Original Article





Association of postural education and postural hygiene with low back pain in schoolchildren: Cross-sectional results from the PEPE study

Aina Maria Galmes-Panades[®], Pere Antoni Borràs, Josep Vidal-Conti[®]

Physical Activity and Sport Sciences Research Group (GICAFE), Institute for Educational Research and Innovation (IRIE), University of the Balearic Islands, Palma, ES-07122, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article History: Received: March 24, 2023 Accepted: May 15, 2023 ePublished: July 10, 2023

Keywords:

Low back pain, Child, Health education, Posture

*Corresponding Author: Josep Vidal-Conti, Email: josep.vidal@uib.es

Abstract

Background: Low back pain (LBP) is the leading cause of disability in the world that affects the population of all ages globally. The main aim of the present study was to analyze the cross-sectional association of postural education and postural hygiene habits with LBP, differentiating between frequency and intensity of pain.

Methods: This cross-sectional study assessed 849 students aged 10-12 years from primary schools. The study was based on four different structured and self-administered questionnaires: back pain questionnaire, Back Pain and Body Posture Evaluation Instrument (BackPEI), Frequency of Commuting to and from School Questionnaire, and the Hebacaknow questionnaire. In addition, height and weight were included to determine the body mass index (BMI).

Results: Participants with prevalence of LBP were significantly older (P=0.038), girls (P<0.001), taller (P=0.018), and practice active travelled back from school (P=0.016). Otherwise, participants with no prevalence of LBP sat correctly at the desk (P<0.001). Higher knowledge of postural education was associated with lower intensity of LBP (β =-0.07, CI=-0.12 - -0.02, P=0.004).

Conclusion: The knowledge related to postural education it is associated with less LBP. School interventions improving knowledge about postural education, ergonomics and postural hygiene are needed to address this important matter.

Introduction

Low back pain (LBP) is the leading cause of disability in the world, and it is on the rise.¹ The frequency of non-specific LBP in children under the age of 7 is quite low (1%),² however, from the age of 13, with the onset of adolescence, the values are like those of adults, with a range of lifetime prevalence from 27.3% to 74%.³

The cause of LBP is multifactorial, associated with a host of risk factors. According to Foltran et al school environment can expose children to many of them, such as inadequate furniture, heavy backpacks, or prolonged periods of sedentary postures.⁴ However, in accordance with Yamato et al there are no clear evidence that carrying a heavy backpack affects negatively to LBP.⁵ Poor posture can cause many health problems: neck tension, muscle aches, poor circulation, physical and mental stress lack of sleep and pain. To prevent the above health problems, it is important to adapt school environment to environmental needs, increase back care knowledge and correct postural hygiene.⁶ A solid understanding of those concepts helps prevent school place injuries by adjusting tools (desks, chairs, computer screen, etc) to the user, with an emphasis on suitability posture to reduce the effects of repeated movements and prolonged sitting periods.

There are many factors that increase the risk of LBP, but the vast majority are related to lifestyle habits and postural education and postural hygiene. In a recent study,⁷ variables associated with a high frequency of LBP were posture lying, daily use of tablets and cell phones and computer use. The study by de Souza Santos et al,³ identifies that backpack weight and screentime increase the intensity and frequency of LBP in children aged 6-12 years old.

According to the review of the existing literature,^{8,9} studies are needed to analyze the risk factors for LBP in children, especially in the school environment, and to promote the prevention of these risk factors, in a multifactorial manner, through physical exercise to improve physical condition, postural education and postural hygiene, among others.

Although it is true that some studies have analyzed the association between knowledge of postural habits and postural hygiene with LBP, there are limitations in this regard. Few studies have focused on the school

^{© 2023} The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

population,¹⁰ and there are important biases in some of them, for example, some studies have been carried out with small samples that make it difficult to generalize the results and have carried out very short interventions,¹¹ which make it difficult to assess the long-term effects of the intervention carried out.

There are many studies carried out in school children that study the association between the use of backpack and LBP.^{12,13} A recent systematic review and metaanalysis¹⁴ conclude that wearing a backpack induces postural changes while standing and affects gait in children and adolescents; however, almost all the changes are not related to the backpack weight. Moreover, there is no clear evidence on the effect of backpacks on LBP,¹⁵⁻¹⁷ so other factors (anatomical, physiological, or environmental) might play an important role in pain perception.¹³ Consequently, more studies are needed to analyze both the association of backpack weight and the way it is carried with LBP.

Furthermore, there may be a relationship between these two gaps in knowledge, that is, it is possible that the weight of the backpack is a mediator in the association between the type of transport to school and LBP, since although it is a healthy habit to perform an active commuting to school if during this commuting an overweight backpack is carried, it may have negative effects on LPB. For all these reasons, more studies are needed to analyze both associations separately, and the possible mediating role of the backpack's weight and the way it is carried in this association.

The main hypothesis of the present study is that high levels of knowledge of postural education, active commuting to school and better postural hygiene will be associated with less LBP, both in terms of pain frequency and intensity. The aim of the present study is to analyze the cross-sectional association between anthropometric measurements, postural education knowledge, type of commuting to school and postural hygiene habits with LBP.

Materials and Methods Participants

This cross-sectional study assessed students aged 10-12 years from primary schools (5th- and 6th-grade) from Majorca (Spain). Data collection was carried out between February and March 2021. The final sample was 849 participants, and according to the formula $S = ((z^2 x p (1$ $(-p) / e^2 / (1 + ((z^2 xp (1 - p) / e^2 N))))$, where S = sample size, N = population size, e = margin of error, z = z-value, and a reliability level of 95%, the sampling error was 3.4%. The sample was obtained from 10 primary schools, of whom 400 were boys (47.1%) and 449 were girls (52.9%), with a mean age of 11.3 (33.5% were 10 years old, 47.9% were 11 years old and 18.6% were 12 years old). The sample was selected from different clusters (schools) using convenience sampling. All schools received a letter inviting them to participate in the study and informing them about the characteristics and objectives of the study.

Selection criteria

The inclusion criteria were as follows: students must be aged between 10 and 12 years old and attending 5th or 6th grade primary school. Exclusion criteria were as follows: students whose parents or tutors did not return the informed consent form signed and those who did not participate due to illness or disability (see Figure 1).

Instruments

The study was based on four different structured and self-administered questionnaires. The language used in the questionnaires was Spanish. In addition, height and weight were included to determine the body mass index (BMI).

The data related to back pain was obtained using a validated questionnaire¹⁸ whose kappa values ranged from 0.88 to 1, and the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) values from 0.83 to 0.88. The questionnaire included lifetime prevalence, last 7-days prevalence, point



Figure 1. Flow of participants in the PEPE study

prevalence, LBP in bed or upon rising, LBP impeding usual activities, last 3-months LBP intensity (visual analogue scale ranged from 0 to 10), and also included sex and age.

The lifetime prevalence of LBP was collected through a self-reported questionnaire, with the question "Have you ever had low back pain?" Initially the response options were five: (1) never, (2) only once, (3) several times, (4) frequently, (5) almost always. To analyze the data, the lifetime prevalence of LBP variable was changed to dichotomous, unifying participants who had never experienced LBP and those who had only experienced pain once in the "No" category and unifying participants who had experienced pain several times, frequently or almost always in the "Yes" category.

Postural hygiene was assessed using the Spanish version¹⁹ of the Back Pain and Body Posture Evaluation Instrument (BackPEI),²⁰ a self-report questionnaire designed to evaluate back pain and its associated risk factors in school-age children. In the validation study, the kappa coefficient for questions 1–20 in the questionnaire, 5 were classified as "very good", 8 as "good", 1 as "moderate", and 1 as "fair", and the ICC was 0.951.

The data included sitting position when writing, sitting position on a chair when talking, sitting position when using a computer, and position adopted when lifting an object from the floor. BackPEI was scored according to the general scoring system to BackPEI.²¹ Each item was coded as 0 = incorrect and 1 = correct. A sum score was computed from the 6 items, namely, the daily postural habits score (range from 0 to 6), so that the higher the score the healthier daily habits related to LBP.

Variables related to commuting to school, as mode of commuting from and to school, and self-report time from home to school were assessed using the Frequency of Commuting to and from School Questionnaire,²² a selfreported questionnaire designed to assess this behavior in Spanish youths. there were two questions: (1) the usual mode of commuting to school, (2) the usual mode of commuting from school. Each question provided these answers: walk, cycle, car, motorcycle, bus or other (in this case, the mode was required), and subsequently were grouped into active commuting, motorized commuting and mixed commuting. The time from home to school and from school to home were reported for each participant in the questionnaire. The response options were less than 10 minutes, between 10 and 20 minutes, more than 20 minutes.

The Hebacaknow questionnaire²³ was used to assess the knowledge level of postural education. In the validation study, the Cronbach's alpha for the 24 items was 0.82, and the ICC was 0.76 for the total score. The resulting 24 multiple choice items were associated with one of the following categories according to conceptual knowledge: topographical-anatomical knowledge; functional-anatomical knowledge; habits in standing posture; or seated; or lying; habits in carrying heavy objects in a

backpack; and how to move heavy loads. The score for each item was 0 (wrong option) or 1 (correct option). The scores for each category and for the total questionnaire were obtained computing the mean value of the items involved.

