

Douleur cervicales atypiques: diagnostic et traitement

KCE reports 119B

Le Centre fédéral d'expertise des soins de santé

Présentation : Le Centre fédéral d'expertise des soins de santé est un parastatal, créé le 24 décembre 2002 par la loi-programme (articles 262 à 266), sous tutelle du Ministre de la Santé publique et des Affaires sociales, qui est chargé de réaliser des études éclairant la décision politique dans le domaine des soins de santé et de l'assurance maladie.

Conseil d'administration

Membres effectifs : Pierre Gillet (Président), Dirk Cuypers (Vice président), Jo De Cock (Vice président), Frank Van Massenhove (Vice président), Yolande Avondtroodt, Jean-Pierre Baeyens, Ri de Ridder, Olivier De Stexhe, Peter Degadt, Daniel Devos, Jean-Noël Godin, Floris Goyens, Jef Maes, Pascal Mertens, Raf Mertens, Marc Moens, François Perl, Marco Schetgen, Yves Smeets, Patrick Verertbruggen, Michel Foulon, Myriam Hubinon.

Membres suppléants : Rita Cuypers, Christiaan De Coster, Benoît Collin, Lambert Stamatakis, Karel Vermeyen, Katrien Kesteloot, Bart Ooghe, Frederic Lernoux, Anne Vanderstappen, Paul Palsterman, Geert Messiaen, Anne Remacle, Roland Lemeye, Annick Poncé, Pierre Smiets, Jan Bertels, Catherine Lucet, Ludo Meyers, Olivier Thonon.

Commissaire du gouvernement : Roger Yves

Direction

Directeur général a.i. : Jean-Pierre Closon

Contact

Centre fédéral d'expertise des soins de santé (KCE).
Cité Administrative Botanique, Doorbuilding (10^{ème})
Boulevard du Jardin Botanique, 55
B-1000 Bruxelles
Belgium

Tel: +32 [0]2 287 33 88

Fax: +32 [0]2 287 33 85

Email : info@kce.fgov.be

Web : <http://www.kce.fgov.be>

Douleurs cervicales aspécifiques : diagnostic et traitement

KCE reports 119B

GIANNOULA TSAKITZIDIS, ROY REMMEN, LIEVE PEREMANS, PAUL VAN ROYEN,
CHRISTIANE DUCHESNES, DOMINIQUE PAULUS,
MARIJKE EYSEN

KCE reports I 19B

Titre :	Douleur cervicales atypiques: diagnostic et traitement
Auteurs :	Giannoula Tsakitzidis (UA, Antwerpen), Roy Remmen (UA, Antwerpen), Lieve Peremans (UA, Antwerpen) Paul Van Royen (UA, Antwerpen), Christiane Duchesnes (ULg, Liège), Dominique Paulus (KCE), Marijke Eyssen (KCE)
Reviewers:	Gaetane Stassijns (UZ, Antwerpen), Guy Hans (UZ, Antwerpen)
Experts Externes:	Dankaerts, Wim (Faculteit Bewegings- en Revalidatiewetenschappen, KULeuven), De Preitere, Bart (Neurochirurgie, UZ-KULeuven), Morlion, Bart (Président Belgian Pain Society, Anesthésiste, UZ-KULeuven), Paulus, Yves (INAMI, Bruxelles), Schoonejans, Bruno (Spécialiste en médecine physique et réadaptation, Grand Hôpital de Charleroi), Vanderstraeten, Jacques (médecin généraliste, Société Scientifique de Médecine Générale, Bruxelles), Vermoesen, Dré (Wetenschappelijke Vereniging van Vlaamse Kinesitherapeuten, Oostakker), Wyffels, Patrick (médecin généraliste, Halledorp)
Validateurs externes:	Bert Aertgeerts (Academic Center for General Practice, KULeuven), Anita Gross (School of Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Western Ontario, Canada), Jan Van Zundert (Multidisciplinary Pain Clinic, Hospital Oost-Limburg, Genk)
Conflit d'intérêt potentiel:	B. Morlion, D. Vermoesen, W. Dankaerts ont déclaré avoir été rétribués pour des interventions lors de congrès scientifiques
Disclaimer:	Les experts externes ont été consultés sur une version (préliminaire) du rapport scientifique. Une version (finale) a ensuite été soumise aux validateurs.. La validation du rapport résulte d'un consensus ou d'un vote majoritaire entre les validateurs. Le KCE reste seul responsable des erreurs ou omissions qui pourraient subsister de même que des recommandations faites aux autorités publiques

Layout: Ine Verhulst

Bruxelles, 19 novembre 2009

Etude nr 2008-24

Domaine: Good Clinical Practice (GCP)

MeSH: Neck pain ; Diagnosis ; Prognosis ; Therapeutics ; Review

NLM classification : WE 708

Langage: anglais, français

Format: Adobe® PDF™ (A4)

Dépot Légal: D/2009/10.273/55

La reproduction partielle de ce document est autorisée à condition que la source soit mentionnée. Ce document est disponible en téléchargement sur le site Web du Centre fédéral d'expertise des soins de santé.

Comment citer ce document?

Tsakitzidis G, Remmen R, Peremans L, Van Royen P, Duchesnes C, Paulus D, Eyssen M. Douleur cervicales atypiques: diagnostic et traitement. Good Clinical Practice (GCP). Bruxelles: Centre fédéral d'expertise des soins de santé (KCE). 2009. KCE Reports I 19B. D/2009/10.273/55



PREFACE

Le rapport KCE relatif au mal de dos chronique a rencontré et rencontre encore un vif succès auprès des internautes belges et étrangers. Le vieillissement de notre population couplé à une sédentarité croissante influence de manière négative la fréquence des douleurs d'origine articulaire dans notre pays et par là même les soins de santé et les coûts indirects qui y sont liés.

Le KCE continue sur sa lancée, avec ce rapport relatif aux douleurs cervicales aspécifiques. De multiples professionnels de la santé sont confrontés à des patients qui expriment cette plainte, raison pour laquelle ce rapport est le fruit d'une collaboration scientifique entre spécialistes de divers horizons tels que médecine physique, médecine générale, anesthésie, neurochirurgie. Nous tenons à remercier l'équipe du centre de médecine générale de l'Université d'Anvers pour le travail minutieux réalisé dans le cadre de cette revue systématique de la littérature scientifique.

L'arsenal diagnostique et surtout thérapeutique est large : il semble donc primordial de fournir au praticien une information clinique basée sur les données probantes les plus récentes. Puisse ce travail contribuer à la prise en charge optimale de la douleur cervicale, à l'amélioration de la qualité de vie des patients qui en font la pénible expérience et à la minimisation du nombre d'actes inutiles potentiellement porteurs de faux espoirs.

Jean-Pierre Closon

Directeur général a.i.

Résumé

INTRODUCTION

La présente étude a pour vocation de fournir une revue systématique de la littérature scientifique portant sur le diagnostic, le pronostic et le traitement des douleurs cervicales aspécifiques aiguës et chroniques. L'objectif est de proposer des messages-clés basés sur des données probantes aux fins du diagnostic et du traitement des adultes souffrant d'une douleur cervicale aspécifique.

Le concept « douleurs cervicales » couvre un champ vaste. Il englobe notamment la douleur cervicale aspécifique et les troubles associés qui y sont associés. Les symptômes varient en fonction de l'activité physique et avec le temps. On entend par douleur cervicale aspécifique toute douleur cervicale chronique aiguë, subaiguë ou chronique dans laquelle aucune anomalie de la structure anatomique ne peut être identifiée comme étant la cause de la douleur. La revue de littérature n'a pu fournir aucune définition claire des concepts aigu, subaigu et chronique.

METHODOLOGIE

La recherche dans la littérature a couvert la période 1998-2008. Elle a inclus des revues systématiques, des méta-analyses, des recommandations pour la pratique clinique (RPC), essais randomisés contrôlés (Randomised controlled trials – RCTs) et des essais cliniques.

Les chercheurs ont analysé la littérature scientifique dans les banques de données Medline, Embase, Cochrane et Pedro. De surcroît, les RPC existantes ont été recherchées dans les bases de données spécifiques. Toutes les publications ont été passées en revue par une équipe de deux chercheurs. Un panel pluridisciplinaire constitué d'experts s'est joint à l'équipe de chercheurs afin de déterminer le niveau de preuve des conclusions, en utilisant pour ce faire le système « GRADE » :

- Grade A (niveau de preuve élevé): RCTs sans limitations importantes ou preuves inébranlables par des études d'observation ;
- Grade B (niveau de preuve moyen): RCTs avec limitations importantes (résultats contradictoires, lacunes méthodologiques, résultats indirects ou imprécis) ou preuves exceptionnellement solides par des études d'observation ;
- Grade C (faible niveau de preuve): niveau de preuves moins élevé.

Enfin, les conclusions de cette revue systématique ont été comparées à celles de deux RPC de qualité élevée identifiées durant la recherche.

RESULTATS

De la recherche de données probantes sur le diagnostic et le pronostic sont ressorties 135 publications potentiellement pertinentes : 11 de bonne qualité ont été sélectionnées. La recherche relative au traitement a donné 564 références, dont 55 revues de littérature : 24 ont été retenues après évaluation de leur qualité. Enfin, 13 RCT publiés après les revues de littérature de bonne qualité les plus récentes ont également été inclus après évaluation de leur qualité.

EVALUATION DE LA DOULEUR CERVICALE ET DE LA PERTE FONCTIONNELLE

Le «Neck Disability Index» est un instrument validé largement utilisé pour évaluer la perte fonctionnelle reportée par les patients souffrant de douleurs cervicales. Cet index a été utilisé de manière effective tant dans le contexte clinique que dans les recherches. Il a été traduit en néerlandais mais pas en français.

DIAGNOSTIC DE LA DOULEUR CERVICALE ASPECIFIQUE

Les chercheurs n'ont identifié aucune revue systématique de littérature ou étude primaire portant sur l'exactitude diagnostique de l'anamnèse ou de l'imagerie diagnostique chez les patients présentant une douleur cervicale aspécifique.

Exclusion des «red flags» et des troubles d'origine radiculaire

Les « red flags » (signes d'alerte) sont des signes ou symptômes cliniques qui suggèrent l'existence d'une cause sous-jacente grave. Pour confirmer le diagnostic de douleur cervicale aspécifique, il est essentiel d'exclure les « red flags » (voir tableau 1 dans le rapport scientifique) ainsi que les douleurs d'origine radiculaire/radiculopathies (pathologie affectant une racine nerveuse pouvant résulter d'une compression et d'autres troubles). La présence d'une douleur radiculaire/radiculopathie peut être cliniquement démontrée grâce à la manœuvre de Spurling, à la traction/distraction cervicale, au test d'abduction de l'épaule et à la manœuvre de Valsalva (faible niveau de preuve). L'absence de douleur radiculaire/radiculopathie est présumée après un test du membre supérieur négatif (faible niveau de preuve).

Diagnostic de la douleur d'origine facettaire

Un bloc anesthésique local peut être utile pour diagnostiquer une douleur facettaire en tant que structure sous-jacente provoquant la douleur (faible niveau de preuve). Toutefois, cette technique invasive ne devrait être utilisée que lorsque le diagnostic clinique reste incertain. En effet, elle est associée à un taux élevé de faux positifs et il n'existe pas de consensus sur la définition d'un « bloc anesthésique réussi » dans la douleur facettaire.

PRONOSTIC

Le nombre de publications relatives aux facteurs pronostiques pour la douleur cervicale aspécifique est limité. Quelques indicateurs d'un pronostic moins favorable (intensification de la douleur, perte fonctionnelle plus importante, plus faible amélioration générale, recours accru aux services de santé, augmentation de l'absentéisme) ont été identifiés notamment, l'âge, une lombalgie concomitante, l'intensité de la douleur et des antécédents d'épisodes de douleur cervicale aspécifique (faible niveau de preuve).

Les recherches laissent supposer que les constats radiologiques (par exemple des modifications dégénératives des disques ou des articulations) ne sont pas associés à un pronostic plus défavorable (faible niveau de preuve).

TRAITEMENT

Pour de nombreuses modalités thérapeutiques, il est malaisé de tirer des conclusions en se fondant sur les données probantes disponibles. En effet, les techniques ne sont pas toujours décrites avec précision, la littérature scientifique fait défaut pour certains traitements et les populations enrôlées dans les études comprennent parfois d'autres patients que ceux souffrant de douleur cervicale aspécifique.

Thérapie manuelle

L'efficacité réelle de la seule manipulation ou mobilisation dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique aiguë ou chronique reste hypothétique (niveau de preuve moyen). Cependant, la manipulation et/ou mobilisation qui s'inscrit dans le cadre d'une prise en charge multimodale (association d'au minimum deux modalités thérapeutiques différentes, voir ci-dessous) semble efficace dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique chronique tant en ce qui concerne la douleur qu'en ce qui concerne l'état fonctionnel (niveau de preuve élevé).

Des exercices effectués sous supervision d'un professionnel de la santé peuvent être efficaces dans le traitement de la douleur cervicale aspécifique aiguë et chronique (niveau de preuve moyen). La littérature laisse entendre (niveau de preuve moyen) que les exercices de renforcement musculaire, de stretching, de proprioception (p.ex. fixation oculaire) ainsi que les exercices dynamiques contre résistance peuvent être efficaces. Les bienfaits des exercices à domicile, des exercices en groupe et des écoles de la nuque (pour des groupes hétérogènes) ne sont pas étayés par la littérature scientifique (faible niveau de preuve).

Les limites des études portant sur le traitement par massage empêchent de tirer toute conclusion à propos de son efficacité dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique. Les données relatives aux effets bénéfiques potentiels de techniques de massage spécifiques (notamment le massage chinois traditionnel) restent floues (faible niveau de preuve).

Les données probantes relatives à la traction cervicale sont limitées et les éléments indiquant un avantage potentiel restent flous.

Interventions multimodales et pluridisciplinaires

On entend par traitement multimodal, l'association d'au minimum deux modalités thérapeutiques différentes utilisées dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique, par exemple, des exercices combinés à la mobilisation et/ou à un traitement médicamenteux.

Les approches, méthodes ou traitements pluridisciplinaires exigent une prise en charge par une équipe de thérapeutes de diverses disciplines qui soignent le même patient soit ensemble soit de manière isolée sans objectif commun préétabli.

Des données probantes confirment un avantage à court et à long terme d'une prise en charge multimodale impliquant des exercices (sous supervision) associés à des mobilisations ou à des manipulations (niveau de preuve élevé). L'effet se marque tant sur la douleur qu'en ce qui concerne une amélioration de l'état fonctionnel. Une incertitude subsiste quant aux composantes précises de l'intervention qui apportent au traitement son efficacité réelle (par exemple, la fréquence, la durée, les techniques). S'agissant des approches pluridisciplinaires, la littérature ne recèle qu'un nombre insuffisant de recherches de bonne qualité pour soutenir cette option.

Modalités de l'électrothérapie et autres traitements de médecine physique

Compte tenu de la palette des interventions et des données probantes limitées et contradictoires, il est difficile de formuler des conclusions relatives aux modalités de l'électrothérapie et à d'autres traitements de médecine physique.

Les données manquent pour affirmer l'effet bénéfique de la neurostimulation électrique transcutanée (TENS) dans le traitement de la douleur cervicale chronique. Des données limitées indiquent une absence de bénéfice à court terme pour les autres traitements tels que la stimulation musculaire électrique ou d'autres traitements d'électrothérapie, comme les courants galvaniques, les courants diadynamiques, l'iontophorèse (faible niveau de preuve).

Des preuves limitées existent pour la thérapie électromagnétique (PEMF- pulsed electromagnetic field therapy, stimulation magnétique répétitive). Cette dernière semble bénéfique pour la douleur et la fonction à court terme dans la douleur chronique. La thérapie PEMF aurait un effet post-traitement immédiat dans la douleur cervicale aiguë et chronique (faible niveau de preuve).

Des preuves limitées étayaient également les bienfaits du LLLT (« low-level laser therapy ») avec longueurs d'ondes infrarouges (faible niveau de preuve). A court terme, le LLLT semble soulager la douleur et avoir un effet bénéfique sur l'état fonctionnel dans la douleur cervicale aiguë et chronique. Aucun bénéfice sur la douleur n'a été démontré pour les autres types de thérapie au laser dans le traitement des patients avec douleur cervicale.

Traitement médicamenteux

Seuls certains traitements médicamenteux ont été étudiés chez les patients souffrant de douleur cervicale aspécifique. Des preuves de qualité moyenne montrent les bienfaits des analgésiques non narcotiques, y compris les anti-inflammatoires non stéroïdiens : leurs effets sur la douleur sont supérieurs à ceux du placebo, mais restent flous par rapport à d'autres traitements tels que la manipulation (faible niveau de preuve). Des données incertaines existent à propos des avantages des agents psychotropes utilisés comme myorelaxants (faible niveau de preuve).

Les injections locales d'anesthésiques contenant de la lidocaïne dans les points gâchettes myofasciaux semblent efficaces dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique chronique (faible niveau de preuve).

D'autres traitements comme la toxine botulique A (niveau de preuve moyen) et des injections ou insufflations sous-cutanées de dioxyde de carbone (faible niveau de preuve) n'ont apporté aucun effet clinique.

Autres traitements : acupuncture, programmes éducatifs, oreillers spéciaux, colliers souples et attelles

Des preuves de qualité moyenne indiquent que l'acupuncture, et plus précisément celle qui stimule les points gâchettes, peut améliorer le soulagement de la douleur dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique chronique.

Quelques données probantes ne montrent aucun avantage des différents programmes éducatifs dans le traitement de la douleur cervicale aspécifique par rapport à l'abstention ou à d'autres traitements (niveau de preuve moyen). Des programmes spécifiques pourraient être efficaces pour des populations données, notamment une intervention de groupe relative à la façon de travailler ou des conseils de type ergonomique aux personnes qui travaillent sur ordinateur (faible niveau de preuve).

Des données de niveau de preuve moyen indiquent l'absence d'avantages liés au port d'un collier souple ou d'une attelle (« oral splints ») chez les patients souffrant de douleur cervicale aspécifique.

Il n'existe pas de preuves relatives à l'utilisation d'oreillers spéciaux en tant que traitement isolé chez les patients souffrant de douleur cervicale chronique. En revanche, les oreillers utilisés dans le cadre d'une prise en charge multimodale comprenant des exercices ont donné des résultats positifs au niveau de l'atténuation de la douleur cervicale (niveau de preuve moyen).

CONCLUSION

Toutes les conclusions détaillées ci-dessus ont été comparées au contenu de deux RPC de bonne qualité. La plupart des conclusions de la présente étude correspondent à celles de ces RPC.

Dans l'interprétation des résultats, il convient de prendre en considération les limites suivantes. D'abord, le concept de « douleur cervicale aspécifique » est assez vaste et vague. Il se peut que l'identification de sous-groupes spécifiques aboutisse à des procédures de diagnostic et à des traitements plus ciblés. La littérature disponible est actuellement insuffisante pour définir ces sous-groupes.

Dans le même ordre d'idées, il est essentiel de souligner le caractère hétérogène et l'absence de définition de multiples interventions décrites dans la littérature. De nombreuses études ne contenaient pas de définition de la douleur cervicale aspécifique et ne décrivaient pas les modalités thérapeutiques dans tous les détails (durée, fréquence).

Les données probantes sont limitées en ce qui concerne le traitement médicamenteux de la douleur cervicale aspécifique : la littérature scientifique fait défaut sur de nombreux traitements médicamenteux utilisés dans la pratique. En conséquence, les conclusions relatives à ce type de traitement pourraient être complétées par des RPC relatives à la douleur (par exemple, celles de l'American Geriatrics Society

<http://www.americangeriatrics.org/> ou de la Société Scientifique de Médecine Générale <http://www.ssmg.be>).

Les experts et les auteurs ont évalué les procédures de diagnostic et interventions thérapeutiques en utilisant le système GRADE (voir Tableau). Dans le cas où les effets positifs d'une intervention primaient (ou non) manifestement sur les effets indésirables, le panel (dé) recommandait fortement cette intervention. Par contre, il émettait un avis plus nuancé lorsque l'effet escompté des interventions proposées était moins certain, soit en raison de données probantes de faible qualité, soit à cause d'un équilibre incertain entre les effets souhaitables et indésirables. Dans ce dernier cas, les cliniciens devraient prendre en compte avec toute la prudence qui s'impose à la fois les avantages, les risques et les inconvénients pour chaque patient.

MESSAGES CLE

Pour l'évaluation d'un patient avec douleur cervicale, les points suivants peuvent être résumés :

- Importance de l'anamnèse et de l'examen clinique ;
- Exclusion des “red flags” ;
- Procédures diagnostiques:
 - Absence de données probantes dans la littérature pour l'utilisation de l'imagerie diagnostique dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique. Les images radiologiques pathologiques n'ont par ailleurs pas de caractère pronostique défavorable (faible niveau de preuve) ;
 - Faible niveau de preuve pour l'utilisation des manœuvres diagnostiques étudiées.

Pour la prise en charge d'un patient souffrant de douleur cervicale aspécifique chronique, un seul traitement présente dans la littérature des données probantes de niveau élevé : une prise en charge multimodale (au moins 2 techniques) incluant des exercices (sous supervision) associés à des mobilisations ou à des manipulations.

Pour l'ensemble des autres modalités de prise en charge, les données de littérature sont de qualité médiocre et / ou ne permettent pas de recommander une technique particulière sur base de données probantes de qualité élevée.

RECOMMANDATION

Cette revue systématique de littérature présente les dernières données scientifiques relatives aux procédures diagnostiques et thérapeutiques de la douleur cervicale aspécifique. Dans cette optique, le KCE recommande que les données probantes détaillées dans ce rapport servent de base pour l'élaboration de guides de pratique clinique par les associations scientifiques belges de médecins, de kinésithérapeutes et autres professionnels de la santé.

Le message scientifique de ces futurs guides devrait mettre l'accent sur l'utilité de l'approche multimodale (exercices sous supervision associés à des mobilisations ou à des manipulations) pour la prise en charge de la douleur cervicale aspécifique chronique.

Intervention(s) proposée(s)	Niveau de preuve (A, B, C) ; suivant les meilleures données disponibles ou aucune preuve dans la littérature	« Elevé » ou « Faible » et « Pour » ou « Contre »
Diagnostic et pronostic		
Anamnèse	Pas de donnée probante dans la littérature	Elevé – Pour
Exclusion des « Red flags »	Meilleures données probantes disponibles dans la littérature	Elevé – Pour
Imagerie diagnostique	Pas de donnée probante dans la littérature	Faible - Contre
« Neck Disability Index » comme instrument d'auto-évaluation de la perte fonctionnelle	Instrument valide- Niveau de preuve non applicable	Elevé - Pour
Confirmation de radiculopathie : manœuvre de Spurling – Traction/distraction – Abduction de l'épaule – Manœuvre de Valsalva	C	Faible - Pour
Exclusion de radiculopathie : « upper limb tension test » négatif	C	Faible-Pour
Diagnostic d'une douleur facettaire en l'absence de diagnostic clinique : bloc anesthésique local	C	Faible - Pour
Eléments pronostiques défavorables : gravité de la douleur, épisodes préalables, âge avancé ou lombalgie concomitante	C	Faible - Pour
Images radiologiques pathologiques associées à un pronostic moins favorable.	C	Faible - Contre

Traitement de la douleur cervicale aspécifique (DCAS)		
DCAS chronique -Approche multimodale : exercices sous supervision d'un professionnel associés à des mobilisations/manipulations	Effet sur douleur/état fonctionnel court-/long terme (A)	Elevé - Pour
DCAS chronique – Manipulation/mobilisation associée à d'autres modalités thérapeutiques	Pas d'effet (C)	Faible – Contre
DCAS chronique -Exercices sous supervision : programmes de stretching et de renforcement musculaire de la région cervicale	Effet sur douleur/état fonctionnel long terme (B)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique -Exercices sous supervision : programmes de stretching et de renforcement musculaire ciblés sur la région scapulaire et la condition générale	Effet sur état fonctionnel court-terme (C)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique -Exercices sous supervision : fixation oculaire et exercices de proprioception	Effet sur douleur/état fonctionnel court- terme (B)	Faible - Pour
DCAS aiguë et chronique -Manipulation ou mobilisation isolées	Pas d'effet (B)	Faible – Contre
DCAS chronique -Traction	Pas d'effet (C)	Faible – Contre
DCAS aiguë et chronique -Massage	Pas de conclusion (C)	Faible – Contre
DCAS chronique -Exercices à domicile ou en groupe sans supervision, écoles de la nuque traditionnelles non multidisciplinaires	Pas d'effet (C)	Faible - Contre
DCAS aiguë et chronique -Low level laser therapy (LLLT); PEMF (champs électromagnétiques pulsés)	Effet court-terme sur douleur/état fonctionnel (LLLT); sur douleur (PEMF) (C)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique –TENS; EMS sur les points gâchettes	Pas d'effet (C)	Faible - Contre
DCAS chronique -Approche multidisciplinaire	Pas de conclusion (C)	Faible - Pour
DCAS aiguë et chronique -Paracétamol, AINS, analgésiques opiacés	Effet sur douleur court-terme (C)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique -Injection locale d'anesthésique contenant de la lidocaïne dans les points gâchettes myofasciaux	Effet sur douleur court-terme (C)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique -Toxine botulique A dans la douleur cervicale aspécifique	Pas d'effet (B)	Faible - Contre
DCAS aiguë -Insufflations sous-cutanées de dioxyde de carbone.	Pas d'effet (C)	Faible - Contre
DCAS aiguë et chronique -Programmes d'éducation isolés	Pas d'effet (B)	Faible - Contre
DCAS chronique -Oreillers spéciaux en association avec des exercices dans la douleur cervicale chronique aspécifique	Effet sur douleur court-/long terme (C)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique -Acupuncture au niveau des points gâchettes	Effet sur douleur court-terme (B)	Faible - Pour
DCAS chronique -Collier souple – attelle (« oral splint »)	Pas d'effet (B)	Faible - Contre

Scientific summary

Table of contents

I	INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3
1.2	NON-SPECIFIC NECK PAIN: DEFINITION AND EPIDEMIOLOGY	3
1.2.1	Definition	3
1.2.2	Importance of neck pain	5
2	METHODOLOGY.....	6
2.1	SELECTION CRITERIA	6
2.1.1	Participant.....	6
2.1.2	Intervention.....	7
2.1.3	Comparison.....	7
2.1.4	Outcome.....	7
2.2	LOCATING STUDIES	8
2.2.1	Searches in databases	9
2.2.2	Screening of titles and abstracts	9
2.2.3	Screening full text and quality appraisal.....	9
2.2.4	New search for diagnosis and prognosis	10
2.3	DATA EXTRACTION	11
3	RESULTS	12
3.1	NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED	12
3.2	DIAGNOSIS	12
3.3	ASSESSMENT OF PAIN AND DISABILITY	14
3.4	PROGNOSIS	15
3.5	TREATMENT	15
3.5.1	Manual therapy	15
3.5.2	Electrotherapy and other physical medicine modalities.....	19
3.5.3	Multimodal interventions.....	20
3.5.4	Multidisciplinary treatments.....	21
3.5.5	Medication	22
3.5.6	Other methods.....	23
3.6	CLINICAL QUESTIONS ON NON-SPECIFIC NECK PAIN: SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE FINDINGS	25
3.6.1	Management of non-specific neck pain	26
4	DISCUSSION	28
5	SUMMARY	30
6	APPENDICES.....	32
	APPENDIX 1: SEARCH STRATEGY.....	32
	SEARCH STRATEGY MEDLINE CLINICAL QUERIES AND SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS	32
	SEARCH STRATEGY MEDLINE OTHERS	33
	SEARCH STRATEGY COCHRANE	34
	SEARCH STRATEGY PEDRO	34
	SEARCH STRATEGY GUIDELINES	34
	SEARCH STRATEGY EMBASE.....	35
	SEARCH STRATEGY PUBMED SECOND SEARCH.....	36
	SEARCH STRATEGY EMBASE.....	36
	APPENDIX 2: CRITERIA USED TO ASSESS THE METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY OF THE STUDIES: RESULTS OF THE QUALITY APPRAISAL.....	37
	QUALITY APPRAISAL: PAPERS ON DIAGNOSIS	37

QUALITY APPRAISAL: RCTs ON TREATMENT	38
QUALITY APPRAISAL: SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS	38
QUALITY APPRAISAL: AGREE SCORES FOR THE 2 SELECTED GUIDELINES.....	39
APPENDIX 3: EVIDENCE TABLE OF INCLUDED SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS.....	41
APPENDIX 4: EVIDENCE TABLE OF INCLUDED RCT'S FOR TREATMENT	51
APPENDIX 5: EVIDENCE TABLE OF INCLUDED PUBLICATIONS DIAGNOSIS AND PROGNOSIS	55
APPENDIX 6: RECOMMENDATIONS COMPARED TO EXISTING GUIDELINES	57
APPENDIX 7 : NECK DISABILITY INDEX	60
ORIGINAL VERSION NECK DISABILITY INDEX: INSTRUMENT AND INTERPRETATION.....	60
DUTCH VERSION NECK DISABILITY INDEX : INSTRUMENT AND INTERPRETATION.....	67
7 REFERENCE LIST	70

I INTRODUCTION

I.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study aims to review scientific literature on diagnosis, prognosis and treatment of acute, subacute and chronic non-specific neck pain. The objective is to offer an overview of the currently available evidence to primary care and specialized practitioners involved with adults who suffer from non-specific neck pain.

