SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Open Access



Jingwen Jia^{1,2†}, Mingtao Zhang^{1,2†}, Zhenyu Cao^{1,2}, Zhijing Yang³, Xuchang Hu^{1,2}, Shuanhu Lei^{1,2}, Yibao Zhang^{1,2}, Wenting Leng¹ and Xuewen Kang^{1,2*}

Abstract

Purpose A growing body of research indicates a correlation between occupational exposure, particularly among individuals in driving-related occupations, and the incidence of low back pain (LBP).

Methods Databases were systematically searched, including PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, and SinoMed, from their inception through December 2023 for relevant studies of the prevalence and risk factors of LBP among professional drivers. Subsequent meta-analyses were performed utilizing Stata 17.0 and RevMan 5.4 software, while risk factor indicators were assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation evidence quality grading system.

Results A systematic review and meta-analysis comprising 19 studies involving 7,723 patients indicated that the incidence of LBP among drivers was 39% (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.20–0.57) in the past 7 days and 53% (95% CI 0.43–0.63) in the past 12 months. A subgroup analysis revealed a prevalence of 48% (95% CI 0.33–0.64) in 2005–2015 and 56% (95% CI 0.42–0.70) in 2016–2023. Among the identified factors, robust evidence highlighted age \geq 41 years (odds ratio [OR]=2.10; 95% CI 1.36–3.24; P=0.0008), alcohol consumption (OR=1.75; 95% CI 1.31–2.34; P=0.0001), sleeping <6 h/night (OR=1.60; 95% CI 1.13–2.24; P=0.007), uncomfortable seating (OR=1.71; 95% CI 1.23–2.36; P=0.001), improper driving posture (OR=2.37; 95% CI 1.91–2.94; P<0.00001), and manual handling (OR=2.23; 95% CI 1.72–2.88; P<0.00001) as significant risk factors for LBP. There was moderate evidence of a lack of exercise (OR=1.78; 95% CI 1.37–2.31; P<0.0001), working >10 h/day (OR=2.49; 95% CI 1.89–3.28; P<0.00001), >5 years' driving experience (OR=2.12; 95% CI 1.66–2.69; P<0.00001), a lack of back support (OR=1.81; 95% CI 1.25–2.62; P=0.002), high work-related pressure (OR=2.04; 95% CI 1.59–2.61; P<0.00001), and job dissatisfaction (OR=1.57; 95% CI 1.23–2.01; P=0.0003) as moderate risk factors. There was no evidence of body mass index or smoking as risk factors for LBP among professional drivers.

Conclusion The current evidence indicates an increasing annual trend in the prevalence of LBP among professional drivers. Factors including age ≥ 41 years, alcohol consumption, and sleeping < 6 h/night were among the 12 influential factors contributing to LBP in professional drivers. Enhancing awareness of these factors and formulating targeted preventive strategies may be beneficial.

Keywords Low back pain, Professional drivers, Risk factors, Incidence, Meta-analysis

[†]Jingwen Jia and Mingtao Zhang contributed equally to this work.

*Correspondence: Xuewen Kang ery_kangxw@lzu.edu.cn Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Introduction

Low back pain (LBP) is an exceedingly prevalent ailment affecting more than 540 million individuals worldwide annually. Research assessing 194 countries/ regions revealed LBP as a primary contributor to global productivity decline and a significant disability-related factor across 126 countries/regions, resulting in substantial economic and healthcare burdens [1, 2]. LBP has various pathogenic mechanisms and is a popular research topic in the academic community. Examples include inflammatory stimulation, mechanical injury, and nutritional deficiency. Moreover, improper lifestyle as well as psychological and social factors are closely related to its occurrence [3–6].

Exposure to physically demanding work is reportedly associated with a higher likelihood of LBP, particularly in professions that require heavy lifting and frequently involve nonergonomic postures [7–9]. Drivers constitute a high-risk group for occupational LBP owing to their exposure to various potential pathogenic factors, including whole-body vibration (WBV), prolonged periods of sitting, the lifting of heavy objects, and extended working hours [10]. Research on driver populations in the United States and Sweden revealed that approximately 80% of American drivers versus 50% of Swedish bus drivers reported experiencing LBP, a notably higher proportion than the general worker population [11].

No definitive conclusions have been reached to date regarding the risk factors of LBP in the driving population. Recent studies suggest that multiple factors could potentially be linked to LBP onset among drivers; according to Abere et al., among 265 drivers working over 10 h daily, 245 had LBP [12]. In contrast, Rufa'i et al. reported no substantial correlation between daily working hours and LBP prevalence among drivers [13]. While some studies indicated that drivers who completed insufficient exercise have an elevated occurrence of LBP, Bayana presented a contrasting perspective [12, 14-18]. Debate persists regarding the association between age, body mass index (BMI), smoking, alcohol intake, sleep duration, manual handling, driving experience, seat comfort, back support, driving posture, work-related pressure, and job satisfaction with LBP among professional drivers.

Hence, to ensure timely diagnosis and treatment, it is essential that clinicians understand the pertinent factors that lead to LBP among drivers. This meta-analysis aimed to identify the prevalence and risk factors associated with LBP in the driving community and offer insights and guidance for early intervention among affected groups and healthcare practitioners.

Methods

Literature search strategy

Two researchers independently conducted a rigorous search of five databases, namely PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, and China Biology Medicine, covering their records until December 2023. To ensure a thorough search, they combined controlled and free terms and meticulously tracked and retrieved references. The key search terms included intervertebral disk degeneration, lower back pain, automobile driving, driver population, risk factors, and incidence. A comprehensive overview of the search strategy is provided in the appendix.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria were (1) study population; drivers aged \geq 18 years experiencing LBP, (2) study content; examination of factors potentially causing LBP and determination of the incidence or prevalence of LBP in drivers, (3) outcome measures; findings directly extracted or converted into odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI), (4) study design; using cohort, cross-sectional, and case-control study methodologies, and (5) language; studies published in Chinese and English languages. The exclusion criteria were (1) duplicate studies, conference abstracts, and other redundant materials, (2) requirement for clear and consistent diagnostic criteria for the identification of LBP, (3) studies with inaccessible full texts or missing data, (4) evaluation based on suboptimal quality assessments, and (5) research merging with other arbitrary diseases.

Quality assessment

The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS; maximum score, 9 points) was used to evaluate the quality of the incorporated cohort and case-control studies. Studies scoring 0-4, 5-6, or 7-9 points were categorized as low, moderate, and high quality, respectively [19]. This cross-sectional study used the quality assessment tool recommended by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) in the United States, which includes 11 evaluation indicators. Each indicator was scored as "yes" (1 point), "no" (0 points), or "unclear" (0.5 points). Ultimately, scores of 0-3 indicate low quality, 4-7 indicate moderate quality, and 8–11 indicate high quality [20]. This study incorporated both high- and moderate-quality literature. The Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Scale was used to assess the strength of the recommendations. The quality assessments were performed independently by two assessors.

Any discrepancies were addressed through discussion or consultation with a third researcher to reach consensus.

Data extraction

Two researchers independently conducted the literature screening and data extraction processes, cross-referenced the findings, and resolved any discrepancies through discussion. After eliminating duplicate publications using EndNote version 20, they conducted a preliminary title and abstract screening before progressing to a full-text review. The extracted data included primary author, publication year, country of origin, study design, population source, total sample size, number of occurrences, and assessment tools used.

Statistical analysis

The occurrence rate of LBP, along with the OR and 95% CI of risk factors among drivers, were synthesized for the effect size using Stata 17.0 and RevMan 5.4. Using the I² statistic and Cochran's Q test to assess heterogeneity among the included studies, if I²>50% and $p \le 0.1$, significant heterogeneity among the studies is indicated, prompting the use of a random-effects model, whereas if I²<50% and p>0.1, minor heterogeneity among the studies is suggested, warranting the use of a fixed-effects model. Further exploration of the sources of heterogeneity was conducted through subgroup and sensitivity analyses to verify the stability of the combined occurrence rates and risk factor results. Studies with ≥ 10 publications undergo Egger's test and funnel plots are used to evaluate publication bias.

Results

Literature search

A total of 2,328 articles were retrieved, of which 770 duplicates were eliminated. The subsequent title and abstract screening led to the exclusion of 1,402 articles. The full-text evaluation of the remaining 156 articles led to the exclusion of 137, resulting in the final inclusion of 19 articles, representing a total of 7,723 patients (Fig. 1).

Characteristics of included studies

The 19 included publications (7723 patients) consisted of 17 cross-sectional studies, one case–control study, and one cohort study. The studies were conducted across different continents: seven studies in Africa (seven in Ethiopia [12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22], one in Nigeria [13]), six in Asia (two in China [16, 23]; one each in Malaysia [24], Singapore [25], India [26], and Bangladesh [27]), three in Europe (two in Italy [28, 29], one in Turkey [14]), and three in North America (two in the United States [30, 31], one in Mexico [32]). Based on the NOS and AHRQ

scores, 18 studies were rated as high-quality and one as moderate-quality. Fourteen risk factors were identified: six received a high recommendation based on GRADE score and the rest were moderately recommended. Study characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Occurrence of LBP in professional drivers

Utilizing a random-effects model, the incidence of LBP within 7 days among the professional drivers was 39% (95% CI 0.20–0.57), demonstrating substantial heterogeneity (I^2 =97.2%; P<0.000) (Fig. 2). Applying the random-effects model, the prevalence of LBP within 12 months in the driver population was 53% (95% CI 0.43–0.63), further indicating significant interstudy heterogeneity (I^2 =98.6%; P<0.001) (Fig. 3).

Subsequent to the additional subgroup analysis, the annual prevalence of lower back pain in drivers was investigated. If stratified by publication year, the prevalence rates were 48% and 56% (95% CI 0.33–0.64 and 0.42–0.70) from 2005 to 2015 and 2016 to 2023, respectively (Fig. 4). Based on the state of national development, the prevalence was 46% and 57% (95% CI 0.31–0.60 and 0.43–0.71) in developed and underdeveloped countries, respectively (Fig. 5). For vehicle classification, the prevalence rates stood at 22% (95% CI 0.13–0.31) for tricycle drivers, 56% (95% CI 0.43–0.70) for car drivers, and 61% (95% CI 0.47–0.74) for drivers of larger vehicles (Fig. 6).

