

1 **Work-related road traffic crashes: emergence of new modes of personal journey. Analysis**
2 **based on data from a register of road traffic crashes**

3

4 Emmanuel Fort^a, Nicolas Connesson^a, Julien Brière^b, Amina Ndiaye^a, Blandine Gadegbeku^a,

5 Barbara Charbotel^{a,c}

6

7 ^a Univ Lyon, Univ Gustave Eiffel, Univ Claude Bernard Lyon 1, UMRESTTE UMR T 9405, F

8 69622 Lyon, France.

9 emmanuel.fort@univ-lyon1.fr

10 nicolas.connesson@gmail.com

11 amina.ndiaye@univ-eiffel.fr

12 blandine.gadegbeku@univ-eiffel.fr

13 barbara.charbotel@univ-lyon1.fr

14 ^bDepartment of Environmental and Occupational Health, Santé Publique France, French

15 National Public Health Agency, Saint Maurice, France. julien.briere@santepubliquefrance.fr

16 ^cCRPPE de Lyon (Regional Center for Occupational and Environmental Pathologies), Hospices

17 Civils de Lyon, Centre Hospitalier Lyon Sud, Pierre-Bénite, France.

18 Corresponding author: Emmanuel Fort

19 Univ Lyon, Univ Gustave Eiffel, Univ Claude Bernard Lyon 1, UMRESTTE UMR T 9405, F 69622

20 Lyon, France emmanuel.fort@univ-lyon1.fr

21 Abstract

22

23 **Introduction:** According to the 2018–2019 People Mobility Survey, work-related journeys
24 (commuting and on-duty journeys) account for approximately 25% of all journeys. The use of
25 non-motorized (nm) and motorized (m) personal mobility devices (PMDs) has steadily
26 increased since their introduction into the French market in the last decade.

27 **Objective:** This study aimed to describe the characteristics of work-related road crashes and
28 their evolution since the introduction of new PMDs in France and the increase in the use of
29 scooters.

30 **Materials and methods:** This was a retrospective, cross-sectional study using data from the
31 Rhône Road Trauma Registry. Data were collected from 2015 to 2020. We included the data
32 for the victims aged 18–70 years who were injured in work-related road crashes.

33 **Results:** We identified 11,296 individuals aged 18–70 years who experienced work-related
34 road crashes. An injury report was provided for a total of 11,277 patients. A total of 546
35 passengers and 78 drivers of other motorized vehicles (buses/trams, construction
36 equipment, and tractors) were excluded from the analysis. Seven patients died at the time of
37 the crash, and seven died after hospitalization. Of the 10,653 (94.4%) victims, there were
38 pedestrians (5.1%), or riders of bicycles (16.9%), scooters (3.8%), other PMDs (roller blades,
39 skateboards, monowheels, gyropods, and hoverboards; 0.4%) and motorized two-wheeler
40 (21.4%), or drivers of car (45.3%), and truck (1.5%). More than half of the scooter riders and
41 80% of other PMD riders were men. More than 60% of other PMD riders and 53% of scooter
42 riders were under 34 years of age. Most scooter road crashes occurred during commuting

43 (95.6%). Sixty-five percent of the scooter crashes and 50% of other PMD crashes did not
44 have opponents. Overall, one-quarter of the victims experienced crashes without
45 opponents. Most scooter riders had injuries to their upper limbs (59.2%), lower limbs
46 (46.8%), face (21.2%) or head (17.9%).

47 **Discussion:** Most work-related road crashes were of low or moderate severity (97.5%;
48 Maximum Abbreviated Injury Scale, MAIS score < 3). The frequency and severity of injuries
49 among scooter and other PMD users were similar. Scooter opponents were rarely observed
50 in pedestrian injuries (12/575). Most scooter- and other PMD-crashes did not have
51 opponents.

52 **Conclusion:** Many head injuries could be prevented with more widespread use of helmets,
53 among scooter- and other PMD users and bicycle users.

54 **Keywords:** scooters; personal mobility device; mobility; road crash; work-related road crash;
55 injuries; regulations

56

57 **What is already known on this topic**

- 58
- The use of personal mobility devices (PMDs) has steadily increased in France.
- 59
- Work-related journeys (commuting and on-duty journeys) account for approximately
- 60 25% of all journeys

61

62 **What this study adds**

- 63
- We describe work-related road crashes' characteristics since PMDs' introduction.
- 64
- Work-related road crashes involving scooters or other PMDs riders are of low
- 65 severity.
- 66
- Most scooter riders had injuries to their upper limbs (59.2%), lower limbs (46.8%),
- 67 face (21.2%) or head (17.9%).

68

69 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

- 70
- Many head injuries could be prevented with more widespread helmet use.
- 71
- Companies can take preventive actions to ensure that employees are better
- 72 informed.

73

74 1. Introduction

75 While a large proportion of travel in France involves private journeys (leisure or other),
76 work-related journeys (home-work and on-duty) account for approximately 25% according
77 to the 2018–2019 People Mobility Survey [1]. The main modes of transportation for
78 commuting journeys were cars (72%), public transport (12%), walking (9%), cycling (3%), and
79 motorized two-wheelers (2%); other modes accounted for less than 1%. According to the
80 National Transport and Mobility Survey, work-related journeys accounted for approximately
81 27% of all journeys in 2008 [2]. The 2016 National Survey of Environmental Behavior [3]
82 showed that 25% of journeys were mainly for commuting. According to the Sumer surveys in
83 France, 25% of employees drive on public roads as part of their work [4,5]. This proportion
84 has remained constant since the surveys were conducted (2003, 2010, and 2017).

85 The mode of transport to reach work depends on several factors [3]. The distance to work,
86 availability of transportation, car ownership, household size, parking, and cost are
87 determining factors in choosing the travel mode(s). In addition, there is a significant
88 difference between the types of territory; walking, cycling, and other soft modes of
89 transport are preferred in Paris and its suburbs, as well as in large cities and urban areas
90 (those with 100,000–10,000,000 inhabitants).

91 A personal mobility device (PMD) is a class of compact micromobility vehicle for transporting
92 an individual. It can be separated in 2 subgroups: the non-motorized personal mobility
93 devices (nmPMDs) which can be typically scooter, roller, skateboard; and motorized
94 personal mobility devices (mPMDs) which include electric scooter, skateboards, kick
95 scooters, self-balancing unicycles and Segways, as well as gasoline-fueled motorized scooters
96 or skateboards, typically using two-stroke engines of less than 49 cc (3.0 cu in) displacement

97 and which can't ride at speeds that do normally exceed 25 km/h (16 mph) or sometimes
98 20km/h in some countries. The use of PMD has been steadily increasing, mostly since the
99 introduction of electric scooter into the market in France in the last decade, as well as in
100 other cities globally [6]. These modes of transport can be referred to as micromobility that
101 combines all easy modes of transport that allow their users to make hybrid use of the vehicle
102 either as a pedestrian or as a vehicle occupant [7]. It represents between 8–15% of daily
103 journeys of less than 8 km, which today account for 50–60% of the distance traveled in
104 China, the European Union, and the USA, and replaces 20% of public transport journeys (in
105 addition to bridging the gap between the first and last kilometers) as well as bicycle, moped,
106 scooter, or on-foot journeys [8].

107 The introduction of electric scooter sharing (in June 2018 in France) has accelerated the use
108 of electric scooters for journeys. It has been observed in all industrialized countries, mainly
109 in large metropolises [9]. In overall, the development of PMDs is growing, primarily in urban
110 areas, for several reasons. First, their use could replace motorized vehicles, such as cars or
111 motorized two-wheelers. Second, they reduce air pollution; therefore, their use is favored in
112 cities with reserved lanes (for bicycles and PMDs) or shared lanes (usually for bicycles, PMDs,
113 bus and taxi). Finally, the increase in the cost of fossil energy favors the development of
114 PMDs. In fact, it appears that most walking and public transport journeys are replaced by
115 trips using PMDs [10]. Electric scooters replace walking or biking for the last mile of a
116 journey [11], potentially reducing the overall physical activity of the population [12]. The
117 introduction of large low-emission zones (ZFE), where vehicle speeds are limited to 30 km/h,
118 is a new incentive to use PMDs. The COVID-19 pandemic has increased the use of PMDs,
119 particularly by encouraging social distancing [13]. Thus, public transport users have

120 abandoned subways, tramways, or buses, where distances between people can be too small,
121 for the use of PMDs. However, some authors have highlighted problems caused by electric
122 scooters, both regarding the safety of other vulnerable users and the impact on the
123 environment during the production of scooters, especially batteries, which cause pollution
124 [14].

