Compressive and Shear Forces of L5/S1 during Patient Transfer in Different Loads on Hands

Kodai Kitagawa^{1,*}, Hayato Nodagashira¹, Tadateru Kurosawa¹, Hinako Maeyama², and Chikamune Wada²

¹ Mechanical and Medical Engineering Course, Department of Industrial Systems Engineering, National Institute of Technology, Hachinohe College, Hachinohe, Japan; Email: h30m38@hachinohe.kosen-ac.jp (H.N.),

kuro-m@hachinohe-ct.ac.jp (T.K.)

² Graduate School of Life Science and Systems Engineering, Kyushu Institute of Technology, Kitakyushu, Japan; Email: maeyama.hinako628@mail.kyutech.jp (H.M.), wada@brain.kyutech.ac.jp (C.W.)

*Correspondence: kitagawakitagawa156@gmail.com (K.K.)

Abstract-Patient transfer is the primary cause of lower back pain among caregivers because it requires awkward postures and movements such as twisting, lifting, and lowering with heavy external loads such as body weight. To prevent lower back pain, the relationship between lumbar loads and external loads from patient weight should be investigated to explore the hazardous limits of external loads during patient transfer. However, this investigation requires frequent trials and heavier loads than the hazardous limit. Therefore, we have used a computational musculoskeletal simulation for patient handling without the actual measured load data of human subjects. A previous study used a musculoskeletal simulation of sit-to-stand assistance motion; however, this simulation did not consider twisting and lowering patient transfer. Hence, this study aims to investigate the relationship between lumbar loads and external loads during patient transfer, including twisting and lowering. The musculoskeletal simulation for this investigation was implemented using the 3D Static Strength Prediction Program. First, the implemented musculoskeletal simulation was validated by comparison with related research using actual measured motion data and an optical motion capture system. Furthermore, the relationship between lumbar loads (compressive and shear forces of L5/S1) and external loads during patient transfer was investigated using a validated musculoskeletal simulation. According to the results, the compressive and shear forces of L5/S1 during patient transfer exceeded the limits of safety when the external load was more than 40 kgf. These findings will contribute to the prevention of lower back pain due to patient transfer.

Keywords—musculoskeletal simulation, patient transfer, lower back pain, compressive force, shear force, external load

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Patient handling causes Lower Back Pain (LBP) among caregivers [1–5]. In particular, patient transfer is the primary cause of LBP because it requires awkward movements such as twisting, lifting, and lowering with a

heavy external load from patient weight [6–8]. Therefore, the relationship between lumbar loads and external load from patient weight should be investigated for LBP prevention.

B. Previous Studies

Previous studies explored the risk factors of patient transfer by measuring actual patient transfer [9-11]. According to Xiang et al., the external load for patient transfer should be less than 15 kgf in an experimental study because the lumbar compressive force of a participant might exceed the injury threshold (3400 N) [12] defined by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) [11]. This report suggests that the effect of heavy weight on patient transfer cannot be investigated through an experimental study alone. Thus, a computational musculoskeletal simulation of patient transfer that does not require actual transfer motion is necessary to investigate the effect of weight. previous studies used a computational Our musculoskeletal simulation of assistive motion for sit-tostand [13, 14], which could provide the relationship between external and lumbar loads without actual motion data. However, this simulation cannot consider twist and lowering in patient transfer, as it focuses only on sit-tostand. Because asymmetric posture relates to lumbar loads, lumbar loads during twisting of patient transfer should be considered in particular [15-17]. Therefore, a new computational musculoskeletal simulation for patient transfer should be developed.

C. Objective

This study aims to investigate the relationship between lumbar loads and external loads during patient transfer, including twisting and lowering. Computational musculoskeletal simulations for patient transfer, including twisting and lowering, were developed and validated to perform the investigation.

II. MUSCULOSKELETAL SIMULATION

A. Implementation

Computational musculoskeletal simulation was implemented using the 3D Static Strength Prediction

Manuscript received September 30, 2022; revised January 6, 2023; accepted January 24, 2023.

Program (3DSSPP, University of Michigan, USA). The musculoskeletal model for the computational simulation was based on Bean *et al.*'s model provided in the 3DSSPP [18, 19]. The 3DSSPP was selected because Rajaee *et al.* [19] reported that it could correctly calculate the compressive force of the lumbar vertebral while manual handling tasks such as asymmetry postures. Furthermore, the 3DSSPP has been used in occupational health for musculoskeletal disorders in various fields, including airline baggage handling, manufacturing, and construction [20–23]. In addition, our previous research used the 3DSSPP to investigate the relationship between foot position and lumbar loads in turning patients on a bed [24].