Provided the pronounced heterogeneity in the pooled findings regarding the prevalence of LBP among drivers over the previous week and year, sensitivity analyses were performed using Stata17 to systematically eliminate studies on the prevalence rates of LBP among drivers over these timeframes. Following the meticulous exclusion of each study, the final aggregated outcomes did not display any notable variance, underscoring the robustness of the results (Fig. 7 and 8).

Risk factors

In more than two studies, the following 14 risk factors of LBP were identified: $age \ge 41Y$, alcohol consumption, lack of sleep, lack of exercise, high BMI, smoking, seat discomfort, poor driving posture, handling heavy objects, extended daily working hours, extended years of driving, lack of back support, high job stress, and low job satisfaction. According to GRADE score, six risk factors were highly recommended, whereas the rest were moderately recommended (Table 2).

Patient-related factors

Age: Four studies examined the relationship between age and the occurrence of LBP in the driver population [18, 27, 28, 30]. Significant heterogeneity was observed among the studies ($I^2 = 74\%$; P=0.01) (Fig. 9A). Following



Fig. 1 Literature search results

the sensitivity analysis, Buegel's study was identified as the primary source of the heterogeneity [30]. Upon the exclusion of this study, no heterogeneity was observed among studies ($I^2=0\%$; P=0.89) (Fig. 9B). The use of a fixed-effects model provided substantial evidence that age ≥ 41 years was a risk factor for LBP among professional drivers (OR=2.10; 95% CI 1.36-3.24; P=0.0008).

Alcohol: Four studies examined the association between alcohol consumption and LBP incidence of LBP in drivers [12, 15, 18, 28]. A heterogeneity test ($I^2=0\%$, P=0.43) performed using a fixed-effects model provided robust evidence that alcohol consumption was a significant risk factor for LBP among the drivers (OR=1.75; 95% CI 1.31–2.34; P=0.0001) (Fig. 10).

Sleep: Three studies explored the correlation between sleep patterns and LBP incidence among the drivers [16, 17, 27]. A heterogeneity test ($I^2 = 0\%$; P = 0.38) performed using a fixed-effects model provided compelling evidence

that sleeping < 6 h/night was a risk factor for LBP in this population (OR=1.60; 95% CI 1.13-2.24; P=0.007) (Fig. 11).

Exercise: Five studies examined the relationship between a lack of exercise and the incidence of LBP in the driving population [12, 15–18]. Substantial heterogeneity was noted across studies ($I^2 = 73\%$; P = 0.002) (Fig. 12A). Through a sensitivity analysis, the Bayana study was identified as the primary contributor to this heterogeneity [18]. Upon the exclusion of this study, no significant heterogeneity was observed among studies ($I^2 = 0\%$; P = 0.90) (Fig. 12B). A fixed-effects model revealed moderate evidence supporting the association between a lack of exercise and an increased risk of LBP in drivers (OR = 1.78; 95% CI 1.37–2.31; P < 0.0001).

BMI and smoking: Five studies examined the correlation between BMI and LBP among drivers [12, 14, 16, 28, 30]. The findings indicated that a high BMI (\geq 28 kg/m²)

Author (Year)	Country	Study type	population	Age(mean±sd)	No. of	Prevalence	Prevalence of LBP		Quality score
					cases	The last 7 days	The past 12 months	tool	
Abere et al. [12]	Ethiopia	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	_	371	53.4%	85.7%	AHRQ	7
Awang Lukman et al. [24]	Malaysia	Cross-sec- tional study	Commercial vehicle driver	40.5 ± 7.6	110	35.6%	-	AHRQ	8
Bayana et al. [18]	Ethiopia	Cross-sec- tional study	Pedicab driver	27.9±5.5	396	-	-	AHRQ	7
Bovenzi et al. [29]	Italy	Cross-sec- tional study	Professional driver	-	598	26.8%	62.2%	AHRQ	9
Bovenzi (28)	Italy	Cohort study	Professional driver	-	537	_	36.3%	NOS	8
Burgel and Elshatarat (30)	USA	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	45.3±10.8	129	-	62.8%	AHRQ	8
Chen et al. [31]	USA	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	44.5±8.7	1242	-	51.0%	AHRQ	7
Jadhav [<mark>26</mark>]	India	Cross-sec- tional study	Bus driver	-	178	-	67.4%	AHRQ	7
Kurtul and Güngördü [14]	Turkey	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	43.6±11.9	447	-	49.7%	AHRQ	8
Nabi et al. [27]	Bangladesh	Cross-sec- tional study	Bus driver	41.1±7.8	368	_	_	AHRQ	8
Noda et al. [25]	Singapore	Cross-sec- tional study	Pedicab driver	38.6±10.7	200	_	17.5%	AHRQ	8
Prado-León et al. [32]	Mexico	Case–control study	Professional driver	/	231	_	-	AHRQ	7
Rufa'i et al. [13]	Nigeria	Cross-sec- tional study	Long-dis- tance driver	42.5±11.6	200	_	73.5%	AHRQ	7
Terfa et al. [21]	Ethiopia	Cross-sec- tional study	Pedicab driver	27.9 ± 5.5	396	_	26.3%	AHRQ	8
Wanamo et al. [15]	Ethiopia	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	35.3±10.1	422	_	64.2%	AHRQ	8
Wang et al. [23]	China	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	40.1 ± 5.8	719	_	54.0%	AHRQ	9
Wu et al. 2019 [<mark>16</mark>]	China	Case–control study	Taxi driver	36.9±4.9	465	_	_	NOS	7
Yitayal et al. [22]	Ethiopia	Cross-sec- tional study	Taxi driver	39.6±10.7	294	-	27.9%	AHRQ	9
Yosef et al. [17]	Ethiopia	Cross-sec- tional study	Long-dis- tance driver	37.7±9.1	400	-	65.0%	AHRQ	7

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

was not a significant determinant of LBP in this population (OR=1.18; 95% CI 0.64–2.19; P=0.59), showcasing notable heterogeneity (I^2 =75%; P=0.003) (Fig. 13A).

Six studies investigated the association between smoking and LBP in drivers [12, 16, 17, 26–28]. The results revealed that smoking did not display a significant relationship with LBP in drivers (OR=1.46; 95% CI 0.77–2.76; P=0.24), with considerable heterogeneity observed (I^2 =73%; P=0.002) (Fig. 13B).

Employing the one-by-one exclusion method for the sensitivity analysis of smoking and BMI revealed that

the combined effect values remained stable, with no significant changes after excluding each article. This indicates the reliability and consistency of the meta-analysis results.

Work-related factors

Seat comfort: Three studies investigated the association between car seat comfort and the incidence of LBP among drivers [15, 21, 27]. The heterogeneity test ($I^2=0\%$; P=0.84) using a fixed-effects model revealed compelling evidence supporting the notion that an







NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

Fig. 3 Occurrence of LBP within 12 months among the professional drivers

uncomfortable car seat was a risk factor for LBP in drivers (OR = 1.71; 95% CI 1.23–2.36; P = 0.001) (Fig. 14).

Driving posture: Five studies examined the correlation between driving posture and the prevalence of LBP among drivers [17, 21, 28, 29, 31]. The heterogeneity test ($I^2=0\%$; P=0.68) conducted with a fixed-effects model

unveiled substantial evidence indicating that an improper driving posture was a risk factor for LBP in drivers (OR = 2.37; 95% CI 1.91–2.94; P < 0.00001) (Fig. 15).

Handling of heavy objects: Five studies investigated the correlation between engaging in manual handling of heavy objects and the incidence of LBP among Group and Study

		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,
2005-2015			
Bovenzi 2006	-	0.62 (0.58, 0.66)	7.20
Bovenzi 2009	*	0.36 (0.32, 0.40)	7.19
Chen 2005		0.51 (0.48, 0.54)	7.23
Noda 2015		0.17 (0.12, 0.23)	7.13
Rufa'l 2013		0.74 (0.67, 0.80)	7.08
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.6%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.48 (0.33, 0.64)	35.83
2016-2023			
Abere 2023	-	0.86 (0.82, 0.89)	7.21
Burgel 2017		0.63 (0.54, 0.71)	6.92
Jadhav 2016		0.67 (0.61, 0.74)	7.03
Kurtul 2022		0.50 (0.45, 0.54)	7.16
Terfa 2022		0.26 (0.22, 0.31)	7.18
Wanamo 2017		0.64 (0.60, 0.69)	7.17
Wang 2017	*	0.54 (0.50, 0.58)	7.20
Yitayal 2021	-	0.28 (0.23, 0.33)	7.14
Yosef 2019	-	0.65 (0.60, 0.70)	7.16
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.56 (0.42, 0.70)	64.17
Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.461			
Overall, DL (l ² = 98.6%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.53 (0.43, 0.63)	100.00
-1 (1	
-1	,		

NOTE: Weights and between-subgroup heterogeneity test are from random-effects model Fig. 4 Occurrence of LBP within 12 months among the professional drivers of different year

drivers [15, 17, 24, 28, 32]. Through the heterogeneity test ($I^2=0\%$; P=0.48) employing a fixed-effects model, compelling evidence emerged supporting the association between the manual handling of heavy objects and an increased risk of LBP in drivers (OR=2.23; 95% CI 1.72–2.88; P<0.00001) (Fig. 16).

Daily working hours: Nine studies investigated the association between daily working hours and the incidence of LBP in drivers [12, 13, 17, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31, 32]. Significant heterogeneity was observed among studies (I^2 =98%; P<0.00001) (Fig. 17A). Following the sensitivity analysis, the Rufa'i study was identified as the primary contributor to this heterogeneity [13]. After the exclusion of this study, the heterogeneity across studies diminished (I^2 =0%; P=0.85) (Fig. 17B). The findings of a fixed-effects model provided moderate evidence that working > 10 h/day is a risk factor for LBP among drivers (OR=2.49; 95% CI 1.89–3.28; P<0.00001).

Years of driving experience: Seven studies reported on the relationship between years of driving experience and the occurrence of LBP in drivers [12, 14–17, 23, 27]. The heterogeneity test ($I^2=35\%$; P=0.16), utilizing a fixed-effects model indicated moderate evidence of > 5 years of driving experience as a risk factor for LBP in drivers (OR=2.12; 95% CI 1.66-2.69; P<0.00001) (Fig. 18).