125 In Vienna, Austria, Laa and Leth [15] showed that users were shifting to electric scooters,
126 followed by buses and street cars, to replace walking. Electric scooters are used in
127 combination with other modes of transport. A study from the USA on users of the shared-
128 bike service in Washington, D.C. found that 35% of occasional users reported using it as a
129 substitute for public transport [16]. In Belgium, nearly 50% of customers reported replacing
130 one or more modes of transport with electric scooters [17].

131 PMDs now represent a significant part of urban and peri-urban transport modes. In France,
132 22% of respondents have used them at least once, and 11% are regular users (at least once a
133 month) [18]. The electric scooters are the most-used mPMD, followed to a lesser extent by
134 the gyro-mot, electric skateboard, gyropod, and hoverboard. One of two daily users of
135 mPMD uses a self-service electric scooter. In Greece, 40% of the users mentioned using
136 electric scooters for work purposes [9]. These electric vehicles offer new opportunities to
137 users in terms of travel speed and less effort than their non-electric counterparts; however,
138 they cause problems with public space sharing and road safety [18].

139 Many regulations have been implemented and experiments have been conducted in cities
140 and countries to better control the use of electric scooters [6] and reduce the injuries
141 associated with them, such as restrictions on hiring and using electric scooters at night [19],
142 wearing helmets, adhering to speed limits, and traffic zones [6].

143 Many studies have found an increase in injuries associated with the use of electric-sharing
144 scooters. In USA, the estimated incidence of electric scooter injuries treated in emergency
145 departments in the US nearly doubled between 2018 and 2019 [20]. In the United Kingdom,
146 a case series demonstrated an increasing frequency of significant orthopedic injury
147 associated with electric scooter use treated at a Level 1 Major Trauma Center over the
148 course of two years [21] while a study in a trauma unit found a significant rise in electric
149 scooter-related injuries seen between 2019 and 2020 [22]. A study about the patients
150 attended on in an emergency room in Spain concluded that the popularization of electric
151 scooters among the employed population has caused a high increased number of crashes in
152 this range of age [22]. Finally, in Finland, [23] and in France [24] other studies have found an
153 increase in injuries associated with the introduction and the use of electric-sharing scooters
154 [25–29].

155 Thus, although this increase has not yet been quantified in mobility surveys, there has been
156 an increase in road crashes for users. In a recent publication, the Rhône Registry reported
157 1,186 scooter crashes, resulting in 1,197 injured users and a 7.3-fold increase in the number
158 of scooter crashes between 2018 and 2019 [30].

159 Therefore, this study aimed to describe the characteristics of victims injured during a work-
160 related road crash and their evolution since the emergence of PMDs, more specifically the
161 scooters. A secondary objective was to characterize and compare crashes involving scooters
162 and other PMDs with the usual user categories.

163 2. Materials and Methods

164

165 2.1. Design

166 This retrospective cross-sectional study used data from the Rhône Road Trauma Registry.

167 2.2. The Rhône Road Trauma Registry

168 The Rhône Road Trauma Registry has been recording data prospectively since its inception in
169 1995 and covers the Rhône region (1.85 million inhabitants), including one of France's
170 largest cities (Lyon, 0.5 million inhabitants, 11,000 inhabitants/km²) within a metropolis
171 (Lyon Metropolis, 1.4 million inhabitants). Individuals were included in the registry if they
172 faced a road crash involving one or more road users (motorized or not) in the Rhône region
173 and consulted one of the 245 public or private healthcare facilities (including 42 emergency
174 departments and 20 intensive care units within levels I, II, and III trauma centers), including
175 pre-hospital primary care services and forensic medicine institutes.

176 The Registry collects the data on demographics of each victim, their sustained injuries, and
177 crashes. Patient information was prospectively collected from the time of the crash to
178 hospital discharge from prehospital emergency care, emergency departments, intensive care
179 units, and surgical units.

180

181 2.3. Study population

182 Data were collected from 2015 to 2020. The victims aged 18–70 years (legal age limit for
183 working in France for workers) who were injured on the way to/from work or while working
184 were included in the Rhône Registry database (Figure 1). Persons without an injury were
185 excluded because they were out of the scope of our study, as were passengers in a vehicle

186 (n=546) because they were not driver and drivers of buses/coaches/tramway (n=61) or other
187 motorized vehicles (tractors, construction equipment, quad bikes; n=17) because they were
188 few and with specific particularities that don't allow relevant comparisons with other users
189 (defined paths for buses and coaches).

190 2.4. Variables

191 The following variables were analyzed: sex, age, category of work journey (commuting or
192 mission), category of road user, type of road network, opponent, time of crash, month of
193 crash, day of crash, use of adequate safety equipment, hospitalization, injuries and death at
194 the scene or post-crash.

195 2.5. Gravity of the injuries

196 Each injury was coded according to the Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS), the AIS 2005 Revision,
197 which comprises 2,000 codes divided into nine body areas [31,32]. Each code has an
198 associated AIS severity score ranging from 1 (minor injury) to 6 (beyond treatment/death).
199 As a patient may have multiple injuries in the same body part, the maximum AIS (MAIS)
200 reports the greatest severity in each injury area. Similarly, the overall MAIS score is
201 calculated to determine the victims' overall severity of injuries. Finally, the New Injury
202 Severity Score (NISS) was calculated from the three most severe injuries and was defined as
203 the sum of the squares of the respective AIS [33,34]. It was then classified into 3 categories:
204 minor trauma <9, moderate trauma (9–15), and severe trauma ≥16.

205 2.6. Statistical analysis

206 A descriptive analysis was conducted for the overall data and by user category (for the main
207 categories). Seven categories of users were identified: pedestrians, bicycle riders, scooter
208 riders, riders of other PMDs (roller blades, skateboards, hoverboards, and monowheels),

209 car/light commercial vehicle drivers, truck drivers, and motorized two-wheeler riders. We
210 also considered these 7 categories into 2 subgroups: “soft mode transport users”
211 (pedestrians, bicyclists, scooters, and other PMDs) and “motor vehicle users not authorized
212 to use bicycle paths and lanes” (cars/light commercial vehicles, trucks, and motorized two-
213 wheelers).

214 Firstly, we described the victims of the 2015-2020 register, grouped into 7 user categories
215 according to socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age) and crash characteristics (type
216 of commute, antagonist, month of crash,...), with comparisons between the 7 user
217 categories as a whole and between users belonging to 2 sub-groups, then we describe and
218 compare the same groups according to injury characteristics (MAIS, area of injury,...), and
219 finally we studied the trends over the 2015-2019 period.

220 Categorical variables were compared by user category using the chi-square test, and
221 quantitative variables, using analysis of variance (ANOVA). All analyses were performed
222 using SAS software version 9.4.

223 3. Results

224 3.1. Description of the victims of work-related road crash

225 Between 2015 and 2020, 53,487 victims were recorded in the Rhône registry, of whom
226 approximately 82% (n=43,791) were between 18 and 70 years of age. Approximately 26%
227 (n=11,296) of crashes were related to commutes or duty journeys.

228 Of the 11,296 victims aged 18–70 years involved in work-related road traffic crashes, 11,277
229 had an injury report. Seven people died at the time of the crash and seven died after
230 hospitalization.

231 We excluded 546 passengers and 78 drivers of other motorized vehicles (buses, tramways,
232 construction equipment, and tractors) from the analysis according to the main categories of
233 interest, resulting in 10,653 participants (94.4%). These were scooter riders (3.8%), other
234 PMD riders (0.4%), bicycles riders (16.9%), motorized two-wheelers riders (21.4%),
235 pedestrians (5.1%), and cars or light commercial vehicles (45.3%) and trucks (1.5%) drivers.

236 Nearly half of the scooter riders (54.8%) and more than three-quarters of other PMD riders
237 were male (Table 1). Overall, most victims were male (60.9%), except for pedestrians (45.7%)
238 and car occupants (47.1%).

239 Most PMD riders were under 35 years of age (60% for other PMDs and 52.7% for scooters).

240 Overall, the population was young, with 54.1% aged < 35 years, and 76.1% aged < 45 years.

241 The average age differed significantly according to the user category.

242 Most work-related scooter crashes occurred during commuting (95.6%). The reason for the
243 journey was related to the mode of travel; 78.9% of the truck driver victims were on duty

244 and 20.7% of pedestrians were involved in the crash while on duty. Overall, 87.2% of the
245 victims were commuters.

246 Nearly two-thirds of scooter riders and half of other PMD riders had no opponents. Overall,
247 only 26.5% of the victims faced crashes without opponents. By definition, all the pedestrians
248 had opponents.

249 Of the victims, 90% were involved in crashes during the week, with no difference based on
250 the user category. Less than 25% of scooter and other PMD riders were involved in nighttime
251 crashes. The crashes occurred at night for 29% of the victims, with a higher proportion of
252 pedestrians (34.6%).

