Prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders among dental healthcare providers: A systematic review and meta-analysis
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Abstract

Background: Work-related musculoskeletal disorders (MSD) are common in dentistry due to the prolonged static work involved during patient care, making dental health care personnel vulnerable to musculoskeletal complaints. We aimed to pool the prevalence estimates of MSD among various dental healthcare providers, including dentists, dental students, dental hygienists, and auxiliaries.

Methods: A systematic search of five databases was performed (Scopus, Embase, CINAHL, Web of Science, Dentistry & Oral Sciences Source). The studies that reported the prevalence of MSD among dental healthcare workers and those written in English were selected. Screening and data extraction were performed by two review authors independently. Discrepancies were resolved by another review author. Risk of bias assessment was done using a nine-item questionnaire developed by Hoy et al. Pooled estimates were calculated using meta-analysis of proportions (random effects model).

Results: Among the 3090 publications screened, 234 publications were included for full-text screening. Meta-analysis was performed for 89 estimates from 88 publications. Females showed significantly higher prevalence [OR = 1.42 (95% CI = 1.09–1.84); I² = 66.02; N = 32]. The analysis yielded a pooled estimate of 78.4% (95% CI = 74.8–82). The meta-regression showed similar prevalence over the years (Coefficient: 0.001; P-value: 0.762).

Conclusions: A high prevalence of MSD was noted among dental healthcare providers, with about seven out of ten having experienced MSD in the past. This emphasizes the need for awareness and adoption of appropriate ergonomic postures by dental healthcare
providers from early in their careers to minimize work-related MSD.
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Introduction

“Musculoskeletal disorders (MSD) are injuries to the human support system of muscles, ligaments, tendons, nerves, blood vessels, bones, and joints” (https://www.cdc.gov/). MSDs are defined as musculoskeletal system and connective tissue diseases and disorders when the event or exposure leading to the case is bodily reaction (e.g., bending, climbing, crawling, reaching, twisting), overexertion, or repetitive motion. MSDs do not include disorders caused by slips, trips, falls, or similar incidents (Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. NIOSH workers health chartbook 2004. NIOSH Publication No. 2004-146. Washington, D.C). Such injuries resulting due to occupation or work-related exposure are termed work-related MSD. Work-related MSD is common in dentistry due to the prolonged static work involved during patient care, making dental health care personnel vulnerable to musculoskeletal complaints. Moreover, the current lifestyle practices make the onset of such problems likely at an early stage of life. MSD includes pain, discomfort, or limitation in a range of activities in the head, neck, shoulders, arms, wrists, fingers, elbows, upper and lower back, buttocks, thighs, feet, ankle, etc.

MSD among dental healthcare personnel can potentially impact the individual and the community. Literature has shown a decrease in work efficiency, stress, poor sleep quality, multisite pain, frequent absenteeism, and/or early retirement resulting in loss of workforce.1,2 The preventive strategies adopted to mitigate MSD are massage treatments, increased physical activity, adopting ergonomically designed equipment, maintaining correct postures, and using complementary and alternative medicine.3,4

The studies on self-reported MSD have reported a high prevalence among dental healthcare personnel.5–10 Studies have also evaluated the associated risk factors of MSD among dentists,7,11–19 dental hygienists,6,20,21 and dental students.22,23 Increasing age, gender (female), comorbidities, prolonged working hours, increased patient load, lack of physical exercise, non-usage of loupes, stress, lack of breaks between patients, awkward postures, administrative work, vibration, and repetition were some of the reported risk factors of MSD.6,24 A few literature reviews and meta-analysis on these conditions have reported a high prevalence among dental healthcare personnel.25–31 However, there was no attempt to study the overall prevalence estimates of MSD burden among various dental healthcare providers, including dentists, dental students, dental assistants, and auxiliaries at a global level. Hence, we aimed to pool the estimates of the MSD burden among dental healthcare providers.

Methods

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The studies that reported the overall prevalence of MSD among dental healthcare personnel (dentists, dental students, hygienists, or dental auxiliaries), and the studies written in English were included. Only cross-sectional studies and cohort studies, where prevalence data can be extracted or calculated were included. The studies reported as commentaries, letters, or conference abstracts were excluded. The protocol was registered with INPLASY (DOI: 10.37766/implasy2021.5.0100).32

Literature search

A systematic search in five databases (Scopus (RRID:SCR_022706), Embase (RRID:SCR_001650), CINAHL (RRID:SCR_022707), Web of Science (RRID:SCR_022706), Dentistry & Oral Sciences Source (RRID:SCR_022705)) from inception to 5 August 2021 was performed. The keywords used were “dentist OR dental hygienist OR dental personnel OR dental student” AND “musculoskeletal disease OR musculoskeletal disorder OR occupational disease OR work-related musculoskeletal disorder.” Suitable filters (reports on humans, research articles) for each database were applied.

