

Abstract: 328
Words: 2483
Tables: 0
Supplemental Tables: 0
Figures: 3
Supplemental Figures: 0
References: 19
Pages: 14
Contact: Dr John J Fraser
Email: john.j.fraser@uky.edu.

Differences in neuromusculoskeletal injury and disability rates between US Navy aircraft carrier and amphibious assault ships.

CDR John J. Fraser, DPT, PhD, FACSM, MSC, USN, Retired^{*1,2}, ORCID: 0000-0001-9697-3795

LCDR Joshua Halfpap, PT, DPT, DSc, OCS, FAAOMPT, MSC, USN, Retired³

CAPT Michael Rosenthal, PT, DSc, ATC, MSC, USN, Retired⁴, ORCID: 0000-0003-3299-3791

Affiliations:

1. University of Kentucky Sports Medicine Research Institute, Lexington, KY USA. email: john.j.fraser@uky.edu. phone: (757) 438-0390; Twitter: @NavyPT
2. Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Bethesda, MD
3. Bowling Green State University, College of Health and Human Services, School of Physical Therapy, Bowling Green, OH USA. Email: joshph@bgsu.edu.
4. Doctor of Physical Therapy Program, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE USA. Email: mrosenthal@unmc.edu

Keywords: Occupational Injuries; Military Personnel; Sports Medicine; Public Health; Physical Therapists

Declarations: Dr Fraser reports grants from Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs and the Office of Naval Research, outside of the submitted work. In addition, Dr Fraser has a patent pending for an Adaptive and Variable Stiffness Ankle Brace, U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 63254,474.

Acknowledgements: None

Prior Presentation. None

Clinical Trial Registration: Not applicable

Sources of Support / Funding Sources: None

Competing Interests: None

Institutional Review Board (Human Subjects): The study protocol was approved by the Naval Health Research Center Institutional Review Board in compliance with all applicable Federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects. Research data were derived from an approved Naval Health Research Center Institutional Review Board protocol, number NHRC.2022.0201-NHSR.

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC): Not applicable

Individual Author Contributions: JJF was responsible for study conception, methodological development, and data analysis. All authors contributed to the data interpretation, manuscript development, critical revision, and final approval of the study.

Data Availability: All data relevant to the study are included in the article or are available as supplementary files.

Disclaimer: The opinions and assertions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences or the Department of Defense.

Institutional Clearance: Institutional clearance approved.

Differences in neuromusculoskeletal injury and disability rates between US Navy aircraft carrier and amphibious assault ships.

Word Count: 2483

Abstract Word Count: 328

Key Words: Occupational Injuries; Military Personnel; Sports Medicine; Public Health; Physical Therapists

Structured Summary

1

2 **Introduction:** Musculoskeletal injuries (MSKI) are the most common clinical condition in the
3 military that affect medical readiness. Evaluation of MSKI burden and the effects of these
4 injuries on readiness in large deck Navy ships is warranted.

5 **Materials and Methods:** A retrospective cohort study assessing population-level MSKI rates,
6 limited duty (LIMDU), and long-term disability episode counts of all Sailors assigned to US
7 Navy Aircraft Carriers (CVNs) and Amphibious Assault Ships (LHA/LHD) from November
8 2016 to February 2023 were extracted from the Musculoskeletal Naval Epidemiological
9 Surveillance Tool. A negative binomial regression and general additive (gaussian) models
10 evaluated the association of ship platform, deployment status, days underway, and sex on MSKI
11 rates and the proportion of cases that resulted in LIMDU, returned-to-duty following LIMDU, or
12 progressed to long-term disability.