253 The majority of scooter, other PMD, and bicycle riders, and pedestrians were involved in
254 crashes in street-type traffic lanes in the city. More than 45% of car and truck drivers were
255 involved in crashes outside urban areas, whereas approximately 90% of crashes involving
256 scooters, other PMDs, and bicycles occurred in urban areas (Lyon and its metropolitan area).

257 The use of personal protective equipment according to the user category was the highest for
258 car drivers (97% wore a seatbelt), truck drivers (82% wore a seatbelt), and motorized two-
259 wheeler riders (95% wore a helmet). Only one-third of injured bicycle riders wore helmets,
260 and less than one-fifth of injured scooter and other PMD riders wore helmets.

261 3.2. Description of the injuries

262 Half of the riders of other PMDs had a single injury, whereas scooter riders, pedestrians, and
263 motorized two-wheeler riders more frequently had multiple injuries (Table 2). Of the victims,
264 41.9% had a single injury, 33.2% had two injuries, 17.8% had three injuries, and 7.1% had

265 more than four injuries. The average number of injuries differed significantly according to
266 user category ($p < 0.0001$).

267 Of the victims, 7.8% were hospitalized. This proportion was higher for pedestrians, drivers of
268 trucks, and riders of motorized two-wheeler and other PMDs. One scooter rider died in an
269 crash. Twelve people died from their injuries (including three pedestrians and three
270 motorcyclists).

271 The most frequently affected body parts were the spine (37.6%), lower limbs (36.4%), upper
272 limbs (36.1%), head (14.8%), thorax (9.3%), neck (9.7%), face (8.1%), and abdomen (3.3%).

273 Head injuries were significantly ($p < 0.0001$) more common in pedestrians (20.5%), car
274 (16.1%) and truck (26.5%) drivers and scooter (17.9%) and bicycle (15.5%) riders. Facial
275 injuries were significantly ($p < 0.0001$) more common among scooter (21.2%) and bicycle
276 (16.5%) riders, pedestrians (12.7%), and other PMD riders (14.0%). Neck injuries were
277 significantly ($p < 0.0001$) more common among truck (23.9%) and car (15.5%) drivers. Chest
278 injuries were significantly ($p < 0.0001$) more common among truck (15.7%) and car (14.7%)
279 drivers, pedestrians (11.6%), and two-wheeler riders (11.2%). Abdominal injuries were more
280 common among pedestrians (5.7%) and motorized two-wheeler riders (4.7%). Spinal injuries
281 were significantly ($p < 0.0001$) more common among car (60.9%) and truck (42.2%) drivers,
282 and pedestrians (20.7%) than among other users. Upper extremity injuries were significantly
283 ($p < 0.0001$) more common among riders of scooters (59.2%), bicycles (56.9%), motorized
284 two-wheelers (48.1%), and other PMDs (48.0%), and pedestrians (40.0%). Finally, lower limb
285 injuries were significantly ($p < 0.0001$) more common among riders of motorized two-
286 wheelers (68.5%), other PMDs (52.0%), bicycles (47.1%) and scooters (46.8%).

287 Only 2.1% of scooter riders were seriously injured (MAIS 3+). Overall, 97.5% of the victims
288 were slightly injured (MAIS <3). The proportion of serious injuries (MAIS 3+) was higher
289 among pedestrians (6.6%), other PMD riders (8%), and motorized two-wheeler riders (4.5%).
290 Differences between global severity and categories of user injured were significant
291 ($p < 0.0001$).

292 Facial injuries were minor for all crash victims, except for 4% of pedestrians who had injuries
293 of MAIS 3+. Among scooter and other PMD riders, all upper-extremity injuries were of low
294 severity (MAIS <3). However, three riders of other PMD had lower extremity injuries of MAIS
295 ≥ 3 .

296

297 3.3. Trends in work-related road crashes during 2015–2019

298 Between 2015 and 2019, an increase in the number of work-related traffic injuries has been
299 observed (28.2%), mainly due to an increase in the number of crashes while commuting
300 (36.3%) and a decrease of the number of crashes on duty (6.9%); 2020, the year of the
301 COVID-19 pandemic, was characterized by a break in this increase (Figure 2).

302 Between 2015 and 2019, the number of scooter riders increased by 773%, that of other PMD
303 by 200%, that of bicycles by 92.1%, that of pedestrian by 33.3% and that of car by 18.3%
304 (Figure 3). In contrast, the number of motorized two-wheeler riders decreased by 5.9%, and
305 that of truck drivers was stable.

306

307 4. Discussion

308 4.1. Main findings

309 This original study on work-related road crashes allowed us to characterize the increase in
310 work-related road crashes associated with new modes of travel, particularly scooters. This
311 new mode of travel has been constantly increasing for approximately 10 years and even
312 more since the emergence of shared electric scooters. Companies in Lyon have offered this
313 service since 2018. Its use accelerated following the COVID-19 pandemic. The results of this
314 study showed that for work-related trips, the proportion scooter riders increased by 773%
315 between 2015 and 2019, and car crashes users increased only by 18.3% in 2020. Bagou et al.
316 [30] found a seven-times increase in scooter crash victims between 2018 and 2019 in the
317 Rhône Department. In contrast, the proportion of car drivers decreased in 2020 due to
318 COVID-19 pandemic-related restrictions [35].

319 Most work-related road crashes were commuting crashes. Among people working in a fixed
320 and regular place outside the home (i.e., approximately 79% of employed people),
321 approximately 29% make two or more home-to-work trips [2]. This proportion is inversely
322 correlated with commuting journey time. Approximately 25% of employees are exposed to
323 driving as part of their work activities [4,5].

324 However, only a small proportion of scooter riders (4.4%) were involved in a road crash on
325 duty, while 95.6% of scooter riders had a road crash on commuting. Either their use is
326 reserved for home-work trips or people using this mode of transport have less risky behavior
327 when it comes to a trip within the framework of their professional activity.

328

329 4.2. Characterization of users of nmPMD/mPMD who had road crash

330 A prospective study in Spain also characterized electric scooter crashes [36]: women
331 represented 40% of the injured, and approximately 13% of the injured were under 18 years
332 of age. In Austria, two-thirds of the injuries involved men, and 60% of the crashes occurred
333 at night [37]. In Denmark, the majority of injured electric scooter riders were 18-25 years
334 old. The proportion of pedestrians injured by an electric scooter was 17% in crashes
335 involving scooters [38]. A recent German study observed a two-thirds were men, and
336 nighttime crashes [39]. In another study, Graef et al. [40] observed that among patients
337 admitted to a level 1 trauma center with a mean age of 30 years, 44% were female. In Italy,
338 patients involved in electric scooter crashes were predominantly male (79%) with an average
339 age of 30 years [41]. In an annual incidence study of patients with injuries related to the use
340 of electric scooters in the USA, 60% of the victims were men and 92% were riders [42]. In
341 Germany, following the implementation of the first registry to examine injury patterns and
342 collect epidemiological data on people injured while riding electric scooters, Heuer et al. [43]
343 described injuries in 90 patients (65% male; mean age, 35 years).

344 An early review of the literature on electric scooters provided insights into the circumstances
345 and consequences of electric scooter crashes [44]. The majority of these crashes occur
346 without an opponent and as a result of a fall, collision with an object, excessive speed, or
347 unfavorable road conditions. Nikiforiadis et al. [9] found that electric scooter traffic on
348 sidewalks affected pedestrian experiences the most, ahead of uncontrolled parking on
349 sidewalks. The speed of scooters leads to feelings of insecurity among pedestrians. However,
350 the results of this study showed that scooter opponents were rarely observed among injured
351 pedestrian (12/575). According to a study by Shichman et al. [29], which compared crashes

352 involving electric scooters before and after the introduction of electric- sharing scooters,
353 80% of the injuries were due to falls. Sixty percent of the scooter riders in our study did not
354 have an opponent and thus, were likely to have fallen in the crash; this proportion was 80%
355 for riders of other PMD.

356 According to a German study, PMD riders perform secondary tasks while riding [45]. More
357 than 13% of bicycle and electric scooter riders in Germany performed secondary tasks, such
358 as wearing headphones or earphones and chatting with another user. However, the use of
359 cell phones was rare. Riders with a delivery task using a PMD as part of their activities were
360 at higher risk of performing secondary tasks in addition to driving [45]. This observational
361 study found that delivery riders were most likely to wear headphones or earphones;
362 however, they did not show significantly more traffic violations, inappropriate use of
363 roadway infrastructure, or at-fault crashes.

364

365 4.3. Injuries related to PMD

366 Most crashes were of low or moderate severity (97.5% MAIS < 3). In the context of work-
367 related road crashes, the frequency of injuries among scooter riders and other PMDs was
368 similar according to the different injury areas and severity. Work-related crashes are
369 generally less severe than private crashes [46].

