pagepress

Work resumption after invasive heart procedures, rehabilitation and ergonomic evaluation: from the hospital to the workplace

Fabrizio Scafa,[1,2] Alessia Gallozzi,[1,2] Giovanni Forni,[3] Stefano M. Candura[1,2]

[1]Occupational Medicine Unit, Department of Public Health, Experimental and Forensic Sciences, University of Pavia; [2]Occupational Medicine Unit, ICS Maugeri IRCCS, Pavia; [3]Rehabilitation Cardiology Unit, ICS Maugeri IRCCS, Pavia, Italy

Correspondence: Stefano M. Candura, Occupational Medicine Unit, ICS Maugeri IRCCS, Via Maugeri 4, 27100, Pavia, Italy.
Tel.: +39.0382.592740.
Fax: +39.0382.592701.
E-mail: stefano.candura@icsmaugeri.it

Key words: myocardial revascularization, valve replacement, cardiac rehabilitation, energy requirement, job fitness.

Contributions: FS, conceptualization and design, occupational medicine evaluations, writing; AG, occupational medicine evaluations, data collection and statistical analysis, writing; GF, cardiology evaluations (clinical and instrumental), patients' rehabilitation, data collection; SMC, conceptualization and design, project coordination, review and editing. All the authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Conflict of interest: the authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to report regarding the present study.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: the study was conducted according to the Helsinki Declaration criteria.

Informed consent: informed consent was obtained from all individual participants.

Funding: Italian Ministry of Health ("Ricerca Corrente").

Availability of data and materials: the data used to support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Received: 30 June 2023.
Accepted: 31 July 2023.
Early view: 4 September 2023.

Licensee PAGEPress, Italy
Monaldi Archives for Chest Disease 2024; 94:2689
doi: 10.4081/monaldi.2023.2689

Abstract

Our Institute adopts a multidisciplinary protocol named "CardioWork" for work resumption after invasive cardiac procedures and subsequent rehabilitation: after evaluation of the cardiac functional profile, the occupational physician analyzes the work activity prior to the cardiopathological event, identifies the presumed task energy requirement (from specific, published tables), and compares it with the exercise test results. Indications regarding the timing and modality of returning to work are formulated accordingly. To verify the reliability of the indications thus provided, we carried out a clinical-functional follow-up study in the workplace with Holter electrocardiography (ECG) and armband measurement of actual energy expenditure. Over the course of 2 years, we enrolled 36 patients (mostly males, aged between 30 and 70 years) who were hospitalized after coronary revascularization, valve replacement, or cardiac defibrillator implant. After rehabilitation, instrumental diagnostics (Holter ECG, echocardiography, exercise test) showed discrete functional conditions, with better values with regard to cardiac function than exercise capacity and effort tolerance. All subjects were judged fit for the job, in most cases with limitations concerning ergonomic factors, working timetable, and/or stress. They returned to work quickly, with good adherence to the indications provided. The workplace Holter ECG did not show appreciable differences compared to the hospital evaluation. In one case, the average energy expenditure measured while working was higher than that inferred from the tables; in the remaining subjects, the actual expenditure coincided with what was expected or was lower. In a minority of cases (39%), the measured average expenditure slightly exceeded the optimal value (35% of the maximal value at the exercise test) recommended at the time of hospital discharge. At the end of the workplace evaluation, it was not necessary to formulate new indications. The study provides further evidence of the effectiveness of the CardioWork protocol in promoting a return to work after invasive heart procedures. Although they need continuous updating, the published estimates of presumed task energy requirements remain reliable. In particularly complex cases, however, it is advisable to carry out a field check of the ergometric assessments performed at the end of rehabilitation.

Introduction

Cardiovascular diseases are the main cause of death and disability in Italy and worldwide. Ischemic heart disease alone is responsible for about a fifth of deaths in both sexes [1-3].

In recent decades, mortality from heart disease has decreased, both due to the containment of risk factors and the improvement of diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. However, morbidity rates, as opposed to mortality rates, are increasing. Moreover, although cardiopathies, and especially coronary heart disease, are typical of the elderly, many affected patients are still of working age [4,5].