13 **Results:** Sailors attached to CVNs contributed a mean 17893.8 ± 23280.6 person-months, with
14 those attached to LHA/LHDs contributing an average 5981.8 ± 8432.7 person-months. Aboard
15 CVNs, MSKI occurred at a rate of $0.30 \pm 0.16/1000$ person-months while deployed and
16 $0.64 \pm 0.31/1000$ person-months in homeport. Aboard LHA/LHDs, Sailors incurred MSKI at a
17 rate of $0.59 \pm 0.58/1000$ person-months while on deployment and $1.24 \pm 0.68/1000$ person-months
18 in homeport. Among Sailors aboard CVNs, LIMDU occurred in $7.95 \pm 7.75\%$ of MSKI cases
19 while deployed and $5.13 \pm 5.26\%$ while in homeport. Aboard LHA/LHDs, $8.57 \pm 13.42\%$ of MSKI
20 cases were placed on LIMDU while deployed and $4.95 \pm 5.27\%$ while in homeport. In the
21 multivariable assessment of LIMDU, being deployed underway was a significant factor ($B=3.62$
22 $p=.03$, variance explained= 3.86%). Sailors that were female and served aboard LHA/LHDs
23 returned to full duty at a significantly greater frequency compared to their male counterparts and

24 Sailors serving aboard CVNs. None of the independent variables evaluated were associated with
25 long-term disability.

26 **Conclusion:** The findings in the current study demonstrate the substantial burden of MSKI
27 aboard large deck ships, both in homeport and while deployed. Inclusion of a PT aboard
28 LHA/LHDs, like the CVN, may help to prevent and mitigate the effects of MSKI through early
29 access to specialized care and integral injury prevention and performance optimization methods.

30

31

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

INTRODUCTION

Musculoskeletal injuries (MSKI) are the most common clinical condition in the military.¹ These injuries frequently result in limited activity and restricted ability of the servicemember to perform military duties, with diminished capability of the unit to meet mission objectives.² While this is salient while in garrison or in homeport, where servicemembers and their units train in preparation for deployment, this becomes even more relevant when servicemembers deploy. While servicemembers have access to specialized medical care while in garrison or homeport, medical services for MSKI are curtailed while underway and typically limited to primary care in all ship platforms except for aircraft carriers (CVNs). When contextualized with the increased exposure to environmental and manmade hazards in the operational setting, the importance of clinicians with the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to prevent and mitigate the effects of MSKI cannot be overstated.³

Operational environments are an important consideration for MSKI in the US Navy, where Sailors function in the industrial setting of modern large deck warships. Ship construction (e.g. steel decks), negotiating steep ladders, and unique occupational exposures experienced by Sailors assigned to ship's company are a few factors that may contribute to MSKI. CVNs are a capital warship in the US Navy, providing a mobile aviation strike capability used for power projection in meeting national security objectives. Ship's company assigned to CVNs consists of more than 3000 Sailors, with a medical capability that includes a Navy Physical Therapist as part of the crew.⁴ This clinician provides not only specialized and timely evaluation and management of MSKI, but also serves as the health promotion officer leading ship and strike group-wide prevention and health optimization programs while in port and during the ~7-month

55 deployments.⁴ This officer is assigned on two-year orders typically prior to deployment, while
56 underway, and during dwell periods. During extended shipyard maintenance, this billet may be
57 gapped to meet other operational needs as the ship's company relies upon the nearby branch
58 medical clinic for management of MSKI.

59 The ship most comparable to CVNs in the US fleet is the amphibious assault ship,
60 consisting of the LHA and LHD classes. This ship's company consists of approximately 1000
61 Sailors. The mission of the LHA/LHD, like CVNs, is to forward project Marine aviation and
62 ground strike capabilities ashore. The ship's medical capability, with the exception of two proof
63 of concept projects conducted since 2010,^{3,5} does not typically include a physical therapist.⁶
64 Ship's company must rely on primary care practitioners for the management of MSKI while
65 underway or the local branch medical clinic while in homeport.⁶

66 In previous studies of MSKI, the effects of Navy Physical Therapists aboard CVNs have
67 been centered on measures of injury frequency derived from patient encounters and estimated
68 cost savings from prevented medical evacuations.^{3,7-9} Based on the limitations of the study
69 designs and the potential for bias, there is a need for empirical evaluation of ship-based physical
70 therapists compared to a reference ship that does not have this medical capability. Therefore, the
71 purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of ship platform on MSKI rate, limited duty
72 (LIMDU), and long-term disability in Sailors assigned to CVNs and LHA/LHDs. Since there is a
73 potential for sex-related differences in care-seeking for injury¹⁰ and different environmental
74 factors while deployed, these factors will also be evaluated.