370 The upper limbs, lower limbs, face and head were the main areas injured by scooter riders.
371 This finding is consistent with those of other studies. In an Italian study, nearly 47% of the
372 injuries were fractures, with the majority being radial fractures and 25% requiring surgical
373 intervention [36]. In a South Korean study [47], the main anatomical region affected in

374 electric scooter crash victims was the face, followed by the head and upper extremities. In
375 an annual incidence study on patients with injuries related to electric scooter use in the USA
376 [42], the most common injuries were fractures and head injuries. In Germany, among 90
377 people injured while riding electric scooters, 32 fractures and seven ligament injuries were
378 reported, and head injuries were found in 38 patients [43]. Moftakhar et al. [37] studied the
379 severity of injuries caused by electric scooter crashes in Austria. These crashes occurred at
380 high kinetic energies and caused head and upper extremity injuries. In Germany, following
381 the introduction of shared electric scooters in 2019, the topic of safety emerged as a public
382 debate. A recent study [39] reported that electric scooter crashes were the source of serious
383 injuries, with 28% of crash victims requiring surgical management. In another study, Graef et
384 al. [40] observed that more than two-thirds of patients had extremity injuries, and half had
385 facial injuries. The chest region exhibited the highest AIS scores. Overall, 70% of the injuries
386 were minor. Finally, in Italy, among patients involved in electric scooter crashes [41], 60%
387 had a head injury, 30% were transported to emergency departments for life-threatening
388 injuries, and 15% were placed in intensive care units.

389 The fact that not all scooter riders used electric scooters in our study minimized the severity
390 of the crashes. Shichman et al. [29] studied crashes involving electric scooters before and
391 after the introduction of shared electric scooters and showed a significant increase in
392 electric scooter-related injuries during emergency department visits after the introduction of
393 sharing services (six times more admissions).

394 Compared to non-electric scooter riders, electric scooter riders suffered more bruises and
395 lacerations on the face, required sutures, and were more often under the influence of
396 alcohol or drugs [38].

397 4.4. Protective equipment for PMD users

398 Although seatbelt use among car and truck drivers and helmet use among motorized two-
399 wheeler riders are very high in the context of work travel, the results indicate that helmet
400 use among bicycles, scooters, and other PMD riders is low. This has also been found in other
401 studies in the general population. Helmet use among electric scooter users was anecdotal in
402 a German study [39], only one out of 43 patients wore a helmet in another German study
403 [40], and 4% of victims wore a helmet in a study in Dallas, USA [48].

404 Helmet use for electric scooter users significantly reduces the risk of serious head and facial
405 injuries [49], maxillofacial fractures, and soft tissue injuries [50]. Similar to the
406 recommendations for helmet use for bicycle users 10 years ago, the scientific literature
407 confirms and recommends helmet use for electric scooter users and, in a larger set, for users
408 of PMDs [51,52]. The non-use of helmets by electric scooter users and the high prevalence of
409 head injuries found in numerous studies [44,53] suggest that these types of injuries may be
410 preventable. Studies demonstrating the effectiveness of helmet use among cyclists can
411 confirm this [54]. As highlighted in this literature review, several cities (Brisbane,
412 Copenhagen, Dallas, Los Angeles, Malaga Paris, Stockolm, and Vienna) and countries (France
413 and Italy) [55,56] have legislated this area [6]. However, results from an Australian study
414 showed that helmet use among commercial shared electric scooter riders was only 60%
415 whereas 95% of private electric scooter riders wore a helmet [57]. It is necessary to ensure
416 that helmets remain available for the commercial shared e--scooters riders or encourage
417 these users to bring their own helmet. Finally, helmet is the least restrictive and most
418 practical form of safety protection.

419 In order to reduce the risk of injury to upper and lower limbs, several other protective
420 equipments could be used by scooter and other PMDs riders like gloves, jackets with
421 protection or pants. These protective equipments increase the safety of motorized two-
422 wheeler riders. However, it seems difficult to ask scooter riders to wear protective
423 equipment as if they were motorized two-wheelers if wearing a helmet doesn't seem to be a
424 priority for them already.

425

426 4.5. Regulations for PMD users

427 In France, a user of rollerblades, skateboards, or scooters (without a motor) is considered a
428 pedestrian who must ride on the sidewalk. Electrical PMDs (scooters, hoverboards,
429 gyropods, monowheels) must be used on the bicycle path, if available. Bicycles must be on a
430 roadway or bike path, if there is one.

431 The Mobility Law 2019 [58] established that electric scooters are prohibited on sidewalks
432 (unless authorized by the mayor and unless the engine is turned off). In built-up areas, traffic
433 is only authorized on bicycle paths or, failing that, on roads with a maximum speed limit of
434 50 km/h. Outside built-up areas, traffic is authorized only on bicycle paths or greenways
435 (except for exemptions). Electric scooters are prohibited for children under 12 years of age.
436 Wearing a helmet is mandatory for minors over 12 years of age and strongly recommended
437 for adults. Civil insurance is mandatory. Riding an electric scooter at speeds exceeding 25
438 km/h is forbidden. Similar to other means of transportation, the use of headphones is
439 prohibited. Front and rear lights are mandatory, as is wearing a retroreflective vest at night
440 or during low visibility. A horn is mandatory. Finally, passenger transport is prohibited. The

441 regulations mandate fines: 135 euros for driving on sidewalks, 35 euros for failure to comply
442 with traffic laws, and 1,500 euros for exceeding the authorized speed limit [59].

443 The various regulations on PMDs established by European countries are recent and
444 heterogeneous [60]. Regulations regarding helmet use, specific categories of electric
445 scooters, authorized bike lanes, authorized pedestrian lanes, and age restrictions vary by
446 country. However, the maximum speed limit is a common rule except in Hungary. France
447 and Germany require liability insurance. In the USA, regulations differ by state [56,61].
448 Overall, many countries are yet to establish the legal requirements of this mode of travel in
449 detail, and more specific legislation is required. In January 2017, the Singaporean
450 government passed the Active Mobility Act (AMA) to regulate the use of PDMs. However, an
451 increase in injuries related to these new travel modes has been observed [62].

452 Road unsafety related to electric bikes/motorcycles is becoming increasingly problematic
453 owing to their growing popularity compared with other two-wheeled vehicles [63].

454 The majority of studies on the subject have confirmed that men and users between the ages
455 of 18 and 34 years are most concerned with the use of and crashes involving private or
456 shared PMDs.

457 In France, one of the few studies on this subject compared the demographic characteristics
458 of users sharing electric scooters with those of personal electric scooters [64]. The latter are
459 more likely to be men, older, and have a higher income. Therefore, the use of electric
460 scooters is motivated by saving time, rather than financial reasons. They also seem to have
461 less risky behaviors, particularly with regard to alcohol consumption, than other electric

462 scooter users [7]. A comparison of the frequency of use (occasional versus frequent users)
463 shows that frequent users have riskier behaviors, perhaps because of their habit of use.

464 4.6. Limitations of the study

465 Difficulties in correctly identifying nmPMDs were noted. The Rhône Road Trauma Registry
466 collection form evolved in November 2019 to better quantify electric vehicle-related
467 crashes. A "No/Yes" checkbox was introduced for the retrieval of mPMD with certainty, but
468 it does not distinguish nmPMD from missing data.

469 The analyzed period ended at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The year 2020 differed
470 from previous years in that car crashes decreased and scooter crashes increased. It will be
471 relevant to conduct another study spanning a few more years to better measure the impact
472 of nmPMD and mPMD on work-related traffic crashes.

473 A limitation concerns the geographic area of the study which is the Rhône department of
474 France. Even if data from the Road Trauma Registry are usually used to perform official
475 statistics of road crashes in France [65] because French Police crash data, are incomplete
476 and biased [66], we cannot fully assert that a bias does not exist for work-related road crash
477 in this data.

478 5. Conclusion

- 479 • This is the first study describing work-related traffic crashes that have occurred since
480 the emergence of PMDs.
- 481 • The results observed for users of scooters and other PMDs in this study were
482 generally consistent with those found in the scientific literature. However, in most
483 available studies, the type of travel was not restricted to work-related journeys: a
484 young and predominantly male population, crashes mostly without opponents.

- 485 • Most scooter and other PMD riders had injuries to their upper limbs (59.2%), lower
486 limbs (46.8%), face (21.2%) or head (17.9%).
- 487 • Despite limited data, the results suggest that crashes involving scooters or other
488 PMDs are of low severity. Many head injuries could be prevented with more
489 widespread helmet use.
- 490 • The use of protective equipment like helmet is essential and not very burdensome
491 and should be mandatory for PMDs and bicycle riders.
- 492 • Finally, companies can take preventive actions so that employees using these modes
493 of transport for work-related journeys are better informed about the risks.