Screening

The search was imported to Rayyan, a web-based application (RRID:SCR_017584).13 The screening and data extraction were done by two review authors independently (MK and MM). Disagreements were arbitrated by another review author (PKC). Agreement between the reviewers for title and abstract screening and full text screening showed almost perfect agreement (Kappa: 0.94 and 0.98 respectively).
Risk of bias (RoB) assessment

All studies were assessed using the 10 item Quality Assessment Checklist for Prevalence Studies questionnaire\(^3\)4 by two review authors independently (HS and PKC). Disagreements were arbitrated by another review author (CD). Each question has two levels, low risk (0) and high risk (1). The total of all nine questions was used to categorize the studies as “low (0–3), moderate (4–6), or high risk (7–9)”. 

Data extraction

The variables for data extraction included study details such as authors, year, country, continent, study design, sample size, type of participants (dentist or dental students, or dental auxiliaries), age distribution, sex distribution, the overall prevalence of MSD at maximum recall along with lifetime, annual, one-week prevalence, gender and site-specific estimates.

Statistical analysis

Due to variation in the reporting of the prevalence of MSD among the included studies, the prevalence estimates at the maximal follow-up were used to calculate the pooled estimates of MSD. Measures of heterogeneity (Q and \(I^2\)) were calculated. A random-effects model (restricted maximum likelihood estimation method) was used to calculate the prevalence estimates using the OpenMeta[Analyst] software for Windows 8 (Metafor Package 1.4, 1999) (RRID: SCR_022698). Time trends of MSD were evaluated using meta-regression. A sub-group analysis based on the continent, country, type of dental personnel, site of MSD, and sex was performed. A funnel plot was used to evaluate the publication bias. Complete data for the analysis can be accessed at Mendeley datasets.\(^1\)5

Results

A comprehensive systematic search of five databases (Scopus (1080), Embase (592), CINAHL (728), Web of Science (514), Dentistry & Oral Sciences Source (750)) yielded a total of 3664 articles. Reviews, conference proceedings, case reports, clinical trials, studies on ergonomics, quality of life, burnout, etc. letters, magazine reports, work related hazards other than MSD, studies among health professionals other than dentists were excluded (n = 2856). A further 146 publications were excluded after screening the full-text. Meta-analysis was performed for 89 estimates (Table 1 and Figure 1).