Fig. 1 shows the data processing of the computational musculoskeletal simulation for this research. Input data for the simulation were patient transfer motion, external load on the hands of the patient, and body parameters of the musculoskeletal model. Fig. 2 shows the patient transfer motion of the simulation. This patient transfer motion was built based on the patient transfer video published by the patient handling section of the Japanese society of nursing art and science [25]. Output data were the lumbar compressive and shear forces between the L5/S1, known as lumbar loads related to LBP [12, 26, 27]. These lumbar forces were calculated using inverse kinematics-based posture and static force prediction and Bean *et al.*'s model in the 3DSSPP [18].



Figure 1. Data processing of the musculoskeletal simulation.



Figure 2. Patient transfer motion of the musculoskeletal simulation.

B. Verification

As mentioned previously, the patient transfer motion was built from the video data, which the motion capture system did not record. Therefore, the implemented motion should be verified because it does not use highly accurate motion data obtained from marker-based measurement [28]. Thus, in this study, the output of the implemented simulation was compared with a previous study on patient transfer using marker-based measurement [29]. Table I shows the parameters of the implemented simulation for this verification. The external load on the hands was set at 30 kgf compared with a previous study [29]. In addition, the specifications of the caregiver (gender, body height, and body weight) were also determined by a previous study [29]. The sampling rate of 25 Hz depended on the specifications of the 3DSSPP. The time of motion was determined by a video of patient transfer [25] used for the implemented simulation. The compressive force L5/S1 was compared between the implemented simulation and a previous study [29].

Notably, this verification was not required for the ethics committee review because this procedure did not require participants and measurement for actual motions.

 TABLE I.
 PARAMETERS OF THE IMPLEMENTED SIMULATION IN VERIFICATION

| Parameters | Value/Status |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Gender of Caregiver | Female |
| Body Height of Caregiver [m] | 1.78 |
| Body Weight of Caregivers [kg] | 95 |
| External Load on the Hands [kgf] | 30 |
| Orientation of External Load | Vertical |
| During Time of Motion [seconds] | 3.12 (Each Phase: 1.04) |
| Sampling Rate [Hz] | 25 |
| Outcome of Lumbar Loads | Compressive Force of L5/S1 |

C. Results of Verification

Fig. 3 shows the temporal waveform of the simulated compressive force of L5/S1 during patient transfer. The mean values of the simulated compressive force of L5/S1 for each section are shown in Table II.

The mean of the simulated compressive force during all sections was 5281 N (Table II). According to a previous study, the compressive force of L5/S1 during patient transfer with a 30 kgf external load was approximately 5000 N [29]. As mentioned previously, the specifications of caregivers (gender, body height, and body weight) were set to similar values as in this previous study [29]. These results indicate that the implemented computational musculoskeletal simulation could provide almost accurate lumbar loads during patient transfer.

The temporal waveform (Fig. 3) and mean values of each section (Table II) showed that the simulated compressive force of the sit-to-stand (lifting) section exceeded that of the stand-to-sit (lowering) section. This agrees with the results of a previous study using optical motion capture systems [11]. These results indicate that the implemented computational musculoskeletal simulation can calculate accurate lumbar loads during patient transfer, including asymmetric postures. Thus, the implemented simulation was used to investigate the relationship between external load and lumbar loads during patient transfer.



Figure 3. Simulated compressive force of L5/S1 in verification (external load was 30 kgf).

TABLE II. PARAMETERS OF THE IMPLEMENTED SIMULATION IN VERIFICATION

| Section | Mean of Simulated Compressive Force of L5/S1 [N] |
|--------------|---|
| Sit-to-Stand | 6554 |
| Twist | 5324 |
| Stand-to-Sit | 3991 |
| All | 5281 |

III. SIMULATION-BASED EXPERIMENT

The relationship between external and lumbar loads during patient transfer was investigated using a validated musculoskeletal simulation. Table III shows the parameters of the implemented simulation. The external load was set as 0-50 kgf. Compressive and anteroposterior shear forces of L5/S1 were calculated as lumbar loads. The other parameters were the same as in verification (Table I).

The relationships between external and lumbar loads investigated using linear regression. were The correlations between the lumbar and external loads were investigated using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. In these analyses, the mean values of the temporal waveform for each external load were used for compressive and anteroposterior shear forces of L5/S1. The significance level was p < 0.05. These statistical analyses were performed using EZR [30].

