

1 **Title:** Effect of Schoolbag Weight on Musculoskeletal Pain among Primary School Children in Yaounde,
2 Cameroon: A Cross-sectional Study

3
4 **Author names:** Wiliam Richard Guessogo,¹ Peguy Brice Assomo-Ndemba,² Edmond Ebal-Minye,¹ Jerson
5 Mekoulou-Ndongo,³ Claude Bryan Bika-Lélé,³ William Mbang-Bian,¹ Eva Linda Djuine-Soh,¹ Jean Bertrand
6 Ondoa,¹ Samuel Honoré Mandengue,³ Abdou Temfemo.⁴

7 **Degrees:** ¹ PhD; ² MD, PhD; ³ PhD; ⁴ PhD; ⁵ PhD; ⁶ MSc; ⁷ MSc; ⁸ MSc; ⁹ PhD; ¹⁰ PhD.

8 **Affiliations:** ¹. National Institute of Youth and Sports, Yaoundé, Cameroon, ². Faculty of Medicine and
9 Biomedical Sciences, University of Yaounde 1, Yaounde, Cameroon. ³. Exercise and Sport Physiology and
10 Medicine Unit, Faculty of Science, University of Douala, Cameroon, ⁴. Faculty of Medicine and Pharmaceutical
11 Sciences, University of Douala, Cameroon.

12 **About the author:** Assomo-Ndemba is a MD of the Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences of the
13 University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon.

14 **Acknowledgment:** We thank the principals, teachers and parents of children for their collaboration. We also
15 thank the students who participated and, Loick Pradel Kojom for its advices in statistical analysis.

16 **Financing:** The authors have no funding source to disclose.

17 **Conflict of interest statement by authors:** The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

18 **Compliance with ethical standards:** Yes

19 **Authors Contribution Statement:** Conceptualization: WRG & PBAN. Data Curation, Methodology,
20 Resources & Validation: WRG, PBAN, EEM, JMN, CBBL, WMB, ELDS, JBO & AT. Formal Analysis, Project
21 Administration, & Supervision: WRG, PBAN, SHM & AT. Investigation: WRG, PBAN, ELDS & JBO.
22 Visualization: WRG, PBAN & CBBL. Writing – Original Draft Preparation: WRG, PBAN, EEM, SHM & AT.
23 Writing – Review & Editing: WRG, PBAN, SHM & AT

24
25 **Manuscript word count:** 2375

26 **Abstract word count:** 243

27 **Number of Figures and Tables:** 04

28 **Personal, Professional, and Institutional Social Network accounts.**

- 29 • **Facebook:** temfemo@hotmail.com

30 **Discussion Points:**

- 31 1. What is the weight of the schoolbag?

32
33
34 **Publisher's Disclosure:** *This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication.*
35 *As a service to our readers and authors we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript*
36 *will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable*
37 *form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content,*
38 *and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.*

1 **ABSTRACT**

2
3 **Background:** Heavy schoolbag is known to cause health problems for school children. The aim of this study
4 was to determine the effects of carrying heavy schoolbags on the musculoskeletal pain among primary school
5 children of the two subsystems in Yaounde, Cameroon.

6 **Methods:** A cross-sectional study was carried out in primary schools in Yaounde. A total of 457 school-
7 children (8.2 ± 2.2 years) were included, 202 from the French-speaking subsystem, and 255 from the English-
8 speaking subsystem. Parameters studied included weight, height, and schoolbag weight. A questionnaire was
9 used to collect socio-demographic information and potential musculoskeletal pain in three regions: back,
10 shoulders, and neck.

11 **Results:** The mean weight of children and their bags was 28.4 ± 8.2 kg and 5.2 ± 2.3 kg respectively. More
12 than 50% of schoolchildren in the two subsystems carried a schoolbag weighing more than 15% of body
13 weight. The back (38%) was the least affected area in comparison to the shoulders (58.6%) and neck (42.4%)
14 ($p < 0.001$). Carrying heavy bags and walking to school was associated with pain in the back, shoulders, and
15 neck. School-children in the French-speaking subsystem had lower risk (adjusted Odds Ratio 0.438, 95% CI =
16 0.295-0.651; $p < 0.001$) to develop a sore neck compared to peers from the English-speaking subsystem.