| Author and year         | Continent | Sample size | Population | ROB | Prevalence |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----|------------|
| Osborn et al. 1990      | NA        | 385         | Dentists   | Low | 68.31      |
| Rundcrantz et al. (a) 1990 | Eu        | 311         | DA         | Low | 83.28      |
| Rundcrantz et al. (b) 1991 | Eu        | 311         | Dentists   | Low | 84.24      |
| Marshall et al. 1997    | Au        | 355         | Dentists   | Low | 81.97      |
| Akesson et al. 1999     | Eu        | 74          | ALL        | Low | 91.89      |
| Kerosuo et al. 2000     | Eu        | 228         | Dentists   | Low | 70.61      |
| Lalumandier et al. 2001 | NA        | 5119        | ALL        | Low | 47.14      |
| Anton et al. 2002       | NA        | 95          | DA         | Low | 92.63      |
| Szymanska 2002          | Eu        | 268         | Dentists   | Low | 91.42      |
| Tezel et al. 2005       | Asia      | 221         | DS         | Low | 85.97      |
| Leggat et al. 2006      | Au        | 285         | Dentists   | Low | 87.37      |
| Polat et al. 2007       | Asia      | 120         | Dentists   | Low | 94.17      |
| Puriene et al. 2008     | Eu        | 1670        | Dentists   | Low | 86.53      |
| de Carvalho et al. 2009 | SA        | 227         | DS         | Low | 70.93      |
| Akar et al. 2009        | Asia      | 185         | DA         | Low | 23.78      |
| Ayers et al. 2009       | Au        | 560         | Dentists   | Low | 59.82      |
| Dajpratham et al. 2010  | Asia      | 163         | ALL        | Low | 96.93      |
| Kierklo et al. 2011     | Eu        | 220         | Dentists   | Low | 90.00      |
| Ellapen et al 2011      | Africa    | 94          | Dentists   | Low | 54.26      |
| Moradia and Prakash 2011| Asia      | 77          | ALL        | Low | 63.64      |
| Author and year            | Continent | Sample size | Population | ROB | Prevalence |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----|------------|
| Sankar et al. 2012        | Asia      | 259         | Dentists   | Low | 41.70      |
| Tzu et al. 2012           | Asia      | 197         | Dentists   | Low | 92.39      |
| Muralidharan et al. 2013  | Asia      | 73          | Dentists   | Low | 78.08      |
| Kumar et al. 2013         | Asia      | 536         | Dentists   | Low | 100.00     |
| Vuletic et al. 2013       | Eu        | 89          | Dentists   | Low | 69.66      |
| Kazancioglu et al. 2013   | Asia      | 608         | Dentists   | Low | 87.01      |
| Rafeemanesh et al. 2013   | Asia      | 58          | Dentists   | Low | 82.76      |
| Zoidaki et al. 2013       | Eu        | 80          | Dentists   | Low | 82.50      |
| Movahhed et al. 2013      | Asia      | 177         | DS         | Low | 83.62      |
| Sustova et al. 2013       | Eu        | 182         | DS         | Low | 39.01      |
| Vora et al. 2014          | Asia      | 86          | Dentists   | Low | 62.79      |
| Zarra and Lambrianidis 2014| Eu        | 120         | Dentists   | Low | 60.83      |
| Mendegeri et al. 2014     | Asia      | 60          | Dentists   | Low | 88.33      |
| Shadmehr et al. 2014      | Asia      | 446         | Dentists   | Low | 80.94      |
| Kursun et al. 2014        | Asia      | 264         | DS         | Low | 48.48      |
| Tirgar et al. 2015        | Asia      | 60          | Dentists   | Low | 93.33      |
| Gupta et al. (a) 2015     | Asia      | 877         | Dentists   | Low | 71.04      |
| Humann et al. 2015        | NA        | 488         | DA         | Low | 98.36      |
| Sakzewski et al. 2015     | Au        | 466         | Dentists   | Low | 86.05      |
| Kanaparthi et al. 2015    | Asia      | 134         | DS         | Moderate | 53.73 |
| Aljanakh et al. 2015      | Asia      | 68          | Dentists   | Low | 77.94      |
| Alghadir et al. 2015      | Asia      | 146         | Dentists   | Low | 84.93      |
| Hodacova et al. 2015      | Eu        | 575         | Dentists   | Low | 97.91      |
| Bhagwat et al. 2015       | Asia      | 200         | Dentists   | Low | 57.50      |
| Gupta et al. (b) 2015     | Asia      | 2879        | Dentists   | Low | 100.00     |
| Sahu et al. 2015          | Asia      | 206         | Dentists   | Low | 81.07      |
| Tamo et al. 2015          | Asia      | 156         | Dentists   | Low | 70.51      |
| Batham and Yasobant 2016  | Asia      | 93          | Dentists   | Low | 92.47      |
| Rehman et al. 2016        | Asia      | 120         | DS         | Low | 70.00      |
| Kriangkrai et al. 2016    | Asia      | 68          | DS         | Low | 100.00     |
| Rayyan et al. 2016        | Asia      | 191         | DS         | Low | 83.77      |
| Cho et al. 2016           | Asia      | 401         | Dentists   | Low | 86.78      |
| Phedy et al. 2016         | Asia      | 241         | Dentists   | Low | 63.49      |
| Freire et al. 2016        | SA        | 94          | Dentists   | Low | 90.43      |
| Al-Rawi et al. 2016       | Asia      | 101         | Dentists   | Low | 67.33      |
| Barry et al. 2017         | NA        | 337         | DA         | Low | 80.42      |
| Garbin et al. 2017        | SA        | 204         | Dentists   | Low | 81.37      |
| Taib et al. 2017          | Asia      | 82          | Dentists   | Low | 100.00     |
| Al-Hourani et al. 2017    | Asia      | 81          | DA         | Low | 100.00     |
| Revankar et al. 2017      | Asia      | 150         | Dentists   | Moderate | 81.33 |
| Hegde et al. 2018         | Asia      | 200         | Dentists   | Low | 97.00      |
| Hosseini et al. 2019      | Asia      | 136         | Dentists   | Low | 91.91      |
| Scepanovic et al. 2019    | Eu        | 87          | ALL        | Low | 79.31      |
Prevalence
The prevalence of MSD ranged from 19.4 to 100%. Only seven publications showed less than 50% of MSD.\textsuperscript{17,36–41} More than one-quarter (n = 24) of the included publications reported more than 90% prevalence.\textsuperscript{5–12,16,18,23,42–54} One fourth of the studies (n = 21) reported a lifetime prevalence,\textsuperscript{3,37,39,44,45,49,51,53–66} while only eight studies reported a one-week prevalence.\textsuperscript{8,18,19,22,42,53,54,67} Most of the included studies reported a one-year prevalence (n = 65) (Table 1).