Notably, this experiment did not require an ethics committee review because the procedure did not need real participants and measurements for actual motions.

TABLE III. PARAMETERS OF SIMULATION FOR EXPERIMENT

| Parameters | Value/Status |
|-------------------------|---|
| External load [kgf] | 0–50 |
| Outcome of Lumbar Loads | Compressive Force of L5/S1 |
| | Anteroposterior Shear Force of L5/S1 |

IV. RESULTS

Figs. 4 and 5 show the relationships between the mean value of lumbar loads and external load. Data distributions for each external load are shown in Figs. 6 and 7.

There was a significant positive correlation between the compressive force of L5/S1 and the external load during patient transfer (p < 0.05) (Fig. 4). For compressive force, the results of linear regression showed that the compressive force of L5/S1 exceeded the injury threshold (3,400 N) [12] when the external load exceeded approximately 15 kgf. These results agree with a previous study of patient transfer using an optical motion capture system [11]. The data distribution indicated that all compressive forces exceeded the injury threshold (3,400 N) [12] in 30 kgf, 40 kgf, and 50 kgf external loads (Fig. 6).

There was a significant positive correlation between the anteroposterior shear force of L5/S1 and external load during patient transfer (p < 0.05) (Fig. 5). The linear regression results for the anteroposterior shear force showed that the shear force of L5/S1 exceeded 500 N when the external load exceeded approximately 40 kgf. McGill *et al.* recommended that the shear force of the lumbar vertebral should be less than 500 N to prevent LBP [31]. Data distribution indicated that all shear forces exceeded the injury threshold (500 N) [12] at a 50 kgf external load (Fig. 7).



Figure 4. Relationship between the compressive force of L5/S1 (mean values) and external load.



Figure 5. Relationship between anteroposterior shear force of L5/S1 (mean values) and external load.



Figure 6. Data distribution of compressive force of L5/S1.



Figure 7. Data distribution of the anteroposterior shear force of L5/S1.

V. DISCUSSION

According to the results, the compressive and anteroposterior shear forces of L5/S1 exceeded the injury threshold when the external load was more than approximately 40 kgf. The results indicate that the injury threshold of the anteroposterior shear force of L5/S1 allows a heavy external load than compressive force. The results of this study and a previous study [11] suggest that the compressive force of L5/S1 exceeds the injury threshold when the external load is more than 15 kgf. Thus, caregivers are recommended to avoid more than 15 kgf of external load. In particular, more than 40 kgf of external load is dangerous because both the compressive and anteroposterior shear forces of L5/S1 exceed the injury threshold. These findings will contribute to the proposed limits of external load during patient transfer.

The advantage of the implemented computational musculoskeletal simulation is that it does not require actual participants or motion measurements. The external load should be less than 15 kgf for safety when participants perform patient transfer [11]. However, there is a possibility of a larger external load in actual patient

handling in clinical fields. On the other hand, the implemented simulation can investigate patient transfer with heavy external loads, such as clinical conditions, because this simulation does not require actual participants or frequent motion measurements. The other advantage of the implemented simulation is that the 3DSSPP can change the joint angles and positions of the full body. This advantage will contribute to the investigation suitable posture and movement to prevent LBP owing to patient transfer.

This study's limitation was that verification of the implemented simulation was only compared with previous studies. Ideally, the output of the implemented simulation should be compared with the reference signals obtained from the experiment. Furthermore, the specifications of the caregiver were only one type. Therefore, various genders, weights, and heights should be applied in future studies. In particular, the injury thresholds might be changed for other specifications of the participants [32]. The implemented computational musculoskeletal simulation has some limitations. The orientation of the external load was only vertical in the implemented simulation. Other vectors of external loads should be considered in manual handling [33]. In addition, the implemented simulation calculated only lumbar vertebral forces. Other lumbar loads, such as muscle activity, should be investigated [34]. Finally, the movement and effort of the lower and upper limbs are important factors in preventing LBP [34, 35].

VI. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the relationships between lumbar loads and external loads during patient transfer using musculoskeletal simulation.

The implemented simulation was validated by comparison with a previous study using an optical motion capture system. The results showed that both the compressive and shear forces of L5/S1 during patient transfer exceeded the limits of safety when the external load were more than 40 kgf. These findings will contribute to the prevention of LBP due to patient transfer.