494

495 **Acknowledgments**

496 We would like to thank all those involved in data collection and computerization, through
497 the Association pour le registre des victimes d'accidents de la circulation du Rhône (Arvac,
498 chaired by Étienne Javouhey) and the Université Gustave-Eiffel-TS2-Umrestte (under the
499 direction of Barbara Charbotel).

500 **Funding**

501 This work was supported by The French National Public Health Agency (Santé publique
502 France) and The Rhône-Alpes retirement and occupational health funds (Carsat Rhône
503 Alpes).

504

505 **Declaration of Interest(s)**

506 None

507

508 **Data Statement**

509 Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available.

510

511 **Research ethics**

512 The Rhône Road Trauma Registry has been qualified by the Registry Evaluation Committee

513 (CER) and it has been approved by the National Commission on Informatics and Liberty

514 (CNIL).

515 References

- 516 1 Ministère de la Transition écologique et de la Cohésion des territoires ,. Comment les
517 Français voyagent-ils en 2019? Résultats de l'enquête mobilité des personnes. 2019.
518 [https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/comment-les-francais-](https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/comment-les-francais-voyagent-ils-en-2019-resultats-de-lenquete-mobilite-des-personnes)
519 [voyagent-ils-en-2019-resultats-de-lenquete-mobilite-des-personnes](https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/comment-les-francais-voyagent-ils-en-2019-resultats-de-lenquete-mobilite-des-personnes) (accessed 18
520 January 2023)
- 521 2 Service de l'Observation et des Statistiques ,. La mobilité des Français, panorama issu
522 de l'enquête nationale transports et déplacements 2008. 2010.
523 [https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-](https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-11/La_mobilite_des_Francais_ENTD_2008_revue_cle7b7471.pdf)
524 [11/La_mobilite_des_Francais_ENTD_2008_revue_cle7b7471.pdf](https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-11/La_mobilite_des_Francais_ENTD_2008_revue_cle7b7471.pdf) (accessed 18 January
525 2023)
- 526 3 Pautard É. Les Français et la mobilité durable: quelle place pour les déplacements
527 alternatifs à la voiture individuelle en 2016? 2016.
528 [https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-](https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-10/Datalab-essentiel-36-les-francais-et-la-mobilite-durable-septembre2016.pdf)
529 [10/Datalab-essentiel-36-les-francais-et-la-mobilite-durable-septembre2016.pdf](https://www.statistiques.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/2018-10/Datalab-essentiel-36-les-francais-et-la-mobilite-durable-septembre2016.pdf)
530 (accessed 18 January 2023)
- 531 4 Fort E, Ndagire S, Gadegbeku B, *et al.* Working conditions and occupational risk
532 exposure in employees driving for work. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2016;89:118–27.
- 533 5 Fort E, Gadegbeku B, Gat E, *et al.* Working conditions and risk exposure of employees
534 whose occupations require driving on public roads – Factorial analysis and
535 classification. *Accid Anal Prev.* 2019;131:254–67.
- 536 6 Gössling S. Integrating e-scooters in urban transportation: Problems, policies, and the
537 prospect of system change. *Transp Res D Transp Environ.* 2020;79:102230.
- 538 7 Christoforou Z, Gioldasis C, de Bortoli A, *et al.* Who is using e-scooters and how?
539 Evidence from Paris. *Transp Res D Transp Environ.* 2021;92:102708.
- 540 8 Heineke K, Kloss B, Scurtu D, *et al.* Micromobility's 15,000-mile checkup. 2019.
- 541 9 Nikiforiadis A, Paschalidis E, Stamatiadis N, *et al.* Analysis of attitudes and engagement
542 of shared e-scooter users. *Transp Res D Transp Environ.* 2021;94:102790.
- 543 10 6t-bureau de recherche. Usages et usagers des trottinettes électriques en free-floating
544 en france. 2019. [https://cvip.sphinxonline.net/SurveyServer/s/6t-bureau/trottinettes-](https://cvip.sphinxonline.net/SurveyServer/s/6t-bureau/trottinettes-freefloating/questionnaire.htm)
545 [freefloating/questionnaire.htm](https://cvip.sphinxonline.net/SurveyServer/s/6t-bureau/trottinettes-freefloating/questionnaire.htm) (accessed 1 March 2023)
- 546 11 Sanders RL, Branion-Calles M, Nelson TA. To scoot or not to scoot: Findings from a
547 recent survey about the benefits and barriers of using E-scooters for riders and non-
548 riders. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract.* 2020;139:217–27.
- 549 12 Glenn J, Bluth M, Christianson M, *et al.* Considering the Potential Health Impacts of
550 Electric Scooters: An Analysis of User Reported Behaviors in Provo, Utah. *International*
551 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020, Vol 17, Page 6344.
552 2020;17:6344.

- 553 13 Fédération Française de l'Assurance (FFA), Assurance Prévention, Fédération
554 des Professionnels de la Micro-Mobilité (FP2M), Usages, risques et accidentalité des
555 Engins de Déplacement Personnel Motorisés (EDPM), avant et après le confinement.
556 2020. [https://www.assurance-prevention.fr/nos-etudes/engins-deplacement-](https://www.assurance-prevention.fr/nos-etudes/engins-deplacement-personnel-motorises-edpm-usages-risques-accidentalite)
557 [personnel-motorises-edpm-usages-risques-accidentalite](https://www.assurance-prevention.fr/nos-etudes/engins-deplacement-personnel-motorises-edpm-usages-risques-accidentalite) (accessed 18 January 2023)
- 558 14 Echeverría-Su M, Huamanraime-Maquín E, Cabrera FI, *et al.* Transitioning to
559 sustainable mobility in Lima, Peru. Are e-scooter sharing initiatives part of the problem
560 or the solution? *Sci Total Environ.* 2023;866. doi: 10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2022.161130
- 561 15 Laa B, Leth U. Survey of E-scooter users in Vienna: Who they are and how they ride. *J*
562 *Transp Geogr.* 2020;89:102874.
- 563 16 Buck D, Buehler R, Happ P, *et al.* Are Bikeshare Users Different from Regular Cyclists?:
564 A First Look at Short-Term Users, Annual Members, and Area Cyclists in the
565 Washington, D.C., Region. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tran.2013.11.009>. 2013;112–9.
- 566 17 Lefrancq M. Shared freefloating micromobility regulations and results of scooter
567 users' survey (summer 2019). *ERSCharter Webinar: e scooters.* 2019.
568 https://erscharter.eu/sites/default/files/resources/presentation_martin_lefrancq.pdf
569 (accessed 29 March 2022)
- 570 18 Zagorskas J, Burinskiene M. Challenges Caused by Increased Use of E-Powered
571 Personal Mobility Vehicles in European Cities. *Sustainability* 2020, Vol 12, Page 273.
572 2019;12:273.
- 573 19 Anderson B, Rupp JD, Moran TP, *et al.* The Effect of Nighttime Rental Restrictions on E-
574 Scooter Injuries at a Large Urban Tertiary Care Center. *International Journal of*
575 *Environmental Research and Public Health* 2021, Vol 18, Page 10281. 2021;18:10281.
- 576 20 Farley KX, Aizpuru M, Wilson JM, *et al.* Estimated Incidence of Electric Scooter Injuries
577 in the US From 2014 to 2019. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3:e2014500.
- 578 21 Pepper T, Barker M, Smyth D, *et al.* Electric scooters: a quick way to get to the
579 emergency department? *Br Dent J.* 2022;232:535–7.
- 580 22 Hourston GJM, Ngu A, Hopkinson-Woolley J, *et al.* Orthopedic injuries associated with
581 use of electric scooters in the UK: A dangerous trend? Case series and review of the
582 literature. *Traffic Inj Prev.* 2021;22:242–5.
- 583 23 Bascones K, Maio Méndez TE, Yañez Siller FA. [Translated article] E-scooter accidents:
584 A new epidemic. *Rev Esp Cir Ortop Traumatol.* Published Online First: February 2022.
585 doi: 10.1016/J.RECOT.2022.02.001
- 586 24 Suominen EN, Sajanti AJ, Silver EA, *et al.* Alcohol intoxication and lack of helmet use
587 are common in electric scooter-related traumatic brain injuries: a consecutive patient
588 series from a tertiary university hospital. *Acta Neurochir (Wien).* 2022;164:643–53.
- 589 25 Hennocq Q, Schouman T, Khonsari RH, *et al.* Evaluation of Electric Scooter Head and
590 Neck Injuries in Paris, 2017-2019. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3. doi:
591 10.1001/JAMANETWORKOPEN.2020.26698