Age
Most of the studies reported the age distribution of the participants (n = 61), while 14 studies reported only the age range of the participants. Prevalence estimates could not be calculated as there was substantial variation in age grouping.

Gender
Most of the studies reported the gender distribution of the participants (n = 80). Only one-third of the studies (n = 32) reported gender-specific estimates. The pooled prevalence of MSD among males and females was 72.4% (95% CI = 65.2–79.6) and 77.4% (95% CI = 69.4–85.4) respectively.\textsuperscript{6,7,10,12,13,16,18,22,23,38,39,41,53,56,58,59,62,67–80} Most of the included studies reported a one-year prevalence (n = 65) (Table 1). Females had significantly higher estimates of MSD than males (OR = 1.42) (Figure 2).

| Author and year | Continent | Sample size | Population | ROB | Prevalence |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----|------------|
| El Naji et al. 2019 | Asia | 134 | Dentists | Low | 19.40 |
| Benlidiay et al. 2019 | Asia | 99 | DS | Low | 85.86 |
| Zafar et al. 2019 | Asia | 142 | DS | Low | 58.45 |
| dos Santos et al. 2019 | SA | 241 | DS | Low | 82.57 |
| Meisha et al. 2019 | Asia | 234 | Dentists | Low | 70.09 |
| Gandham et al. 2019 | Asia | 150 | Dentists | Low | 58.67 |
| Khandan et al. 2020 | Asia | 51 | Dentists | Low | 84.31 |
| Netanely et al. 2020 | Asia | 102 | DA | Low | 89.22 |
| Harris et al. 2020 | NA | 647 | DA | Low | 82.53 |
| Pope-Ford et al. 2020 | NA | 14 | Dentists | Moderate | 92.86 |
| Senosy et al. 2020 | Asia | 66 | Dentists | Low | 89.39 |
| Shekhawat et al. 2020 | Asia | 72 | Dentists | Low | 100.00 |
| Rahman et al. 2020 | Asia | 82 | DA | Low | 81.71 |
| Uppada et al. (b) 2020 | Asia | 624 | Dentists | Low | 69.07 |
| Aboalshamat 2020 | Asia | 332 | ALL | Low | 81.33 |
| Ohlendorf et al. (b) 2020 | Eu | 450 | ALL | Low | 95.78 |
| Ohlendorf et al. (a) 2020 | Eu | 406 | DA | Low | 98.52 |
| Uppada et al. (a) 2020 | Asia | 156 | Dentists | Low | 84.62 |
| Kumar M et al. 2020 | Asia | 151 | ALL | Low | 58.28 |
| Berdouses et al. 2020 | Eu | 1500 | Dentists | Low | 54.07 |
| Ahmad et al. 2020 | Asia | 244 | Dentists | Low | 86.48 |
| Hashim et al. 2021 | Asia | 202 | DS | Moderate | 68.32 |
| Alnaser et al. 2021 | Asia | 186 | Dentists | Low | 47.85 |
| Gandolfi et al. 2021 | Eu | 284 | ALL | Low | 84.86 |
| Felemban et al. 2021 | Asia | 377 | DS | Low | 91.25 |
| Bhuvaneshwari et al. 2021 | Asia | 545 | Dentists | Low | 88.07 |

Eu: Europe; NA: North America; SA: South America; Au: Australia; DA: Dental auxillaries; DS: Dental students; ALL: All types of dental health care personnel; ROB: Risk of Bias.
Table 2. Sub-group analysis of the pooled estimates of overall musculoskeletal disorders.

