

## ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF AN INTERVENTION PROGRAM ON EXPOSURE TO RISK FACTORS, PREVALENCE OF ARM, SHOULDER AND NECK SYMPTOMS, AND SICK LEAVE IN COMPUTER WORKERS

SPEKLÉ E.M.<sup>1,2,3</sup>, HEINRICH J.<sup>2,5</sup>, HOOZEMANS M.J.M.<sup>1,2</sup>, BLATTER B.M.<sup>2,5</sup>, VAN DER BEEK A.J.<sup>2,4</sup>, VAN DIEËN J.H.<sup>1,2</sup>, VAN TULDER M.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research institute MOVE, Faculty of Human Movement Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands - <sup>2</sup> Body@Work, Research Centre on Physical Activity, Work and Health, The Netherlands - <sup>3</sup> Arbo Unie, Haarlem, The Netherlands - <sup>4</sup> Department of Public and Occupational Health, EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands - <sup>5</sup> TNO Quality of Life, Hoofddorp, The Netherlands - <sup>6</sup> Section Health Economics & Health Technology Assessment, Faculty of Earth and Life Sciences, VU University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

### Aims:

The purpose of this study was to perform an economic evaluation of the RSI QuickScan intervention programme for computer workers. In this study, effectiveness was defined at three levels: exposure to risk factors, prevalence of arm, shoulder and neck symptoms, and days of sick leave.

### Methods:

The economic evaluation was conducted alongside a randomised controlled trial (RCT). Participating computer workers from 7 companies (N=638) were assigned to either the intervention group (N=320) or the usual care group (N=318) by means of cluster randomisation (N=50). The intervention consisted of a tailor-made programme, based on a previously established risk profile. At baseline, 6 and 12 month follow-up, the participants completed the RSI QuickScan questionnaire.

### Results:

The mean intervention costs, paid by the employer, were €59 per participant in the intervention and €28 in the usual care group. Mean total health care and non-health care costs per participant were €108 in both groups. As to the cost-effectiveness, improvement in received information on healthy computer use as well as in their work posture and movement was observed at higher costs. With regard to the other risk factors, symptoms and sick leave, only small and non-significant effects were found.

### Conclusion:

In this study, the RSI QuickScan intervention programme did not prove to be cost-effective and, therefore, this study does not provide a financial reason for implementing this intervention. However, with a relatively small investment, the programme did increase the number of workers who received information on healthy computer use and improved their work posture and movement.

**Keywords:** Computer work, Intervention studies, Economics.