17 **Conclusion:** Carrying heavy schoolbags is associated to musculoskeletal pain in schoolchildren. The means
18 moving to and from school is a main risk factor of developing musculoskeletal pain. French-speaking
19 schoolchildren develop less neck pain than English-speaking schoolchildren.

20
21 **Key words:** Weight-Bearing, Musculoskeletal Pain, Primary School, Cameroon (Source: MeSH-NLM).

1 INTRODUCTION

2
3 Excessive schoolbag weight is a health problem commonly reported in pediatric age.¹ Carrying heavy school
4 bags is associated with a multitude of body biomechanical affections or disorders such as changes in sagittal
5 plane in posture and balance, spinal curvature, consistency of repositioning and musculoskeletal discomfort.²⁻⁷
6 ⁷ The particular situation of musculoskeletal pain is the basis of studies investigating the relative weight limit of
7 schoolbags which has a less impact on the imbalance of physiological and biomechanical functions.^{2-7,8}

8
9 Previous studies showed that school bags should be within acceptable limits of 10-15% of a child's body
10 weight to avoid musculoskeletal pain.^{1,8-14} Secondary school children are a target group at risk for
11 musculoskeletal pain because of the maximum development of the appendicular skeletal system that occurs
12 especially during puberty.^{15,16} Other studies conducted in the population of primary school pupils revealed
13 negative effects on the musculoskeletal system associated to heavy schoolbag carriage.^{6,17-22} In addition,
14 considering the musculoskeletal development of school-age in children, the schoolbag weight and the
15 negative consequences of heavy loads can lead to problems in the development of the spine.²³⁻²⁶ Studies
16 reported that the development of back pain in children can increase the risk of developing chronic back pains
17 in adulthood.^{27,28}

18
19 Items contributing to the weight of schoolbags include school manuals, and additional items such as afternoon
20 tea, bottles of water, sports equipment, and jackets.²⁹

21
22 Unfortunately, despite the negative consequences of carrying heavy schoolbags on the children's health,²⁻⁷ to
23 our opinion, this situation does not seem to worry parents and school officials. It is still accepted today that the
24 weight of the backpack should be further reduced in order to limit the prevalence of back pains in children;³⁰
25 and with this regard many studies have been conducted in variety of educational systems.^{1,2,6,8,9,18,20,21,29,31-33}

26
27 In Cameroon, the educational system is bilingual, and is subdivided into two sub-systems: French-speaking
28 and English-speaking. In November 2017, the Government recommended and prescribed one schoolbook per
29 subject matter instead of the multiple books per subject as it was previously. Before this Government decision,
30 the mean number of textbooks per student was 13 in Cameroon, whereas the average in Africa was 8.5.³⁴
31 One of the objectives of this prescription was to prevent health risks associated with increasing volume and
32 weight of schoolbag.

33
34 Since this Government decision, no scientific investigation in our knowledge has been carried to evaluate the
35 current impact of the weight of the schoolbag on musculoskeletal pain in Cameroon.

- 1 The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of carrying a heavy schoolbag on the musculoskeletal
- 2 pain among primary school children in the English-speaking and French-speaking educational systems of
- 3 Cameroon.

Accepted, in-press

1 **METHODS**

2 ***Study design***

3 A cross-sectional study was conducted in primary schools of the two subsystems in Yaounde, the Capital of
4 Cameroon, during the first term 2017/2018 school year.

