radiologists and radiation oncologists by age and gender. An analysis of variance produced a *P* value of .0016 for back pain, a *P* value of .0035 for neck pain, and a *P* value of .0031 for repetitive stress injuries. All three differences in distributions were statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

The rates of back pain, neck pain, and repetitive stress injury reported by practice leaders among radiologists in their practices in the 2017 ACR workforce survey are within the ranges observed in previous studies in other populations.

Table 2. Comparison by distributions of musculoskeletal injury rates by age with distribution of all radiologists and radiation oncologists by age, using χ^2 test

Age (y)	All Radiologists (n = 7,642)		Low Back Pain (n = 201)		Neck Pain (n = 145)		Repetitive Stress Injury (n = 89)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	<35	866	11.3	6	3.0	1	0.7	2
35-45	2,429	31.8	33	16.4	16	11.0	17	19.1
46-55	2,257	29.5	63	31.3	58	40.0	30	33.7
56-65	1,590	20.8	81	40.3	58	40.0	39	43.8
>65	500	6.5	18	9.0	12	8.3	1	1.1
<i>P</i>			.0029		.0001		.0002	

Table 3. Comparison by distributions of musculoskeletal injury rates by gender with distribution of all radiologists and radiation oncologists by gender, using χ^2 test

Gender	All Radiologists (n = 7,642)		Low Back Pain (n = 201)		Neck Pain (n = 145)		Repetitive Stress Injury (n = 89)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Male	5,999	78.5	182	90.6	114	78.6	68
Female	1,643	21.5	19	9.4	31	21.4	21	23.6
P			.0012		.89		.71	

Low Back Pain

Studies of low back pain are difficult to compare because of differences in the definition of low back pain, study design, and populations. The incidence of low back pain in the United States was reported to be 139 cases per 100,000 person-years [6,7]. Reports related to a systematic review of 15 studies of low back pain carried out both internationally and in the United States, published from 1997 to 2007, found reported annual incidence rates of low back pain ranging from 5% to 22% [7,8]. The annual cost to the US economy from low back pain has been estimated to be \$100 billion to \$200 billion [9], with one-third of that cost attributed to direct medical expenses and two-thirds to indirect costs from loss of productivity and absenteeism. Low back pain is sixth among diseases in terms of overall global disease burden and first in terms of years lived with disability [10]. It is estimated that 37% of all cases of low back pain are occupational [11]. Occupational low back pain historically has been more common in men than in women because of men's higher rate of participation in occupations involving heavy lifting or whole-body vibration [11].

In our survey, 32% of radiologists were reported to have back pain. A systematic review of global studies of low back pain published between 1980 and 2009 found a mean

1-year prevalence of low back pain of 38.0%, which was not significantly different from the mean lifetime prevalence of 38.9% [12]. In the aforementioned systematic review of studies of low back pain published from 1997 to 2007, the prevalence of low back pain ranged from 5% to 65%, with a mean of 18.7% [8]. The prevalence of low back pain in the United States has increased over time because of the aging population [13].

In our survey, 91% of radiologists reported to have back pain were men. Some studies suggest that women may be more prone to low back pain than men [12]. However, there are currently more men than women in the radiology workforce [5]. Specifically, there are more men than women in interventional radiology [14,15], which involves maneuvers more likely than those in other subspecialties to cause low back pain [16]. Because of these trends, no definite conclusions can be drawn from our current study about the relationship between radiologist gender and low back pain. Further study of this issue is needed.

Neck Pain

In our survey, 25% of radiologists were reported to have neck pain. A systematic search and critical review of published US and international studies between 1980 and 2006 found that the 12-month prevalence of neck pain ranged from 30% to 50% [17]. Another systematic review of five databases from 1966 to 2002 (MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL, OSH-ROM, and PsycINFO) reported a 1-year prevalence rate of neck pain ranging from 16.7% to 75.1%, with a mean of 37.2% [18].

In the Global Burden of Disease 2010 Study, neck pain was the fourth leading cause of years of life lost to disability, ranking behind low back pain, depression, and arthralgia [19]. Approximately half of all individuals will experience clinically significant episodes of neck pain during their lifetimes [18], and approximately 50% of these people will report episodes of neck pain 1 year

Table 4. Comparison by distributions of musculoskeletal injury rates by age and gender with distribution of all radiologists and radiation oncologists by age and gender, using analysis of variance

Age (y)	All Radiologists (n = 7,642)		Low Back Pain (n = 201)		Neck Pain (n = 145)		Repetitive Stress Injury (n = 89)	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<35	9%	2%	3%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
35-45	23%	9%	13%	3%	9%	2%	11%	8%
46-55	23%	6%	29%	2%	31%	9%	27%	7%
56-65	17%	3%	36%	4%	33%	7%	36%	8%
>65	6%	1%	9%	0%	6%	3%	1%	0%
P			.0016		.0035		.0031	

after their initial episodes [20]. Despite these statistics, neck pain receives only a fraction of the attention and research funding devoted to low back pain [21].

The balance of the literature demonstrates a higher prevalence of neck pain in women than in men, and studies demonstrate that the peak prevalence occurs at middle age [17,18,22]. In our study, 21% of the radiologists experiencing neck pain were women. Our data are likely skewed because the majority of radiologists in the United States are men [5]. Specifically, there are more men than women in interventional radiology [14,15], which involves maneuvers more likely than those in other subspecialties to cause neck pain [16].

To our knowledge, our study is the first national survey of radiology practices to demonstrate that radiologists not only practice with neck pain but also are bothered enough by it to notify their practice leaders. Health care workers in general have a higher incidence of neck pain than the incidence in the general population [23]. Risk factors for neck pain that may apply to individual radiologists include genetics, sleep problems, smoking, obesity, sedentary lifestyle, back pain, and poor general health [22,24-27].

Repetitive Stress Injuries

Repetitive stress injuries, also known as occupational overuse syndromes, are any injuries (often musculoskeletal) that result from continual vibrations, repetitive motions, or sustained awkward movements [28].

The prevalence of repetitive stress injuries is population dependent. A large study in Canada with more than 89,000 respondents demonstrated a prevalence of 7% in women and 6.5% in men [29]. A survey of the members of the Society of Breast Imaging found that approximately 60.2% of breast imagers reported repetitive stress injuries [30]. The reported prevalence in our population was lower, but that may be related to differences in population and survey design. It is conceivable that breast imagers who experienced repetitive stress injuries were more likely to respond to the Society of Breast Imaging survey, which would have resulted in response bias. In our present survey, practice leaders of all types of radiology practices were surveyed. Although certain subspecialties of radiology, such as breast imaging [30], ultrasound [31], and interventional radiology [32], are most likely associated with an increased risk for repetitive stress injuries, other specialties in radiology may be associated with a lower risk for repetitive stress injuries. Our results, which

included all types of radiologists, may be more reflective than the Society of Breast Imaging survey results of the true prevalence of repetitive stress injuries.

The transition from a film environment to PACS and digital imaging has inherently contributed to the development of repetitive stress injuries in radiologists [30,33]. In the filmless environment, radiologists have become more sedentary [34]. A study of one department showed that the majority of radiologists spent more than 8 hours per day at computer terminals, 55% of radiologists spent more than 2 hours per day in awkward positions, 58% of radiologists had symptoms of repetitive stress injuries, and 38% had actually been diagnosed with repetitive stress injuries [33]. In the aforementioned Society of Breast Imaging survey, respondents recalled increased pain from repetitive stress injuries after the implementation of PACS [30].

Strategies for Prevention of Musculoskeletal Injuries in Radiologists

A fundamental strategy to address musculoskeletal injuries among radiologists is to increase awareness on the part of radiologists of the prevalence of musculoskeletal injuries and the importance of ergonomics. The ACR Human Resources Commission therefore carried out this study with the specific goal of obtaining prevalence data to inform such communications.

The current digital environment and PACS workstations have almost certainly contributed to the development of musculoskeletal injuries in radiologists. Long hours sitting at workstations, use of nonergonomic chairs, failure to take breaks from sitting, and sitting in awkward positions likely all contribute to low back pain, neck pain, and repetitive stress injuries in radiologists.

The acute need for ergonomic overhaul and redesign was previously described in a position paper by the ACR Human Resources Commission [4]. Ergonomics is derived from the terms *ergo* (work) and *nomos* (natural law), and ergonomics is the science that encompasses all methods that can reduce discomfort for workers and help maximize productivity [4,35]. In radiology, ergonomic overhaul begins with the meticulous design of an optimal digital reading room for radiologists with attention to core factors such as room architecture, room layout, workstation design, and environmental factors, such as lighting, temperature, and noise [4].

Both poor job satisfaction and a poor workplace environment have been specifically associated with neck pain [23]. Decreased job satisfaction in radiology was also associated with burnout in a previous article by the

Human Resources Commission [36]. Both practice leaders and radiologists should therefore make a concerted effort to create a positive and pleasant work environment to prevent burnout and reduce musculoskeletal injuries.

The Society of Interventional Radiology (SIR) has described various risk factors for the development of low back pain and neck pain in interventional radiologists. These include the axial load of radiation protection garments, long hours associated with procedures, awkward or poor posture, and repetitive movements, especially over a long career [16]. Practical interventions to reduce low back pain and neck pain in interventional radiology suggested by the SIR include identifying and stopping the action responsible for generating the pain, taking breaks, eliminating repetitive painful motions, and using freestanding and suspended shields for radiation protection. The SIR also advises ergonomic design of procedure rooms with appropriate ergonomic positioning, clean floor space, and adjustable C-arms [16].

Study Limitations and Strengths

A strength of our study is that, to our knowledge, it is the first national survey to specifically investigate the prevalence of musculoskeletal illnesses among radiologists and radiation oncologists in practices across the United States. This addresses a specific void of knowledge that could be potentially beneficial for radiologists and radiation oncologists. Increasing awareness among radiologists, radiation oncologists, practice leaders, and practice administrators may help catalyze a culture change in radiology in which more practices are ergonomically designed to help prevent musculoskeletal ailments and improve job satisfaction.

There are limitations to this study. The survey was limited to practice leaders, who reported on radiologists in their practice who they were aware had musculoskeletal issues. Almost certainly, the prevalence rates of low back pain, neck pain, and repetitive stress injuries among radiologists in the United States are higher than those indicated by our survey. Some radiologists may be shy, may prefer to be discreet, or may not feel comfortable divulging to their practice leader their musculoskeletal ailments. In addition, 24% of practice leaders did not know if any of their radiologists had low back or neck pain, and 27% did not know if any of their radiologists had a repetitive stress injury. This fact most likely also translated into underestimation of the prevalence rates of these musculoskeletal ailments in radiologists. Also, the limitations of our database did not allow us to analyze the

results of injuries by radiology subspecialties. Furthermore, because this was a snapshot survey, no control group exists that would allow comparison of radiologists and nonradiologists.

At the time of this baseline survey design, the ACR Human Resources Commission intentionally decided to ask practice leaders to identify the numbers of radiologists or radiation oncologists they had supervised within the past 5 years in their practice who had experienced neck pain, low back pain, or a repetitive stress injury. This was to obtain a more accurate estimate of the overall prevalence. The Human Resources Commission currently plans to repeat a similar survey within 5 years to look at annual prevalence, similar to published studies from other populations, and thereby begin to regularly track trends in workforce injuries affecting radiologists.

TAKE-HOME POINTS

- Of the surveyed radiology practice leaders, 25% reported that radiologists or radiation oncologists in their practice had neck pain.
- Almost a third (32%) of practice leaders reported having radiologists or radiation oncologists with low back pain within their practice.
- Sixteen percent of the surveyed radiology practice leaders reported that radiologists or radiation oncologists in their practice had repetitive stress injuries.
- Strategies to help reduce musculoskeletal injuries in radiologists and radiation oncologists include increasing awareness, applying ergonomic solutions to the work area, creating a positive work environment to improve job satisfaction, and implementing specialty-specific strategies, such as ergonomic evaluation of radiologist and radiation oncologist mechanics and design of procedure rooms in interventional radiology.

REFERENCES

1. Kohli M, Dreyer KJ, Geis JR. Rethinking radiology informatics. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2015;204:716-20.
2. Towbin AJ, Perry LA, Larson DB. Improving efficiency in the radiology department. *Pediatr Radiol* 2017;47:783-92.
3. Reiner B, Siegel E, Protopapas Z, Hooper F, Ghebrekidan H, Scanlon M. Impact of filmless radiology on frequency of clinician consultations with radiologists. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1999;173:1169-72.
4. Sze G, Bluth EI, Bender CE, Parikh JR. Work-related injuries of radiologists and possible ergonomic solutions: recommendations from the ACR Commission on Human Resources. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1353-8.