Procedure

The questionnaires were administered at school or home. Teachers gave away the questionnaires at the school's classroom using laptops or provided families with the guide to fill it. The questionnaires were available on Google Forms. All participants (students, teachers, and parents) were informed about the purpose of the study and its procedure. Moreover, students' parents or tutors were requested to give their consent for children to participate in the study.

Statistical analysis

Participants were classified in two categories, depending of the presence or absence of LBP. First category included participants with prevalence of LBP (Yes), and the second category those participants without LBP (No). Descriptive characteristics were summarized as means and standard deviations (SDs) or as numbers and percentages (%). One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi-square test (χ^2) were used to assess differences across groups of presence of LBP for continuous and categorical variables respectively. Multivariate linear regression analyses were used to estimate the β -coefficients and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the associations between intensity of LBP (outcome variable) and weight, height, BMI, knowledge of postural education, types and duration of commuting to school and postural hygiene (exposure variables). Our models were adjusted by the minimally sufficient adjustment set for estimating the total effect of postural education and postural hygiene on LBP, determined using directed acyclic graphs implemented in DAGitty software²⁴ available free on http://www.dagitty. net. Therefore, our main models were adjusted for age, sex and school (see Figure 2). Logistic regression models were used to assess the association between categories of pain frequency (ever, in the las 7 days, today and in bed), consequences of pain (daily restrictions) and knowledge of postural education with types and duration of commuting to school and postural hygiene. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis under covariables was used to assess the accuracy of postural hygiene and types of commuting to school for prediction of LBP intensity, consequences of pain, and knowledge of postural education.

Sensitivity analyses were also conducted, adjusting all statistical analysis for: age, sex, school and BMI. Statistical analyses were performed using Stata v13.0 program. P values < 0.05 were deemed as statistically significant.

Results

Table 1 presents a comparison of participants'

characteristics among the two categories of prevalence of LBP. Participants with prevalence of LBP were significantly older, girls, taller, and practice active travelled to school. Otherwise, participants with no prevalence of LBP sat correctly at the desk (P < 0.001). Table S1 (Supplementary file 1) presents a comparison of participants' characteristics among the two categories of prevalence of LBP in the last 7 days. In line with results of



Figure 2. Directed acyclic graphs. Figure legend: The total unconfounded effect of postural education and postural hygiene on Low back Pain, drawn and analysed using DAGitty (http://www.dagitty.net/). The minimal sufficient adjustment sets for estimating the total effect of postural education and postural hygiene on low back pain was age, sex and school. Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index

		Life-time prevalence	ce of low back pain	
-	Total n	Yes	No	<i>P</i> value
Age, years	797	11.3 (0.69)	11.2 (0.67)	0.038
Gender	837			< 0.001
Women, n (%)	443 (52.9)	231 (59.8)	212 (47.0)	
Men, n (%)	394 (47.1)	155 (40.2)	239 (53.0)	
Anthropometric measures				
Weight (kg)	770	43.0 (10.4)	41.6 (9.24)	0.051
Height (cm)	749	151 (9.19)	149 (8.70)	0.018
BMI (kg/m ²)	708	19.9 (3.61)	18.7 (3.56)	0.392
Knowledge of postural education				
Knowledge, score (0-24)	837	9.68 (3.86)	9.65 (3.85)	0.908
Types of commuting to school				
To go to school	837			0.399
Active commuting, n (%)	389 (46.5)	187 (48.5)	202 (44.8)	
Motorised commuting, n (%)	415 (49.6)	182 (47.2)	233 (51.7)	
Mixed commuting, n (%)	33 (3.94)	17 (4.40)	16 (3.55)	
To come back from school	837			0.016
Active commuting, n (%)	401 (47.9)	195 (50.5)	206 (45.7)	
Motorised commuting, n (%)	400 (47.8)	168 (43.5)	232 (51.4)	
Mixed commuting, n (%)	36 (4.3)	23 (5.96)	13 (2.88)	
Duration of commuting	837			0.746
Less than 10 minutes, n (%)	546 (65.2)	252 (65.3)	294 (65.2)	
Between 10 and 20 minutes, n (%)	256 (30.6)	120 (31.1)	136 (30.2)	
More than 20 minutes, n (%)	35 (4.18)	14 (3.63)	21 (4.66)	
Postural hygiene				
Sitting at a desk, correct, n (%)	173 (20.7)	56 (14.5)	117 (25.9)	< 0.001
Sitting in a chair, correct, n (%)	142 (17.0)	64 (16.6)	78 (17.3)	0.784
Sitting in front of a computer, correct, n (%)	328 (39.2)	147 (38.1)	181 (40.1)	0.545
Picking up an object, correct, n (%)	208 (24.9)	102 (26.4)	106 (23.5)	0.330

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the study population across categories of frequency of Life-time prevalence of low back pain

Abbreviations: BMI; body mass index.

Data shown is mean (standard deviation), unless otherwise specified.

Table 1, participants with prevalence of LBP in the last 7 days were girls and sat incorrectly at the desk (P < 0.05).

Table 2 shows the β -coefficients (95% CIs) for the associations between intensity of LBP and anthropometric measures and knowledge of postural education. Higher knowledge of postural education was associated with lower intensity of LBP (β =-0.07, CI=-0.12 - -0.02, P=0.004). No significant associations were found with weight, height and BMI.

Table 3 shows the β -coefficients (95% CIs) for the associations between intensity of LBP in continuous and types and duration of commuting to school and postural hygiene by categories. No statistically significant associations were found.

Table 4 shows the odds ratios for types and duration of commuting to school and postural hygiene by categories of pain frequency, consequences of pain and knowledge of postural education. Sitting correctly at a desk was significantly associated with no LBP ever (OR=1.98, CI=1.37-2.86, P<0.001), nor in the last 7 days (OR=1.70, CI=1.06-2.73, P=0.028). In addition, to come back from school actively and picking up correctly an object were associated with increased knowledge of postural education (OR=0.52, CI=0.34-0.81, P=0.004 and OR=0.58, CI=0.35-0.94, P=0.027, respectively).

Table 5 shows the AUC - area under ROC curve, for different postural education and hygiene for elevated LBP risk. Sitting correctly at a desk was significantly associated with no LBP (AUC=0.56, CI=0.52-0.60, P=0.004). Active commuting to school was border associated with higher knowledge of postural education (P=0.051).

The results were relatively consistent when linear and logistic regression analyses were further-adjusted for BMI.

Discussion

Although there are many studies that link LBP with knowledge related to health and specifically with back health, there is very little literature related to the knowledge and health habits of children and adolescents and their relationship with LBP.²⁵ The present study analyses the association between BMI, postural hygiene, type of commuting to and from school (motorized vs active), and the degree of knowledge of postural education, with LBP prevalence, intensity and frequency in children aged 10 to 12 years. The aim is to provide information that will help future intervention protocols.

Results from the present study are consistent with previous research, where LBP being more prevalent in girls, taller schoolchildren, older schoolchildren, and those who sit poorly at the desk.²⁶ However, according to the present results, schoolchildren who travelled using motorized transport had lower levels of LBP.²⁷ Although not analyzed in the present study, the greater presence of LBP in those schoolchildren who walk to school could be related to carrying backpacks for longer periods of time, bearing in mind that it is common for backpacks to

 Table 2. Associations of anthropometric measures and postural education

 knowledge with intensity of low back pain

Exposures	Outcome pain, cont	(intensity of low back inuous)	P value
Anthropometric measures			
Maight (kg)	Model 1	-0.004; (-0.023; 0.015)	0.651
weight (kg)	Model 2	-0.034; (-0.073; 0.004)	0.085
Unight (and)	Model 1	-0.019; (-0.041; 0.004)	0.099
Height (Cm)	Model 2	-0.018; (-0.040; 0.005)	0.121
$\mathbf{P} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{I} \left(l_{12} / m^2 \right)$	Model 1	0.023; (-0.031; 0.077)	0.396
Divit (kg/tit-)	Model 2		
Knowledge of postural education			
Knowledge score (1.24)	Model 1	-0.070; (-0.117; -0.022)	0.004
Knowledge, score (1-24)	Model 2	-0.039; (-0.090; 0.011)	0.125

Values shown are β (95% CI). Abbreviations: BMI; Model 1, adjusted for: age, sex and school; model 2, adjusted for: age, sex, school and BMI. Sample included in the analysis, n = 551. The values 0 have been eliminated, with the aim of analysing what may be associated with greater back pain, in cases in which back pain already exists.