I.2 NON-SPECIFIC NECK PAIN: DEFINITION AND EPIDEMIOLOGY

I.2.1 Definition

Neck pain is a wide concept and many definitions exist. In this report non-specific neck pain is defined in accordance to established guidelines, high quality systematic reviews, key text books, search on the topic in Pubmed and discussion with experts ¹⁻⁵.

Non-specific neck pain can be defined as simple (non-specific) neck pain without specific underlying disease causing the pain. Symptoms vary with physical activity and over time. Each form of acute, subacute or chronic neck pain, where no abnormal anatomic structure; as cause of pain, can be identified, is non-specific neck pain. There are different opinions about duration of symptoms but according to Binder, neck pain can be acute (< 4 weeks duration), sub-acute (1-4 months duration) or chronic (> 4 months duration) ¹.

The symptoms of non-specific neck pain are very similar to the symptoms of whiplash associated disorders grades one and two (WAD I-II). Whiplash is an acceleration-deceleration mechanism of energy transfer to the neck and can result in injury to bony or soft tissue. The clinical symptoms, known as whiplash associated disorders, are for grade I 'pain, stiffness and tenderness in the neck, but no physical signs' and for grade II 'neck complaints and other musculoskeletal complaints (e.g., a decreased range of motion and tender spots)' ⁶. The WAD's can also include headache and numerous other symptoms e.g. dizziness, tinnitus, sleep disturbance, mood disturbance, pain in areas outside the neck. Therefore, as also mentioned in the methodology section, literature on WAD will be excluded in this review. However, although it is not our purpose to review WAD primary literature, probably the systematic reviews and primary RCT's to be retrieved will not always allow us to separate this subgroup out from non-specific neck pain. In this case, these data will be accepted.

Non-specific neck pain can be diagnosed on clinical grounds alone, provided there are no features (for example Table I: 'Red flags') to suggest more serious conditions ¹. The red flags proposed in table I are based on a good quality guideline already mentioned above ³, and represent the best available evidence in the field.

Table 1: Best available evidence of ‘Red flags’ for neck pain (clinical features that indicate an increased risk of specific conditions that can present with neck pain and require urgent attention)
http://www.cks.nhs.uk/neck_pain_non_specific

A serious underlying cause is more likely in people presenting with:

- New symptoms before the age of 20 years or after the age of 55 years
- Weakness involving more than one myotome or loss of sensation involving more than one dermatome
- Intractable or increasing pain

‘Red flags’ that suggest compression of the spinal cord (myelopathy):

- Insidious progression
- Neurological symptoms: gait disturbance, clumsy or weak hands, or loss of sexual, bladder, or bowel function
- Neurological signs:
 - Lhermitte’s sign: flexion of the neck causes an electric shock-type sensation that radiates down the spine and into the limbs.
 - Upper motor neuron signs in the lower limbs (Babinski’s sign-up-going plantar reflex, hyperreflexia, clonus, spasticity)
 - Lower motor neuron signs in the upper limbs (atrophy, hyporeflexia)
- Sensory changes are variable, with loss of vibration and joint position sense more evident in the hands than in the feet

‘Red flags’ that suggest cancer, infection, or inflammation:

- Malaise, fever, unexplained weight loss
- Pain that is increasing, is unremitting, or disturbs sleep
- History of inflammatory arthritis, cancer, tuberculosis, immunosuppression, drug abuse, AIDS, or other infection
- Lymphadenopathy
- Exquisite localized tenderness over a vertebral body

‘Red flags’ that suggest severe trauma or skeletal injury:

- A history of violent trauma (e.g. a road traffic accident) or a fall from a height. However, minor trauma may fracture the spine in people with osteoporosis
- A history of neck surgery
- Risk factors for osteoporosis: premature menopause, use of systemic steroids

‘Red flags’ that suggest vascular insufficiency:

- Dizziness and blackouts (restriction of vertebral artery) on movement, especially extension of the neck when gazing upwards
- Drop attacks

1.2.2 Importance of neck pain

1.2.2.1 *Epidemiology in Belgium and in the international literature*

Data on neck pain are scarce in Belgium. The only available data for Flanders come from Intego, a network of general practitioners established since 1990 by the academic general practice centre at the university of Leuven (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, KUL). Over fifty practices of general practitioners (GPs) work with an electronic medical file Medidoc®. Data are registered automatically and include reasons for contact, diagnoses, laboratory tests and medical prescriptions. Based on the results of Intego (www.intego.org and www.intego.be), the “neck syndrome”, with ICPC code L83 (includes diagnosis ‘non-specific neck pain’) is in the top 20 of most frequent diagnoses in the period of 1994-2006. The estimated incidence of neck syndromes (including non-specific neck pain) was 24.84 ‰ for the yearly contact population in that period. Women suffered more frequently from this symptom (31.48 ‰, 7th reason for contact) than men (18.43 ‰, 9th reason for contact). These incidences refer to the population who consult their GP and so can be an underestimation of the incidence of non-specific neck pain in the general population in Belgium.

In the international literature prevalence studies show variation in results ⁷⁻¹¹. For instance, in a Swedish population-based study of 8356 subjects (6000 respondents i.e.72%) 43 % (48% of women and 38% of men) of the population reported neck pain. Chronic neck pain defined as continuous pain of more than 6 months duration, was more common in women (22%) than in men (16%). More than one fourth of the cases with chronic symptoms had a history of neck or head trauma and one third of these had sustained a whiplash type injury ¹⁰. These figures reinforce the conclusion of the systematic review of Fejer ⁹ i.e. the higher prevalence of neck pain in Scandinavian countries than in other European countries. Fejer et al. concluded that the prevalence increases with longer prevalence periods ⁹. The point prevalence in the Fejer review ⁹ for the adult population (15-74 years) ranged from 5.9 to 22.2 % (mean= 7,6%). In the USA the point prevalence of neck pain is 4.4% (4.1 to 4.7% in a population of 29,828 interviewees) with 3.9 % (3.5-4.3%) in men and 4.8% in women (4.4-5.2%) ¹¹. The Task Force on neck pain (2008) reported that depending on the case definitions used, the 12-month prevalence of neck pain ranged from 12.1% to 71.5% in the general population, and from 27.1% to 47.8% in workers. However, neck pain with associated disability was less common: 12-month prevalence estimates ranged from 1.7% to 11.5% in the general population ⁶.

1.2.2.2 *Consequences of neck pain*

Chronic neck pain may lead to substantial medical consumption, absenteeism from work and disability ⁷. Whatever the duration of neck pain, pain can impair functional capacity, quality of life and can cause worry, anxiety and depression. Consequently, neck pain places a heavy burden on individuals, employers and health care services ^{1, 7, 10, 12}. Non-specific neck pain is not just a clinical problem, it can develop into a complex disorder where physical, psychological, social, compensation and other possible forces interact to cause and lead to maintained disability ¹².

2 METHODOLOGY

The objective of this scientific summary is to answer the following research question: “What are the most accurate diagnostic procedures, prognostic factors and therapeutic interventions for adults with acute, subacute or chronic non-specific neck pain?” The existing scientific literature for non-specific neck pain is reviewed and critically assessed.

2.1 SELECTION CRITERIA

The interdisciplinary research team (general practitioners, neurologist, specialist in rehabilitation, anaesthesiologist, neurologist, radiologist, physiotherapist) had several meetings to define a well-built clinical question and translating it into the following relevant and accurate inclusion and exclusion criteria using the PICO framework (www.cebm.net). The acronym ‘PICO’ stands for patient or problem being addressed (P), the intervention or exposure being considered (I), the comparison intervention or exposure (when relevant) or area of interest (C), and the outcomes of interest (O)¹³. Based upon the PICO relevant and accurate in- and exclusion criteria are constructed. Clinical and KCE experts were consulted for feedback. Besides the in- and exclusion criteria for content of the studies also the design of the studies is important. Included are high-quality systematic reviews, supplemental RCTs, and clinical trials for diagnostic and prognostic studies. Excluded are other study designs, pilot RCT studies or designs including neck and back interventions where data on neck alone cannot be extracted.

2.1.1 Participant

2.1.1.1 Inclusion criteria

- Adults (18 years and over);
- Neck pain in the cervical region, possibly with referred or radiating pain in the occiput, nuchal muscles, shoulders and upper limbs without proven structural disorders in the cervical spine, nerve roots or spinal cord¹.

2.1.1.2 Exclusion criteria

- Children (Age younger than 18);
- Having signs and symptoms of neurological disorders (irradiated pain in the shoulders and /or arms and /or hands (radicular pain/radiculopathy), cervicobrachialgia, myelopathy, ...);
- Headache as a consequence of specific headache diagnosis (migraine, cervical headache, ...);
- Having a history of specific signs of malignancy, infection;
- Having a history of trauma with or without proven structural disorders in the region of the neck, shoulder and head (e.g. whiplash);
- Having signs and symptoms of cerebrovascular insufficiency (e.g., dizziness, drop attacks, cerebrovascular accident and Transient Ischemic Attack);
- Having a severe chronic disease of the locomotor system (e.g. polyarthritis, muscular disease);
- Having clinical features that indicate an increased risk of specific conditions that can present with neck pain and require urgent attention e.g. described in ‘Red flags’ (http://www.cks.nhs.uk/neck_pain_non_specific).

2.1.2 Intervention

“Diagnostic evaluation”, “management and treatment” and “prognosis” are considered as an intervention of non-specific neck complaints and pain.

2.1.2.1 Inclusion criteria

Diagnostic and/or prognostic evaluation

- Medical history taking
- Symptoms and signs
- Physical examination and assessment
- Diagnostic reasoning
- Psychological assessment
- Imaging
- Diagnostic injections
- Other tests

Management and treatment

- Information or education programs
- Ergonomic interventions both in private and work situation
- Non-medicinal treatment: psychotherapy, manipulations, mobilisation, orthosis (pillows, collar, oral splint) exercise, laser, acupuncture, ...
- Medicinal treatments: various (invasive and non-invasive) forms of administration
- Complex interventions (e.g. psychological treatment and exercise program, multidisciplinary approaches)
- Surgery

2.1.2.2 Exclusion criteria

No exclusion criteria for intervention were applied.

2.1.3 Comparison

Comparators are either the natural progress of symptoms or alternative diagnostic tests, management and treatment procedures. Inclusion criteria were the followings:

- Diagnostic evaluation versus other diagnostic evaluation
- Management and treatment versus other management and treatment
- Diagnostic evaluation and/or management and treatment versus no intervention, no treatment

2.1.4 Outcome

2.1.4.1 Inclusion criteria

This study should give up to date information about:

- Diagnostic accuracy of procedures (i.e. false positive, rate, sensitivity, specificity, ROC); history taking, clinical examination, diagnostic tests and procedures

This study should also give up to date information on outcomes of treatments, namely about:

- Side effects, adverse events of treatments
- Evolution (improvement or not) in: the degree of pain, functional capacity, quality of life (only if standardized and validated outcome measures have been used), activity, return to work, work disability, disability measures, global perceived effect.

Definitions of short- and long-term outcomes vary between the studies. The Cochrane back group suggests durations of short term follow-up: between one day and three months, intermediate-term follow up: between three months and one year and long-term follow-up: one year and beyond ¹⁴, but individual studies use their own specific criteria.

2.1.4.2 Exclusion criteria

Studies using patient satisfaction data are excluded if no validated and reliable instrument for assessment of pain/disability by the patient was used for data collection.

2.2 LOCATING STUDIES

The PICO framework as described in section 2.1, has been applied to screen the literature. PubMed/ Medline, Embase, Cochrane and Pedro were used to identify publications concerning diagnosis, prognosis and therapy for non-specific neck pain. The search strategies are detailed in appendix 1.

For a reproducible and relevant search, the medical subject heading (MeSH) used was "Neck Pain": "discomfort or more intense forms of pain that are localized to the cervical region. This term generally refers to pain in the posterior or lateral regions of the neck" (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/>).

The electronic search covered the period from 1998 to 2008. We searched for (systematic) reviews, meta-analyses, guidelines, RCT's and clinical trials. For (systematic) reviews, meta-analyses, RCT's and clinical trials the search engines were PubMed (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/>), Cochrane Database of systematic reviews (<http://www.cochrane.org>), Embase (<http://www.embase.com/>) and Pedro search database (<http://www.pedro.fhs.usyd.edu.au/redirect.html>). For the guidelines the search engines were G.I.N. guideline resource (<http://www.g-i-n.net>), NEHL guidelines finder (<http://www.library.nhs.uk/GuidelineFinder/>), National Guideline Clearinghouse (<http://www.guideline.gov/>), New Zealand Guidelines (<http://www.nzgg.org.nz/>), NICE-guidelines (<http://www.nice.org.uk>), SIGN guidelines (<http://sign.ac.uk/>) and Pedro search database (<http://www.pedro.fhs.usyd.edu.au/redirect.html>).

A high number of publications (n=1133) were identified during the initial search. Therefore the research team decided to reconsider the inclusion criteria and to screen the (systematic) reviews on full text.

The inclusion criteria became more strictly focussed on non-specific neck pain. Topics as dizziness, temporomandibular, dystonia were excluded. Articles were excluded if they concerned reliability or validity tests of translated assessment instruments. Furthermore publications were excluded if they covered issues of the total spine or the low back and neck, if neck pain was not analysed apart. Finally, pilot studies were also excluded. The results were imported in a reference manager (Endnote X2) and checked for duplicates.

All papers were screened by teams of two reviewers. This process resulted in 564 included publications from which 55 (systematic) reviews. In the following paragraphs a detailed overview of search and screening strategies is reported.

2.2.1 Searches in databases

The first search for “Neck Pain”[MeSH] in PubMed and Embase resulted in 685 hits. The second search was executed in Embase and with the “clinical queries” search engine in PubMed to find (systematic) reviews and also to target clinical study categories including diagnosis, therapy, prognosis and clinical prediction guides. The search has been tested using a narrow search and a broad search approach. The difference in hits was so large (see appendix I: Literature search strategy) that the team of researchers decided to include the narrow search strategy. This resulted in 373 papers (duplicates excluded). The third search for relevant literature was executed in the Cochrane library and Pedro search engines. It resulted in 75 (systematic) reviews. A total of 1133 potentially relevant citations was finally identified.

Moreover, 40 guidelines were added using in guidelines search engines ‘Neck Pain’ as keyword.

2.2.2 Screening of titles and abstracts

The 685 publications of the first search were screened on title by two researchers with the PICO in- and exclusion criteria and so 619 papers were left for further screening on title and abstract. With a team of five researchers these 619 papers were screened on title and abstract as well as the 373 publications of the second search and the 75 publications of the third search. Respectively 279, 245 and 40 publications (564 in total) were included.

The screening of the guidelines on title was performed by two researchers. Six met the inclusion criteria (PICO). In a further stage the guidelines were screened with the AGREE instrument (<http://www.agreecollaboration.org/instrument/>) by two researchers. Only two UK guidelines were included after the quality appraisal (http://www.cks.nhs.uk/neck_pain_non_specific and www.bestpractice.bmj.com).

2.2.3 Screening full text and quality appraisal


2.2.3.1 Systematic reviews

The (systematic) reviews (n=55) on full text were screened and assessed with the use of the Dutch Cochrane assessment instrument for evaluation of systematic reviews of RCT's. To define the quality of the publication seven reviewers were trained during a workshop and consensus was defined for appreciation of inclusion and exclusion criteria for studies. If systematic reviews did not score positive on the first two items of the instrument (concerning the research question and the search strategy), the (systematic) review was rejected without any further assessment. Fifty five full text publications were reviewed by pairs of reviewers working independently. Two researchers checked the results of this screening. Only 24 publications met the inclusion criteria (PICO and Cochrane score $\geq 4/8$). Reasons for exclusion of the 31 publications were mainly study design (no systematic review, RCT, guideline, case report, technical report, out of scope (WAD, trauma)) or too low score on the Cochrane assessment instrument ($< 4/8$). Excluded publications were saved apart for potential use in a next phase.

2.2.3.2 Randomised controlled trials

From the screening on title and abstract 120 RCT's met the PICO. In the next phase only RCT's published on a later date than the most recent included systematic review were screened on full text and a critical appraisal was performed using the instrument from the Dutch Cochrane Collaboration. Thirteen RCT's met the inclusion criteria and provided complementary or new information in comparison with the systematic reviews.


Figure 1: Flow chart: final results of the screening of the literature – first search



2.2.4 New search for diagnosis and prognosis

The database of 55 full text (systematic) reviews was checked for content of diagnosis and prognosis. One systematic review of Borghouts et al was included for prognosis ¹⁵. The search strategy has been further completed for the diagnosis part because of the limited information found after the strategy described above. An adjuvant search was performed in PubMed and Embase using 'neck pain' as a term and "Neck Pain"[Mesh] in clinical queries for diagnosis and with limits: humans, last 10 years, adults and with a narrow search (sensitivity 64%, specificity 98%). This search resulted in 135 possible relevant publications. After screening the articles on diagnosis or prognosis, five publications met the inclusion criteria for diagnosis and two for prognosis (one from the first search and one from the second search). One book has been added i.e., a narrative review advised by experts ¹⁶. Finally, three publications ¹⁷⁻¹⁹ for additional information were found by hand search.

Figure 2: Flow chart: final results of the second search for diagnosis and prognosis



2.3 DATA EXTRACTION

Based on the selection described above, two researchers independently extracted the data of the included systematic reviews using prepiloted forms. Data were reported in an evidence table (appendix 2) containing four main themes ‘Diagnosis’, ‘Assessment of pain and disability’, ‘Prognosis’ and ‘Treatment’. For the screening of the RCT’s and the publications on diagnosis and prognosis on full text, one researcher extracted the data of the included publications (respectively see appendix 3 and appendix 4). Data from the selected guidelines were extracted by one researcher. Finally, the results from these selected guidelines have been compared to the conclusions from the literature search by two researchers.

The results of the data extractions are reported in appendix 5 and chapter 3.4.

The results from the literature are defined per main theme and subtheme in the following paragraphs and where possible the level of evidence in “Grade” is given, ^{20, 21}.

- “Grade A”, highest level of evidence: RCTs without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies;
- “Grade B”, moderate level of evidence: RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodological flaws, indirect, or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies;
- “Grade C”, lowest level of evidence: studies with lower level of evidence than above.

3 RESULTS

3.1 NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS INCLUDED

The initial search strategy identified 564 publications. The refined search yielded 55 systematic reviews and 53 RCT's, of which 23 (systematic) reviews for treatment and one SR for prognosis met the inclusion criteria; and 13 RCT's met the inclusion criteria for treatment. With a second search for primary articles on diagnosis or prognosis seven publications met the inclusion criteria. Four additional publications, which met the inclusion criteria, were found by hand search. The evidence tables in appendix provide details of the included systematic reviews (appendix 2), RCT's for treatment (appendix 3) and papers on diagnosis (appendix 4).

At the end of the research process and before publication, the KCE standards require that a draft of the report is submitted to 3 independent experts-in-the-field, for peer-review and validation. For this report, the validation experts suggested 4 other papers with updated information not retrieved by the systematic search; 2 of them were systematic reviews published after the date of the literature search. One systematic review published on a specific topic included a mixed patient population but provided also specific results for neck pain ²². These recommended publications were added in this review.

3.2 DIAGNOSIS

Key messages regarding diagnosis

- **No systematic review or primary study was identified which examined the diagnostic accuracy of history-taking or diagnostic imaging in patients with neck pain. During the diagnostic procedures it is important to exclude the “red flags” (see 1.2, table 1), and nerve-root pain (radicular pain/radiculopathy) and to confirm the diagnosis “Non-specific Neck Pain”.**
- **Presence of radicular pain/radiculopathy can be demonstrated by the Spurling's test, traction/neck distraction, shoulder abduction test and a Valsalva's manoeuvre. (Grade C)**
- **To exclude radicular pain/radiculopathy, a (negative) upper limb tension test (ULTT) can be used. (Grade C)**
- **Local anesthetic block is useful in diagnosing facet joint spinal pain, when the clinical diagnosis remains uncertain. (Grade C)**

Evidence from the literature

Four publications ^{16, 23-25} investigated procedures to diagnose non-specific neck pain. No systematic review or primary study was identified which examined the diagnostic accuracy of history-taking or diagnostic imaging in patients with neck pain.

In the next paragraph, provocative tests for clinical diagnostic procedures will be discussed.

EXCLUSION OF SPINAL OR NERVE-ROOT PATHOLOGY

In order to make the diagnosis of 'Non-specific Neck pain', serious spinal pathology or nerve-root pain has to be excluded²⁴. In the review of Rubinstein 2008²⁴, a search was conducted to identify systematic reviews and primary studies on diagnostic procedures for the neck. This search did not identify any systematic reviews which examined the diagnostic accuracy of history-taking in patients with neck pain. For diagnostic imaging, systematic reviews were not identified for non-specific neck pain. One systematic review was selected²³; the authors conducted a comprehensive search to identify studies about provocative tests of the neck for diagnosing cervical radicular pain/radiculopathy. From this study, Spurling's test (Table 2) demonstrated low to moderate sensitivity and high specificity, as did traction/neck distraction (Table 2) and Valsalva's manoeuvre (Table 2). The upper limb tension test (ULLT, Table 2) demonstrated high sensitivity and low specificity, while the shoulder abduction test demonstrated low to moderate sensitivity and moderate to high specificity. So a positive Spurling's test, traction/neck distraction, shoulder abduction test (Table 2) and Valsalva's manoeuvre might be indicative of a cervical radicular pain/radiculopathy, while a negative ULTT might be used to rule it out²³. Because of the heterogeneity between studies, the paucity of primary studies and several methodological problems, there is only weak evidence about the usefulness of these tests²³ (Grade C). These findings are confirmed in the narrative review by Van Zundert et al (2009)¹⁶.

DIAGNOSIS OF FACET JOINT PAIN

Neck pain originating from (degenerative) facet joints potentially requires specific treatment (e.g. surgical treatment for an advanced stage) and therefore careful diagnosis is warranted. Clinical examination such as tenderness over the facet joints, the radiation pattern,... can give a working diagnosis of facet pain. Single local anaesthetic blocks of the medial branch of the cervical dorsal ramus may be useful in confirming the working diagnosis¹⁶. For diagnosing chronic spinal pain of facet joint origin, controlled comparative local anaesthetic blocks of facet joints are reproducible, reasonably accurate and safe. The sensitivity, specificity, false-positive rates, and predictive values of these diagnostic tests for neck pain have been determined in multiple studies^{16, 25} but the systematic review of Rubinstein (2007) mentions a false positive rate of 27 to 63%. Moreover, no consensus was found about the definition of "a successful anaesthetic block" for cervical facet joints pain. In conclusion, this invasive technique should only be used in case of uncertainty about the clinical diagnosis¹⁶. (Grade C). This conclusion is supported in the systematic review of Nordin et al²⁶ added by the validation experts.

The Nordin review also comments on the usefulness of discography. This specific radiological technique uses provocative cervical discography injections to determine if the injection reproduces a neck-patient's usual symptoms, so that primary discogenic pain can be diagnosed and eventually treated. However, since a high proportion of asymptomatic healthy controls also reported a painful response after the injection, the authors conclude that currently discography can not be supported as a diagnostic instrument in neck pain and that it is even not clear whether its underlying premise is valid in these circumstances.

Table 2: Clinical tests for the diagnosis of cervical radicular pain/radiculopathy ¹⁶ en ²⁷

Clinical tests	Description
Spurling's Test or neck compression test ¹⁶	The cervical spine is turned to the painful shoulder and then an axial compression is performed. Reproduction of pain in the shoulder or arm might suggest a nerve compression.
Shoulder abduction test or shoulder abduction relief sign) ¹⁶	The patient elevates his hand above his head. When radicular pain decreases or disappears the test is positive.
Axial manual traction test ¹⁶	Traction on the neck is performed while patient is lying on his back. The traction is around 10 to 15kg. If the radicular pain decreases or disappears the test is positive.
Upper limb tension test (ULTT) ²⁷	The manoeuvre is performed to mechanically stress the cervical nerve roots and upper limb nerves to test their involvement in suspected radicular pain/radiculopathy. The plexus brachialis can be tested in general, but also the median, radial and ulnar nerve can be tested separately.