5. Bluth EI, Bansal S, Bender CE. The 2017 ACR Commission on Human Resources workforce survey. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1613-9.
6. Waterman BR, Belmont PJ Jr, Schoenfeld AJ. Low back pain in the United States: Incidence and risk factors for presentation in the emergency setting. *Spine J* 2012;12:63-70.
7. Ma VY, Chan L, Carruthers KJ. Incidence, prevalence, costs, and impact on disability of common conditions requiring rehabilitation in the United States: stroke, spinal cord injury, traumatic brain injury, multiple sclerosis, osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, limb loss, and back pain. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2014;95:986-95.e1.
8. Dagenais S, Caro J, Haldeman S. A systematic review of low back pain cost of illness studies in the United States and internationally. *Spine J* 2008;8:8-20.
9. Katz JN. Lumbar disc disorders and low-back pain: socioeconomic factors and consequences. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2006;88(suppl 2):21-4.
10. Hoy D, March L, Brooks P, et al. The global burden of low back pain: estimates from the Global Burden of Disease 2010 study. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2014;73:968-74.
11. Punnett L, Pruss-Utun A, Nelson DI, et al. Estimating the global burden of low back pain attributable to combined occupational exposures. *Am J Ind Med* 2005;48:459-69.
12. Hoy D, Bain C, Williams G, et al. A systematic review of the global prevalence of low back pain. *Arthritis Rheum* 2012;64:2028-37.
13. Smith M, Davis MA, Stano M, Whedon JM. Aging baby boomers and the rising cost of chronic back pain: secular trend analysis of longitudinal medical expenditures panel survey data for years 2000 to 2007. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2013;36:2-11.
14. Ghatan CE, Fassiotto M, Jacobsen JP, Sze DY, Kothary N. Occupational radiation exposure during pregnancy: a survey of attitudes and practices among interventional radiologists. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2016;27:1013-20.e3.
15. Lewis RS, Bhargavan M, Sunshine JH. Women radiologists in the United States: results from the American College of Radiology's 2003 survey. *Radiology* 2007;242:802-10.
16. Dixon RG, Khatani V, Statler JD, et al. Society of Interventional Radiology: occupational back and neck pain and the interventional radiologist. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2017;28:195-9.
17. Hogg-Johnson S, van der Velde G, Carroll LJ, et al. The burden and determinants of neck pain in the general population: results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2009;32:S46-60.
18. Fejer R, Kyvik KO, Hartvigsen J. The prevalence of neck pain in the world population: a systematic critical review of the literature. *Eur Spine J* 2006;15:834-48.
19. Murray CJ, Atkinson C, Bhalla K, et al. The state of us health 1990-2010: burden of diseases, injuries, and risk factors. *JAMA* 2013;310:591-608.
20. Vos CJ, Verhagen AP, Passchier J, Koes BW. Clinical course and prognostic factors in acute neck pain: an inception cohort study in general practice. *Pain Med* 2008;9:572-80.
21. Cohen SP. Epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment of neck pain. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2015;90:284-99.
22. Cohen SP, Hooten WM. Advances in the diagnosis and management of neck pain. *BMJ* 2017;358:j3221.
23. Cote P, van der Velde G, Cassidy JD, et al. The burden and determinants of neck pain in workers: results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and its Associated Disorders. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2009;32:S70-86.
24. Croft PR, Lewis M, Papageorgiou AC, et al. Risk factors for neck pain: a longitudinal study in the general population. *Pain* 2001;93:317-25.
25. Kaaria S, Laaksonen M, Rahkonen O, Lahelma E, Leino-Arjas P. Risk factors of chronic neck pain: A prospective study among middle-aged employees. *Eur J Pain* 2012;16:911-20.
26. Linton SJ. A review of psychological risk factors in back and neck pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2000;25:1148-56.
27. Nilsen TI, Holtermann A, Mork PJ. Physical exercise, body mass index, and risk of chronic pain in the low back and neck/shoulders: longitudinal data from the Nord-Trøndelag Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2011;174:267-73.
28. Tjepkema M. Repetitive strain injury. *Health Rep* 2003;14:11-30.
29. Breslin FC, Ibrahim S, Smith P, Mustard C, Amick B, Shankardass K. The demographic and contextual correlates of work-related repetitive strain injuries among Canadian men and women. *Am J Ind Med* 2013;56:1180-9.
30. Thompson AC, Kremer Prill MJ, Biswal S, et al. Factors associated with repetitive strain, and strategies to reduce injury among breast-imaging radiologists. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2014;11:1074-9.
31. Janga D, Akinfenwa O. Work-related repetitive strain injuries amongst practitioners of obstetric and gynaecological ultrasound worldwide. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2012;286:353-6.
32. Klein LW, Miller DL, Balter S, et al. Occupational health hazards in the interventional laboratory: time for a safer environment. *Radiology* 2009;250:538-44.
33. Boiselle PM, Levine D, Horwich PJ, et al. Repetitive stress symptoms in radiology: prevalence and response to ergonomic interventions. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2008;5:919-23.
34. Harisinghani MG, Blake MA, Saksena M, et al. Importance and effects of altered workplace ergonomics in modern radiology suites. *Radiographics* 2004;24:615-27.
35. Goyal N, Jain N, Rachapalli V. Ergonomics in radiology. *Clin Radiol* 2009;64:119-26.
36. Harolds JA, Parikh JR, Bluth EI, Dutton SC, Recht MP. Burnout of radiologists: Frequency, risk factors, and remedies: a report of the ACR Commission on Human Resources. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2016;13:411-6.

Work-Related Injuries of Radiologists and Possible Ergonomic Solutions: Recommendations From the ACR Commission on Human Resources

SA-CME

Gordon Sze, MD^a, Edward I. Bluth, MD^b, Claire E. Bender, MD^c, Jay R. Parikh, MD^d

Abstract

Increasingly, radiologists' workplaces revolve around PACS and digital imaging. Use of these technologies can lead to repetitive strain injuries, many of which can be exacerbated by specific features of a radiology practice environment. Ergonomic approaches, such as proper reading room structure, lighting, temperature, noise, and equipment setup, can help decrease the frequency and severity of repetitive strain injuries and improve radiologist productivity. However, ergonomic approaches are complex, include all aspects of the radiology practice environment, and are best implemented along with proper training of the practicing radiologists. The ergonomic approaches considered most important by members of the ACR Commission on Human Resources are presented in this report, and this information may serve as an aid in departmental planning.

Key Words: Repetitive strain injuries, workplace optimization, ergonomics

J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:1353-1358. Copyright © 2017 American College of Radiology

INTRODUCTION

The roles of radiologists continue to evolve and broaden. Increasingly, radiologists not only interpret imaging examinations but also perform additional activities, including consulting with referring clinicians and ancillary staff members, prioritizing and protocoling studies, conducting interdisciplinary patient care and teaching sessions, and performing image-guided procedures [1]. All of these activities of radiologists, both the traditional interpretation of imaging examinations and the new multidisciplinary responsibilities, revolve around the use of computers. Because of the advent of fully digitized radiology departments centered around PACS and digital imaging, many radiologists now spend their careers at computer workstations [2,3].

In this article, we discuss the impact of the digital radiology environment on the occurrence of repetitive

strain injuries (RSIs) among radiologists and possible ergonomic solutions. We also present the results of a survey of ACR Commission on Human Resources members regarding prioritizing ergonomic solutions; this information may help in departmental planning.

THE PROBLEM OF RSIs IN RADIOLOGISTS

RSIs, also known as repetitive stress injuries and occupational overuse syndromes, are any injuries, generally musculoskeletal or neurologic, that result from continual repetitive motion, vibrations, or sustained or awkward movements [4]. Although PACS and digital imaging systems permit increases in efficiency and improvements in patient care, they also have the deleterious effect of producing RSIs [5-7]. For example, Boiselle et al [8] documented that in their department, the majority of radiologists reported spending more than 8 hours a day at computer terminals, 58% reported symptoms of RSI, and 38% had actually been diagnosed with RSIs. Furthermore, these injuries have become more common as the workloads of radiologists have increased.

Radiologists work under conditions that precipitate RSIs in multiple ways. First, use of a computer mouse can result in tenosynovitis, carpal tunnel syndrome, and

^aYale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

^bOchsner Clinic, New Orleans, Louisiana.

^cMayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.

^dUniversity of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas.

Corresponding author and reprints: Gordon Sze, MD, Yale University School of Medicine, 330 Cedar Street, New Haven, CT 06520; e-mail: gordon.sze@yale.edu.

The authors have no conflicts of interest related to the material discussed in this article.

cubital tunnel syndrome. Ruess et al [9] documented work-related carpal tunnel syndrome and cubital tunnel syndrome in four symptomatic radiologists. Brusin [10] suggested that tenosynovitis is particularly associated with the use of handheld devices and texting.

Second, radiologists' prolonged positions at computer terminals can result in neck and low back pain. Boiselle et al [8] showed that 55% of surveyed radiologists reported spending more than 2 hours per day in awkward positions. Harisinghani et al [11] showed that when hospitals move to a filmless environment, radiologists become more sedentary.

Third, certain specialties of radiology are associated with particular RSIs [12]. For example, ultrasonographers in particular are prone to develop shoulder symptoms due to the forces exerted by pressing the ultrasound probe on the area of interest on the patient's body with an extended arm [10]. Neck, elbow, and low back pain are also common in ultrasonographers. Thompson et al [13] found that 60.2% of breast imagers reported RSIs and found a significant increase in pain level after the implementation of PACS. As expected, this correlated with an increase in the number of hours spent working per day and with awkward positioning. Interventional radiology is associated with musculoskeletal problems associated with protective gear, as discussed by Klein et al [14].

FEATURES OF RSIs UNIQUE TO RADIOLOGY

Robertson et al [15] performed a work systems analysis of the typical work environment of radiologists and found that complex, prolonged pointing and handheld device activities constituted the majority of PACS-related activities. These researchers compared the actions of radiologists and nonradiologists during their time using computers and found that compared with nonradiologists, radiologists spent more time using a mouse (69% versus 42%) and less time using a keyboard (2% versus 22%).

ERGONOMIC APPROACHES TO MINIMIZE THE RISK FOR RSIs IN RADIOLOGISTS

The term *ergonomics* comes from *ergos* (work) and *nomos* (natural law). The science of ergonomics encompasses all of the methods that can decrease discomfort and RSIs to maximize productivity [16]. To minimize the risk for discomfort and RSIs in radiologists, a wide range of parties must be involved, from biomechanical experts, who can analyze problems, to equipment designers, who can improve on existing platforms and hardware, to administrators, who must implement the necessary changes.

The digital workplace in radiology presents many ergonomic challenges. Although the shift away from hard copies to PACS and digital imaging has become almost universal in the United States, radiology departments have lagged in realizing that these changes create conditions that mandate changes in the work environment. Ergonomic issues range from the structure of the reading room to background lighting and noise to chair and monitor positioning to mouse and keyboard design and placement [12].

Reading Room Structure

In a film-based environment, a reading room requires view boards, which provide lighting, both for the films and for background lighting; storage facilities for films in the queue to be read and films the radiologist has finished reading; and conference areas for film display and to facilitate consultations with clinicians. The switch to a digital environment has drastically altered the structure of the reading room [3,17]. View boards have been replaced by a number of computer screens for workflow and for image display. This creates a need for alternative lighting sources. Storage facilities for films are no longer necessary. Similarly, areas for conferences with clinicians can be reduced because face-to-face meetings are no longer as frequent, having been replaced by telephone interactions, in which clinicians view images at their desks while consulting by phone.

Studies have examined the qualities of an optimal digital reading room [18]. Factors needing consideration include "architectural planning, room layout, workstation design, and general environmental concerns" [18-20]. Hugine et al [18] found that the most popular layout was an open environment, allowing easy interaction with other radiologists, with soundproof walls and sound-absorbing clouds above, as well as individually controlled lighting. Also popular was a separate image interpretation center with state-of-the-art touch-screen technology for conferences and interactions with a clinical team. Individual enclosed reading pods were unpopular.

Lighting, Temperature, and Noise

Other general environmental factors are also important [21,22]. Individual lighting needs can vary, depending on personal preference and age. Mild ambient lighting should be indirect and overhead, to avoid glare. At the same time, individualized lighting control in the immediate individual reading space is also required when written materials or notes on paper must be read.

Equally important are maintenance of appropriate temperature and ventilation, both to benefit readers and to prevent damage to sensitive electronic devices.

It is also important to facilitate noise reduction. Ambient noise levels in a reading room can come from mechanical sources, such as the imaging equipment or terminals, or from human sources, such as other radiologists' phone consults, staff members giving patients instructions, or crying children. Noise from human sources has been found to be more distracting than mechanical noise and should be minimized to the extent possible [12]. Speech recognition systems are more sensitive to noise than classic Dictaphones, which is another reason to reduce noise in the reading room.

Equipment Setup

Finally, as far as specific workplace tools are concerned, the monitors, keyboard, and mouse must be optimized [23-25]. The ideal number of monitors is controversial, but a three-monitor approach is popular, with one low-resolution monitor to view worklists and hospital electronic medical records and two high-resolution monitors to review imaging examinations. The use of three monitors also reduces the need for body movements compared with setups in which more monitors are used.

The ideal distance from the radiologist to the screen is believed to be 50 to 75 cm, with a 5-mm font size [26]. Computer visual syndrome, a set of symptoms including eye strain, headaches, blurred vision, and eye pain, has been found in 90% of users who spend three or more hours per day in front of a terminal [27,28].

The keyboard and mouse are particularly important in minimizing stress to the hands and wrists. The keyboard and mouse should be placed in a convenient location and at a comfortable height, with plenty of desk space available around them and few obstructions, to allow fluid movements [29]. Ideally, these devices should be thin and flat to reduce wrist extension. The mouse should be configured to minimize long and repetitive movements down the screen.

Raising Radiologists' Awareness of Best Ergonomic Practices

Just as important as optimization of the work environment is raising awareness among radiologists of best ergonomic practices [30]. Training with respect to potential ergonomic adjustments and personalization of the reading area is also helpful in reducing work-related injuries. Rodrigues et al [30] found that even when ergonomic adjustments were available, in terms of monitor, chair, desk, and armrest height, chair back support, ambient light and temperature, and mouse and keyboard optimization, few radiologists made adjustments before beginning read-out. Yet individualizing the workplace is crucial. Thompson

et al [13] showed that radiologists experienced a significant decrease in workplace injuries after ergonomic training. Even more successful is participatory ergonomics, in which radiologists themselves develop personalized ergonomic measures [31].

Need for Further Research

Further studies directed at the specific work patterns of radiologists have great potential to further clarify the risks for RSIs in imaging professionals. For example, according to the study by Robertson et al [15], the computer mouse was believed to contribute more to RSIs than any other single factor, including table height, monitors, keyboards, and others, suggesting that concentrated effort on specific improvements may prove particularly beneficial. However, the study of Boiselle et al [8] demonstrated that typical ergonomic interventions did not deal with the computer mouse, diminishing the value of improvements. Further studies in conjunction with occupational health specialists are especially recommended.

SURVEY RESULTS TO GUIDE DEPARTMENTAL PLANNING

In a time of potentially limited resources, our commission attempted to determine which of the potential ergonomic improvements cited in the literature might be particularly preferable to radiologists. We polled our members to determine which individual ergonomic adjustments they deemed most important. Our questionnaire and the polling results are shown in Table 1. Respondents were asked to rank individual factors on a scale ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 the least important and 5 the most important. Although some of the results were predictable, many were not, as shown below.