6 ***Sampling***

7 In Cameroon, the two sub-systems (French-speaking and English-speaking) operate independently,
8 particularly on the aspect of training programs, with specific books and schedules used in each sub-system.
9 According to the authorization of the Regional Delegate of the Ministry of Basic Education, we used a non-
10 probability sampling method of convenience to investigate. In each school, one class per level of study (6
11 levels) was chosen. In order to avoid any interference, the administration of each school randomly selected
12 one class per level in the three classes that comprises each level, using the draw method from the list of
13 classes. The school administration was not informed of the purpose of the study. All school-children of both
14 sexes attending the day of collection, able to walk and wear their schoolbag independently were included in
15 the study. According to their medical informations available in the administration, school-children who were
16 diagnosed by a medical doctor as having spinal and musculoskeletal problems such as leg length
17 discrepancies were excluded.

19 ***Data collection***

20 The body weight and schoolbag weight were measured using the same Tanita BC 532 electronic scale
21 (Tokyo, Japan) placed on a flat and hard surface, calibrated before the start of data collection. The weight of
22 each participant was first measured without schoolbag, then after, carrying his schoolbag, to obtain the total
23 weight. The difference of the two weights was recorded as the schoolbag weight, and then, the schoolbag
24 weight percentage compared to body weight was determined. The height was measured using a Graduated
25 scale Mark Seca (Hamburg, Germany).

27 A questionnaire developed for the study and deriving from the Standardized Nordic Body Map Questionnaire
28 was used to collect additional information. The questionnaire was administered and each student answered, if
29 necessary with the help of the investigator. This study tool consisted of a self-administered questionnaire
30 translated in French and in English, the two official languages spoken in Cameroon. The tool was pre-tested
31 in order to simplify the language of the questions. A diagram was introduced to indicate the body parts to
32 report the pain. The questionnaire included: the mean of moving to and from school and the location of
33 musculoskeletal pain.

35 ***Data analysis***

36 Data were entered into an Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft Office 2016) before being exported to the statistical
37 analysis software StatView 5.0 for windows (SAS Institute, Inc., IL, USA). Categorical variables were
38 presented as frequency and percentage while continuous variables were presented as mean \pm standard

1 deviation (SD). The schoolbag weight as percentage of body weight (%BW) was classified into those with
2 $\leq 10\%$ BW, those with BW located from $>10\%$ to $\leq 15\%$, and those with $>15\%$ BW. The descriptive statistics
3 were used to determine the anthropometric characteristics of the participants, the number of schoolchildren in
4 each category of schoolbag weight as percentage of body weight, and the prevalence of pain symptoms in
5 different regions of the body. The unpaired Student t-test was used to compare the mean schoolbag weight
6 among schoolchildren in the two educational subsystems as well as the characteristics of the participants.

7
8 A Pearson chi square test (χ^2) was used to compare percentages of participants in different categories of
9 schoolbag weight to body weight. Multivariate logistic regression was used to identify factors associated with
10 the presence/absence of pain on different body regions (back, shoulders and neck). The outcome variable
11 was the presence of pain on the body region of interest and the independent variables (factors) included
12 gender, age, educational system, means of transport and %BW. Adjusted values of odd ratio (aOR) along
13 with their confidence interval at 95% (95%CI) and level of significance were computed. A log-transformed
14 value of likelihood was used to appraise the goodness-of-fit of each logistic regression model. Statistical
15 significance was set at p-value < 0.05 .

16 17 **Ethics Clearance**

18 The current study received the approval of the National Committee of Ethics for Scientific Research and was
19 conducted in conformity with the recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki revised in 1989. Access into
20 schools was authorized by the Regional Delegate of the Ministry of Basic Education. An informed written
21 consent form including the description of the study and its importance was distributed to school-children to
22 obtain parental consent.

1 RESULTS

2 *Characteristics of participants*

3 A total of 457 school-children (50.6% boys) were included; 202 (44.2%) from the French-speaking subsystem
4 and 255 (55.8%) from the English-speaking subsystem. The mean age, body height, body weight and body
5 max index (BMI) of participants were 8.2 (\pm 2.2) years, 132.3 (\pm 14.4) cm, 28.4 (\pm 8.2) kg and 16.1 (\pm 2.9)
6 kg/m² respectively.

7
8 No difference was found in the characteristics between boys and girls in both educational subsystems (Table
9 1).