The involvement of relatively young subjects and the onset of a condition of chronicity and disability have exacerbated problems that were little considered in the past, namely that of returning to work after an acute cardiac event and that of maintaining occupational activity in the event of chronic heart disease. They are complex processes, conditioned by clinical and functional aspects [residual ischemia, left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), effort tolerance, arrhythmic risk], interacting with psychological, sociodemographic, and occupational factors (exposure to noxious agents, work and night shifts, commuting). Therefore, to promote a permanent and secure reintegration, return to work should take place after a multidimensional assessment that analyzes the possible interference of these factors [6-8].

Our group adopts a multidisciplinary protocol named "CardioWork", aimed at job resumption after invasive cardiac procedures and subsequent rehabilitation. The protocol applies to workers who have undergone surgery for myocardial revascularization (coronary angioplasty or bypass) or valvular disease and are subsequently sent to our Institute for rehabilitation. During the rehabilitation treatment, the heart's functional profile is defined. After that, the occupational physician analyzes the work activity preceding the cardiopathological event, identifies the presumed energy requirement of the job, and compares it with the results of the ergometric test. Indications regarding the timing and modality of returning to work are formulated accordingly. The subjects are re-evaluated over time, providing them with new indications when appropriate. Workers who follow the protocol show high survival with the maintenance of satisfactory clinical conditions (good left ventricular function, exercise tolerance, rare cardiologic relapses, and few sick leave days), adherence to prescriptions, a high employment rate, and a high degree of subjective satisfaction. All this confirms the importance of appropriate rehabilitation after an acute cardiac event and the need for an interdisciplinary approach involving the occupational physician. By following this strategy, patients not only return to work quickly, effectively, and with minimal risk but also tend to maintain it and reach retirement age in good health [9,10].

The energy requirement of the task contemplated in the CardioWork protocol is obtained from published estimates [11-13]. However, in the workplace, several factors (such as microclimate and work-related stress) can influence the residual functional capacities with modalities that are unpredictable during the evaluation in a hospital environment. Furthermore, work activity is often dynamic, especially in jobs that require an alternation of tasks; thus, energy requests during the work shift may fluctuate significantly. To overcome these possible interferences, a valid strategy could be that of an objective ergonomic assessment directly in the workplace. We therefore decided to measure the actual energy expenditure in the field and compare the results with the indications provided at the time of hospital discharge in order to verify their reliability.

The primary endpoint of the study was to verify the correspondence between the estimated task energy requirement (based on literature data) and the real energy profusion on the job. An additional purpose was the further validation of the CardioWork protocol to support the return to work after invasive cardiac procedures.

Materials and Methods

Hospital evaluation

The study enrolled occupationally active patients of both sexes with a recent history of heart disease and related invasive treatment who were hospitalized over 2 years at the Rehabilitation Cardiology Unit of our Institute. The inclusion criteria were the willingness of the subject and his/her employer to participate in the study and the practical feasibility of the evaluation phase in the workplace.

Each subject followed the CardioWork protocol, including instrumental diagnostics [echocardiography, 24-hour Holter electrocardiography (ECG), treadmill exercise test], personalized physiokinesitherapy, and interviews with psychologists and dieticians aimed at alimentary education and control of cardiovascular risk factors (in particular, smoking habits and sedentary lifestyle) [9,10]. This part does not substantially differ from an ordinary cardiac rehabilitation program [14]. As an additional stage, the hospitalization ended with an occupational medicine evaluation to provide indications of return to work and job limitations. Recommendations were tailored to each single case, relating the patient's psychophysical conditions to the physical and mental requirements of his or her job. Particularly, we formulated limitations regarding one or more of the following work aspects: physical energy requirements, psychological stress, timetable, night shifts, transfers, and thermal discomfort.

To standardize data collection, an anamnestic form was utilized, specifying: personal data; cardiac event (date, type, previous treatment, residual symptoms, current drug therapy); job typology (employee or self-employed); working timetable (full-time, part-time, shifts); daily work-related travel (less than or greater than 50 km, adding the home-workplace roundtrip to the transfers during working time); workplace climate (thermal comfort or discomfort); exposure to noise or chemicals; injury rate index, calculated using the National Workers' Compensation Authority (INAIL) data for the last 3 years; and (most important to estimate the residual working capability) task energy requirement, expressed as multiples of basal metabolic rate [metabolic equivalent of the task (MET)].