ES(95% CI) Weight(%)

Back support: Three studies investigated the association between back support and the incidence of LBP in drivers [12, 14, 22]. Significant heterogeneity was detected initially ($I^2 = 66\%$; P = 0.05) (Fig. 19A). Following a sensitivity analysis, Abere's study was identified as the primary contributor to this heterogeneity [12]. After its exclusion, no heterogeneity was observed among studies ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.58) (Fig. 19B). A fixed-effects model provided moderate evidence that the absence of back support in seats poses a risk factor for LBP in drivers (OR = 1.81; 95% CI 1.25–2.62; P = 0.002).

Psychological factors

Job stress: Six studies investigated the association between job stress and the incidence of LBP among drivers [12, 17, 25, 28, 30, 31]. A heterogeneity test (I^2 =46%;

Group and Study

developed countryBovenzi 2006Bovenzi 2009Burgel 2017Chen 2005Noda 2015Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000)developing countryAbere 2023Jadhav 2016Kurtul 2022Rufa'l 2013Terfa 2022Yitayal 2021Yosef 2019Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000)Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000)				
Bovenzi 2006 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Chen 2005 Noda 2015 Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Vitayal 2021 Yosef 2019 Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000) Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270 Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000) a $l = 0.270$ b	developed country			
Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Chen 2005 Noda 2015 Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Vitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270 Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000) = 0.36 (0.32, 0.40) 7.19 = 0.63 (0.54, 0.71) 6.92 0.53 (0.43, 0.63) 100.00 = 0.53 (0.43, 0.63) 100.00	Bovenzi 2006	-	0.62 (0.58, 0.66)	7.20
Burgel 2017 Chen 2005 Noda 2015 Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Vitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yosef 2019 Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000) Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270 Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 $developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 developing country Abere 2023 developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 developing country Abere 2023 developing country develop$	Bovenzi 2009	*	0.36 (0.32, 0.40)	7.19
Chen 2005 Noda 2015 Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Vitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270 Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 $developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 developing country Abere 2023 developing country developing count$	Burgel 2017		0.63 (0.54, 0.71)	6.92
Noda 2015 $0.17 (0.12, 0.23) 7.13$ Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000)	Chen 2005		0.51 (0.48, 0.54)	7.23
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 98.2\%$, p < 0.000) developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Vitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.27C Overall, DL ($I^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000) I = 0.000 I = 0.000 I = 0.000 I = 0.0000 I = 0.00000 I = 0.0000 I = 0.00000 I = 0.00000 I = 0.00000 I = 0.000000 I = 0.000000 I = 0.0000000000000000000000000000000000	Noda 2015		0.17 (0.12, 0.23)	7.13
developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Wanamo 2017 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Heterogeneity between groups: $p = 0.270$ Overall, DL (l² = 98.6%, p < 0.000) -1 -	Subgroup, DL (I^2 = 98.2%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.46 (0.31, 0.60)	35.67
developing country Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Viayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Heterogeneity between groups: $p = 0.270$ Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, $p < 0.000$) l = 0.270 l =				
Abere 2023 Jadhav 2016 Kurtul 2022 Rufa'l 2013 Terfa 2022 Wanamo 2017 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2021 Yitayal 2021 Heterogeneity between groups: $p = 0.270$ Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, $p < 0.000$) l l l l l l l l	developing country			
Jadhav 2016 \bullet 0.67 (0.61, 0.74) 7.03 Kurtul 2022 0.50 (0.45, 0.54) 7.16 Rufa'l 2013 \bullet 0.74 (0.67, 0.80) 7.08 Terfa 2022 \bullet 0.26 (0.22, 0.31) 7.18 Wanamo 2017 \bullet 0.64 (0.60, 0.69) 7.17 Wang 2017 \bullet 0.54 (0.50, 0.58) 7.20 Yitayal 2021 \bullet 0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14 Yosef 2019 \bullet 0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16 Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	Abere 2023	*	0.86 (0.82, 0.89)	7.21
Kurtul 2022 \bullet 0.50 (0.45, 0.54) 7.16 Rufa'l 2013 \bullet 0.74 (0.67, 0.80) 7.08 Terfa 2022 0.26 (0.22, 0.31) 7.18 Wanamo 2017 \bullet 0.64 (0.60, 0.69) 7.17 Wang 2017 \bullet 0.54 (0.50, 0.58) 7.20 Yitayal 2021 \bullet 0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14 Yosef 2019 \bullet 0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16 Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	Jadhav 2016		0.67 (0.61, 0.74)	7.03
Rufa'l 2013 \bullet 0.74 (0.67, 0.80) 7.08 Terfa 2022 \bullet 0.26 (0.22, 0.31) 7.18 Wanamo 2017 0.64 (0.60, 0.69) 7.17 Wang 2017 0.54 (0.50, 0.58) 7.20 Yitayal 2021 \bullet 0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14 Yosef 2019 0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16 Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	Kurtul 2022	- M	0.50 (0.45, 0.54)	7.16
Terfa 2022 • $0.26 (0.22, 0.31)$ 7.18 Wanamo 2017 $0.64 (0.60, 0.69)$ 7.17 Wang 2017 $0.54 (0.50, 0.58)$ 7.20 Yitayal 2021 • $0.28 (0.23, 0.33)$ 7.14 Yosef 2019 $0.65 (0.60, 0.70)$ 7.16 Subgroup, DL (I ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	Rufa'l 2013		0.74 (0.67, 0.80)	7.08
Wanamo 2017 $0.64 (0.60, 0.69) 7.17$ Wang 2017 $0.54 (0.50, 0.58) 7.20$ Yitayal 2021 $0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14$ Yosef 2019 $0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16$ Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	Terfa 2022	*	0.26 (0.22, 0.31)	7.18
Wang 2017 $0.54 (0.50, 0.58) 7.20$ Yitayal 2021 $0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14$ Yosef 2019 $0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16$ Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000)	Wanamo 2017	*	0.64 (0.60, 0.69)	7.17
Yitayal 2021 \bullet 0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14 Yosef 2019 \bullet 0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16 Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000)	Wang 2017	*	0.54 (0.50, 0.58)	7.20
Yosef 2019 $0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16$ Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000)	Yitayal 2021	*	0.28 (0.23, 0.33)	7.14
Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 98.7\%$, p < 0.000) Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270 Overall, DL ($l^2 = 98.6\%$, p < 0.000) 0.53 (0.43, 0.63) 100.00	Yosef 2019	-	0.65 (0.60, 0.70)	7.16
Heterogeneity between groups: $p = 0.270$ Overall, DL (l² = 98.6%, p < 0.000) 1 -1 0 1	Subgroup, DL (I ² = 98.7%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.57 (0.43, 0.71)	64.33
Heterogeneity between groups: $p = 0.270$ Overall, DL (I² = 98.6%, $p < 0.000$) 0.53 (0.43, 0.63) 100.00				
Overall, DL (l^2 = 98.6%, p < 0.000) 0.53 (0.43, 0.63) 100.00	Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.270			
	Overall, DL (l ² = 98.6%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.53 (0.43, 0.63)	100.00
	-1 (1	

NOTE: Weights and between-subgroup heterogeneity test are from random-effects model Fig. 5 Occurrence of LBP within 12 months among the professional drivers of different country

P=0.10) utilizing a fixed-effects model indicated moderate evidence of job stress as a risk factor for the development of LBP in drivers (OR=2.04; 95% CI 1.59–2.61; P<0.00001) (Fig. 20).

Job satisfaction: Four studies reported a relationship between job satisfaction and the occurrence of LBP among drivers [12, 14, 28, 31]. A heterogeneity test ($I^2=12\%$; P=0.33) utilizing a fixed-effects model indicated is moderate evidence that job dissatisfaction is a risk factor for the development of LBP in drivers (OR=1.57; 95% CI 1.23–2.01; P=0.0003) (Fig. 21).

Publication Bias assessment

The meta-analysis included only the overall prevalence of LBP among drivers in the previous year from studies with \geq 10 publications. Subsequently, publication bias assessment was conducted. Egger's test yielded p of 0.826, indicating no statistical significance (p > 0.05). Furthermore, the funnel plot exhibited a symmetrical distribution, suggesting a minimal risk of publication bias (Fig. 22).

Discussion

Three key findings emerged from this study. First, the incidence of LBP among drivers was 39% within 7 days and 53% within 12 months. Second, factors contributing to LBP in drivers included age \geq 41 years, alcohol consumption, inadequate exercise, sleeping < 6 h/ night, the manual handling of heavy objects, working > 10 h/day, > 5 years of driving experience, uncomfortable seating, absence of seat back support, poor driving posture, high work-related stress, and job dissatisfaction. Finally, a high BMI and smoking were not associated with the occurrence of LBP among the drivers.

ES(95% CI) Weight(%)

LBP is a prevalent ailment posing a substantial challenge to global healthcare systems. A worldwide review of the prevalence of LBP among the general adult population revealed an annual prevalence of 38% and a lifetime prevalence of 40% [33]. An analysis of 19 studies revealed that, within a 7-day period, drivers experienced a 39% incidence of LBP (95% CI 0.20–0.57); this value increased to 53% within 12 months (95% CI 0.43–0.63), surpassing

Group and Study

three-wheeler driver		
Noda 2015	*	0.17 (0.12, 0.23) 7.13
Terfa 2022	*	0.26 (0.22, 0.31) 7.18
Subgroup, DL ($I^2 = 84.2\%$, p = 0.012)	\diamond	0.22 (0.13, 0.31) 14.31
small-car driver		
Abere 2023	-	0.86 (0.82, 0.89) 7.21
Burgel 2017		0.63 (0.54, 0.71) 6.92
Chen 2005	•	0.51 (0.48, 0.54) 7.23
Kurtul 2022	-	0.50 (0.45, 0.54) 7.16
Wanamo 2017	*	0.64 (0.60, 0.69) 7.17
Wang 2017	÷	0.54 (0.50, 0.58) 7.20
Yitayal 2021	*	0.28 (0.23, 0.33) 7.14
Subgroup, DL (I^2 = 98.6%, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.56 (0.43, 0.70) 50.04
large-vehicle driver		
Bovenzi 2006	-	0.62 (0.58, 0.66) 7.20
Bovenzi 2009	*	0.36 (0.32, 0.40) 7.19
Jadhav 2016		0.67 (0.61, 0.74) 7.03
Rufa'l 2013	-	0.74 (0.67, 0.80) 7.08
Yosef 2019	*	0.65 (0.60, 0.70) 7.16
Subgroup, DL ($l^2 = 97.4\%$, p < 0.000)	\diamond	0.61 (0.47, 0.74) 35.66
Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.00	Þ	
Overall, DL (I ² = 98.6%, p < 0.000)	↓ ♦	0.53 (0.43, 0.63) 100.00
-1))	1