Rating 4.5 to 5

Unsurprisingly, the amount of light and noise at the reading station, as well as the accessibility of phone and Internet, were considered of paramount importance, with ratings of 4.5 to 5. Also ranked in this highest category were wheeled chairs of adjustable height.

Rating 4.0 to 4.4

Also important but slightly less so (rating 4.0-4.4) were adjustable monitors, adjustable desks, and chairs that swivel and have adjustable armrest height. Access to the electronic medical record from the workstation also achieved this rating.

It should be underscored that adequate space, both at the reading station desk and in the layout of the reading

Table 1. Poll of commission members on importance of factors

	Member										Total	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
GENERAL FACTORS, IN TERMS OF CONTRIBUTION TO OPTIMAL READING ENVIRONMENT												
Light	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	47	4.7
Noise	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	46	4.6
Temperature	3	3	5	3	2	3	4	4	3	3	33	3.3
Ventilation	2	3	4	2	1	4	2	4	3	3	28	2.8
LIGHTING												
Dimmers and switches at workstation	4	5	4	5	2	5	2	3	3	4	37	3.7
Individual controls	5	5	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	5	38	3.8
Flexible stems	3	5	1	1	3	2	3	5	3	2	28	2.8
Overhead lighting with dimmers	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	41	4.1
Air conditioning												
Temperature, individually controlled	4	5	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	5	38	3.8
Humidity	3	5	4	1	4	1	3	2	3	3	29	2.9
LAYOUT												
Flexible layout with movable dividers to accommodate different number of people	4	3	1	3	3	2	1	3	3	2	25	2.5
Individual rooms	5	2	3	1	2	4	2	3	3	5	30	3
Open layout in a large reading room	2	4	3	4	3	2		3	3	2	26	2.9
Adequate space	4	5	3	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	42	4.2
Space for personal belongings	4	5	4	2	4	3	2	3	4	3	34	3.4
Headphones	3	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	19	1.9
Separate consultation area	3	4	1	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	23	2.3
MOUSE												
Traditional mouse	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	4	3	4	42	4.2
Joystick or pen	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	16	1.6
Multiple ways to scroll, such as mouse wheel	5	3	1	4	3	5	3	5	3	4	36	3.6
Wrist support mouse pad	4	4	5	1	3	3	3	5	3	3	34	3.4
Wireless	4	4	5	1	3	2	2	4	3	2	30	3
NOISE												
Acoustic ceiling and carpeting	5	5	3	4	3	2	5	4	3	5	39	3.9
Absorption panels on walls	4	5	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	38	3.8
Clouds over each station	3	2	3	3	2	2	2		3	2	22	2.4
CHAIRS												
Swivel	5	5	3	1	4	5	5	5	5	2	40	4
Adjustable height	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	48	4.8
Adjustable back support	5	5	1	3	2	5	3	5	5	5	39	3.9
Armrests	5	5	4	2	3	5	5	3	5	1	38	3.8
Adjustable armrest height	5	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	40	4
Wheels	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	45	4.5
Footrest	3	5	1	1	2	3	1	4	3	1	24	2.4
Neck rest	3		1	1	2	2	1		2	3	15	1.9
MONITORS												
Adjustable angle superior-inferior	5	5	5	2	3	3	2	5	5	3	38	3.8
Adjustable angle right-left	5		5	1	3	2	2	5	5	3	31	3.4
Adjustable distance	5	5	5	2	3	4	4	5	5	3	41	4.1
Adjustable height	5	5	5	3	3	4	4	4	5	3	41	4.1
Adjustable brightness	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	4	5	3	41	4.1

(continued)

Table 1. Continued

	Member										Total	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
DESK												
Adjustable height	5	5	3	5	2	5	4	5	5	2	41	4.1
Adequacy of desk space	5	5	4	4	4	4	2	5	5	4	42	4.2
Keyboard tray	3	5	1	1	3	3	1		3	4	24	2.7
READING STATION												
Phone	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	47	4.7
Internet	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	49	4.9
Paging	5		5	3	2	1	2	5	3	4	30	3.3
Electronic medical record	5	5	5	5	2	3	5	5	5	4	44	4.4
Hands free dictation	5	5	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	2	29	2.9
READING STATION												
Number of monitors: 2, 3, 4, more	4	3	3	4	More (5)	3	4	4	4	4	33	3.7

room, was a high priority. Space is often sacrificed in an effort to cram as many reading stations as possible into the limited space of the reading room. This has become a particularly important issue in recent years with the increased workloads of radiologists and the need for increased staffing.

Rating 3.0 to 3.9

Among the factors with ratings of 3.0 to 3.9 was individualization of the workplace. Individualization took the form of individual controls for lighting and temperature, back support for chairs, and angulation of monitors. Individualization of the workplace also took the form of space for personal belongings and even individual reading rooms. Also important at this level were optimization of the mouse to allow individual preferences in terms of scrolling and other computer manipulations.

Unexpected Results

Some of the results were unexpected and differed from recommendations or discussions often cited in reviews of best ergonomic practices. For example, the number of monitors preferred by respondents in our poll was four, with three coming in as second choice. Two monitors were not believed to be adequate by any of the respondents. Similarly, although mouse design is frequently discussed as a significant factor in RSIs, our respondents were primarily in favor of the traditional mouse. Ventilation requirements and humidity were also not ranked highly, nor were footrests on the reading room chairs.

Of course, some of the criteria that were not considered high priorities may have received low ratings because their impact on and direct connection to highly

rated factors were not considered by the respondents. For example, elimination of distracting sources of noise was one of the highest priorities, achieving a score of 4.6. However, the installation of acoustic clouds over each station was not given a high rating, perhaps because respondents did not realize that this intervention is actually very effective in reducing noise levels. Similarly, a separate consultation area was not considered a high priority although it could be vital in reducing noise in the other reading areas.

TREATMENT AND PREVENTION OF RSIs

Once symptoms of an RSI appear, the best initial treatments, in addition to ergonomic approaches, are rest and anti-inflammatory agents [32]. Other treatments, such as splinting, physical therapy, and appropriate directed exercises to strengthen the muscles at risk, are also widely used. Although the vast majority of cases of RSI in radiologists are self-limited, it is important to acknowledge and treat these injuries because progression to chronicity, even to the point of requiring surgery, can occur.

With respect to prevention, it is widely known that ergonomic training and devices can substantially decrease the incidence and prevalence of RSI in radiologists. However, implementation is still incomplete in radiology departments in the United States, despite formal guidelines from the offices of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the American National Standards Institute and despite studies showing that ergonomic improvements can not only decrease RSIs but also result in myriad other benefits, including improved diagnostic accuracy and efficiency.

TAKE-HOME POINTS

- Radiologists' professional lives increasingly center on PACS and digital imaging.
- The implementation of the digital workplace has resulted in an increase in RSIs.
- Radiology work practices in general and practices common to certain radiology subspecialties in particular are especially prone to RSIs.
- Ergonomic approaches can reduce the frequency and severity of RSIs and improve radiologists' productivity but are multifactorial and involve nearly all aspects of the radiology workplace.
- A poll of our commission members with respect to prioritization of frequently mentioned ergonomic approaches revealed members' preferences that may help in departmental planning.

REFERENCES

1. Dhanoa D, Dhese TS, Burton KR, Nicolaou S, Liang T. The evolving role of the radiologist: the Vancouver workload utilization evaluation study. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2013;10:764-9.
2. Reiner BI, Siegel EL. The cutting edge: strategies to enhance radiologist workflow in a filmless/paperless imaging department. *J Digital Imaging* 2002;15:178-90.
3. Reiner BI, Siegel EL, Siddiqui K. Evolution of the digital revolution: a radiologist perspective. *J Digital Imaging* 2003;16:324-30.
4. Tjepkema M. Repetitive strain injury. *Health Rep* 2003;14:11-30.
5. Bryan S, Weatherburn G, Watkins J, et al. Radiology report times: impact of picture archiving and communication systems. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1998;170:1153-9.
6. Dackiewicz D, Bergsneider C, Piraino D. Impact of digital radiography on clinical workflow and patient satisfaction. *J Digital Imaging* 2000;13(2 Suppl 1):200-1.
7. Redfern RO, Horii SC, Feingold E, Kundel HL. Radiology workflow and patient volume: effect of picture archiving and communication systems on technologists and radiologists. *J Digital Imaging* 2000;13(2 Suppl 1):97-100.
8. Boiselle PM, Levine D, Horwich PJ, et al. Repetitive stress symptoms in radiology: prevalence and response to ergonomic interventions. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2008;5:919-23.
9. Ruess L, O'Connor SC, Cho KH, et al. Carpal tunnel syndrome and cubital tunnel syndrome: work-related musculoskeletal disorders in four symptomatic radiologists. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003;181:37-42.
10. Brusin JH. Ergonomics in radiology. *Radiol Technol* 2011;83:141-57.
11. Harisinghani MG, Blake MA, Saksena M, et al. Importance and effects of altered workplace ergonomics in modern radiology suites. *Radiographics* 2004;24:615-27.
12. Garcia-Lallana A, Viteri-Ramirez G, Saiz-Mendiguren R, Broncano J, Damaso Aquerreta J. [Ergonomics of the workplace in radiology]. *Radiologia* 2011;53:507-15.
13. Thompson AC, Kremer Prill MJ, Biswal S, et al. Factors associated with repetitive strain, and strategies to reduce injury among breast-imaging radiologists. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2014;11:1074-9.
14. Klein LW, Miller DL, Balter S, et al. Occupational health hazards in the interventional laboratory: time for a safer environment. *Radiology* 2009;250:538-44.
15. Robertson MM, Boiselle P, Eisenberg R, et al. Examination of computer task exposures in radiologists: a work systems approach. *Work* 2012;41(Suppl 1):1818-20.
16. Goyal N, Jain N, Rachapalli V. Ergonomics in radiology. *Clin Radiol* 2009;64:119-26.
17. Siegel E, Reiner B. Work flow redesign: the key to success when using PACS. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2002;178:563-6.
18. Hugine A, Guerlain S, Hedge A. User evaluation of an innovative digital reading room. *J Digital Imaging* 2012;25:337-46.
19. Gay SB, Sobel AH, Young LQ, Dwyer SJ III. Process involved in reading imaging studies: workflow analysis and implications for workstation development. *J Digital Imaging* 2002;15:171-7.
20. Horii SC. Electronic imaging workstations: ergonomic issues and the user interface. *Radiographics* 1992;12:773-87.
21. Siddiqui KM, Chia S, Knight N, Siegel EL. Design and ergonomic considerations for the filmless environment. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2006;3:456-67.
22. Siegel E, Reiner B, Abiri M, et al. The filmless radiology reading room: a survey of established picture archiving and communication system sites. *J Digital Imaging* 2000;13(2 Suppl 1):22-3.
23. Bennett WF, Vaswani KK, Mendiola JA, Spigos DG. PACS monitors: an evolution of radiologist's viewing techniques. *J Digital Imaging* 2002;15(Suppl 1):171-4.
24. Krupinski EA, Kallergi M. Choosing a radiology workstation: technical and clinical considerations. *Radiology* 2007;242:671-82.
25. Nagy P, Siegel E, Hanson T, Kreiner L, Johnson K, Reiner B. PACS reading room design. *Semin Roentgenol* 2003;38:244-55.
26. Burgess-Limerick R, Plooy A, Ankrum DR. The effect of imposed and self-selected computer monitor height on posture and gaze angle. *Clin Biomech* 1998;13:584-92.
27. Blehm C, Vishnu S, Khattak A, Mitra S, Yee RW. Computer vision syndrome: a review. *Surv Ophthalmol* 2005;50:253-62.
28. Vertinsky T, Forster B. Prevalence of eye strain among radiologists: influence of viewing variables on symptoms. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2005;184:681-6.
29. Straker L, Burgess-Limerick R, Pollock C, Maslen B. The influence of desk and display design on posture and muscle activity variability whilst performing information technology tasks. *Appl Ergonom* 2009;40:852-9.
30. Rodrigues JC, Morgan S, Augustine K, et al. Musculoskeletal symptoms amongst clinical radiologists and the implications of reporting environment ergonomics—a multicentre questionnaire study. *J Digital Imaging* 2014;27:255-61.
31. Driessen MT, Proper KI, Anema JR, Bongers PM, van der Beek AJ. Process evaluation of a participatory ergonomics programme to prevent low back pain and neck pain among workers. *Implement Sci* 2010;5:65.
32. van Tulder M, Malmivaara A, Koes B. Repetitive strain injury. *Lancet* 2007;369:1815-22.



Credits awarded for this enduring activity are designated "SA-CME" by the American Board of Radiology (ABR) and qualify toward fulfilling requirements for Maintenance of Certification (MOC) Part II: Lifelong Learning and Self-assessment. Scan the QR code to access the SA-CME activity or visit <http://bit.ly/ACRSACME>.

The Agony of It All: Musculoskeletal Discomfort in the Reading Room

Rebecca L. Seidel, MD, Elizabeth A. Krupinski, PhD

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine the extent and severity of musculoskeletal discomfort in radiologists using a standardized tool, the Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire (CMDQ). In addition, we evaluated the influence of demographic factors on the frequency of symptoms, degree of discomfort, interference of symptoms with ability to work, and overall pain.

Methods: The CMDQ was distributed via an anonymous link to all radiology trainees and faculty at our institution. The questionnaire assessed frequency and location of pain, severity of symptoms, and degree to which discomfort interfered with work. In addition, demographic data were collected.

Results: The survey was completed by 99 radiologists (39% response rate). The majority (80%) of respondents spent greater than 7 hours per workday at a diagnostic workstation. The neck (66%), lower back (61%), upper back (43%), right shoulder (36%), and right wrist (33%) were the areas where radiologists most frequently reported ache, pain, or discomfort at least once per week. More than 7 hours per day at a computer workstation was significantly associated with higher total pain.

Conclusions: Musculoskeletal discomfort in the week before the survey was reported by the majority of radiologists and was significantly influenced by demographic factors. Further investigation is needed to understand the causes of radiologists' discomfort at work and to evaluate interventions to ameliorate these symptoms.