Table 3. Associations of types of commuting to schools and postural hygiene with intensity of low back pain

Exposures	Outcome (Intensity of low back pain, continuous)	P for trend
Types of commuting to school		
To go to school		0.391
Active commuting	0 (Ref.)	
Motorised commuting	-0.08 (-0.46;0.29)	
Mixed commuting	-0.40 (-0.46;0.29)	
To come back from school		0.782
Active commuting	0 (Ref.)	
Motorised commuting	-0.16 (-0.53;0.21)	
Mixed commuting	0.20 (-0.59;0.99)	
Duration of commuting		0.738
Less than 10 minutes	0 (Ref.)	
Between 10 and 20 minutes	0.02 (-0.35;0.40)	
More than 20 minutes	0.20 (-0.70;1.10)	
Postural hygiene		
Sitting at a desk, incorrect	0 (Ref.)	
Sitting at a desk, correct	0.11 (-0.34;0.56)	0.627
Sitting in a chair, incorrect	0 (Ref.)	
Sitting in a chair, correct	-0.06 (-0.51;0.39)	0.799
Sitting in front of a computer, incorrect	0 (Ref.)	
Sitting in front of a computer, correct	-0.01 (-0.36;0.35)	0.967
Picking up an object, incorrect	0 (Ref.)	
Picking up an object, correct	-0.09 (-0.48;0.31)	0.661

Values shown are β (95% Cl). Model 1, adjusted for: age, sex, and school. Sample included in the analysis, n=551. The values 0 have been eliminated, with the aim of analysing what may be associated with greater back pain, in cases in which back pain already exists.