| Characteristic          | Estimate (95% CI) | Q   | $I^2$ | N  |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|----|
| Recall interval         |                   |     |       |    |
| Overall                 | 0.78 (0.75–0.82)  | 13941.24 | 99.82 | 89 |
| Lifetime                | 0.78 (0.7–0.85)   | 4752.99  | 99.4  | 21 |
| One year                | 0.82 (0.78–0.85)  | 4922.35  | 99.79 | 65 |
| One week                | 0.66 (0.52–0.79)  | 330.09   | 97.67 | 8  |
| Sex                     |                   |     |       |    |
| Male                    | 0.73 (0.65–0.8)   | 1914.47 | 98.69 | 30 |
| Female                  | 0.77 (0.69–0.85)  | 2047.83 | 99.41 | 32 |
| Dental personnel        |                   |     |       |    |
| Dentists                | 0.79 (0.75–0.83)  | 5788.91 | 99.85 | 56 |
| Dental auxiliaries      | 0.83 (0.69–0.97)  | 768.63  | 99.7  | 10 |
| Dental students         | 0.73 (0.64–0.82)  | 671.93  | 98.09 | 14 |
| Mixed                   | 0.78 (0.66–0.89)  | 2346.13 | 99.16 | 9  |
### Table 2. Continued

| Characteristic | Estimate (95% CI) | Q     | I²   | N  |
|----------------|-------------------|-------|------|----|
| **Continent**  |                   |       |      |    |
| North America  | 0.8 (0.67–0.93)   | 3272.59 | 99.5 | 7  |
| Europe         | 0.8 (0.72–0.88)   | 1530.95 | 99.29| 17 |
| Australia      | 0.79 (0.66–0.91)  | 124.04  | 97.79| 4  |
| Asia           | 0.78 (0.73–0.83)  | 4693.83 | 99.88| 56 |
| South America  | 0.81 (0.74–0.89)  | 21.15  | 87.39| 4  |
| **Country**    |                   |       |      |    |
| US             | 0.8 (0.64–0.95)   | 3263.61 | 99.59| 6  |
| Sweden         | 0.86 (0.81–0.91)  | 5.485  | 67.53| 3  |
| Australia      | 0.85 (0.82–0.88)  | 3.984  | 49.84| 3  |
| Turkey         | 0.71 (0.48–0.94)  | 506.76 | 99.3 | 6  |
| Brazil         | 0.81 (0.74–0.89)  | 21.15  | 87.39| 4  |
| India          | 0.77 (0.7–0.85)   | 1744.26 | 99.94| 20 |
| Iran           | 0.86 (0.82–0.91)  | 20.21  | 71.87| 6  |
| Greece         | 0.66 (0.49–0.82)  | 41.93  | 95.13| 3  |
| Saudi          | 0.76 (0.66–0.85)  | 133.73 | 95.64| 8  |
| Malaysia       | 0.9 (0.79–1)      | 43.86  | 94.73| 3  |
| **Risk of bias** |               |       |      |    |
| Low            | 0.79 (0.75–0.82)  | 13700.42 | 99.83| 85 |
| Moderate       | 0.74 (0.58–0.9)   | 37.04  | 93.86| 4  |

Figure 2. Forest plot of gender difference in the prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders (MSD).
Table 3. Site-specific pooled estimates of overall musculoskeletal disorders.

| Site         | Estimate (95% CI) | Q    | I²  | N  |
|--------------|-------------------|------|-----|----|
| Neck         | 0.51 (0.46–0.56)  | 11158.95 | 98.86 | 78 |
| Shoulder     | 0.41 (0.36–0.47)  | 8921.3 | 99.09 | 71 |
| Wrist        | 0.31 (0.27–0.35)  | 4668.92 | 98.39 | 65 |
| Arm          | 0.11 (0.07–0.15)  | 269.08  | 96.9 | 14 |
| Elbow        | 0.16 (0.11–0.2)   | 1666.43 | 98.82 | 50 |
| Fingers      | 0.18 (0.06–0.3)   | 260.81  | 98.23 | 6  |
| Hip          | 0.16 (0.13–0.2)   | 1697.04 | 97.31 | 49 |
| Thighs       | 0.1 (0.06–0.14)   | 92.07   | 89.32 | 10 |
| Knee         | 0.18 (0.15–0.21)  | 1483.36 | 95.92 | 49 |
| Leg          | 0.11 (0.06–0.17)  | 604.18  | 99.34 | 19 |
| Ankle        | 0.14 (0.11–0.17)  | 1023.76 | 97.12 | 41 |
| Feet         | 0.13 (0.06–0.2)   | 302.74  | 97.02 | 10 |
| Back         | 0.5 (0.39–0.6)    | 8971.27 | 99.45 | 17 |
| Lower back   | 0.46 (0.42–0.5)   | 3142.31 | 97.49 | 66 |
| Upper back   | 0.35 (0.3–0.4)    | 3480.2  | 97.99 | 58 |

Geographic distribution
Only a few studies were reported from North America (n = 7), and Australia (n = 4) while only one study was reported from Europe. Most of the studies were from Asia (Table 2). Countries with more than three studies were included for the sub-group analysis. The highest pooled prevalence was seen in Malaysia, and the lowest pooled prevalence was seen in Greece.