NOTE: Weights and between-subgroup heterogeneity test are from random-effects model Fig. 6 Occurrence of LBP within 12 months among the professional drivers of different vehicle type

the levels among average adult populations. This finding indicates a direct association between the occupational aspects of driving and increased LBP rates among drivers. A subgroup analysis by year, country, and vehicle type highlighted a higher incidence of LBP in 2016-2023 among drivers in underdeveloped nations and those operating large vehicles. Three causative factors were identified. 1. Recent advancements in the transportation sector led to more demanding driving responsibilities post-2016. A 2019 World Health Organization report underscored the increase in illnesses and fatalities due to road traffic, emphasizing a critical public health concern and the rapid evolution of the global transport industry [34]. 2. Drivers in underdeveloped countries commonly have a lower socioeconomic status, education levels, and income, all of which are correlated with the occurrence of LBP [35]. Moreover, strenuous labor in these regions is directly linked to increased LBP rates [36]. 3. Large-vehicle operators endure extended work hours and irregular routines compared with other drivers that subjects them to heightened WBV intensity and an elevated risk of LBP development [37].

ES(95% CI) Weight(%)

Patient-related factors

Previous studies established a strong correlation between LBP and aging in humans. A study of healthy female subjects undergoing magnetic resonance imaging revealed that around 30% of individuals in their twenties experienced LBP, a figure that escalated to 90% among those in their seventies [38, 39]. In our study, age was a significant risk factor for LBP among professional drivers, with individuals aged \geq 41 years being 2.10 times more likely to develop LBP than younger drivers. Intervertebral disc degeneration was identified as a key risk factor for LBP, with degeneration levels increasing with age, particularly among the elderly. Furthermore, as individuals age,





Fig. 8 The sensitivity analysis of the prevalence rate of lower back pain among drivers over the previous year

pain intensity tends to increase, establishing a detrimental cycle between pain and inadequate physical activity, thereby exacerbating LBP. Exploration of the intricate molecular mechanisms linking LBP to aging has gained prominence. Studies revealed that age-related secretion patterns can trigger

Risk factors	Number of	Study design	Certainty as	sessment	Effect of estimate	Certainty			
	studies	2	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	OR/MD (95%Cl)	
Patient-related	factors								
Age≥41Y	4	Observational studies	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	2.10 (1.36,3.24)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Alcohol con- sumption	4	Observational studies	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.75 (1.31,2.34)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Lack of sleep	3	Observational studies	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.60 (1.13, 2.24)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Lack of exer- cise	5	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.78 (1.37, 2.31)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
High BMI	5	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.49 (0.90,- 2.47)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
Smoking	6	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.46 (0.77, 2.76)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
Work-related fa	ctors								
Seat discom- fort	3	Observational studies	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.71 (1.23, 2.36)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Poor driving posture	5	Observational studies	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	2.37 (1.91, 2.94)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Handling heavy objects	5	Observational studies	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	2.23 (1.72, 2.88)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Extended daily working hours	9	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	2.49 (1.89, 3.28)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
Extended years of driv- ing	7	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	2.12 (1.66, 2.69)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
Lack of back support	3	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.81 (1.25, 2.62)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
Psychological-r	elated factor	S							
High job stress	6	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	2.04 (1.59, 2.61)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate
Low job satisfaction	4	Observational studies	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	1.57 (1.23, 2.01)	⊕⊕⊕ Moder- ate

Table 2 Overall study-provided evidence quality according to GRADE score

CI Confidence interval, GRADE Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation, OR Odds ratio, MD Mean difference.

inflammation and metabolic changes through autocrine and paracrine pathways, ultimately affecting tissue microstructure and contributing to LBP onset and progression [40-42]. The potential causal link between alcohol consumption and LBP has sparked debate.

Previous studies indicated higher instances of alcohol abuse among individuals with LBP than in the general population [43]. Although Khatun et al. highlighted the adverse effects of alcohol consumption on LBP occurrence in young adult males, the Kovacs et al. study did not support this notion [44, 45]. Our research revealed a robust correlation between alcohol consumption and LBP incidence, with drivers who consume alcohol facing a 2.34 times higher risk of developing LBP than nondrinkers. Individuals with LBP tend to exhibit elevated alcohol consumption, possibly as a coping mechanism for the pain and negative emotions exacerbated by their condition. This interplay between LBP and alcohol use may manifest bidirectionally, in which pain drives alcohol consumption for relief but alcohol consumption can exacerbate pain severity [46]. Concrete evidence of a direct causal association between alcohol intake and intervertebral disc degeneration is currently lacking, indicating the necessity for further exploration of the specific mechanisms.

Decreased sleep duration is increasingly prevalent in modern society, and closely linked to various physiological and psychological disorders [47]. Research suggests that chronic sleep deprivation boosts the expression of inflammatory markers, such as interleukin-1 and -6 in

А				Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	:1	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Bayana 2023	1.06471074	0.71741922	11.1%	2.90 [0.71, 11.83]			-	
Bovenzi 2009	0.67803354	0.36268906	23.6%	1.97 [0.97, 4.01]				
Burgel 2017	-0.0010005	0.02475193	38.6%	1.00 [0.95, 1.05]		•		
Nabi 2023	0.72754861	0.30375704	26.7%	2.07 [1.14, 3.75]				
T () (05% O)			100.00/	4 00 10 00 0 701				
l otal (95% CI)			100.0%	1.60 [0.92, 2.79]				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	0.21; Chi² = 11.33,	df = 3 (P = 0.0	1); l² = 74	%	0.01		n ,	100
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 1.67 (P = 0.09)				Aae	$e < 41$ Years Age ≥ 41 Y	ears	100
Л								
В				Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
B Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl		
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Bayana 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074	SE 0.71741922	<u>Weight</u> 9.5%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 2.90 [0.71, 11.83]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl		
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906	Weight 9.5% 37.3%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl		
B Study or Subgroup Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354 -0.0010005	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906 0.02475193	Weight 9.5% 37.3% 0.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01] 1.00 [0.95, 1.05]		Odds Ratio		
B Study or Subgroup Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Nabi 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354 -0.0010005 0.72754861	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906 0.02475193 0.30375704	Weight 9.5% 37.3% 0.0% 53.2%	Odds Ratio <u>IV. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01] 1.00 [0.95, 1.05] 2.07 [1.14, 3.75]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
B Study or Subgroup Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Nabi 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354 -0.0010005 0.72754861	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906 0.02475193 0.30375704	Weight 9.5% 37.3% 0.0% 53.2%	Odds Ratio <u>IV. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01] 1.00 [0.95, 1.05] 2.07 [1.14, 3.75]		Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI		
B Study or Subgroup Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Nabi 2023 Total (95% CI)	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354 -0.0010005 0.72754861	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906 0.02475193 0.30375704	Weight 9.5% 37.3% 0.0% 53.2% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01] 1.00 [0.95, 1.05] 2.07 [1.14, 3.75] 2.10 [1.36, 3.24]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
B Study or Subgroup Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Nabi 2023 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354 -0.0010005 0.72754861 0.24, df = 2 (P = 0.8	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906 0.02475193 0.30375704 39); I ² = 0%	Weight 9.5% 37.3% 0.0% 53.2% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01] 1.00 [0.95, 1.05] 2.07 [1.14, 3.75] 2.10 [1.36, 3.24]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
B Study or Subgroup Bayana 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Burgel 2017 Nabi 2023 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect:	log[Odds Ratio] 1.06471074 0.67803354 -0.0010005 0.72754861 0.24, df = 2 (P = 0.8 Z = 3.35 (P = 0.000	SE 0.71741922 0.36268906 0.02475193 0.30375704 39); 1 ² = 0%	Weight 9.5% 37.3% 0.0% 53.2% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.90 [0.71, 11.83] 1.97 [0.97, 4.01] 1.00 [0.95, 1.05] 2.07 [1.14, 3.75] 2.10 [1.36, 3.24]	L 0.01 0	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI .1 .1 .1 .1 .1 .1 .1 .1 .1 .1) î	100

Fig. 9 Age ≥41 years as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI confidence interval; IV, instrumental variable; SE, standard error.



Fig. 10 Alcohol consumption as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers

			Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE Weigh	t IV, Fixed, 95% C		IV, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
Nabi 2023	0.60431597 0.263	332582 43.69	6 1.83 [1.09, 3.07]				
Wu 2019	0.96393738 0.54	947467 10.09	6 2.62 [0.89, 7.70]				
Yosef 2019	0.23111172 0.25	560853 46.39	6 1.26 [0.76, 2.08]		-	│ ■──	
Total (95% CI)		100.09	6 1.60 [1.13, 2.24]			•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	l.94, df = 2 (P = 0.38); l ² Z = 2.69 (P = 0.007)	= 0%		0.01	0.1 Sleeping ≥ 6h/night	1 10 Sleeping < 6 h/night	100

Fig. 11 Sleeping < 6 h/night as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

men and women, significantly affecting LBP development and occurrence [48–50]. Our findings suggest a substantial relationship between sleeping < 6 h/night and LBP among drivers, potentially influenced by irregular schedules and late-night work habits. Furthermore, pain, a significant clinical manifestation of LBP, often disrupts sleep patterns and leads to poor sleep quality, exacerbating pain and perpetuating a vicious cycle. Studies have shown that sleep disturbances can compromise downstream pain pathways, increase spinal excitability, and increase the sensitivity of peripheral pathways to cold- and pressure-induced pain [51]. Two studies demonstrated a notable relationship between sleep and biological aging, highlighting that sufficient sleep can mitigate the health risks associated with prolonged sedentary behaviour [52, 53]. Thus, sleep quality and duration are important