- 592 26 Badeau A, Carman C, Newman M, *et al.* Emergency department visits for electric
593 scooter-related injuries after introduction of an urban rental program. *Am J Emerg*
594 *Med.* 2019;37:1531–3.
- 595 27 Beck S, Barker L, Chan A, *et al.* Emergency department impact following the
596 introduction of an electric scooter sharing service. *Emerg Med Australas.* 2020;32:409–
597 15.
- 598 28 Mair O, Wurm M, Müller M, *et al.* E-scooter accidents and their consequences: First
599 prospective analysis of the injury rate and injury patterns in the urban area of
600 a German city with over 1 million residents. *Unfallchirurg.* 2021;124:382–90.
- 601 29 Mitchell G, Tsao H, Randell T, *et al.* Impact of electric scooters to a tertiary emergency
602 department: 8-week review after implementation of a scooter share scheme. *EMA -*
603 *Emergency Medicine Australasia.* 2019;31:930–4.
- 604 30 Shichman I, Shaked O, Factor S, *et al.* Emergency department electric scooter injuries
605 after the introduction of shared e-scooter services: A retrospective review of 3,331
606 cases. *World J Emerg Med.* 2022;13:5–10. [https://doi.org/10.5847/WJEM.J.1920-](https://doi.org/10.5847/WJEM.J.1920-8642.2022.002)
607 8642.2022.002
- 608 31 Bagou G, Ndiaye A, Hugenschmitt D, *et al.* Traumatismes consécutifs aux accidents de
609 trottinettes. *Annales françaises de médecine d'urgence.* 2021;11:144–9.
- 610 32 Salottolo K, Settell A, Uribe P, *et al.* The impact of the AIS 2005 revision on injury
611 severity scores and clinical outcome measures. *Injury.* 2009;40:999–1003.
- 612 33 Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine. The Abbreviated Injury
613 Scale 2005—Update 2008. Association for the Advancement of Automotive Medicine
614 Barrington, IL 2008.
- 615 34 Koch M, Nygren A, Tingvall C. Validation of the new injury impairment scale (IIS). In:
616 AAAM, ed. *38th AAAM conference.* Lyon, France: AAAM 1994:123–38.
- 617 35 Li H, Ma YF. New injury severity score (NISS) outperforms injury severity score (ISS) in
618 the evaluation of severe blunt trauma patients. *Chinese Journal of Traumatology.*
619 2021;24:261–5.
- 620 36 Laumon B, Tardy H, Ndiaye A, *et al.* Traumatologie routière pendant la première
621 période de confinement pour cause de pandémie de Covid-19 – Registre du Rhône.
622 *Bull Épidémiol Hebd.* 2022;18:308–14.
- 623 37 Toofany M, Mohsenian S, Shum LK, *et al.* Injury patterns and circumstances associated
624 with electric scooter collisions: A scoping review. *Injury Prevention.* 2021;27:490–9.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1136/injuryprev-2020-044085>
- 626 38 Coelho A, Feito P, Corominas L, *et al.* Electric scooter-related injuries: A new epidemic
627 in orthopedics. *J Clin Med.* 2021;10. doi: 10.3390/jcm10153283
- 628 39 Moftakhar T, Wanzel M, Vojcsik A, *et al.* Incidence and severity of electric scooter
629 related injuries after introduction of an urban rental programme in Vienna: a
630 retrospective multicentre study. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2021;141:1207–13.

- 631 40 Blomberg SNF, Rosenkrantz OCM, Lippert F, *et al.* Injury from electric scooters in
632 Copenhagen: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9. doi: 10.1136/BMJOPEN-
633 2019-033988
- 634 41 Störmann P, Klug A, Nau C, *et al.* Characteristics and injury patterns in electric-scooter
635 related accidents—A prospective two-center report from Germany. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9.
636 doi: 10.3390/jcm9051569
- 637 42 Graef F, Doll C, Niemann M, *et al.* Epidemiology, Injury Severity, and Pattern of
638 Standing E-Scooter Accidents: 6-Month Experience from a German Level I Trauma
639 Center. *Clin Orthop Surg*. 2021;13:443–8.
- 640 43 Scquizzato T, Gamberini L, Stella F, *et al.* Analysis of road traffic accidents involving
641 standing electric scooters reported in newspapers in Italy. *Clin Exp Emerg Med*.
642 2022;9:36–40.
- 643 44 Trivedi TK, Liu C, Antonio ALM, *et al.* Injuries Associated With Standing Electric Scooter
644 Use. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2:e187381.
- 645 45 Heuer S, Landschoof S, Kornherr P, *et al.* Epidemiology and Injury Pattern of E-Scooter
646 Injuries - Initial Results. *Z Orthop Unfall*. Published Online First: 3 May 2021. doi:
647 10.1055/a-1419-0584
- 648 46 Huemer AK, Banach E, Bolten N, *et al.* Secondary task engagement, risk-taking, and
649 safety-related equipment use in German bicycle and e-scooter riders - An observation.
650 *Accid Anal Prev*. 2022;172:106685.
- 651 47 Charbotel B, Martin JL, Chiron M. Work-related versus non-work-related road
652 accidents, developments in the last decade in France. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2010;42:604–
653 11.
- 654 48 Choi JH, Oh SS, Kim KS, *et al.* Electric Scooter-Related Trauma in Korea. *J Korean Med*
655 *Sci*. 2022;37. doi: 10.3346/JKMS.2022.37.E181
- 656 49 Trivedi B, Kesterke MJ, Bhattacharjee R, *et al.* Craniofacial Injuries Seen With the
657 Introduction of Bicycle-Share Electric Scooters in an Urban Setting. *Journal of Oral and*
658 *Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2019;77:2292–7.
- 659 50 Hamzani Y, Bar Hai D, Cohen N, *et al.* The impact of helmet use on oral and
660 maxillofacial injuries associated with electric-powered bikes or powered scooter: a
661 retrospective cross-sectional study. *Head Face Med*. 2021;17. doi: 10.1186/S13005-
662 021-00288-W
- 663 51 Al Saffar MMA, Verdonschot RJCG, Stassen HS, *et al.* The Association of Helmet Use
664 with the Occurrence of Maxillofacial Injuries Following Bicycle or Scooter Accidents: A
665 Retrospective Cohort Study. *Craniofacial Trauma Reconstr*. 2022;15:21–7.
- 666 52 Dimaggio CJ, Bukur M, Wall SP, *et al.* Injuries associated with electric-powered bikes
667 and scooters: Analysis of US consumer product data. *Injury Prevention*. Published
668 Online First: 2019. doi: 10.1136/injuryprev-2019-043418

- 669 53 Lin S, Goldman S, Peleg K, *et al.* Dental and maxillofacial injuries associated with
670 electric-powered bikes and scooters in Israel: A report for 2014-2019. *Dental*
671 *Traumatology*. 2020;36:533–7.
- 672 54 Toofany M, Mohsenian S, Shum LK, *et al.* Systematic review Injury patterns and
673 circumstances associated with electric scooter collisions: a scoping review. *Inj Prev*.
674 2021;0:1–10.
- 675 55 Olivier J, Creighton P. Bicycle injuries and helmet use: a systematic review and meta-
676 analysis. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46:278–92.
- 677 56 La Torre G, Van Beeck E, Bertazzoni G, *et al.* Head injury resulting from scooter
678 accidents in Rome: Differences before and after implementing a universal helmet law.
679 *Eur J Public Health*. 2007;17:607–11.
- 680 57 Peng Y, Vaidya N, Finnie R, *et al.* Universal Motorcycle Helmet Laws to Reduce Injuries:
681 A Community Guide Systematic Review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;52:820–32.
- 682 58 Haworth NL, Schramm A. Illegal and risky riding of electric scooters in Brisbane. *Med J*
683 *Aust*. 2019;211:412–3.
- 684 59 Décret n° 2019-1082 du 23 octobre 2019 relatif à la réglementation des engins de
685 déplacement personnel. JORF n°0249 du 25 octobre 2019 2019.
686 <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000039272656> (accessed 12 January
687 2023)
- 688 60 La nouvelle réglementation pour les Engins de Déplacements Personnels motorisés
689 (EDPM) | Cerema. [https://www.cerema.fr/fr/actualites/nouvelle-reglementation-](https://www.cerema.fr/fr/actualites/nouvelle-reglementation-engins-deplacements-personnels)
690 [engins-deplacements-personnels](https://www.cerema.fr/fr/actualites/nouvelle-reglementation-engins-deplacements-personnels)
- 691 61 Serra GF, Fernandes FAO, Noronha E, *et al.* Head protection in electric micromobility: A
692 critical review, recommendations, and future trends. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2021;163. doi:
693 10.1016/J.AAP.2021.106430
- 694 62 The 2022 Comprehensive Guide to Electric Scooter Laws.
695 [https://unagiscooters.com/scooter-articles/the-comprehensive-guide-to-electric-](https://unagiscooters.com/scooter-articles/the-comprehensive-guide-to-electric-scooter-laws-2022/)
696 [scooter-laws-2022/](https://unagiscooters.com/scooter-articles/the-comprehensive-guide-to-electric-scooter-laws-2022/) (accessed 2 March 2023)
- 697 63 Lee W, Goo T, Lim W, *et al.* Hospital seeing more personal mobility device accidents
698 and serious injuries despite active mobility act. *J Emerg Trauma Shock*. 2020;13:274–8.
- 699 64 Zhang X, Yang Y, Yang J, *et al.* Road traffic injuries among riders of electric bike/electric
700 moped in southern China. *Traffic Inj Prev*. 2018;19:417–22.
- 701 65 Gioldasis C, Christoforou Z, Seidowsky R. Risk-taking behaviors of e-scooter users: A
702 survey in Paris. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2021;163. doi: 10.1016/J.AAP.2021.106427
- 703 66 Amoros E, Martin J-L, Laumon B. Estimating non-fatal road casualties in a large French
704 county, using the capture-recapture method. *Accid Anal Prev*. 2007;39:483–90.
- 705 67 Amoros E, Martin JL, Laumon B. Under-reporting of road crash casualties in France.
706 *Accid Anal Prev*. 2006;38:38(4):627-35.