Harding controls Enh models E	ExposuresLBP ever (no) $P \text{ for trend days (no)} \text{ trend days (no)} trong to school active0.94 (0.69; 1.28) 0.683 1.07 (0.57; 0.59; 0.89; 0.61; 0.89; 0.61; 0.89; 0.61; 0.93; 0.57; 0.92; 0.68; 1.45; 0.97; 0.90; 0.120; 0.56; 0.59; 0.55; 0.55; 0.52; 0.55; 0.52; 0.55; 0.55; 0.52; 0.55; 0.52; 0.55; 0.52; 0.55; 0.52; 0.52; 0.52; 0.55; 0.52; 0.55; 0.$	LBP in the last 7 days (no) 1.07 (0.74; 1.55) 0.89 (0.61; 1.28) 0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) njusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable the din two categories, an and hygiene accord	Pain freq P for P for trend 0.716 0.716 0.519 0.237 0.240 0.131 0.240 0.240 d school. muting, the first follow the first follow	Iuency LBP today (no) 1.04 (0.63; 1.73) 1.12 (0.68; 1.86) 0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.75; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; 1 values shown corrected to the stown corrected to be t	P for trend 0.880 0.654 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.965 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 9 (reference	LBP in bed (no) 1.22 (0.78; 1:90) 1.02 (0.66; 1.58) 1.02 (0.66; 1.58) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 1.17 (0.77; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables categramore than 10 minute shown correspond tte s category) and the s	P for P for trend 1 0.388 1 0.923 1 0.432 1 0.432 1 0.461 1 0.336 1 0.461 1 0.461 1 0.545 1 0.546 1 0.546 1 0.546 1 0.546 1 0.546 1 0.546 1 0.546 1 0.546	Consequences LBP daily LBP daily restrictions 3 0.99 (0.72; 1.32) 4 0.96 (0.70; 1.32) 5 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 6 0.06 (0.70; 1.29) 7 1.116 (0.80; 1.70) 8 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 9 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 9 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 9 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 9 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 9 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.24) 1 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 1 1 1 1	of pain P for trend P for 200 P for 200 <td< th=""><th>knowledge of postur: Knowledge, score (0-24) (0-24) 0.68 (0.44; 1.06) 0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the vidence categories wown).</th><th>education <i>P</i> for trend 0.091 0.094 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.390 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the</th></td<>	knowledge of postur: Knowledge, score (0-24) (0-24) 0.68 (0.44; 1.06) 0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the vidence categories wown).	education <i>P</i> for trend 0.091 0.094 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.390 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the
	LBP ever (no) p for trend days (no) Commuting to school 0.94 (0.69; 1.28) 0.683 1.07 (0.74; To come back from school actively 0.75 (0.55; 1.02) 0.89 (0.61; To come back from school actively 0.75 (0.55; 1.02) 0.89 (0.61; Duration of commuting 0.92 (0.68; 1.25) 0.580 0.89 (0.61; Postural hygiene 0.99 (0.68; 1.25) 0.590 0.87 (0.59; Sitting correctly at a desk 1.98 (1.37; 2.86) <0.001 1.70 (1.06; Sitting correctly at a desk 1.98 (1.37; 2.86) <0.001 1.70 (1.06; Sitting correctly at a desk 1.02 (0.76; 1.37) 0.977 1.46 (0.87) Sitting correctly an object 0.85 (0.61; 1.18) 0.334 0.87 (0.59) Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for ag correspond to active commuting. reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two correspond to active commuting. reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two correspond to active correct postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two correspond to active the correct postures for postural education and hygie Table 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis f	LBP in the last 7 days (no) 1.07 (0.74; 1.55) 0.89 (0.61; 1.28) 0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) insted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable need in two categories, an and hygiene accord	P for trend 0.716 0.519 0.297 0.297 0.213 0.240 0.131 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.491 nd school. / muting, the es categori2, the first follow ing to low	LBP today (no) 1.04 (0.63; 1.73) 1.12 (0.68; 1.86) 0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.20 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; I Abbreviations: LBP; I ration – Outcomes: a ration	P for trend 0.880 0.881 0.882 0.883 0.883 0.883 0.883 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.873 0.9873 0.9873 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 9 (reference	LBP in bed (no) 1.22 (0.78; 1.90) 1.22 (0.66; 1.58) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables category and the shown correspond the second sec	P for trend trend 0.388 0.388 0.9238 0.9238 0.9238 0.9238 0.9238 0.9238 0.9238 0.9388 0.9088 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388 0.9388	LBP daily restrictions restrictions 3 0.99 (0.72; 1.32) 4 0.96 (0.70; 1.32) 9 1.21 (0.80; 1.67) 9 1.21 (0.80; 1.70) 9 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 1 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 2 0.99 (0.77; 1.29) 3 0.99 (0.76; 1.29) 5 0.99 (0.77); 1.40 5 0.99 (0.77); 1.40 7 0.99 (0.77); 1.40 7 0.99 (0.77); 1.40 8 category was less t tand no impediments r 1 0.99 (0.77); 1.40	P for trend 0.971 0.0.821 0.0.247 0.0.247 0.0.37 0.0.449 0.0.349 0.0349 0.0349 0.01 and coland colon and coland coland coland colon and coland c	Knowledge, score (0-24) (0-24) (0-24) (0.52 (0.34; 0.81) (0.52 (0.34; 0.81) (1.28 (0.85; 1.94) (1.19 (0.87; 1.91) (1.19 (0.80; 1.77) (1.19 (0.80; 1.77) (0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w	P for trend 0.091 0.094 0.240 0.480 0.165 0.165 0.390 0.390 0.27 alues shown ariables, the presence
	Commuting to school 0.94 (0.69; 1.28) 0.683 1.07 (0.74) To go to school active 0.94 (0.69; 1.28) 0.683 1.07 (0.74) To come back from school actively 0.75 (0.55; 1.02) 0.066 0.89 (0.61) Duration of commuting 0.92 (0.68; 1.25) 0.580 0.82 (0.57) Postural hygiene 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.76 (1.06) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.89) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.87) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.87) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.87) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.87) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.990 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.87) Sitting correctly in a chair 0.901 (0.66; 1.137) 0.902 1.24 (0.87) Sitting correctly an object 0.85 (0.61; 1.18) 0.334 0.87 (0.59) Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for ag correspond to active commuting, reference category was incorrect postures of pain a	1.07 (0.74; 1.55) 0.89 (0.61; 1.28) 0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) jlusted for age, sex, article ding: Duration of com tring. Duration of com tring. Duration of com the in two categories.	0.716 0.519 0.297 0.28 0.131 0.131 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 in the first foi	1.04 (0.63; 1.73) 1.12 (0.68; 1.86) 0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.26 (0.75; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; 1 Abbreviations: LBP; 1 rvalues between 0-9 stron – Outcomes: 1 stron – Outcomes:	0.880 0.654 0.873 0.811 0.811 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.395 0.995 0.995 0.965 0.995 0.975 0.995 9 (reference	1.22 (0.78; 1.90) 1.02 (0.66; 1.58) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables categrame and the state of the shown correspond the state state of the state state state state of the state state of the state state state state of the state st	0.388 0.388 0.223 0.209 0.709 0.709 0.245 0.0.336 0.0.336 0.0.336 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.565 0.0.536 0.0.0.536 0.0.556 0.0.556 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.5666 0.0.56666 0.0.56666 0.0.566666666 0.0.56666666666	 0.99 (0.72; 1.37) 0.96 (0.70; 1.32) 1.21 (0.88; 1.67) 1.21 (0.80; 1.67) 1.16 (0.80; 1.46) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 5 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch tad no impediments r values between 10-2. 	 0.971 0.821 0.821 0.247 0.247 0.247 0.247 0.41 0.949 0.737 0.949 0.737 0.949 0.737 0.949 0.749 0.749 0.749 0.747 0.747 0.747 0.747 0.747 0.747 0.747 0.747 0.949 <l< th=""><th>0.68 (0.44; 1.06) 0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w</th><th>0.091 0.004 0.240 0.480 0.480 0.165 0.390 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the</th></l<>	0.68 (0.44; 1.06) 0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w	0.091 0.004 0.240 0.480 0.480 0.165 0.390 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the
Top is bolication 0540.04.128 0.643 117.04.64.128 0.644 10.01.64.128 0.634 10.01.64.123 0.634 10.01.64.123 0.634 10.01.64.123 0.634 10.01.64.123 0.634 0.631 </td <td>To go to school active0.94 (0.69; 1.28)$0.683$$1.07$ (0.74,To come back from school actively0.75 (0.55; 1.02)$0.066$$0.89$ (0.61,Duration of commuting0.92 (0.68; 1.25)$0.580$$0.82$ (0.57,Postural hygiene0.92 (0.68; 1.25)0.92 (0.68; 1.25)$0.100$$1.70$ (1.06,Sitting correctly at a desk1.98 (1.37; 2.86)$0.977$$1.46$ (0.89,Sitting correctly in a chair0.99 (0.68; 1.45)$0.977$$1.46$ (0.87,Sitting correctly in front of a computer1.02 (0.76; 1.37)$0.902$$1.24$ (0.87,Picking up correctly an object0.85 (0.61; 1.18)$0.334$$0.87$ (0.59)Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for a correspond to active commuting, reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two cTable 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygieExposures</td> <td>1.07 (0.74; 1.55) 0.89 (0.61; 1.28) 0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) Jjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable tet in two categories, an and hygiene accord</td> <td>0.716 0.519 0.297 0.28 0.131 0.131 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 in crosol. <i>i</i> muting, the escategoriz , the first foi</td> <td>1.04 (0.63; 1.73) 1.12 (0.68; 1.86) 0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.26 (0.75; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; 1 values shown corre artion – Outcomes: ¹ r values between 0.4</td> <td>0.880 0.654 0.873 0.811 0.811 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 9 (reference</td> <td>1.22 (0.78; 1.90) 1.02 (0.66; 1.58) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.25 (0.72; 2.16) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables categr more than 10 minute shown correspond the s</td> <td>0.388 0.923 0.709 0.709 0.709 0.709 0.709 0.703 0.0.461 0.0.461 0.0.461 0.0.545 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.55555 0.0.555555 0.0.55555555</td> <td> 0.99 (0.72; 1.37) 0.96 (0.70; 1.32) 1.21 (0.88; 1.67) 1.21 (0.80; 1.70) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) Exposures: Go to sch Exposures: Go to sch e category was less t and no impediments r values between 10-2. </td> <td> 0.971 0.821 0.8247 0.247 0.247 0.241 0.941 0.737 0.737 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 4 (values s) </td> <td>0.68 (0.44; 1.06) 0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.80; 1.77) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w</td> <td>0.091 0.004 0.240 0.240 0.480 0.165 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence</td>	To go to school active 0.94 (0.69 ; 1.28) 0.683 1.07 (0.74 ,To come back from school actively 0.75 (0.55 ; 1.02) 0.066 0.89 (0.61 ,Duration of commuting 0.92 (0.68 ; 1.25) 0.580 0.82 (0.57 ,Postural hygiene 0.92 (0.68 ; 1.25) 0.92 (0.68 ; 1.25) 0.100 1.70 (1.06 ,Sitting correctly at a desk 1.98 (1.37 ; 2.86) 0.977 1.46 (0.89 ,Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68 ; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.87 ,Sitting correctly in front of a computer 1.02 (0.76 ; 1.37) 0.902 1.24 (0.87 ,Picking up correctly an object 0.85 (0.61 ; 1.18) 0.334 0.87 (0.59)Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for a correspond to active commuting, reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two cTable 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygieExposures	1.07 (0.74; 1.55) 0.89 (0.61; 1.28) 0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) Jjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable tet in two categories, an and hygiene accord	0.716 0.519 0.297 0.28 0.131 0.131 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 in crosol. <i>i</i> muting, the escategoriz , the first foi	1.04 (0.63; 1.73) 1.12 (0.68; 1.86) 0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.26 (0.75; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; 1 values shown corre artion – Outcomes: ¹ r values between 0.4	0.880 0.654 0.873 0.811 0.811 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 0.995 9 (reference	1.22 (0.78; 1.90) 1.02 (0.66; 1.58) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.25 (0.72; 2.16) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables categr more than 10 minute shown correspond the s	0.388 0.923 0.709 0.709 0.709 0.709 0.709 0.703 0.0.461 0.0.461 0.0.461 0.0.545 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.5555 0.0.55555 0.0.555555 0.0.55555555	 0.99 (0.72; 1.37) 0.96 (0.70; 1.32) 1.21 (0.88; 1.67) 1.21 (0.80; 1.70) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) Exposures: Go to sch Exposures: Go to sch e category was less t and no impediments r values between 10-2. 	 0.971 0.821 0.8247 0.247 0.247 0.241 0.941 0.737 0.737 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 4 (values s) 	0.68 (0.44; 1.06) 0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.80; 1.77) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w	0.091 0.004 0.240 0.240 0.480 0.165 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	To come back from school actively 0.75 (0.55 ; 1.02) 0.066 0.89 (0.61 ; Duration of commuting 0.92 (0.68 ; 1.25) 0.580 0.82 (0.57 ; Postural hygiene 1.98 (1.37 ; 2.86) < 0.001 1.70 (1.06 ; Sitting correctly at a desk 1.98 (1.37 ; 2.86) < 0.077 1.46 (0.89 ; Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68 ; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.89 ; Sitting correctly an object 0.85 (0.61 ; 1.137) 0.902 1.24 (0.87 ; Picking up correctly an object 0.85 (0.61 ; 1.137) 0.334 0.87 (0.59) Picking up correctly an object 0.85 (0.61 ; 1.11) 0.334 0.87 (0.59) respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two correspond to active commuting. Teference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two corresponds are a under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygien Exposures .	