Key Words: Ergonomics, musculoskeletal discomfort, occupational health, radiology

J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:1620-1625. Copyright © 2017 American College of Radiology

INTRODUCTION

Prolonged sitting and repetitive tasks are associated with musculoskeletal injury, fatigue, and poor health outcomes [1,2]. In a study of office workers at a large telecommunications company, 77.5% of respondents reported neck discomfort in the previous week, and musculoskeletal symptoms were most frequently reported in the neck, shoulder, low back, and wrist [3]. Another study showed a high prevalence of discomfort in the neck, upper back, and lower back of occupational notebook personal computer users [4].

In the PACS environment, radiologists spend the majority of their time seated at a computer workstation

and, therefore, are also at risk for work-related musculoskeletal injury. Previous studies have demonstrated a high incidence of work-related injuries such as back pain, carpal tunnel syndrome, eye strain, and headaches in radiologists [5,6]. A multicenter study in Great Britain reported radiology-associated occupational injury in 38% of surveyed radiologists [7]. Another study demonstrated a prevalence of repetitive strain injuries in 60.2% of surveyed breast imaging radiologists [8].

Fatigue and discomfort have also been identified as contributors to interpretation errors. Using the Swedish Occupational Fatigue Inventory to measure manifestations of physical fatigue, Krupinski et al demonstrated that radiologists are significantly fatigued after a long day of clinical reading. In addition, they showed that after an average of 8 hours in the clinic, radiologists' diagnostic accuracy decreased by over 4% [9-11].

There have been no studies of radiologists using validated tools designed to assess musculoskeletal discomfort among office workers. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent and severity of

Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences, Emory University School of Medicine Atlanta, Georgia.

Corresponding author and reprints: Rebecca L. Seidel, MD, Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences, Emory University School of Medicine 1365-C Clifton Road, NE, Suite C1104 Atlanta, GA 30322; e-mail: rseidel@emory.edu.

The authors have no conflicts of interest related to the material discussed in this article.

musculoskeletal discomfort in radiologists using a standardized tool, the Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire (CMDQ) [12]. In addition, we evaluated the influence of demographic factors on the frequency of symptoms, degree of discomfort, and interference of symptoms with ability to work.

METHODS

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Emory University School of Medicine. An electronic survey was distributed via anonymous link to all radiology residents, fellows, and attendings (n = 252) at our institution using survey software by Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com/survey-software/). The survey contained an electronic version of the CMDQ, a 54-item questionnaire about the prevalence of musculoskeletal symptoms in 18 regions of the body during the previous week. This standardized and validated survey tool assessed the frequency of ache, pain, or discomfort in specific areas of the body using a 5-point scale (never, 1-2 times last week, 3-4 times last week, once every day, and several times every day). These scores were weighted according to the survey scoring guidelines with weights of 0, 1.5, 3.5, 5, and 10, respectively, to determine an overall frequency score [12]. The degree of discomfort and the degree to which discomfort interfered with work were evaluated using a 3-point scale. Responses were weighted to calculate a discomfort score (slightly = 1, moderate = 2, very = 3) and an interference score (not at all = 1, slightly = 2, substantially = 3). The frequency, discomfort, and interference scores were multiplied to obtain a weighted score for each body area, which ranged from 0 to 90.

A total pain score was calculated for each individual by summing the weighted scores for each body part. The total weighted scores were dichotomized with those above the median categorized as high pain and those below the median considered low pain. A multivariable logistic regression was then carried out using these categories as the dependent variable and age (≥ 40 , < 40), gender (male, female), years of board certification (≥ 10 , < 10 years), rank (attending, trainee), shift length (≥ 7 hours, < 7 hours), workstation hours, and percent time standing as independent variables.

RESULTS

The survey was distributed to 252 radiologists (31% women, 69% men; 36% trainees, 64% faculty). It was

completed by 99 (39% response rate); 39% of participants were women and 61% were men, and 43% were trainees and 57% were faculty physicians. χ^2 analysis demonstrated that the data were representative of the gender and rank distribution of the population under study. The average age of respondents was 36.94 (SD = 10.19, minimum = 26, maximum = 61). The majority (80%, n = 78) of participants reported spending 7 hours per day or more at a computer workstation, and more than one-half (52%, n = 51) spent 100% of their time in a seated position (Table 1).

Overall, 87% of radiologists surveyed reported ache, pain, or discomfort in at least one body area at least one to two times in the week before the survey. The areas of the body where discomfort was most frequently reported were the neck, back, and right upper extremity (Fig. 1). Respondents reported discomfort one to two times per week or more in the neck (66%), lower back (61%),

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants

Characteristic	%
Position	
Trainee (resident or fellow)	43
Faculty	57
Gender	
Male	61
Female	39
Years board certified	
<10	29
11-20	12
21-30	10
>30	5
Not yet certified	44
Hours per day at diagnostic workstation	
1-2	7
3-4	2
5-6	11
7-8	44
9-10	33
11-12	3
Time spent standing vs seated	
100% seated	52
90% seated, 10% standing	27
80% seated, 20% standing	8
70% seated, 30% standing	1
60% seated, 40% standing	1
50% seated, 50% standing	3
40% seated, 60% standing	1
30% seated, 70% standing	1
20% seated, 80% standing	1
10% seated, 90% standing	3
100% standing	1




Fig 1. Location of symptoms in radiologists reporting ache, pain, and discomfort in the work week before the survey.

upper back (43%), right shoulder (36%), and right wrist (33%) (Table 2).

In areas where pain was reported, participants were asked, “If you experienced ache, pain, or discomfort, did this interfere with your ability to work?” Of respondents with neck pain, 53% (n = 28) reported that their symptoms slightly or substantially interfered with their ability to work, and 41% (n = 22) of participants with low back pain and 40% (n = 13) with upper back pain reported slight interference with their ability to work. No one with back pain reported that it substantially interfered with their ability to work. Of those with right wrist pain, 11% (n = 3) reported that it substantially interfered with their ability to work (Fig. 2).

The weighted frequency, severity, and work interference scores were multiplied to obtain a total weighted score for each body site. Analysis of the mean weighted scores demonstrated the most severe scores in the neck (mean = 7.88, range 0-60, SD = 15.2), right shoulder (mean = 4.49, range 0-90, SD = 13.85), and lower back (mean = 5.66, range 0-60, SD = 13.38) (Table 2).

Statistically significant gender differences were observed in the location and severity of discomfort. Female radiologists were more likely than male radiologists to report symptoms in the right shoulder ($P = .007$), left shoulder ($P = .0078$), and left forearm ($P = .031$). Female radiologists were more likely than male radiologists to report that their neck ($P = .0346$), lower back ($P = .0354$), and hip or buttocks ($P = .0472$) symptoms were moderately or very uncomfortable. Female radiologists (75%) were more likely than male radiologists (11%) to report that right thigh pain slightly interfered with their ability to work ($P = .015$).

Years of board certification and age of radiologist were associated with statistically significant differences in responses. Radiologists who were board certified for more

than 10 years were more likely to report ache, pain, or discomfort in the left upper arm ($P = .044$) and left forearm ($P = .016$). Radiologists that have been board certified for more than 10 years were more likely to report that neck pain interfered with their work than radiologists who were board certified for less than 10 years ($P = .0128$).

Hours at the workstation and percent of day seated were also associated with statistically significant differences in responses. Respondents who spent 7 hours per day or greater at the workstation were more likely to report right shoulder symptoms than those who spent up to 6 hours per day at the workstation ($P = .042$). Those who spent 90% or more of their day seated were more likely to report discomfort in their left shoulder ($P = .01$) and upper back ($P = .0007$).

The total weighted score for each body part was summed for each individual to calculate a total pain score. The mean total pain score was 36.1 (median = 4.75, SD = 60.47). The only variable that was significantly related to a high pain score was > 7 hours at a workstation ($P = .045$) (Table 3). Logistic regression analysis showed that those who worked >7 hours at a workstation were 3.4 times more likely to report high pain.

DISCUSSION

This survey confirmed previously published findings of musculoskeletal pain among radiologists and added new insight into the frequency of symptoms, the degree to which they impact ability to work, and the role of demographics on the location and prevalence of musculoskeletal discomfort. Statistically significant demographic factors included gender, age, years of board certification, time spent seated, and hours at the workstation.

Our data show that the majority of radiologists in our sample spent 7 or more hours per workday at a computer workstation. This variable was significantly associated with an overall higher total pain score. In addition, the majority worked in a seated position 100% of the time. This amount of sedentary time potentially places radiologists at risk of sitting disease [13]. *Sitting disease* is a term that refers to the increased incidence of illness and mortality associated with prolonged sedentary time. Our findings suggest the need to educate radiologists regarding the adverse health effects of prolonged sitting and encourage them to incorporate movement breaks and periods of standing into their workday. In addition, the reading room environment must be modified to allow for changes in work position throughout the

Table 2. Frequency, severity, and work interference of musculoskeletal discomfort

Site	Frequency of Ache, Pain, Discomfort in the Last Work Week (%)					Severity of Discomfort (%)			Work Interference (%)			Mean Weighted Scores (SD)
	Never	1-2 Times	3-4 Times	Once Every Day	Several Times Every Day	Slightly	Moderately	Very	Not at All	Slightly	Substantially	
Neck	34	30	10	7	19	60	28	11	47	51	2	7.80 (15.2)
R shoulder	64	17	5	2	12	57	30	13	53	43	4	4.44 (13.85)
L shoulder	70	13	5	3	9	64	16	20	60	36	4	3.26 (13)
Upper back	57	22	9	4	8	67	24	9	60	40	0	3.34 (9.34)
Lower back	39	39	7	4	11	67	25	8	59	41	0	5.60 (13.38)
R upper arm	84	10	3	1	2	69	31	0	60	40	0	.78 (3.04)
L upper arm	91	5	1	0	3	73	27	0	82	18	0	.23 (1.47)
R forearm	85	7	5	1	2	73	27	0	53	47	0	.84 (3.15)
L forearm	92	5	1	0	2	78	11	11	82	9	9	1.11 (9.14)
R wrist	67	21	5	3	4	56	44	0	46	43	11	2.46 (7.42)
L wrist	86	10	0	2	2	69	31	0	67	27	6	1.18 (5.49)
Hip or buttocks	68	16	8	6	2	58	42	0	69	28	3	1.78 (5)
R thigh	89	7	2	1	1	60	40	0	72	28	0	0.66 (2.91)
L thigh	89	7	2	1	1	80	20	0	79	21	0	0.36 (1.67)
R knee	84	11	3	1	1	80	20	0	78	22	0	0.60 (2.68)
L knee	88	7	3	2	0	83	17	0	81	19	0	0.51 (2.54)
R lower leg	89	8	2	1	0	83	17	0	81	19	0	0.43 (2.48)
L lower leg	92	6	1	0	1	91	9	0	87	13	0	0.32 (1.76)

L = left; R = right.




Fig 2. Responses to “If you experienced ache, pain, or discomfort, did this interfere with your ability to work?”

course of the work day, for example, by incorporating furniture that is height adjustable.

A high prevalence of discomfort in the neck, back, and wrists has been shown in nonradiologist office workers, as well as in radiologists [3,4]. In their survey of breast imagers, Thompson et al showed that repetitive strain injury was most commonly reported in the neck and wrists [8]. In our study, 33% of radiologists reported right wrist pain and 66% of respondents reported neck pain at least one or two times in the previous work week. More than half of those reporting neck symptoms stated that the discomfort at least slightly interfered with their ability to work. Neck pain was more likely to interfere with work in radiologists that are older or have been practicing longer. Because we included trainees in our survey, our data may underestimate the prevalence and impact of neck pain,

Table 3. Associations of individual and work-related risk factors with high pain score

Risk Factors	High Pain (%)	χ^2	P Value
Age		0.7025	.402
Under 40	46.8		
Over 40	55.6		
Gender		0.1719	.678
Male	48.3		
Female	52.6		
Years board certified		0.0414	.839
<10	49.1		
10+	51.2		
Rank		2.743	.098
Attending	44.6		
Resident	62.5		
Shift length (hours)		4.021	.045
<7	30.0		
7+	55.1		

because it might be slightly skewed toward a younger demographic.

Further investigation into the etiology of radiologists’ neck pain is required, but it could be due to improper monitor positioning, insufficient neck support from the chair, or even eye strain. This finding should be taken into consideration when choosing reading room furniture and equipment. Radiologists may benefit from education about reading room ergonomics and proper adjustment of furniture and equipment before each reading session.

Although our study did not demonstrate significant gender differences with respect to overall pain, we found statistically significant gender differences in location and severity of discomfort. Female radiologists were more likely than male radiologists to report right shoulder, left shoulder, and left forearm symptoms. They were more likely than male radiologists to report moderately or very uncomfortable neck, low back, and hip or buttock pain. They were also more likely to report that right thigh pain slightly or substantially interfered with their ability to work. Interestingly, gender differences have also been observed in other industries. Erdinc found that female gender was significantly associated with musculoskeletal discomfort in the neck and upper extremity in occupational notebook personal computer users [4]. These differences may be due to furniture design that favors a male body habitus or differences in position and posture between genders. More investigation is needed to better understand how to optimize workstation ergonomics for the female radiologist.

This study has some limitations. There was potential for self-selection bias such that those with musculoskeletal symptoms may have been more likely to respond than those without. Because trainees were included, the average age of participants was 36.94, which is likely younger than the average age of practicing radiologists. In addition, it was a single-institution study that may not reflect the ergonomics or demographics of other practices.

In summary, musculoskeletal strain symptoms were prevalent among radiologists. Greater than 7 hours per day at a PACS workstation was significantly associated with a higher overall pain score. Symptoms differ in location and severity among male and female radiologists. Symptoms may be more likely to interfere with work with increasing age and increasing years in practice. Further investigation is required to determine if ergonomic education and changes in furniture and equipment design would ameliorate pain and discomfort in radiologists.

TAKE-HOME POINTS

- The majority (80%, n = 78) of participants reported working 7 hours per day or more at a computer workstation, and more than half (52%, n = 51) spent 100% of their time in a seated position.
- Radiologists most frequently reported symptoms in the neck, back, and right upper extremity.
- Musculoskeletal symptoms varied in location and severity between male and female radiologists.
- Musculoskeletal symptoms were more likely to interfere with work with increasing age and increasing years in practice.
- Greater than 7 hours per day at a PACS workstation was significantly associated with a higher total pain score.