Table 1: Socio-demographic and characteristics of the crash of victims injured in work-related crash, by user category (source the Rhône Road Trauma Registry, 2015-2020)

	Pedestrian (n=575)	Bicycle rider (n=1 908)	Scooter rider (n=429)	Other PMD rider (n=50)		Car driver (n=5 111)	Truck driver (n=166)	Motorized two- wheelers rider (n=2 414)		All (n=10 653)	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ¹	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ²		p-value ³ (All)
Sex					<0.0001				<0.0001		<0.0001
Women	312 (54.3)	664 (34.8)	194 (45.2)	10 (20.0)		2703 (52.9)	3 (1.8)	277 (11.5)		4163 (39.1)	
Men	263 (45.7)	1244 (65.2)	235 (54.8)	40 (80.0)		2408 (47.1)	163 (98.2)	2137 (88.5)		6490 (60.9)	
Age categories					<0.0001				<0.0001		<0.0001
18-24 years	139 (24.2)	355 (18.6)	94 (21.9)	15 (30.0)		1208 (23.6)	27 (16.3)	678 (28.1)		2516 (23.6)	
25-34 years	140 (24.4)	636 (33.3)	132 (30.8)	15 (30.0)		1597 (31.2)	42 (25.3)	683 (28.3)		3245 (30.5)	
35-44 years	113 (19.6)	426 (22.3)	108 (25.2)	12 (24.0)		1149 (22.5)	39 (23.5)	499 (20.7)		2346 (22.0)	
45-54 years	108 (18.8)	331 (17.4)	77 (17.9)	4 (8.0)		832 (16.3)	34 (20.5)	388 (16.1)		1774 (16.7)	
55-64 years	69 (12.0)	157 (8.2)	17 (4.0)	4 (8.0)		317 (6.2)	21 (12.6)	164 (6.8)		749 (7.0)	
65-70 years	6 (1.0)	3 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	0 (0)		8 (0.2)	3 (1.8)	2 (0.1)		23 (0.2)	
Type of work-related journey					<0.0001				<0.0001		<0.0001
Commuting	456 (79.3)	1742 (91.3)	410 (95.6)	43 (86.0)		4565 (89.3)	35 (21.1)	2041 (84.5)		9292 (87.2)	
On duty	119 (20.7)	166 (8.7)	19 (4.4)	7 (14.0)		546 (10.7)	131 (78.9)	373 (15.5)		1361 (12.8)	
Opponent					NA				NA		NA
None	0 (0)	909 (47.6)	281 (65.5)	26 (52.0)		548 (10.7)	48 (28.9)	1015 (42.1)		2827 (26.5)	
Pedestrian	0 (0)	29 (1.5)	3 (0.7)	1 (2.0)		7 (0.1)	0 (0)	11 (0.5)		51 (0.5)	
Other or unknown	14 (2.4)	19 (1.0)	4 (0.9)	0 (0)		15 (0.3)	0 (0)	11 (0.5)		63 (0.6)	

	Pedestrian (n=575)	Bicycle rider (n=1 908)	Scooter rider (n=429)	Other PMD rider (n=50)		Car driver (n=5 111)	Truck driver (n=166)	Motorized two-wheelers rider (n=2 414)		All (n=10 653)	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ¹	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ²		p-value ³ (All)
Car	391 (68.0)	646 (33.9)	87 (20.3)	16 (32.0)		3414 (66.8)	34 (20.5)	1139 (47.2)		5727 (53.8)	
Fixed obstacle	0 (0)	164 (8.6)	31 (7.2)	3 (6.0)		584 (11.4)	43 (25.9)	112 (4.6)		937 (8.8)	
Light commercial vehicle, truck, bus, train/tram, tractor	66 (11.5)	63 (3.3)	10 (2.3)	1 (2.0)		517 (10.1)	40 (24.1)	85 (3.5)		782 (7.3)	
Motorized two-wheelers	52 (9.0)	21 (1.1)	5 (1.2)	1 (2.0)		23 (0.5)	1 (0.6)	31 (1.3)		134 (1.3)	
Bicycle	52 (9.0)	56 (2.9)	8 (1.9)	2 (4.0)		3 (0.1)	0 (0)	10 (0.4)		131 (1.2)	
Rollerblade, skateboard	0 (0)	1 (0.05)	0 (0)	0 (0)		0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		1 (0)	
Lighting					0.0009				0.5		0.002
Day	320 (65.4)	1067 (74.1)	218 (76.5)	31 (75.6)		3072 (70.7)	105 (73.4)	1401 (69.7)		6294 (71.0)	
Night	169 (34.6)	373 (25.9)	67 (23.5)	10 (24.4)		1274 (29.3)	38 (26.6)	610 (30.3)		2567 (29.0)	
Month					<0.0001				0.0006		<0.0001
January	60 (10.4)	141 (7.4)	32 (7.5)	4 (8)		494 (9.7)	27 (16.3)	170 (7)		928 (8.7)	
February	56 (9.7)	115 (6)	22 (5.1)	3 (6)		385 (7.5)	10 (6)	172 (7.1)		763 (7.2)	
March	49 (8.5)	122 (6.4)	27 (6.3)	4 (8)		421 (8.2)	10 (6)	189 (7.8)		822 (7.7)	
April	32 (5.6)	128 (6.7)	29 (6.8)	3 (6)		359 (7)	6 (3.6)	169 (7)		726 (6.8)	
May	30 (5.2)	149 (7.8)	34 (7.9)	3 (6)		367 (7.2)	12 (7.2)	168 (7)		763 (7.2)	
June	52 (9)	180 (9.4)	45 (10.5)	5 (10)		479 (9.4)	15 (9)	239 (9.9)		1015 (9.5)	
July	38 (6.6)	193 (10.1)	50 (11.7)	9 (18)		419 (8.2)	21 (12.6)	223 (9.2)		953 (8.9)	
August	27 (4.7)	131 (6.9)	23 (5.4)	3 (6)		254 (5)	10 (6)	141 (5.8)		589 (5.5)	
September	41 (7.1)	246 (12.9)	46 (10.7)	7 (14)		436 (8.5)	12 (7.2)	255 (10.6)		1043 (9.8)	
October	64 (11.1)	199 (10.4)	37 (8.6)	4 (8)		518 (10.1)	12 (7.2)	258 (10.7)		1092 (10.3)	

	Pedestrian (n=575)	Bicycle rider (n=1 908)	Scooter rider (n=429)	Other PMD rider (n=50)		Car driver (n=5 111)	Truck driver (n=166)	Motorized two-wheelers rider (n=2 414)		All (n=10 653)	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ¹	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ²		p-value ³ (All)
November	72 (12.5)	179 (9.4)	41 (9.6)	5 (10)		536 (10.5)	14 (8.4)	218 (9)		1065 (10.0)	
December	54 (9.4)	125 (6.6)	43 (10)	0 (0)		443 (8.7)	17 (10.2)	212 (8.8)		894 (8.4)	
Season					0.0003				0.002		<0.0001
Spring	111 (19.3)	399 (20.9)	90 (21)	10 (20)		1147 (22.4)	28 (16.8)	526 (21.8)		2311 (21.7)	
Summer	117 (20.3)	504 (26.4)	118 (27.6)	17 (34)		1152 (22.6)	46 (27.6)	603 (24.9)		2557 (24.0)	
Autunm	177 (30.7)	624 (32.7)	124 (28.9)	16 (32)		1490 (29.1)	38 (22.8)	731 (30.3)		3200 (30.0)	
Winter	170 (29.5)	381 (20)	97 (22.6)	7 (14)		1322 (25.9)	54 (32.5)	554 (22.9)		2585 (24.3)	
Urban area					<0.0001				<0.0001		<0.0001
Lyon	205 (35.6)	1257 (65.9)	325 (75.8)	26 (52.0)		730 (14.3)	15 (9.0)	700 (29.0)		3258 (30.6)	
Grand Lyon	220 (38.3)	498 (26.1)	77 (17.9)	18 (36.0)		2068 (40.5)	72 (43.4)	886 (36.7)		3839 (36.0)	
Hors Grand Lyon	66 (11.5)	88 (4.6)	10 (2.3)	2 (4.0)		1375 (26.9)	53 (31.9)	388 (16.1)		1982 (18.6)	
Rhône SAP	84 (14.6)	65 (3.4)	17 (4.0)	4 (4.0)		938 (18.3)	26 (15.7)	440 (18.2)		1574 (14.8)	