The average energy requirement was estimated from published tables, classifying the various tasks into four groups: sedentary (<2 METs), light (2 to 4 METs), moderate (4 to 6 METs), and heavy (>6 METs) [12]. For each patient, the data were compared with the maximum working capability achieved during the exercise stress test: a healthy subject is able to carry out the exercise for 6 to 8 hours, amounting to 30-35% of maximum aerobic capacity, with peak values that must not exceed two-thirds of the maximal effort.

Workplace evaluation

After resuming work, the subjects underwent a Holter ECG during a work shift (to reveal any differences from what emerged at the end of rehabilitation and to verify whether the performance of the tasks led to arrhythmias or ischemic signs) and an ergonomic monitoring with SenseWear® Armband (SWA) for a week to measure the average energy expenditure and the maximal effort of the job. The SWA, a metabolic band, is a multi-sensor tool that, worn on the triceps of the right arm for a continuous period of time, provides the calculation of energy expenditure and the quantification of physical activity during daily activities. In short, physiological signals from the body (skin temperature, temperature proximal to the body, body heat dissipation, galvanic skin resistance) are used, in combination with activity identification formulas, to calculate

energy consumption based on predetermined algorithms. Individual data were downloaded, analyzed, and stored with the SenseWere® base software.

Another anamnestic form was utilized to collect the time (in months) that elapsed between hospital discharge and return to work; periods of absence from work due to illness or injury; task changes or variations in working conditions in terms of timetable (reduction or modification of shifts), travel due to work, and energy requirement; compliance with the limitations suggested at the hospital evaluation (total, partial, or absent).

After this second assessment, the occupational physician once again expressed an opinion on the adequacy of reintegration into work, formulating new indications if necessary.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was performed, calculating means and standard deviations for the quantitative variables; medians, minimum and maximum values for ordinal variables; and frequencies and percentages for qualitative variables. Comparisons between two groups (subjects returning to work within/after 3 months) were carried out with the Student's *t*-test for unpaired data on quantitative variables and with the chi-square test on qualitative or categorical variables.

Results

During the enrolment period (2 years), 36 patients (mainly males, aged between 30 and 70 years) were recruited (Table 1). In 16 of them (44.4%), cardiac rehabilitation was due to a coronary event, treated with percutaneous angioplasty (PTCA) or (more rarely) coronary artery bypass graft (CABG), alone or associated with valve heart surgery (CABG+VS). In 2 patients, a cardiac defibrillator had been implanted (ICD). In the other half of the sample (18 cases) the rehabilitative hospitalization was consequent to valve replacement surgery (VS). Holter ECG revealed an arrhythmic profile (≥10 ventricular extrasystoles per hour and/or episodes of non-sustained ventricular tachycardia and/or episodes of atrial fibrillation) in 9 subjects (25.7%) and residual ischemia (ST segment and/or T wave alterations) in 3 subjects (8.6%). Echocardiography showed an average LVEF of 51.5±7.2%. VS patients had worse cardiac function (LVEF<50% in 30.6% of subjects) than patients hospitalized for coronary artery disease (LVEF<40% in 19.4% of subjects).

Both ICD subjects had an LVEF value of around 35%. At the exercise test, 13 patients (36.1%) reached a value higher than 6 METs, 15 (41.7%) reached a value between 4 and 6 METs, and 8 (22.2%) were unable to reach 4 METs. Contrary to echocardiographic results, there was no statistical difference between subjects who had undergone VS compared to those hospitalized for coronary artery disease. Within the latter group, CABG subjects performed worse than those treated with PTCA. Regarding occupational data, 26 patients (72.2%) worked full-time during the day, 8 (22.2%) worked day/night shifts, and 2 (5.6%) had a part-time job. With regard to traveling, 10 subjects (27.8%) made work-related trips greater than 50 km per day. As regards physical-chemical risk factors, 18 (50.0%) reported thermal discomfort, 11 (30.6%) were exposed to noise, and 9 (25.0%) to chemical risk. 15 subjects (41.7%) carried out a job with an INAIL injury rate index >4. Regarding energy requirements, light tasks (presumed requirement: 2-4 METs) were the most represented, followed by sedentary tasks (Table 1). At the end of hospital rehabilitation, all the patients were judged fit to return to their jobs, in 2 cases, without any restrictions.