REFERENCES

1. Gibbs BB, Hergenroeder AL, Katzmarzyk PT, et al. Definition, measurement, and health risks associated with sedentary behavior. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2015;47:1295-300.
2. Chau JY, Grunseit AC, Chey T, et al. Daily sitting time and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e80000.
3. Kumar S, Fagarasanu M. Musculoskeletal symptoms in support staff in a large telecommunication company. *Work* 2006;27:137-42.
4. Erdinc O. Upper extremity musculoskeletal discomfort among occupational notebook personal computer users: work interference, associations with risk factors and the use of notebook computer stand and docking station. *Work* 2011;39:455-63.
5. Boiselle PM, Levine D, Horwich PJ, et al. Repetitive stress symptoms in radiology: prevalence and response to ergonomic interventions. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2008;5:919-23.
6. Reuss L, O'Connor SC, Cho KH, et al. Carpal tunnel syndrome and cubital tunnel syndrome: work-related musculoskeletal disorders in four symptomatic radiologists. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003;181:37-42.
7. Rodrigues JC, Morgan S, Augustine K, et al. Musculoskeletal symptoms amongst clinical radiologists and the implications of reporting environment ergonomics—a multicentre questionnaire study. *J Digit Imaging* 2014;27:255-61.
8. Thompson AC, Kremer Prill MJ, Biswal S, et al. Factors associated with repetitive strain, and strategies to reduce injury among breast-imaging radiologists. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2014;11:1074-9.
9. Krupinski EA, Berbaum KS. Measurement of visual strain in radiologists. *Acad Radiol* 2009;16:947-50.
10. Krupinski EA, Berbaum KS, Caldwell RT, et al. Long radiology workdays reduce detection and accommodation accuracy. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2010;7:698-704.
11. Krupinski EA, Berbaum KS, Caldwell RT, et al. Do long radiology workdays affect nodule detection in dynamic CT interpretation? *J Am Coll Radiol* 2012;9:191-8.
12. Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire for Sedentary Workers. Cornell University Ergonomics Web. Available at: <http://ergo.human.cornell.edu/ahmsquest.html>. Accessed April 17, 2017.
13. Levine JA. *Get up! Why your chair is killing you and what you can do about it.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press; 2014.

Tired in the Reading Room: The Influence of Fatigue in Radiology

EC: Editor's Choice

SA-CME

Stephen Waite, MD^a, Srinivas Kolla, MD^a, Jean Jeudy, MD^b, Alan Legasto, MD^c,
Stephen L. Macknik, PhD^d, Susana Martinez-Conde, PhD^d, Elizabeth A. Krupinski, PhD^e,
Deborah L. Reede, MD^a

Abstract

Commonly conflated with sleepiness, fatigue is a distinct multidimensional condition with physical and mental effects. Fatigue in health care providers and any secondary effects on patient care are an important societal concern. As medical image interpretation is highly dependent on visual input, visual fatigue is of particular interest to radiologists. Humans analyze their surroundings with rapid eye movements called saccades, and fatigue decreases saccadic velocity. Oculomotor parameters may, therefore, be an objective and reproducible metric of fatigue and eye movement analysis can provide valuable insight into the etiology of fatigue-related error.

Key Words: Fatigue, saccades, fixations, eye tracking, error

J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:191-197. Copyright © 2016 American College of Radiology

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary radiologists practice in an environment of increasing workloads, reduced reimbursement, and shorter turnaround times to interpret increasingly complex examinations [1]. Because financial compensation in many practices is dependent on productivity, radiologists may interpret studies faster than their “natural” reporting speed, take fewer breaks, and work longer hours to optimize compensation [2]. Pressure to increase productivity has evolved with little understanding of the perceptual, cognitive, and physical limitations of interpreting radiologists, despite evidence that increased workload and fatigue is associated with visual tiredness,

cognitive overload, and decision fatigue [1,3]. As radiologists strive to maximize productivity, it is important to consider the potential implications of fatigue to ensure that higher volume and reporting speeds do not compromise patient outcomes.

FATIGUE VERSUS SLEEPINESS

The terms “sleepiness” and “fatigue” are commonly conflated in both clinical research and practice [4]. Sleepiness is defined as drowsiness, sleep propensity, and decreased alertness [5]. Fatigue is typically described as weariness, weakness, and depleted energy [5]. Although the two conditions often coexist, fatigue can occur without sleepiness. Insomniacs, for example, may feel fatigued without being sleepy [5]. Both fatigue and sleepiness can have adverse effects on daily functions, but their etiology and preventative interventions may differ [4].

FATIGUE—TYPES AND MEASUREMENT

A term with multiple meanings, “fatigue” has both physical and mental components [6]. Exertion and discomfort are physical manifestations of fatigue and lack of motivation and “sleepiness” are considered mental components [6]. Lack of energy reflects both physical and mental aspects of fatigue [6]. Several subjective scales are used to measure fatigue (eg, Brief Fatigue Scale), but there is no

^aDepartment of Radiology, SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York.

^bDepartment of Diagnostic Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, University of Maryland Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland.

^cDepartment of Radiology, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, New York.

^dDepartments of Ophthalmology, Neurology, Physiology, and Pharmacology, SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York.

^eDepartment of Radiology & Imaging Sciences, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Corresponding author and reprints: Stephen Waite, MD, SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Department of Radiology, 450 Clarkson Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11203; e-mail: Stephen.waite@downstate.edu.

The authors have no conflicts of interest related to the material discussed in this article.

gold standard and data interpretation may depend on the particular scale employed [4,5].

Fatigue-Critical Flicker Fusion Test

One controversial measurement of fatigue is the Critical Flicker Fusion test (CFF). During this test, the subject indicates the minimum frequency at which a flickering light is perceived as flickering and not continuous, the “fusion-frequency threshold” [7]. Because the threshold provides a measure of the observer’s ability to distinguish discrete sensory events, it is thought to provide a measure of central nervous system (CNS) activity or “cortical arousal” [8]. A lower CFF value is, therefore, believed to be associated with CNS fatigue [9]. As CFF is sensitive to both intrinsic and extrinsic factors, the impact of either factor can be confounded by the other factor’s influence [8]. Despite its potential limitations, CFF has been used to assess fatigue in radiologists.

Two studies showed a decline in the CFF frequency (the rate at which the stimulus appears as continuous, indicative of CNS fatigue) of radiologists after a 4-hour work shift and one shift of undefined duration [9,10].

FATIGUE IN GENERAL MEDICINE

Fatigue in health care professionals can potentially contribute to medical errors [11]. Recent analysis estimates a mean rate of death from medical error of over 251,000 per year, suggesting it is the third most common cause of death in the United States [12]. To reduce errors potentially caused by fatigue, in 2003 the ACGME implemented resident work-hour restrictions with the expectation that this would have a positive effect on patient care outcomes and resident quality-of-life measures [13,14].

Subsequent studies demonstrate that residents with shorter work hours report improved quality of life, better sleep, and less fatigue, but work-hour restrictions have not translated into definitive improvements in patient outcomes [13,14].

VISUAL FATIGUE

As interpretation of medical images relies highly on visual input, in addition to “general” fatigue, visual fatigue is of particular concern in radiology. The first step in the interpretation of medical imaging is detection, noting a finding of potential medical concern. This initial task is of prime importance, because without detection subsequent steps leading to diagnosis cannot be executed [15].

Most investigations regarding the quantification of visual fatigue are focused on its oculomotor-related

symptoms. These symptoms reflect changes in the accommodation and vergence responses of the eye as well as changes in pupil and eye-blink responses. Accommodation refers to the action of the ciliary muscles contracting or relaxing, altering the curvature of the lens of the eye to optimize the focus of images on the retina [16]. Vergence is the simultaneous movement of both eyes in opposite directions to obtain or maintain single binocular vision on an object as a function of its distance (focal point). Accommodation and vergence decline with fatigue, resulting in decreased ability to maintain focus on a set point in space (eg, a solitary pulmonary nodule in a chest x-ray) [16] (Fig. 1). An extended period of image interpretation at close viewing distances requires active and sustained convergence and accommodation, which tire ciliary and extraocular muscles [6,16,17].

In research studies, accommodation and vergence measures are considered objective indicators of visual




Fig 1. (a) Accommodation. Accommodation is the process where the eye changes optical power to maintain focus on objects. Accommodation increases as objects get nearer. To focus on near objects, the ciliary muscle contracts and the lens assumes a more spherical shape. (b) Convergence. When viewing far objects, the eyes are parallel. To look at a near object, the eyes converge—rotate toward each other—to maintain binocular vision.

fatigue [6,16]. Krupinski and Berbaum [16] found that radiologists had worse accommodation after a day of reading than at the start of the workday. Affected at all distances, participants were least able to accommodate to near targets (critical for radiologic interpretation, a near-work task). This difficulty to focus can make it harder to detect abnormalities, by either reducing accuracy or necessitating additional reading time if accuracy is preserved [16]. Ikushima et al [9] also found that radiologists' visual strain, measured on a subjective scale, increases after a day of reading.

EFFECTS OF FATIGUE ON INTERPRETIVE ERROR

Increased eye strain after a shift does not necessarily predict interpretative error. Early studies found no difference in the error rates of residents before and after a 15-hour shift, or of attending radiologists from the beginning to the end of the workday in pulmonary nodule detection tasks [18,19]. However, neither study measured physical or visual fatigue. In 2010, Krupinski et al [20] investigated the effect of fatigue in the detection of "easy"- and "hard"-to-detect bone fractures, finding that readers were more myopic (nearsighted), were more subjectively fatigued, and experienced increased visual strain after a day of diagnostic interpretation, compared with the morning before diagnostic reading. Detection accuracy was lower for late versus early readings [20].

CT scans are viewed dynamically, with successive images presented one after another under the radiologists' control. Because the internal processing of dynamic and static images differs, the impact of fatigue could vary [21]. Krupinski et al [21] studied this possibility by investigating the effect of fatigue and error in CT scan interpretation in a nodule detection task. After a day of reading, radiologists had high levels of visual strain and statistically significantly decreased accuracy for nodule detection [21].

Ruutinen et al [22] found an increased number of clinically significant interpretation disparities between preliminary resident reports in the last 2 hours of a 12-hour overnight shift, compared with the final readings by attending physicians rendered the following day. Although the residents' level of fatigue was not directly ascertained, the authors surmised that fatigue was the most plausible explanation for this deterioration in performance [22].

In clinical practice, attending radiologists operate without defined work hours and can choose shifts and work hours that do not optimize their performance. Furthermore,

residents routinely work 16- to 24-hour shifts, often overnight and without adequate sleep. It is therefore likely that fatigue-related effects are more significant in clinical practice than has been demonstrated experimentally.

OCULOMOTOR DYNAMICS AND SCENE ANALYSIS

When scanning the immediate surroundings, the eyes make jerky saccadic movements, interleaved with fixation periods [23]. These saccades are rapid movements of the eyes that capture detailed snapshots with the fovea—the central part of the retina, with sufficient photoreceptor density to provide high-resolution vision [23]. The fovea is only about 0.4 mm in diameter, corresponding to about 2 degrees of visual angle, but plays a critical role in resolving detail [24] (Figs. 2 and 3). Under normal viewing conditions, observers generate several saccades per second, unconsciously selecting their goals. The visual system does not obtain useful information while a saccade is in motion; thus, vision is dependent upon the information gathered during the fixation pauses between saccades [25].

One of the major components of interpretation is how images are searched. Radiologists obtain a significant amount of information before a focused visual search. In 1975, Kundel and Nodine found that radiologists




Fig 2. Relationship of rod and cone density to the distance from the fovea. The retina contains 2 different types of photoreceptors, rods and cones, and the region of the retina with the highest visual acuity is the area of highest cone density, the fovea centralis.




Fig 3. Vertical (A) and horizontal (B) field of view of the human eye. The fovea is the portion of the retina with the highest spatial resolution constituting the central 2 to 4 degrees of the visual field.

detected abnormalities on chest radiographs presented for 200 msec (enough time for just a single fixation) with 70% accuracy, indicating that valuable information can be extracted from an image without performing a detailed examination [26]. Subsequent studies confirm this finding demonstrating that radiologists can detect abnormalities in sub-second viewing times with high accuracy [27-30].

Visual search of complex images, such as radiographic studies, is thought to occur in two steps. The first step consists of a rapid primary global or “gist” response, which takes place during the first 40 to 200 msec of looking at an image [23,29]. The radiologist may rapidly identify abnormal areas in the image with peripheral vision and select them for subsequent foveal scrutiny [27,31]. A second “systemic scan” then occurs, which allows for accurate object recognition using foveal

vision [27]. Features are examined carefully and tested against the readers’ cognitive schema to determine whether a finding is suspicious. Once concordance is achieved between image elements and the viewer’s cognitive scheme, a decision is made [31]. This step, termed the “bottleneck of attention,” lasts seconds to minutes and is capacity limited [27,28].

ELUCIDATION OF ERRORS IN RADIOLOGY WITH EYE-TRACKING TECHNOLOGY

Errors in image interpretation have been recognized since the seminal works of Garland in 1949 [32]. Inadequate and erroneous perception are the primary etiologies for these mistakes [33]. The estimated interpretive error rate in a mix of normal and abnormal cases averages 3.5% to 4%. However, when the case mix consists exclusively of studies with abnormalities the error rate increases to approximately 30% [34]. This rate of error has remained virtually unchanged for over 50 years [34,35].

Modern research conducted with eye-tracking technology has demonstrated a link between oculomotor dynamics and cognitive processes [36]. This understanding has been instrumental in elucidating the nature of radiologic error. Three types of false-negative or omission errors have been defined: (1) search errors—failure of the observer to fixate the fovea on the lesion; (2) recognition errors—the observer fixates on the lesion for a short time but fails to discern it from the background; (3) decision-making or cognitive errors—the observer fixates on the lesion for a sufficient amount of time, but either does not recognize concerning features of the lesion or actively dismisses them [31,35,37]. Search and recognition errors are considered to be “perceptual” in nature [35].