А				Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	1	IV, Random, 95%	CI	
Abere 2023	0.40546511	0.48614891	12.2%	1.50 [0.58, 3.89]		-+		
Bayana 2023	-0.65392647	0.26029594	18.8%	0.52 [0.31, 0.87]				
Kurtul 2022	0.5068176	0.2356657	19.5%	1.66 [1.05, 2.63]				
Wanamo2017	0.47000363	0.25338055	19.0%	1.60 [0.97, 2.63]		⊢ ∎−		
Wu 2019	0.81845737	0.50628661	11.7%	2.27 [0.84, 6.12]			_	
Yosef 2019	0.75141609	0.2573357	18.9%	2.12 [1.28, 3.51]				
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.42 [0.89, 2.28]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.24; Chi² = 18.79, c	df = 5 (P = 0.0	02); l ² = 7	3%			10	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.46 (P = 0.14)				0.01	U.1 1 Evercise Lack of	TU	100
						Exercise Eack of	exercise	
B								
В				Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
B Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% C	I	
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511	SE 0.48614891	<u>Weight</u> 7.4%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% C	1	
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Bayana 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594	Weight 7.4% 0.0%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% C	1	
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% C	1	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022 Wanamo2017	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176 0.47000363	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657 0.25338055	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7% 27.4%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63] 1.60 [0.97, 2.63]		Odds Ratio	1	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022 Wanamo2017 Wu 2019	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176 0.47000363 0.81845737	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657 0.25338055 0.50628661	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7% 27.4% 6.9%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63] 1.60 [0.97, 2.63] 2.27 [0.84, 6.12]		Odds Ratio	_	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022 Wanamo2017 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176 0.47000363 0.81845737 0.75141609	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657 0.25338055 0.50628661 0.2573357	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7% 27.4% 6.9% 26.6%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63] 1.60 [0.97, 2.63] 2.27 [0.84, 6.12] 2.12 [1.28, 3.51]		Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% C	-	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022 Wanamo2017 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI)	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176 0.47000363 0.81845737 0.75141609	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657 0.25338055 0.50628661 0.2573357	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7% 27.4% 6.9% 26.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63] 1.60 [0.97, 2.63] 2.27 [0.84, 6.12] 2.12 [1.28, 3.51] 1.78 [1.37, 2.31]		Odds Ratio	-	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022 Wanamo2017 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176 0.47000363 0.81845737 0.75141609	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657 0.25338055 0.50628661 0.2573357	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7% 27.4% 6.9% 26.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63] 1.60 [0.97, 2.63] 2.27 [0.84, 6.12] 2.12 [1.28, 3.51] 1.78 [1.37, 2.31]		Odds Ratio	-	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bayana 2023 Kurtul 2022 Wanamo2017 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	log[Odds Ratio] 0.40546511 -0.65392647 0.5068176 0.47000363 0.81845737 0.75141609 1.08, df = 4 (P = 0.9 Z = 4.34 (P < 0.000	SE 0.48614891 0.26029594 0.2356657 0.25338055 0.50628661 0.2573357 90); l ² = 0%	Weight 7.4% 0.0% 31.7% 27.4% 6.9% 26.6% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 1.50 [0.58, 3.89] 0.52 [0.31, 0.87] 1.66 [1.05, 2.63] 1.60 [0.97, 2.63] 2.27 [0.84, 6.12] 2.12 [1.28, 3.51] 1.78 [1.37, 2.31]	L	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% C	I - 10	100

Fig. 12 Lack of exercise as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

А				Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Abere 2023	-1.10866262	0.44463503	18.1%	0.33 [0.14, 0.79]	-
Bovenzi 2009	0.18232156	0.29385042	22.8%	1.20 [0.67, 2.13]	
Burgel 2017	-0.05234648	0.23648111	24.5%	0.95 [0.60, 1.51]	
Kurtul 2022	0.76546784	0.30084214	22.5%	2.15 [1.19, 3.88]	 − ∎−
Wu 2019	1.38303907	0.68349993	12.1%	3.99 [1.04, 15.22]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.18 [0.64, 2.19]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.35: Chi ² = 16.20.	df = 4 (P = 0.0)	$(003): ^2 = 7$	75%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.53 (P = 0.59)		,		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
_	()				$BMI < 28 \; kg/m^2 \; \; BMI \geqslant 28 \; kg/m^2$
В				Odds Ratio	Odde Ratio
				oudortatio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Study or Subgroup Abere 2023	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685	SE 0.79567742	Weight 10.2%	IV, Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61]	IV. Random, 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528	Weight 10.2% 21.8%	IV. Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43]	IV. Random, 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0%	IV. Random. 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17]	IV. Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016 Nabi 2023	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526 2.27315628	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862 1.04498535	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0% 7.1%	IV. Random. 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17] 9.71 [1.25, 75.29]	IV. Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016 Nabi 2023 Wu 2019	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526 2.27315628 1.1668938	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862 1.04498535 0.4959172	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0% 7.1% 16.3%	IV. Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17] 9.71 [1.25, 75.29] 3.21 [1.22, 8.49]	IV. Random. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016 Nabi 2023 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526 2.27315628 1.1668938 0.80647587	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862 1.04498535 0.4959172 0.2973591	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0% 7.1% 16.3% 21.6%	IV. Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17] 9.71 [1.25, 75.29] 3.21 [1.22, 8.49] 2.24 [1.25, 4.01]	IV. Random. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016 Nabi 2023 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI)	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526 2.27315628 1.1668938 0.80647587	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862 1.04498535 0.4959172 0.2973591	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0% 7.1% 16.3% 21.6% 100.0%	IV. Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17] 9.71 [1.25, 75.29] 3.21 [1.22, 8.49] 2.24 [1.25, 4.01] 1.46 [0.77, 2.76]	IV. Random, 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016 Nabi 2023 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526 2.27315628 1.1668938 0.80647587 0.40: Chi ² = 18.72.	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862 1.04498535 0.4959172 0.2973591 df = 5 (P = 0.0	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0% 7.1% 16.3% 21.6% 100.0% 002); ² = 7	IV. Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17] 9.71 [1.25, 75.29] 3.21 [1.22, 8.49] 2.24 [1.25, 4.01] 1.46 [0.77, 2.76]	IV. Random, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Bovenzi 2009 Jadhav 2016 Nabi 2023 Wu 2019 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	log[Odds Ratio] -0.27443685 -0.21072103 -0.32020526 2.27315628 1.1668938 0.80647587 0.40; Chi ² = 18.72, Z = 1.16 (P = 0.24)	SE 0.79567742 0.29111528 0.24418862 1.04498535 0.4959172 0.2973591 df = 5 (P = 0.0	Weight 10.2% 21.8% 23.0% 7.1% 16.3% 21.6% 100.0% 002); I ² = 7	IV. Random, 95% CI 0.76 [0.16, 3.61] 0.81 [0.46, 1.43] 0.73 [0.45, 1.17] 9.71 [1.25, 75.29] 3.21 [1.22, 8.49] 2.24 [1.25, 4.01] 1.46 [0.77, 2.76]	U. Random, 95% Cl

Fig. 13 A Body mass \geq 28 kg/m² as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers; **B** Smoking as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable; SE, standard error

				Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl		IV, Fixe	<u>d, 95% C</u>		
Nabi 2023	0.58778666	0.26232036	40.1%	1.80 [1.08, 3.01]					
Terfa 2022	0.25464222	0.50388718	10.9%	1.29 [0.48, 3.46]					
Wanamo 2017	0.55388511	0.23743148	49.0%	1.74 [1.09, 2.77]					
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.71 [1.23, 2.36]			•		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	0.36, df = 2 (P = 0.84 Z = 3.22 (P = 0.001)	4); l² = 0%			0.01	0.1 Seat comfort	1 Seat di	10 scomfort	100

Fig. 14 Seat discomfort as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

Study or Subaroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% Cl		Odd IV. Fixe	s Ratio ed. 95% Cl		
Bovenzi 2006	0.81093022	0.2351808	21.8%	2.25 [1.42, 3.57]					
Bovenzi 2009	1.03318448 0	0.20762671	27.9%	2.81 [1.87, 4.22]					
Chen 2005	0.62057649 0	0.24460468	20.1%	1.86 [1.15, 3.00]					
Terfa 2022	1.10525683 0	0.33042021	11.0%	3.02 [1.58, 5.77]					
Yosef 2019	0.78845736 0	0.25021154	19.2%	2.20 [1.35, 3.59]					
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	2.37 [1.91, 2.94]			•		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2	2.33, df = 4 (P = 0.68	s); I² = 0%			0.01	0.1	+ 1	10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.87 (P < 0.0000	1)			Prope	er driving posture	Poor drivir	ng posture	100

Fig. 15 Poor driving posture as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

			Odds Ratio			Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV	. Fixed, 95% Cl		
Awang 2019	1.22377543 0.494	42041 7.0%	3.40 [1.29, 8.96]					
Bovenzi 2009	0.74193734 0.218	79372 35.7%	2.10 [1.37, 3.22]					
Prado-León 2008	0.09531018 0.6	96436 3.5%	1.10 [0.28, 4.31]				-	
Wanamo 2017	0.64185389 0.231	63059 31.8%	1.90 [1.21, 2.99]			- -		
Yosef 2019	1.10525683 0.278	79633 22.0%	3.02 [1.75, 5.22]					
Total (95% CI)		100.0%	2.23 [1.72, 2.88]			•		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	3.49, df = 4 (P = 0.48); l ² =	= 0%				1	10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.13 (P < 0.00001)			No he	u.i avy objects han	dling Handling	i heavy objects	100

Fig. 16 Handling heavy objects as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

in preserving physical health and cognitive function and averting potential complications.

Moreover, the absence of physical activity may predispose professional drivers to LBP. Engaging in physical activity is crucial in enhancing cardiovascular health, muscle strength, and overall endurance, which are all essential for coping with the physical demands and fatigue associated with LBP. Research indicates that engaging in moderate exercise 1–5 times weekly is associated with a reduced risk of LBP compared with lower or higher exercise frequency [54]. Recent studies have underscored the crucial role of moderate physical activity in health outcomes and disease management. You et al. discovered that the interplay between physical activity and immune function positively influences the recovery and overall health of individuals with LBP [50, 55]. Here, lack of exercise was a risk factor for LBP among drivers, and this finding was likely influenced by their demanding work schedules and limited time and energy.