1 Comparison of pedestrian, bicycle rider, scooter rider and other PMD rider

2 Comparison of car driver, truck driver, and Motorized two-wheelers rider

3 Comparison of the 7 categories of injured users

Table 2: Injury characteristics of victims injured in work-related crash, by user category (source the Rhône Road Trauma Registry, 2015-2020)

	Pedestrian (n=575)	Bicycle rider (n=1908)	Scooter rider (n=429)	Other PMD rider (n=50)		Car driver (n=5111)	Truck driver (n=166)	Motorized two- wheelers rider (n=2414)		All (n=10 653)	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ¹	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ²		p-value ³
Hospitalization	80 (13.9)	156 (8.2)	38 (8.9)	6 (12.0)	0.0005	216 (4.2)	29 (17.5)	301 (12.5)	<0.0001	826 (7.8)	<0.0001
Death	3 (0.5)	2 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	0 (0)	NA	2 (0.1)	1 (0.6)	3 (0.1)	NA	12 (0.1)	NA
Number of injuries					0.0001				<0.0001		<0.0001
1	186 (32.3)	759 (39.8)	163 (38.0)	25 (50.0)		2414 (47.2)	66 (39.8)	854 (35.4)		4467 (41.9)	
2	183 (31.8)	601 (31.5)	146 (34.0)	13 (26.0)		1685 (33.0)	54 (32.5)	853 (35.3)		3535 (33.2)	
3	129 (22.4)	410 (21.5)	76 (17.7)	8 (16.0)		760 (14.9)	31 (18.7)	483 (20.0)		1897 (17.8)	
4+	77 (13.4)	138 (7.2)	44 (10.3)	4 (8.0)		252 (4.9)	15 (9.0)	224 (9.3)		754 (7.1)	
MAIS					NA				NA		NA
1 Minor	451 (78.4)	1433 (75.1)	315 (73.4)	37 (74.0)		4830 (94.5)	138 (83.1)	1790 (74.1)		8994 (83.5)	
2 Moderate	86 (15.0)	428 (22.4)	105 (24.5)	9 (18.0)		223 (4.4)	22 (13.2)	516 (21.4)		1389 (12.9)	
3 Serious	21 (3.6)	37 (1.9)	6 (1.4)	3 (0.6)		44 (0.8)	4 (2.4)	86 (3.6)		201 (1.9)	
4 Severe	13 (2.3)	8 (0.4)	2 (0.5)	0 (0)		10 (0.2)	2 (1.2)	14 (0.6)		49 (0.4)	
5 Critical	3 (0.5)	2 (0.1)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)		4 (0.1)	0 (0)	8 (0.3)		18 (0.2)	
6 Maximum	1 (0.2)	0 (0)	1 (0.2)	0 (0)		0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		2 (0)	
MAIS3+	38 (6.6)	47 (2.5)	9 (2.1)	4 (8.0)	<0.0001	58 (1.1)	6 (3.6)	108 (4.5)	<0.0001	270 (2.5)	<0.0001
Head injury	118 (20.5)	295 (15.5)	77 (17.9)	5 (10.0)	0.02	821 (16.1)	44 (26.5)	198 (8.2)	<0.0001	1558 (14.5)	<0.0001
Global gravity of head injury MAIS3+	11 (9.3)	12 (4.1)	2 (2.6)	1 (20.0)		15 (1.8)	1 (2.3)	8 (4.0)		50 (3.2)	<0.0001
Face injury	73 (12.7)	315 (16.5)	91 (21.2)	7 (14.0)	0.004	279 (5.5)	17 (10.2)	94 (3.9)	0.0001	876 (8.1)	<0.0001

	Pedestrian (n=575)	Bicycle rider (n=1908)	Scooter rider (n=429)	Other PMD rider (n=50)			Car driver (n=5111)	Truck driver (n=166)	Motorized two- wheelers rider (n=2414)		All (n=10 653)	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ¹		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ²		p-value ³
Global gravity of face injury MAIS3+	3 (4.0)	1 (0.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)			0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	NA	4 (0.4)	
Neck injury	34 (5.9)	53 (2.8)	18 (4.2)	0 (0)	0.002		791 (15.5)	23 (23.9)	77 (3.2)	<0.0001	996 (9.2)	<0.0001
Global gravity of neck injury MAIS3+	1 (3.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			1 (0.1)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)		3 (0.3)	
Chest injury	67 (11.6)	169 (8.9)	35 (8.2)	1 (2.0)	0.04		740 (14.5)	26 (15.7)	270 (11.2)	0.0003	1308 (12.1)	<0.0001
Global gravity of chest injury MAIS3+	16 (23.9)	14 (8.3)	5 (14.3)	0 (0)			31 (4.2)	5 (19.2)	52 (19.3)		123 (9.4)	
Abdomen injury	33 (5.7)	47 (2.5)	13 (3.0)	0 (0)	0.0006		148 (2.9)	6 (3.6)	113 (4.7)	0.0004	360 (3.3)	<0.0001
Global gravity of Abdomen injury MAIS3+	8 (24.2)	6 (12.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)			12 (8.1)	1 (16.7)	8 (7.1)		35 (9.7)	
Spinal injury	119 (20.7)	198 (10.4)	39 (9.1)	4 (8.0)	<0.0001		3114 (60.9)	70 (42.2)	373 (15.4)	<0.0001	3917 (36.4)	<0.0001
Global gravity of Spinal injury MAIS3+	0 (0)	2 (1.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			6 (0.2)	1 (1.4)	5 (1.3)		14 (0.4)	
Upper limb injury	230 (40.0)	1086 (56.9)	254 (59.2)	24 (48.0)	<0.0001		1121 (21.9)	55 (33.1)	1161 (48.1)	<0.0001	3931 (36.5)	<0.0001
Global gravity of Upper limb injury MAIS3+	1 (0)	2 (0.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)			3 (0.3)	1 (1.8)	5 (0.4)		12 (0.3)	

	Pedestrian (n=575)	Bicycle rider (n=1908)	Scooter rider (n=429)	Other PMD rider (n=50)		Car driver (n=5111)	Truck driver (n=166)	Motorized two- wheelers rider (n=2414)		All (n=10 653)	
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ¹	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	p-value ²		p-value ³
Injury of the lower limbs / pelvis	395 (68.7)	899 (47.1)	201 (46.8)	26 (52.0)	<0.0001	750 (14.7)	45 (27.1)	1653 (68.5)	<0.0001	3969 (36.8)	<0.0001
Global gravity of Injury of the lower limbs / pelvis MAIS3+	18 (4.6)	23 (2.6)	4 (2.0)	3 (11.5)		17 (2.3)	1 (2.2)	49 (3.0)		115 (2.9)	
New Injury Severity Score (NISS)					<0.0001				<0.0001		<0.0001
NISS < 9	523 (91.0)	1824 (95.6)	413 (96.3)	45 (90.0)		5024 (98.3)	153 (92.2)	2241 (92.8)		10343	
NISS = [9–15]	21 (3.6)	62 (3.2)	10 (2.3)	4 (8.0)		49 (1.0)	8 (4.8)	112 (4.6)		266 (2.5)	
NISS ≥ 16	31 (5.4)	22 (1.2)	6 (1.4)	1 (2.0)		38 (0.7)	5 (3.0)	61 (2.5)		164 (1.5)	

1 Comparison of pedestrian, bicycle rider, scooter rider and other PMD rider

2 Comparison of car driver, truck driver, and Motorized two-wheelers rider

3 Comparison of the 7 categories of injured users

Figure 1 : Flow chart




Figure 2 : Trends in the number of drivers, riders and pedestrians involved in work-related road crashes, by type of journey between 2015 and 2020 (source the Rhône Road Trauma Registry)








Figure 3 : Frequencies (and numbers) of different user categories of drivers, riders and pedestrians injured in work-related crashes, by year (source the Rhône Road Trauma Registry, 2015-2020)












■ Pedestrian 

▨ Bicycle driver 

■ Scooter driver 

■ Other PMD driver 

▨ Car driver 

■ Truck driver 

○ Two-wheelers driver 