THE INFLUENCE OF FATIGUE ON EYE MOVEMENTS

Mental fatigue has major effects on eye movement dynamics and increased time on task is linked to decreased saccadic velocity [38]. Saccadic velocity (the speed of the saccade measured in degrees/second), therefore, has the potential to serve as an objective and noninvasive biomarker of fatigue [39].

Di Stasi et al [40] measured subjective fatigue and eye-movement dynamics of surgical residents before and after a 24-hour shift and found that residents felt more fatigued with increased time on duty and had decreased saccadic velocity (Fig. 4). Other studies have reported similar oculomotor findings as a function of fatigue/time on task in both laboratory and natural scenarios [38,41,42].




Fig 4. Effect of time on duty and the saccadic peak velocity–magnitude relationship. There is a consistent relationship between saccadic velocity and amplitude (saccadic magnitude in degrees of visual angle), termed the “main sequence.” The slope of the main sequence decreases with increased time on duty in postcall (dashed line) versus precall (solid line) surgical residents. This finding is attributable to decreased saccadic velocity with increased fatigue. (Based on Di Stasi LL, McCamy MB, Macknik SL, Mankin JA, Hooft N, Catena A, Martinez-Conde S. Saccadic eye movement metrics reflect surgical residents’ fatigue. *Ann Surg* 2014;259:824-9).

UTILITY OF OCULOMOTOR MEASURES OF FATIGUE IN THE STUDY OF MEDICAL INTERPRETATION ERRORS

Eye-movement analysis can provide valuable insights into the nature of fatigue-related error, such as whether fatigue changes the nature of visual search, whether fatigued radiologists have typical viewing patterns, and whether fatigue-related error is cognitive or perceptual in etiology.

Fatigue and Search Pattern Analysis

The analysis of search patterns (scanpaths) has provided insight into the nature of expertise (Fig. 5) and, similarly, can determine how fatigue affects specific elements of search [27,43-45].

Scanpath alteration as a consequence of fatigue has been noted in nonmedical tasks. During a 30-minute sustained attention task in which subjects had to detect digits in a rectangular array, subjective fatigue increased, the number of fixations decreased, the distance between fixation location and target digits increased, and the subjects’ gaze drifted toward the center of the screen over time [46]. Another study found increased mean fixation duration as a function of subjective fatigue during free visual exploration of a landscape [47].

The Influence of Fatigue on Gaze Volume and Coverage

Recent studies have quantified radiologists’ gaze volume (as a percentage of the image viewed) during CT chest interpretation, demonstrating that radiologists look at an average of 27%-69% of the parenchyma [43,48,49].

Radiologists often report that they “barely look at” and “gloss over” studies at the end of a long, demanding shift. These subjective feelings may be reflected in changes in their interpretation time and/or the percentage of the image viewed. Burling et al [50] found that radiologists spend less time interpreting CT colonography examinations as they near the end of a day of work: they interpreted the




Fig 5. Typical scanpath in a first-year (novice) radiologist (a) and an expert radiologist (b) while searching a chest radiograph (CXR) for lung nodules. This CXR has a pulmonary nodule at the left base (arrow). Expert radiologists demonstrate more efficient scanpaths (red lines) compared with novices with fewer fixations (circles), less coverage of the image, fewer saccades, and faster arrival at the abnormality.

last five cases 29% faster than the first five cases of the shift. This increase in interpretive speed at the end of a shift suggests that radiologists may be less thorough toward the end of a long reading period, possibly secondary to decreased image coverage/gaze volume. Both scan coverage and interpretation times can be assessed utilizing eye-tracking technology to elucidate the effects of fatigue on interpretation mechanics.

Eye-tracking technology can also provide insight into whether fatigued radiologists neglect any specific portion of the visual field. Roge et al [51] studied ocular dynamics in subjects while they drove a simulator for 1 hour. Monotonous driving resulted in decreased vigilance and deterioration of the useful visual field for both sleep-deprived and non-sleep-deprived participants. The authors suggest that deterioration of the useful visual field may be progressive, taking the form of tunnel vision when sleep debt is not significant and affecting the whole visual field in the presence of significant sleep deprivation [51]. Similarly, fatigued interpreters may neglect a portion of the image, with resultant search errors.

Fatigue and its Influence on Omission Errors

Lastly, eye tracking technology can elucidate the nature of omission errors made by fatigued radiologists by analyzing the length of time spent fixating on abnormalities that were seen but not interpreted as abnormal (ie, consistent with a cognitive error) [37]. Cognitive versus perceptual errors likely require different approaches for amelioration via training and system support [35].

CONCLUSION

Although technological solutions, such as computer-aided detection, have been advanced as a solution to interpretive error (including those errors engendered from fatigue), clinical results thus far have been mixed, at best [52]. Other technological techniques such as osseous subtraction in chest imaging have also been advanced, with promising results; however, for the foreseeable future, imaging interpretation remains a human endeavor and is thereby subject to human emotional, physical, and mental states—including fatigue [53,54]. As such, it is critically important for radiologists and practice leaders to leverage neuroscience tools to understand and mitigate effects of fatigue on interpretation. Targeted interventions may then be proposed, studied, and implemented to ameliorate any negative effects on patient safety.

TAKE-HOME POINTS

- The implications of fatigue on interpretive error are important to study, given its potential to compromise patient safety.
- In addition to “generalized” physical and mental fatigue, radiologists have to consider the effects on visual oculomotor fatigue, given the primacy of lesion detection in diagnostic interpretation.
- Radiologists demonstrate decreased ability to focus and decreased accuracy with fatigue.
- Fatigue decreases the velocity of rapid eye movements, termed “saccades,” which occur between fixation periods, potentially an objective metric of fatigue.
- Although technological solutions have been advanced as a solution to reduce errors in interpretation, for the foreseeable future radiology is a human endeavor. As such, factors such as fatigue, which potentially decreases performance, are important to comprehensively understand.

REFERENCES

1. Forman HP, Larson DB, Kazerooni EA, et al. Masters of radiology panel discussion: hyperefficient radiology—can we maintain the pace? *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2012;199:838-43.
2. Sokolovskaya E, Shinde T, Ruchman RB, et al. The effect of faster reporting speed for imaging studies on the number of misses and interpretation errors: a pilot study. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2015;12:683-8.
3. Reiner BI, Krupinski E. The insidious problem of fatigue in medical imaging practice. *J Digit Imaging* 2012;25:3-6.
4. Shahid A, Shen J, Shapiro CM. Measurements of sleepiness and fatigue. *J Psychosom Res* 2010;69:81-9.
5. Pigeon WR, Sateia MJ, Ferguson RJ. Distinguishing between excessive daytime sleepiness and fatigue: toward improved detection and treatment. *J Psychosom Res* 2003;54:61-9.
6. Krupinski E, Reiner BI. Real-time occupational stress and fatigue measurement in medical imaging practice. *J Digit Imaging* 2012;25:319-24.
7. Bajaj JS. Review article: the modern management of hepatic encephalopathy. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2010;31:537-47.
8. Wilson S, Benjamin K, Sreenivasan B. An Evaluation of the Sensitivity of the Critical Flicker Fusion (CFF) Test to the Neurobehavioural Effects of Alcohol. Sheffield, UK: UK Health & Safety Laboratory; 2003. Available at http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/hsl_pdf/2003/hsl03-16.pdf. Accessed on October 22, 2016.
9. Ikushima Y, Yabuuchi H, Morishita J, Honda H. Analysis of dominant factors affecting fatigue caused by soft-copy reading. *Acad Radiol* 2013;20:1448-56.
10. Maeda E, Yoshikawa T, Hayashi N, et al. Radiology reading-caused fatigue and measurement of eye strain with critical flicker fusion frequency. *Jpn J Radiol* 2011;29:483-7.
11. Ricci JA, Chee E, Lorandeanu AL, Berger J. Fatigue in the U.S. workforce: prevalence and implications for lost productive work time. *J Occup Environ Med* 2007;49:1-10.
12. Makary MA, Daniel M. Medical error—the third leading cause of death in the US. *BMJ* 2016;353:i2139.

13. Harris JD, Staheli G, LeClere L, Anderson D, McCormick F. What effects have resident work-hour changes had on education, quality of life, and safety? A systematic review. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2015;473:1600-8.
14. Volpp KG, Rosen AK, Rosenbaum PR, et al. Mortality among hospitalized Medicare beneficiaries in the first 2 years following ACGME resident duty hour reform. *JAMA* 2007;298:975-83.
15. Gray JE, Taylor KW, Hobbs BB. Detection accuracy in chest radiography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1978;131:247-53.
16. Krupinski EA, Berbaum KS. Measurement of visual strain in radiologists. *Acad Radiol* 2009;16:947-50.
17. Murata K, Araki S, Yokoyama K, Yamashita K, Okumatsu T, Sakou S. Accumulation of VDT work-related visual fatigue assessed by visual evoked potential, near point distance and critical flicker fusion. *Ind Health* 1996;34:61-9.
18. Brogdon BG, Kelsey CA, Moseley RD. Effect of fatigue and alcohol on observer perception. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1978;130:971-4.
19. Christensen EE, Dietz GW, Murry RC, Moore JG. The effect of fatigue on resident performance. *Radiology* 1977;125:103-5.
20. Krupinski EA, Berbaum KS, Caldwell RT, Scharz KM, Kim J. Long radiology workdays reduce detection and accommodation accuracy. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2010;7:698-704.
21. Krupinski EA, Berbaum KS, Caldwell RT, Scharz KM, Madsen MT, Kramer DJ. Do long radiology workdays affect nodule detection in dynamic CT interpretation? *J Am Coll Radiol* 2012;9:191-8.
22. Ruutiainen AT, Durand DJ, Scanlon MH, Itri JN. Increased error rates in preliminary reports issued by radiology residents working more than 10 consecutive hours overnight. *Acad Radiol* 2013;20:305-11.
23. McCamy MB, Otero-Millan J, Di Stasi LL, Macknik SL, Martinez-Conde S. Highly informative natural scene regions increase microsaccade production during visual scanning. *J Neurosci* 2014;34:2956-66.
24. Di Stasi LL, Renner R, Staehr P, et al. Saccadic peak velocity sensitivity to variations in mental workload. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2010;81(4):413-7.
25. Ibbotson M, Kregelberg B. Visual perception and saccadic eye movements. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 2011;21:553-8.
26. Kundel HL, Nodine CF. Interpreting chest radiographs without visual search. *Radiology* 1975;116(3):527-32.
27. Drew T, Evans K, Vo ML, Jacobson FL, Wolfe JM. Informatics in radiology: what can you see in a single glance and how might this guide visual search in medical images? *Radiographics* 2013;33:263-74.
28. Oestmann JW, Greene R, Bourgouin PM, Linetsky L, Llewellyn HJ. Chest "gestalt" and detectability of lung lesions. *Eur J Radiol* 1993;16:154-7.
29. Oestmann JW, Greene R, Kushner DC, Bourgouin PM, Linetsky L, Llewellyn HJ. Lung lesions: correlation between viewing time and detection. *Radiology* 1988;166:451-3.
30. Evans KK, Georgian-Smith D, Tambouret R, Birdwell RL, Wolfe JM. The gist of the abnormal: above-chance medical decision making in the blink of an eye. *Psychon Bull Rev* 2013;20:1170-5.
31. Krupinski EA. The role of perception in imaging: past and future. *Semin Nucl Med* 2011;41:392-400.
32. Garland LH. On the scientific evaluation of diagnostic procedures. *Radiology* 1949;52:309-28.
33. Kundel HL. History of research in medical image perception. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2006;3:402-8.
34. Berlin L. Accuracy of diagnostic procedures: has it improved over the past five decades? *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007;188:1173-8.
35. Tourassi G, Voisin S, Paquit V, Krupinski E. Investigating the link between radiologists' gaze, diagnostic decision, and image content. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2013;20:1067-75.
36. Shinar D. Looks are (almost) everything: where drivers look to get information. *Hum Factors* 2008;50:380-4.
37. Nodine CF, Kundel HL. Using eye movements to study visual search and to improve tumor detection. *Radiographics* 1987;7:1241-50.
38. Di Stasi LL, Catena A, Canas JJ, Macknik SL, Martinez-Conde S. Saccadic velocity as an arousal index in naturalistic tasks. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2013;37:968-75.
39. Martinez-Conde S. Fixational eye movements in normal and pathological vision. *Prog Brain Res* 2006;154:151-76.
40. Di Stasi LL, McCamy MB, Macknik SL, et al. Saccadic eye movement metrics reflect surgical residents' fatigue. *Ann Surg* 2014;259:824-9.
41. Goldich Y, Barkana Y, Pras E, Zadok D, Hartstein M, Morad Y. The effects of sleep deprivation on oculomotor responses. *Curr Eye Res* 2010;35:1135-41.
42. Zils E, Sprenger A, Heide W, Born J, Gais S. Differential effects of sleep deprivation on saccadic eye movements. *Sleep* 2005;28(9):1109-15.
43. Drew T, Vo ML, Olwal A, Jacobson F, Seltzer SE, Wolfe JM. Scanners and drillers: characterizing expert visual search through volumetric images. *J Vis* 2013;13.
44. Krupinski EA, Graham AR, Weinstein RS. Characterizing the development of visual search expertise in pathology residents viewing whole slide images. *Hum Pathol* 2013;44:357-64.
45. Manning D, Ethell S, Donovan T, Crawford T. How do radiologists do it? The influence of experience and training on searching for chest nodules. *Radiography* 2006;12:134-42.
46. Lavine RA, Sibert JL, Gokturk M, Dickens B. Eye-tracking measures and human performance in a vigilance task. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 2002;73:367-72.
47. Cazzoli D, Antoniadis CA, Kennard C, Nyffeler T, Bassetti CL, Muri RM. Eye movements discriminate fatigue due to chronotypical factors and time spent on task—a double dissociation. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e87146.
48. Rubin GD, Roos JE, Tall M, et al. Characterizing search, recognition, and decision in the detection of lung nodules on CT scans: elucidation with eye tracking. *Radiology* 2015;274:276-86.
49. Kundel HL. Visual search and lung nodule detection on CT scans. *Radiology* 2015;274:14-6.
50. Burling D, Halligan S, Altman DG, et al. CT colonography interpretation times: effect of reader experience, fatigue, and scan findings in a multi-centre setting. *Eur Radiol* 2006;16:1745-9.
51. Roge J, Pebayle T, El Hannachi S, Muzet A. Effect of sleep deprivation and driving duration on the useful visual field in younger and older subjects during simulator driving. *Vision Res* 2003;43:1465-72.
52. Lehman CD, Wellman RD, Buist DS, Kerlikowske K, Tosteson AN, Miglioretti DL. Diagnostic accuracy of digital screening mammography with and without computer-aided detection. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;175:1828-37.
53. Schalekamp S, van Ginneken B, van den Berk IA, et al. Bone suppression increases the visibility of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in chest radiographs. *PLoS One* 2014;9(10):p. e108551.
54. Freedman MT, Lo SC, Seibel JC, et al. Lung nodules: improved detection with software that suppresses the rib and clavicle on chest radiographs. *Radiology* 2011;260(1):p. 265-73.