11 *Schoolbag weight to body weight*

12 The mean schoolbag weight in the whole sample was 5.2 (\pm 2.3) kg, ranging from 1.2 kg to 14.8 kg with no
13 significant difference in the French-speaking subsystem (5.6 \pm 2.2 kg, ranging from 1.2 kg to 11.0 kg)
14 compared to the English-speaking subsystem (5.1 \pm 2.4 kg, ranging from 1.6 kg to 14.8 kg) (Table 2). The
15 majority of students in the whole population (62.30%) belonged to the category >15%, both in the French-
16 speaking (67.32%) and English-speaking subsystems (58.43%) (Table 2).

18 *Musculoskeletal pain*

19 A total of 174 (38.1%) participants reported pain at their back and 194 (42.4%) at the neck. But, 58.6% of
20 them reported having pain at the shoulders. The prevalence of pains was significantly different in the back (p
21 = 0.0091) and the neck (p = 0.0284) in the different category percentages of body weight. Self-reported pains
22 at the back, shoulders and neck across schoolbag weight related to body weight are detailed in Table 3.

24 *Risk factors*

25 In relation to risk factors, children whose schoolbag weight was >15% of their body weight were almost 4
26 times more likely to develop neck pain compared to those whose schoolbag weight was <10% of their body
27 weight (aOR = 3.56, 95% CI = 1.38 - 9.21, p = 0.008) (Table 4).

28
29 Except from the mean of moving to and from school, the other variables (Gender, age, educational system)
30 were not significantly associated, with the risk of developing localized pain at the back, shoulders and neck
31 (Table 4). Children who moved using public car transport to school were less likely to develop musculoskeletal
32 disorders at their back (aOR = 0.40, 95% CI: 0.27-0.60, p < 0. 001), shoulders (aOR = 0.48, 95% CI = 0.32-
33 0.72, p = 0.0004) and neck (aOR = 0.56, 95% CI = 0.37-0.83, p = 0.0043) compared to those walking to
34 school. Moreover, school-children who were enrolled in the French-speaking subsystem were less likely (aOR
35 = 0.44, 95% CI = 0.30-0.66, p < 0.001) to develop a sore neck compared to those in the English-speaking
36 subsystem (Table 4).

1 DISCUSSION

2 The objective of the current study was to investigate the association between schoolbag weight and
3 musculoskeletal pain among Cameroonian school-children.

4
5 We found that the average percentage of the schoolbag weight relative to the body weight of the school-
6 children was well above the recommended limits (10-15%)¹² in the two Cameroonian educational sub-
7 systems. In addition, musculoskeletal pain was common in school-children sample with a high prevalence of
8 back pain compared to the neck pain and shoulders pain. Our study showed that the average of schoolbag
9 weight in the whole population is close to what is reported by other authors.^{9,27,35} Nevertheless, this value is
10 higher than those found by Mwaka et al.¹, Dianat et al.¹⁹, and Furjuoh et al.³⁶ On the other hand, the value
11 obtained in school-children in the present study is lower than that reported by Ibrahim³¹ and Dorji et al.³⁷ This
12 disparity in schoolbag weight in these different studies could be explained by differences in curricula in each
13 country, by levels of development, and by behavioral and cultural differences between countries.

14
15 A possible reason for this increase in the average of schoolbag weight found in our study compared to the
16 norms would be the particular context of the textbook policy in Cameroon. Indeed, the Government published
17 in November 2017 a text fixing for each subject matter one textbook, but, to our observation of the educational
18 environment, there is persistent violation and non-respect of this regulation, leading to an increase the weight
19 of the schoolbag.