75

76

METHODS

77

78 A population-based epidemiological retrospective cohort study of all active-duty Sailors
79 assigned to CVNs and LHA/LHDs from November 2016 to February 2023 was performed to
80 assess how ship platform, deployment status, and sex is associated with MSKI rates. In addition
81 to characterizing the MSKI burden aboard large deck ships, the proportion of MSKI cases placed
82 on limited duty (LIMDU), LIMDU cases returned to duty and those who progressed to long-term
83 disability (disability evaluation system [DES] referral) were evaluated. The Strengthening the
84 Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement was used to guide
85 reporting.¹¹

86 MSKI episodes, LIMDU, and long-term disability counts were extracted from the
87 Musculoskeletal Naval Epidemiological Surveillance Tool (MSK NEST) (Navy Bureau of
88 Medicine & Surgery, Falls Church, VA). This surveillance tool, which has been used in prior
89 study of MSKI in the Navy and Marine Corps,¹⁰ leverages existing validated databases, such as
90 the Military Health System Data Repository (MDR), LIMDU Sailor and Marine Readiness
91 Tracker System (LIMDU SMART), Disability Evaluation System (DES) and Defense
92 Manpower Data Center Reporting System to report injury burden in a deidentified, aggregated
93 database. MSKI episodes within the MSK NEST were derived from healthcare encounters in the
94 MDR and defined using the Army Public Health Center's Taxonomy for Musculoskeletal
95 Injuries based on an International Classification of Diagnosis, Tenth Revision (ICD-10)
96 classification.⁴ Individuals with repeat visits for the same diagnosis in a single care episode were
97 only counted once. The database does not include any personal identifiable health information.
98 This study was approved as non-human-subjects research by the Institutional Review Board at
99 the U.S. Naval Health Research Center (NHRC.2022.0201.NHSR).

100 Since military end strength fluctuates annually due to attrition and recruitment of
101 replacements,¹² the population at risk was a dynamic cohort. Rate of MSKI was calculated and
102 normalized to the subpopulation at risk (with consideration to ship platform, deployment status,
103 and sex) during the 6-year study epoch. A multivariable negative binomial regression was
104 performed to evaluate the association of ship platform, deployment status, days underway, and
105 sex on MSKI rates. General additive (gaussian) models were used to evaluate ship platform,
106 deployment status, days underway between ports, and sex on the percentage of cases that
107 resulted in LIMDU, returned-to-duty following LIMDU, or long-term disability. Since days
108 underway was not a significant factor for any of these analyses, it was removed from the final
109 parsimonious model. The regression analyses were performed using the ‘PSCL’ (version 1.5.5.1)
110 ‘MGCV’ (version 1.9), and ‘TidyGAM’ (version 0.2) packages on R (version 4.3.1, The R
111 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). LHA/LHD served as the reference in the
112 assessment of ship platform. Homeport was selected as the reference for deployment status. Male
113 Sailors served as the reference group in the assessment of sex. The level of significance was
114 $p < 0.05$ for all analyses. Statistical significance was evaluated using the convergence CIs that did
115 not cross 1.00 and the p -value reported in the regression analysis.

116

117 RESULTS

118

119 During the study epoch, CVNs deployed 56 times (mean 167.0±69.1 days) and had 74
120 dwell periods in homeport (mean 545.8±572.3 days). LHA/LHDs deployed 40 times (mean
121 148.0±69.7 days) and had 54 dwell times in homeport (mean 490.2±388.5 days). There was no
122 significant interaction observed between platform and deployed time ($p = .73$). Sailors attached to

123 CVNs contributed a mean 17893.8 ± 23280.6 person-months, with those attached to LHA/LHDs
124 contributing an average 5981.8 ± 8432.7 person-months.