Work-related factors

Most occupational risk factors are related to the types of activities performed at work, and ergonomic factors are known risk factors for LBP. These factors include WBV, manual material handling, awkward postures, and others [56]. The current study found that uncomfortable seating and improper driving postures increased the risk of LBP development by 1.71 and 2.37 times, strongly ٨

А				Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV. Random, 95% Cl
Abere 2023	0.97077892	0.45540869	11.1%	2.64 [1.08, 6.45]	
Chen 2005	0.73236789	0.29863918	11.4%	2.08 [1.16, 3.73]	
Nabi 2023	0.90016135	0.43377798	11.2%	2.46 [1.05, 5.76]	
Noda 2015	1.66770682	0.72160158	10.5%	5.30 [1.29, 21.80]	
Prado-León 2008	0.78845736	0.7344894	10.5%	2.20 [0.52, 9.28]	
Rufa'i 2015	-3.21887582	0.17682326	11.5%	0.04 [0.03, 0.06]	-
Wang 2017	1.19392247	0.28905573	11.4%	3.30 [1.87, 5.82]	
Yitayal 2022	0.83116848	0.33365441	11.3%	2.30 [1.19, 4.42]	_ _
Yosef 2019	0.47623418	0.46544625	11.1%	1.61 [0.65, 4.01]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.59 [0.35, 7.13]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	5.07 Chi ² = 338.23	df = 8 (P < 0)	00001)· I ²	= 98%	
Test for overall effect:	7 = 0.60 (P = 0.55)	, di = 0 (i = 0.	00001), 1	- 5070	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
	2 = 0.00 (1 = 0.00)				Working \leqslant 10h/day Working $>$ 10h/day
-					
В				Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u>	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892	SE 0.45540869	Weight 9.5%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Chen 2005	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918	Weight 9.5% 22.1%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73]	Odds Ratio
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76]	Odds Ratio
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80]	Odds Ratio
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28]	Odds Ratio
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015 Wang 2017	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582 1.19392247	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326 0.28905573	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0% 23.6%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06] 3.30 [1.87, 5.82]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2022	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582 1.19392247 0.83116848	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326 0.28905573 0.33365441	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0% 23.6% 17.7%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06] 3.30 [1.87, 5.82] 2.30 [1.19, 4.42]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2022 Yosef 2019	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582 1.19392247 0.83116848 0.47623418	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326 0.28905573 0.33365441 0.46544625	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0% 23.6% 17.7% 9.1%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06] 3.30 [1.87, 5.82] 2.30 [1.19, 4.42] 1.61 [0.65, 4.01]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2022 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI)	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582 1.19392247 0.83116848 0.47623418	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326 0.28905573 0.33365441 0.46544625	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0% 23.6% 17.7% 9.1% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06] 3.30 [1.87, 5.82] 2.30 [1.19, 4.42] 1.61 [0.65, 4.01] 2.49 [1.89, 3.28]	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2022 Yosef 2019 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582 1.19392247 0.83116848 0.47623418	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326 0.28905573 0.33365441 0.46544625	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0% 23.6% 17.7% 9.1% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06] 3.30 [1.87, 5.82] 2.30 [1.19, 4.42] 1.61 [0.65, 4.01] 2.49 [1.89, 3.28]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Chen 2005 Nabi 2023 Noda 2015 Prado-León 2008 Rufa'i 2015 Wang 2017 Yitayal 2022 Yosef 2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	log[Odds Ratio] 0.97077892 0.73236789 0.90016135 1.66770682 0.78845736 -3.21887582 1.19392247 0.83116848 0.47623418 3.39, df = 7 (P = 0.6 7 = 6 50 (P < 0.00)	SE 0.45540869 0.29863918 0.43377798 0.72160158 0.7344894 0.17682326 0.28905573 0.33365441 0.46544625 35); l ² = 0%	Weight 9.5% 22.1% 10.5% 3.8% 3.7% 0.0% 23.6% 17.7% 9.1% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% Cl 2.64 [1.08, 6.45] 2.08 [1.16, 3.73] 2.46 [1.05, 5.76] 5.30 [1.29, 21.80] 2.20 [0.52, 9.28] 0.04 [0.03, 0.06] 3.30 [1.87, 5.82] 2.30 [1.19, 4.42] 1.61 [0.65, 4.01] 2.49 [1.89, 3.28]	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI

Fig. 17 Working > 10 h/day as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	CI IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Abere 2023	0.03922071 0.52787	11 5.4%	1.04 [0.37, 2.93]	
Kurtul 2022	1.17248214 0.273880	35 20.1%	3.23 [1.89, 5.52]] – – –
Nabi 2023	0.9282193 0.415086	09 8.7%	2.53 [1.12, 5.71]]
Wanamo 2017	1.5260563 0.532455	02 5.3%	4.60 [1.62, 13.06]] – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –
Wang 2017	0.53062825 0.187237	03 43.0%	1.70 [1.18, 2.45]] –
Wu 2019	1.32015456 0.609773	25 4.0%	3.74 [1.13, 12.37]]
Yosef 2019	0.5068176 0.334398	93 13.5%	1.66 [0.86, 3.20]	ı † ∎−
Total (95% Cl)		100.0%	2.12 [1.66, 2.69]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9	9.28, df = 6 (P = 0.16); l ² = 35	%		
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 6.11 (P < 0.00001)			$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Driving} \leqslant 5 \text{Y} & \text{Driving} > 5 \text{Y} \\ \end{array}$

Fig. 18 Driving > 5 years as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

indicating that uncomfortable seating and poor driving postures are significant risk factors for LBP among drivers. This may be because, in professional drivers engaged in long-term driving tasks, uncomfortable seating and a poor driving posture exacerbate WBV exposure, leading to increased pressure on the lumbar discs, impaired nutrition, enhanced release of neuropeptides, and muscle fatigue. Hansson et al. suggested that constrained work postures and WBV induce muscle fatigue, thereby causing LBP through neurophysiological changes at the cellular level [57]. Increasing evidence indicates that vertebral body injuries caused by mechanical factors such

А				Odds Ratio		0	dds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C		IV, Ra	<u>indom, 95</u>	% CI	
Abere 2023	1.8531681	0.50063981	23.6%	6.38 [2.39, 17.02]			-	-	
Kurtul 2022	0.51282363	0.23712652	40.9%	1.67 [1.05, 2.66]					
Yitayal 2022	0.72996115	0.30992002	35.5%	2.08 [1.13, 3.81]				_	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	2.47 [1.30, 4.72]					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.21; Chi ² = 5.86, d	f = 2 (P = 0.05	5); I² = 66%	Ď	0.01	01	1	10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.75 (P = 0.006)			0.01	Back supp	ort Lack	of back sup	port
В				Odds Ratio		Oc	lds Ratio		
B Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI		Oc IV, Fi	lds Ratio xed, 95%	CI	
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023	log[Odds Ratio] 1.8531681	SE 0.50063981	Weight 0.0%	Odds Ratio <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6.38 [2.39, 17.02]		Oc IV, Fi	lds Ratio xed, 95%	CI	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Kurtul 2022	log[Odds Ratio] 1.8531681 0.51282363	SE 0.50063981 0.23712652	Weight 0.0% 63.1%	Odds Ratio IV, Fixed, 95% CI 6.38 [2.39, 17.02] 1.67 [1.05, 2.66]		Oc IV, Fi	lds Ratio xed, 95%	CI	
B <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abere 2023 Kurtul 2022 Yitayal 2022	log[Odds Ratio] 1.8531681 0.51282363 0.72996115	SE 0.50063981 0.23712652 0.30992002	Weight 0.0% 63.1% 36.9%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed, 95% CI 6.38 [2.39, 17.02] 1.67 [1.05, 2.66] 2.08 [1.13, 3.81]		Oc IV, Fi	Ids Ratio xed, 95%	<u>CI</u>	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Kurtul 2022 Yitayal 2022 Total (95% CI)	log[Odds Ratio] 1.8531681 0.51282363 0.72996115	SE 0.50063981 0.23712652 0.30992002	Weight 0.0% 63.1% 36.9% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI 6.38 [2.39, 17.02] 1.67 [1.05, 2.66] 2.08 [1.13, 3.81] 1.81 [1.25, 2.62]		Oc IV. Fi	Ids Ratio xed, 95%	<u>cı</u> -	
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Kurtul 2022 Yitayal 2022 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	log[Odds Ratio] 1.8531681 0.51282363 0.72996115 0.31, df = 1 (P = 0.4	58); 1 ² = 0%	Weight 0.0% 63.1% 36.9% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI 6.38 [2.39, 17.02] 1.67 [1.05, 2.66] 2.08 [1.13, 3.81] 1.81 [1.25, 2.62]	L	Oc IV, Fi	Ids Ratio xed, 95%	<u>CI</u>	100
B Study or Subgroup Abere 2023 Kurtul 2022 Yitayal 2022 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	log[Odds Ratio] 1.8531681 0.51282363 0.72996115 0.31, df = 1 (P = 0.3 Z = 3.15 (P = 0.002	58); 1 ² = 0%	Weight 0.0% 63.1% 36.9% 100.0%	Odds Ratio IV. Fixed. 95% CI 6.38 [2.39, 17.02] 1.67 [1.05, 2.66] 2.08 [1.13, 3.81] 1.81 [1.25, 2.62]	<u>н</u> 0.01	Oc IV. Fi 0.1 Back cuppe	Ids Ratio xed, 95%	CI	

Fig. 19 Lack of back support as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

			Odds Ratio	Odds	s Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio] S	E Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	IV, Fixe	<u>d, 95% Cl</u>	
Abere2023	-0.56211892 0.5620039	5.1%	0.57 [0.19, 1.71]		+	
Bovenzi 2009	1.16627094 0.269165	51 22.1%	3.21 [1.89, 5.44]			
Burgel 2017	1.20237152 0.8201608	31 2.4%	3.33 [0.67, 16.61]	_	· · · · ·	
Chen 2005	0.55961579 0.1922887	2 43.3%	1.75 [1.20, 2.55]			
Noda 2015	0.95551144 0.4978888	6.5%	2.60 [0.98, 6.90]			
Yosef 2019	0.72754861 0.2781234	8 20.7%	2.07 [1.20, 3.57]			
Total (95% CI)		100.0%	2.04 [1.59, 2.61]		•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9 Test for overall effect:	9.22, df = 5 (P = 0.10); l ² = 469 Z = 5.63 (P < 0.00001)	0		0.01 0.1 Low job stress	High job stress	100