20
21 The percentage of the weight of the schoolbag relative to the body weight of school-children was higher in the
22 French-speaking subsystem compared to the English-speaking subsystem. Usman et al.³⁸ reported a slightly
23 higher value among school-children in Karachi, Pakistan. On the other hand, the percentage obtained in our
24 study is higher than those obtained by some authors.^{1,9,18,35} Some authors noted percentages close to the
25 recommended standard, like Al-Hazzaa³³ and Grimmer et al.³⁹

26
27 The results of our study revealed a higher proportion of school-children (67.3%) in the category > 15% of body
28 weight in the French-speaking subsystem. This observation justifies the fact that for a decade in Cameroon,
29 there was a gradual loss of interest in the French-speaking subsystem in favor of the English-speaking
30 subsystem. Indeed, the English-speaking subsystem is characterized with an earlier specialization of the
31 studies, and leads to a reduction of the number of textbooks. This result is consistent with the one generally
32 observed in many studies,^{17,19,36} thus explaining the difference in educational systems and curricula. This
33 result may also account for the low proportion of musculoskeletal symptoms in the participants of our study
34 compared to some similar studies where the percentages was generally high i.e. more than 60%.^{6,16,19,37}

35
36 The analysis of the adjusted odds ratio showed that the risk of developing musculoskeletal symptoms was
37 higher for school-children in categories >10% to ≤15% and >15% and this in the French-speaking subsystem
38 compared to the English-speaking subsystem ($p < 0.001$). There was no significant difference in gender. This

1 result justifies the governmental measures in the field of school policy that took place in November 2017 in
2 Cameroon, which prescribed a single textbook per subject. The back was the least affected zone in
3 comparison to the shoulders and neck ($p < 0.001$). This result joins the observations of Yamato et al.⁴⁰ who in
4 their review did not find an objective link between the symptoms at the back and the weight of the schoolbag.
5 According to these authors, the appearance of pain in this region is much more perceptible.

6
7 In the analysis of other factors determining the occurrence of musculoskeletal disorders, only the means
8 moving to and from school was significantly associated with the risk of developing localized pain in the back,
9 shoulders and neck ($p < 0.01$). School-children who moved to school using public car transport were less
10 likely to develop musculoskeletal symptoms.

11 **Recommendations**

12 Compliance with the Government circular on textbooks that prescribed one schoolbook per subject matter
13 instead of the multiple books by subject as it was previously is recommended.

14 **Limitations**

15
16 First, the limited sample size cannot allow a generalization of the results at National level. On the other hand,
17 the results obtained may be different if we take into account rural regions where access to the textbook is
18 limited. Second, there is also the cross-sectional nature of the study which does not allow reliable conclusions
19 on the causal link. Third, only few risk factors for musculoskeletal pain were studied. Future studies should
20 highlight the long-term effects of school bag weight on musculoskeletal pain and many other risk factors
21 should be investigated.

22 **Conclusions**

23
24 The schoolbag weight is high in the Cameroonian education system compared to international standards and
25 is associated with common musculoskeletal pain. Carrying heavy schoolbag is associated to musculoskeletal
26 pain in schoolchildren. The means moving to and from school is a main risk factor of developing
27 musculoskeletal pain. French-speaking schoolchildren develop less neck pain than English-speaking
28 schoolchildren.
29