Risk of bias (RoB)
Out of the 88 studies included, only four studies had a moderate RoB. The pooled estimates for studies with low and moderate RoB were 79% and 74% (Table 2).

Site distribution
The commonly reported sites were the neck, back, lower back, shoulder, upper back, and wrists. The least affected sites were thighs, legs, arms, feet, and ankles (Table 3).

Meta-analysis
There was high heterogeneity among the included studies, as evidenced by Q and I² statistics. The model yielded a pooled estimate of 78.4% (Figure 3), and sensitivity analysis did not show any change in the overall estimate. The meta-regression showed no change in the trend of MSD (Coefficient: 0.001; 95% CI: -0.004 to 0.006) (Figure 4). Asymmetry was noted in the funnel plot (p < 0.001) (Figure 5).

Discussion
MSD’s result in pain, discomfort, or limitation in the range of movement. They are preventable conditions often due to poor ergonomic postures adopted by dental health care providers. We aimed to pool the estimates of MSD among dental healthcare providers. Eighty-eight publications recorded a comprehensive assessment of all body areas and reported the overall prevalence of MSD. The estimates needed to be evaluated carefully due to the high heterogeneity. The overall estimate was 78%, which was much higher than Greek and Czech surveys. However, extensive surveys of dentists from India and Lithuania have reported similar or higher prevalence estimates. Therefore, it is clear that dental professionals have quite a higher prevalence of MSD. Age-specific prevalence estimates could not be estimated due to a lack of standardized age groups or specific prevalence estimates. It was found that females showed higher prevalence estimates than males. Although the number of studies that reported gender distribution was high, only one-third of these studies reported gender-specific estimates of MSD.
Figure 3. Forest plot of the prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders (MSD).
The prevalence estimates were similar across the continents. The highest number of studies were reported from the Asian continent. The highest number of studies were from India, followed by the US, Iran, and Turkey. Studies from Malaysia reported the highest prevalence estimates among various countries, followed by Iran, Sweden, Australia, Brazil, and the US. There was not much variation in the prevalence estimates among the dentists, dental auxiliaries, and dental students. These observations suggest that all types of dental healthcare providers globally suffer from MSDs due to prolonged static postures. Over three decades, there was no significant change in the trend of MSD, indicating a consistently higher prevalence, highlighting the need to incorporate ergonomics into the dental curriculum.

There was substantial inconsistency in the assessment of prevalence estimates among the studies. The Nordic/standardized Nordic questionnaire was the most commonly used tool to assess MSDs. A few studies used generic questionnaires and single-item questions without adequate validity and reliability. Moreover, the studies used various time recall periods (lifetime, one year, six months, one month, and one week) to assess the prevalence estimates. The studies that used lifetime or extended recall periods might have included pre-existing MSDs that may not be work-related, which could have diluted the estimates of MSD.

MSD can arise from various reasons, and there was a lack of clarity in most of the studies. Only one study explicitly recorded the estimates before and after joining the dental profession. There was a general lack of clarity on the estimates reported for various body parts (shoulders, hands, elbow, wrists, legs, ankles, hips, fingers, toes). The studies reported right, left, and bilateral prevalence estimates of MSD without detailing the prevalence for each site. MSD in such areas could have been reported as unilateral and bilateral rather than right, left, and bilateral estimates. Furthermore, there was no uniformity in the evaluation of site-specific assessments among the studies included (e.g. lack of clarity on the terms hand and arms).

Figure 4. Meta-regression to evaluate the trends in the prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders (MSD).

Figure 5. Funnel plot to evaluate the publication bias.
The strength of this review is the inclusion of studies that reported the overall estimates of MSD, including many databases, all types of dental healthcare personnel, overall, lifetime and annual estimates, sub-group analysis, gender, and site-specific prevalence estimates. A few limitations were observed in our study. They are the exclusion of studies published in other languages, lack of age-specific prevalence estimates, lack of differentiation between work-related and pre-existing MSDs, causes of MSDs due to inadequate reporting in primary studies, use of self-reported measures of MSD rather than objective measures, and exclusion of studies with no comprehensive assessment or overall estimates of MSD.

