

Original article. Scand J Work Environ Health.

The impact of workplace ergonomics and neck-specific exercise versus ergonomics and health promotion interventions on office productivity: A cluster-randomized trial ¹

by Michelle Pereira, MPhty,² Tracy Comans, PhD, Gisela Sjøgaard, PhD, Leon Straker, PhD, Markus Melloh, MD, PhD, Shaun O’Leary, PhD, Xiaoqi Chen, PhD, Venerina Johnston, PhD

1. *Appendices*
2. *Correspondence to: School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. [E-mail: michelle_jessica_pereira@nhg.com.sg]*

Appendix 1. Titles of talks delivered in EHP arm.

1. Making changes towards success
2. Food guide workshop
3. Practical eating part 1
4. Practical eating part 2
5. Alcohol – how does it affect your health?
6. Tobacco & other drugs
7. Self-esteem, stress & relaxation
8. Conflict management & resilience
9. Attitudes to health & elements of success
10. Common mental health issues & their impact on a healthy lifestyle
11. Maintaining a healthy lifestyle with ageing
12. Keeping the ball rolling

Appendix 2. Income levels, recruitment rate, clustering information, participation numbers and adherence by organization and intervention group.

Organization	Annual income – ‘000 (mean, SD)	Recruitment rate ^	Clusters (N)	EET (n = 381)			EHP (n = 382)		
				Participants (N)	Cluster size [mean (SD; range)]	Adherence	Participants (N)	Cluster size [mean (SD; range)]	Adherence
1 ^{#a}	71.7 (11.3)	10.4	4	29	7.9 (2.5, 6 – 11)	48.0 (25.5)	28	7.3 (1.8, 5 – 9)	53.2 (29.9)
2 ^{*b}	98.3 (31.8)	19.7	6	36	6.1 (1.2, 4 – 8)	54.1 (22.2)	39	7.4 (2.5, 3 – 11)	68.8 (26.8)
3 ^{#a}	81.7 (15.7)	68.8	4	20	4.8 (0.4, 4 – 5)	53.0 (25.9)	24	6.6 (1.4, 4 – 8)	61.1 (30.6)
4 ^{#a}	79.5 (20.9)	17.2	4	23	6.9 (2.1, 3 – 9)	36.0 (31.2)	30	7.4 (0.8, 6 – 8)	49.4 (29.1)
5 ^{*a}	66.9 (12.9)	17.9	2	18	9.0 (0.0, 9 – 9)	61.3 (22.7)	19	9.9 (1.5, 8 – 11)	66.2 (25.5)
6 ^{#a}	93.5 (23.1)	24.7	4	26	6.6 (0.9, 6 – 8)	46.0 (30.5)	22	5.9 (1.3, 3 – 7)	54.5 (25.3)
7 ^{#d}	81.9 (21.1)	14.1	4	52	12.9 (1.5, 11 – 15)	61.6 (26.0)	47	12.7 (3.3, 9 – 17)	51.2 (31.4)
8 ^{#c}	89.9 (26.3)	24.4	6	42	6.0 (0.7, 6 – 8)	45.3 (26.4)	39	6.7 (1.0, 5 – 8)	53.1 (29.9)
9 ^{*d}	74.7 (22.6)	43.1	4	25	6.4 (0.8, 5 – 7)	71.2 (20.7)	25	6.4 (0.8, 5 – 7)	77.3 (20.6)
10 ^{#b}	76.1 (17.2)	34.9	4	33	8.4 (1.1, 7 – 10)	54.4 (24.2)	35	9.5 (2.4, 5 – 12)	59.2 (19.9)
11 ^{#c}	81.0 (14.8)	21.7	2	18	9.4 (2.0, 7 – 11)	56.3 (28.0)	17	8.8 (1.5, 7 – 10)	55.9 (19.9)
12 ^{*a}	142 (63.4)	7.63	2	16	8.1 (1.0, 7 – 9)	51.0 (32.6)	19	9.5 (0.5, 9 – 10)	28.2 (28.5)
13 ^{#c}	96.3 (18.5)	13.0	2	20	10.9 (2.9, 7 – 13)	57.7 (25.5)	19	9.5 (0.5, 9 – 10)	53.4 (25.6)
14 ^{*d}	162 (91.5)	77.8	2	23	11.5 (0.5, 11 – 12)	64.2(25.6)	19	10.2 (2.5, 7 – 12)	45.0 (28.1)
Overall	89.8 (38.7)	18.9	50	381	8.4 (2.8, 3 – 15)	54.3 (25.9)	382	8.5 (2.8, 3 – 17)	56.2 (28.6)

SD = Standard deviation. # Public sector organization; * Private sector organization.

a: Size of organization by number of employees <1000; b: Size of organization by number of employees 1000 – 4999; c: Size of organization by number of employees 5000 – 10000; d: Size of organization by number of employees >10,000.

^ The denominator for recruitment rates was the number of office workers working ≥ 30 hours weekly in areas where recruitment occurred reported by each organization.

N. B. For EET group: Total number of supervised and unsupervised sessions = 36. For EHP group: Total number of sessions (all supervised) = 12.

Adherence levels defined as percentage of sessions attended of all sessions offered. For EET, this is based on observed attendance at supervised sessions and self-report for unsupervised sessions via exercise diary (for 270 EET participants who returned exercise diaries) and predicted attendance at unsupervised sessions for participants who did not submit exercise diaries (111 participants).