0.89 (0.61; 1.28) 0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) jlusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable need in two categories, an and hygiene accord	0.519 0.297 0.288 0.131 0.131 0.131 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 ind school. <i>i</i> muting the esc categoriz the first follow	1.12 (0.68; 1.86) 0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP, I Abbreviations: LBP, I ration – Outcomes: ration – Outc	0.654 0.873 0.811 0.811 0.363 0.363 0.363 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.955 0.873	1.02 (0.66; 1.58) 1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.25 (0.72; 2.16) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) <u>0.87 (0.54; 1.38)</u> ain. Variables catego note than 10 minute shown correspond the s shown correspond the s	0.923 0.709 0.709 0.461 0.461 0.0.332 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.709	 0.96 (0.70; 1.32) 1.21 (0.88; 1.67) 1.21 (0.80; 1.67) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.99 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch e category was less t and no impediments r values between 10-2. 	 0.821 0.247 0.247 0.247 0.247 0.41 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 10 mit column to mit columnto mit column to mit column to mit column to mit columnto mit	0.52 (0.34; 0.81) 1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w	0.004 0.240 0.480 0.165 0.390 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Duration of commuting 0.92 (0.68; 1.25) 0.580 0.82 (0.57) Postural hygiene 1.98 (1.37; 2.86) <0.001	0.82 (0.57; 1.19) 1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) Jjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variabl nted in two categories an and hygiene accord	0.297 0.028 0.131 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 0.240 ind school. <i>i</i> muting, the escategoriz , the first foi	0.96 (0.57; 1.60) 0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; 1 Abbreviations: LBP; 1 arolues between 0-9 r values between 0-9	0.873 0.811 0.233 0.363 0.363 0.995 0.995 0.995 iow back pi sepond to r The values 9 (reference	1.09 (0.70; 1.69) 1.25 (0.72; 2.16) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables catego more than 10 minute shown correspond the s	0.709 0.432 0.432 0.0.461 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.00 0.0.545 0.0.000 0.0.000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.00000 0.00000 0.000000	 1.21 (0.88; 1.67) 1.21 (0.88; 1.67) 1.16 (0.80; 1.70) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Co to sch Exposures: Co to sch and no impediments r values between 10-2.) 0.247 0.427) 0.427) 0.337) 0.737) 0.949 ool and co han 10 mic han 10 mic han 10 mic han 10 mic han shues sh	1.28 (0.85; 1.94) 1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the- utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w town).	0.240 0.480 0.165 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
Monology and space of the probability of the probabil	Postural hygiene Sitting correctly at a desk 1.98 (1.37; 2.86) <0.001	1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) Jjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable ted in two categories, an and hygiene accord	0.028 0.131 0.240 0.491 d school. <i>A</i> muting, the es categoriz the first fol	0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; 1 e values shown corre zation – Outcomes: ¹ r values between 0-9	0.811 0.233 0.363 0.995 0.995 0.995 iow back pi iow back pi iow back pi iow back pi or the values 9 (reference	1.25 (0.72; 2.16) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables catege nore than 10 minute shown correspond the s	0.432 0.338 0.461 0.0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.545 0.0.555 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.545 0.0.555 0.0.555 0.0.555 0.0.555 0.0.5550 0.0.55500000000	 1.16 (0.80; 1.70) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.95 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch Exposures: Go to sch ec category was less t' and no impediments r values between 10-2. 	 0.427 0.941 0.941 0.737 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 0.949 4 (values sł 	1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene utes. Postural hygiene v reference categories w	0.480 0.165 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
Single concely as defc 198 1.17 2.000 1.01 1.01 1.02 0.23 0.33 1.33 0.32 0.33 0.3	Sitting correctly at a desk 1.98 (1.37; 2.86) <0.001	1.70 (1.06; 2.73) 1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) jlusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com trect postures. Variable nted in two categories, an and hygiene accord	0.028 0.131 0.240 0.240 $\frac{1}{10}$ escategoriz, the first foi	0.93 (0.50; 1.71) 1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) <u>Abbreviations: LBP, 1</u> <u>Abbreviations: LBP, 1</u> ration – Outcomesi ration – Outcomesi ration – Outcomesi ration – Outcomesi pack pain	0.811 0.233 0.363 0.395 0.995 0.095 0.095 0.00 back pii iow back pii iow calues 9 (reference	1.25 (0.72; 2.16) 1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) <u>0.87 (0.54; 1.38)</u> ain. Variables catege nore than 10 minute shown correspond the s shown correspond the s e category) and the s	0.432 0.338 0.361 0.661 0.545 0.545 0.545 srization – srization – sr reference second for	1.16 (0.80; 1.70) 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.95 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch ze category was less th and no impediments r values between 10-2.	 0.427 0.941 0.737 0.737 0.749 0.049 001 and co han 10 mit han 10 mit espectively 4 (values sl 	1.19 (0.74; 1.91) 1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene treference categories w iown).	0.480 0.165 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
Sing correctly in object. 0.99 (0.06; 1.4) 0.97 1.46 (0.07; 2.30) 0.031 1.33 (0.75, 2.30) 0.031 1.33 (0.75, 2.30) 0.031 1.42 (0.87; 2.30) 0.031 0.130 0.991 (0.61, 1.40) 0.941 1.42 (0.87; 2.30) 0.031 0.030 Pring agreemethy in force of company 0.68 (0.61, 1.18) 0.34 0.793 1.90 (0.71, 1.0) 0.991 0.491 1.42 (0.87; 2.30) 0.031 Oth a disage accompliation for company 0.68 (0.61, 1.18) 0.34 0.793 1.90 (0.71) 0.991 0.703 0.901 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.701 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703 0.700 0.703	Sitting correctly in a chair 0.99 (0.68; 1.45) 0.977 1.46 (0.89; Sitting correctly in front of a computer 1.02 (0.76; 1.37) 0.902 1.24 (0.87; Picking up correctly an object 0.85 (0.61; 1.18) 0.334 0.87 (0.59). Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for a correspond to active commuting, reference category was inactive commuting. Duratio values shown correspond to correct postures, reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two c Table 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygier Exposures .	1.46 (0.89; 2.38) 1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) jjusted for age, sex, ar trect for age, sex, ar rect postures. Variable tred in two categories an and hygiene accord	0.131 0.240 0.491 <u>0.491</u> <u>d school.</u> A muting, the sc categorie , the first foi , the first foi	1.53 (0.76; 3.10) 1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Mbhreviations: LBP; 1 values shown corre ation – Outcomes: 1 r values between 0-9 r values between 0-9	0.233 0.363 0.995 0.995 0.00 back pi sepond to n The values : 9 (reference	1.33 (0.74; 2.40) 1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) <u>ain. Variables catege</u> nore than 10 minute shown correspond the s	0.338 0.461 0.545 0.545 0.545 10.555 10.5555 10.5555 10.5555 10.5555 10.5555 10.5555 10.5555	 0.99 (0.66; 1.46) 0.95 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch Exposures: Go to sch and no impediments r values between 10-2.) 0.941) 0.737) 0.749 <u>ool and co</u> han 10 mir espectively 4 (values sł	1.42 (0.87; 2.34) 1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene teference categories w iown).	0.165 0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
Bing correctly in four (a) a compute 120 (b) (51, 13) 0.001 124 (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) (b) 0.031 0.0134	Sitting correctly in front of a computer 1.02 (0.76; 1.37) 0.902 1.24 (0.87; Picking up correctly an object 0.85 (0.61; 1.18) 0.334 0.87 (0.59; Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for ag correspond to active commuting. reference category was inactive commuting. Duratio values shown correspond to correct postures, reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two c Table 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygier Exposures .	1.24 (0.87; 1.78) 0.87 (0.59; 1.29) jjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com treet postures. Variable need in two categories, an and hygiene accord	0.240 0.491 nd school. A muting, the es categoriz , the first fou ding to low	1.26 (0.76; 2.10) 1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; I values shown corre zation – Outcomes: 1 r values between 0-f back pain	0.363 0.995 ow back pi sepond to n The values : 9 (reference	1.17 (0.77; 1.80) 0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables catege nore than 10 minute shown correspond tt e category) and the s	0.461 0.545 0.555	0.95 (0.70; 1.29) 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch- ce category was less th and no impediments r values between 10-2.) 0.737) 0.949 ool and co han 10 mit espectively 4 (values sh	1.19 (0.80; 1.77) 0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the v utes. Postural hygiene , reference categories w iown).	0.390 0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Picking up correctly an object 0.85 (0.61; 1.18) 0.334 0.87 (0.59; Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for ag correspond to active commuting, reference category was inactive commuting. Duratio values shown correspond to correct postures, reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two c Table 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygie Exposures	0.87 (0.59; 1.29) iJjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variabl ited in two categories an and hygiene accord	0.491 Id school. A muting, the es categoriz , the first foi	1.00 (0.57; 1.75) Abbreviations: LBP; I. Aulues shown corre- ration – Outcomes: I r values between 0-9 back pain	0.995 ow back på spond to n The values : 9 (reference	0.87 (0.54; 1.38) ain. Variables categor nore than 10 minute shown correspond the shown correspond the s category) and the s	0.545 nrization – .s. referenc o no pain é iecond for	i 0.99 (0.70; 1.40) Exposures: Go to sch e category was less th and no impediments r values between 10-2.	0.949 ool and coi han 10 mir espectively 4 (values sh	0.58 (0.35; 0.94) me back to school, the v utes. Postural hygiene , reference categories w iown).	0.027 alues shown ariables, the ere presence
odda active current early on standard corrent journal of correnting in a values above orrespond to non-tandard the scond for values featured singly are already and the scond for values featured singly are already and the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from it. <i>Parturely pagree analysis</i> the transfeatured angore value show correspond to non-tang of the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from it. <i>Parturely pagree analysis</i> the transfeatured angore value show correspond to non-tang of the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from it. <i>Parturely pagree analysis</i> the transfeatured angover values the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from it. <i>Parturely pagree analysis</i> the transfeatured argore value show correspond to non-tang of the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from it. <i>Parturely pagree analysis</i> the transfeatured argore value show correspond to non-tang of the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from it. <i>Parturely pagree analysis</i> the transfeatured argore value show correspond to non-tang of the scond for values between 0.24 tvalues from transfeatured duration to parture duration transfeatured argore scond score score and transfeatured argore score	Odds ratios values are shown (95% CI). Logistic regression models were adjusted for a correspond to active commuting, reference category was inactive commuting. Duratio values shown correspond to correct postures, reference category was incorrect postures of pain and impediments respectively. The knowledge variable was presented in two c Table 5. Adjusted area under the ROC curve analysis for postural education and hygie Exposures	Jjusted for age, sex, ar ting. Duration of com rect postures. Variable nted in two categories, an and hygiene accord	id school. A muting, the es categoriz , the first fou ling to low	Abbreviations: LBP; I, values shown corre zation – Outcomes: 1 r values between 0-5 back pain	ow back pa spond to n The values (9 (reference	ain. Variables catego nore than 10 minute shown correspond tr 2 category) and the s	rrization – 15, referenc 2 no pain <i>e</i> 16cond for	Exposures: Go to schr e category was less th and no impediments r values between 10-2.	ool and co han 10 mir espectively 4 (values sh	me back to school, the utes. Postural hygiene , reference categories w iown).	alues shown ariables, the ere presence
Exposures Tain Frequency Consequences of pair Knowledge of postural elucation IBP ever (no) p value IBP ever (no) p value IBP eduity p value IBP eduity p value </th <th>Exposures</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Out</th> <th>come</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Exposures				Out	come					
IBP ever (no) $Value BP in the last Value Value IBP in the last Value Value IBP in the last Value Value IBP ever (no) Value Redain Value Nonwelees, score Value Value $			Pain Frequ	iency				Consequences c	of pain	knowledge of postura	education