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 1. Mwaka ES, Munabi IG, Ochieng J. Musculoskeletal pain and school bag use: a cross-sectional study
3 among Ugandan pupils. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014 Apr 9;7:222.
- 4 2. Cottalorda J, Rahmani A, Diop M, Gautheron V, Ebermeyer E, Belli A. Influence of school bag carrying on
5 gait kinetics. *J Pediatr Orthop B*. 2003 Nov;12: 357-364.
- 6 3. Chow DH, Kwok ML, Cheng JC, Lao ML, Holmes AD, Au-Yang A, Yao FY, Wong MS. The effect of
7 backpack weight on the standing posture and balance of schoolgirls with adolescent idiopathic scoliosis
8 and normal controls. *Gait & posture*. 2006 Oct;24:173-181.
- 9 4. Chow DHK, Leung KTY, Holmes AD. Changes in spinal curvature and proprioception of schoolboys
10 carrying different weights of backpack. *Ergonomics*. 2007 Dec;50:2148-2156.
- 11 5. Chow DHK, Ou ZY, Wang XG. A Lai Short-term effects of backpack load placement on spine deformation
12 and repositioning error in schoolchildren. *Ergonomics*. 2010 Jan;53:56-64.
- 13 6. Dockrell S, Simms C, Blake C. Schoolbag carriage and schoolbag-related musculoskeletal discomfort
14 among primary school children. *Appl Ergon*. 2015 Nov;51:281-90.
- 15 7. Al Shahry FS, Almahmoud HA, Alhujairy RI, Aljohi KK. Effect of school bags on body mechanics among
16 Saudi children. *Biosci Biotech Res Comm*. 2018 July-Sep;11:402-408.
- 17 8. Ministère de l'Education Nationale et Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche. Poids des
18 cartables. Circulaire N° 2008-002 du 11-01-2008, Bulletin officiel N°3 du 17 janvier 2008.
- 19 9. Muhammad Salim Khan S, Sheikh M, Inaam-ul-haq, Mariya A. Back pain and school bag use: A cross-
20 sectional study among school children in Kashmir valley. *Int J Current Advanced Res*. 2017 July;
21 06(07):4598-4602.
- 22 10. Poornajaf A, Omidi L, Khodadadi I, Rahim Nejad N, Rahmani A, Akbarzadeh A, Karchani M. Backpack
23 and related health problems among school students. *Payesh*. 2016;15(1):79-85.
- 24 11. Sahib MA. The effects of schoolbags on the health of students. *Karbala J Med*. 2016 Jun; 9(1):2301-
25 2315.
- 26 12. Brackley HM, Stevenson JM. Are children's backpack weight limits enough? A critical review of the
27 relevant literature. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2004 Oct 1;29(19):2184-2190.
- 28 13. Iyer MR. An ergonomic study of chronic musculoskeletal pain in school children. *Ind J Pediatr*. 2001 Oct;10:
29 937-941.
- 30 14. Leboeuf-Yde C, Kyvik KO, Bruun NH. Low back pain and lifestyle. Part II — Obesity. Information from a
31 population based sample of 29,424 twin subjects. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1999 Apr 15;24:779-784.
- 32 15. Shamsoddini AR, Hollisaz MT, Hafezi R. Backpack weight and musculoskeletal symptoms in secondary
33 school students, Tehran, Iran. *Iran J Public Health*. 2010;39(4):120-125.
- 34 16. Whittfield J, Legg SJ, Hedderley DI. Schoolbag weight and musculoskeletal symptoms in New Zealand
35 secondary schools. *Appl Ergon*. 2005 Mar;36:193-198.
- 36 17. Pau M, Pau M. Postural sway modifications induced by backpack carriage in primary school children: a
37 case study in Italy. *Ergonomics*. 2010 Jul;53:872-881.