One or more limitations were recommended for the remaining 34 subjects, as illustrated in Table 2, from which it can be seen that most limitations concerned the energy requirement of the job (for heavy tasks) or (especially for sedentary tasks) working timetable and stress. It was possible to retrieve reliable information on the actual return to work for 32 patients; all had started working again (in 3 cases, with a change of job). Half of them (n=16) had returned to work within 3 months of the cardiac invasive procedure, 12 subjects (37.5%) within 6 months, and 4 (12.5%) within a year (average resumption time: 122±12.5 days).

The mean age (54.1±4.8 years) of those who had returned to work within 3 months was higher than that (48.4±5.9 years) of those who had returned later ($p<0.01$; Student's *t*-test). There was no significant difference between the groups (work resumption before and after 3 months) concerning the type of cardiac event, LVEF values, presumed task energy requirement, and exercise test results. Information on compliance with the recommended limitations was provided by 35 subjects: 9 of them (25.7%) declared to have completely respected the recommendations, and 24 (67.7%) reported partial compliance. A total of 3 subjects (8.6%) reported no compliance. Holter ECG during a work shift did not show appreciable differences in any subject compared to the hospital evaluation. In particular, the work activity did not induce arrhyth-

Table 1. Main sample characteristics (n=36).

Characteristics	% (n) or mean (±SD)
Age (years)	51.1 (±6.1)
Sex	
Male	80.6 (29)
Female	19.4 (7)
Education	
Primary/secondary school	58.3 (21)
High school	30.6 (11)
University	11.1 (4)
Presumed task energy requirement	
<2 (sedentary)	22.2 (8)
2-4 (light)	69.4 (25)
4-6 (moderate)	5.6 (2)
>6 (heavy)	2.8 (1)
Type of intervention	
Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty	30.6 (11)
Coronary artery bypass graft	11.1 (4)
Valvular substitution	50.0 (18)
Coronary artery bypass graft + valvular substitution	2.8 (1)
Implantable cardioverter defibrillator	5.6 (2)

SD, standard deviation.

Table 2. Suggested work limitations (n=65).

Limitation field	% (n)
Energy requirement	77.8 (28)
Working timetable	33.3 (12)
Stress	27.8 (10)
Shifts	16.7 (6)
Thermal discomfort	13.9 (5)
Transfers	11.1 (4)

mias or signs of ischemia. Armband measurement of the average energy expenditure in the workplace (carried out between 2 months and one year after returning to work) showed in one case a value higher than that estimated in the literature [11-13]: the tables indicated a requirement of less than 2 METs, while the measured value was 2.2 METs. In 13 cases (36%) the tables reflected what was measured at work, while in 22 cases (61%) they overestimated the real expenditure. Most of the overestimations (19 of 22 cases) were observed among subjects with presumed energy requirements between 2 and 4 METs. In this group, the mean measured expenditure was 1.54±0.23 METs. Compared to the calculation carried out in the hospital phase regarding the optimal average energy expenditure during the working day (35% of the maximum value achieved during the exercise test), the expenditure measured with the armband was below the limit in 22 cases (61% of the sample; mean deviation: 1.08±0.87 METs). In the remaining 14 subjects (39%), the actual expenditure exceeded the limit set at the time of hospital discharge (mean deviation: 0.53±0.45 METs). Regarding the maximal effort, 23 subjects (64%) exceeded the peak value (80% of the maximum exercise test value) suggested at the end of the hospital evaluation (mean deviation: 3.21±2.33 METs). At the end of the workplace evaluation, job resumption was considered adequate for all subjects, without the need to formulate new indications.

Discussion

During the enrolment period (2 years), it was possible to recruit a relatively limited number (36) of patients. This was due to the difficulty of harmonizing the practical problems of the patients themselves, of the companies where the post-hospital phase of the research was to take place, and of the healthcare and technical support staff for the study. Even with this limitation, the data collected provide further confirmation of the usefulness of the CardioWork protocol in promoting job resumption after invasive cardiac procedures. As in previous studies [9,10], the subjects returned to work quickly while maintaining good health conditions, with discrete adherence to the limitations recommended at the end of the cardiologic rehabilitation process.