Commuting to school To go to school active 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.446 0.50 (0.45; 0.55) 0.391 0.52 (0.45; 0.57) 0.533 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.54 (0.50; 0.56) 0.50 To go to school active 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.446 0.50 (0.45; 0.55) 0.391 0.50 (0.43; 0.57) 0.533 0.435 0.380 0.53 (0.50; 0.57) 0.508 To come back from school actively 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.715 0.52 (0.47; 0.58) 0.435 0.323 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.711 Postural hysiene 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.715 0.52 (0.47; 0.58) 0.436 0.53 (0.57; 0.53) 0.711 Postural hysiene 0.56 (0.52; 0.60) 0.40 0.46 (0.41; 0.51) 0.48 (0.42; 0.53) 0.47 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.711 Postural hysiene 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.41 (0.42; 0.53) 0.41 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.711 Postural hysiene 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.80 0.47 (0.42; 0.53) 0.41 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.49 (0.4	LBP ever (no) P value LBP in the is days (no	LBP in the last 7 I days (no)	⁹ value	LBP today (no)	P value	LBP in bed (no)	P value	LBP daily restrictions	<i>P</i> value	Knowledge, score (0-24)	P value
To go to school active (0.52 (0.48), 0.56) (0.44) (0.50 (0.45), 0.55) (0.931 (0.50 (0.43), 0.57) (0.53)	Commuting to school										
$ To come back from school actively 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.449 0.50 (0.45; 0.55) 0.979 0.50 (0.43; 0.57) 0.943 0.53 (0.47; 0.58) 0.391 0.48 (0.44; 0.52) 0.392 0.53 (0.53 (0.55) 0.53) 0.711 \\ Duration of commuting 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.715 0.51 (0.46, 0.56) 0.725 0.52 (0.45; 0.59) 0.558 0.52 (0.47; 0.58) 0.435 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.392 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.711 \\ Dotume the commuting 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.808 0.47 (0.45; 0.55) 0.751 0.48 (0.42; 0.53) 0.354 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.356 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.721 \\ Sitting correctly in a chair 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.808 0.47 (0.43; 0.51) 0.095 0.49 (0.42; 0.55) 0.614 0.42 (0.53) 0.354 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.356 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.356 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.801 \\ Sitting correctly in front of a compute 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.50 0.47 (0.43; 0.55) 0.51 0.48 (0.42; 0.53) 0.40 0.51 (0.45; 0.54) 0.801 \\ Sitting correctly in front of a compute 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.50 0.40 0.42 (0.54) 0.30 0.316 0.49 (0.44; 0.55) 0.81 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.801 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.305 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.801 \\ Picking up correctly in front of a compute 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.50 0.49 0.43; 0.55 0.646 0.50 0.831 0.50 (0.46; 0.55) 0.831 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50 0.46; 0.54) 0.95 0.47 (0.43; 0.50) 0.800 \\ Picking up correctly an object 0.49 0.45; 0.53) 0.541 0.49 (0.45; 0.55) 0.831 0.51 (0.46; 0.55) 0.831 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.95 0.51 (0.46; 0.54) 0.35 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50 0.46 (0.45; 0.53) 0.301 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50 0.46 (0.45; 0.53) 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.50$	To go to school active 0.52 (0.48;0.56) 0.446 0.50 (0.45; (0.50 (0.45; 0.55)	0.931 (0.50 (0.43; 0.57)	0.967	0.52 (0.46; 0.57)	0.553	0.49 (0.45; 0.53)	0.621	0.54 (0.50; 0.58)	0.051
Duration of commuting 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.715 0.51 (0.45; 0.56) 0.52 (0.45; 0.53) 0.52 (0.45; 0.53) 0.392 0.392 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.711 Postural hygiene 0.56 (0.52; 0.60) 0.004 0.46 (0.41; 0.51) 0.095 0.49 (0.42; 0.55) 0.52 (0.45; 0.53) 0.356 0.356 0.392 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.721 Postural hygiene 0.56 (0.52; 0.60) 0.004 0.46 (0.41; 0.51) 0.095 0.49 (0.42; 0.53) 0.470 0.430 0.356 0.356 0.356 0.356 0.356 0.375 0.721 Sitting correctly in a chair 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.808 0.47 (0.42; 0.53) 0.242 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.49 (0.44; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.53) 0.490 0.48 (0.42; 0.53) 0.711 Sitting correctly in front of a computer 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.242 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.48 (0.42; 0.55)<	To come back from school actively 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.449 0.50 (0.45; (0.50 (0.45; 0.55)	0.979 (0.50 (0.43; 0.57)	0.943	0.53 (0.47; 0.58)	0.391	0.48 (0.44; 0.52)	0.380	0.53 (0.50; 0.57)	0.086
Postural hygiene Outed 0.46 (0.41; 0.51) 0.095 0.49 (0.42; 0.56) 0.354 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.356 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.721 Sitting correctly at a desk 0.56 (0.52; 0.60) 0.004 0.46 (0.41; 0.51) 0.095 0.49 (0.42; 0.55) 0.47 (0.42; 0.53) 0.354 0.52 (0.48; 0.56) 0.366 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.721 Sitting correctly in a chair 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.609 0.47 (0.42; 0.53) 0.356 0.49 (0.45; 0.54) 0.881 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.807 Sitting correctly in front of a computer 0.51 (0.47; 0.53) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.49 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.44; 0.55) 0.48 (0.45; 0.54) 0.48 (0.43; 0.55) 0.48 (0.43; 0.56) 0.48 (0.43; 0.56) 0.48 (0.43; 0.56)	Duration of commuting 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.715 0.51 (0.46; (0.51 (0.46; 0.56)	0.725 (0.52 (0.45; 0.59)	0.558	0.52 (0.47; 0.58)	0.435	0.52 (0.48; 0.56)	0.392	0.49 (0.45; 0.53)	0.711
Sitting correctly at a desk $0.56 (0.52; 0.60)$ 0.004 $0.46 (0.41; 0.51)$ 0.095 $0.49 (0.42; 0.55)$ $0.47 (0.42; 0.53)$ 0.354 $0.52 (0.48; 0.56)$ 0.376 $0.49 (0.45; 0.53)$ 0.721 Sitting correctly in a chair $0.51 (0.47; 0.54)$ 0.808 $0.47 (0.43; 0.52)$ 0.261 $0.48 (0.42; 0.53)$ 0.402 $0.50 (0.46; 0.54)$ 0.881 $0.51 (0.47; 0.54)$ 0.807 Sitting correctly in front of a computer $0.51 (0.47; 0.53)$ 0.402 $0.47 (0.42; 0.53)$ 0.402 $0.50 (0.46; 0.54)$ 0.943 $0.51 (0.47; 0.53)$ $0.048 (0.42; 0.53)$ 0.031 $0.50 (0.46; 0.54)$ $0.948 (0.43; 0.52)$ 0.376 Picking up correctly an object $0.49 (0.45; 0.53)$ 0.531 $0.49 (0.43; 0.55)$ 0.645 $0.50 (0.46; 0.54)$ $0.948 (0.43; 0.50)$ 0.030 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and highene for elevated LBP risk are shown. $0.51 (0.46; 0.57)$ 0.645 $0.50 (0.46; 0.54)$ $0.947 (0.43; 0.50)$ 0.030 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and highene for elevated LBP risk are shown. $0.51 (0.46; 0.54)$ 0.956 $0.47 (0.43; 0.50)$ 0.030 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and highene for elevated LBP risk are shown. $0.51 (0.46; 0.54)$ 0.956 $0.47 (0.43; 0.50)$ 0.040 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural show	Postural hygiene										
Sitting correctly in a chair 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.808 0.47 (0.43; 0.52) 0.261 0.48 (0.42; 0.55) 0.614 0.48 (0.42; 0.53) 0.402 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.881 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.807 Sitting correctly in front of a computer 0.51 (0.47; 0.55) 0.609 0.47 (0.42; 0.52) 0.242 0.47 (0.40; 0.54) 0.376 0.48 (0.44; 0.55) 0.803 0.48 (0.44; 0.52) 0.376 Picking up correctly an object 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.406 0.52 (0.47; 0.53) 0.531 0.49 (0.45; 0.55) 0.645 0.56 (0.46; 0.54) 0.943 0.600 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higwee for elevated LBP risk are shown. 0.645; 0.54) 0.956 0.47 (0.43; 0.50) 0.080 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higwee for elevated LBP risk are shown. 0.554) 0.956 0.47 (0.43; 0.50) 0.080 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higwee for elevated LBP risk are shown. 0.5645 0.576 (0.46; 0.54) 0.956 0.47 (0.43; 0.50) 0.080 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and	Sitting correctly at a desk 0.56 (0.52; 0.60) 0.004 0.46 (0.41; (0.46 (0.41; 0.51)	0.095 (0.49 (0.42; 0.56)	0.755	0.47 (0.42; 0.53)	0.354	0.52 (0.48; 0.56)	0.356	0.49 (0.45; 0.53)	0.721
Sitting correctly in front of a computer 0.51 (0.47;0.55) 0.609 0.47 (0.42; 0.52) 0.242 0.47 (0.46; 0.54) 0.376 0.49 (0.44; 0.55) 0.831 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.943 0.48 (0.44; 0.52) 0.376 Picking up correctly an object 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.466 0.52 (0.47; 0.53) 0.531 0.49 (0.43; 0.56) 0.858 0.51 (0.46; 0.57) 0.645 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.956 0.47 (0.43; 0.50) 0.080 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higyene for elevated LBP risk are shown. An other eceiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higyene for elevated LBP risk are shown. An other eceiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higyene for elevated LBP risk are shown. An other eceiver operating characteristic mode area to school, the values shown correspond to active commuting. reference category was inactive commuting. Duration of commuting the values shown correspond to correct postures. Fortune category was incorrect postures. Variables the values for an other ecoiver operating to active commuting. The values shown correspond to correct postures reference category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct postures. Fortune category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct postures relation of commuting. The values shown correspond to correct postures relation to correct postures. Fortune category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct postures relation to correct postures. The values shown correspond to correct postures relation to correct postures. Fortune category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct postures relation to correct postures. Fortune category was incorrect postures. Was incorrect postures fortune to correct postures relation to correct postures relative commuting. The value shown correspond to correct postures relation to correc	Sitting correctly in a chair 0.51 (0.47; 0.54) 0.808 0.47 (0.43; (0.47 (0.43; 0.52)	0.261 (0.48 (0.42; 0.55)	0.614	0.48 (0.42; 0.53)	0.402	0.50 (0.46; 0.54)	0.881	0.51 (0.47; 0.54)	0.807
Picking up correctly an object 0.45; 0.53) 0.466 0.52 (0.47; 0.53) 0.531 0.49 (0.43; 0.56) 0.858 0.51 (0.46; 0.57) 0.645 0.50 (0.46; 0.54) 0.956 0.47 (0.43; 0.50) 0.080 AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and CIs of different postural education and higyene for elevated LBP risk are shown. Abbreviations: LBP; lower post pairs categorization – Exposures Cot os chool and come back to school, the values shown correspond to active commuting, reference category was inactive commuting. Duration of commuting, the values shown correspond to correct postures, reference category was less than 10 minutes. Postural 10 minutes. Postural hydiene values shown correspond to correct postures, reference category was incorrect postures. Variables	Sitting correctly in front of a computer 0.51 (0.47;0.55) 0.609 0.47 (0.42; (0.47 (0.42; 0.52)	0.242 (0.47 (0.40; 0.54)	0.376	0.49 (0.44; 0.55)	0.831	0.50 (0.46; 0.54)	0.943	0.48 (0.44; 0.52)	0.376
AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and Cls of different postural education and higyene for elevated LBP risk are shown. Abbreviations: LBP; low back pain. Variables categorization – Exposures: Go to school and come back to school, the values shown correspond to active commuting, reference category was inactive commuting. Duration of commuting, the values shown correspond to active correspond to more than 10 minutes, reference category was incorrect postures. Variables	Picking up correctly an object 0.49 (0.45; 0.53) 0.466 0.52 (0.47; 0.47; 0.49)	0.52 (0.47; 0.53)	0.531 (0.49 (0.43; 0.56)	0.858	0.51 (0.46; 0.57)	0.645	0.50 (0.46; 0.54)	0.956	0.47 (0.43; 0.50)	0.080
Aboreviations: LBY, low back pain. Variables categorization – Exposures: Co to school and come back to school, the values shown correspond to active commung, reterence category was inactive community. Turation of commung, the values shown correspond to more than 10 minutes, reference category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to more than 10 minutes, reference category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct posture category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct posture category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct posture category was incorrect postures. Variables the values shown correspond to correct posture category was incorrect postures. Variables the value shown correspond to correct posture category was incorrect postures. Variables the value shown correspond to correct posture category was incorrect postures.	AUC, area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. TThe AUCs and Cls of	s and CIs of different	postural edu	ucation and higyene	for elevate	ed LBP risk are show	Ļ	ų			-
	Abbreviations: LBP; low back pain. Variables categorization – Exposures: Go to schoo the values shown correspond to more than 10 minutes. reference category was less (Lo to school and cor rv was less than 10 r	ne back to ninutes. Po:	school, the values s. stural hygiene varia	hown corre bles. the vi	espond to active cor alues shown correst	mmuting, r and to co	eterence category wa vrect postures, refere	is inactive - nce catego	commuting. Uuration o rv was incorrect postur	commuting, ss. Variables
	categorization – Outcomes: The values shown correspond to no pain and no impedim	no impediments resp	sctively ref	erence categories wi		and shown conceptor of name	diments rec	snectively. The know	ledge varia	he was incontect postur the was presented in th	or categories