The additional confounding factors related to lifestyle (sedentary lifestyle, lack of regular physical exercise, and other extra-curricular activities) could significantly influence the onset and duration of MSD. Furthermore, the number of clinical working days/week, working hours/day, type and duration of procedures, specialization, number of patients/ days, remedial measures, and history of MSD in the past could also substantially impact the estimates of MSD. These inconsistencies in the included studies could have influenced the overall prevalence of MSD.

Conclusions
MSD among dental healthcare personnel is widespread and mostly chronic. Seven out of ten dental healthcare providers could have experienced MSD in the past. However, the severity and self-limiting nature of MSD cannot be underestimated. Awareness, adoption, and maintenance of appropriate ergonomic postures should be encouraged at dental schools and early in the career. Future studies should use the “Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)” guidelines and use validated questionnaires for reporting MSD.

Data availability
Underlying data
Mendeley Data: Underlying data for ‘Musculoskeletal disorders among dental health care professionals’. https://www. doi.org/10.17632/2twfzm9n.2

Reporting guidelines
Mendeley Data: PRISMA checklist for ‘Musculoskeletal disorders among dental health care professionals’. https://www. doi.org/10.17632/2twfzm9n.2

Data are available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY 4.0)
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The authors have studied the prevalence estimates of MSD among dental healthcare workers using a systematic search of five databases. The authors observed high prevalence of MSD among dental healthcare workers which highlights the importance of them becoming aware of and adopting appropriate ergonomic postures early in their careers in order to reduce work-related MSD.
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Introduction:
The authors showed the high prevalence of Musculoskeletal disorder (MSD) among dental health care providers in a worldwide scenario. MSD-related problems seem to be a significant issue for this profession and this is an already known problem. The authors tried to put up possibly all available publications related to MSD and did this attempt. However, certain changes in the manuscript and corrections to spelling mistakes or typos are recommended.

The exact definition of MSD is missing.

Methods:
1) Inclusion Criteria:
Question: Is there any previously published systematic review included in this study?
Question: Hygienists mentioned here are missing in Table 2. Are they included in auxiliaries?
Question: What kind of studies were included - Cross-sectional/cohort/case-control?
Question: Were there any self-reported studies?

2) RoB:
Question: What is the cutoff point used in this study? It is not mentioned that some cut-off point was used here.
Question: How many articles were excluded after RoB calculations?

3) Results:
Question: Meta-analysis was performed for 89? Or 88?
**Question:** What is the reason for the exclusion of 146 publications after the full screening of the full text?

4) **Prevalence:** There is a repeated word “than than”.

5) **Geographic distribution:**
   **Question:** The authors mentioned that Australia (4), Africa (1), and north and south America (7,4) why not Asia and Europe (N=?)?
   It may be better to revise this “One study from Africa (N=1)”.

6) **Figure 1:**
   **Question:** Where is the N=89 in this chart?
   **Question:** What are the other sources used to identify additional records?

7) **Table 2:**
   **Question:** Why is Africa not mentioned here?
   **Question:** Malaysia has the highest estimates. What is the reason? Is it due to the inappropriate definition of MSD in Malaysia?
   **Question:** The estimate for one year (0.82) is more than for a lifetime (0.78); What may be the possible reason?
   **Question:** What is the definition of “mixed”?
   **Question:** Dental auxiliaries seem to have more difficulties with MSD with an estimate of 0.83 (0.69-0.97). Is it not because 2-3 categories are grouped together?

8) **Limitation:**
   **Question:** It's mentioned that “the exclusion of studies published in other languages”; does it mean other than English?

**Discussion:**
**Question:** What was the national survey estimate? Mentioned in references 37,80? Better to mention Greek and Czech surveys.
**Question:** Reference 37, is it a national survey?
**Question:** What was the prevalence of the studies that used the Nordic questionnaire?
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Introduction:
The authors showed the high prevalence of Musculoskeletal disorder (MSD) among dental health care providers in a worldwide scenario. MSD-related problems seem to be a significant issue for this profession and this is an already known problem. The authors tried to put up possibly all available publications related to MSD and did this attempt. However, certain changes in the manuscript and corrections to spelling mistakes or typos are recommended.

The exact definition of MSD is missing.