Work resumption was also confirmed to be optimal for the less young and for jobs with moderate or heavy energy demands. Surprisingly, those who returned to work early (within 3 months of the cardiac event that had led to hospitalization) were slightly older than those who returned later. The tendency for older people to resume earlier could be due to greater family responsibilities or a greater fear of not being able to relocate in the event of job loss.

Our previous observations indicated that return to work is faster for those performing sedentary or light tasks and that patients undergoing thoracotomy surgery take longer to resume than those undergoing angioplasty [9,10]. It was not possible to confirm these data in the present study, probably due to the small sample size.

In the investigated patients, instrumental diagnostics (Holter ECG, echocardiography, exercise test) showed discrete functional conditions, with better values concerning cardiac function than those relating to exercise capacity and effort tolerance. In particular, for almost all types of cardiac events, we measured a mean value of LVEF greater than 50%. The only exceptions were the 2 subjects who had received an ICD, as can be expected since international guidelines set an LVEF value ≤35% as an indication for ICD [15]. Predictably, patients with VS had worse cardiac function than those hospitalized after coronary revascularization.

Regarding the exercise test, most of the subjects presented a reduced working capacity: about two-thirds failed to reach 6 METs, and 8 patients achieved a value of less than 4. Contrary to echocardiographic findings, there were no differences between subjects with VS and those treated for coronary artery disease. However, among the latter, bypass patients obtained worse results than those treated with angioplasty. In any case, at the end of the rehabilitation process and after careful evaluation by the occupational physician, everyone could return to work (with appropriate precautions; in 3 cases, with a change of job). In particular, ergonomic limitations were necessary for those performing more energy-consuming tasks, while lighter tasks (*e.g.*, office work) required measures aimed at reducing work-related stress and modulating the working timetable.

The percentage of patients who returned to work – total in the present study, slightly below 90% in our previous experiences [9,10] – is higher than that reported in other studies [16,17]. The short time in which the return to work takes place (a few months) and the high percentage of subjects who (at least partially) comply with the limitations are other noteworthy results. Our research follows the pioneering observations of Mompere *et al*. [18], who reported, as early as the 1980s, a more frequent return to work in coronary bypass patients when the occupational physician intervenes during rehabilitation. In more recent times, the usefulness of this approach in promoting the return to work of the cardiologic patient has also been highlighted by Italian authors [19,20].

The main purpose of the present study was the ergonomic evaluation of the job in the field, to verify the correspondence between presumed energy requirements (based on specific, published tables) and real expenditure, and to remodulate the indications provided at the end of cardiological rehabilitation. In only one subject, the requirements foreseen by the tables were underestimated. In 13 cases, the tables reflected reality, and in the remaining 22 (more than half), they overestimated it, especially for light tasks. What was found is not surprising since the tables need continuous updating to reflect the changes (in particular the improvement of ergonomic conditions) that occur over time [13,21]. Furthermore, the tables estimate the average energy requirement considering all the foreseen activities of the single task. In our sample, on the other hand, most of the subjects had received a judgment of job fitness with limitations, and therefore they complied, at least partially, with the recommendations, with a predictable reduction in the actual energy expenditure. With all this considered, the tables can be considered reliable.

In a minority of subjects (39%) the average energy expenditure of the task measured at work turned out to be higher than the optimal value recommended at the end of the hospital evaluation. This deviation was modest (on average about 0.5 METs), was not reflected in subjective disturbances and/or electrocardiographic alterations (excluded by Holter ECG during work activity), and therefore did not require the remodulation of the job fitness judgment. All this is not easy to interpret: the value recommended based on the ergometric test takes into account only the subject's functional capacity, while on the job there are confounding factors such as load handling, an unfavorable microclimate, and work-related stress that can affect the real energy expenditure. Furthermore, between the evaluations (exercise test in the hospital and workplace measurement with armband) there was a period of time of a few months during which the clinical-functional conditions could have improved, as generally happens after the acute cardiac event and consequent rehabilitation.

Conclusions

Overall, the comparison between the hospital evaluations and those carried out in the workplace is reassuring regarding the reliability of the indications provided by the CardioWork protocol to facilitate work resumption. However, in particularly complex cases (*e.g.*, "difficult fitness judgment" with the need for second-level assessment) [22], it is advisable (for an optimal return to work) to carry out a field check of the ergometric assessments performed at the end of hospital rehabilitation.