3.3 ASSESSMENT OF PAIN AND DISABILITY

Key messages regarding pain and disability assessment

- **To assess self-rated disability of patients with neck pain: the “Neck Disability index” is the most strongly validated instrument for self-rated disability.**

Evidence from the literature

Four publications ^{17, 18, 28, 29} investigated pain and disability assessment (including questionnaires) in non-specific neck pain.

A small study ²⁹ including 18 neck patients and 22 asymptomatic controls aimed at examining the diagnostic value of pain assessment using a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), a short form history using the Bournemouth Questionnaire (BQ) and a selection of tests, both manual and instrumental. The VAS and BQ resulted in a high percentage of correctly identified patients and controls ($\geq 77,5\%$) and a high specificity (90,9%) ²⁹.

The manual examination procedures (MEPs) included a manual examination of both rotations on the C0-2 – C6-7 levels, the adapted Spurling test was performed, starting at the C1-2 proceeding downwards to C6-7 levels performed bilaterally. The percentages of correct identifications based on the manual rotation and adapted Spurling were high (82,5%) as their sensitivity and specificity (respectively 72,2 and 90,9 %). Using CROM (Professional Medical Technologies, inc., 702, North McRoll road, McCallen, TX 78504, USA) for the instrumental mobility examination all identification percentages were around 50%, indicating a lesser diagnostic value. The combination of the VAS, BQ and MEPs resulted in a sensitivity and specificity of 100% and 86,4%, respectively ²⁹. (Grade C).

In a group of unskilled women (20-45 yrs) performing monotonous work, Björkstén et al ²⁸ evaluated a questionnaire (a modification of the Nordic Questionnaire) on musculoskeletal pain and conditions by means of clinical assessment. Sensitivity of the Questionnaire for neck pain during the last 3 months and 7 days was high (100% resp. 92%), but the specificity was low (41 resp. 62%) ²⁸. (Grade B)

The “Neck Disability Index” (NDI) is the most widely used and most strongly validated instrument for assessing self-rated disability in patients with neck pain. It has been used effectively in both clinical and research settings in the treatment of this very common problem ^{17, 18}. (Grade A). This is confirmed in a recent review provided by the validation experts ³⁰.

3.4 PROGNOSIS

Key messages regarding prognosis

- **There is a limited number of publications regarding prognostic factors for non-specific neck pain. A few indicators of a less favourable prognosis of neck pain were identified, of which older age and concomitant low back pain were the most consistent. (Grade C) Also there are indications that pathologic radiological findings are not associated with a less favourable prognosis. However, the severity of pain and a history of previous attacks seem to be associated with worse prognosis. (Grade C)**

Evidence from the literature

One (systematic) review and two prospective cohort studies were found considering prognostic factors for non-specific neck pain ^{15, 19, 31}. There is limited evidence regarding prognostic factors related to the course of non-specific neck pain. For the few studies reporting on prognostic factors the main shortcomings are the sample size and the lack of appropriate analyses techniques. Bearing these limitations in mind there are some indications that there is no association between localization (e.g. radiation to the arms) and worse outcome. Furthermore there are some indications that there is no association between pathologic radiological findings (e.g. degenerative changes in discs or joints) and less favourable prognosis (more pain, lower level of functionality or less general improvement, more utilization of health care, more lost days of work) ¹⁵. The severity of pain and a history of previous attacks however seem to be associated with a worse prognosis ¹⁵. Further, 3 of the studies included in the systematic review report on age as a prognostic factor in only one of them age proves to be a prognostic factor. (Grade C)

In the primary study of Hoving et al ¹⁹ the prognostic models showed differences between short- and long-term indicators. At the short-term, besides the baseline values of the respective outcome measurements, only older age (≥ 40) and concomitant low back pain and headache were associated with poor outcome. At the long term, in addition to age, concomitant low back pain, previous trauma, a long duration of neck pain, stable neck pain during 2 weeks prior to baseline measurement and previous neck pain predicted poor prognosis. So only a few indicators of a less favourable prognosis of neck pain were identified, e.g. older age and concomitant low back pain as the most consistent ones ¹⁹.

In the primary study of Vos et al ³¹ a modified version of the instrument "The Acute Low Back Pain Screening Questionnaire" (ALBPSQ) was investigated for its use in patients with acute neck pain in general practice ³¹, to predict prolonged sick leave. However, Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves were regarded as doubtful (0.66 (95%CI 0.56-0.76) (Grade C)

3.5 TREATMENT

This chapter has been divided into six main parts i.e., manual therapy, electrotherapy and other physical medicine modalities, multimodal interventions, multidisciplinary treatment, medication and other methods. To clarify the definition of the treatment modalities as found in the included literature, each of them has been described and if necessary renamed.

3.5.1 Manual therapy

Manual therapy involves the evaluation of a disorder and, on the basis of this evaluation, prescribing an intervention for the disorder rather than administering treatment based simply on signs and symptoms ³². In this report manual therapy involves 'target joint motion therapy', 'soft tissue therapy' and 'exercises'.

3.5.1.1 Target joint motion therapies

Target joint therapy involves targeted joint motion which includes manipulation, mobilisation and traction. *Manipulation* is used to reduce pain and improve range of motion. Manipulation involves a high-velocity thrust that is exerted through either a long or short lever-arm³³. *Mobilisation* of the cervical spine involves low-velocity (no thrust) passive motion. Manual and mechanical *traction* is a technique applied with a tractive force to the neck to separate two joint partners^{34, 35}.

Key messages regarding treatment with target joint therapy

- **Drawing conclusions based on the available evidence is difficult: treatment modalities are not always precisely described and the participants are not always patients with non-specific neck pain (sometimes inclusion of participants with WAD grade I and II). Taking these remarks into account, results show that the effectiveness of manipulation or mobilization alone for acute or chronic non-specific neck pain remains inconclusive (Grade B). Manipulation and/or mobilization within a multimodal approach with exercises however appears effective for chronic non-specific neck pain for pain as well as for function in the short- and long-term follow up (Grade A). The existing evidence on cervical traction is limited and the evidence of possible benefit remains unclear.**

Evidence from the literature

Ten systematic reviews^{19, 35-44} analysed manipulation or mobilization as a possible non-invasive intervention. In the systematic review of Kay et al, manipulation and mobilisation combined with exercises are studied within a multimodal approach⁴⁴. Only one systematic review assessed whether traction, either alone or in combination with other treatments, improves pain, function/disability and global perceived effect for mechanical neck disorders³⁵. In the publication of Gross⁴⁵ the intermittent traction is discussed as one possible conservative treatment. One additional RCT was found on effects of two different types of manipulation⁴⁶.

- The effectiveness of manipulation or mobilisation for non-specific neck pain remains inconclusive⁴⁰. Manipulation or mobilisation alone seems not beneficial^{19, 37, 38} (Grade B). However Vernon⁴¹ reports that a small number of trials have demonstrated a superior effect of manipulation or mobilisation versus the comparison treatment in chronic neck pain. But the same publication also concludes that the majority of studies have not shown any effect of manipulation or mobilisation⁴¹. More specific in the systematic analysis of group change scores in randomized clinical trials of chronic neck pain not due to whiplash and not including headache, Vernon concludes, based upon 8 of 9 included trials, that “a course of spinal manipulation or mobilisation shows significantly or clinically important changes in the group receiving manipulation”⁴¹. For acute neck pain treated with spinal manipulation, Vernon reports limited evidence of immediate benefit, but this conclusion is only based upon two RCT’s of low quality⁴³ (Grade C).

- The comparison of different treatment modalities provided as single interventions (i.e. manipulation or mobilization or exercises or massage or physical modalities) does not provide evidence for differences in pain or disability outcomes^{19, 38, 39} (Grade C). The study of Cleland⁴⁶ (60 participants) suggests that thoracic spine thrust mobilisation/manipulation results in significantly greater short-term (4 days) reductions in pain and disability than does thoracic non thrust mobilisation/manipulation in people with neck pain (Grade C). This is not in line with the results above on comparative effectiveness of manipulation or mobilization. However, treatment modalities are not always precisely described across studies, and might therefore differ from those described by Cleland. The review of Gemmell et al³⁶ addresses specifically the usefulness of the 'Activator instrument' as compared to manipulation or mobilization, but insufficient evidence is available to draw conclusions.
- Manual therapy (involving mobilization, manipulation) combined with exercises (supervised) seems effective particularly in the treatment of patients with chronic non-specific neck pain, for pain as well as for function in the short- and longterm follow up^{19, 38-40, 44, 45} (Grade A). But for manipulation and mobilization combined with other modalities as advice or home exercises no pain relief or improvement in function in mechanical neck disorders is found^{38, 45} (Grade C).
- Although rare, associated negative effects of manipulation can be headache, radicular pain, thoracic pain, increased neck pain, distal paresthesia, dizziness, and ear symptoms¹⁹
- The studies of Graham³⁵ and Gross⁴⁵ support intermittent traction in comparison with control or placebo. However both systematic reviews referenced the same trials of low quality (Zybergold, 1985 and Goldie 1970). (Grade C)

3.5.1.2 Soft tissue therapies

Soft tissue therapy involves massage. *Massage* is a manipulation of the soft tissues of the human body with the hand, foot, arm, elbow on the structures of the neck⁴⁷. Techniques include fascial techniques, cross fiber friction, non-invasive myofascial trigger point techniques and shiatsu massage.

Key messages regarding treatment with soft tissue therapies

- **Massage was never described in sufficient detail to know for sure how it was performed. The limitations of existing studies prevent from drawing any firm conclusion on the effectiveness of massage therapy for non specific neck pain. The evidence on possible beneficial effects of specific massage techniques remain unclear (Grade C).**

Evidence from the literature

Four systematic reviews assessed the effect of massage on pain and function^{41, 45, 47, 48} and two of them^{47, 48} had similar conclusions. All reviews identified major methodological weaknesses e.g. often a lack of uniform definition of the technique and dosage. Therefore no general conclusion can be made that supports massage as treatment for non-specific neck pain.

- Limited evidence was identified that traditional Chinese massage may be beneficial for short-term pain management (but not for function)⁴⁵. (Grade C)
- It is suggested that various other massage techniques do not reduce pain^{45, 47} (Grade C). Massage alone was not identified as effective treatment (Grade B). Massage versus exercise showed no significant difference between the groups for pain at short-term follow-up⁴⁷ (Grade C).

- It was impossible to identify the effect of the contribution of massage within a multimodal approach ^{41, 47, 48}. (Grade C). No significant difference was found between massage plus sham laser and manipulation at short-term follow-up ⁴⁷.

3.5.1.3 Exercise

Exercises involves bodily activities related to the neck region. These can be shoulder exercises, active exercises, stretching, strengthening, postural, functional, eye-fixation and proprioceptive exercises for the treatment of non-specific neck pain ⁴⁴.

Key messages regarding treatment with exercises

- **There is evidence that exercise (under supervision) can be effective for the treatment of non-specific chronic neck pain to diminish pain and improve function in the short-term as well as in the long-term. (Grade B). Strengthening, stretching, proprioceptive (eye-fixation) and dynamic resisted exercises are treatments that can be effective (Grade B). Home exercises (not supervised), group exercises and neck school (for a heterogeneous group) are not supported by evidence (Grade C) .**

Evidence from the literature

Two systematic reviews were found on this topic ^{44, 49}; both included non-specific neck pain as well as whiplash associated disorders grade I and II with the same complaints as non-specific neck pain patients. Two other systematic reviews dealt with various techniques among which also exercises ^{38, 45}; one of them explicitly described non-specific neck pain excluding whiplash associated disorders ³⁸. Four additional recent RCT's describe neck muscle training ⁵⁰⁻⁵³.

- For stretching and strengthening programs focussing on the cervical or cervical and shoulder/thoracic region, there is moderate evidence of short- and long-term benefit on pain and function in chronic mechanical neck disorders ^{44, 45} (Grade B). Strengthening and stretching of only the shoulder region plus general condition did not alter pain in the short or long term, but did assist in improving function in the short term for chronic mechanical disorders ⁴⁵ (Grade C). In a study of females with chronic neck pain both endurance exercises and strength training decreased 12-month pain and disability outcomes more than did an exercise advice control group ^{38, 51}. (Grade C). Recent studies concluded to the effectiveness of manual therapy and stretching on neck muscle strength and mobility in chronic neck pain. Neck muscle strength improved slightly during the first 4 weeks in the manual therapy and stretching groups. There was no further improvement. These treatments alone are not effective in neck muscle strengthening ⁵³ (Grade C). The same group of researchers studied strength training and stretching versus stretching only. Stretching only was probably as effective as combined strength training and stretching ⁵².
- Eye-fixation and neck proprioceptive exercises were found to be effective for pain relief and function and general perceived effect (GPE) in the short term and in the long term only for GPE for cases of chronic mechanical disorders ^{44, 45, 49}. (Grade B)
- There is conflicting evidence about the effect of home exercises (exercises not supervised on a continued basis) on neck pain for pain and function ^{38, 44, 45, 52}. Also group exercises, neck school (for heterogeneous groups of patients with different kinds of neck pain) or single session of extension-retraction exercises cannot be supported by evidence ⁴⁹. (Grade C)

- There is strong evidence of benefit for pain and function favoring a multimodal care approach of exercises (supervised) combined with mobilizations or manipulations for sub-acute and chronic mechanical neck disorders in the short and long term ^{38,44}. (Grade A)
- The decrease in pain and disability was found to be maintained at the three year follow-up after a neck muscle training ⁵¹. The indices in this RCT showed no statistically discernible change compared to the situation at the 12-month follow-up. Also, gains in neck strength, ROM and pressure pain threshold achieved during the training year were largely maintained ⁵¹. (Grade C)
- Some support has been found for the prescription of therapeutic exercises as an immediate pain-relieving strategy. Results of one RCT suggest that specific cranio-cervical flexion-exercises can be prescribed with the intention of providing an effective pain relieving modality potentially as a substitute for, or as adjunct therapy to, other self-applied pain relieving modalities such as medication or heat ⁵⁰. (Grade C)

3.5.2 Electrotherapy and other physical medicine modalities

Electrotherapy modalities include galvanic or diadynamic currents, iontophoresis, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS), electrical muscle stimulation, pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF), repetitive magnetic stimulation or permanent magnets. However, electro-acupuncture is not included here (<http://www.electrotherapy.org/modalities.htm>).

Other physical modalities included in this review are low-level laser therapy (LLLT), other types of laser therapy, ultrasound and thermal agents (e.g. hot packs).

Key messages regarding treatment with physical medicine modalities

- **Conclusions on physical medicine modalities are difficult given the range of interventions and the limited and conflicting evidence (Grade C).**
- **For electrotherapy, there is inconsistent evidence that transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) would be beneficial in the treatment of chronic neck pain. For electrical muscle stimulation or other electrotherapies such as galvanic current, diadynamic currents or iontophoresis, there is limited evidence of no benefit on pain at short term (Grade C).**
- **For electromagnetic therapy (pulsed electromagnetic field therapy (PEMF), repetitive magnetic stimulation) limited evidence is found for beneficial effects. Repetitive magnetic stimulation is beneficial for pain and function in the short term in chronic neck pain; for PEMF this is true for pain immediately post treatment in acute and chronic neck pain (Grade C).**
- **Limited evidence supports the benefit of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) with infrared wavelengths (Grade C). LLLT appears to relief pain and have positive functional changes for acute and chronic neck pain in the short term. For other types of laser therapy no benefit was found for pain treatment in patients with neck pain.**
- **There is limited evidence of no benefit for thermal and ultrasonic agents in the treatment of non-specific neck pain (Grade C).**

Evidence from the literature

Five systematic reviews studied the effect of physical medicine modalities as treatment for mechanical neck disorders^{14, 38, 43, 45, 54}.

- Notwithstanding the heterogeneity of the studies identified in the review of Chow, low-level laser therapy (LLLT) with infrared wavelengths has some limited evidence for the treatment of acute and chronic neck pain⁵⁴. The reduction in pain levels with LLLT was modest in patients with chronic neck pain and although limited by short term follow up were supported by positive functional changes^{45, 54}. Hurwitz concluded that LLLT is more effective than no treatment to improve acute pain and short term function in persons with sub-acute or chronic neck pain³⁸.
- For repetitive magnetic stimulation there is limited evidence of a beneficial effect in chronic non-specific neck pain on pain and function at short term (Grade C)³⁸.
- There is limited evidence that extremely low frequency and high frequency PEMF (pulsed electromagnetic field) reduce pain for patients with acute or chronic mechanical disorders immediately post treatment. The effect is not maintained on short term^{14, 45} compared with placebo (Grade C).
 - Limited evidence of no benefit for chronic non-specific neck pain on pain in the short term is mentioned for magnetic necklace i.e. a static electromagnetic field (Grade C).^{14, 45}
- Inconsistent evidence is found that TENS treatment is beneficial for chronic neck pain^{14, 38}. The limited evidence mentioned by Vernon is based on a low quality RCT⁴³ (Grade C).
- There is limited evidence that for chronic non-specific neck pain, EMS (electrical muscle stimulation) has no detectable effect on pain or function at short or long term follow up^{14, 45}. Limited evidence of no benefit on pain in the short term is also mentioned for electrotherapies such as galvanic current, diadynamic currents or iontophoresis (Grade C).

The studies of Hurwitz³⁸ and Gross⁴⁵ report limited evidence of no benefit for thermal and ultrasonic agents as an isolated intervention for chronic non-specific neck pain (Grade C). Limited evidence of no benefit on pain in the short term is also mentioned for spray and stretch.

3.5.3 Multimodal interventions

Multimodal treatment is the combination of at least 2 different therapy modalities used for non-specific neck pain, for example exercises combined with mobilisation and medication.

Key messages regarding multimodal interventions

- **There is evidence to support multimodal therapies for patients with non-specific neck pain to reduce pain and improve function in the short and the long term. A multimodal approach should consider exercises (supervised) in combination with passive treatment as mobilisation, manipulation or both and if possible forms of education (Grade A). Also active treatment seems advisable for non-specific neck pain patients. However, there is uncertainty of the precise modalities that provide the effective ingredients.**

Evidence from the literature

Five systematic reviews^{19, 37, 38, 44, 45} analysed the effects of a multimodal treatment for mechanical neck disorders. Multimodal approaches including stretching/strengthening exercise and mobilisation/manipulation for sub acute/chronic mechanical neck disorders reduced pain, improved function and resulted in favourable general perceived effect in the long term⁴⁵.

- There is strong evidence of benefit favouring a multimodal care approach of exercise (supervised) combined with mobilisations or manipulations for subacute and chronic mechanical neck disorders^{37, 38, 44, 45} (Grade A).
- There is moderate evidence that manipulation and/or mobilisation in combination with electrotherapy or medication or other non invasive techniques have shown no difference in benefit for pain relief, improvement in function and global perceived effect¹⁹.

3.5.4 Multidisciplinary treatments

Multidisciplinary approaches, methods or treatments require a team of therapists from different disciplines working on the same patient together or alone without a common discussed purpose⁵⁵. The main difference between multimodal and multidisciplinary is the involved therapists. One therapist can give a multimodal therapy, but one therapist cannot give a multidisciplinary treatment.

Key messages regarding multidisciplinary treatments

- **There is little evidence found to support multidisciplinary approaches. This conclusion is to be considered carefully because little research of good quality has been performed to measure the effect of multidisciplinary approaches for patient with non-specific neck pain (Grade C) .**

Evidence from the literature

Two systematic reviews studied the effect of multidisciplinary approaches for the treatment of patients with neck pain^{38, 56}.

- A rehabilitation program in a Cochrane review updated in 2008 was considered multidisciplinary if it encompassed a physician's consultation with either a psychological, social or vocational intervention, or a combination of these last interventions⁵⁶. It could not be shown by the two included studies (of low quality) that multidisciplinary rehabilitation was better than usual care for neck and shoulder pain⁵⁶.
- One of these two studies was also included by Hurwitz (2008). Patients with neck pain who took part in a multidisciplinary rehabilitation program had comparable sick-leave outcomes compared to patients who received other care. But patients in this program experienced improved mobility over two years whereas those receiving other care did not³⁸.

3.5.5 Medication

Medication for the treatment of non-specific neck pain can be delivered by oral, intravenous, intramuscular, intra-articular, sub-cutaneous or intrathecal routes and classed as analgesics, anaesthetics, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), muscle relaxants, opioids, corticosteroids or Botulinum toxin ⁵⁷.

Key messages regarding medication

- **There are not enough studies on any medicinal treatment for non-specific neck pain to allow strong recommendation for treatment regarding medication. Therefore all the following key messages should be completed with key messages on pain therapy as found in general guidelines (American Geriatrics Society (<http://www.americangeriatrics.org/>), Société Scientifique de Médecine Générale (<http://www.ssmg.be>)).**
- **Local anaesthetic injection with lidocaine into myofascial trigger points appears beneficial for chronic non-specific neck pain, but it is no more effective than other less invasive techniques such as ultrasound or laser (Grade C) .**
- **There is moderate evidence for the benefits of non-narcotic analgesics including NSAIDs, because of their effectiveness on pain compared to placebo but unclear benefits compared to other treatments (Grade C).**
- **Other treatments such as Botulinum toxin A (Grade B) injections or subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations (Grade C) have no better effect than placebo and so have no indication for non-specific neck pain.**
- **There is unclear evidence about the benefit of psychotropic agents used as muscle relaxants (Grade C).**

Evidence from the literature

One systematic review was found on the use of medication as an intervention ⁵⁷ and two which include this topic among other treatments ^{38, 45}. Two other recent RCT's were found, dealing with the effectiveness of medication treatment for non specific neck pain ^{58, 59}. The experts added a recent systematic review during the validation meeting ²².

- Local anaesthetics (lidocaine injections into myofascial trigger points) appear effective in reducing chronic neck pain when compared to dry needling or treatment as usual (stretching, exercises...). ⁵⁷ However, it is no more effective than other less invasive treatments such as laser and ultrasound²² (Grade C);
- There is moderate evidence showing that, on average, Botulinum toxin A is no better than saline injections at lessening pain and disability for chronic mechanical neck disorders ^{38, 45, 57} (Grade B). There is also low evidence that subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations are no better than sham ultrasound for treating acute non specific neck pain ⁵⁸. (Grade C);
- There is unclear evidence of benefit for oral psychotropic agents (such as diazepam, tetrazepam) used as muscle relaxants ^{38, 45, 57} (Grade C);
- There is unclear evidence of benefit for nerve block injections ^{38, 45, 57}. (Grade C)
- In subacute and chronic neck disorders, there is unclear evidence of benefit for oral non-narcotic analgesics including anti-inflammatory agents (NSAIDs) ⁵⁷: NSAIDs (such as ibuprofen, oxicams) combined with education or manipulation show no significant differences on pain compared with manipulation/physical therapy ⁵⁷. Placebo controlled studies (moderate or low quality), show benefits of paracetamol, (opioid) analgesics or NSAIDs on pain. However, there is no clear difference when analgesics and/or NSAIDs are compared with each other. (Grade C)

- One RCT of good quality on 116 patients with chronic neck pain over more than 6 months and with acute attacks compared oxycodone to placebo. The conclusion is that oxycodone could be used for chronic neck patients with frequent acute episodes of neck pain. However side effects were present during the first days and the follow-up was of limited duration ⁵⁹ (Grade C).

3.5.6 Other methods

Other methods involve giving advice, education programs, using special pillows, collars and acupuncture as treatment.

For surgical treatment in non-specific neck pain, no publications were retrieved in the search of this review; it will shortly be included here also.

3.5.6.1 Surgery

No publications were retrieved in the current search for surgical treatment. This was confirmed in a systematic review provided by the validation experts⁶⁰. It can be concluded that at this time there is no acceptable clinical evidence supporting surgical procedures such as anterior or posterior cervical fusion or cervical arthroplasty for neck pain with common degenerative changes only, when there is no radiculopathy, demonstrable instability or serious deformity.

3.5.6.2 Education

Education programs and giving advice are methods which intend to influence the learning experience ⁶¹, illness beliefs and behaviour of the patient with non-specific neck pain.

Key messages regarding patient education programs

- **There is evidence of no benefit for education programs as treatment for non-specific neck pain- when compared to no treatment or to other treatments.**
- **A group-based work style intervention or ergonomic counselling in computer workers seemed to be effective.**
- **More evidence and of higher level is necessary to conclude education programs generally are beneficial or not. (Grade B)**

Evidence from the literature

In three systematic reviews 'education' is tested as treatment modality ^{38, 45, 61}. Two RCTs studied the effectiveness of a group-based interactive work style intervention and ergonomic counselling in computer workers ^{62 63}.

- Various educational programs were studied. They were delivered to the patients orally, under a written or audiovisual form ^{38, 45, 61}. There is evidence of no short- or long term benefit for pain or function with educational programs focusing on activation or on stress coping skills when compared to no treatment or other treatments (manual therapy, behavioural cognitive skills, massage, etc). (Grade B)
- For traditional neck schools also no benefit was found, when compared to no treatment ^{38, 45, 61}. (Grade C)
- For specific groups, such as (female) computer workers, there is moderate evidence for the effectiveness of education or counselling programmes (Grade B). After ergonomic counselling alone or combined with ambulant myofeedback in female computer workers, pain intensity and disability significantly decreased on short and medium term ⁶³. A group-based work style intervention in a similar group of patients, resulted in a different work style behaviour such as a more frequent use of breaks ⁶².

3.5.6.3 Pillows

Key messages regarding pillows

- **Pillows used in a multimodal approach in combination with exercises have shown positive results in reducing neck pain. (Grade C) There is not enough evidence for the use of pillows as isolated treatment for patients with chronic neck pain.**

Evidence from the literature

Only one systematic review is found on this topic ⁶⁴ and one other systematic review mentions pillows within various techniques ⁴⁵. One RCT studied the effect of sleeping neck support combined or not with exercise ⁶⁵. The combination of exercise with a neck pillow showed a significant effect. Although some studies showed positive effects on pain reduction, there is not enough evidence for the use of pillows alone to reduce chronic neck pain. (Grade C)

3.5.6.4 Soft collars

From one systematic review there is moderate evidence of no benefit for the use soft collars for patient with non-specific neck pain ⁴⁵. (Grade B)

3.5.6.5 Oral splint

One systematic review studied the effect of oral splints and found moderate evidence of no benefit ⁴⁵ (Grade B).

3.5.6.6 Acupuncture

Acupuncture is the insertion of needles into the body to reduce pain or induce anaesthesia. There are a number of different approaches that incorporate medical traditions from China, Japan, Korea, and other countries. The most thoroughly studied mechanism of stimulation of acupuncture points employs penetration of the skin by thin, solid, metallic needles, which are manipulated manually or by electrical stimulation ⁶⁶.

