and designing for construction ergonomics skills, resonates with the findings of other research. There is a need for construction ergonomics to be embedded in tertiary built environment programmes, ergonomics continuing professional development (CPD), a construction industry ergonomics standard, and ergonomics practice notes.

**SECONDARY PREVENTION OF LOW BACK PAIN IN THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: EFFECTIVENESS AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF AN EARLY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

1,2,3J Rantonen*, 4,5,6J Karppinen, 7A Vehtari, 8,9,10S Taimela. 1Department of Occupational Medicine, South Karelia Social and Health Care District, Lappeenranta, Finland; 2Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland; 3University of Helsinki, Faculty of Medicine, Helsinki, Finland; 4Medical Research Centre Oulu, University of Oulu, Finland; 5Oulu University Hospital, Oulu, Finland; 6Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland; 7Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT, Department of Computer Science, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland; 8Evalua International, Espoo, Finland; 9Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Helsinki University Hospital, Finland; 10University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

**Introduction** Low back pain (LBP) is one of the leading causes of disability all over the world. We performed a secondary prevention program of LBP among employees that reported mild or moderate level low back symptoms in a large forestry industry complex.

**Methods** First, respondents of an employee survey (n=2480; response rate 71%) were eligible into this study, if they fulfilled pre-defined low back (LB) specific risk assessment criteria. Secondly, eligible employees (n=505, 66% males, 45 y) were divided into two sub-cohorts, ‘Mild’ and ‘Moderate’ LBP according to recent LB pain intensity. Sub-cohort Mild (n=181, 47 refused) was randomised into two intervention arms, both receiving back book information and the other arm also additional face-to-face patient information. Sub-cohort Moderate (n=126, 17 refused) was randomised into three groups, receiving either one of two active exercise interventions or LB specific advice from their occupational health (OH) physician. All intervention arms in Mild and Moderate were controlled by their respective natural course (NC) of LBP groups (n=83 and n=50, respectively). Primary outcomes were disability (Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire (0–18) and Oswestry Disability sum index, 0–50), LB pain (Visual Analogue Scale, 0–100 mm) and total sickness absence days (SA).

**Results** Mild: Compared to NC, pain, disability and SA decreased after both interventions and back book information alone was also cost-effective. Moderate: Compared to NC, pain and disability decreased after both active interventions but SA did not. OH physician’s advice was not effective. Interventions in Moderate were not cost-effective in two years.

**Discussion** Simple patient information was effective and also cost-effective in mild LBP. Active LB specific interventions were effective but not cost-effective after two years in moderate LBP. OH physician’s advice was not effective. Population-based LB specific risk assessment seems feasible. In general, proactive management of LBP is recommendable in the OH setting.

**852 WORK-BREAK SCHEDULES FOR PREVENTING MUSCULOSKELETAL DISORDERS IN WORKERS – A COCHRANE REVIEW**

1Tesya Lugter*, 2Chris G Maher, 3Monika A Rieger, 4Benjamin Steinhiber. 1Institute of Occupational and Social Medicine and Health Services Research, Tuebingen, Germany; 2Sydney School of Public Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

**Introduction** Repetitive and monotonous work, especially manual work, is very common in modern industrial operations, resulting in an increased risk of musculoskeletal disorders. It is therefore important to find an appropriate intervention countering or preventing the repetitive and monotonous character of work tasks, for example by work-breaks. This review aims to assess the effectiveness of work-breaks (compared to no work-breaks or regular work-break schedules) for preventing work-related musculoskeletal disorders in workers. A work-break can be defined as any scheduled work-interruption that is not related to work, which includes the following characteristics: frequency (amount, timing), duration, or type (e.g. active or passive).

**Methods** We will search the literature (e.g., CENTRAL, PubMed) for randomised, quasi-randomised, and cluster-randomised studies without language restrictions. We will include trials that have enrolled adult workers without musculoskeletal symptoms and that have assessed one or more of the following work-break interventions: changes in break duration, frequency, timing, or type. Two review authors will independently consider retrieved records for eligibility and extract the data.

**Result** The extracted data will be summarised and two review authors will independently assess the risk of bias for each study regarding random sequence allocation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and selective outcome reporting (criteria as outlined in the Cochrane Handbook). The meta-analysis will initially be performed including all studies. Thereafter a sensitivity analysis confined to trials at low risk of bias will be conducted. The heterogeneity of the results of included studies will be assessed by visual inspection of the forest plots and consideration of trial characteristics, e.g. work-break characteristics.

**Discussion** The results of this Cochrane Review will provide insights into the effectiveness of work-break interventions and provide direction for optimising current prevention approaches and help prioritise future fields of research.