References

1. Lennon RP, Claussen KA, Kuersteiner KA. State of the heart: an overview of the disease burden of cardiovascular disease from an epidemiologic perspective. Prim Care 2018;45:1-15.
2. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs). 2021. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds)
3. Dégano IR, Salomaa V, Veronesi G, et al. Twenty-five-year trends in myocardial infarction attack and mortality rates, and case-fatality, in six European populations. Heart 2015;101:1413-21. Erratum in: Heart 2018;104:e2.
4. Roth GA, Mensah GA, Johnson CO, et al. Global burden of cardiovascular diseases and risk factors, 1990-2019: update from the GBD 2019 study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2020;76:2982-3021. Erratum in: J Am Coll Cardiol 2021;77:1958-9.
5. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics – 2020 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation 2020;141:e139-596.
6. Price AE. Heart disease and work. Heart 2004;90:1077-84.
7. Bresseleers J, De Sutter J. Return to work after acute coronary syndrome: time for action. Eur J Prev Cardiol 2019;26:1355-7.
8. Reibis R, Salzwedel A, Abreu A, et al. The importance of return to work: how to achieve optimal reintegration in ACS patients. Eur J Prev Cardiol 2019;26:1358-69.
9. Scafa F, Calsamiglia G, Tonini S, et al. Return to work after coronary angioplasty or heart surgery: a 5-year experience with the "CardioWork" protocol. J Occup Environ Med 2012;54:1545-9.
10. Scafa F, Calsamiglia G, Cadei P, et al. Health and work after invasive heart procedures, rehabilitation and occupational evaluation. Med Lav 2018;109:219-24. [Article in Italian].
11. Haskell WL, Brachfeld N, Bruce RA, et al. Task force II: determination of occupational working capacity in patients with ischemic heart disease. J Am Coll Cardiol 1989;14:1025-34.
12. Pezzagno G, Capodaglio E. Criteri di valutazioni energetiche delle attività fisiche. Pavia: La Goliardica Pavese; 1991, p. 269. [Book in Italian].
13. Ainsworth BE, Haskell WL, Herrmann SD, et al. 2011 Compendium of physical activities: a second update of codes and MET values. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2011;43:1575-81.
14. Ceci V, Assennato P, Boncompagni F, et al. ANMCO-SIC-GIVFRC guidelines on cardiac rehabilitation. G Ital Cardiol 1999;29:1057-91. [Article in Italian].
15. Adduci C, Ali H, Francia P, et al. The subcutaneous implantable cardioverter-defibrillator: Current trends in clinical practice between guidelines and technology progress. Eur J Intern Med 2019;65:6-11.
16. Kai SHY, Ferrières J, Rossignol M, et al. Prevalence and determinants of return to work after various coronary events: meta-analysis of prospective studies. Sci Rep 2022;12:15348.
17. Mortensen M, Sandvik RKNM, Svendsen ØS, et al. Return to work after coronary artery bypass grafting and aortic valve replacement surgery: a scoping review. Scand J Caring Sci 2022;36:893-909.
18. Monpere C, Francois G, Rondeau du Noyer C, Phan Van J. Return to work after rehabilitation in coronary bypass patients. Role of the occupational medicine specialist during rehabilitation. Eur Heart J 1988;9:S48-53.
19. Taino G, Brevi M, Gazzoldi T, Imbriani M. Vocational integration of the worker suffering from ischemic heart disease: prognostic factors, occupational evaluation, and criteria for the assessment of their suitability for the specific task. G Ital Med Lav Erg 2013;35:102-19. [Article in Italian].
20. Borchini R, Ferrario MM. Work ability in workers with heart disease: assessing physical and psycho-social risks. G Ital Med Lav Erg 2019;41:341-3. [Article in Italian].
21. Werner NE, Ponnala S, Doutcheva N, Holden RJ. Human factors/ergonomics work system analysis of patient work: state of the science and future directions. Int J Qual Health Care 2021;33:60-71.
22. Candura SM, Frascaroli M, Scafa F. Work reintegration after illness or accident. The role of the occupational physician. In: Argentero P, Fiabane E, eds. Il rientro al lavoro. Milan: R. Cortina Editore; 2016, pp. 297-312. [Book in Italian].