The implemented simulation will be validated for various specifications of caregivers in future studies. In addition, other factors, such as posture and movement, will be investigated to prevent LBP due to patient transfer.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: K.K. and C.W.; methodology: K.K., H.N., T.K., H.M., and C.W.; software: K.K.; validation: K.K., H.N., T.K., H.M., and C.W.; formal analysis: K.K.; investigation: K.K., H.N., T.K., H.M., and C.W.; resource: C.W.; data curation: K.K. and H.M.; writing—original draft preparation: K.K.; writing—review and editing: K.K., H.N., T.K., H.M., and C.W.; and supervision: K.K. and C.W. All authors have read and agreed to the final version of the manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant Number: 22K12908).

REFERENCES

- A. Holtermann, T. Clausen, M. B. Jørgensen, *et al.*, "Patient handling and risk for developing persistent low-back pain among female healthcare workers," *Scand. J. Work. Environ. Health*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 164–169, Mar. 2013.
- [2] S. Kai, "Consideration of low back pain in health and welfare workers," J. Phys. Ther. Sci., vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 149–152, 2001.
- [3] K. Kitagawa, T. Nagasaki, S. Nakano, et al., "Analysis of occupational injury reports related to patient care activities using text mining technique," in Proc. 11th Asian Pac. Conf. Med. Biol. Eng. Proc. Online Conf. APCMBE 2020, May 25-27, 2020, pp. 153–158.
- [4] J. Smedley, P. Egger, C. Cooper, et al., "Manual handling activities and risk of low back pain in nurses," Occup. Environ. Med., vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 160–163, Mar. 1995.
- [5] S. Hignett, "Postural analysis of nursing work," *Appl. Ergon.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 171–176, Jun. 1996.
- [6] S. E. Samaei, N. Hasheminejad, and F. Zolala, "Evaluation of risk factors influencing low back pain in patient transfer tasks," *Int. J. Occup. Hyg.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 76–82, Oct. 2015.
- [7] S. E. Samaei, M. Mostafaee, H. Jafarpoor, *et al.*, "Effects of patient-handling and individual factors on the prevalence of low back pain among nursing personnel," *Work*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 551–561, Jan. 2017.
- [8] A. Sadiq, M. Waris, M. M. Ahmed, *et al.*, "Prevalence of postural biomechanical awareness among male and female paramedical staff during patient transfer—A comparative study," *Pak. J. Med. Health Sci.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 412–415, Jun. 2022.
- [9] B. Schibye, A. F. Hansen, C. T. Hye-Knudsen, *et al.*, "Biomechanical analysis of the effect of changing patient-handling technique," *Appl. Ergon.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 115–123, Mar. 2003.
- [10] X. Xiang, Y. Yamada, H. Nakamura, *et al.*, "Effect of dynamic parameters on lumbar compressive force during patient transfer task," in *Proc. IEEE 4th Glob. Conf. Life Sci. Technol. (LifeTech)*, 2022, pp. 225–226.
- [11] X. Xiang, Y. Yamada, Y. Akiyama, *et al.*, "Effect of parameters on lumbar compressive force during patient transfer," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 24, 11622, Dec. 2021.
- [12] T. Waters, A. Garg, and V. Putz-Anderson, "Applications manual for the revised NIOSH lifting equation [DHHS (NIOSH) Pub No. 94-110]," N. Atl. Inst. Occup. S. Afr. Health Cincinnati OH, 1994.
- [13] K. Kitagawa, Y. Nishisako, T. Nagasaki, *et al.*, "Musculoskeletal simulation of the relationship between foot position and stress of the L4–L5 joint in supporting standing-up motion to prevent low back pain among caregivers," *J. Mech. Med. Biol.*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1940016, Mar. 2019.
- [14] K. Kitagawa, Y. Nishisako, T. Nagasaki, *et al.*, "Regression equation between required force and lumbar load of caregiver in supporting standing-up motion via computational musculoskeletal simulation," *Pertanika J. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 28, no. S2, pp. 59–70, 2020.
- [15] H. K. Kim and Y. Zhang, "Estimation of lumbar spinal loading and trunk muscle forces during asymmetric lifting tasks: Application of whole-body musculoskeletal modelling in OpenSim," *Ergonomics*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 563–576, Apr. 2017.
- [16] A. R. Choi, T. S. Yun, K. S. Lee, et al., "Asymmetric loading of erector spinae muscles during sagittally symmetric lifting," J. Mech. Sci. Technol., vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 64–74, Jan. 2009.
- [17] S. Gallagher, C. A. Hamrick, A. C. Love, *et al.*, "Dynamic biomechanical modelling of symmetric and asymmetric lifting tasks in restricted postures," *Ergonomics*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 1289– 1310, Aug. 1994.
- [18] J. C. Bean, D. B. Chaffin, and A. B. Schultz, "Biomechanical model calculation of muscle contraction forces: A double linear

programming method," J. Biomech., vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 59-66, Jan. 1988.