Fig. 20 High job stress as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE Weig	Odds Ratio ht IV, Fixed, 95%	Odds Ratio Cl IV, Fixed, 95%	CI
Abere 2023	1.521699 0.610	20196 4.2	% 4.58 [1.39, 15.1	5]	
Bovenzi 2009	0.51879379 0.365	79653 11.6	% 1.68 [0.82, 3.4	4] +	-
Chen 2005	0.36464311 0.157	91816 62.1	% 1.44 [1.06, 1.9	6] –	
Kurtul 2022	0.46373402 0.26	45689 22.1	% 1.59 [0.95, 2.6	7]	
Total (95% CI)		100.0	% 1.57 [1.23, 2.0 ⁴	ı] 🔶	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.41$, $df = 3$ (P = 0.33); $l^2 = 12\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 3.64 (P = 0.0003)				0.01 0.1 1 High job satisfaction Low i	10 100 ob satisfaction

Fig. 21 Low job satisfaction as a risk factor for low back pain among professional drivers. CI Confidence interval, IV Instrumental variable, SE Standard error

as heavy lifting are key mechanisms in the occurrence of LBP [58]. We found that drivers with lifting requirements had a 2.23 times higher risk of developing LBP. This may be because of the significant impact of lifting on the lower back, especially during lifting tasks, as it greatly increases the pressure within the intervertebral discs and may lead to disc damage [59]. Furthermore, we identified prolonged driving experience, excessively long daily driving hours, and a lack of back support as risk factors for LBP among professional drivers. Previous studies



Fig. 22 The funnel plot of lower back pain prevalence among drivers in the previous year

reported that driving prolonged hours exacerbates discomfort among individuals [60]. This could be due to drivers being confined to a limited space behind the steering wheel, sitting for prolonged periods, and using insufficient back support, factors that lead to the lumbar muscle fatigue and LBP. Therefore, drivers should avoid prolonged WBV exposure, feeling work-related pressure, and performing repetitive, monotonous tasks. Moreover, they should learn self-regulation techniques and rest adequately during extended work periods.

Psychological factors

A cohort study of 4,712 elderly Chinese individuals found a noteworthy correlation between depression and LBP onset [61]. Our study corroborated these findings by revealing that drivers facing high work-related stress and dissatisfaction were more susceptible to developing LBP. LBP is a chronic recurring pain ailment that frequently induces fear and emotional upheaval in patients. Emotionally unstable states can stimulate the release of corticotropin-releasing hormone by the hypothalamic neurons, influencing endocrine and immune metabolic processes at the biological and behavioral levels. Moreover, this can trigger immune-cell activation in the central and peripheral nervous systems, leading to the secretion of pro-inflammatory cytokines that can breach the blood-brain barrier, causing a detrimental cycle that significantly impacts LBP development and progression [62, 63]. Engaging in practices that foster emotional equilibrium, such as yoga and meditation, can ameliorate LBP by enhancing emotional well-being. For professional drivers, listening to soothing and enjoyable music while driving may serve as a preventive measure.

Overall, LBP, a prevalent degenerative spinal condition, has emerged as a global health concern. Therefore, preventive strategies should be established to address the occurrence of LBP among drivers. Considering patient-related factors, we posit that cessation of smoking, ensuring adequate sleep, and engaging in moderate weekly exercise are pivotal for improving cardiovascular health, muscle strength, and overall endurance. Moreover, research suggests that adequate energy intake and optimal nutrition can aid in physical function recovery and overall health maintenance while decreasing inflammatory responses [64]. Therefore, we recommend the daily intake of a healthy and balanced diet. Considering the work-related factors, we suggest that drivers install ergonomic seats in the driving cabins according to their needs. If constrained by economic factors, comfortable pillows or back supports can effectively reduce the impact of ergonomic factors on LBP. Additionally, maintaining the correct driving posture is equally important. It is advisable to minimise the frequency of lifting heavy objects. Using lumbar supports or tools can help reduce the pressure on intervertebral discs during lifting. Incorporating psychological factors, alleviating work stress for drivers, and enhancing the work environment are fundamental preventive measures. Governments and industry regulatory agencies should establish reasonable work hours and rest policies to safeguard the legal rights of drivers. Furthermore, regular health checkups and psychological counselling for drivers are indispensable. Notably, researchers, such as You, have found a certain correlation between dietary nutrition and reducing depressive symptoms [65]. Hence, proper dietary intake aids in improving the psychological well-being of drivers and preventing the occurrence of LBP.

Original studies on the risk factors for LBP in drivers still face ethical concerns and lack clear research directions. Hence, future studies should prioritise safeguarding the privacy of the investigators. Moreover, researchers should offer valuable guidance for enhancing the working conditions and health outcomes of professional drivers, while ensuring confidentiality. Longitudinal research is essential to establish the causal relationships between specific risk factors and LBP. The implementation of tailored interventions, such as structured exercise programs, ergonomic training, and balanced nutrition, are crucial for assessing their effectiveness and long-term impact on reducing LBP among drivers. Additionally, conducting multicentre studies across diverse demographics is necessary to establish standardised preventive measures for LBP in driver cohorts, ultimately enhancing their long-term occupational status and quality of life.

This study has certain limitations. First, variations in the definitions and measurement standards of influencing factors can result in notable interstudy heterogeneity. Furthermore, the heterogeneity evaluations highlighted the variability among studies. Finally, this study incorporated cross-sectional research, utilizing the Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire or self-developed questionnaires as assessment tools, potentially introducing selection bias. Despite its limitations, this study provides a comprehensive and lucid discussion of the prevalence of and associated risk factors for LBP among professional drivers. Our study provides empirical support for the escalating problem of LBP in the driving community, aids the promotion of healthy behavioral habits among professional drivers, and serves as a valuable resource for society to enhance relevant social security and healthcare frameworks.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1186/s13018-024-04999-z.

Supplementary file 1.

Supplementary file 2.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the financial support of Cuiying Scientific and Technological Innovation Program of Lanzhou University Second Hospital (2020QN-16), Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province (22JR11RA082) and Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province (22JR5RA953).

Author contributions

JJ and M.Z collected the literature and wrote the article. Z.Y, W.L and X.K revised the article. Z.C, S.L and Y.Z designed the study. JJ, X.H and M.Z prepared figures and tables. All authors contributed toward data analysis, drafting and critically revising the paper and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding

This work was supported by Cuiying Scientific and Technological Innovation Program of Lanzhou University Second Hospital (2020QN-16), Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province (22JR1RA082) and Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province (22JR5RA953).

Data availability

No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Informed consent

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author details

¹Department of Orthopaedics, Lanzhou University Second Hospital, No. 82 Cuiyingmen, Chengguan District, Lanzhou 730000, Gansu, People's Republic of China. ²Orthopaedics Key Laboratory of Gansu Province, Lanzhou 730000, Gansu, People's Republic of China. ³Department of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, The People's Hospital of Linxia, Gansu 731100, People's Republic of China.

Received: 16 July 2024 Accepted: 16 August 2024 Published online: 09 September 2024

References

- Knezevic NN, Candido KD, Vlaeyen JWS, Van Zundert J, Cohen SP. Low back pain. Lancet. 2021;398(10294):78–92.
- Bisanzio D, Shokraneh F. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2017. The Lancet. 2018;392(10159):1789–858.
- Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, et al. What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. Lancet. 2018;391(10137):2356–67.
- 4. Li H, Wang X, Pan H, Xiao C, Wang C, Guo S, et al. The mechanisms and functions of IL-1 β in intervertebral disc degeneration. Exp Gerontol. 2023;177: 112181.
- Pan H, Li H, Guo S, Wang C, Long L, Wang X, et al. The mechanisms and functions of TNF-α in intervertebral disc degeneration. Exp Gerontol. 2023;174: 112119.
- Urban JP, Smith S, Fairbank JC. Nutrition of the intervertebral disc. Spine. 2004;29(23):2700–9.
- Garcia JB, Hernandez-Castro JJ, Nunez RG, Pazos MA, Aguirre JO, Jreige A, et al. Prevalence of low back pain in Latin America: a systematic literature review. Pain Phys. 2014;17(5):379–91.
- Louw QA, Morris LD, Grimmer-Somers K. The prevalence of low back pain in Africa: a systematic review. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2007;8:105.
- Ning X, Zhou J, Dai B, Jaridi M. The assessment of material handling strategies in dealing with sudden loading: the effects of load handling position on trunk biomechanics. Appl Ergon. 2014;45(6):1399–405.
- Lyons J. Factors contributing to low back pain among professional drivers: a review of current literature and possible ergonomic controls. Work. 2002;19(1):95–102.
- Magnusson ML, Pope MH, Wilder DG, Areskoug B. Are occupational drivers at an increased risk for developing musculoskeletal disorders? Spine. 1996;21(6):710–7.
- Abere G, Yenealem DG, Worede EA. Prevalence and associated factors of low back pain among taxi drivers in Gondar City, Northwest Ethiopia: a community-based cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2023;13(5): e069631.
- Rufa'i AA, Sa'idu IA, Ahmad RY, Elmi OS, Aliyu SU, Jajere AM, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for low back pain among professional drivers in Kano, Nigeria. Arch Environ Occup Health. 2015;70(5):251–5.
- 14. Kurtul S, Güngördü N. Low back pain and risk factors among taxi drivers in Turkey: a cross-sectional study. Med Lav. 2022;113(3): e2022025.
- Wanamo ME, Abaya SW, Admassu A. Prevalence and risk factors for low back pain (LBP) among taxi drivers in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a community based cross-sectional study. Ethiop J Health Dev. 2017;31:244–50.
- Wu, Analysis of disease situation and risk factors of non-specific low back pain in taxi drivers in a city. J Cervicodynia Lumbodynia. 2019;40:770–2.
- 17. Yosef T, Belachew A, Tefera Y. Magnitude and contributing factors of low back pain among long distance truck drivers at Modjo dry port, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. J Environ Public Health. 2019;2019:6793090.
- Bayana E, Terfa Y, Tucho A, Germossa G, Hailu F, Abdisa B, et al. Selfreported low back pain intensity and interferences among three-wheel drivers in Southwest of Ethiopia: a community-based cross-sectional study. Int J Occup Saf Health. 2023;13:512–20.
- Lo CK, Mertz D, Loeb M. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale: comparing reviewers' to authors' assessments. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014;14:45.
- Rostom A, Dubé C, Cranney A, Saloojee N, Patel D. Celiac disease. Evid Rep Technol Assess. 2004;104(104):1–6.
- Terfa YB, Akuma AO, Kebede EB, Tucho AE, Abdisa B, Ayele S, et al. Ergonomic risk factors for low back pain among three-wheel drivers in ethiopia: a community-based cross-sectional study. J Environ Public Health. 2022;2022:8133872.
- 22. Yitayal MM, Ayhualem S, Fiseha B, Kahasay G, Gashaw M, Gebre H. Occupational lower back pain and associated factors among taxi drivers in Mekelle city, north Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. Int J Occup Saf Ergon JOSE. 2022;28(4):2046–51.
- Wang M, Yu J, Liu N, Liu Z, Wei X, Yan F, et al. Low back pain among taxi drivers: a cross-sectional study. Occup Med. 2017;67(4):290–5.
- Awang Lukman K, Jeffree MS, Rampal KG. Lower back pain and its association with whole-body vibration and manual materials handling among commercial drivers in Sabah. Int J Occup Saf Ergon JOSE. 2019;25(1):8–16.