162 | Health Promot Perspect, 2023, Volume 13, Issue 2

exceed the recommended weight, and not to be carried in the correct or ergonomic position for the back,²⁸ although there is controversy in the results regarding the impact of schoolbags into LBP in children and adolescents and some authors consider negative evidence of backpack or schoolbag weight and LBP in children and adolescents.²⁹ Active commuting to school, has been associated with higher levels of total daily physical activity, but not to higher levels of physical fitness.³⁰ On the contrary, physical fitness is associated with better levels LBP.⁸

Promoting a higher level of physical fitness has to be on the scope of future interventions to prevent and improve LBP. Furthermore, active commuting to school is a tool for reducing sedentary time and introducing physical activity between sedentary periods, which seems to have beneficial effects on the overall health of schoolchildren.³¹ Although there is a growing body of literature investigating active commuting to school, to the best of our knowledge, there are no studies examining the association between type of commuting to school and LBP.^{32,33} A separate chapter deserves the necessary work to be done in improving knowledge of the use of the school backpack. The present study is part of the PEPE study, where the possible effect of backpack weight on LBP will be analyzed. Unfortunately, this data was not yet available for inclusion in the present analyses.

The present results indicate that the prevalence of LBP is lower in children who present better results in postural habits and knowledge of postural hygiene, the main example is the posture of sitting at the desk, in concordance with the findings of de Souza Santos et al.³ It may be that the only significant effect in terms of sitting position has been observed in "sitting correctly at the desk" due to the fact that it is the most repeated position during school hours, and therefore, the one that could be most emphasized at school, i.e. the one on which teachers have given the most feedback. This element indicates the way with respect to possible school interventions in improving knowledge about postural education, ergonomics, and postural hygiene, on the contrary, factors such as gender, height or age are not modifiable. On the other hand, by knowing that these are risk factors for developing LBP, specific interventions can be made for this population groups. That is, taller children, girls, and to emphasize early in life so that habits are well acquired in preadolescence and adolescence, when pain is most likely to manifest itself.

As regards knowledge of postural education, it is particularly important that it is associated with less LBP. This may suggest that in order to prevent LBP, the population should be encouraged to have adequate knowledge of postural education from childhood and adolescence. Postural education could be considered part of the Health literacy, defined by the WHO as 'the cognitive and social skills which determine the motivation and ability of individuals to gain access to understand and use information in ways which promote and maintain good health.³⁴ In order to obtain better levels of health literacy in our school children, studies show that a greater effort is required to make health education programs easier to understand³⁵; carrying out targeted interventions to improve health literacy, and also target those interventions to specific objectives such as, knowledge of Postural Education and hygiene. The findings of this study means that future interventions may focus on health literacy related to LBP knowledge and be primary addressed to girls.

A marked strength of this study was the use of a large sample of girls and boys in school age, from 10 different schools, combining schools from different geographical areas, which increases the representativeness of the sample. All questionnaires were validated and extensively used in this population. Moreover, sophisticated statistical analyses where performed. Furthermore, the exposure variables represent an innovative aspect in LBP research and may establish the basis for future interventions in the child and adolescent population, favoring health education, the promotion of lifelong healthy habits, and prevention as an educational and therapeutic tool. All this will help society to be more responsible with its health and self-care and may have important implications for health systems in terms of savings and cost-effectiveness.

In terms of limitations, the cross-sectional design of the study does not allow causality to be established. Furthermore, the postural hygiene variable is self-reported, which may lead to bias. The scarcity of significant results limits the ability to draw firm conclusions. A certain level of recall bias can be assumed caused by differences in the accuracy or completeness of memories retrieved by study participants regarding past events and experiences. There is some loss of data due to the ages of the subjects who in the school environment usually have a high level of nonappearance due to illness.

Conclusion

Results from this cross-sectional study indicate that LBP is more prevalent in girls, taller schoolchildren, older schoolchildren, those who sit poorly at the desk and those who walk to school. On the contrary, knowledge related to postural education is associated with less LBP in this school population. School interventions in improving knowledge about postural education, ergonomics and postural hygiene are needed to address this important matter. In addition to studies on backpack weight and mode of use, to clarify why students who walk to school have higher LBP than those who use motorized transport.

Authors' Contribution

Conceptualization: Josep Vidal-Conti, Pere A. Borràs.

Methodology: Josep Vidal-Conti, Aina Maria Galmes-Panades. Formal analysis: Josep Vidal-Conti, Aina Maria Galmes- Panades. Resources: Josep Vidal-Conti.

Writing-original draft: Josep Vidal-Conti, Pere A. Borràs, Aina Maria Galmes- Panades.

Writing-review & editing: Josep Vidal-Conti, Pere A. Borràs, Aina

Maria Galmes-Panades.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Ethical Approval

The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Balearic Islands (reference number: 130CER19).

Funding

Grant [RTI2018-101023-A-I00] funded by Ministry of Science and Innovation MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by "European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) A way of making Europe".

Supplementary Files

Supplementary file 1 contains Table S1.