- [19] M. A. Rajaee, N. Arjmand, A. Shirazi-Adl, *et al.*, "Comparative evaluation of six quantitative lifting tools to estimate spine loads during static activities," *Appl. Ergon.*, vol. 48, pp. 22–32, May 2015.
- [20] A. Tafazzol, S. Aref, M. Mardani, *et al.*, "Epidemiological and biomechanical evaluation of airline baggage handling," *Int. J. Occup. Saf. Ergon.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 218–227, Apr. 2016.
- [21] I. Żabińska and A. Kuboszek, "Ergonomic diagnosis of concrete mixer workplace. Case study," *Multidiscip. Asp. Prod. Eng.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 751–758, 2018.
- [22] K. Teymourian, P. Tretten, D. Seneviratne, et al., "Ergonomics evaluation in designed maintainability: case study using 3 DSSPP," *Manag. Syst. Prod. Eng.*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 309–319, 2021.
- [23] S. Beyrami, A. S. Sahlabadi, S. Talebolhagh, et al., "Evaluation of compressive and shear forces exerted on the lower back in manual load handling tasks among young workers of selected block maker using 3DSSPP," Int. J. Occup. Hyg., vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 49–63, Mar. 2021.
- [24] K. Kitagawa, K. Yamamoto, and C. Wada, "Relationship between foot position and lumbar loads while turning patients on a bed: An investigation via computational simulation and electromyography," *Int. J. Online Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 131–143, Oct. 2021.
- [25] Japanese Society of Nursing Art and Science. (2018). Patient Handling Technique Q&A Ver.3.0 (in Japanese). [Online]. Available: https://jsnas.jp/system/data/20180905102422_vwtd9.pdf
- [26] S. Gallagher and W. S. Marras, "Tolerance of the lumbar spine to shear: A review and recommended exposure limits," *Clin. Biomech.*, vol. 27, no. 10, pp. 973–978, Dec. 2012.
- [27] S. M. McGill, "The biomechanics of low back injury: Implications on current practice in industry and the clinic," *J. Biomech.*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 465–475, May 1997.
- [28] E. V. D. Kruk and M. M. Reijne, "Accuracy of human motion capture systems for sport applications; state-of-the-art review," *Eur. J. Sport Sci.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 806–819, Jul. 2018.
- [29] S. S. Ulin, D. B. Chaffin, C. L. Patellos, *et al.*, "A biomechanical analysis of methods used for transferring totally dependent patients," *Sci Nurs*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 19–27, Mar. 1997.
- [30] Y. Kanda, "Investigation of the freely available easy-to-use software 'EZR' for medical statistics," *Bone Marrow Transplant.*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 452–458, 2013.
- [31] S. M. McGill, R. W. Norman, V. R. Yingling, *et al.*, "Shear happens! Suggested guidelines for ergonomists to reduce the risk of low back injury from shear loading," in *Proc. 30th Ann. Conf. Hum. Factors Assoc. Canada*, 1998, pp. 157–161.
- [32] A. M. Genaidy, S. M. Waly, T. M. Khalil, *et al.*, "Spinal compression tolerance limits for the design of manual material handling operations in the workplace," *Ergonomics*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 415–434, Apr. 1993.
- [33] G. S. Faber, A. S. Koopman, I. Kingma, *et al.*, "Continuous ambulatory hand force monitoring during manual materials handling using instrumented force shoes and an inertial motion capture suit," *J. Biomech.*, vol. 70, pp. 235–241, Mar. 2018.
- [34] K. Itami, T. Yasuda, Y. Otsuki, *et al.*, "Development of a checking system for body mechanics focusing on the angle of forward leaning during bedmaking," *Educ. Technol. Res.*, vol. 33, no. 1–2, pp. 63–71, 2010.
- [35] S. Hellmers, A. Brinkmann, C. F. Böhlen, *et al.*, "Posture and mechanical load assessment during patient transfers," *SN Comput. Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 1–13, Sep. 2022.

Copyright © 2023 by the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (<u>CC BY-NC-ND 4.0</u>), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided that the article is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.