**Response:** MSDs are defined as musculoskeletal system and connective tissue diseases and disorders when the event or exposure leading to the case is bodily reaction (e.g., bending, climbing, crawling, reaching, twisting), overexertion, or repetitive motion. MSDs do not include disorders caused by slips, trips, falls, or similar incidents (Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. NIOSH workers health chartbook 2004. NIOSH Publication No. 2004-146. Washington, D.C). We will add the same into the manuscript.

Methods:
1) Inclusion Criteria:
Question: Is there any previously published systematic review included in this study?
**Response:** No
Question: Hygienists mentioned here are missing in Table 2. Are they included in auxiliaries?
**Response:** Yes
Question: What kind of studies were included - Cross-sectional/cohort/case-control?
**Response:** We included studies from which prevalence could be calculated. However, most of the included studies were cross-sectional (n=86)
Question: Were there any self-reported studies?
**Response:** All the studies were self-reported

2) RoB:
Question: What is the cutoff point used in this study? It is not mentioned that some cut-off point was used here.

**Response:** Each question has two levels, low risk (0) and high risk (1). The total of all nine questions was used to categorize the studies as “low (0–3), moderate (4–6), or high risk (7–9)”. (This information was in the risk of bias assessment in the methodology section)

Question: How many articles were excluded after RoB calculations?

**Response:** Nil. Sensitivity analysis did not show any change in the overall estimate

3) Results:

Question: Meta-analysis was performed for 89? Or 88?

**Response:** Meta-analysis was performed for 89 estimates that yielded from 88 publications.

Question: What is the reason for the exclusion of 146 publications after the full screening of the full text?

**Response:** During the full-text screening of the publications, we excluded studies which had unclear outcome (n=138), inappropriate study design (n=4), short communications (n=2), and secondary analysis (n=2). This information is presented in figure 1.

4) Prevalence: There is a repeated word “than than”.

**Response:** Thank you. We will incorporate the change.

5) Geographic distribution:

Question: The authors mentioned that Australia (4), Africa (1), and north and south America (7,4) why not Asia and Europe (N=?)?

**Response:** We didn't want to replicate the data that has been presented in tables. Continent and country wise estimates with number of studies were presented in table 2.

It may be better to revise this “One study from Africa (N=1)”.

Response: We will incorporate the change.

6) Figure 1:

Question: Where is the N=89 in this chart?

**Response:** 89 estimates were obtained from 88 publications. In the flow chart we have highlighted the process flow with respect to the number of publications.

Question: What are the other sources used to identify additional records?

**Responses:** We have sought additional publications from the reference list given at the end of each article.

7) Table 2:

Question: Why is Africa not mentioned here?

**Response:** As there was only one study reported from Africa, we could not pool the estimate.

Question: Malaysia has the highest estimates. What is the reason? Is it due to the inappropriate definition of MSD in Malaysia?

**Response:** We could not identify the reason for this. Many factors like the number of clinical working days/week, working hours/day, type and duration of procedures, specialization, number of patients/days, remedial measures, and history of MSD in the past can have substantially impact on the estimates of MSD.

Question: The estimate for one year (0.82) is more than for a lifetime (0.78); What may be the possible reason?

**Response:** Different studies have used different time frames to report the MSD. Most studies have reported one year prevalence (n=65) followed by lifetime prevalence. Some studies reported both. Hence, it is not possible to substantiate what could be reason of this
disparity. There could be possibility of recall bias among the participants that report lifetime events when compared to one-year events.

Question: What is the definition of “mixed”?

Response: Studies that have not reported estimates separately for dentists, dental students or dental auxiliaries or studies that included different type of dental personnel.

Question: Dental auxiliaries seem to have more difficulties with MSD with an estimate of 0.83 (0.69-0.97). Is it not because 2-3 categories are grouped together?

Response: Among the ten publications that were included in the dental auxiliaries, 6 studies were among dental hygienists (prevalence: 80.42 to 98.36), two were among dental technicians (prevalence 23.8 and 100%) and one was among dental assistant (prevalence 81.71%) and one was among dental auxiliaries (prevalence 81.7). Hence, estimates are high and may not related to the categorisation.

8) Limitation:

Question: It's mentioned that “the exclusion of studies published in other languages”; does it mean other than English?

Response: Yes

Discussion:

Question: What was the national survey estimate? Mentioned in references 37,80? Better to mention Greek and Czech surveys.

Response: Yes, we will incorporate the change.

Question: Reference 37, is it a national survey?

Response: No. It is a study among dental personnel in US dental army.

Question: What was the prevalence of the studies that used the Nordic questionnaire?

Response: 45 studies used Nordic questionnaire.
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