Credits awarded for this enduring activity are designated "SA-CME" by the American Board of Radiology (ABR) and qualify toward fulfilling requirements for Maintenance of Certification (MOC) Part II: Lifelong Learning and Self-assessment. Scan the QR code to access the SA-CME activity or visit <http://bit.ly/ACRSACME>.

Factors Associated with Repetitive Strain, and Strategies to Reduce Injury Among Breast-Imaging Radiologists

Atalie C. Thompson, MD, MPH^{a,b}, Marnie J. Kremer Prill, MD^c, Sandip Biswal, MD^c, Murray Rebner, MD^d, Rachel E. Rebner, BA^e, William R. Thomas, MD^{c,f}, Sonya D. Edwards, MD^{c,g}, Matthew O. Thompson, MD^{a,h}, Debra M. Ikeda, MD^c

Purpose: To investigate the prevalence of repetitive strain injury (RSI) among breast-imaging radiologists, the factors associated with such symptoms, and strategies to reduce injury.

Methods: In 2012, an anonymous survey regarding RSI and work habits was administered to 2,618 physician members of the Society of Breast Imaging via e-mail. Analysis of 727 (27.8%) de-identified responses was completed using STATA 12.1. Pain levels before and after implementation of digital imaging were compared with the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The associations between RSI symptoms and work habits were assessed with logistic regression and test for trend.

Results: In the survey 438 of 727 (60.2%) respondents reported RSI symptoms, and 242 of 727 (33.3%) reported prior diagnosis/treatment. Results showed a statistically significant trend for the odds of RSI symptoms to increase with decreasing age ($P = .0004$) or increasing number of daily hours spent working ($P = .0006$), especially in an awkward position ($P < .0001$). Respondents recalled a significant increase in pain level after implementation of PACS, and a decrease in pain after ergonomic training or initiating use of an ergonomic mouse, adjustable chair, or adjustable table ($P < .001$, all comparisons). Only 17.7% (129 of 727) used an ergonomic mouse and 13.3% (97 of 727) had attended ergonomic training. Those with RSI symptoms or prior diagnosis of a Repetitive Strain Syndrome (RSS) were more likely to desire future ergonomic training compared with those without symptoms or injury (odds ratio 5.36, $P < .001$; odds ratio 2.63, $P = .001$, respectively).

Conclusions: RSI is highly prevalent among breast-imaging radiologists nationwide and may worsen after implementation of PACS or with longer work hours. Ergonomic training and ergonomic devices may diminish or prevent painful RSI among radiologists.

Key Words: Repetitive strain injury, breast-imaging radiology, ergonomics

J Am Coll Radiol 2014;11:1074-1079. Copyright © 2014 American College of Radiology

INTRODUCTION

PACS and digital imaging improve radiologist efficiency and turnaround times [1-3] and save costs [4,5]. But repetitive work at computer workstations can produce repetitive strain injuries (RSIs) [6-12], which have the potential to decrease productivity. As case volumes increase in radiology practices [13,14], it is especially important for radiologists to know how to protect

against RSI. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) has been publishing guidelines for human interactions with computers since 1988 [6], and several recent publications have endorsed both ergonomic work environments and ergonomic training for RSI prevention [2,4,5,7-9,12,15-19].

Despite widespread availability of computer ergonomic guidelines, a single-center survey of departmental

^aStanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California.

^bUniversity of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.

^cDepartment of Radiology, Stanford University Hospital, Stanford, California.

^dDepartment of Radiology, Beaumont Hospital, Royal Oak, Michigan.

^eDepartment of Physical Therapy, Simmons College, Boston, Massachusetts.

^fDepartment of Radiology, San Antonio Military Medical Center, San Antonio, Texas.

^gDepartment of Radiology, Kaiser Permanente, Greater Southern Alameda Area, Hayward, California.

^hDepartment of Internal Medicine, Highland Hospital, Oakland, California.

Corresponding author: Atalie C. Thompson, MD, MPH, 5959 Maple Avenue #1358 Dallas, TX 75235; e-mail: ataliethompson@gmail.com.

radiologists after PACS installation found that RSI symptoms were prevalent in more than 58% of respondents; 38% had a prior diagnosis of a repetitive strain syndrome (RSS) [20]. In the breast-imaging field, most radiologists read film mammograms on alternators before the 2000 FDA digital mammography approval [21]. After FDA approval, radiologists began to read digital mammograms, ultrasounds, and MRIs on mammography-specific or PACS workstations. These computerized workstations changed the way breast imagers interacted with their environment, raising a new risk for RSI. The goal of our national study was to estimate the prevalence of RSI among breast imagers, to identify factors associated with RSI symptoms, and to assess the prevalence and impact of ergonomic workplace strategies to reduce injury in the breast-imaging reading environment.

METHODS

We developed an anonymous survey instrument for the Society of Breast Imaging as part of a quality assurance project on the prevalence of RSI in breast imagers, incorporating questions based on existing literature about computer workstation ergonomics. In 2013, our institutional review board approved the retrospective analysis of the anonymous cross-sectional survey data.

The survey incorporated questions from a previously published "Ergonomic Survey" instrument, including those regarding: departmental position; current use of digital or analog mammography at work; hours per day spent at a personal computer or PACS workstation; hours per day spent in an awkward position (eg, with wrist bent, bent at the waist leaning forward, kneeling, stooping, squatting, reaching overhead); current RSI (eg, pain, stiffness, soreness, or cramping in any extremity, or the back or neck area related to work tasks); and prior diagnosis of an RSS or overuse syndrome [20]. Age information was grouped into 5-year intervals from ≤ 34 to > 65 years. Additional information collected included sites of pain or discomfort related to work tasks, and use of an ergonomic mouse or peripheral input device, adjustable chair, or adjustable table at work. A previously validated visual analog scale consisting of a 10-cm horizontal line that ranged from 0 to 10 was used to assess self-reported pain before and after implementation of a computer PACS workstation and various ergonomic devices or training in the workplace [22].

Our online Qualtrics (www.survey.qualtrics.com) survey instrument was administered by e-mail to the 2,618 physician members of the Society of Breast Imaging in November 2012 and was resent in December 2012 to increase the response rate. A total of 727 (27.8% response rate) anonymous responses were received. Statistical analysis was performed using STATA 12.1 (College Station, TX). The difference in self-reported median pain levels before and after

implementation of PACS workstations or various ergonomic devices or training was calculated using the nonparametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

In the literature evaluating socioeconomic data, principal component analysis is a statistical technique commonly used to reduce several correlated variables (ie, income, education, health insurance) into a single socioeconomic score index [23]. Because the use of various ergonomic devices was correlated with each other in our study, we applied this analysis to generate an ergonomic score index that accounted for the use of an ergonomic mouse or peripheral input device, adjustable chair, and adjustable table. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression was performed to assess the association between RSI symptoms and the following variables: ergonomic score index, desire for ergonomic training, age, and number of hours spent working in an awkward position or number of hours spent at a computer or PACS workstation. A test for a trend in the odds of RSI symptoms with increasing age or number of hours spent working at a computer or in an awkward position was also calculated. *P* values and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were generated using logistic regression or Wilcoxon signed-rank test where applicable. A *P* value of $< .05$ was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Table 1 lists information on the respondents' demographics and work environment. Although 80.3% ($n = 584$ of 727) reported that a breast-imaging workstation or PACS had been installed, only 17.7% ($n = 129$ of 727) were using an ergonomic mouse or peripheral input device; only 56.4% ($n = 410$ of 727) had adjustable tables at work, but adjustable chairs were highly prevalent ($n = 667$ of 727, 91.7%). A majority of respondents ($n = 630$ of 727, 86.6%) had not participated in ergonomic training sessions at work but expressed interest in participating ($n = 534$ of 630, 84.8%).

Table 2 reports the prevalence of RSI symptoms ($n = 438$ of 727, 60.2%) and diagnoses/treatment ($n = 242$ of 727, 33.3%), with the most common sites being in the neck and wrists, respectively. In a free-response textbox, respondents were allowed to report additional sites of RSI or prior treatment for a RSS; the elbow was the most common reported site.

A statistically significant trend was found for the odds of current RSI symptoms to increase with decreasing age ($P = .0004$), greater number of hours spent working each day ($P = .0006$), and greater number of hours spent in an awkward position (eg, with wrist bent, stooping; $P < .0001$). A significant trend was found for the association of decreasing age with working ≥ 6 hours ($P < .001$). Inclusion of all 3 variables in a multivariate model mildly attenuated the association between RSI symptoms and number of hours worked; the association between RSI and either age or hours spent in an awkward position remained statistically significant (Table 3).

Table 1. Demographics and characteristics of the work environment of 727 respondents

Characteristic	Number	%
Departmental position		
Resident	16 of 727	2.2
Fellow	34 of 727	4.7
Attending	677 of 727	93.1
Age (years)		
≤34	82 of 727	11.3
35-39	104 of 727	14.3
40-44	83 of 727	11.4
45-49	88 of 727	12.1
50-54	96 of 727	13.2
55-59	131 of 727	18.0
60-64	74 of 727	10.2
≥65	69 of 727	9.5
Mammography		
All digital	661 of 727	90.9
All analog	5 of 727	0.7
Both digital and analog	61 of 727	8.4
Number of hours per day spent working at a personal computer, breast-imaging workstation, or PACS		
0-4	11 of 727	1.5
>4-6	49 of 727	6.7
>6-8	253 of 727	34.8
>8	414 of 727	56.9
Number of hours per day spent in an awkward posture (eg, with wrist bent, bent at the waist leaning forward, kneeling, stooping, squatting, reaching overhead)		
0-2	302 of 727	41.5
>2-4	149 of 727	20.5
>4-6	115 of 727	15.8
>6	161 of 727	22.1
Breast-imaging workstation or PACS has been installed		
Yes	584 of 727	80.3
Own a personalized ergonomic mouse or other ergonomic input peripheral devices at work		
Yes	129 of 727	17.7
Work area has adjustable chairs		
Yes	667 of 727	91.7
Work area has adjustable tables		
Yes	410 of 727	56.4
Prior participation in an ergonomic training session at work		
Yes	97 of 727	13.3
Would be interested in participating in an ergonomic training session at work if it were available*		
Yes	534 of 630	84.8

*Number out of 630 respondents who had not previously participated in an ergonomic training session at work.

Respondents recalled a statistically significant increase in their pain level after implementation of a PACS workstation ($P < .001$). However, those who underwent ergonomic training and/or initiated use of an ergonomic mouse or peripheral input device, adjustable chair, and adjustable table reported a significant decrease in pain after these ergonomic workplace changes ($P < .001$, all comparisons), although pain was not eliminated (Table 4). Among 438 radiologists who reported RSI symptoms, 392 were currently using ≥ 1 ergonomic intervention ($n = 392$ for adjustable chair; $n = 237$ for adjustable table; $n = 78$ for ergonomic mouse; $n = 64$ for ergonomic training). For a unit increase in

Table 2. Prevalence and location of RSI symptoms and RSS diagnosis among 727 respondents

	Number	%
Frequently experience pain, stiffness, soreness, or cramping in any extremity, or the back or neck area that you feel may be related to your work tasks		
Yes	438 of 727	60.2
No	289 of 727	39.8
Select all sites of pain or discomfort related to your work tasks*		
Hands	133 of 438	30.4
Wrists	199 of 438	45.4
Neck	312 of 438	71.2
Shoulder	257 of 438	58.7
Upper back	205 of 438	46.8
Lower back	158 of 438	36.1
Lower extremities/sciatica	71 of 438	16.2
Other (please state location)	54 of 438	12.3
Elbow	29 of 438	6.6
Past diagnosis or treated for a repetitive strain or overuse syndrome, or believe they may have suffered from such a condition†		
Yes	242 of 727	33.3
No	485 of 727	66.7
Select all sites of previously diagnosed or treated repetitive strain or overuse syndrome		
Hands	48 of 242	19.8
Wrists	101 of 242	41.7
Neck	89 of 242	36.8
Shoulder	71 of 242	29.3
Upper back	49 of 242	20.2
Lower back	38 of 242	15.7
Lower extremities/sciatica	20 of 242	8.3
Other (please state location)	35 of 242	14.5
Elbow	22 of 242	9.1

RSI = repetitive strain injury; RSS = repetitive strain syndrome.
 *Number out of 438 respondents who reported frequently experiencing pain, stiffness, etc. related to work tasks.
 †Number out of 242 respondents who reported a past diagnosis or treatment for a repetitive strain or overuse syndrome.

ergonomic score, respondents were 38% less likely to report RSI symptoms, even after adjusting for age and number of hours worked (odds ratio [OR] 0.62, 95% CI 0.43-0.89, $P = .009$).

Among the 630 radiologists who previously had not attended ergonomic training, those with current symptoms (OR 5.36, 95% CI 3.28-8.74, $P < .001$) or prior diagnosis/treatment for an RSS or overuse syndrome (OR 2.63, 95% CI 1.47-4.70, $P = .001$) were significantly more likely to want to participate in ergonomic training compared with those without symptoms or prior injury. These associations remained significant after adjusting for age (OR 5.01, 95% CI 3.0-8.3, $P < .0001$) and number of hours worked (OR 2.47, 95% CI 1.37-4.45, $P = .003$).