Key messages regarding acupuncture

- **Based on the literature there is moderate evidence that acupuncture, and more specifically trigger point acupuncture can improve pain relief for non-specific chronic neck pain in the short term only without any significant change in function. (Grade B)**

Evidence from the literature

One systematic review ⁶⁷ analysed the effect of acupuncture and one systematic review ⁴⁵ on conservative treatments and acupuncture was also included. Three additional recent RCT's on the effects of acupuncture, including its cost-effectiveness, were also included ⁶⁸⁻⁷⁰

- There is strong to moderate evidence that acupuncture is effective for pain relief compared to inactive treatments either immediately post-treatment or in short - and intermediate follow-up for chronic mechanical neck disorders ^{45, 67, 69}. (Grade A) A recent cost-effectiveness study among 3451 patients with chronic neck pain, showed that treating patients with acupuncture resulted in a marked clinical relevant benefit and was relatively cost-effective in Japan, Spain and Germany (€ 12.469 per QALY gained) ⁷⁰.
- There is heterogeneity in acupuncture interventions (trigger point acupuncture, classical, and others). Trigger point acupuncture seems more effective than some other types of acupuncture for pain relief, measured at the end of the treatment and at short-term follow-up ⁶⁸. (Grade C)

3.6 CLINICAL QUESTIONS ON NON-SPECIFIC NECK PAIN: SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE FINDINGS

This last chapter translates the results from the literature review into clinical questions. The conclusions from this literature search have been compared to the recommendations from the selected high quality guidelines http://cks.library.nhs.uk/neck_pain_non_specific and www.bestpractice.bmj.com. A table with the clinical questions that summarize the literature results, and the comparison of these questions to the recommendations in the selected guidelines, can be found in appendix 5. Overall, the conclusions from this literature search are consistent with the selected (inter)national guidelines.

For a quick overview of evidence-based treatment of neck pain including non-specific neck pain as well as neck disorders with radicular signs or associated with WAD, the interested reader is referred to a reference published after closure of the database search for this report. This reference was provided by the validators (Gross et al., 2009).⁷¹

The 3 main clinical questions for diagnosis for non-specific neck pain are:

1. How to assess someone with neck pain?
 - Firstly, exclude "red flags", serious spinal pathology, radicular pain/radiculopathy;
 - Secondly, consider the possible prognostic factors:
 - Old age and concomitant low back pain seem to be indicators of a less favourable prognosis of neck pain (Grade C);
 - Pathologic radiological findings (e.g. degenerative changes in disc or joint) are not associated with worse prognosis, but the severity of pain and a history of previous attacks seem to be associated with a worse prognosis. (Grade C);
2. What are the diagnostic procedures to be performed to diagnose non-specific neck pain?
 - No literature addressing the diagnostic accuracy of history taking has been found;
 - No literature addressing the diagnostic accuracy for imaging in patients with non-specific neck pain has been found;
 - Confirm or exclude 'radicular pain/radiculopathy' with the combination of the following tests:
 - Tests to confirm radicular pain/radiculopathy (Grade C):
 - Positive Spurling Test
 - Positive Traction Distraction test
 - Positive Valsalva manoeuvre
 - Positive Shoulder Abduction test
 - Tests to exclude radicular pain/radiculopathy (Grade C): Negative Upper Limb Tension test.
 - Diagnose facet joint spinal pain :
 - Local anesthetic block can be used for proving or excluding facet joint spinal pain if a diagnosis by manual examination procedures fails and/or if the diagnosis remains uncertain in patients with chronic non-specific neck pain (Grade C)
3. How to assess pain intensity or disability in patients with non-specific neck pain?
 - For self-rated disability, the "Neck Disability index" is the most validated instrument.

3.6.1 Management of non-specific neck pain

The 13 clinical questions and the answers for non-specific neck pain are:

1. Does manipulation or mobilization alone work for acute or chronic non-specific neck pain?
 - There is moderate evidence that manipulation or mobilization alone have no effect during the acute or chronic phase of non-specific neck pain. (Grade B)
2. Does manipulation or mobilization combined with supervised exercises work for acute or chronic non-specific neck pain?
 - Manual therapy (involving mobilization, manipulation) combined with exercises are effective in the treatment of patients with chronic non-specific neck pain for pain and disability in short- and long term follow up. (Grade A)
 - Manipulation and mobilization combined with other modalities such as advice or home exercises do not relieve pain or decrease disability. (Grade C)
3. Is traction an effective intervention for non-specific neck pain?
 - Traction on the cervical spine may not be effective for treatment of non-specific neck pain. (Grade C)
4. Is massage an effective intervention for non-specific neck pain?
 - No conclusion can be made for massage therapy given the low methodological quality of the studies (Grade C).
5. Are exercises effective for the treatment of non-specific neck pain?
 - Exercises (supervised by a qualified professional) are effective for the treatment of non-specific chronic neck pain for pain and function. (Grade B)
 - Strengthening, stretching, proprioceptive and dynamic resisted exercises are effective for chronic non-specific neck pain. (Grade B)
 - Stretching and strengthening programs focussing on the cervical or cervical and shoulder/thoracic region give short- and long-term benefit on pain and function in chronic mechanical neck disorders. (Grade B)
 - Strengthening and stretching of only the shoulder region plus improving general condition may help in improving function in the short term for chronic non-specific neck pain. (Grade C)
 - Eye-fixation and neck proprioceptive exercises are effective for pain relief and function in the short term for chronic non-specific neck pain. (Grade B)
 - Home exercises (not supervised), group exercises, neck school (for heterogeneous groups of patients) and single session of extension-retraction exercises may not be effective for non-specific neck pain (grade C).
6. Are electrotherapy modalities and other physical medicine treatments effective as an intervention for non-specific neck pain?
 - Low Level laser therapy may be effective for acute and chronic non-specific neck pain to relieve pain and improve function in the short term. For other types of laser therapy there may be no benefit (Grade C);
 - PEMF (pulsed electromagnetic field) may reduce pain immediately post-treatment for patients with acute or chronic non-specific neck pain (Grade C);
 - For repetitive magnetic stimulation, there may be a beneficial effect for chronic non-specific neck pain on pain and function in the short term (Grade C);

- Benefit from TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) treatment for chronic non-specific neck pain is doubtful (Grade C);
- For EMS (electrical muscle stimulation) and other electrotherapies (diadynamic currents, iontophoresis...) in chronic non-specific neck pain, there may be no benefit on pain or function (Grade C);

Thermal and ultrasonic agents as an isolated intervention for chronic non-specific neck pain may not be effective (Grade C).

7. Are multimodal approaches effective for non-specific neck pain?

- A multimodal approach of exercises (supervised) combined with mobilizations and/or manipulations is effective for sub-acute and chronic non-specific neck pain (Grade A).

8. Is a multidisciplinary approach effective for non-specific neck pain?

- No recommendation could be made based upon the literature search (Grade C).

9. Does medication work for non-specific neck pain?

There are not enough studies on any medicinal treatment for non-specific neck pain to allow strong recommendation for treatment regarding medication. Therefore all the following recommendations should be completed with key messages on pain therapy as found in general guidelines (American Geriatrics Society (<http://www.americangeriatrics.org/>), Société Scientifique de Médecine Générale (<http://www.ssmg.be>)).

- Local anaesthetics (lidocaine injections into myofascial trigger points) may be effective in reducing chronic non-specific neck pain, but it is probably no more effective than other less invasive procedures (Grade C);
- Botulinum toxin A is no better than saline injections for chronic non-specific neck pain (Grade B);
- Subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations are no better than sham ultrasound (placebo treatment) for acute non-specific neck pain (Grade C);
- Paracetamol, (opoid) analgetics or NSAIDs on pain are beneficial, but no clear difference is found when analgetics and/or NSAIDs are compared with each other (Grade C).

10. Do education programs work for patients with non-specific neck pain?

- Educational programs focusing on activation or on stress coping skills are not beneficial for non-specific neck pain (Grade B);
- Traditional neck schools may not be beneficial for the treatment of non-specific neck pain (Grade C);
- Education or counselling programmes for (female) computer workers are effective to decrease pain intensity and disability (Grade B).

11. Are pillows effective in the treatment of non-specific neck pain?

- Neck pillows in combination with exercises seem effective to reduce pain for patients with chronic non-specific neck pain (Grade C).

12. Is the use of collars, oral splints effective for patients with non-specific neck pain?

- There is no benefit of the use of soft collars or oral splints for patients with non-specific neck pain (Grade B).

13. Does acupuncture have a positive effect on treatment of non-specific neck pain?

- Acupuncture and more specifically trigger point acupuncture improve pain but not function in the short term for non-specific chronic neck pain (Grade B).

4 DISCUSSION

This study aimed to review the scientific literature on diagnosis, prognosis and treatment of acute and chronic non-specific neck pain. The objective was to propose an evidence-based review on how to diagnose and to treat adults who suffer from non-specific neck pain. Nevertheless all conclusions should be applied with caution due to the actual weaknesses of most studies and should be applied as a guide to clinical decision making. All key messages were compared afterwards with the conclusions of two guidelines of high quality and discussed with a panel of experts.

The following limitations have to be considered for the interpretation of the results of this systematic review:

- First of all the concept “non-specific neck pain” has been described by several authors but it is a rather broad and vague concept ¹. Also the concept of ‘diagnosis’ in non-specific neck pain is a contradiction as it is based upon the definitions found in the literature: it is a concept which confirms that no identification of cause can be made to explain the ‘neck pain’. The focus in the search on non-specific neck pain can have limited finding other possible effective treatment modalities.
- It is possible that an identification of subgroups in the group of non-specific neck pain patients might result in more targeted diagnostic procedures and treatments with a better response rate. Unfortunately, the available literature does not allow any further precision over those possible subgroups, so further research on this subgroups can give more clarity.
- One should remind that many other diagnostic evaluation techniques exist within the broad field of general pain assessment. This search only included studies on non-specific neck pain, but it is possible that some diagnostic instruments for general acute or chronic pain assessment could be useful in non-specific neck pain.
- In this review the treatment modalities were clustered: this classification might not be ideal but gives a good overview of possible treatment modalities.
- It is important to emphasize the heterogeneity and lack of definition of many interventions described in the literature. Many studies lacked a definition of non-specific neck pain and did not describe the treatment modalities in detail.
- Only the multimodal approach of manual therapy and exercises was found to be clearly effective. One could hypothesize that subgroups within the group of non-specific neck pain patients do exist, and that by combining several therapeutic approaches each of which is indicated for a specific subgroup, results are positive for the whole group.
- Only limited evidence exists on pharmaceutical therapy for non-specific neck pain. These limited results are due to our methodology focusing only on non-specific neck pain, and so excluding all trials and (systematic) reviews on pain treatment for musculoskeletal disorders. So the conclusions of this report need to be completed with other evidence or guidelines on pain management.
- No publications on surgical treatment nor on psychotherapy were retrieved in this review. The lack of publications on surgery for non-specific neck pain was confirmed in the systematic review by Carragee et al ⁶⁰ and at this time there is no acceptable clinical evidence supporting surgical procedures for the indication of neck pain when there is no radiculopathy, demonstrable instability or serious deformity. The lack of publications on psychotherapy might be due to the fact that psychological databases (e.g. PsycINFO) were not included.

This study results in a limited number of statements useful for clinical practice. These conclusions are mostly consistent with (inter)national guidelines: http://www.cks.nhs.uk/neck_pain_non_specific, www.bestpractice.bmj.com, http://www.guideline.gov/summary/summary.aspx?doc_id=8392&nbr=004700&string=ce rvical http://www.guideline.gov/summary/summary.aspx?doc_id=8542&nbr=004751&string=ce rvical

However there is a clear need for more focussed research as for example :

- Research into fine-tuning sub diagnoses, hence moving patients currently identified with non-specific neck pain into a group of patients suffering a more precisely identified pathology, for which a more targeted treatment option may be available;
- Symptoms assessment, using symptom scores, and the added value of clinical near-patient tests;
- Testing specific therapy for subcategories of adult patients with non-specific neck pain, which may respond better to specific therapies;
- Evaluating several treatment modalities (e.g. manual therapy, education programs, neck schools, etc). including a more precise description of the treatment technique used.

5 SUMMARY

The results displayed in chapter 3 were translated into statements. These statements were scored in accordance with the GRADE-system^{21, 72}, by four Belgian experts: two in the field of physiotherapy, one anaesthesiologist and one general practitioner. In consensus with the research team the statements were graded “strong” or “weak” and also “in favour” or “against” the proposed intervention.

When the desirable effects of an intervention clearly outweighed (or clearly did not outweigh) the undesirable effects, the guideline panel offered strong recommendations according to the GRADE-system^{21, 72}. On the other hand, when the proposed methods were less certain - either because of low quality evidence or because evidence suggested that desirable and undesirable effects were closely balanced - weak recommendations were offered according the GRADE-system^{21, 72}. Clinicians should keep in mind that in that case, they should carefully consider the benefits, risks, and burdens in the context of the individual patient. How to individualize decision making in weak recommendations remains a challenge⁷².

Table 3: Summary: diagnostic procedures, prognosis and treatment modalities in non-specific neck pain (NSNP)

Proposed intervention(s)	Level of evidence A, B, C; best available or no evidence from the literature	“Strong” or “weak” and “in favour” or “against”
Diagnosis and prognosis		
History taking	No evidence from the literature	Strong - In favour
Excluding red flags	Best available evidence from the literature	Strong - In favour
Diagnostic imaging	No evidence from the literature	Weak - Against
The “Neck Disability Index” as instrument for self-rated disability	Level of evidence not applicable Valid instrument	Strong - In favour
Confirm radiculopathy: Spurling’s test – traction/neck distraction – Shoulder abduction – Valsalva’s manoeuvre	C	Weak - in favour
Rule out radiculopathy: Negative Upper Limb Tension test	C	Weak-In favour
Diagnose facet joint spinal pain: Local anesthetic block when no clinical diagnosis	C	Weak - In favour
Unfavourable prognostic elements: severity of pain; previous attacks; old age or concomitant low back pain	C	Weak - In favour
Pathologic radiological findings (e.g. degenerative changes) are associated with worse prognosis	C	Weak - Against

Treatment of non-specific neck pain (NSNP)		
Chronic NSNP -Multimodal approach: mobilizations/manipulations combined with supervised exercises	Effect on pain/function in short and long term (A)	Strong - In favour
Chronic NSNP -Manipulation / Mobilization combined with other modalities	No effect (C)	Weak – Against
Chronic NSNP -Supervised exercise: stretching and strengthening programs focussing e.g. on the cervical region	Effect on pain/function in the long term (B)	Weak - In favour
Chronic NSNP -Supervised exercise: stretching and strengthening of the shoulder region with exercises improving general condition	Effect on function in the short term (C)	Weak - In favour
Chronic NSNP -Supervised exercise: eye-fixation and proprioceptive exercises	Effect on pain/function in the short term (B)	Weak - In favour
Acute and chronic NSNP -Manipulation / Mobilization alone	No effect (B)	Weak – Against
Chronic NSNP -Traction	No effect (C)	Weak – Against
Acute and chronic NSNP -Massage	No conclusion (C)	Weak – Against
Chronic NSNP –Isolated Home exercises, isolated group exercises, non-multidisciplinary traditional neck schools	No effect (C)	Weak - Against
Acute and chronic NSNP -Low level laser therapy (LLLT); pulsed electromagnetic fields (PEMF)	Effect in the short term on pain/function (LLLT); on pain (PEMF)(C)	Weak - In favour
Chronic NSNP – transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) or electrical muscle stimulation (EMS) on trigger points	No effect (C)	Weak - Against
Chronic NSNP –Multidisciplinary approach	No conclusion (C)	Weak - In favour
Acute and chronic NSNP -Paracetamol, NSAIDs, opioids analgesics	Effect on pain in the short term (C)	Weak - in favour
Chronic NSNP –Local anaesthetic injection with lidocain into myofascial trigger points	Effect on pain in the short term (C)	Weak - in favour
Chronic NSNP –Botulinum toxin A	No effect (B)	Weak - against
Acute NSNP -Subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations	No effect (C)	Weak - against
Acute and chronic NSNP -Isolated educational programs	No effect (B)	Weak - against
Chronic NSNP -Pillows in combination with exercises	Effect on pain in the short and long term (C)	Weak - in favour
Chronic NSNP –Acupuncture (e.g. trigger point)	Effect on pain in the short term (B)	Weak - in favour
Chronic NSNP -Use of collar or oral splints	No effect (B)	Weak - against

6 APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: SEARCH STRATEGY

SEARCH STRATEGY MEDLINE CLINICAL QUERIES AND SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Author	
Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck Pain

Date	3-12-2008
Database	Medline – Pubmed
Search Strategy	<p>Neck pain systematic reviews: Search (Neck Pain [Mesh]) AND systematic review [sb] Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 46</p> <p>Neck pain Clinical queries+<u>therapy</u>+narrow: Search (Neck Pain [Mesh]) AND (randomized controlled trial[Publication Type] OR (randomized[Title/Abstract] AND controlled[Title/Abstract] AND trial[Title/Abstract])) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 185</p> <p>Neck pain Clinical queries+<u>therapy</u>+broad: Search (Neck Pain [Mesh]) AND ((clinical[Title/Abstract] AND trial[Title/Abstract] OR clinical trials[MeSH Terms] OR clinical trial[Publication Type] OR random*[Title/abstract] OR random allocation[MeSH Terms] OR therapeutic use[MeSH Subheading]) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 632</p> <p>Neck pain Clinical queries+<u>clinical prediction guides</u>+narrow: Search (Neck Pain [Mesh]) AND (validation[tiab] OR validate[tiab] Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 16</p> <p>Neck pain Clinical queries+<u>clinical prediction guides</u>+broad: Search (Neck Pain[Mesh] AND (predict*[tiab] OR predictive value of tests[mh] OR scor*[tiab] OR observe*[tiab] OR observer variation[mh] Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 445</p> <p>Neck Pain Clinical queries+<u>diagnosis</u>+narrow: Search (Neck Pain[Mesh] AND (specificity[Title/Abstract]) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 19</p> <p>Neck pain Clinical queries+<u>diagnosis</u>+broad: Search (Neck Pain [Mesh] AND (sensitivity*[Title/Abstract] OR sensitivity and specificity [MeSH Terms] OR diagnos*[Title/Abstract] OR diagnosis[MeSH:noexp] OR diagnostic*[MeSH:noexp] OR diagnosis,differential[MeSH:noexp] OR diagnosis[Subheading:noexp]) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German,</p>

	<p>Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 621</p> <p>Neck Pain Clinical queries+prognosis+narrow: Search (Neck Pain [Mesh] AND (prognos*[Title/Abstract] OR (first[Title/Abstract] AND episode[Title/Abstract]) OR cohort[Title/Abstract])) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 140</p> <p>Neck pain Clinical queries+prognosis+broad: Search (Neck pain [Mesh] AND (incidence[MeSH:noexp] OR mortality[MeSH Terms] OR follow up studies[MeSH:noexp] OR prognos*[Text Word] OR predict*[Text Word] OR course*[Text Word])) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 370</p>
Note	Only the narrow search will be included because of the big range and a lot of bias. Many articles are not relevant for the study.

SEARCH STRATEGY MEDLINE OTHERS

Author	
Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck Pain

Date	24-10-2008
Database (Medline - Pubmed
Search Strategy	<p>"Neck pains" [Mesh] Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, Clinical Trial, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 283 Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, Meta-Analysis, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 6 Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, Randomized Controlled Trial, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 178 Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, Review, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years: n = 66</p>
Note	

SEARCH STRATEGY COCHRANE

Author	
Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck Pain
Date	03-12-2008
Database (name + access ; eg Medline OVID)	Cochrane
Search Strategy (attention, for PubMed, check « Details »)	Neck pain systematic reviews: "Neck Pain" [Mesh]) n = 11
Note	There are 11 results out of 5546 records for: "MeSH descriptor Neck Pain explode all trees in Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews "

SEARCH STRATEGY PEDRO

Author	
Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck Pain
Date	04-12-2008
Database (name + access ; eg Medline OVID)	Pedro
Search Strategy (attention, for PubMed, check « Details »)	Neck Pain systematic reviews: Search Neck Pain Limits: Since 1998 and systematic reviews n = 62 Search Neck Pain Limits: Since 1998 and practice guidelines: n = 7 Search Neck Pain Limits: Since 1998 and clinical trials n = 150
Note	

SEARCH STRATEGY GUIDELINES

Author Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis		
Search engine	Search term	number	PICO
GIN	neck pain	9	2
NGC	Cervical/ disease=neck pain/sort order=relevance	4	3
NHS	neck pain	25	0
NZGG	neck pain	1	0
BMJ	neck pain	1	1
			6

SEARCH STRATEGY EMBASE

Author	
Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck Pain
Date	18-11-2008
Database (name + access ; eg Medline OVID)	Embase
Search Strategy (attention, for PubMed, check « Details »)	<p>Neck pain as Mesh 'neck pain':</p> <p>'neck pain'/exp AND [systematic review]/lim AND [embase]/lim AND [1998-2008]/py n= 79</p> <p>'neck pain'/exp AND [controlled clinical trial]/lim AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [humans]/lim AND ([adult]/lim OR [aged]/lim) AND [embase]/lim AND [1998-2008] /py n=250</p> <p>'neck pain'/exp AND [meta analysis]/lim AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim)AND [humans]/lim AND ([adult]/lim OR [aged]/lim) AND [embase]/lim AND [1998-2008]/py n=4</p> <p>'neck pain'/exp AND ([controlled clinical trial]/lim OR [meta analysis]/lim) AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [humans]/lim AND ([adult]/lim OR [aged]/lim) AND [embase]/lim AND [1998- 2008]/py N=251</p> <p>'neck pain'/exp AND [randomized controlled trial]/ lim AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [humans]/lim AND ([adult]/lim OR [aged]/lim) AND [embase]/lim AND [1998-2008]/py N=183</p> <p>'neck pain'/exp AND [systematic review]/lim AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim)AND [humans]/lim AND ([adult]/lim OR [aged]/lim) AND [embase]/lim AND [1998-2008]/py N= 3</p>
Note	

SEARCH STRATEGY PUBMED SECOND SEARCH

Author	
Name	Giannoula Tsakitzidis
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck Pain
Date	14-05-2009
Database (name + access ; eg Medline OVID)	Pubmed
Search Strategy (attention, for PubMed, check « Details »)	Neck Pain Clinical queries+ <u>diagnosis</u> +narrow: Search (Neck Pain[Mesh] AND (specificity[Title/Abstract]) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years n= 29 Search (neck pain AND (specificity[Title/Abstract]) Limits: published in the last 10 years, Humans, English, French, German, Dutch, all Adult: 19+years n= 45
Note	Only the narrow search will be included because of the big range and a lot of bias. Many articles are not relevant for the study.

SEARCH STRATEGY EMBASE

Author	
Name	Tsakitzidis Giannoula
Project number	PPF08-24-GCP
Project name	Cervicalgia : Diagnosis and Therapy
Keywords	Neck pain, 'neck pain' [Mesh], diagnosis, specificity
Date	16-06-2009
Database (name + access ; eg Medline OVID)	Embase
Search Strategy (attention, for PubMed, check « Details »)	<p>#1. 'neck pain'/exp/dm_di AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [embase]/lim n= 474</p> <p>#2. 'neck pain'/exp/dm_di/mj AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [embase]/lim AND [humans]/lim AND [embase]/lim AND [1998-2009]/py n= 205</p> <p>#3. specificity:ti,ab AND [1998-2009]/py N= 131,416</p> <p>#4. 'neck pain'/exp AND [1998-2009]/py 5,520 16 Jun 2009</p> <p>#5. #3 AND #4 n= 55</p> <p>#6. ('neck'/exp OR 'neck') AND ('pain'/exp OR 'pain') AND [1998-2009]/py N= 14,069</p> <p>#7. #3 AND #6 n= 127</p> <p>#8. #3 AND #4 AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [embase]/lim N= 49</p> <p>#9. #3 AND #6 AND ([dutch]/lim OR [english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [german]/lim) AND [humans]/lim AND [embase]/lim N= 101</p>
Note	

APPENDIX 2: CRITERIA USED TO ASSESS THE METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY OF THE STUDIES: RESULTS OF THE QUALITY APPRAISAL

QUALITY APPRAISAL: PAPERS ON DIAGNOSIS

Author (y)	Questions (Quadas for diagnosis instrument)														TOTAL /14	Medium/High
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14		
Björkstén, 1999	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	12	H
De Hertogh, 2007	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	10	H
Vos, 2009	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	10	H

For all questions 1=yes
 Questions: 1. Was the spectrum of patients representative of the patients who will receive the test in practice? 2. Were selection criteria clearly described? 3. Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? 4. Is the time period between reference standard and index test short enough to be reasonably sure that the target condition did not change between the two tests? 5. Did the whole sample or a random selection of the sample, receive verification using a reference standard of diagnosis? 6. Did patients receive the same reference standard regardless of the index test result? 7. Was the reference standard independent of the index test (i.e. the index test did not form part of the reference standard)? 8. Was the execution of the index test described in sufficient detail to permit replication of the test? 9. Was the execution of the reference standard described in sufficient detail to permit its replication? 10. Were the index results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? 11. Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? 12. Were the same clinical data available when test results were interpreted as would be available when the test is used in practice? 13. Were uninterpretable/intermediate test results reported? 14. Were withdrawals from the study explained? Note: Publications with a score < 7 were excluded.

Author (y)	Questions (Dutch Cochrane for diagnosis instrument)							Total/7	Medium/High
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Rubinstein, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Rubinstein, 2008	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	M
Sehgal, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	6	H

For all questions 1=yes
 Questions: 1. Is the question adequately formulated? 2. Is search strategy adequately performed? 3. Is the selection procedure of the publications adequately performed? 4. Is the quality appraisal adequately performed? 5. Is the description of the data-extraction adequately performed? 6. Is the description of the study baseline characteristics adequate? 7. Is the meta-analysis correctly performed? Note: Publications with a score < 4 were excluded.

QUALITY APPRAISAL: RCTS ON TREATMENT

Author (y)	Questions (Dutch Cochrane for RCT's instrument)									TOTAL/ 9	Medium/High
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
Helewa, 2007	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
O'Leary, 2007	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Ylinen, 2007	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Cleland, 2007	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Hakkinen, 2008	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Hakkinen, 2007	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Itoh, 2007	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Vas, 2006	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Willich, 2006	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	5	M
Ma, 2008	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	M
Bernaards, 2008	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Voerman, 2007	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	M
Brockow, 2001	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	H

For all questions 1=yes
 Questions: 1. Is the randomisation well performed? 2. Was there an allocation concealment? 3. Were the patients blinded for treatment? 4. Were the administrators blinded for treatment? 5. Was there a blinding of outcome assessment? 6. Was there similarity of groups at the start of the study? 7. Was the description of losses to follow up/withdrawals available? 8. Was the intention-to-treat reported? 9. Were the groups equally provided of care? Note: Publications with a score < 4 were excluded.