- 1 18. Dianat I, JavadiVala Z, Allahverdipour H. School bag weight and the occurrence of shoulder, hand/wrist
2 and low back symptoms among Iranian elementary school-children. *Health Promot Perspect*. 2011 Jul
3 25;1:76-85.
- 4 19. Dianat I, JavadiVala Z, Asghari-Jafarabadi M, Asl Hashemi A, Haslegrave CM. The use of schoolbags and
5 musculoskeletal symptoms among primary school children: are the recommended weight limits
6 adequate? *Ergonomics*. 2013;56:79-89.
- 7 20. Al-Saleem SA, Ali A, Ali SI, Alshamrani AA, Almulhem AM, Al-Hashem MH. A Study of School Bag Weight
8 and Back Pain among Primary School Children in Al-Ahsa, Saudi Arabia. *Epidemiol (Sunnyvale)*. 2016
9 Feb;6(1):222.
- 10 21. Azabagic S, Spahic R, Pranjic N, Mulic M. Epidemiology of musculoskeletal disorders in primary school
11 children in Bosnia and herzegovina. *Mater Sociomed*. 2016 Jun;28(3):164-167.
- 12 22. Delele M, Janakiraman B, Bekele Abebe A, Tafese A, van de Water ATM. Musculoskeletal pain and
13 associated factors among Ethiopian elementary school Children. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2018 Jul
14 31;19(1):276.
- 15 23. Smith DR, Leggat PA. Back Pain in the Young: A Review of Studies Conducted Among School Children
16 and University Students. *Curr Pediatr Rev*. 2007;3(1):69-77.
- 17 24. Dockrell S, Kane C, O'keefe E. Schoolbag weight and the effects of schoolbag carriage on secondary
18 school students. *Meeting Diversity Ergon*. 2006;9:216-222.
- 19 25. Ugur C, Ali, Beyza C. Non-specific low back pain in a Turkish population based sample of school children:
20 a field survey with analysis of associated factors. *The Pain Clinic* 2006 Oct;18(4):351-360.
- 21 26. Troussier B, Davoine P, de Gaudemaris R, Fauconnier J, Phelip X. Back pain in school children: a study
22 among 1178 pupils. *Scand J Rehabil Med*. 1994 Sep;26:143-146.
- 23 27. Spiteri K, Busuttill M, Aquilina S, Gauci D, Camilleri E, Grech V. Schoolbags and back pain in children
24 between 8 and 13 years: a national study. *Br J Pain*. 2017 May;11:81-86.
- 25 28. Wirth B, Humphreys BK. Pain characteristics of adolescent spinal pain. *BMC Pediatr*. 2015 Apr
26 17;15(1):42.
- 27 29. Siambanes D, Martinez JW, Butler EW, Haider T. Influence of school backpacks on adolescent back pain.
28 *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2004 Mar-Apr;24(2):211-217.
- 29 30. Negrini S, Carabalona R, Sibilla P. Backpack as a daily load for school-children. *Lancet*. 1999 Dec
30 4;354(9194):1974.
- 31 31. Ibrahim AH. Incidence of Back Pain in Egyptian School Girls: Effect of school Bag Weight and Carrying
32 Way. *World Appl Sci J*. 2012;17:1526-1534.
- 33 32. Giusti PH, De Almeida Jr. HL, Tomasi E. Weight excess of school materials and its risks factors in South
34 Brazil. A cross sectional study. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2008 Mar;44(1):33-38.
- 35 33. Al-Hazzaa HM. School backpack. How much load do Saudi school boys carry on their shoulders? *Saudi
36 Med J*. 2006 Oct; 27(10):1567-1571.

- 1 34. Read T. Where Have All the Textbooks Gone? The Affordable and Sustainable Provision of Learning and
2 Teaching Materials in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. 2015 Jul.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0572-1>.
- 4 35. Daneshmandi H, Rahmani-Nia F, Hosseini SH. Effect of carrying school backpacks on cardio-respiratory
5 changes in adolescent students, *Sport Sci Health*. 2008 Dec;4:7-14
- 6 36. Furjuoh SN, Schuchmann JA, Lane BL. Correlates of heavy backpack use by elementary school children.
7 *Public health*. 2004 Oct;118(7):532-535
- 8 37. Dorji T, Tamang ST, Yoezer S, Wangdi K. The Weight of Schoolbags and Musculoskeletal Pain in
9 Children of Selected Schools in Thimphu, Bhutan: A Cross-sectional Study. *Int J Med Students*. 2019
10 May-Aug;7(2):29-32.
- 11 38. Usman G, Agha S, Ameen F. Effect of heavy bags, plus desks and postural variations association with
12 lower back pain in school going children. *Gonal Univ J Res*. 2014 Jun;30(1):76-83.
- 13 39. Grimmer K, Dansie B, Milanese S, Pirunsan U, Trott P. Adolescent standing postural response to
14 backpack loads: a randomized controlled experimental study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2002 Apr 17;
15 3:10.
- 16 40. Yamato TP, Maher CG, Traeger AC, Williams CM, Kamper SJ. Do schoolbags cause back pain in children
17 and adolescents? A systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2018 Oct;52(19):1241-1245.