DISCUSSION

Digital imaging saves time and costs and improves efficiency [1-5], but with increasing case volumes [13,14] and longer workstation hours, radiologists may develop painful RSI symptoms that limit productivity

Table 3. Characteristics and trends associated with current RSI symptoms

Characteristic	Current RSI symptoms, n		Unadjusted		Adjusted*	
	Yes	No	OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
Age (years)						
≥60	66	77	Reference	N.A.	Reference	N.A.
50-59	138	89	1.81 (1.18-2.78)	.006	1.53 (0.95-2.46)	.08
40-49	111	60	2.16 (1.36-3.43)	.0009	1.84 (1.10-3.07)	.02
≤39	123	63	2.28 (1.44-3.60)	.0003	1.96 (1.183.25)	.009
Test of trend of odds				.0004		
Number of hours per day spent working at a personal computer, breast-imaging workstation, or PACS						
0-4	2	9	Reference	N.A.	Reference	N.A.
>4-6	24	25	4.32 (0.79-23.5)	.06	3.29 (0.57-19)	.18
>6-8	146	107	6.14 (1.27-29.7)	.01	4.12 (0.77-21.9)	.097
>8	266	148	8.09 (1.69-38.7)	.002	4.23 (0.80-22.4)	.090
Test of trend of odds				.0006		
Number of hours per day spent in an awkward posture (eg, with wrist bent, bent at the waist leaning forward, kneeling, stooping, squatting, reaching overhead)						
0-2	107	195	Reference	N.A.	Reference	N.A.
>2-4	106	43	4.49 (2.86-7.06)	.0001	4.53 (2.93-7.00)	.0001
>4-6	95	20	8.66 (4.79-15.7)	.0001	8.34 (4.86-14.3)	.0001
>6	130	31	7.64 (4.60-12.7)	.0001	7.20 (4.50-11.5)	.0001
Test for trend of odds				.0001		

CI = confidence interval; N.A. = not applicable; OR = odds ratio; RSI = repetitive strain injury.
 *Multivariable logistic regression model includes the following independent variables: age, hours per day spent working, and hours per day spent in an awkward position.

[8-10,19,20,24]. RSI has been widely documented in repetitive, low-force work roles, including typist/administrative assistant, nurse, housewife, and assembly line worker [25-27], although little work has been done among radiologists [10,20]. A recent case report documented carpal tunnel and cubital tunnel syndrome among 4 radiologists [10], and a single-center study by Boiselle et al [20] showed that most of their radiologists exceeded 8 workstation hours, with >58% of respondents having RSI symptoms and 38% reporting a prior RSS diagnosis.

Our study found a similar prevalence of RSI symptoms and RSS diagnoses among breast imagers (60% and 33.3%, respectively), most commonly in the neck, wrists, and elbow, with a similar period effect as in the Boiselle et al article [20], as respondents recalled a significant increase in their pain level after PACS

implementation ($P = .001$). However, unlike other repetitive-work field surveys that showed a higher RSI prevalence in older subjects [27], our study reports a higher RSI prevalence among younger breast imagers, possibly as a result of their longer work hours. Together, such findings underscore that long hours on PACS may be predisposing radiologists to significant RSI injuries. Furthermore, if younger radiologists continue to accumulate injury over years of PACS use, the epidemiologic age distribution of RSI may shift to older ages unless there is an intervention.

The relationship between computer work and RSI has been long established [28]. A recent study reported a 43% increase in the use of radiology services after PACS implementation, which could further potentiate the risk for RSI [14]. Our study found that most recommendations on ergonomic practices and workstations [5,8,9,16,18,19], including formal guidelines from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [29] and ANSI [6], were not being widely incorporated. Almost half of our respondents did not have adjustable tables to allow seated or standing image interpretation, even though adjustable tables have been shown to improve RSI symptoms [20]. In addition, respondents to our survey study reported a substantial pain-level decrease after table installation ($P < .001$). The prevalence and impact of use of personalized peripheral input devices or a computer mouse among radiologists had not been previously investigated, and their use was uncommon (17.7%) among our respondents, although they were reported as effective in improving pain ($P < .001$).

Table 4. Difference in median pain level with changes in work environment

	Median Pain (IQR)		P value
	Before	After	
PACS	2.9 (1.7, 5.1)	4.05 (2, 6.2)	<.001
Ergonomic input device or mouse	6.1 (3.2, 7.7)	2 (1, 3)	<.001
Adjustable chair	5 (3, 6.8)	2.9 (1.8, 4.4)	<.001
Adjustable table	5 (3, 7)	2.1 (1, 3.55)	<.001
Ergonomic training	5.7 (3, 7.15)	3.05 (1.85, 5.1)	<.001

P value was calculated using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. IQR = interquartile range.

Such simple, inexpensive ergonomic interventions may help prevent continued or future RSI among radiologists by helping them assume neutral postures that reduce neck, shoulder, back, and wrist strain [6,8,11,29].

Proper ergonomic positioning and posture training has been endorsed repeatedly to prevent injury among radiologists working at the computer [8,20], and 80% of radiologists in Boiselle et al's study [20] reported improvement in RSS after such training. In our study, those participating in ergonomic training reported a subsequent decrease in their pain level ($P < .001$). However, most respondents had *not* participated in any ergonomic training through their job, despite a strong desire to have access to such training. The overall lack of attention to the importance of ergonomics in the workplace is concerning and may explain the high prevalence of RSI in our study. We recommend that radiologists utilize the Rapid Office Strain Assessment Checklist (Sonne et al [12]) to evaluate the ergonomics of their work environment, and follow the ANSI guidelines on interventions to prevent injury [6].

Limitations

Our study has several important limitations. This is a cross-sectional survey, so causality cannot be directly assessed. Because the data were originally collected anonymously for quality assurance purposes for the Society of Breast Imaging, we do not have any demographic data or RSI information on nonrespondents, and the demographic data on respondents are limited. Thus, it was not possible to conduct a sensitivity analysis to estimate the impact of nonrespondent bias on our results or adjust for potential demographic confounders.

The modest response rate raises concern for selection bias if respondents were more likely to participate because they had RSI. On the other hand, for nonrespondents, there is potential for worker bias because those who are no longer working or utilizing e-mail, owing to significant RSI, may have been unable to respond to this survey. Although our response rate of 28% is relatively low, it is an acceptable response rate for an e-mail-based survey, especially considering that there were no financial or other incentives for completing the survey [30-33]. In addition, the proportion of respondents exceeds that of recent e-mail-based surveys of national radiology groups, such as an 11% response rate for an e-mail-based survey of the members of the Association of University Radiologists and Society of Chairs of Academic Radiology Departments recently published in the *JACR* [33]. Moreover, the proportions of patients reporting RSI symptoms and a prior RSS diagnosis were comparable to those in a previous study [20] that gave paper surveys to a single department of radiology (achieving a higher response rate of 68%). Finally, we sampled breast-imaging radiologists, who may not be representative of practices in other fields of radiology.

Future studies should assess responses across disciplines of radiology to confirm the generalizability of these results.

TAKE-HOME POINTS

- Among breast-imaging radiologists responding to this national survey, the prevalence of current RSI symptoms is 438 of 727 (60.2%), and the prevalence of prior diagnosis or treatment for a specific RSS or overuse syndrome is 242 of 727 (33.3%).
- Although 80.3% ($n = 584$ of 727) reported that a breast-imaging workstation or PACS had been installed, only 17.7% ($n = 129$ of 727) were using an ergonomic mouse or peripheral input device, and only 56.4% ($n = 410$ of 727) had adjustable tables at work, whereas adjustable chairs were highly prevalent ($n = 667$ of 727, 91.7%).
- A minority of respondents ($n = 97$ of 727, 13.3%) had participated in an ergonomic training session at work, but among those who had not previously participated, 84.8% ($n = 534$ of 630) expressed interest in participating in ergonomic training if it were available.
- There was a statistically significant trend for the odds of current RSI symptoms to increase with decreasing age ($P = .0005$), greater number of hours spent working each day ($P = .0006$), and greater number of hours spent in an awkward position (eg, with wrist bent, stooping; $P < .0001$).
- Respondents recalled a statistically significant increase in their pain level after implementation of a PACS workstation, but a significant decrease in their pain level after ergonomic training, or after use of an ergonomic mouse or peripheral input device, adjustable chair, or adjustable table ($P < .001$, all comparisons).
- Improvement in the ergonomics of the workplace of breast-imaging radiologists may help prevent RSIs among radiologists and ensure that they can provide timely and efficient patient care. Thus, we strongly recommend that radiology departments take aggressive action to prevent radiologist injury through work-based ergonomic training and ergonomic changes in the reading room.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the Society of Breast Imaging for granting us permission to analyze these survey data.

REFERENCES

1. Gale DR, Gale ME, Schwartz RK, Muse VV, Walker RE. An automated PACS workstation interface: a timesaving enhancement. *Am J Roentgenol* 2000;174:33-6.
2. Hayt DB, Alexander S. The pros and cons of implementing PACS and speech recognition systems. *J Digit Imaging* 2001;14:149-57.
3. Mehta A, Dreyer K, Boland G, Frank M. Do picture archiving and communication systems improve report turnaround times? *J Digit Imaging* 2000;13:105-7.

4. Siegel EL, Reiner BI. Filmless radiology at the Baltimore VA Medical Center: a 9 year retrospective. *Comput Med Imaging Graph* 2003;27:101-9.
5. Siegel EL, Reiner BI, Siddiqui KM. Ten filmless years and ten lessons: a 10th-anniversary retrospective from the Baltimore VA Medical Center. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2004;1:824-33.
6. American National Standards Institute/Human Factors and Ergonomics Society. ANSI/HFES 100-2007 human factors engineering of computer workstations. Available at: <http://www.hfes.org/publications/ProductDetail.aspx?ProductID=69>. Accessed July 31, 2013.
7. Garcia-Lallana A, Viteri-Ramirez G, Saiz-Mendiguren R, Broncano J, Damaso Aquerreta J. Ergonomics of the workplace in radiology. *Radiologia* 2011;53:507-15.
8. Harisinghani MG, Blake MA, Saksena M, et al. Importance and effects of altered workplace ergonomics in modern radiology suites. *Radiographics* 2004;24:615-27.
9. Prabhu SP, Gandhi S, Goddard PR. Ergonomics of digital imaging. *Br J Radiol* 2005;78:582-6.
10. Ruess L, O'Connor SC, Cho KH, et al. Carpal tunnel syndrome and cubital tunnel syndrome: work-related musculoskeletal disorders in four symptomatic radiologists. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003;181:37-42.
11. Rumreich LL, Johnson AJ. From traditional reading rooms to a soft copy environment: radiologist satisfaction survey. *J Digit Imaging* 2003;16:262-9.
12. Sonne M, Villalta DL, Andrews DM. Development and evaluation of an office ergonomic risk checklist: ROSA—rapid office strain assessment. *Appl Ergon* 2012;43:98-108.
13. Arenson RL, Lu Y, Elliott SC, Jovais C, Avrin DE. Measuring the academic radiologist's clinical productivity: applying RVU adjustment factors. *Acad Radiol* 2001;8:533-40.
14. Reiner BI, Siegel EL, Flagle C, Hooper FJ, Cox RE, Scanlon M. Effect of filmless imaging on the utilization of radiologic services. *Radiology* 2000;215:163-7.
15. Brusin JH. Ergonomics in radiology. *Radiol Technol* 2011;83:141-57.
16. Goyal N, Jain N, Rachapalli V. Ergonomics in radiology. *Clin Radiol* 2009;64:119-26.
17. Horii SC, Horii HN, Mun SK, Benson HR, Zeman RK. Environmental designs for reading from imaging workstations: ergonomic and architectural features. *J Digit Imaging* 2003;16:124-31.
18. Nagy P, Siegel E, Hanson T, Kreiner L, Johnson K, Reiner B. PACS reading room design. *Semin Roentgenol* 2003;38:244-55.
19. Siewert B, Brook OR, Mullins MM, Eisenberg RL, Kruskal JB. Practice policy and quality initiatives: strategies for optimizing staff safety in a radiology department. *Radiographics* 2013;33:245-61.
20. Boiselle PM, Levine D, Horwich PJ, et al. Repetitive stress symptoms in radiology: prevalence and response to ergonomic interventions. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2008;5:919-23.
21. Pisano ED, Yaffe MJ, Kuzmiak CM. *Digital mammography*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2004.
22. Carlsson AM. Assessment of chronic pain. I. Aspects of the reliability and validity of the visual analog scale. *Pain* 1983;16:87-101.
23. Vyas S, Kumaranayake L. Constructing socio-economic status indices: how to use principal components analysis. *Health Policy Plan* 2006;21:459-68.
24. Krupinski EA, Kallergi M. Choosing a radiology workstation: technical and clinical considerations. *Radiology* 2007;242:671-82.
25. Yagev Y, Carel RS, Yagev R. Assessment of work-related risk factors for carpal tunnel syndrome. *Isr Med Assoc J* 2001;3:569-71.
26. English CJ, Maclaren WM, Court-Brown C, et al. Relations between upper limb soft tissue disorders and repetitive movements at work. *Am J Ind Med* 1995;27:75-90.
27. Palmer KT, Cooper C, Walker-Bone K, Syddall H, Coggon D. Use of keyboards and symptoms in the neck and arm: evidence from a national survey. *Occup Med* 2001;51:392-5.
28. Lerner EJ. Computer as menace: repetitive stress injury. *N J Med* 1998;95:69-70.
29. US Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *Computer workstations*. Available at: <https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/etools/computerworkstations/index.html>. Accessed July 20, 2013.
30. Braithwaite D, Emery J, De Lusignan S, Sutton S. Using the Internet to conduct surveys of health professionals: a valid alternative? *Fam Pract* 2003;20:545-51.
31. Greenlaw C, Brown-Welty S. A comparison of web-based and paper-based survey methods: testing assumptions of survey mode and response cost. *Eval Rev* 2009;33:464-80.
32. Jones R, Pitt N. Health surveys in the workplace: comparison of postal, email and World Wide Web methods. *Occup Med* 1999;49:556-8.
33. Moriarity AK, Brown ML, Schultz LR. We have much in common: the similar inter-generational work preferences and career satisfaction among practicing radiologists. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2014;11:362-8.