QUALITY APPRAISAL: SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Author (y)	Questions (Dutch Cochrane for SR instrument)								TOTAL/ 8	Medium/High
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Borghouts, 1998	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	H
Chow, 2005	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Ezzo, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Gemmell, 2006	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	H
Graham, 2006	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	M
Gross, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Gross, 1998	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Gross, 2002	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	6	M
Gross, 2004	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Haines, 2008	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	H
Haraldsson, 2006	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	H
Hurwitz, 2008	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	H
Karjalainen, 2003	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	6	M
Kay, 2005	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6	M
Kroeling, I	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Macaulay, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	H
Peloso, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Sarig-Bahat, 2003	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	6	M
Saragiovannis, 2005	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	7	H
Shields, 2006	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	7	H
Trinh, 2006	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Vernon, 2007	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	H
Vernon, 2005	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	5	M
Vernon, 2007(b)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6	M

For all questions 1=yes
 Questions: 1. Is the question adequately formulated? 2. Is search strategy adequately performed? 3. Is the selection procedure of the publications adequately performed? 4. Is the quality appraisal adequately performed? 5. Is the description of the data-extraction adequately performed? 6. Is the description of the study baseline characteristics adequate? 7. Is the meta-analysis correctly performed? 8. Is the statistical pooling correctly performed? Note: Publications with a score < 4 were excluded.

QUALITY APPRAISAL: AGREE SCORES FOR THE 2 SELECTED GUIDELINES

	GUIDELINES TOPICS	CKS	BMJ
	Onderwerp en doel		
	Doel van richtlijn spec beschreven	4	4
	Klinische vragen spec. Beschreven	4	2
	Ptenpopulatie spec beschreven	3	3
		11	9
	Standaarddomeinscore	88,89	66,67
	Betrokkenheid van belanghebbenden		
	leden uit alle relevante beroepsgroepen	4	2
	perspectief en voorkeuren v pt nagegaan	4	1
	beoogde gebruikers duidelijk benoemd	3	2
	richtlijn getest onder gebruikers	1	1
		1	1
	Standaarddomeinscore	-25	-25
	Methodologie		
	systematische methoden gebruikt	4	4
	criteria voor selectie behouden	4	4
	methoden van opstelling beschreven	4	4
	gezondheidswinst, risico's beschreven	1	4
	expliciet verband tssen wet materiaal en aanb	4	4
	beoordeling door externe experts	2	2
	procedure voor herziening	1	4
		20	26
	Standaarddomeinscore	61,9	90,48
	Helderheid en presentatie		
	aanbeveling specifiek en ondubbelzinnig	4	4
	beleidsopties vermeld	2	2
	kernaanbeveling herkenbaar	4	4
	hulpmiddelen	2	2
		12	12
	Standaarddomeinscore	66,67	66,67
	Toepassing		
	organisatorische belemmeringen	1	1
	kostenimplicaties overwogen	1	2
	criteria voor toetsing en om na te gaan of ze gevolgd wordt	1	1
		3	4
	Standaarddomeinscore	0	11,11

	Onafhankelijkheid van opstellers		
	geen beïnvloed door belangen van financiers	1	4
	conflicterende belangen vastgelegd	1	4
		2	8
	Standaarddomeinscore	0	100
BESLUIT			
1	Sterk aan te bevelen	1	1
2	Aan te bevelen (onder voorwaarden of met veranderingen)		
3	Niet aan te bevelen		
4	Onzeker		

APPENDIX 3: EVIDENCE TABLE OF INCLUDED SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Reference	Cochrane code medium (4,5,6) or high (>6) max=8	Date of publication	Research question	Included studies	Last search	Patients	Intervention	Compared group	Outcome	Extraction data/results	Conclusion of the author
Borghouts, J. A., B. W. Koes, et al. (1998). "The clinical course and prognostic factors of non-specific neck pain: a systematic review." Pain 77(1): 1-13.	high (7)	1998	systematic review of the clinical course and prognostic factors of non-specific neck pain	1. Abbot, 1990 (observational study) 2. Berg, 1988 (observational study) 3. Gore, 1987 (observational study) 4. Rossignol 1988/Abenheim 1988 (observational study) 5. Takala, 1992 (observational study) 6. Tellnes, 1989 (observational study) 7. Anonymous, 1966 (RCT) 8. Coan, 1982 (RCT) 9. Ceccherelli, 1989 (RCT) 10. Foley-Nolan, 1990 (RCT) 11. Goldie and Landquist, 1970 (RCT) 12. Horvath, 1983 (RCT) 13. Howe, 1983 (RCT) 14. Jensen, 1995 (RCT) 15. Levoska and Keinänen-Kiukaaniemi, 1993 (RCT) 16. Loy, 1983 (RCT) 17. Nordeman and thörner, 1981 (RCT) 18. Petrie and Hazleman, 1986 (RCT) 19. Revel, 1994 (RCT) 20. Sloop, 1982 (RCT) 21. Takala, 1994 (RCT) 22. Thorsen, 1992 (RCT) 23. Vasseljen, 1995 (RCT)	1996	patients suffering non-specific neck pain	non in the observational studies Many different types of interventions in the RCT's (eg. Traction, acupuncture, laser, collar, NSAID, combination therapy, ...)	non in the observational studies Comparison to placebo, no therapy or between two active treatments in the RCT's	two main categories: 1. course of complaints 2. prognostic factors	For pain: 46% had less pain (22-79%) For general improvement: 47% had a general improvement (37-95%) For reduction in use of analgetics: 37% reduced the use of analgetics (32-80%)	The authors acknowledge that the methodological quality is rather low. So, they recommend more research into this area of medicine. Very limited information on the course of acute neck pain. Very limited evidence regarding prognostic factors.
Chow RT, Bamsley L: Systematic review of the literature of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) in the management of neck pain. Volume 37. 2005:46-52.	high (8)	2005	A systematic review to determine the efficacy of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) in the treatment of neck pain and to determine if there were any specific laser parameters or techniques of application that were more likely to yield a positive outcome.	1. Toya, 1994 2. Soriano, 1996 3. Laakso, 1997 4. Ozdemir, 2001 5. Hakguder, 2003	febr. 2004	adults (>16 years) suffering from acute or chronic mechanical (non-specific) neck pain (including conditions described variously as "myofascial pain", "trigger points" or "localized fibromyalgia")	Low-level laser therapy	Sham in 4 of the five included studies. Exercise with LLLT and exercise alone in one included study.	observed change in pain scores before and after treatment.	Effect size (ES) for pain reduction was calculated for the studies of Ozdemir and Hakguder. ES was small for values >0,2 0,4, moderate if >0,5-0,7 and large if >0,8. ES for pain reduction was large for both studies, in the study of Ozdemir ES was 3,9 and in Hakguder 1,8. In the study of Sariano a self reported improvement of 60% was defined as effective. The results showed 94,59% for the treated group and 38,24% in the placebo group. Complete pain relief was achieved in 67,59% in the group of LLLT and 17,65% in the placebo group. In the report of Toya, the treatment of chronic pain with a single session of LLLT achieved affective pain relief in 82% (treatment group) of 42% (placebo group). The results from the study of Laakso were categorized as inconclusive because the outcomes were based on within group analyses and so no comparison was made between the groups.	Notwithstanding the heterogeneity of the studies identified within this review, LLLT with infrared wavelengths appears to be efficacious for the treatment of neck pain with limited evidence being provided. Details of the most effective energy densities, sittings of treatment and mechanisms of actions remain unresolved.

Ezzo J, Haraldsson BG, Gross AR, Myers CD, Morien A, Goldsmith CH, Bronfort G, Peloso PM: Massage for mechanical neck disorders: A systematic review. Volume 32. 2007:353-362.	high (8)	2007	A systematic review to assess the effect of massage on pain, function, patient satisfaction, cost of care and adverse events in adults with neck pain.	1. Ammer and Rathkolb, 1990 2. Brodin, 1985 3. Cen, 2003 4. Fialka, 1989 5. Gam, 1998 6. Hanten, 1997 7. Hanten, 2000 8. hou, 2002 9. Hoving, 2002 10. Irnich, 2001 11. Jordan, 1998 12. Karlberg, 1996 13. Koes, 1991-1992 14. Kogstad, 1978 15. Levoska, 1993 16. Nilsson, 1995-1997 17. Provinciali, 1996 18. Reginiussen, 2000 19. Schnabel, 2002	sept. 2004	adults who suffered from acute (<30 days), subacute (30-90 days) or chronic (>90 days). MND (with whiplash grade I-II included), NDH and NDR (inclusion of whiplash grade III)	cervical massage techniques were included. Massage in multimodal approaches.	no treatment, other multimodal approaches, ...	effect on pain, function, patient satisfaction, cost of care and adverse events	inability to pool data.	no level of evidence could be found for massage alone compared with a control. No level of evidence could be found for or against massage in the studies that combined massage with other methods. No firm statement can be made about the efficacy of massage for neck pain due to the limitations of existing studies.
Gemmell H, Miller P: Comparative effectiveness of manipulation, mobilisation and the Activator instrument in treatment of non-specific neck pain: A systematic review. Volume 14. 2006.	high (7)	2006	A systematic review to critically appraise the literature that directly compared manipulation, mobilisation and the Activator instrument for non-specific neck pain.	1. Vernon, 1990 2. Cassidy, 1991 3. Yurkiw, 1996 4. Wood, 2001 5. Hurwitz, 2002	oct. 2005	patients suffering non-specific neck pain, age or duration of symptoms was not considered.	High Velocity Low Amplitude rotational manipulation (HVLA-rotation manipulation), oscillatory mobilisation, Activator, diversified HVLA manipulation, post isometric relaxation (PIR), HVLA manipulation with heat, HVLA manipulation without heat, HVLA with electrical stimulation, HVLA without electrical stimulation, mobilisation with	the different treatment modalities compared with each other	Pressure pain threshold. Numerical rating scale (NRS) for pain. Cervical ROM. Cervical lateral flexion. VAS for pain. NRS for pain. Neck Disability index. SF-36. Adverse reactions with care. Patient global assessment.	not relevant because of poor quality of included studies	due to lack in quantity and quality of studies reviewed, more high-quality research is needed to be done before a recommendation can be made as to which type of manual therapy has better effectiveness and safety profile for non-specific neck pain.

Graham N. Gross A, Goldsmith CH, Klaber Moffett J, Haines T, Burnie SJ, Peloso PM: Mechanical traction for neck pain with or without radiculopathy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2008(3):CD006408.	medium (5)	2006	A systematic review to assess wether mechanical traction, either alone or in combination with other treatments , improves pain, function/disability, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect in adults with mechanical neck disorders.	1. Brewerton, 1966 2. Goldie, 1970 3. Guangyue, 2001 4. Klaber-Moffett, 1990 5. Kogstad, 1978 6. Loy, 1983 7. Pennie, 1990 8. Shakoor, 2002 9. Wong, 1997 10. Zybergold, 1985		mechanical neck disorder (including WAD graad 1 and 2, myofascial pain, degenerative changes). Neck disorders with headache. Neck disorders with radicular findings.	mechanical traction techniques	placebo or a control	pain relief, disability/function, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect.	traction vs placebo for pain intensity outcome: * Zybergold: -0,78 (-1,36,-0,21) decreased pain (intermittent traction: acute to chronic MND, NDR, DC at 6 weeks treatment) * Goldie: 0,5 (0,27, 0,90) favours treatment (intermittent traction: chronic MND/NDR at three weeks treatment + 3 weeks follow-up)	Inconclusive evidence for both continuous and intermittent traction exists due to trial methodological quality. ==> * Data analysis reveals moderate evidence of benefit for intermittent traction, which denotes findings in a single , high-quality RCT or consistent findings in multiple low-quality trials. * There was moderate evidence of no benefit for continuous traction.	
Gross, A. R., C. Goldsmith, et al. (2007). "Conservative management of mechanical neck disorders: a systematic review." The Journal of Rheumatology 34(5): 1083-1102.	high (8)	2007	To assess effectiveness of conservative treatments (manual, physical therapy, medication, patient education) for patients with mechanical neck disorders	1. Allison, 2002 3. Jull, 2002 5. Gam, 1998 7. Evans, 2002 9. Taimela, 2000 11. Mealy, 1986 13. Zybergold, 1985 15. Petrie, 1986 17. Birch, 1998 19. Coan, 1982 21. Ozdemir, 2001 23. Taverna, 1990 25. Troik, 1994 27. Thuile, 2002 29. Petterson, 1998	2. Karlberg, 1996 4. Brodin, 1985 6. Bronfort, 2001 8. McKinney, 1989, 1989 10. Revel, 1994 12. Cen, 2003 14. Goldie, 1970 16. Irnich, 2001, 2002 18. White, 2000, 2004 20. Ceccherelli, 1998 22. Soriano, 1996 24. Rigato, 2002 26. Foley-Nolan, 1992, 1994 28. smaria, 2003 30. Esenyel, 2000	sep/04	adults >18years or older, who suffered from acute (less than 30 days), subacute (30 to 90 days) or chronic (longer than 90 days) neck disorders. <u>MND</u> : mechanical neck disorders, including WAD I-II, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes <u>NDH</u> : Neck disorders with headache <u>NDR</u> : Neck disorders with radicular findings	Medication, medicinal injections, acupuncture, electrotherapy, exercises, low-level laser therapy, orthosis, thermal agents, traction, massage, mobilisation, manipulation and patient education.	placebo, wait-list, no treatment or active treatment control (e.g. Exercises and ultrasound and ultrasound) or inactive treatment control (e.g. sham, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation)	pain, disability /function including work related measures, patient stisfaction and global perceived effect. Follow-up periods were defined as post treatment , short-term, intermediate term and longterm .	Taken form the conclusion: - a multimodal management approach (exercises, mobilisation/manipulation) is compatible with 28% to 70% treatment advantage over a control and with a long term benefit in pain reduction of 25 mm on a numeric rating scale (0-100mm) from baseline for 1 in 2 to 5 patients with subacute or chronic MND.	For treatment of subacute and chronic MND, our review found evidence favoring a multimodal strategy (exercises and mobilisation/manipulation) , exercises alone, intramuscular lidocaine injection and low-level laser therapy for pain, function and GPE in short and long term. Acupuncture, low-frequence pulse electromagnetic field, repetitive magnetic stimulation, cervical orthopedic pillow and traditional Chinese massage are favored for either immediate or short term pain management.
Gross, A. R., P. D. Aker, et al. (1998). "Physical medicine modalities for mechanical neck disorders." Cochrane Database Syst Rev(2): CD000961.	high (8)	1998	The objective of this review was to assess the effects of physical medicine modalities for pain in adults with mechanical neck disorders.	1. Foley-Nolan, 1990 2. Foley-Nolan, 1992 3. Goldie, 1970 4. Levoska, 1993 5. Lewith, 1981 6. Loy, 1983 7. Nordemar, 1981 8. Pennie, 1990 9. Petrie, 1983 10. Snow, 1992 11. Thorsen, 1991 12. Thorsen 1992 13. Wavlonis. 1988		dec/93	adults with mechanical neck disorders	physical medicine modalities		pain, tenderness, ROM, medication use, activities of daily living, return to work status, patient performance or costs of treatment		At most three trials were accumulated demonstrating some benefit for electromagnetic therapy and no benefit for laser therapy in terms of pain reduction.

Gross, A. R., T. Kay, et al. (2002). "Manual therapy for mechanical neck disorders: a systematic review." Man Ther 7(3): 131-49.	medium (6)	2002	To determine whether manual therapy improves pain, function and patient satisfaction in adults suffering from mechanical pain disorders	1. Ammer and Rathkolb, 1990 2. Bitterli, 1977 3. Brodin, 1985, 1984 4. Bronfort, 2001, 1998, 1997, 1996 5. Cassidy, 1992 6. David, 1998 7. Geibel, 1997 8. Jensen, 1990 9. Jordan, 1998 10. Karlberg, 1996 11. Koes, 1992, 1991, 1992b, 1993 12. McKinney, 1989 13. Mealy, 1986 14. Nilsson, 1997 15. Nordemar and Thörner, 1981 16. Parkin-Smith and Penter, 1997 17. Provinciali, 1996 18. Sloop, 1982 19. Vasseljen, 1995 20. Vernon, 1990	dec/1997 personal files 1998	adults older than 18 years; however inclusion of patients with many different aspecific and specific pain syndromes (eg. Whiplash, radicular signs and symptoms).	manipulation alone, mobilization alone, manipulation plus mobilization, and combination of both with massage or exercise or multimodal care	comparison between two or more interventions, sometimes also compared to doing nothing (patient staying on waiting list)	Pain, function, patient satisfaction	Manipulation in one session shows no benefit at all for pain reduction. High-tech exercise and manipulation showed benefit over 20 sessions. The effect of mobilisation on pain remains unclear at this stage? manipulation + mobilization showed no benefit on pain versus placebo. multimodal therapies showed efficacy in acute, subacute and chronic conditions (one trial showed a NNT of 2-6 with a 37-41% treatment advantage). However, some studies showed no benefit!	Results remain inconclusive. For mechanical neck disorders, with and without headache, it appears to be most beneficial, manual therapies should be done with exercise for improving pain and patient satisfaction. Manipulation and mobilization alone appear to be less effective.
Gross, A., L. Hoving Jan, et al. (2004) Manipulation and mobilisation for mechanical neck disorders. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004249.pub2	high (8)	2004	To assess the effect of manipulation and mobilisation either alone or in combination with other treatments on pain, function, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect in adults with mechanical neck disorders.	1. Allison, 2002 3. Bitterli, 1977 5. Bronfort, 2001 7. Coppeters, 2002 a+b 9. Giebel, 1997 11. Hoving, 2002, 2001 13. Howe, 1983 15. Jensen, 1990 17. Jull, 2002 19. Koes, 1992(a,b,c,d,e), 1993 21. McKinney, 1989 (a,b) 23. Nilsson, 1995, 1996, 1997 25. Parkin-Smith, 1998 27. Provinciali, 1996 29. Skargren, 1997, 1998 31. van Schalkwyk, 2000 33. Vernon, 1990 2. Ammer, 1990 4. Brodin, 1984, 1985 6. Cassidy, 1992 8. David, 1998 10. Giles, 1999 12. Korthals-de-Bos, 2002 14. Hurwitz, 2002 16. Jordan, 1998 18. Karlberg, 1996 20. Kogstad, 1978 22. Mealy, 1986 24. Norderman, 1981 26. Persson, 1996-2001 28. Reginiussen, 2000 30. Sloop, 1982 32. Vasseljen, 1995 34. Wood, 2001	march/2002	adults >18years or older with the following neck disorders: - Mechanical neck disorders including WAD, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes. - Neck disorders with headache. - Neck disorders with radicular findings, including WAD category III.	Manipulation or mobilisation techniques. These techniques in combination with other treatment agents in what is called multimodal care.	Control group (placebo control, active control, or no treatment control) or various other treatment groups.	pain relief, disability/function, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect.		Multimodal care including mobilisation and/or manipulation plus exercises, is beneficial for pain relief, functional improvement and global perceived effect for subacute/chronic mechanical neck disorder with or without headache. The evidence did not favour manipulation and/or mobilisation done alone or in combination with various other types of treatments for pain, function, and global perceived effect.
Haines, T., A. Gross, et al. (2008) "Patient education for neck pain with or without radiculopathy (Cochrane review) [with consumer summary]."	high (7)	2008	To assess whether patient education strategies, either alone or in combination with other treatments, are of benefit for pain, function or disability, patient satisfaction, ratings of overall effectiveness, knowledge transfer, or behaviour change in adults with mechanical disorders.	1. Borchgrevink, 1998 2. brison, 2005 3. Brodin, 1984-1985 4. Crawford, 2004 5. Ferrari, 2005 6. Glossop, 1982 7. Homeij, 2001 8. Hoving, 2002 9. Jensen, 1995 10. Karlberg, 1998 11. Kamwendo, 1991 12. Klaber Moffet, 2005 13. Koes, 1992 14. Kogstad, 1978 15. Kongsted, 2007 16. Lundblad, 1999 17. McKinney, 1989 18. Mealy, 1986 19. Oliveira, 2005 20. Persson, 2001 21. Provinciali, 1996 22. Rosenfeld, 2003 23. Soderlund, 2001 24. Taimela, 2000	june/2008	adults >18years or older, who suffered from acute (less than 30 days), subacute (30 to 90 days) or chronic (longer than 90 days) neck disorders. Neck disorders without radiculopathy, including WAD, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes Cervicogenic headache Neck disorders with radicular findings.	educational techniques (basic definition: consumer education was any learning experience intended to influence consumer health knowledge and behaviour (Barlett, 1985))	placebo, other treatment added to both arms of the trial, wait list or no treatment or another treatment (for example: education vs another intervention, one technique of education vs another, one "dose" of education vs another dose.	pain relief, disability/function, patient satisfaction, quality of life and global perceived effect. Secondary outcomes collected were: knowledge transfer, behaviour change, adverse events and cost of care. Periods were defined as: immediately post treatment (less than or equal to one day), short term follow-up (greater than equal to three months to less than equal to one year) and long term follow-up (greater than or equal to one year).	not possible!	This review has not shown effectiveness for educational interventions in various disorder types and follow-up periods, including advice to activate, advice on stress coping skills, and 'neck school'.

Haraldsson, B., A. Gross, et al. (2006) Massage for mechanical neck disorders. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD004871.pub3	high (7)	2006	To assess the effect of massage on pain, function, patient satisfaction and cost of care in adults with neck pain.	1. Ammer, 1990 2. Brodin, 1983, 1985 3. Cen, 2003 4. Fialka, 1989 5. Gam, 1998 6. Hanten, 1997, 2000 7. Hoving, 2006, 2001 ch5, 2001 ch6 8. Hou, 2002 9. Irnich, 2001 10. Jordan, 1998 11. karlberg, 1996 12. Koes, 1991, 1992 a,b,c,d,e, 1993 13. Kogstad, 1978 14. Levoska, 1993 15. Nilsson, 1995, 1996, 1997 16. Provinciali, 1996 17. Reginiussen, 2000 18. Schnabel, 2002	sep/04	adults >18years or older, who suffered from acute (less than 30 days), subacute (30 to 90 days) or chronic (longer than 90 days) neck disorders. <u>MND</u> : mechanical neck disorders, including WAD I-II, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes <u>NDH</u> : Neck disorders with headache <u>NDR</u> : Neck disorders with radicular findings	Massage	different types of treatment (e.g. acupuncture, exercises, manipulation, ...)	pain relief, neck-related disability, function, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect.	Main results: -Massage vs Control treatments, outcome Pain intensity. (favours treatment) Massage+TENS+hot packs+active ROM vs hot packs+activeROM (Hou, 2002) -1,07[-1,91,-0,24] Massage+interferential current+hot packs+activeROM vs hot pack+activeROM (Hou, 2002) -1,20[-2,05,-0,36] Massage+exercises+ultrasound vs no-treatment control (Gam, 1998) -0,75[-1,40,-0,10] Massage+mobilisation+exercise+relaxation+analgesic+ED vs wait list (Karlberg, 1996) -1,47[-2,58,-0,36] Massage +exercises+traction vs lantophoresis (Fialka, 1989) 0,17[0,03-0,85] massage+exercise+hot pack+control vs soft collar+NSAID +Rantidin (Schnabel, 2002) Mobilisation/massage+exercises(eye	the contribution of massage to managing cervical pain remains unclear. There is no evidence found for massage alone relative to a control. Also no evidence is found for or against massage in studies that combined massage with other modalities. Most studies lacked a definition, description, or rationale of massage as a treatment or the massage technique selected. The massage treatment components need to be reprinted in a transparent and standardized way. So because of the limitation in the existing studies no firm statement can be made to guide clinical practice.
Hurwitz, E. L., E. J. Carragee, et al. (2008). "Treatment of neck pain: noninvasive interventions. Results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000 to 2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and its Associated Disorders [with consumer summary]." Spine 33(4 Suppl): S123-S152.	high (7)	2008	To identify, critically appraise, and synthesize literature from 1980 through 2006 on noninvasive interventions for neck pain and its associated disorders.	1. Hong, 1982 4. Koes, 1992 7. Wheeler, 2001 10. Gur, 2004 13. Irnich, 2002 16. He, 2004 19. Hoivik, 1983 22. White, 2000 25. Horneij, 2001 28. Korthals-de-Bos, 2003 30. Taimela, 2000 33. Ylinen, 2003 37. Viljanen, 2003 40. Jull, 2002 42. van den Heuvel, 2003 44. David, 1998 46. Hagberg, 2000 48. Hurwitz, 2002 50. Jordan, 1998 52. Manca, 2006 54. Evans, 2002 56. Revel, 1994 58. Persson, 1997 60. McReynolds, 2005	2. Karppinen, 1999 5. Koes, 1993 8. Ozdemir, 2001 11. Chow, 2006 14. Irnich, 2001 17. He, 2005 20. Yamamoto, 1983 23. Cleland, 2005 26. Hoving, 2002 29. Ekberg, 1994 31. Witt, 2006 34. Ylinen, 2005 38. Aaras, 1998 41. Stanton, 2003 43. Brodin, 1984 45. Dziedzic, 2005 47. Martinez-Segura, 2006 49. Wood, 2001 51. Klaber-Moffett, 2005 53. Bronfort, 2001 55. Chiu, 2005 57. Lavin, 1997 59. Skillgate, 2007	from 1980 up to March 2007	Patients with nonspecific Neck pain or associated Disorders.	noninvasive interventions	placebo or sham, "usual care", no care, or another intervention	pain and disability outcomes evaluated on clinical importance	No extraction is possible because of the enourmes included studies. No pooling is performed because of the heterogeneity between the study, studypopulation, intervention groups, outcome measures, follow-up time, esitamted effects

Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, van Tulder M, Roine R, Jauhiainen M, Hurri H, Koes B: Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for neck and shoulder pain among working age adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003(2):CD002194.	medium (6)	2003	To determine the effectiveness of multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for neck and shoulder pain among working age adults.	1. Ekberg, 1994 2. Jensen, 1995	nov/02	Patients with neck or shoulder pain (no distinction)	multidisciplinary rehabilitation vs none: active multidisciplinary rehabilitation (physical training + education+information+social interaction + work place visit). (multidisciplinary rehabilitation with a psychologist working with patients, Multidisciplinary rehabilitation with a psychologist coaching the team	traditional treatment (medication, physio, rest and sick leave	sick leave, pain, health-related behavior, working conditions. 2 years follow-up		Based on the two trials (low methodological quality) it could not be shown that multidisciplinary rehabilitation is better than usual care.												
Kay, T. M., A. Gross, et al. "Exercises for mechanical neck disorders (Cochrane Review) [with consumer summary]."	medium (6)	2005	To assess the effect of exercise therapy on pain relief, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect and function. Where appropriate the influence of methodological quality, duration of the disorder, subtypes of neck disorder and treatment effect.	1. Allison, 2002 3. Bronfort, 2001 5. Gam, 1998 7. Goldie, 1970 9. Hanten, 2000 11. Jordan, 1996, 1998 13. Karlberg, 1996 14. Koes, 1991, 1991a, 1992a,b,c,d,e, 1993 15. Kogstad, 2002 17. Lundblad, 1999 19. Mealy, 1986 21. Persson, 2001 23. Randlov, 1998 25. Rosenfeld, 2000 27. Taimela, 2000 29. Vasseljen, 1995 31. Ylinen, 2003	2. Brodin, 1984, 1985 4. Fitz-Ritson, 1995 6. Geibel, 1997 8. Hagberg, 2000 10. Hoving, 2001a,b 12. Jull, 2002 16. Levoska, 1993 18. McKinney, 1989, 1998 20. Pennie, 1990 22. Provinciali, 1996 24. Revel, 1994 26. Soderlund, 2000, 2001 28. Takala, 1994 30. Waling, 2002	march/2004	adults >18 years or older, who suffered from acute (less than 30 days), subacute (30 to 90 days) or chronic (longer than 90 days) neck disorders. <u>MND</u> : mechanical neck disorders, including WAD I-II, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes <u>NDH</u> : Neck disorders with headache <u>NDR</u> : Neck disorders with radicular findings	exercises (e.g. specific neck exercises, shoulder exercises, active exercises, stretching, strengthening, postural, functional, eye-fixation, proprioception exercises, home exercises)	other therapies or no treatment (other therapies e.g. neural treatment, anagetic, manual traction, mobilisation, electrical stimulation, education, ... applied alone or in combination)	pain , measures of function/disability, patient satisfaction, global perceived effect. Favouring treatment Exercise vs control effect on pain: - McKinney, 1989 -0,77[-1,20,-0,35] - Jull, 2002 -0,75[-1,17,-0,34] - Jull, 2002 (45w follow-up) -0,59[-1,0,-0,18] - Goldie, 1970 (3wfollow-up) 0,42[0,21-0,8] - Ylinen, 2003(52wtreatment)0,52[0,37-0,73] Exercise vs control effect on function: - Revel, 1994 (8wtreatment+2wfollow-up) 0,55[0,33-0,89] NNT and treatment advantage: pain relief with multimodal care. <table><tr><td></td><td>NNT</td><td>Advantage%</td></tr><tr><td>- Jull, 2002</td><td>5</td><td>40,8</td></tr><tr><td>- Rosenfield, 2000</td><td>5</td><td>38</td></tr><tr><td>- Skargren, 1997, 1998</td><td>4</td><td>26,1</td></tr></table>		NNT	Advantage%	- Jull, 2002	5	40,8	- Rosenfield, 2000	5	38	- Skargren, 1997, 1998	4	26,1	Exercise, both stretching and/or strengthening (of the cervical or shoulder region) and vertigo/eye-fixation exercises, are more beneficial than no treatment. A multimodal care approach of exercise combined with mobilisations or manipulations for subacute and chronic MND with or without headache, reduced pain, improved function, and high global perceived effect in the short and long term. It is unclear what the relative benefit of exercises therapy is when compared to other treatments. the relative benefit of different exercise approaches is unclear. It was not possible to determine which technique or dosage was more beneficial or if certain subgroups benefit more from one form of care than another.
	NNT	Advantage%																					
- Jull, 2002	5	40,8																					
- Rosenfield, 2000	5	38																					
- Skargren, 1997, 1998	4	26,1																					

Kroeling P, Gross AR, Goldsmith CH: A Cochrane review of electrotherapy for mechanical neck disorders. Spine 2005, 30(21):E641-648.	high (8)	2005	To assess whether electrotherapy relieves pain or improves function/disability in adults with mechanical neck disorders	1. Ammer, 1990 2. Chee, 1986 3. Foley-Nolan, 1990 4. Foley-Nolan, 1992 5. hong, 1982 6. Hsueh, 1997 7. Norderman, 1981 8. Persson, 2001 9. Philipson, 1983 10. Provinciali, 1996 11. Trock, 1994	march 2003	adults >18 years or older, who suffered from acute (less than 30 days), subacute (30 to 90 days) or chronic (longer than 90 days) neck disorders. <u>MND</u> : mechanical neck disorders, including WAD I-II, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes <u>NDH</u> : Neck disorders with headache <u>NDR</u> : Neck disorders with radicular findings	all studies used at least one type of electrotherapy: - Galvanic current modulated DC or faradic stimulation - EMS (electrical muscle stimulation) - TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) - interferential or diadynamic current - PEMF: pulsed electromagnetic fields - static magnetic fields	placebo or wait list or an active comparison group	pain relief, disability/function, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect.	there was no possibility to perform any calculation because the data were incompatible.	Kroeling et al didn't find convincing evidence of a clinically important benefit of electrotherapy for MND. The current evidence is lacking, limited, or conflicting.
Macaulay, J., M. Cameron, et al. (2007). "The effectiveness of manual therapy for neck pain: a systematic review of the literature." Physical Therapy Reviews 12(3): 261-267.	high (7)	2007	To determine the effectiveness of manual therapy for mechanical disorders in reducing pain and disability in adult populations.	1. Dziedzic, 2005 2. Evans, 2002 3. Jull, 2002 4. Hoving, 2006 5. Martinez-Segura, 2006	2006	adults with mechanical neck pain	manual therapy (combination of therapies e.g. SM, mobilisation, massage and muscle energy technique applied either alone or with another intervention) or no therapy	other therapy (combination of therapies e.g. SM, mobilisation, massage and muscle energy technique applied either alone or with another intervention) or no therapy	pain relief disability/function, patient satisfaction, global perceived effect, overall improvement and adverse effects.	For pain the scores were not significant between groups (p=0,84).	Although there is strong evidence suggesting that there are no statistically significant differences in the effectiveness of manual therapy compared with other interventions, patients receiving manual therapy interventions were significantly more satisfied with their care. Despite the absence of statistically significant results when compared to other interventions, patients receiving manual therapy demonstrated improvements in both the short and long term on a variety of outcomes. These results suggest that multimodal approach including manual therapy and exercises, is a potentially useful intervention in the management of mechanical neck disorders, however further research is necessary to determine the cost-effectiveness of this approach in comparison to other interventions.

Peloso Paul Michael, J., A. Gross, et al. (2007) Medicinal and injection therapies for mechanical neck disorders. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000319.pub4	high (8)	2007	To determine what medication are effective in adults with mechanical disorders, whether these medication were delivered by oral, intravenous, intramuscular or intra-articular routes.	1. Baresley, 1994 3. Basmajian, 1983 5. Brockow, 2001 7. Cheshire, 1994 9. Dennert, 1976 11. Esenyel, 2000 13. Freund, 2000 15. Ginsberg, 1980 17. Hong, 1994 19. Kamanli, 2005 21. McReynolds, 2005 23. Payne, 1964 25. Rubenthaler, 2000 27. San Martin, 1978 29. Schnider, 2002 31. Stav, 1993 33. Thomas, 1991 35. Wheeler, 1998	2. Basmajian, 1978 4. Bose, 1999 6. Castagnera, 1994 8. Choffray, 1987 10. Dostal, 1978 12. Ferrznte, 1998 14. Giles, 1999 16. Heikkila, 2000 18. Inan, 2001 20. Koes, 1991-1993 22. Nasswetter, 1998 24. Petterson, 1998 26. Salzman, 1993 28. Sand, 1992 30. Schreiber, 2001 32. Terzi, 2002 34. Van Wieringen, 2001 36. Wheeler, 2001	dec/06	Adults with neck disorders, with or without associated headache or radicular findings.	Medicine. Medicines could be delivered by oral, intravenous, intramuscular, intra-articular, sub-cutaneous or intrathecal routes and classed as analgetics, anaesthetics, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, muscle relaxants, opioids, corticosteroids, or botulinum toxin.	control treatment or another treatment. Contraol treatments included: placebo control, active control (e.g. analgetics plus ultrasound versus untrasound), inactive treatment control (e.g. analgetics plus sham TENS versus sham TENS and wait list control, or no treatment.	pain, measures of performance such as function, disability related to neck pain, work related disability, work status, quality of life, patient global perceived effect, patient satisfaction, ROM of the cervical spine.	Assessment of all Trials versus Varied Comparison: effect size was not estimable. Meta analysis of Injections: intramuscular: - Pain intensity: botox-A vs placebo at short term follow-up ES: -0,06 [-0,45, 0,32] botox-A vs placebo at intermediate term ES: 0,08 [-0,61, 0,78] Comparison I assessment of all trials vs Varied comparison for pain intensity. [the following results favour treatment] psychotropic: oral: Salzmann, 1993 -1,22 [-2,20, -0,25] Injection: intra-muscular (local anesthetic): Esenyel, 2000 -1,36 [-1,93, -0,08] Hong, 1994 -3,46 [-4,48, -2,45] Injection: nerve block: Terzi, 2002 -3,60 [-5,12, -2,07] Injections: epidural: Stav, 1993 -1,46 [-2,16, -0,76] Muscle relaxant: oral: Bose, 1999 0,68 [0,52, 0,90] Comparison I assessment of all trials vs Varied comparison for function/disability.	Lidocaine injections into myofascial trigger points appears effective in two trials. There is moderate evidence that botulinum toxin A is not superior to saline injection for chronic MND. There is unclear evidence for oral psychotropic agents. Based on limited numbers of studies providing advice on NSAIDs and analgetics it is not possible to draw conclusions.
Sarig-Bahat H: Evidence for exercise therapy in mechanical neck disorders. Man Ther 2003, 8(1):10-20.	medium (6)	2003	Present existing evidence for the use of exercise therapy in the management of mechanical neck disorder, and to determine which exercise methods are effective in treating the various mechanical neck disorders.	1. Bronfort, 2001 2. Kamwendo and Linton, 1991 3. Vasseljen, 1995 4. Friedrich, 1996 5. Rosenfield, 2000 6. Taimela, 2000 7. Jordan, 1998 8. Takala, 1994 9. Levoska and Keinanen-Kiukaanniemi, 1993 10. McKinney, 1989 11. Söderlund, 2000 12. Wailing, 2000 13. Randlov, 1998 14. Revel, 1994 15. Hanten, 1997 16. Fitz-Ritson, 1995	Oct/2001	adults (>18 years) with mechanical disorders.	various types of active exercises (e.g. stretching, strengthening, endurance or aerobic training, postural correction, neuromuscular control and movement awareness. Phasic, isometric, isotonic or isokinetic exercise were also included.)	compared to placebo or control, or comparison between two or more interventions if one of them was exercise.	pain relief, function/disability	effect of proprioceptive exercises (favouring treatment) Taimela, 2000 For pain p<0,01-0,003 favouring prop. ex. No significant difference is found for function. Revel, 1994 difference between mean head relocation ability before and after treatment was highly significant (p=0,0004) for the intervetnion group. And no effect for the control group. Neck pain decreased in both groups, but improvement in de intervention group was significantly greater. Small but significantly greater improvement in rotation ROM in intervention group compared with the control group.	For chronic or frequent neck pain one may consider the use of proprioceptive or dynamic strengthening exercises, based on relatively strong evidence. Evidence identified cannot support the use of group exercise, neck schools or single sessions of extension-retraction exercises.	

Sarigiannis, P. and B. Hollins (2005). "Effectiveness of manual therapy in the treatment of non-specific neck pain: a review." Physical Therapy Reviews 10(1): 35-50.	high (7)	2005	To assess the effectiveness of spinal manual therapy (manipulation and mobilisation) in the treatment of non-specific neck pain.	1. Bronfort, 2001 2. Evans, 2002 3. Hoving, 2002 4. Hurwitz, 2002 5. Yurkiw&Mior, 1996 6. Wood, 2001 7. Pikula, 1999 8. Jordan, 1998 9. Parkin-Smith&Penter, 1998 10. Nordemar&Thörner, 1981 11. Moodley&Brantingham, 1999 12. Vernon, 1990 13. Brodin, 1985	apr/03	patients suffering from non-specific neck pain	manual therapy (cervical manipulation and/or mobilisation)	compared to different treatment modalities: eg compared to another treatment, sham treatment, ...	level of pain, cervical spine mobility, global measurement of improvement, use of drugs and medical services of functional status.	unclear	it was interesting to note the weight of evidence in support of spinal manipulation therapy when used together with exercises, particularly in the treatment of patients suffering from chronic non-specific neck pain.
Shields, N., J. Capper, et al. (2006). "Are cervical pillows effective in reducing neck pain? [with consumer summary]." New Zealand Journal of Physiotherapy 34(1): 3-9.	high (7)	2006	To investigate the effect of cervical pillows on acute or chronic neck pain.	1. Burns, 1999 2. Erfanian, 2004 3. Hagino, 1998 4. Jochems, 1997 5. Lavin, 1997	May/2005	Patients (no age restriction) having acute or chronic neck pain. (the neck pain was a result of a systematic disease for example rheumatoid arthritis.)	cervical pillow	travel or ordinary pillow	pain	Results which favor treatment: Repeated measures designed trial: Hagino, 1998 (align right pillow) 0,67 [0,28-1,06] Comparative trials (two treatment pillows): Burns, 1999 Purity health vs travel pillow 0,99 [0,06-1,92] Lavin, 1997 Mediflow water vs cervi-garde roll pillow 0,48 [0,04-0,92] Controlled trials (neck support vs usual pillow) Lavin, 1997 Mediflow water vs usual pillow 0,60 [0,16-1,14]	There is insufficient evidence to conclude if cervical pillows can reduce chronic neck pain. Further studies are required.
Trinh K, Graham N, Gross A, Goldsmith C, Wang E, Cameron I, Kay T: Acupuncture for neck disorders. Volume 32. 2007:236-243.	high (8)	2006	To summarize the most current scientific evidence on the effectiveness of acupuncture for acute, subacute and chronic neck pain.	1. Birch, 1998 2. Coan, 1982 3. David, 1998 4. Irnich, 2001 5. Irnich, 2002 6. Loy, 1983 7. Petrie, 1983 8. Petrie, 1986 9. White, 2000 10. White, 2004	feb/06	adults >18 years or older with the following neck disorders: <u>MND</u> : mechanical neck disorders, including WAD I-II, myofascial neck pain, and degenerative changes <u>NDH</u> : Neck disorders with headache <u>NDR</u> : Neck disorders with radicular symptoms	acupuncture techniques involving inserting of needles.	sham acupuncture, wait-list control, active treatment control (e.g. ultrasound), or inactive treatment control (e.g. sham TENS)	pain relief, Numerical Rating scale, disability or functional measures (e.g. NDI), activity of daily living, patient satisfaction and global perceived effect.	NNT and treatment benefit: control: NNT treatment benefit % -Sham acupuncture Birch, 1998 5 29,8% White, 2000 (MS) 3 29% White, 2000 (ESNS) 3 25% -Inactive treatment Irnich, 2002 2 37,5% Petrie, 1983 2 85,9% Irnich, 2001 13 13,5% Petrie, 1986 17 -10,6% White, 2004 12 15,6% -Wait-list control Coan, 1982 3 40,6%	For mechanical neck disorders there is moderate evidence that acupuncture is more effective than some types of sham controls for pain relief, measured at the end of the treatment. There is also moderate evidence that acupuncture is more effective than inactive treatment for pain relief, measured at the end of the treatment; this effect is still seen at short-term follow-up. Acupuncture treatments appear to be relatively safe.

Vernon, H. and B. K. Humphreys (2007). "Manual therapy for neck pain: an overview of randomized clinical trials and systematic reviews." Europa MedicoPhysica [Mediterranean Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine] 43(1): 91-118.	high (8)	2007	To present a broad overview of the topic with a distinctive approach emphasizing the analysis of changes scores in the clinical trials.	1. Brodin, 1985 2. David, 1998 3. Hurwitz, 2002 4. Hoving, 2002 5. Korthals-de-Bos, 2003 6. Hemmila, 2005 7. Gam, 1998 8. Irnich, 2001 9. Cen, 2003 10. Norderman and Thorner, 1981 11. Howe, 1983 12. Pikula, 1999 13. Jordan, 1998 14. Giles and Muller, 1999, 2003 15. Bronfort, 2001 16. Evans, 2002 17. Rogers, 1997 18. Parkin-Smith and penter, 1998 19. van Schalwyk and Parkin-Smith, 2000 20. Wood, 2001 21. Moretti, 2004 22. Palmgren, 2006	nov/06	adults (18-50) with nonspecific neck pain -acute neck pain - chronic neck pain	manual therapy	comparative treatments	pain, impairment		the evidence reviewed provides for the contention that MT which induce joint mobility-manipulation and mobilisation-are effective in the treatment of neck pain, especially chronic neck pain. The evidence reviewed here does not yet support the contention that massage therapy is similarly effective in those subjects randomized to receive it.
Vernon, H. T., B. K. Humphreys, et al. (2005). "A systematic review of conservative treatments for acute neck pain not due to whiplash." Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics 28(6): 443-448.	medium (5)	2005	To identify the evidence base of clinical trials of conservative treatments for acute neck pain not due to whiplash injury	1. Norderman and Thorner, 1981 2. Howe, 1983 3. Ekberg, 1994 4. Pikula, 1999	aug/03	acute mechanical neck pain in adults not due to whiplash	conservative or complementary therapy	control intervention, comparative treatments	pain, ROM		The quality scores for all 4 trials were in the fair-to-medium range. None scored above 60%. Therefore, none of these studies can be said to provide convincing evidence for their findings. Two trials provided limited evidence of the immediate benefit of a spinal manipulation. One trial provides some evidence that TENS treatment is beneficial over a 3-week interval.
Vernon, H., K. Humphreys, et al. (2007). "Chronic mechanical neck pain in adults treated by manual therapy: a systematic review of change scores in randomized clinical trials." Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics 30(3): 215-227.	medium (6)	2007	A systematic analysis of group change scores in RCTs of chronic neck pain not due to whiplash and not including headache or arm pain treated with manual therapy.	1. Rogers, 1997 2. Parkin-Smith and Penter, 1998 3. Jordan, 1998 4. Giles and Muller, 1999, 2003 5. Wood, 2001 6. Bronfort, 2001 7. Evans, 2002 8. Hurwitz, 2002 9. Brodin, 1985 10. Hoving, 2002 11. Korthals-de Bos, 2003 12. Gam, 1998 13. Irnich, 2001	dec/05	adults 18-50 with chronic mechanical neck pain.	Manual therapy	Compared group could be: -ultrasound, massage, exercises, -control -acupuncture -sham laser acupuncture -stretching -general practitioner -physiotherapy (mostly exercises) -medical care -manipulation with or without heat, with or without ES -daily aspirin+neck school	pain	Change scores and effect size for studies of manipulation: outcome interval mm-change % change Effect size 0-6wk 20,6 58,2 1,63(1.13-2.13) 7-12 wk 22 56 1,56(0.73-2.39) >12wk 22 50 1,22(0.38-2.06) Mobilisation trials: change scores: Study Outcome Result point (wk) Brodin 4 78,3% with>2 point reduction David 6 ES=2,5 Hurwitz 2,6,13,24 NS difference mobvs man Hoving 7 Full recovery=63% of subjects Korthals-de Bos 13, 52 Full recovery=71,7% of subjects	There is moderate to high-quality evidence that subjects with chronic neck pain not due to whiplash and without arm pain and headaches who are randomized to receive a course of spinal manipulation or mobilisation show clinically important improvements at 6,12 and up to 104 weeks posttreatment.

APPENDIX 4: EVIDENCE TABLE OF INCLUDED RCT'S FOR TREATMENT

Reference	Cochrane code medium (4,5,6) or high (>6) max=9	Publication date	Objective	Patient	Intervention	Compare	Outcome	Data-extraction	Authors conclusion
1 Helewa, A., et al., Effect of therapeutic exercise and sleeping neck support on patients with chronic neck pain: a randomized clinical trial. J Rheumatol, 2007. 34(1): p. 151-8.	high (7)	2007	To investigate the effect of therapeutic exercises and sleeping neck support contoured pillows on patients with chronic neck pain.	adults 18-70 years with unresolved neck pain (between 2 -12 months duration) n=151 participants and n=128 who completed the 12-week assessment	treatment maneuvers were provided by a physiotherapist assigned to the study. 1. Thermal modalities and massage 2. Neck support 3. Active exercises	1. Active control: heat or cold plus superficial massage 2. Control + instruction in using a sleeping neck support pillow(provided) 3. Control + active neck and postural exercises 4. Control + a neck support pillow + active neck and postural exercises	* The northwick Park Neck Pain Questionnaire * SF-36 Health Status Survey (acute) * Physical measures: grip strength, anterior neck muscle strength with modified sphygmomanometer. VAS for recording pain.		The results indicate that subjects with chronic neck pain should be treated by health professionals trained to teach both exercises and the appropriate use of a neck support pillow during sleep; either strategy alone will not give the desired clinical benefit.
2 O'Leary, S., et al., Specific therapeutic exercise of the neck induces immediate local hypoalgesia. J Pain, 2007. 8(11): p. 832-9.	high (7)	2007	To compare two specific cervical flexor muscle exercise protocols on immediate pain relief in the cervical spine of people with chronic neck pain.	n=48 females with a history of neck pain of 3 or more months' duration and scored 5 or greater on the NDI (Neck Disability Index).	* Cranio-cervical flexion co-ordination exercise (CCF) * Cervical Flexion endurance exercise (CF)	* Cranio-cervical flexion co-ordination exercise (CCF) * Cervical Flexion endurance exercise (CF)	* pain (with VAS and pressure pain threshold (PPT) with the Smedic Production, Stockholm, Sweden) * SNS (sympathetic nervous system) measures (skin conductance, blood flow, skin temperature and blood pressure).	PPT (kPa) difference between pre- and post-intervention CCF 21,93 (11,34 to 32,51)* CF 8,01 (0,74 to 15,27)* *significant within-group change pre-post exercise intervention (p<0,05) Significance is found between-group interaction pre-post intervention of p=0,03	For clinicians treating patients with painful cervical spine disorders, the findings of this study offer some support for the prescription of therapeutic exercise as an immediate pain-relieving strategy. Results suggest that specific CCF exercise can be prescribed with the intention of providing immediate reduction of pain. Patients may find exercise of this nature an effective pain relieving modality potentially as a substitute for, or as a adjunct therapy to, other self-applied pain relieving modalities such as medication or heat.
3 Ylinen, J., et al., Neck muscle training in the treatment of chronic neck pain: a three-year follow-up study. Eur J Physiother, 2007. 43(2): p. 161-9.	high (7)	2007	To evaluate whether the positive results achieved with a one-year training regimen in patients with chronic non-specific neck pain would have long-standing effects.	n=180 females included of which 5 withdrew for personal reasons, polymyalgia rheumatica or pregnancy. All were employed female office workers of working age with neck pain for over 6 months.	1. strength exercises group (12 days) 2. endurance exercises group (12 days)	The groups were compared with each other and with a control group (3 days)	pain and disability		The decrease in pain and disability was found to remain at the 3-year follow-up. Also, functional improvements were sustained despite the decline in training compliance after the first year. Active neck muscle training can be recommended for patients suffering from chronic non-specific neck pain, and the importance of maintaining compliance up to one year should be emphasised, but specific training is not necessarily a lifelong procedure to eradicate chronic neck pain.

4	Cleland, J.A., et al., Short-term effects of thrust versus nonthrust mobilization/manipulation directed at the thoracic spine in patients with neck pain: a randomized clinical trial. Phys Ther, 2007. 87(4): p. 431-40.	high (7)	2007	The main purpose of this study was to compare the short-term effectiveness of thrust mobilization/manipulation directed at the thoracic spine in patients with mechanical neck pain.	n=60 patients between 18-60 years of age and had a primary complaint of neck pain	nonthrust mobilization/manipulation thrust mobilization/manipulation	thrust mobilization/manipulation nonthrust mobilization/manipulation	Level of disability NDI secondary outcomes: pain and global rating of change	Subjects receiving thrust mobilization/manipulation experienced greater reduction in disability, with a between-group difference of 10% (95% CI=5,3-14,7), and pain, with a between-group difference of 2% (95% CI=1,4-2,7). Subjects in the thrust mobilization/manipulation group exhibited significantly ($p<0,01$) higher scores on the GROG Scale at the time of follow-up, with a mean difference between the groups of 1,5 points (95% CI= 0,48-2,5).	The results suggest that thoracic spine thrust mobilization/manipulation results in significantly greater short-term reductions in pain and disability than does thoracic nonthrust mobilization/manipulation in people with neck pain.
5	Hakkinen, A., et al., Strength training and stretching versus stretching only in the treatment of patients with chronic neck pain: a randomized one-year follow-up study. Clin Rehabil, 2008. 22(7): p. 592-600.	high (7)	2008	To compare the effectiveness of a 12-month home based combined strength training and stretching programme against stretching alone in the treatment of chronic neck pain.	n=101 age 25-53 and a duration of non-specific neck pain for more than 6 months	stretching strength training and stretching	strength training and stretching stretching	pain, disability, neck muscle strength and mobility of cervical spine	pain decrease (no significant difference between the groups): baseline 12 months strength and stretch group 64mm (17) 27 mm (34-20) stretch group 60mm (17) 32 mm (35-22)	No significant difference in neck pain and disability were observed between the two home-based training regimes. Combined strength training and stretching or stretching only were probably as effective in achieving a long-term improvement although the training adherence was rather low most of the time.
6	Hakkinen, A., et al., Effect of manual therapy and stretching on neck muscle strength and mobility in chronic neck pain. J Rehabil Med, 2007. 39(7): p. 575-9.	high (7)	2007	To study the effect of manual therapy and stretching on neck function in women with chronic neck pain.	n=125 age 25-53 permanently employed and neck pain lasting more than 6 months	manual therapy stretching	stretching manual therapy (mobilization and massage and passive stretching)	pain, neck strength, ROM	both neck muscle strength (11-14%) and mobility (7-15%) improved similarly in both groups, with the exception of greater passive flexion-extension mobility ($p=0,019$). Pain during the neck strength trials decreased from the baseline to week 4 by 26-35% and this similar in both groups.	Both manual therapy and stretching were effective short term treatments for reducing both spontaneous and strain-evoked pain in patients with chronic neck pain.
7	Itoh, K., et al., Randomised trial of trigger point acupuncture compared with other acupuncture for treatment of chronic neck pain. Complement Ther Med, 2007. 15(3): p. 172-9.	high (8)	2007	The main aim in this study was to determine if acupuncture at trigger points is an effective treatment for chronic neck pain, when compared to existing, widely used acupuncture at standard acupuncture points.	n=40 patients above 45 years of age with a history of non-specific neck pain of 6 months or longer.	Standard acupuncture Trigger point acupuncture Non-trigger point acupuncture Sham acupuncture	Standard acupuncture Trigger point acupuncture Non-trigger point acupuncture Sham acupuncture	pain intensity VAS pain disability with NDI	Triggerpoint group VAS score baseline = $67\pm13,2$ mm and after 3 weeks treatment $18,6\pm18,5$ mm ($p<0,01$) Triggerpoint group NDI score baseline = $13,0\pm6,3$ and after 3 weeks treatment $3,9\pm3,4$ ($p<0,01$)	These results suggest that triggerpoint acupuncture therapy may be more effective on chronic neck pain in aged patients than the standard acupuncture therapy.

