

Peer Review

Review of: "Managing Work Activities on the Horizon of 2040: Which Challenges for Occupational Safety and Health at Work? A Foresight Study"

Yannick Lémonie¹

1. Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, France

This article uses a prospective research approach to report on changes in the way companies are organised, the associated health risks, and the prospective dimensions to be taken into account in occupational risk prevention.

The methodology, which is particularly well described, is based on three phases: a historical analysis phase, a prospective phase based on design fiction, and finally, a phase of reflection on the associated risks in the companies that were the subject of the research.

Several minor points should/could be highlighted:

Methodology:

(1) In the description of the 5 stages of the first phase, point (b) is marked 'first step': why? I think this is a mistake.

(2) For step (c) of the first phase, what were the criteria for selecting the experts?

What were the results?

Can the authors specify how the 12 work dynamics were identified? Presented like this, one might get the impression that these dynamics are independent of each other. Do they form a system? Could they not be linked?

In point 3.3.2, the authors write: "The techno-centric use of these tools seems to favour activity management in which technologies can replace middle management by automating instructions and delegating monitoring and assessment to customers, colleagues or users. If this trend becomes

widespread, it is likely to widen the gap between prescribed work and actual work, and prove particularly deleterious.”

What is technocentric usage? Talking about usage is already evoking the relationship between man and technology, so why talk about technocentric usage (a term I thought was reserved for design)?

Implicitly, moreover, the authors assert that the gaps between prescribed work and actual work have deleterious effects on health, that it would be necessary to reduce this gap, and that this gap will increase. Is this really the case? This seems to me to be somewhat paradoxical in relation to the literature, and in particular to the French-speaking tradition of ergonomics. Could the authors clarify their findings on this point and say why technologies are likely to increase the gap?

DISCUSSION

The points made in the discussion would benefit from being a little more closely related to the literature. For example, we agree with the authors when they state that the design fiction task can only be carried out after a ‘retrospective’ analysis.

In the literature on ‘future-oriented’ methodologies, the same position is taken, for example, in change laboratories, where historical analysis plays a very important role in future-oriented learning.

Could the ‘dystopian’ dimension of the design fiction method have been counterbalanced by a method geared towards producing a desirable future?

The discussion should perhaps question the methodologies on the orders of the possible, the plausible, the desirable, and the undesirable. This is a suggestion.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.