



DOES SAFE PATIENT HANDLING EQUIPMENT HAVE AN IMPACT ON HEALTHCARE STAFF?

DOES SAFE PATIENT HANDLING EQUIPMENT HAVE AN IMPACT ON PATIENT REHABILITATION?

WHAT IS THE RETURN ON INVESTMENT?

Implementation of Safe Patient Handling and Mobility technology

Safe Patient Handling and Mobility (SPHM) technology, such as a ceiling hoist, reduces healthcare worker injuries, pressure ulcers, and the length of stay. (1, 2, 3). It also optimizes work processes and increases early mobilization.

Reduction of health care worker injuries

Studies have shown that healthcare staff exposes their bodies to high physical strain, and 6-10 transfers per day increases the risk for Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders (WRMD) by 50%. Further studies have shown that the use of a ceiling hoist requires 50-75% less body force compared to using a floor-based lift. The use of Safe Patient Handling and Mobility technology (SPHM), such as the ceiling hoist, reduces WRMD by up to 95%. (1, 2, 4, 5).

Return on Investment (ROI)

Studies from the US have shown that hospitals and medical centers that invested in comprehensive SPHM technology saved costs on workers' compensation and patient handling injuries and reduced the number of patient pressure ulcers. They recovered the full return on investment within the first 1-3 years. (1).

Conclusion

SPHM technology, and the knowledge of how to use it, is important for healthcare staff when reducing WRMD and increasing safe patient handling. The use of this technology provides patients with safe and secure mobility while also reducing the risk of injuries for healthcare workers. With the right solutions, healthcare staff can optimize work processes and increase early mobilization, which can reduce the length of stay for patients. (2).

References

1. Academy of Neurologic Physical Therapy (ANPT), 16303, 01/07/2021, [Justifying an Investment in an Overhead Harness System](#)
2. Darragh AR, Campo MA, Lenore F, Miller M, Pentico M, Margulis H. [Safe-Patient-Handling Equipment in Therapy. Practice: Implications for Rehabilitation](#). 2013. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 67, 45-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2013.005389>.
3. Evans KW, Myers D, Rockefeller K, Rauscher K, Allen A, Gao W. [A qualitative exploration of the lift equipment uses and needs of physical and occupational therapist and assistants participating in safe patient handling and mobility programs](#). *Int SPHM*. June 2021. Vol 22, No 2.
4. Perlow E., Tunney N, Lucado A. [Integrating Safe Patient Handling Into Physical Therapist Education: Reducing the Incidence of Physical Therapist Injury and Improving Patient Outcomes](#). *Journal of Physical Therapy Education* Vol 30, No 2, 2016.
5. Anders LL., Pedersen J., Sundstrup E., Thorsen SV., Rungulies R. [High physical work demands have worse consequences for older workers: prospective study of long-term sickness absence among 69117 employees](#). *Occup Environ Med*. 2021; 78:829-834.