8	Vas, J., et al., Efficacy and safety of acupuncture for chronic uncomplicated neck pain: a randomised controlled study. Pain, 2006. 126(1-3): p. 245-55.	high (7)	2006	To evaluate the efficacy and safety of acupuncture in comparison with transcutaneous nerve stimulation-placebo (TENS placebo) for the treatment of chronic uncomplicated neck pain with a duration exceeding three months.	n=123 with a drop out of 8 participants because of personal reasons, fear for acupuncture, cointervention or pregnancy. All were aged 17 and over; all were diagnosed with uncomplicated neck pain of over three monts duration, symptomatic at the time of examination, with a motion-related neck pain intensity equal to or exceeding 30 on a VAS and who had not received any treatment during the week preceding their incorporation into the study.	Acupuncture	TENS-placebo	pain on VAS secondary outcomes: Northwick Park neck pain questionnaire	Baseline to treatment changes in pain-VAS: acupuncture group 44,1 (SD 19,5) and control group 12,3 (SD 14,6) (p<0,001)	In the treatment of the intensity of chronic neck pain, acupuncture is more effective than the placebo treatment and has a safety pattern that makes it suitable for standard clinical practice.																																																
9	Willich, S.N., et al., Cost-effectiveness of acupuncture treatment in patients with chronic neck pain. Pain, 2006. 125(1-2): p. 107-13.	medium (5)	2006	The objective of this study was to assess costs and cost-effectiveness of additional acupuncture treatment in patients with chronic neck pain compared to patients receiving routine care alone.	n=3.451 (1.753 patients receiving acupuncture and 1.698 control)	Calculation of costs for the acupuncture group	calculation of costs for the control group	neck pain and disability	The ICER was between €12.469 (overall) per Qaly gained and €13.618 (diagnostic-specific) per Qaly gained. When adopting a treshold of €50.000 per Qaly gained, acupuncture is addition to routine care is, therefore, cost-effective.	The results show that treating patients with chronic neck pain with acupuncture in addition to routine resulted in a marked clinical relevant benefit and was relatively cost-effective. Acupuncture should be considered a viable option in the medical care of patients with chronic neck pain.																																																
10	Ma, K., et al., The efficacy of oxycodone for management of acute pain episodes in chronic neck pain patients. Int J Clin Pract, 2008. 62(2): p. 241-7.	medium (6)	2008	The aim of this study is to evaluate the efficacy and side effects of oxycodone controlled release (Oxy-CR) in managing chronic neck pain with acute episodes.	n=116 patients (between 40-70 years of age and over 40 kg of body weight) with acute chronic neck pain flares	Oxycodone (if VAS 4-6: 5mg every 12h if VAS 7-10: 10 mg every 12h)	Placebo (placebo tablet every 12h)	the frequency of patients' pain episodes VAS Quality of life Quality of sleep side effects ==> all recorded at days 1, 3, 7, 14, 21 and 28	<table><tr><td colspan="2"><u>Frequency of acute flare pain: (p<0,05)</u></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Oxy-group</td></tr><tr><td>pre</td><td>pre</td></tr><tr><td>post</td><td>pre</td></tr><tr><td>at 3 days</td><td>58</td></tr><tr><td>33</td><td>58</td></tr><tr><td>40</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>at 7 days</td><td>58</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>58</td></tr><tr><td>26</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><u>VAS</u></td></tr><tr><td>pre</td><td>p<0,05</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><u>Oxy-group post</u></td></tr><tr><td>at day 3</td><td>6,82±1,83 (n=58)</td></tr><tr><td>3,35±1,57</td><td>(n=58)</td></tr><tr><td>at day 7</td><td>6,82±1,83 (n=58)</td></tr><tr><td>3,24±0,92</td><td>(n=58)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><u>Quality of Life for Oxy-group p<0,05</u></td></tr><tr><td>at baseline</td><td>at the end</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">physical functioning</td></tr><tr><td>42,26±11,25</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">56,69±12,26</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Pain index</td></tr><tr><td>41,72±9,78</td><td></td></tr></table>	<u>Frequency of acute flare pain: (p<0,05)</u>			Oxy-group	pre	pre	post	pre	at 3 days	58	33	58	40		at 7 days	58	12	58	26		<u>VAS</u>		pre	p<0,05	<u>Oxy-group post</u>		at day 3	6,82±1,83 (n=58)	3,35±1,57	(n=58)	at day 7	6,82±1,83 (n=58)	3,24±0,92	(n=58)	<u>Quality of Life for Oxy-group p<0,05</u>		at baseline	at the end	physical functioning		42,26±11,25		56,69±12,26		Pain index		41,72±9,78		Oxy-CR demonstrated a quick and good analgesic effect on acute episodes of chronic neck pain and improved patients' QOL with a minimal and tolerable side effects. It could be an important optional drug for the management of refractory chronic neck pain with frequent acute episodes in the patient who failed to respond to non-opioid conservative management.
<u>Frequency of acute flare pain: (p<0,05)</u>																																																										
	Oxy-group																																																									
pre	pre																																																									
post	pre																																																									
at 3 days	58																																																									
33	58																																																									
40																																																										
at 7 days	58																																																									
12	58																																																									
26																																																										
<u>VAS</u>																																																										
pre	p<0,05																																																									
<u>Oxy-group post</u>																																																										
at day 3	6,82±1,83 (n=58)																																																									
3,35±1,57	(n=58)																																																									
at day 7	6,82±1,83 (n=58)																																																									
3,24±0,92	(n=58)																																																									
<u>Quality of Life for Oxy-group p<0,05</u>																																																										
at baseline	at the end																																																									
physical functioning																																																										
42,26±11,25																																																										
56,69±12,26																																																										
Pain index																																																										
41,72±9,78																																																										

11	Bernaards, C.M., et al., Improving work style behavior in computer workers with neck and upper limb symptoms. J Occup Rehabil, 2008. 18(1): p. 87-101.	high (7)	2008	The goal of this study was to assess the effectiveness of a group-based interactive work style intervention in improving work style behavior.	n=466 computer workers	work style work style and physical activity	work style work style and physical activity	Body posture and workstation adjustment Use of breaks and exercise reminder software work stress measured on T1= 6 months and T2 12 months.	A group based work style intervention seems so be effective in improving some elements of work style behavior. Future studies should investigate the effectiveness of work style interventions on all dimensions of the Fuerstein work style model.
12	Voerman, G.E., et al., Effects of ambulant myofeedback training and ergonomic counselling in female computer workers with work-related neck-shoulder complaints: a randomized controlled trial. J Occup Rehabil, 2007. 17(1): p. 137-52.	medium (6)	2007	To investigate the effect of ambulant myofeedback training, including ergonomic counseling and ergonomic counseling alone on work related neck-shoulder pain and disability.	n= 79 participants from Sweden and the Netherlands	Interventions are provided by one physiotherapist in Sweden and two health scientists in the Netherlands. ergonomic counseling (EC) myofeedback (Mfb) (Hannes and processing/storage unit	EC and Mfb groups comparison	Pain and disability Pain intensity in the neck-shoulder region significantly changed over time ($F=12.08$, $p<0.01$), without additional effects for the type of the intervention ($F=1.54$, $p=0.22$), study group ($F=0.48$, $p=0.49$), or interaction effects ($F\leq 0.87$, $p\geq 0.35$). Disability levels significantly changed over time ($F=17.68$, $p<0.01$) and were significantly different between the two study groups (i.e. Sweden and the Netherlands) ($F=5.30$, $p=0.02$). No additional effects were found for intervention type ($F=0.86$, $p=0.35$) nor the interaction terms ($F\leq 1.97$, $p\geq 0.12$).	Myofeedback training combined with ergonomic counseling is beneficial for female computer workers over the age of 45, reporting pain and disability in the neck-shoulder region, but no evidence was found favouring myofeedback training combined with ergonomic counselling over ergonomic counselling alone.
13	Brockow, T., et al., Analgesic effectiveness of subcutaneous carbon-dioxide insufflations as an adjunct treatment in patients with non-specific neck or low back pain. Complement Ther Med, 2001. 9(2): p. 68-76.	high (9)	2007	To evaluate whether patients with acute non specific neck pain get pain free sooner, if treated with subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations compared to sham ultrasound.	n=126 patients with non-specific neck pain <65 years	Subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations (SCI) between 25 and 100ml) + local infrared light	sham ultrasound + local infrared light	neck pain relief secondary: pain intensity, affective pain, sensory pain, treatment failure, recurrence of neck pain	The results of the study indicates that SCI are not superior to sham ultrasound for treating patients with acute non-specific neck pain.

APPENDIX 5: EVIDENCE TABLE OF INCLUDED PUBLICATIONS DIAGNOSIS AND PROGNOSIS

Reference	cochrane code medium (4,5) or high (>6) max=7 or Quadas code medium (7 -9) or high (>10) max=14	date of publication	objective	included studies	last search	patients	intervention	outcome	extraction data/ results	conclusion of the author																			
Bjorksten, M.G., et al., The validity of reported musculoskeletal problems. A study of questionnaire answers in relation to diagnosed disorders and perception of pain. Applied Ergonomics, 1999. 30(4): p. 325-330.	high (12 on Quadas)	1999	To evaluate the validity of answers given in a questionnaire on musculoskeletal pain and conditions by means of a clinical assessment, and to get some understanding of the subject's perception of reported pain.	Not relevant for this study.	Not relevant for this study.	n=171	questionnaire Clinical assessment VAS and pain drawings	sensitivity and specificity data from the questionnaires and the clinical diagnosis	sensitivity and specificity of questionnaire concerning musculoskeletal pain/ailments of the neck/shoulders the last 3 months, the last 7 days and currently, compared with a clinical examination. <table><tr><td></td><td>3 m</td><td></td><td>7m</td><td></td><td>currently</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>sens. spec.</td><td></td><td>sens. spec.</td><td></td><td>sens. spec.</td></tr><tr><td>Neck/shoulders</td><td>100</td><td>22</td><td>97</td><td>41</td><td>95</td><td>88</td></tr></table> Predictive value for current pain is 68,9%.		3 m		7m		currently		sens. spec.		sens. spec.		sens. spec.	Neck/shoulders	100	22	97	41	95	88	The results of this study confirm the validity of the subjective reports of the respondents. A 'pain assessment instrument' including a questionnaire, VAS and pain drawings may be useful to reveal conditions in the neck and the shoulders and thoracic spine, common sites of work related musculoskeletal disorders.
	3 m		7m		currently																								
	sens. spec.		sens. spec.		sens. spec.																								
Neck/shoulders	100	22	97	41	95	88																							
De Hertogh, W.J., et al., The clinical examination of neck pain patients: The validity of a group of tests. Manual Therapy, 2007. 12(1): p. 50-55.	high (10 on Quadas)	2007	To evaluate whether a blinded observer could identify the neck pain patients in a sample of 42 subjects consisting of neck pain patients and asymptomatic controls.		Not relevant for this study.	n=42	Bournemouth questionnaire (BQ) Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) Manual examination procedures (rotation C0-2-7, rated range of motion, end feel, onset of pain) Spurling test Cervical Range of Motion Device	senitivity and specificity of the tests	VAS and BQ had 77,5% correct allocations and a high specificity of 90,9%. The manual examination procedures have similar results. The combination of the VAS score, BQ and mEPs resulted in a sensitivity and specificity of 100% and 86,4%, respectively. Except for the flexion movement all CROM allocation percentages are around 50%.	The findings reinforce the validity of MEPs. Clustering pain measurements, BQ and MEPs provides the highest diagnostic value to identify neck pain patients or necks in need of treatment.																			
Rubinstein, S.M., et al., A systematic review of the diagnostic accuracy of provocative tests of the neck for diagnosing cervical radiculopathy. European Spine Journal, 2007. 16(3): p. 307-319.	high (7 on Cochrane)	2007	A systematic review in order to assess the diagnostic accuracy of clinical provocative tests of the neck.	1. Davidson, 1981 USA 2. Quinter, 1989 Australia 3. Shah, 2004 India 4. Tong, 2002 USA 5. Viikari-Juntura, 1989 Finland 6. Wainner, 2003 USA	is not reported	all studies together n=693	Clinical provocative tests of the neck	Diagnostic accuracy of the tests	Spurling's test demonstrated low to moderate sensitivity and specificity, as did individual studies for traction/neck distraction and the Vasaalva's manoeuvre. On the other hand the two studies which investigated the ULTT demonstrated high sensitivity and low specificity , while the three studies for the shoulder abdudction test demonstrated low to moderate sensitivity and moderate to high specificity.	A positive Spurling's test, traction/neck distraction, and Vasaalvas manoeuvre might be indicative of a cervical radiculopathy, while a negative ULTT might be used to rule it out. However, the lack of evidence precludes any firm conclusions rgarding their diagnostic value, especially when used in primary care. More high quality studies are necessary in order to resolve this issue.																			

Rubinstein, S.M. and M. van Tulder, A best-evidence review of diagnostic procedures for neck and low-back pain. Best Practice and Research: Clinical Rheumatology, 2008. 22(3): p. 471-482.	medium (4 on cochrane)	2008	The aim is to present an overview of the best available evidence on diagnostic procedures for neck and low-back pain.		up until 2007	not reported	diagnostic procedures	valid procedures		There is sufficient sound evidence from systematic reviews to make the following recommendations: * the history is principally for triage, during which 'red flags' should be identified * the presence of multiple red flags should raise clinical suspicion and indicates the need for further investigation * the physical examination is used to confirm suspicion from history: - in the case of cervical radiculopathy, tests such as Spurling's can be used to make the diagnosis, while others, such as the upper limb tension test, can be used to rule it out * in patients older or 50 years of age, plain spinal radiography together with standard laboratory tests are highly accurate in identifying underlying systematic disease; however, plain spinal radiography is not a valuable tool for non-specific neck pain * there is strong evidence for the diagnostic accuracy of facet joint blocks in evaluating spinal pain, and moderate
Sehgal, N., et al., Systematic review of diagnostic utility of facet (Zygapophysial) joint injections in chronic spinal pain: An update. Pain Physician, 2007. 10(1): p. 213-228.	high (6 on cochrane)	2007	To evaluate and update available evidence (2004 to 2006) relating to clinical utility of facet joint injections (intraarticular and medial brach blocks) in diagnosing chronic spinal pain of facet joint origin	publications for cervical region: 1. Barnsley, 1993 and 1995 2. Lord, 1996 3. Manchikanti, 2002a+b, 2004 4. Manchukonda, 2007 5. Speldewinde, 2001	dec/06	n= 1002	controlled diagnostic blocks	prevalence and false-positive rate	All studies had a prevalence between 36 and 67% (from one study no data were available) The false-positive rate was between 27% and 63% (from 3 studies no data were available)	The evidence obtained from the literature review suggests that controlled comparative local anesthetic blocks of facet joints (medial branch or dorsal ramus) are reproducible, reasonably accurate and safe.
Vos, C.J., A.P. Verhagen, and B.W. Koes, The Ability of the Acute Low Back Pain Screening Questionnaire to Predict Sick Leave in Patients With Acute Neck Pain. Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics, 2009. 32(3): p. 178-183.	high (10 Quadas)	2009	The aim of this study was to investigate the use of the Acute Low Back Pain Screening Questionnaire (ALBPSQ) in patients with acute neck pain in general practice.			n=180	The Acute Low Back Pain Screening Questionnaire (ALBPSQ)	reliability of the questionnaire and sick leave	ICC of the total scores on the ALBPSQ of the stable group was 0,85 (95% CI, 0,73-0,92) A cutoff score of 72 at baseline identified patients with or without long-term sick leave with a sensitivity of 77% and a specificity of 62%.	In this prospective cohort study, in general practice, the ALBPSQ was shown to be a reliable instrument and to be able to screen patients with neck pain that may be at risk for prolonged sick leave.

APPENDIX 6: RECOMMENDATIONS COMPARED TO EXISTING GUIDELINES

		De op basis van AGREE geselecteerde richtlijnen:																				
		Aanbeveling 1					Aanbeveling 2					Aanbeveling 3					Aanbeveling 4					
AANBEVELING - KLINISCHE VRAGEN		Kernboodschappen	Evidentieniveau *			Boodschap adapteren? (ja / neen)	Kernboodschappen	Evidentieniveau *			Boodschap adapteren? (ja / neen)	Kernboodschappen	Evidentieniveau *			Boodschap adapteren? (ja / neen)	Kernboodschappen	Evidentieniveau *				
		Guideline CKS	Guideline BMJ	GRADE	Guideline CKS		Guideline BMJ	GRADE	Guideline CKS	Guideline BMJ		GRADE	Guideline CKS	Guideline BMJ	GRADE							
I Diagnostiek - approach																						
1	How do you assess someone with neck pain?	Exclude "red flags" , serious spinal pathology or nerve root pain (radiculopathy) and possible facet joint spinal pain.	How do I assess someone with neck pain? * Exclude non-musculoskeletal causes, such as cardiovascular, respiratory, and oesophageal diseases, and acute upper respiratory tract infection and sore throat. * Look for 'red flags' (that suggest a serious spinal abnormality). If present, refer urgently for investigations and further assessment. * If the neck pain and other symptoms follow recent sudden or excessive hyperextension, flexion, or rotation of the neck, see CKS topic on Neck pain-whiplash injury. * If the neck pain is due to acute spasm with no obvious underlying cause, see the CKs topic on Neck pain- acute torticollis. * If the neck varies with different physical activities and with time, or is related to an awkward movement, poor posture, or overuse, suspect non-specific neck pain. * If there is unilateral neck, shoulder, or arm pain that approximates to a dermatome, suspect cervical radiculopathy, see the CKS topic on Neck Pain-cervical radiculopathy, there may be altered sensation or numbness, or weakness in related muscles. However, the presence of pain or paraesthesia radiating into the arm is not specific for nerve root pain and may be present in people with non-specific neck pain. * Identify risk factors for developing neck pain: 1) workplace associated risks (awkward neck postures, neck flexion, arm force, arm posture, duration of sitting, twisting or bending of the trunk, had-arm vibration, and some workplace designs.) 2) excessive use of pillows. * Identify psychosocial factors that may indicate increased risk for chronicity and disability. Identify any excessive concerns about the neck pain, unrealistic expectations of treatment, disbling sickness behaviour, and problems with compensation, work, family, mood and emotions. * Cervical X-rays and other imaging studies and investigations are not routinely required to diagnose or assess neck pain with radiculopathy and non-specific neck pain.						Older age and coconitnant low back pain are indicators of a less favourable prognosis of neck pain. Radiological findings are not associated with worse diagnosis, but the severity of pain and a history of previous attacks however seem to be associated with worse diagnosis. The 'Acute Low Back Pain Screening instrument' seems to be a reliable instrument in screening patients with non-specific neck pain at risk for prolonged sick leave.	How do I assess someone with neck pain? * Exclude non-musculoskeletal causes, such as cardiovascular, respiratory, and oesophageal diseases, and acute upper respiratory tract infection and sore throat. * Look for 'red flags' (that suggest a serious spinal abnormality). If present, refer urgently for investigations and further assessment. * If the neck pain and other symptoms follow recent sudden or excessive hyperextension, flexion, or rotation of the neck, see CKS topic on Neck pain-whiplash injury. * If the neck pain is due to acute spasm with no obvious underlying cause, see the CKs topic on Neck pain-acute torticollis. * If the neck varies with different physical activities and with time, or is related to an awkward movement, poor posture, or overuse, suspect non-specific neck pain. * If there is unilateral neck, shoulder, or arm pain that approximates to a dermatome, suspect cervical radiculopathy, see the CKS topic on Neck Pain-cervical radiculopathy, there may be altered sensation or numbness, or weakness in related muscles. However, the presence of pain or paraesthesia radiating into the arm is not specific for nerve root pain and may be present in people with non-specific neck pain. * Identify risk factors for developing neck pain: 1) workplace associated risks (awkward neck postures, neck flexion, arm force, arm posture, duration of sitting, twisting or bending of the trunk, had-am vibration, and some workplace designs.) 2) excessive use of pillows. * Identify psychosocial factors that may indicate	C											
2	What are the diagnostic procedures to be performed to diagnose non-specific neck pain?	• No evidence for diagnostic accuracy of history talking is found. • No evidence for diagnostic imaging for patients with non-specific neck pain is found.				• Exclude 'radiculopathy'. With combinations of the following test, radiculopathy can be confirmed or excluded: o Arguments to confirm radiculopathy : *Positive Spurling Test *Positive Traction Distraction test *Positive Vasalva manoeuvre *Positive Shoulder Abduction test o Arguments to exclude radiculopathy: *Negative Upper Limb Tension test.			C		Exclude facet joint spinal pain. If a working diagnose by manual examination procedures fails, than local anesthetic block can be used for proving or excluding facet joint spinal pain.		B									

[illegible]

[illegible]

APPENDIX 7 : NECK DISABILITY INDEX

ORIGINAL VERSION NECK DISABILITY INDEX: INSTRUMENT AND INTERPRETATION

Neck Disability Index

This questionnaire has been designed to give us information as to how your neck pain has affected your ability to manage in everyday life. Please answer every section and **mark in each section only the one box that applies to you**. We realise you may consider that two or more statements in any one section relate to you, but please just mark the box that most closely describes your problem.

Office Use Only

Name _____

Date _____

Section 1: Pain Intensity

- ☐ I have no pain at the moment
- ☐ The pain is very mild at the moment
- ☐ The pain is moderate at the moment
- ☐ The pain is fairly severe at the moment
- ☐ The pain is very severe at the moment
- ☐ The pain is the worst imaginable at the moment

Section 2: Personal Care (Washing, Dressing, etc.)

- ☐ I can look after myself normally without causing extra pain
- ☐ I can look after myself normally but it causes extra pain
- ☐ It is painful to look after myself and I am slow and careful
- ☐ I need some help but can manage most of my personal care
- ☐ I need help every day in most aspects of self care
- ☐ I do not get dressed, I wash with difficulty and stay in bed

Section 3: Lifting

- ☐ I can lift heavy weights without extra pain
- ☐ I can lift heavy weights but it gives extra pain
- ☐ Pain prevents me lifting heavy weights off the floor, but I can manage if they are conveniently placed, for example on a table
- ☐ Pain prevents me from lifting heavy weights but I can manage light to medium weights if they are conveniently positioned
- ☐ I can only lift very light weights

- ☐ I cannot lift or carry anything

Section 4: Reading

- ☐ I can read as much as I want to with no pain in my neck
- ☐ I can read as much as I want to with slight pain in my neck
- ☐ I can read as much as I want with moderate pain in my neck
- ☐ I can't read as much as I want because of moderate pain in my neck
- ☐ I can hardly read at all because of severe pain in my neck
- ☐ I cannot read at all

Section 5: Headaches

- ☐ I have no headaches at all
- ☐ I have slight headaches, which come infrequently
- ☐ I have moderate headaches, which come infrequently
- ☐ I have moderate headaches, which come frequently
- ☐ I have severe headaches, which come frequently
- ☐ I have headaches almost all the time

Section 6: Concentration

- ☐ I can concentrate fully when I want to with no difficulty
- ☐ I can concentrate fully when I want to with slight difficulty
- ☐ I have a fair degree of difficulty in concentrating when I want to
- ☐ I have a lot of difficulty in concentrating when I want to
- ☐ I have a great deal of difficulty in concentrating when I want to
- ☐ I cannot concentrate at all

Section 7: Work

- ☐ I can do as much work as I want to
- ☐ I can only do my usual work, but no more
- ☐ I can do most of my usual work, but no more
- ☐ I cannot do my usual work
- ☐ I can hardly do any work at all
- ☐ I can't do any work at all

Section 8: Driving

- ☐ I can drive my car without any neck pain
- ☐ I can drive my car as long as I want with slight pain in my neck
- ☐ I can drive my car as long as I want with moderate pain in my neck
- ☐ I can't drive my car as long as I want because of moderate pain in my neck
- ☐ I can hardly drive at all because of severe pain in my neck
- ☐ I can't drive my car at all

Section 9: Sleeping

- ☐ I have no trouble sleeping
- ☐ My sleep is slightly disturbed (less than 1 hr sleepless)
- ☐ My sleep is mildly disturbed (1-2 hrs sleepless)
- ☐ My sleep is moderately disturbed (2-3 hrs sleepless)
- ☐ My sleep is greatly disturbed (3-5 hrs sleepless)
- ☐ My sleep is completely disturbed (5-7 hrs sleepless)

Section 10: Recreation

- ☐ I am able to engage in all my recreation activities with no neck pain at all
- ☐ I am able to engage in all my recreation activities, with some pain in my neck
- ☐ I am able to engage in most, but not all of my usual recreation activities because of pain in my neck
- ☐ I am able to engage in a few of my usual recreation activities because of pain in my neck
- ☐ I can hardly do any recreation activities because of pain in my neck
- ☐ I can't do any recreation activities at all

Score: ____/50 **Transform to percentage score x 100 =** **%points**

Scoring: For each section the total possible score is 5; if the first statement is marked the section score = 0, if the last statement is marked it = 5. If all ten sections are completed the score is calculated as follows:

Example: 16 (total scored)

50 (total possible score) x 100 = 32%

If one section is missed or not applicable the score is calculated: 16 (total scored)

45 (total possible score) x 100 = 35.5%

Minimum Detectable Change (90% confidence): 5 points or 10 %points

NDI developed by: Vernon, H. & Mior, S. (1991). The Neck Disability Index: A study of reliability and validity. Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics. 14, 409-415

The Neck Disability Index



An instrument for measuring self-rated disability due to neck pain or whiplash-associated disorder

Copyright:

Howard Vernon DC, FCCS, PhD

Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College

6100 Leslie Street

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

M2H 3J1

All use of the NDI is subject to permission from the author at: hvernon@cmcc.ca

1. Introduction

The Neck Disability Index (NDI) was developed in the late 1980's by Dr. Howard Vernon and first published in the *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics* in 1991 [1]. The NDI was modelled on a similar instrument for assessing self-rated disability in low back pain patients – the Oswestry Low Back Pain Disability Questionnaire, which had been in existence for about eight years. Dr. Vernon received permission from the developer of the “Oswestry Index” to modify it for use in neck pain patients.