125

126 **MSKI Rate**

127 Among Sailors aboard CVNs, MSKI occurred at a rate of $0.30 \pm 0.16/1000$ person-months while
128 deployed and $0.64 \pm 0.31/1000$ person-months in homeport (**Figure 1**). Aboard LHA/LHDs,
129 Sailors incurred MSKI at a rate of $0.59 \pm 0.58/1000$ person-months while on deployment and
130 $1.24 \pm 0.68/1000$ person-months in homeport. In the multivariable assessment of MSKI rate,
131 service aboard aircraft carriers ($p < .001$), being deployed ($p < .001$), and male sex ($p < .001$) were
132 found to have significant and large magnitude protective effects (RR range 0.51-0.77) (**Figure**
133 **1**).

134

135 **MSKI-related LIMDU and Long-term Disability**

136 Among Sailors aboard CVNs, LIMDU occurred in $7.95 \pm 7.75\%$ of MSKI cases while deployed
137 and $5.13 \pm 5.26\%$ while in homeport (**Figure 2**). Aboard LHA/LHDs, $8.57 \pm 13.42\%$ of MSKI
138 cases were placed on LIMDU while deployed and $4.95 \pm 5.27\%$ while in homeport. In the
139 multivariable assessment of LIMDU, being deployed underway was a significant factor ($B=3.62$
140 $p=.03$, variance explained= 3.86%) (**Figure 2**). In the assessment of Sailors returned to full duty
141 following LIMDU (CVN: deployed= $61.33 \pm 43.29\%$, homeport= $40.79 \pm 38.76\%$; LHA/LHD:
142 deployed= $78.58 \pm 37.81\%$, homeport= $40.60 \pm 42.27\%$), service aboard LHA/LHD ($B=12.42$,
143 $p=.02$), being deployed ($B=24.07$, $p < .001$), and female sex ($B=14.92$ $p=.006$) had greater
144 proportion of cases returned to full function (variance explained= 13.00%). Of the Sailors who
145 progressed to long-term disability (DES referral) (CVN: deployed= $1.15 \pm 2.85\%$,

146 homeport=0.75±3.00%; LHA/LHD: deployed=0.48±1.72%, homeport=0.25±0.55%), none of the
147 study predictors were significant. There were no other significant findings observed.

148

149

DISCUSSION

150

151 The primary findings of this study were that service aboard an LHA/LHD, being in
152 homeport, and female sex were salient risk factors for MSKI. Being deployed was significantly
153 associated with Sailors being placed on LIMDU and returned to duty following a LIMDU
154 period. Sailors that were female and served aboard LHA/LHDs returned to full duty at a
155 significantly greater proportion compared to their male counterparts and Sailors serving aboard
156 CVNs. None of the independent variables evaluated were associated with long-term disability.

157

MSKI Rate

159 Sailors assigned to CVNs were 0.51 times less likely to have a MSKI compared to
160 LHA/LHDs. Key functional and structural differences between the ships include the number and
161 type of personnel assigned to the ship, the size of the ship, and capabilities/mission requirements.
162 These differences may result in different types of occupational exposure and hazards. For
163 example, CVNs have a unique catapult system used to launch aircraft and a nuclear reactor, with
164 LHA/LHDs having a well deck capable of carrying, flooding, and launching various amphibious
165 assault craft. Sociocultural differences between these types of ships also likely exist which may
166 influence differences in MSKI. Another difference is U.S. Navy Physical Therapists have been
167 permanently assigned to CVNs dating back to 2002.⁹ The directives that fully detail shipboard
168 medical manning and procedures can be found in the referenced Navy policy.^{4,6} Physical

169 Therapists provide the primary evaluation, management, and treatment of MSKI onboard CVNs.
170 Additionally, the ship's physical therapists are responsible to lead comprehensive health
171 promotion programs as part of their duties.⁴ It is plausible that MSKI prevention and
172 performance programs administered by the ship's physical therapist may have contributed to the
173 protective effect observed aboard CVNs.

174 Females Sailors demonstrated a significantly higher rate of MSKI compared to their male
175 counterparts. This finding is consistent with a prior study of sex as a factor for MSKI in Sailors
176 using the MSK NEST database.¹⁰ Observed sex-related differences in MSKI risk can be
177 attributed to intrinsic biomechanical, physiological, and psychological factors, as well as
178 extrinsic social and environmental factors that include service culture, occupational exposure,
179 and rank.^{10,13} Social determinants such as care-seeking behaviors, stigma, the pressure to work
180 harder than their male counterparts, and other social pressures that may be sex related, a
181 supposition that warrants further investigation.^{3,10,13}

182

183 **LIMDU and Long-term Disability**

184 The Navy Medicine LIMDU program is the primary method for managing the medical
185 care for ill and injured active Sailors to ensure a medically ready force.¹⁴ In the shipboard and
186 deployed environment, medical readiness is more heavily affected when Sailors are placed in a
187 LIMDU status. If a Sailor is unable to perform activities of daily living or occupational-related
188 tasks, the LIMDU policy necessitates the transfer of the Sailor off the ship. This may explain
189 why LIMDU placement rates were marginally (~3-4%) higher while deployed compared to when
190 the ship was in homeport, regardless of ship type. While we did not characterize the type or
191 severity of MSKI that warranted LIMDU placement in the current study, it is highly plausible

192 that these factors were salient in the determination of LIMDU placement. Given the hazards of
193 the industrial environment of a warship and operations at sea, the regulations that govern the
194 suitability for a Sailor to function aboard ship will take precedence, regardless of ship type and
195 the specialists aboard.^{4,6}

196

197 **Return to Full Duty following LIMDU**

198 When controlling for deployment status, days underway, and sex, a significantly higher
199 proportion of Sailors assigned to a deployed LHA/LHDs returned to full duty following LIMDU
200 (mean difference ~17%) compared to those aboard deployed CVNs. The mean proportion of
201 Sailors that returned to full duty while in homeport were similar in both ship platforms (~41%).
202 The greater return to duty in deployed Sailors may be due to motivations, career advancement, or
203 financial incentives associated with being deployed. Deployment, as part of a full scope military
204 operation, is the culmination of service and the numerous hours of labor and training needed
205 during preparation for operations at sea. It is plausible that for many, minimization of persistent
206 pain and disability and prioritization of the needs of the mission over self may explain this
207 finding.^{3,13}

208 We observed a higher rate of return to duty in female Sailors. This may be in part due to
209 greater healthcare utilization while deployed. In a prior study of healthcare use during
210 deployment, female Sailors were found to use ship's medical services at a rate 9.2 times higher
211 than their male counterparts.¹⁵ It is plausible that female Sailors with greater healthcare
212 utilization more readily benefitted from the guidance, relation-inferred efficacy, and social
213 support provided by the ship's medical staff during recovery.¹⁶ Another explanation for this
214 finding may be a function of selection of military occupation and the associated physical

215 demands.¹³ Female service members historically have gravitated toward military occupations
216 with fewer physical demands, with administration, healthcare, and supply being the most
217 common fields.¹⁷ It is possible that women serving in fields with fewer physical requirements
218 can more readily return to full duty, even if there is persistent pain and impairment following
219 MSKI. These suppositions warrant future investigation.

220

221 **Policy and Practice Implications**

222 The findings in the current study demonstrate the substantial burden of MSKI aboard
223 large deck ships, both in homeport and while deployed. Inclusion of a PT aboard LHA/LHDs,
224 like the CVN, may help to prevent and mitigate the effects of MSKI through early access to
225 specialized care and integral injury prevention and performance optimization methods. This
226 concept was evaluated in two proof of concept projects, the first which was conducted in 2010.^{3,5}
227 The Sports Medicine on the Battlefield model promotes early access to physical therapist care
228 and has found to be effective in expediting return to duty and optimizing recovery during theatre
229 medical operations.¹⁸ More recently, this model has been employed and demonstrated to be
230 effective in the Military Health System.¹⁹ In the current era of declining eligibility for military
231 service, failure to meet annual recruiting targets, and fluctuating retention, efforts to fortify
232 Naval capital warships with resources that support the adage “humans are more important than
233 hardware” warrants recurring visitation.^{3,13}

234

235 **Limitations**

236 There are limitations to this study. First, this study relied on deidentified, aggregated data
237 provided in the NEST database. While this allowed us to ascertain population-level burden of

238 MSKI rate, short-term LIMDU, and long-term disability, the lack of individual-level data
239 precluded the assessment of comorbidities and other intrinsic factors that may have contributed
240 to the outcomes under study. This study relied on health encounters in the electronic medical
241 record to ascertain MSKI. Sailors who did not sought care or received undocumented care
242 following MSKI were not captured in this evaluation, so the reported burden is likely
243 underestimated in the current study. In the evaluation of ship platform, we used the ship class
244 LHA/LHD as the most comparable reference to that of the CVN in the fleet (based on size and
245 mission set) to evaluate the effectiveness of the physical therapist aboard ship. While there are
246 inherent limitations for this choice (with the amphibious ships having slightly different mission
247 capabilities and requirements that likely influences exposure), this is the only contrast to our
248 knowledge available for this assessment. Future studies evaluating differences in functional
249 capacity requirements, occupational exposures, and environmental hazards across platforms
250 would help to better elucidate if this influenced the findings in the current study. Lastly, we
251 could not qualify the type and severity of injury incurred by the Sailors, nor the clinician type
252 making the determination for LIMDU and return to duty. Given that the responsibility for the
253 medical needs of Sailors aboard ship is with the Senior Medical Officer (typically a board-
254 certified family, aviation health, or occupational medicine trained physician),^{4,6} retention of a
255 Sailor aboard board ship is often a complex decision that balances the needs of the Sailor, the
256 needs of the ship/mission, and contextualized by the social and environmental factors when
257 making risk decisions. While the physical therapist aboard CVNs have a role in providing expert
258 counsel to the Senior Medical Officer pertaining to disposition, it was not possible to evaluate
259 these potential contextualizing factors. While Sailors with MSKI returned to duty at

260 approximately the same frequency in both ship platforms, differences in the long-term health-
261 related quality of life and function of these Sailors could not be ascertained in this study.

262

263 **CONCLUSION**

264

265 MSKI was common in Sailors assigned to large deck ships, with service aboard an LHA/LHD,
266 being in homeport, and female sex identified as salient risk factors. Being deployed was
267 significantly associated with Sailors being placed on LIMDU and returned to duty following a
268 LIMDU period. Sailors that were female and served aboard LHA/LHDs returned to full duty at a
269 significantly greater proportion compared to their male counterparts and Sailors serving aboard
270 CVNs. None of the independent variables evaluated were associated with long-term disability.
271 These findings can be used to better plan prevention efforts and medical care needed aboard ship
272 following MSKI. The findings in the current study demonstrate the substantial burden of MSKI
273 aboard large deck ships, both in homeport and while deployed. Inclusion of a PT aboard
274 LHA/LHDs, like the CVN, may help to prevent and mitigate the effects of MSKI through early
275 access to specialized care and integral injury prevention and performance optimization methods.
276

277 **Patient and Public Involvement:** The results of this study were provided to the US Navy
278 Bureau of Medicine and Surgery Neuromusculoskeletal Clinical Community for dissemination
279 and translation.

280

281 **Figures and Tables**

282 **Figure 1.** (a) Descriptive statistics and (b) results of the negative binomial regression
283 evaluating ship platform, deployment status, sex, and ship by deployment interaction on
284 musculoskeletal injury rates aboard US Navy amphibious assault ships (LHA/LHD class) and
285 aircraft carriers (CVN class) from November 2016 to February 2023.

286

287 **Figure 2.** Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals detailing the mean proportion of
288 Sailors on musculoskeletal injury-related short and long-term disability aboard US Navy
289 amphibious assault ships (LHA/LHD class) and aircraft carriers (CVN class), stratified by sex,
290 platform, and deployment status, from November 2016 to February 2023.

291

292 **Figure 3.** Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals detailing the mean proportion of
293 Sailors returned to full duty following musculoskeletal injury-related limited duty (short-term
294 disability) aboard US Navy amphibious assault ships (LHA/LHD class) and aircraft carriers
295 (CVN class), stratified by sex, platform, and deployment status, from November 2016 to
296 February 2023.

297

298

References

299


- 300 1. Dijkema I, Bekkers M, Spek B, Lucas C, Stuiver M. Epidemiology and Financial Burden of
301 Musculoskeletal Injuries as the Leading Health Problem in the Military. *Mil Med.*
302 2020;185(3-4):e480-e486. doi:10.1093/milmed/usz328
- 303 2. Molloy JM, Pendergrass TL, Lee IE, Chervak MC, Hauret KG, Rhon DI. Musculoskeletal
304 Injuries and United States Army Readiness Part I: Overview of Injuries and their Strategic
305 Impact. *Mil Med.* 2020;185(9-10):e1461-e1471. doi:10.1093/milmed/usaa027
- 306 3. Fraser JJ, Schmied E, Rosenthal MD, Davenport TE. Physical therapy as a force multiplier:
307 population health perspectives to address short-term readiness and long-term health of
308 military service members. *Cardiopulm Phys Ther J.* 2020;31(1):22-28.
309 doi:10.1097/CPT.000000000000129
- 310 4. Commander Naval Air Forces, Department of The Navy. COMNAVAIRFOR 6000.
311 Shipboard Medical Procedures Manual. Published online November 2020. Accessed May
312 25, 2024.
313 [https://www.med.navy.mil/Portals/62/Documents/NMFA/NMCPHC/root/Preventive%20Me](https://www.med.navy.mil/Portals/62/Documents/NMFA/NMCPHC/root/Preventive%20Medicine/Shipboard%20Medical%20Procedures%20CNAF%206000%201.pdf?ver=pjBcLncgSHWao4GTpaNz9A%3D%3D)
314 [dicine/Shipboard%20Medical%20Procedures%20CNAF%206000%201.pdf?ver=pjBcLncgS](https://www.med.navy.mil/Portals/62/Documents/NMFA/NMCPHC/root/Preventive%20Medicine/Shipboard%20Medical%20Procedures%20CNAF%206000%201.pdf?ver=pjBcLncgSHWao4GTpaNz9A%3D%3D)
315 [HWao4GTpaNz9A%3D%3D](https://www.med.navy.mil/Portals/62/Documents/NMFA/NMCPHC/root/Preventive%20Medicine/Shipboard%20Medical%20Procedures%20CNAF%206000%201.pdf?ver=pjBcLncgSHWao4GTpaNz9A%3D%3D)
- 316 5. Reed MF. Bataan's Physical Therapy Helps Keep Pain Away. *DVIDS.*
317 [https://www.dvidshub.net/news/235591/bataans-physical-therapy-helps-keep-pain-away.](https://www.dvidshub.net/news/235591/bataans-physical-therapy-helps-keep-pain-away)
318 Accessed May 26, 2024.
- 319 6. Commander Naval Surface Forces, Department of the Navy. COMNAVSURFORINST
320 6000. Shipboard Medical Procedures Manual. Published online August 2020. Accessed May
321 25, 2024.
322 [https://www.med.navy.mil/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=1BNyvM8kPWM%3D&portalid=62&](https://www.med.navy.mil/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=1BNyvM8kPWM%3D&portalid=62×tamp=1629987297006)
323 [timestamp=1629987297006](https://www.med.navy.mil/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=1BNyvM8kPWM%3D&portalid=62×tamp=1629987297006)
- 324 7. Hiebert R, Brennan T, Campello M, et al. Incidence and Mechanisms of Musculoskeletal
325 Injuries in Deployed Navy Active Duty Service Members Aboard Two U.S. Navy Air Craft
326 Carriers. *Mil Med.* 2020;185(9-10):e1397-e1400. doi:10.1093/milmed/usaa004
- 327 8. Ziemke GW, Koffman RL, Wood DP. "Tip of the spear" physical therapy during a 6-month
328 deployment to the Persian Gulf: a preliminary report. *Mil Med.* 2001;166(6):505-509.
- 329 9. Rosenthal MD, Ziemke GW, Bush ML, Halfpap J. Physical Therapists Forward Deployed on
330 Aircraft Carriers: A Retrospective Look at a Decade of Service. *Mil Med.* 2018;183(11-
331 12):e377-e382. doi:10.1093/milmed/usy070
- 332 10. Fraser JJ, MacGregor AJ, Fechner KM, Galarneau MR. Factors Associated With
333 Neuromusculoskeletal Injury and Disability in Navy and Marine Corps Personnel. *Mil Med.*
334 Published online December 14, 2022:usac386. doi:10.1093/milmed/usac386

- 335 11. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
336 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)
337 Statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg*. 2014;12(12):1495-
338 1499. doi:10.1016/j.ijisu.2014.07.013
- 339 12. Marrone JB. *Predicting 36-Month Attrition in the U.S. Military: A Comparison across*
340 *Service Branches.*; 2020. Accessed February 11, 2021.
341 [https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR4200/RR4258/RAND_RR_](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR4200/RR4258/RAND_RR_4258.pdf)
342 [4258.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR4200/RR4258/RAND_RR_4258.pdf)
- 343 13. Fraser JJ, Macri, EM. Chapter 2.36. Military Personnel (Tactical Athletes). In: *Brukner &*
344 *Khan's Clinical Sports Medicine*. Vol 2. 6th edition. McGraw-Hill North Ryde; In Press.
345 <https://csm.mhmedical.com/Book.aspx?bookid=1970>
- 346 14. Deployability Assessment and Assignment Branch (Pers-454). MILPERSMAN 1306-1200:
347 Limited Duty. Published online September 2021.
348 [https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Reference/MILPERSMAN/1000/1300Assignme](https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Reference/MILPERSMAN/1000/1300Assignment/1300-1400.pdf?ver=Z5b7JumMSH5qTF4U8ygaKA%3d%3d)
349 [nt/1300-1400.pdf?ver=Z5b7JumMSH5qTF4U8ygaKA%3d%3d](https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Reference/MILPERSMAN/1000/1300Assignment/1300-1400.pdf?ver=Z5b7JumMSH5qTF4U8ygaKA%3d%3d)
- 350 15. Summer M. Gender Differences in the Utilization of a Military Ship's Medical Department.
351 *Mil Med*. 2001;166(1):32-33. doi:10.1093/milmed/166.1.32
- 352 16. Podlog L, Wadey R, Caron J, et al. Psychological Readiness to Return to Sport Following
353 Injury: A State-of-the-Art Review. Published online August 31, 2021.
354 doi:10.51224/SRXIV.7
- 355 17. Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness. *Population*
356 *Representation in the Military Services: Fiscal Year 2018 Summary Report.*; 2020. Accessed
357 February 10, 2021. <http://www.cna.org/research/pop-rep>.
- 358 18. Spooner SP, Tyner SD, Sowers C, Tsao J, Stuessi K. Utility of a Sports Medicine Model in
359 Military Combat Concussion and Musculoskeletal Restoration Care. *Mil Med*.
360 2014;179(11):1319-1324. doi:10.7205/MILMED-D-14-00191
- 361 19. Szymanek E, Jones M, Shutt-Hoblet C, Halle R. Implementation of Direct Access Physical
362 Therapy Within the Military Medical System. *Mil Med*. 2022;187(5-6):e649-e654.
363 doi:10.1093/milmed/usab245


364

A


Injury Rate (per 1000 person-months)




B



Cases (%) that progress to short-term disability (<12 months limited duty)




Cases (%) that progress to long-term disability evaluation/military attrition




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.18.24309118>; this version posted June 19, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Homeport

Deployed



Cases (%) of limited duty that are returned to full duty.



		<i>Deployed</i>	
		<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Female Sailor</i>	○	●	
<i>Male Sailor</i>	□	■	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.18.24309118>; this version posted June 19, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.