- Noda M, Malhotra R, DeSilva V, Sapukotana P, DeSilva A, Kirkorowicz J, et al. Occupational risk factors for low back pain among drivers of three-wheelers in Sri Lanka. Int J Occup Environ Health. 2015;21(3):216–24.
- Jadhav AV. Comparative cross-sectional study for understanding the burden of low back pain among public bus transport drivers. Indian J Occup Environ Med. 2016;20(1):26–30.
- 27. Nabi MH, Hawlader MDH, Naz F, Siddiquea SR, Hasan M, Hossian M, et al. Low back pain among professional bus drivers: a cross-sectional study from Bangladesh. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):1172.
- Bovenzi M. Metrics of whole-body vibration and exposure-response relationship for low back pain in professional drivers: a prospective cohort study. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2009;82(7):893–917.
- Bovenzi M, Rui F, Negro C, D'Agostin F, Angotzi G, Bianchi S, et al. An epidemiological study of low back pain in professional drivers. J Sound Vib. 2006;298(3):514–39.
- Burgel BJ, Elshatarat RA. Psychosocial work factors and low back pain in taxi drivers. Am J Ind Med. 2017;60(8):734–46.
- 31. Chen JC, Chang WR, Chang W, Christiani D. Occupational factors associated with low back pain in urban taxi drivers. Occup Med. 2005;55(7):535–40.
- Prado-León LR, Aceves-González C, Avila-Chaurand R. Occupational driving as a risk factor in low back pain: a case-control study in a Mexican population. Work. 2008;31(4):387–96.
- Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, Benyamin RM, Hirsch JA. Epidemiology of low back pain in adults. Neuromodulation. 2014;17(Suppl 2):3–10.
- 34. World Health O. Global status report on road safety 2018: World Health Organization; 2019.
- Webb R, Brammah T, Lunt M, Urwin M, Allison T, Symmons D. Prevalence and predictors of intense, chronic, and disabling neck and back pain in the UK general population. Spine. 2003;28(11):1195–202.
- Yalew ES, Adem KS, Kibret AK, Gashaw M. Low back pain and its determinants among wait staff in Gondar town, North West Ethiopia: a crosssectional study. Front Pain Res (Lausanne, Switzerland). 2022;3: 964297.
- Palmer KT, Harris CE, Griffin MJ, Bennett J, Reading I, Sampson M, et al. Casecontrol study of low-back pain referred for magnetic resonance imaging, with special focus on whole-body vibration. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2008;34(5):364–73.
- Healy JF, Healy BB, Wong WH, Olson EM. Cervical and lumbar MRI in asymptomatic older male lifelong athletes: frequency of degenerative findings. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 1996;20(1):107–12.
- Powell MC, Wilson M, Szypryt P, Symonds EM, Worthington BS. Prevalence of lumbar disc degeneration observed by magnetic resonance in symptomless women. Lancet. 1986;2(8520):1366–7.
- Novais EJ, Diekman BO, Shapiro IM, Risbud MV. p16(Ink4a) deletion in cells of the intervertebral disc affects their matrix homeostasis and senescence associated secretory phenotype without altering onset of senescence. Matrix Biol J Int Soc Matrix Biol. 2019;82:54–70.
- Che H, Ma C, Li H, Yu F, Wei Y, Chen H, et al. Rebalance of the polyamine metabolism suppresses oxidative stress and delays senescence in nucleus pulposus cells. Oxid Med Cell Longev. 2022;2022:8033353.
- Le Maitre CL, Freemont AJ, Hoyland JA. Accelerated cellular senescence in degenerate intervertebral discs: a possible role in the pathogenesis of intervertebral disc degeneration. Arthritis Res Ther. 2007;9(3):R45.
- Gorman DM, Potamianos G, Williams KA, Frank AO, Duffy SW, Peters TJ. Relationship between alcohol abuse and low back pain. Alcohol Alcoholism. 1987;22(1):61–3.
- 44. Khatun M, Ahlgren C, Hammarström A. The influence of factors identified in adolescence and early adulthood on social class inequities of musculoskeletal disorders at age 30: a prospective population-based cohort study. Int J Epidemiol. 2004;33(6):1353–60.
- Kovacs FM, Gestoso M, Gil Del Real MT, López J, Mufraggi N, Ignacio MJ. Risk factors for non-specific low back pain in schoolchildren and their parents: a population based study. Pain. 2003;103(3):259–68.
- Ferrie ML, Rogers AH, Zvolensky MJ, Buckner JD. Alcohol and marijuana couse among adults with chronic low back pain: associations with substance misuse, mental health, and pain experience. Am J Addict. 2022;31(6):546–9.
- Dattilo M, Antunes HK, Medeiros A, Mônico Neto M, Souza HS, Tufik S, et al. Sleep and muscle recovery: endocrinological and molecular basis for a new and promising hypothesis. Med Hypotheses. 2011;77(2):220–2.
- 48. Miller MA, Kandala NB, Kivimaki M, Kumari M, Brunner EJ, Lowe GD, et al. Gender differences in the cross-sectional relationships between

sleep duration and markers of inflammation: Whitehall II study. Sleep. 2009;32(7):857–64.

- van Leeuwen WM, Lehto M, Karisola P, Lindholm H, Luukkonen R, Sallinen M, et al. Sleep restriction increases the risk of developing cardiovascular diseases by augmenting proinflammatory responses through IL-17 and CRP. PLoS ONE. 2009;4(2): e4589.
- You Y, Ablitip A, Chen Y, Ding H, Chen K, Cui Y, et al. Saturation effects of the relationship between physical exercise and systemic immune inflammation index in the short-sleep population: a cross-sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2024;24(1):1920.
- Staffe AT, Bech MW, Clemmensen SLK, Nielsen HT, Larsen DB, Petersen KK. Total sleep deprivation increases pain sensitivity, impairs conditioned pain modulation and facilitates temporal summation of pain in healthy participants. PLoS ONE. 2019;14(12): e0225849.
- You Y, Mo L, Tong J, Chen X, You Y. The role of education attainment on 24-hour movement behavior in emerging adults: evidence from a population-based study. Front Public Health. 2024;12:1197150.
- You Y, Chen Y, Liu R, Zhang Y, Wang M, Yang Z, et al. Inverted U-shaped relationship between sleep duration and phenotypic age in US adults: a population-based study. Sci Rep. 2024;14(1):6247.
- Reisbord LS, Greenland S. Factors associated with self-reported back-pain prevalence: a population-based study. J Chronic Dis. 1985;38(8):691–702.
- 55. You Y. Accelerometer-measured physical activity and sedentary behaviour are associated with C-reactive protein in US adults who get insufficient sleep: a threshold and isotemporal substitution effect analysis. J Sports Sci. 2024;42(6):527–36.
- 56. Hulshof CTJ, Pega F, Neupane S, Colosio C, Daams JG, Kc P, et al. The effect of occupational exposure to ergonomic risk factors on osteoarthritis of hip or knee and selected other musculoskeletal diseases: a systematic review and meta-analysis from the WHO/ILO joint estimates of the work-related burden of disease and injury. Environ Int. 2021;150: 106349.
- Hansson T, Magnusson M, Broman H. Back muscle fatigue and seated whole body vibrations: an experimental study in man. Clin Biomech. 1991;6(3):173–8.
- Hadjipavlou AG, Tzermiadianos MN, Bogduk N, Zindrick MR. The pathophysiology of disc degeneration: a critical review. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2008;90(10):1261–70.
- Wilke HJ, Neef P, Caimi M, Hoogland T, Claes LE. New in vivo measurements of pressures in the intervertebral disc in daily life. Spine. 1999;24(8):755–62.
- Wildenbeest MH, Kiers H, Tuijt M, van Dieën JH. Effect of postural threat on motor control in people with and without low back pain. PLoS ONE. 2023;18(3): e0280607.
- Huang J, Wang X. Association of depressive symptoms with risk of incidence low back pain in middle-aged and older Chinese adults. J Affect Disord. 2024;354:627–33.
- Jespersen A, Yilmaz Z, Vilhjálmsson BJ. Harnessing the power of population cohorts to study the relationship between endocrine-metabolic disorders and depression. Am J Psychiatry. 2022;179(11):788–90.
- Garofalo S, Cocozza G, Mormino A, Bernardini G, Russo E, lelpo D, et al. Natural killer cells and innate lymphoid cells 1 tune anxiety-like behavior and memory in mice via interferon-γ and acetylcholine. Nat Commun. 2023;14(1):3103.
- 64. You Y, Chen Y, Wei M, Tang M, Lu Y, Zhang Q, et al. Mediation role of recreational physical activity in the relationship between the dietary intake of live microbes and the systemic immune-inflammation index: a real-world cross-sectional study. Nutrients. 2024;16(6):777.
- 65. You Y, Wang R, Li J, Cao F, Zhang Y, Ma X. The role of dietary intake of live microbes in the association between leisure-time physical activity and depressive symptoms: a population-based study. Appl Physiol Nutr Metabol Phys Appl Nutr et metabol. 2024;49(8):1014–24.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.