References

- Hoy D, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, Woolf A, Bain C, et al. The global burden of low back pain: estimates from the Global Burden of Disease 2010 study. Ann Rheum Dis. 2014;73(6):968-74. doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2013-204428.
- Miñana-Signes V, Monfort-Pañego M, Bosh-Bivià AH, Noll M. Prevalence of low back pain among primary school students from the city of Valencia (Spain). Healthcare (Basel). 2021;9(3):270. doi: 10.3390/healthcare9030270.
- de Souza Santos E, Bernardes JM, Noll M, Gómez-Salgado J, Ruiz-Frutos C, Dias A. Prevalence of low back pain and associated risks in school-age children. Pain Manag Nurs. 2021;22(4):459-64. doi: 10.1016/j.pmn.2021.01.017.
- Foltran FA, Moreira RF, Komatsu MO, Falconi MF, Sato TO. Effects of an educational back care program on Brazilian schoolchildren's knowledge regarding back pain prevention. Rev Bras Fisioter. 2012;16(2):128-33. doi: 10.1590/s1413-35552012005000023.
- Yamato TP, Maher CG, Traeger AC, Wiliams CM, Kamper SJ. Do schoolbags cause back pain in children and adolescents? A systematic review. Br J Sports Med. 2018;52(19):1241-5. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-098927.
- Rajan P, Koti A. Ergonomic assessment and musculoskeletal health of the underprivileged school children in Pune, India. Health Promot Perspect. 2013;3(1):36-44. doi: 10.5681/ hpp.2013.005.
- de Vitta A, de Oliveira Perrucini P, Bento TP, Cornélio GP, Felippe LA, Simeão SF. Factors associated with intensity and frequent low back pain in high school students. ABCS Health Sci. 2021;46:e021223. doi: 10.7322/abcshs.2020043.1997.
- Vidal-Conti J, Borràs PA, Palou P, Muntaner-Mas A. Prevalence of low back pain among school-aged children between 10 and 12 years. Sustainability. 2021;13(21):12254. doi: 10.3390/su132112254.
- 9. Hwang J, Louie PK, Phillips FM, An HS, Samartzis D. Low back pain in children: a rising concern. Eur Spine J. 2019;28(2):211-3. doi: 10.1007/s00586-018-5844-1.
- Galmes-Panades AM, Vidal-Conti J. Effects of postural education program (PEPE Study) on daily habits in children. Front Educ (Lausanne). 2022;7:935002. doi: 10.3389/ feduc.2022.935002.
- Miñana-Signes V, Monfort-Pañego M, Rosaleny-Maiques S. Improvement of knowledge and postural habits after an educational intervention program in school students. J Hum Sport Exerc. 2019;14(1):47-60. doi: 10.14198/ jhse.2019.141.04.
- Haselgrove C, Straker L, Smith A, O'Sullivan P, Perry M, Sloan N. Perceived school bag load, duration of carriage, and method of transport to school are associated with spinal pain in adolescents: an observational study. Aust J Physiother. 2008;54(3):193-200. doi: 10.1016/s0004-9514(08)70026-6.

- Aprile I, Di Stasio E, Vincenzi MT, Arezzo MF, De Santis F, Mosca R, et al. The relationship between back pain and schoolbag use: a cross-sectional study of 5,318 Italian students. Spine J. 2016;16(6):748-55. doi: 10.1016/j. spinee.2016.01.214.
- 14. Cuenca-Martínez F, Varangot-Reille C, Calatayud J, Suso-Martí L, Salar-Andreu C, Gargallo P, et al. The influence of the weight of the backpack on the biomechanics of the child and adolescent: a systematic review and meta-analysis with a meta-regression. Pediatr Phys Ther. 2023;35(2):212-26. doi: 10.1097/pep.00000000000996.
- 15. Amyra Natasha A, Ahmad Syukri A, Siti Nor Diana MK, Ima-Nirwana S, Chin KY. The association between backpack use and low back pain among pre-university students: a pilot study. J Taibah Univ Med Sci. 2018;13(2):205-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jtumed.2017.06.005.
- Skaggs DL, Early SD, D'Ambra P, Tolo VT, Kay RM. Back pain and backpacks in school children. J Pediatr Orthop. 2006;26(3):358-63. doi: 10.1097/01. bpo.0000217723.14631.6e.
- Rodríguez-Oviedo P, Ruano-Ravina A, Pérez-Ríos M, García FB, Gómez-Fernández D, Fernández-Alonso A, et al. School children's backpacks, back pain and back pathologies. Arch Dis Child. 2012;97(8):730-2. doi: 10.1136/ archdischild-2011-301253.
- Palou P, Kovacs FM, Vidal J, Gili M, Borràs PA, Gestoso M, et al. Validation of a questionnaire to determine risk factors for back pain in 10–12 year-old school children. Gazz Med Ital Arch Sci Med. 2010;169(5):199-205.
- Miñana-Signes V, Monfort-Pañego M, Morant J, Noll M. Cross-cultural adaptation and reliability of the back pain and body posture evaluation instrument (BackPEI) to the Spanish adolescent population. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(3):854. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18030854.
- Noll M, Tarragô Candotti C, Vieira A, Fagundes Loss J. Back pain and body posture evaluation instrument (BackPEI): development, content validation and reproducibility. Int J Public Health. 2013;58(4):565-72. doi: 10.1007/s00038-012-0434-1.
- 21. Pivotto LR, da Rosa BN, Candotti CT, Noll M, Vieira A, Loss JF. Proposition of a general scoring system to the BackPEI. J Head Neck Spine Surg. 2018;3(4):555618. doi: 10.19080/jhnss.2018.03.555618.
- 22. Chillón P, Herrador-Colmenero M, Migueles JH, Cabanas-Sánchez V, Fernández-Santos JR, Veiga Ó L, et al. Convergent validation of a questionnaire to assess the mode and frequency of commuting to and from school. Scand J Public Health. 2017;45(6):612-20. doi: 10.1177/1403494817718905.
- Monfort-Pañego M, Molina-García J, Miñana-Signes V, Bosch-Biviá AH, Gómez-López A, Munguía-Izquierdo D. Development and psychometric evaluation of a health questionnaire on back care knowledge in daily life physical activities for adolescent students. Eur Spine J. 2016;25(9):2803-8. doi: 10.1007/s00586-016-4627-9.
- 24. Textor J, van der Zander B, Gilthorpe MS, Liskiewicz M, Ellison GT. Robust causal inference using directed acyclic graphs: the R package 'dagitty'. Int J Epidemiol. 2016;45(6):1887-94. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyw341.
- 25. Minghelli B, Nunes C, Oliveira R. Back school postural education program: comparison of two types of interventions in improving ergonomic knowledge about postures and reducing low back pain in adolescents. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(9):4434. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18094434.
- 26. Calvo-Muñoz I, Gómez-Conesa A, Sánchez-Meca J. Prevalence of low back pain in children and adolescents: a meta-analysis. BMC Pediatr. 2013;13:14. doi: 10.1186/1471-2431-13-14.
- 27. Onofrio AC, da Silva MC, Domingues MR, Rombaldi AJ.

Acute low back pain in high school adolescents in Southern Brazil: prevalence and associated factors. Eur Spine J. 2012;21(7):1234-40. doi: 10.1007/s00586-011-2056-3.

- Macedo RB, Coelho-e-Silva MJ, Sousa NF, Valente-dos-Santos J, Machado-Rodrigues AM, Cumming SP, et al. Quality of life, school backpack weight, and nonspecific low back pain in children and adolescents. J Pediatr (Rio J). 2015;91(3):263-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jped.2014.08.011.
- 29. O'Sullivan P, Smith A, Beales D, Straker L. Understanding adolescent low back pain from a multidimensional perspective: implications for management. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2017;47(10):741-51. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2017.7376.
- Muntaner-Mas A, Herrador-Colmenero M, Borràs PA, Chillón P. Physical activity, but not active commuting to school, is associated with cardiorespiratory fitness levels in young people. J Transp Health. 2018;10:297-303. doi: 10.1016/j. jth.2018.05.004.
- 31. Peralta M, Henriques-Neto D, Bordado J, Loureiro N, Diz S, Marques A. Active commuting to school and physical activity levels among 11 to 16 year-old adolescents from 63 low- and

middle-income countries. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(4):1276. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17041276.

- Vorlíček M, Baďura P, Mitáš J, Kolarčik P, Rubín L, Vašíčková J, et al. How Czech adolescents perceive active commuting to school: a cross-sectional study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(15):5562. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17155562.
- Gálvez-Fernández P, Herrador-Colmenero M, Esteban-Cornejo I, Castro-Piñero J, Molina-García J, Queralt A, et al. Active commuting to school among 36,781 Spanish children and adolescents: a temporal trend study. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2021;31(4):914-24. doi: 10.1111/sms.13917.
- 34. Liu C, Wang D, Liu C, Jiang J, Wang X, Chen H, et al. What is the meaning of health literacy? A systematic review and qualitative synthesis. Fam Med Community Health. 2020;8(2):e000351. doi: 10.1136/fmch-2020-000351.
- 35. Farin E, Ullrich A, Nagl M. Health education literacy in patients with chronic musculoskeletal diseases: development of a new questionnaire and sociodemographic predictors. Health Educ Res. 2013;28(6):1080-91. doi: 10.1093/her/cyt095.