1 **TABLES**2 **Table 1.** Sociodemographic and anthropometric characteristics of participants

Educ. Syst.	Gender	n	Age (yrs)	Height (cm)	Weight (kg)	BMI (kg/m²)
French-speaking	Boys	100	8.1±2.3	132.4±16.4	30.2±9.9	17.1±3.9
	Girls	102	7.8±2.3 ^{NS}	131.0±15.6 ^{NS}	28.4±8.8 ^{NS}	16.3±3.3 ^{NS}
English-speaking	Boys	129	8.6±2.0	133.3±12.8	28.2±6.7	15.9±1.7
	Girls	126	8.3±2.1 ^{NS}	132.2±13.3 ^{NS}	27.3±7.6 ^{NS}	15.4±2.2 ^{NS}
Total		457	8.2±2.2	132.3±14.4	28.4±8.2	16.1±2.9

3 BMI = Body mass index; Educ. Syst. = Educational system. ^{NS}= Non significant difference between boys and
4 girls.

5

1 **Table 2.** Distribution of school-children by schoolbag weight as percentage of body weight

	Educational system			p-value
	Total (n=457)	English-speaking (n=255)	French-speaking (n=202)	
SBW (kg)	Mean (\pmSD)	Mean (\pmSD)	Mean (\pmSD)	
	5.2 (\pm 2.3)	5.1 (\pm 2.4)	5.6 (\pm 2.2)	0.0282
%BW	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
$\leq 10\%$	29 (6.4)	17 (6.66)	12 (5.94)	0.8875
$>10\%$ to $\leq 15\%$	143 (31.3)	89 (34.90)	54 (26.73)	0.0769
$> 15\%$	285 (62.3)	149 (58.43)	136 (67.32)	0.064

2 SBW = Schoolbag weight ; %BW = Percentage of body weight.

3

1 **Table 3.** Prevalence of pain symptoms in different regions of the body

Regions and symptoms	Total	SBW (kg)			χ^2	p-value
		$\leq 10\%$ n (%)	$>10\%$ to $\leq 15\%$ n (%)	$> 15\%$ n (%)		
Back						
NO	283 (61.9)	18 (62.1)	105 (71.9)	160 (56.7)	9.40	0.0091
YES	174 (38.1)	11 (37.9)	41 (28.1)	122 (43.3)		
Shoulders						
NO	189 (41.4)	14 (48.3)	66 (45.2)	109 (38.7)	2.31	0.3144
YES	268 (58.6)	15 (51.7)	80 (54.8)	173 (61.3)		
Neck						
NO	263 (57.6)	23 (79.3)	87 (59.6)	153 (54.3)	7.12	0.0284
YES	194 (42.4)	06 (20.7)	59 (40.4)	129 (45.7)		

2 SBW = Schoolbag weight.

3

Table 4. Risk factors for musculoskeletal symptoms in the back, neck and shoulders

Variables	Back		Shoulders		Neck	
	aOR (CI95%)	P-value	aOR (CI95%)	P-value	aOR (CI95%)	p-value
Gender						
Girls	1		1		1	
Boys	1.02 (0.69 - 1.51)	0.927	1.19 (0.81 - 1.74)	0.381	1.35 (0.92 - 2.00)	0.128
Age (years)	1.05 (0.95 - 1.15)	0.334	0.97 (0.89 - 1.07)	0.574	1,05 (0.96 - 1.15)	0.295
%BW						
≤10	1		1		1	
>10 to ≤15	0.58 (0.24 - 1.37)	0.212	1.12 (0.49 - 2.53)	0.788	2.62 (0.98 - 6.95)	0.053
>15	1.19 (0.53 - 2.70)	0.670	1.48 (0.67 - 3.25)	0.327	3.56 (1.38 - 9.21)	0.008
Educ. Syst.						
English -speaking	1		1		1	
French-speaking	1.24 (0.83 - 1.84)	0.301	1.52 (1.03 - 2.25)	0.003	0.44 (0.30 - 0.66)	<0.001
Means of transport						
Feet	1		1		1	
Public car transport	0.40 (0.27 - 0.60)	<0.001	0.48 (0.32 - 0.72)	0.0004	0.56 (0.37 - 0.83)	0.0043

Educ. Syst. = Educational system; BW = Body weight; aOR = adjusted Odds Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval.