WHITE PAPER

The ROI of Corporate Wellness

A Strategic Framework for Translating Employee Health into Organizational Performance

---

Francisco Carreño, Ph.D., Pn1, ReCODE 2.0, CSCS
FCG Health Solutions LLC | Exercise Physiology & Health Strategy
fcarrenogalvez.com/organizations

"Companies that invest in employee well-being outperform their peers by 2.5× in stock performance."
— Gallup, State of the Global Workplace Report (2023)

Executive Summary

Corporate wellness programs occupy an increasingly central position in workforce strategy — yet most organizations are not getting the return they should. The gap between high-performing wellness investments and ineffective ones is not a matter of budget. It is a matter of architecture.

This white paper presents a rigorous, evidence-based framework for designing, measuring, and scaling corporate wellness programs that deliver verifiable ROI. Drawing on peer-reviewed research across physiology, organizational behavior, and health economics, it synthesizes decades of evidence into an actionable strategic model applicable to organizations of any size and sector.

Key findings:

- Well-designed wellness programs return $3.27 in reduced medical costs and $2.73 in reduced absenteeism for every $1 invested — a combined ROI of approximately 6:1 (Baicker, Cutler & Song, Health Affairs, 2010).
- Presenteeism — employees working while impaired — costs employers 2–3 times more than absenteeism and direct medical costs combined, and is the primary productivity lever available to wellness programs.
- Multi-component programs targeting physical, mental, musculoskeletal, and metabolic health consistently outperform single-dimension approaches by 40–60%.
- For physically demanding workforces, a targeted industrial athlete model — combining spine biomechanics, progressive strength training, and occupational movement protocols — produces measurable reductions in workers' compensation costs and lost workdays.
- A three-tier program architecture (Universal → Targeted → Intensive) enables organizations to deliver population-level coverage while concentrating high-touch resources where clinical need is greatest.

> *"The question is no longer whether employers can afford to invest in wellness — it is whether they can afford not to."*

1. The Silent Crisis in the American Workforce

The American workforce is experiencing a chronic health deterioration that unfolds quietly — not in emergency rooms, but in office chairs, warehouse floors, and daily routines. Chronic diseases driven by sedentary behavior, poor nutrition, and unmanaged stress now account for 90% of the $4.1 trillion the U.S. spends annually on healthcare (CDC, 2023). For employers, this translates directly into rising insurance premiums, lost productivity, and talent attrition.

90% of U.S. healthcare spending attributable to chronic disease (CDC)	**60%** of U.S. adults living with at least one chronic condition (CDC)	**$300B** annual cost of workplace stress to U.S. employers (Am. Inst. of Stress)

1.1 The Sedentary Work Epidemic

A landmark meta-analysis published in The Lancet by Ekelund et al. (2016), analyzing data from over one million participants across 16 studies, established that sitting more than 8 hours per day with low physical activity carries mortality risk comparable to obesity and smoking. Crucially, 60–75 minutes of moderate-intensity daily activity eliminated that elevated risk entirely.

The implication for organizations is direct: structured movement opportunities are not perks. They are health interventions with measurable impact on longevity, cognitive performance, and daily output. Only 23% of U.S. adults currently meet federal guidelines for both aerobic and muscle-strengthening activity (CDC, 2022), meaning the majority of any given workforce is operating in a state of preventable physiological underperformance.

1.2 The Mental Health Inflection Point

The World Health Organization estimates 12 billion working days are lost globally each year to depression and anxiety alone, costing the global economy $1 trillion annually in lost productivity. In the U.S., the American Psychological Association's 2023 Work in America Survey found that 77% of workers experienced work-related stress in the prior month, and 57% reported negative functional impacts as a result.

Mental health is no longer a peripheral benefit concern. For organizations with safety-sensitive roles, cognitively demanding positions, or shift-based operations, it is a primary operational risk.

1.3 The Metabolic Health Baseline

Research by Araújo et al. (2019) established that only 12.2% of American adults meet all five criteria for optimal metabolic health. This means that on average, nearly 88% of any employer's workforce has suboptimal metabolic function — a condition associated with a 1.6× increase in healthcare costs and 15–25% reductions in sustained productivity.

2. The Economic Case: Quantifying What Poor Health Actually Costs

Most CFOs and HR leaders underestimate total health-related expenditure because they measure only the visible layer — direct medical claims. Research consistently demonstrates that indirect costs (absenteeism, presenteeism, disability, and turnover) exceed direct medical costs by a factor of 2–3× (Integrated Benefits Institute, 2023).

2.1 Absenteeism

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported a national absence rate of 3.2% in 2022, representing approximately 7.8 missed workdays per employee annually. The CDC estimates that productivity losses linked to absenteeism cost U.S. employers $225.8 billion annually, or $1,685 per employee. These figures represent the floor of measurable health-related cost — not the ceiling.

2.2 Presenteeism: The Primary Productivity Lever

Presenteeism — working while physically or mentally impaired — is estimated to cost employers 2 to 3 times more than absenteeism and direct medical costs combined. Research published in the Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (Hemp, 2004; Loeppke et al., 2009) found that presenteeism accounts for up to 60% of total worker illness cost.

The most common drivers of presenteeism are depression, back and neck pain, fatigue, and gastrointestinal disorders — all conditions that respond to lifestyle intervention. A study in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (2020) found that digital wellness interventions targeting stress and physical activity reduced self-reported presenteeism by 20–25% within six months.

57.5	2–3×	$150B+
lost workdays per employee per year attributable to presenteeism (JOEM)	presenteeism costs vs. direct medical + absenteeism combined	estimated annual U.S. cost of presenteeism

2.3 The ROI Evidence Base

The most rigorous meta-analysis of workplace wellness ROI (Baicker, Cutler & Song, Health Affairs, 2010) examined 36 peer-reviewed controlled studies and produced the most widely cited benchmark figures in the field:

Metric / Finding	Source
$3.27 saved per $1 invested	*Medical cost reduction (Baicker et al., 2010)*
$2.73 saved per $1 invested	*Absenteeism cost reduction (Baicker et al., 2010)*
3.8:1 ROI (disease management)	*RAND Corporation Workplace Wellness Study (2019)*
1.5:1 ROI (lifestyle programs)	*RAND Corporation; improves significantly over multi-year horizons*
2–3× greater effectiveness	*Programs with strong leadership support (Society of Actuaries, 2024)*
40–60% better outcomes	*Personalized vs. generic program design (Society of Actuaries, 2024)*

2.4 Corporate Case Studies

Three landmark organizations illustrate what is achievable at scale:

Johnson & Johnson

One of the longest-running corporate wellness programs in history, J&J's initiative has generated an estimated $250 million in cumulative healthcare savings over a decade, with a return of $2.71 for every $1 invested (Berry, Mirabito & Baun, HBR, 2010). Employee smoking rates declined from 35% to 4%; high-risk health profiles dropped by 50%.

SAS Institute

SAS's comprehensive wellness environment — on-site healthcare, fitness, and work-life integration — sustained a voluntary turnover rate of 4% against an industry average of approximately 20%, generating an estimated $70 million in annual recruitment and training cost avoidance.

MD Anderson Cancer Center

A comprehensive wellness and injury prevention program produced an 80% reduction in lost workdays and a 50% reduction in modified-duty days, with significant declines in workers' compensation costs — demonstrating the disproportionate ROI available through injury prevention in physically demanding environments.

3. The Strategic Framework: Wellness as Organizational Architecture

Effective corporate wellness programs are not collections of standalone benefits — they are integrated systems. The framework presented here is built on five foundational principles and structured through a three-tier delivery architecture that serves both population-level coverage and high-acuity individual need.

3.1 Core Design Principles

- Health as Human Capital: Employee health is an asset to be optimized, not a cost to be minimized. The calculus shifts from reactive claims management to proactive performance investment.
- Personalization at Scale: One-size-fits-all programs consistently underperform. Effective architecture leverages data, role stratification, and behavioral science to deliver relevant interventions to the right populations.
- Integration Over Isolation: Wellness cannot succeed as a standalone HR function. It must integrate into operational planning, leadership accountability, performance culture, and physical environment design.
- Evidence-Based Intervention Only: Every program component is grounded in peer-reviewed research and demonstrated clinical effectiveness. Wellness theater — programs that generate participation metrics without health impact — is discarded.
- Measurement and Accountability: What gets measured gets managed — but only if we measure what matters. Leading indicators (behaviors, biometrics, engagement) and lagging indicators (claims, absenteeism, turnover) are tracked with the same rigor applied to financial performance.

3.2 The Three-Tier Delivery Architecture

Program delivery follows a tiered structure that allocates resources proportionally to need:

Tier	Population & Scope	Program Examples
Tier 1: Universal Foundation	All employees. Broad access, low barrier.	Health education, screenings, digital platform, mental health awareness, fitness resources
Tier 2: Targeted Intervention	Role-specific or condition-specific populations.	Prediabetes prevention, role-specific ergonomics, shift-worker protocols, hypertension management
Tier 3: Intensive Support	High-risk individuals, complex clinical needs.	Disease management, 1:1 coaching, specialist coordination, return-to-work rehabilitation

4. The 12 KPIs of Organizational Vitality

A comprehensive wellness framework tracks twelve interdependent health domains. These are not arbitrary categories — each is associated with measurable organizational cost drivers and responds to evidence-based intervention. A complete picture of workforce health capital.

01

Metabolic Health

Only 12.2% of U.S. adults meet all criteria for optimal metabolic health (Araújo et al., 2019). Metabolic syndrome increases healthcare costs 1.6×; diabetes costs employers an estimated $4,800 per affected employee annually. Prediabetes prevention programs have demonstrated a 58% reduction in diabetes progression.

02

Cardiovascular Resilience

Cardiovascular disease is the leading driver of major medical claims. Shift work increases coronary heart disease risk by 23% (RR 1.23) and compounds approximately 7% per five years of exposure (Proper et al., 2023). Screening, lifestyle intervention, and cessation programs are the primary levers.

03

Musculoskeletal Integrity

MSDs account for 30% of all workers' compensation costs. Average MSD claim direct costs range from $15,000–$35,000, with 12–60 lost workdays per injury depending on severity. Pre-shift warm-up programs alone have demonstrated injury rate reductions of up to 50%.

04

Sleep & Circadian Optimization

17–19 hours without sleep produces cognitive impairment equivalent to a 0.05% blood alcohol concentration. Sleep-deprived workers are 70% more likely to be involved in accidents. CBT for Insomnia (CBT-I) achieves 70–80% improvement rates. For shift-based and safety-sensitive workforces, this KPI is a direct operational risk variable.

05

Mental Health & Psychological Resilience

12 billion working days lost globally per year to depression and anxiety (WHO, 2024). A 2024 network meta-analysis in the British Medical Journal (Noetel et al., 218 RCTs, 14,170 participants) found exercise to be 1.5× more effective than counseling for reducing depression symptoms. Stigma reduction and direct-access care structures are critical implementation levers.

06

Cognitive Performance

Even 2% dehydration impairs cognitive performance measurably. A single bout of moderate exercise improves executive function and working memory for 1–2 hours post-exercise (Chang et al., 2012). Employees who exercise regularly report 21% higher concentration and 25% faster task completion on active days (Coulson et al., 2008).

07

Nutritional Excellence

Nutrition is the biochemical substrate of all other health KPIs. 'Choice architecture' interventions — restructuring cafeteria and vending defaults toward healthy options — increase healthy food selection by 15–25% without mandates (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). Nutrition strategy is particularly impactful for shift workers and physically demanding roles.

08

Physical Activity & Movement

Physical inactivity contributes to 6–10% of all major non-communicable diseases globally and 9% of premature mortality (Lee et al., Lancet, 2012). Group exercise formats improve adherence by 40–65% over solo exercise (Dishman & Buckworth, 1996). Role-specific movement programming delivers superior compliance and relevance.

09

Stress Management & Recovery

Chronic stress drives inflammation, metabolic dysfunction, cardiovascular disease, and accelerated biological aging. 77% of workers experienced work-related stress in the past month (APA, 2023). Mindfulness-based stress reduction programs reduce perceived stress by 23–30% (Khoury et al., 2015, meta-analysis of 209 studies). Resilience training produces 20–30% sustained reductions.

10

Financial Wellness

Financial stress is the primary stressor for 57% of employees. Financially stressed workers are 5× more likely to report significant work distraction. Financial stress costs U.S. employers an estimated $500 billion annually in productivity loss. Financial wellness programming has among the highest perceived-value-to-cost ratios of any benefit.

11

Social Connection & Belonging

The U.S. Surgeon General declared loneliness a public health crisis in 2023. Social isolation increases heart disease risk by 29%, stroke risk by 32%, and premature mortality risk by 60% — equivalent to smoking 15 cigarettes daily. High-quality peer networks and team integration programs are the primary organizational levers.

12

Purpose, Meaning & Engagement

Purpose is associated with a 15% lower mortality risk, 2.4× reduced Alzheimer's risk, and 20% higher productivity (Gallup, 2023). Purpose-driven employees are 3× more likely to remain with their organization. Mission communication, strengths-based development, and career growth pathways are the primary investment categories.

5. The Industrial Athlete Model: Wellness for Physically Demanding Workforces

Organizations with warehouse, distribution, field operations, or manufacturing workforces operate in a distinct risk environment that generic wellness programs consistently fail to address. Employees in these roles are not desk workers — they are industrial athletes performing repetitive, load-bearing movement across full shifts. The wellness architecture must be built accordingly.

5.1 The Injury Risk Reality

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics documented 502,380 workplace musculoskeletal disorders resulting in days away from work in 2021–2022. Overexertion and bodily reaction is the leading injury event category. The Liberty Mutual Workplace Safety Index (2023) estimates overexertion injuries cost U.S. employers over $20 billion annually. The average workplace back injury claim carries direct costs exceeding $40,000 (National Safety Council).

The relevant question for employers is not whether physically demanding workforces face elevated risk — they do, every shift. The question is whether that risk is being systematically managed through evidence-based intervention.

5.2 Strength Training as Injury Prevention: The Evidence

The scientific literature on occupational strength training as an injury prevention modality is substantive and consistent:

- A cluster-randomized controlled trial among slaughterhouse workers (comparable repetitive lifting demands) found that 3×10-minute strength training sessions per week during work hours produced significant reductions in musculoskeletal pain and maintained work ability over a 20-week period, while control group work ability deteriorated (Sjøgaard et al., SJWEH, 2014).
- A series of RCTs by Andersen et al. (2015) demonstrated that just 10 minutes of targeted strength exercise five times per week — performed at the workplace — significantly reduced musculoskeletal pain in physically demanding roles. Critically, on-site exercise produced superior adherence and outcomes compared to identical home-based protocols.
- A 2024 RCT published in BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders found that a 6-month workplace exercise program combining strength training, stretching, and functional movement significantly reduced pain intensity and improved functional capacity in manual workers.

> *"Spine injuries typically occur not from excessive load alone, but from loss of stability under load — exactly the scenario physically demanding workers face during fatigue."* — Professor Stuart McGill, University of Waterloo — world's leading spine biomechanics researcher

5.3 Equipment Selection: Evidence-Based, Purpose-Built

The design of the workplace training environment for physically demanding workforces should not be arbitrary. Equipment selection follows functional analysis of job demands:

Hex (Trap) Bar — The Spine-Safe Strength Platform

The hexagonal barbell deadlift is biomechanically superior for general and occupational populations compared to conventional straight-bar variants. A landmark analysis by Swinton et al. (2011) in the Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research demonstrated that the hex bar produces significantly lower peak moments at the lumbar spine, allows greater peak force and power output, and promotes a more upright torso position that reduces spinal shear forces — a critical advantage for workers who already spend their shifts in flexed postures.

The hex bar also teaches the exact motor pattern — bend, brace, grip, lift — that physically demanding workers perform hundreds of times per shift, but in a controlled, progressive, and strengthening context. Space requirement: approximately 6×4 feet of floor space.

TRX Suspension Training — Scalable Core and Posterior Chain Development

Suspension training produces significantly greater activation of core stabilizing muscles (transverse abdominis, internal and external obliques, multifidus, erector spinae) compared to equivalent ground-based exercises (Aguilera-Castells et al., Sport Biomechanics, 2020). A study by Snarr & Esco (2014) confirmed that key TRX movements produce high-to-very-high activation of the musculature responsible for spinal stability during lifting tasks.

TRX requires no floor storage space, mounts to any fixed anchor point, and enables scalable difficulty through body angle adjustment — serving both deconditioned new hires and veteran high-performers from the same station. This inclusivity is essential for adoption in mixed-fitness-level workforces.

McGill's Big Three: Core Stability as Spine Protection

Professor Stuart McGill's decades of spine biomechanics research at the University of Waterloo established that core stability training — specifically targeting the transverse abdominis, internal obliques, and multifidus — is the primary mechanism for protecting the lumbar spine during loaded movements. His canonical protocol (the McGill Curl-Up, Side Bridge, and Bird Dog) forms the evidence-based foundation for any industrial athlete warm-up or daily movement routine.

5.4 Sample Daily Protocol: The 10-Minute Industrial Athlete Routine

Consistent with Andersen et al.'s finding that 10 minutes of daily targeted exercise is sufficient to produce meaningful musculoskeletal pain reduction, the following structured routine is designed for pre-shift, break-time, or post-shift execution:

Phase	Exercise	Rationale
Warm-Up (2 min)	Band Pull-Aparts ×15 reps	*Shoulder health and posterior chain activation*
Warm-Up (2 min)	Banded Hip Circles ×10 each direction	*Hip activation prior to lifting*
Core & Stability (4 min)	TRX Plank — 30 seconds	*Anti-extension core stability (McGill principle)*
Core & Stability (4 min)	McGill Curl-Up ×10 reps	*Rectus activation without lumbar flexion load*
Core & Stability (4 min)	Bird Dog ×8 each side	*Anti-rotation, multifidus, deep stabilizer activation*
Strength (3 min)	Hex Bar Deadlift — 3×5 moderate load	*Hip hinge patterning, total-body strength, lumbar-safe*
Cool-Down (1 min)	Foam Roll Thoracic Spine — 30 sec	*Thoracic mobility, postural restoration*
Cool-Down (1 min)	Standing Hip Flexor Stretch — 15 sec each	*Counteracts prolonged hip flexion in lifting postures*

Equipment cost for a single workplace micro-gym: approximately $520–$815 — a fraction of the direct cost of a single workers' compensation back injury claim.

6. Measurement Framework: Tracking What Matters

Program measurement must distinguish between leading indicators (behaviors and engagement that predict future outcomes) and lagging indicators (costs and health outcomes that confirm past performance). Tracking only lagging indicators means waiting for the ROI signal to arrive 12–24 months late. Tracking only leading indicators means never connecting program activity to business results.

6.1 Core KPI Dashboard

Metric / Finding	Source
Healthcare cost trend vs. prior year	*Benefits / claims data (quarterly)*
Absenteeism rate — target <2.5%	*HR records (monthly)*
Presenteeism index (WLQ or HPQ)	*Employee survey (biannual)*
Workers' comp MSD claims rate	*Risk management records (quarterly)*
Voluntary turnover rate	*HR records (quarterly)*
Program engagement rate (active monthly users)	*Wellness platform analytics (monthly)*
Biometric improvement in at-risk population (BP, HbA1c, BMI)	*Health screening data (annual)*
Employee satisfaction with wellness — target ≥80%	*Pulse survey (quarterly)*

6.2 Implementation Timeline

The Society of Actuaries Research Institute (2024) and University of Illinois RCT (Jones, Molitor & Reif, 2019) both confirm that meaningful medical cost savings require 12–24 months to materialize in claims data. Behavioral and biometric leading indicators typically appear within 3–6 months. Program design must account for this temporal gap in stakeholder reporting.

Phase	Priority Activities
Foundation (Months 1–6)	Executive sponsorship secured; wellness committee formed; baseline health risk assessment; technology platform selection; manager training initiated; quick-win launches (mental health awareness, step challenge, healthy vending upgrade).
Build (Months 7–18)	Full platform deployment; role-specific pathways launched; prediabetes prevention, sleep optimization, and MSK prevention programs activated; Year 1 mid-point evaluation.
Optimize (Months 19–36)	Program refinement based on Year 1 data; advanced analytics implementation; culture integration initiatives; formal ROI analysis and executive reporting.

7. Conclusion: The Strategic Imperative

The evidence is no longer ambiguous. Well-designed, sustained corporate wellness programs produce verifiable returns across healthcare costs, absenteeism, presenteeism, workers' compensation, and talent retention. The organizations that lead on workforce health — Johnson & Johnson, SAS Institute, MD Anderson — are not outliers. They are case studies in what becomes possible when wellness is treated as strategic infrastructure rather than an HR benefit.

The programs that underperform share a common profile: they are fragmented, generic, participation-focused, and unaccountable to business outcomes. They are wellness theater. The programs that generate 6:1 ROI share a different profile: multi-component, personalized, integrated into operational culture, and measured with the same rigor as financial performance.

The framework presented in this paper — the 12 KPIs of Organizational Vitality, the three-tier delivery architecture, the industrial athlete model, and the phased implementation roadmap — provides the structural scaffolding for building a wellness program that generates real returns. The variables that determine actual outcomes are leadership commitment, program design quality, and sustained measurement discipline.

> *"The greatest competitive advantage in the modern economy is a healthy, engaged, and resilient workforce. Wellness is not a benefit — it is a business strategy."*

For organizations ready to move from wellness as a line item to wellness as a performance strategy, FCG Health Solutions LLC provides the exercise physiology expertise, clinical rigor, and organizational consulting architecture to design, implement, and measure programs that deliver.

Francisco Carreño, Ph.D., Pn1, ReCODE 2.0, CSCS. | FCG Health Solutions LLC

References

Aguilera-Castells, J., et al. (2020). Muscle activation in suspension training: A systematic review. Sport Biomechanics, 19(1), 55–75.

American Psychological Association. (2023). 2023 Work in America Survey.

Andersen, L.L., et al. (2015). Effect of workplace- versus home-based physical exercise on pain in physically demanding workers. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 41(2), 153–163.

Araújo, J., Cai, J., & Stevens, J. (2019). Prevalence of optimal metabolic health in American adults. Metabolic Syndrome and Related Disorders, 17(1), 46–52.

Baicker, K., Cutler, D., & Song, Z. (2010). Workplace wellness programs can generate savings. Health Affairs, 29(2), 304–311.

Berry, L.L., Mirabito, A.M., & Baun, W.B. (2010). What's the hard return on employee wellness programs? Harvard Business Review, 88(12), 104–112.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2023). Employer-reported workplace injuries and illnesses, 2021–2022.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2023). Chronic diseases in America.

Chang, Y.K., et al. (2012). The effects of acute exercise on cognitive performance. Brain Research, 1453, 87–101.

Coulson, J.C., McKenna, J., & Field, M. (2008). Exercising at work and self-reported work performance. International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 1(3), 176–197.

Dishman, R.K., & Buckworth, J. (1996). Increasing physical activity: A quantitative synthesis. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 28(6), 706–719.

Ekelund, U., et al. (2016). Does physical activity attenuate, or even eliminate, the detrimental association of sitting time with mortality? The Lancet, 388(10051), 1302–1310.

Gallup. (2023). State of the Global Workplace Report.

Hemp, P. (2004). Presenteeism: At work—but out of it. Harvard Business Review, 82(10), 49–58.

Integrated Benefits Institute. (2023). Poor health costs U.S. employers $575 billion and 1.5 billion work days of absence.

Jones, D., Molitor, D., & Reif, J. (2019). What do workplace wellness programs do? Evidence from the Illinois Workplace Wellness Study. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 134(4), 1747–1791.

Kaiser Family Foundation. (2024). 2024 Employer Health Benefits Survey.

Khoury, B., et al. (2015). Mindfulness-based stress reduction for healthy individuals: A meta-analysis. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 78(6), 519–528.

Lee, I.M., et al. (2012). Effect of physical inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide. The Lancet, 380(9838), 219–229.

Liberty Mutual Research Institute. (2023). Workplace Safety Index.

Loeppke, R., et al. (2009). Health and productivity as a business strategy. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 51(4), 411–428.

McGill, S.M. (2010). Core training: Evidence translating to better performance and injury prevention. Strength and Conditioning Journal, 32(3), 33–46.

Noetel, M., et al. (2024). Effect of exercise for depression: Systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ, 384, e075847.

Prieske, O., et al. (2023). Core training and performance: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Sports Medicine – Open, 9, 93.

Proper, K.I., et al. (2023). Night shift work and indicators of cardiovascular risk. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 49(1), 5–17.

RAND Corporation. (2019). Do Workplace Wellness Programs Save Employers Money?

Sjøgaard, G., et al. (2014). Workplace strength training prevents deterioration of work ability among workers with chronic pain. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 40(3), 244–251.

Snarr, R.L., & Esco, M.R. (2014). Core muscle activity during TRX suspension exercises. Journal of Human Kinetics, 40, 169–178.

Society of Actuaries Research Institute. (2024). Effectiveness of health and wellness programs.

Swinton, P.A., et al. (2011). A biomechanical analysis of straight and hexagonal barbell deadlifts using submaximal loads. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 25(7), 2000–2009.

Thaler, R.H., & Sunstein, C.R. (2008). Nudge. Yale University Press.

Thosar, S.S., et al. (2015). Effect of prolonged sitting and breaks in sitting time on endothelial function. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 47(4), 843–849.

U.S. Surgeon General. (2023). Our epidemic of loneliness and isolation.

World Health Organization. (2024). Mental health at work.