After selecting some of the original items from the Oswestry Index and then developing new items for neck pain patients, the prototype of the NDI was tested on a group of neck pain patients as well as chiropractors. Several modifications were made until a final version was acceptable. This version was then tested for reliability and validity and the results of these tests were published in the 1991 article. When it was published, the NDI became the first instrument for testing self-rated disability in neck pain patients.

Since 1991, a number of other questionnaires for neck pain patients have been developed, but the NDI remains the oldest and most widely used of these instruments [2]. Here are some more details:

- As of mid-2008, over 350 articles in the scientific literature have cited the NDI.
- It has been used in 40 studies related to whiplash injury.
- It has been translated into over 20 languages.
- It has been used in 103 treatment studies, including 43 surgical studies, 57 studies of non-surgical treatments. 46 of these studies have been randomized clinical trials.

2. Primary findings on the NDI:

Vernon's review paper of 2008 [6] is included in this manual and provides specific data from all of the studies of the psychometric properties of the NDI. The following is a summary of these findings:

The NDI has been shown to be highly reliable on what is called “test-retest” reliability [1]. The individual items have been shown to group together well as a single measure of self-rated physical disability [3].

The NDI has also been shown to be valid by comparing NDI scores to other measures of pain and disability [1, 4].

An important finding as published in the late 1990's by Riddle and Stratford [5]. They found that, for patients with scores in the mild-to-moderate range (where most patients score), there was a certain number of NDI points that could be regarded as “minimally important clinical change” by patients. This number is 5 or 10%. So, if your patient first scores 15 out of 50, and then, two weeks later, scores 12, this would not be regarded as a clinically important change. However, if they scored 10 or less, than this would be regarded as a clinically important change.

3. Scoring the NDI:

The NDI consists of 10 items, each with a score up to 5, for a total score of 50. The lower the score, the less self-rated disability. Dr. Vernon established the following guide to interpretation of a patient's score [1]:

- 0 – 4 = No disability
- 5 – 14 = Mild disability
- 15 – 24 = Moderate disability
- 25 – 34 = Severe disability
- 35 or over = Complete disability

4. Item issues:

Users should attempt to have all 10 items completed at all administrations. Some patients may find 1-2 items not applicable to their lives. This is especially true of “driving”. This item may be omitted and the instrument scored out of 45, converted to 100% and then divided by 2.

The other item which may cause some problem is “work”. While the term “work” was meant for any circumstance, many people interpret it as “work at my job”. Therefore, if they are not employed, they may decline to complete this item. In that case, please re-interpret this item as “housework” for anyone not working out of the house.

For missing items not explained above (simple omissions, etc), only up to 2 missed items should be allowed. With 3 or more missed items, the administration would be regarded as unacceptable.

For 1-2 missed items, there are two strategies that amount to the same result:

- take the score out of 45 or 40, convert to 100% and divide by 2
- insert the average item score (total score divided by 9 or 8) into each missing item

5. Using the NDI:

The NDI should be an important part of your first assessment of any patient with neck pain, especially due to trauma. The question arises, “when should I repeat the NDI?” Remember that the NDI measures self-rated disability, not just current pain level. This applies to a person's ability to perform their daily activities. A single, composite measure of this ability (the NDI score) is not likely to change over a short period of time. So, we recommend that the NDI be used on 2-week intervals over the course of your treatment of a patient with neck pain.

6. Links:

<http://www.proqolid.org/>

http://www.pedro.fhs.usyd.edu.au/CEBP/index_cebp.html

<http://www.worksafe.vic.gov.au>

<http://www.medigraphsoftware.com>

<http://www.painworld.zip.com>

<http://medal.org>

<http://outcomesassessment.org>

<http://www.maa.nsw.gov.au>

http://apa.advsol.com.au/physio_and_health/research/evidence/outcome_measures.cfm

<http://caretrak-outcomes.com>

<http://ccachiro.org>

<http://www.unisa.edu.au/cahe/>

<http://www.tac.vic.gov.au/jsp/content/NavigationController.do?areaID=22&tierID=1&navID=92ACB96A7F000001011DDD0421B6C947&navLink=null&pageID=942>

<http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct/show/NCT00349544;jsessionid=26CC121CFA39CE943448CF75822A8C60?order=1>

<http://www.cks.library.nhs.uk>

7. References:

1. Vernon HT, Mior SA. The Neck Disability Index: a study of reliability and validity. *J Manip Physiol Ther* 1991;14:409-415.
2. Pietrobon B, Coeytaux RB, Carey TS, Richardson WJ, DeVellis RF. Standard scales for measurement of functional outcome for cervical pain or dysfunction - A systematic review. *Spine* 2002; 27(5):515-522.
3. Hains F, Waalen J, Mior S. Psychometric properties of the neck disability index. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics* 1998; 21(2):75-80.
4. Vernon H. Assessment of self-rated disability, impairment, and sincerity of effort in whiplash-associated disorder. *Journal of Musculoskeletal Pain* 2000; 8(1-2):155-167.
5. Riddle DL, Stratford PW. Use of generic versus region-specific functional status measures on patients with cervical spine disorders. *Physical Therapy* 1998; 78(9):951-963.
6. Vernon H. The Neck Disability Index: State-of-the-art, 1991-2008. *J Manip Physiol Ther* 2008;31:491-502.

A complete list of all the NDI citations is available from Dr. Vernon at hvernon@cmcc.ca.

DUTCH VERSION NECK DISABILITY INDEX : INSTRUMENT AND INTERPRETATION

Neck Disability Index Vernon 1991

1. Pijn

- ☐ Ik heb nu geen pijn
- ☐ Ik heb nu weinig pijn
- ☐ Ik heb nu matige pijn
- ☐ Ik heb nu vrij hevige pijn
- ☐ Ik heb nu zeer hevige pijn
- ☐ Ik heb nu de slechts denkbare pijn

2. Persoonlijke verzorging (wassen, aan- en uitkleden)

- ☐ Ik kan goed voor mezelf zorgen zonder dat de pijn toeneemt
- ☐ Ik kan goed voor mezelf zorgen hoewel dat de pijn doet toenemen
- ☐ Voor mezelf zorgen is pijnlijk en gaat langzaam en voorzichtig
- ☐ Voor mezelf zorgen lukt goed maar vaak met enige hulp
- ☐ Elke dag voor mezelf zorgen lukt meestal alleen met hulp
- ☐ Ik kan mezelf niet aankleden; mezelf wassen gaat moeilijk en ik blijf in bed

3. Tillen

- ☐ Ik kan een zwaar gewicht tillen zonder dat de pijn toeneemt
- ☐ Ik kan een zwaar gewicht tillen, maar dat doet de pijn toenemen
- ☐ De pijn weerhoudt mij van het optillen van een zwaar gewicht van de grond, maar zou dat wel kunnen wanneer dat gewicht hoger (bijv. op een tafel) gelegen is
- ☐ Ik kan alleen zeer lichte gewichten tillen
- ☐ Ik kan helemaal niets tillen of dragen

4. Lezen

- ☐ Ik kan zo veel lezen als ik wil zonder pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan zo veel lezen als ik wil met weinig pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan zo veel lezen als ik wil met matige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan niet zo veel lezen als ik zou willen vanwege de matige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan bijna niet meer lezen vanwege de hevige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan helemaal niet meer lezen

5. Hoofdpijn

- ☐ Ik heb helemaal geen hoofdpijn
- ☐ Ik heb af en toe lichte hoofdpijn
- ☐ Ik heb af en toe matige hoofdpijn
- ☐ Ik heb vaak matige hoofdpijn
- ☐ Ik heb vaak hevige hoofdpijn
- ☐ Ik heb bijna altijd hoofdpijn

6. Concentratie

- ☐ Ik kan mij goed concentreren zonder moeite wanneer ik dat wil
- ☐ Ik kan mij goed concentreren met enige moeite wanneer ik dat wil
- ☐ Het kost mij duidelijk moeite om te concentreren wanneer ik dat wil
- ☐ Het kost mij veel moeite om te concentreren wanneer ik dat wil
- ☐ Het kost mij zeer veel moeite om te concentreren wanneer ik dat wil
- ☐ Ik kan mij helemaal niet concentreren

7. Werk

- ☐ Ik kan zo veel werk doen als ik wil
- ☐ Ik kan alleen mijn gewone werk doen, maar niet meer
- ☐ Ik kan het grootste deel van mijn gewone werk doen, maar niet meer
- ☐ Ik kan mijn gewone werk niet doen
- ☐ Ik kan bijna geen enkel werk meer doen
- ☐ Ik kan helemaal niet meer werken

8. Autorijden

- ☐ Ik kan autorijden zonder enige nekpijn
- ☐ Ik kan autorijden zo lang als ik wil met weinig pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan autorijden zo lang als ik wil met matige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan niet autorijden zo lang als ik wil vanwege de matige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan bijna niet meer autorijden vanwege de hevige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan helemaal niet meer autorijden

9. Slapen

- ☐ Ik heb geen moeite met slapen
- ☐ Mijn slaap is heel licht gestoord (minder dan 1 uur wakker)
- ☐ Mijn slaap is licht gestoord (1 tot 2 uur wakker)
- ☐ Mijn slaap is matig gestoord (2 tot 3 uur wakker)
- ☐ Mijn slaap is fors gestoord (3 tot 5 uur wakker)
- ☐ Mijn slaap is volledig gestoord (5 tot 7 uur wakker)

10. Vrije tijd

- ☐ Ik kan aan alle activiteiten meedoen zonder enige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Ik kan aan alle activiteiten meedoen met enige pijn in mijn nek
- ☐ Vanwege de pijn in mijn nek kan ik aan de meeste, maar niet alle, gebruikelijke activiteiten meedoen
- ☐ Vanwege de pijn in mijn nek kan ik aan maar weinig gebruikelijke activiteiten meedoen
- ☐ Vanwege de pijn in mijn nek kan ik nagenoeg aan geen activiteiten meedoen
- ☐ Ik kan aan geen enkele activiteit meer meedoen

MEETINSTRUMENT: Neck Disability Index (NDI)**Beschrijving:**

De neck disability index (NDI) is een modificatie van de Oswestry vragenlijst voor lage rugklachten. De opzet van deze vragenlijst is gelijk aan de Oswestry. Alleen de items en de antwoordcategorieën zijn aangepast voor patiënten met nekklachten¹.

Doelgroep	Benodigde tijd	Kosten	Scholing vereist
Patiënten met chronische klachten in de nek, whip-lash,	8-12 minuten	Fotokopie	Geen specifieke scholing vereist
INSTRUCTIES AAN PATIËNT Met de vragenlijst willen wij een indruk krijgen over beperkingen die u ondervindt in het dagelijks leven ten gevolge van nekklachten. "Kruis bij elke vraag het antwoord aan dat het meest uw situatie weergeeft"			
OVERZICHT Vorm Een door de patiënt zelf in te vullen vragenlijst van 10 items. Subschalen Geen. De vragenlijst meet 10 deelgebieden van het dagelijks functioneren: pijnintensiteit, zelfverzorging, tillen, lezen, hoofdpijn, concentratie, werk, autorijden, slaap, vrije tijd. Scoring Per vraag zijn er 6 antwoordcategorieën. De eerste antwoordcategorie (score 0) geeft geen beperkingen aan, de laatste categorie (score 5) betekent de meeste beperkingen. De totaalscore is de som van de tien delen vragen (maximaal 50) vermenigvuldigd met factor 2. De gevonden waarde representeert het "beperkingen-percentage" (0-100%).			

BETROUWBAARHEID**Interne consistentie**

De interne consistentie is goed Cronbach's alpha = 0.80¹

Test-hertest betrouwbaarheid

De test hertest betrouwbaarheid goed over een periode van: twee dagen $r = 0.89$ ¹

Inter-/intrabeoordelaars betrouwbaarheid**VALIDITEIT****Inhoudsvaliditeit**

Face validity op basis van peer-review en patiënten feedback.

Constructvaliditeit

De correlatie van de NDI met ander meetinstrumenten is berekend :

de McGill Pain Questionnaire totaal $r = 0.70$ ¹

de McGill Pain Questionnaire pijnwoorden $r = 0.69$ ¹

de pijnintensiteit (VAS) $r = 0.65$ ¹

Criterium validiteit**Responsiviteit**

De correlatie van de veranderingsscores van de NDI met de verbetering in activiteiten (gescoord op een VAS) (longitudinale constructvaliditeit) is $r = 0.60$ ¹

REFERENTIES

- 1 Vernon H., Mior S. The neck disability index: a study of reliability and validity. Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics. 1991, 14(7): 409-415
- 2 Marchiori DM, Henderson CNR. A cross-sectional study correlating cervical radiographic degenerative findings to pain and disability Spine 1996; 21:2747-2752

WAAR VERKRIJGBAAR

Hoofdstuk 5

7 REFERENCE LIST

1. Binder A. The diagnosis and treatment of nonspecific neck pain and whiplash. *Eura Medicophys*. 2007;43(1):79-89.
2. Binder AI. Cervical spondylosis and neck pain. *BMJ*. 2007;334(7592):527-31.
3. CKS G. http://www.cks.nhs.uk/neck_pain_specific
4. de Jongh T, de Vries H, Grundmeijer H. Diagnostiek van de alledaagse klachten. bouwstenen voor rationeel probleemoplossen. Bohn Satfleu van Loghum. 2007.
5. Williams N, Hoving J. Neck pain. Jones R, Britten N, culpepper L et al. Oxford textbook of primary medical care. Oxford: oxford University Press. 2004:1111-6.
6. Haldeman S, Carroll L, Cassidy JD, Schubert J, Nygren A. The Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders: executive summary. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(4 Suppl):S5-7.
7. Borghouts JA, Koes BW, Vondeling H, Bouter LM. Cost-of-illness of neck pain in The Netherlands in 1996. *Pain*. 1999;80(3):629-36.
8. Cote P, Cassidy JD, Carroll L. The Saskatchewan Health and Back Pain Survey. The prevalence of neck pain and related disability in Saskatchewan adults. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1998;23(15):1689-98.
9. Fejer R, Kyvik KO, Hartvigsen J. The prevalence of neck pain in the world population: a systematic critical review of the literature. *Eur Spine J*. 2006;15(6):834-48.
10. Guez M, Hildingsson C, Nilsson M, Toolanen G. The prevalence of neck pain: a population-based study from northern Sweden. *Acta Orthop Scand*. 2002;73(4):455-9.
11. Strine TW, Hootman JM. US national prevalence and correlates of low back and neck pain among adults. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2007;57(4):656-65.
12. Côté P, Cassidy J, Carroll L. The epidemiology of neck pain: what we have learned from our population-based studies. *J Can Chiropr Assoc*. 2003;47(4):284-90.
13. Schlosser RW, Koul R, Costello J. Asking well-built questions for evidence-based practice in augmentative and alternative communication. *J Commun Disord*. 2007;40(3):225-38.
14. Kroeling P, Gross A, Houghton PE. Electrotherapy for neck disorders. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005(2):CD004251.
15. Borghouts JA, Koes BW, Bouter LM. The clinical course and prognostic factors of non-specific neck pain: a systematic review. *Pain*. 1998;77(1):1-13.
16. Van Zundert J, Huygen f, Patijn J, van Kleef M. Praktische richtlijnen anesthesiologische pijnbestrijding. gebaseerd op klinische diagnosen. 2009:440.
17. Vos CJ, Verhagen AP, Koes BW. Reliability and responsiveness of the Dutch version of the Neck Disability Index in patients with acute neck pain in general practice. *Eur Spine J*. 2006;15(11):1729-36.
18. Vernon H. The Neck Disability Index: state-of-the-art, 1991-2008. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2008;31(7):491-502.
19. Gross AR, Hoving JL, Haines TA, Goldsmith CH, Kay T, Aker P, et al. Manipulation and mobilisation for mechanical neck disorders. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2004(1):CD004249.
20. Van Royen P. Een systeem om niveau van bewijskracht een graad van aanbeveling aan te geven. *Huisarts Nu*. 2008;37(9):505-9.
21. Guyatt G, Oxman A, vist G, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter T, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2008;336:924-6.

22. Scott N, Barton P, Gerwin R. Trigger point injections for chronic non-malignant musculoskeletal pain: a systematic review. *Pain Med.* 2009;10:54-69.
23. Rubinstein SM, Pool JJM, Van Tulder MW, Riphagen II, De Vet HCW. A systematic review of the diagnostic accuracy of provocative tests of the neck for diagnosing cervical radiculopathy. *European Spine Journal.* 2007;16(3):307-19.
24. Rubinstein SM, van Tulder M. A best-evidence review of diagnostic procedures for neck and low-back pain. *Best Practice and Research: Clinical Rheumatology.* 2008;22(3):471-82.
25. Sehgal N, Dunbar EE, Shah RV, Colson J. Systematic review of diagnostic utility of facet (Zygapophysial) joint injections in chronic spinal pain: An update. *Pain Physician.* 2007;10(1):213-28.
26. Nordin M, Carragee EJ, Hogg-Johnson S, Weiner SS, Hurwitz EL, Peloso PM, et al. Assessment of neck pain and its associated disorders: results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2008;33(4 Suppl):S101-22.
27. Shacklock MO. Positive Upper Limb Tension Test in a Case of Surgically Proven Neuropathy: Analysis and Validity. *Man Ther.* 1996;1(3):154-61.
28. Bjorksten MG, Boquist B, Talback M, Edling C. The validity of reported musculoskeletal problems. A study of questionnaire answers in relation to diagnosed disorders and perception of pain. *Applied Ergonomics.* 1999;30(4):325-30.
29. De Hertogh WJ, Vaes PH, Vijverman V, De Cordt A, Duquet W. The clinical examination of neck pain patients: The validity of a group of tests. *Manual Therapy.* 2007;12(1):50-5.
30. MacDermid J. Measurement properties of the Neck Disability Index: a systematic review. *J. Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2009;39(5):400-4.
31. Vos CJ, Verhagen AP, Koes BW. The Ability of the Acute Low Back Pain Screening Questionnaire to Predict Sick Leave in Patients With Acute Neck Pain. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics.* 2009;32(3):178-83.
32. Boyling J, Jull G. Grieve's Modern Manual Therapy, the vertebral column. Chapter 33: A contemporary approach to manual therapy.(Elvey, RL and O'Sullivan, PB) 2004:471-3.
33. di Fabio RP. Manipulation of the cervical spine: risks and benefits. *Physical Therapy.* 1999;79(1):50-65.
34. Mink, ter Veer, Vorselaars. Extremiteten. functieonderzoek en manuele therapie. 1990.
35. Graham N, Gross A, Goldsmith CH, Klaber Moffett J, Haines T, Burnie SJ, et al. Mechanical traction for neck pain with or without radiculopathy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008(3):CD006408.
36. Gemmell H, Miller P. Comparative effectiveness of manipulation, mobilisation and the activator instrument in treatment of non-specific neck pain: a systematic review. 2006.
37. Gross AR, Kay T, Hondras M, Goldsmith C, Haines T, Peloso P, et al. Manual therapy for mechanical neck disorders: a systematic review. *Man Ther.* 2002;7(3):131-49.
38. Hurwitz EL, Carragee EJ, van der Velde G, Carroll LJ, Nordin M, Guzman J, et al. Treatment of neck pain: noninvasive interventions. Results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000 to 2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and its Associated Disorders [with consumer summary]. *Spine.* 2008;33(4 Suppl):S123-S52.
39. Macaulay J, Cameron M, Vaughan B. The effectiveness of manual therapy for neck pain: a systematic review of the literature. *Physical Therapy Reviews.* 2007;12(3):261-7.
40. Sarigiovannis P, Hollins B. Effectiveness of manual therapy in the treatment of non-specific neck pain: a review. *Physical Therapy Reviews.* 2005;10(1):35-50.
41. Vernon H, Humphreys BK. Manual therapy for neck pain: an overview of randomized clinical trials and systematic reviews. *Europa MedicoPhysica [Mediterranean Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine].* 2007;43(1):91-118.

42. Vernon H, Humphreys K, Hagino C. Chronic mechanical neck pain in adults treated by manual therapy: a systematic review of change scores in randomized clinical trials. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*. 2007;30(3):215-27.
43. Vernon HT, Humphreys BK, Hagino CA. A systematic review of conservative treatments for acute neck pain not due to whiplash. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*. 2005;28(6):443-8.
44. Kay Theresa M, Gross A, Goldsmith Charles H, Hoving Jan L, Brønfort G. Exercises for mechanical neck disorders. In: *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2005.
45. Gross AR, Goldsmith C, Hoving JL, Haines T, Peloso P, Aker P, et al. Conservative management of mechanical neck disorders: a systematic review. *The Journal of Rheumatology*. 2007;34(5):1083-102.
46. Cleland JA, Glynn P, Whitman JM, Eberhart SL, MacDonald C, Childs JD. Short-term effects of thrust versus nonthrust mobilization/manipulation directed at the thoracic spine in patients with neck pain: a randomized clinical trial. *Phys Ther*. 2007;87(4):431-40.
47. Haraldsson B, Gross A, Myers Cynthia D, Ezzo J, Morien A, Goldsmith Charles H, et al. Massage for mechanical neck disorders. In: *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2006.
48. Ezzo J, Haraldsson BG, Gross AR, Myers CD, Morien A, Goldsmith CH, et al. Massage for mechanical neck disorders: a systematic review [with consumer summary]. *Spine*. 2007;32(3):353-62.
49. Sarig-Bahat H. Evidence for exercise therapy in mechanical neck disorders. *Man Ther*. 2003;8(1):10-20.
50. O'Leary S, Jull G, Kim M, Vicenzino B. Specificity in retraining craniocervical flexor muscle performance. *Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy*. 2007;37(1):3-9.
51. Ylinen J, Hakkinen A, Nykanen M, Kautiainen H, Takala EP. Neck muscle training in the treatment of chronic neck pain: a three-year follow-up study. *Eura Medicophys*. 2007;43(2):161-9.
52. Hakkinen A, Kautiainen H, Hannonen P, Ylinen J. Strength training and stretching versus stretching only in the treatment of patients with chronic neck pain: a randomized one-year follow-up study. *Clin Rehabil*. 2008;22(7):592-600.
53. Hakkinen A, Salo P, Tarvainen U, Wiren K, Ylinen J. Effect of manual therapy and stretching on neck muscle strength and mobility in chronic neck pain. *J Rehabil Med*. 2007;39(7):575-9.
54. Chow RT, Barnsley L. Systematic review of the literature of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) in the management of neck pain. *Lasers in Surgery and Medicine*. 2005;37(1):46-52.
55. Tsakitzidis G and Van Royen P. Leren interprofessioneel samenwerken in de gezondheidszorg. Standaard uitgeverij. 2008:133.
56. Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, van Tulder M, Roine R, Jauhiainen M, Hurri H, et al. Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for neck and shoulder pain among working age adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2003(2):CD002194.
57. Peloso Paul Michael J, Gross A, Haines T, Trinh K, Goldsmith Charles H, Burnie Stephen J, et al. Medicinal and injection therapies for mechanical neck disorders. In: *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2007.
58. Brockow T, Heissner T, Franke A, Resch KL. Evaluation of the efficacy of subcutaneous carbon dioxide insufflations for treating acute non specific neck pain in general practice: A sham controlled randomized trial. *Eur J Pain*. 2008;12(1):9-16.
59. Ma K, Jiang W, Zhou Q, Du DP. The efficacy of oxycodone for management of acute pain episodes in chronic neck pain patients. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2008;62(2):241-7.
60. Carragee EJ, Hurwitz EL, Cheng I, Carroll LJ, Nordin M, Guzman J, et al. Treatment of neck pain: injections and surgical interventions: results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010

- Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(4 Suppl):S153-69.
61. Haines T, Gross A, Goldsmith CH, Perry L. Patient education for neck pain with or without radiculopathy (Cochrane review) [with consumer summary]. 2008.
 62. Bernaards CM, Ariens GA, Simons M, Knol DL, Hildebrandt VH. Improving work style behavior in computer workers with neck and upper limb symptoms. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2008;18(1):87-101.
 63. Voerman GE, Sandsjo L, Vollenbroek-Hutten MM, Larsman P, Kadefors R, Hermens HJ. Effects of ambulant myofeedback training and ergonomic counselling in female computer workers with work-related neck-shoulder complaints: a randomized controlled trial. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2007;17(1):137-52.
 64. Shields N, Capper J, Polak T, Taylor N. Are cervical pillows effective in reducing neck pain? [with consumer summary]. *New Zealand Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2006;34(1):3-9.
 65. Helewa A, Goldsmith CH, Smythe HA, Lee P, Obright K, Stitt L. Effect of therapeutic exercise and sleeping neck support on patients with chronic neck pain: a randomized clinical trial. *J Rheumatol*. 2007;34(1):151-8.
 66. <http://www.medterms.com/script/main/art.asp?articlekey=2132>.
 67. Trinh K, Graham N, Gross A, Goldsmith Charles H, Wang E, Cameron Ian D, et al. Acupuncture for neck disorders. In: *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2006.
 68. Itoh K, Katsumi Y, Hirota S, Kitakoji H. Randomised trial of trigger point acupuncture compared with other acupuncture for treatment of chronic neck pain. *Complement Ther Med*. 2007;15(3):172-9.
 69. Vas J, Perea-Milla E, Mendez C, Sanchez Navarro C, Leon Rubio JM, Brioso M, et al. Efficacy and safety of acupuncture for chronic uncomplicated neck pain: a randomised controlled study. *Pain*. 2006;126(1-3):245-55.
 70. Willich SN, Reinhold T, Selim D, Jena S, Brinkhaus B, Witt CM. Cost-effectiveness of acupuncture treatment in patients with chronic neck pain. *Pain*. 2006;125(1-2):107-13.
 71. Gross AR, Haines T, Goldsmith CH, Santaguida L, McLaughlin LM, Peloso P, et al. Knowledge to action: a challenge for neck pain treatment. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2009;39(5):351-63.
 72. Guyatt G, Gutterman D, Baumann MH, Addrizzo-Harris D, Hylek EM, Phillips B, et al. Grading strength of recommendations and quality of evidence in clinical guidelines: report from an american college of chest physicians task force. *Chest*. 2006;129(1):174-81.

This page is left intentionally blank.

KCE reports

1. Efficacité et rentabilité des thérapies de sevrage tabagique. D/2004/10.273/2.
2. Etude relative aux coûts potentiels liés à une éventuelle modification des règles du droit de la responsabilité médicale (Phase I). D/2004/10.273/4.
3. Utilisation des antibiotiques en milieu hospitalier dans le cas de la pyélonéphrite aiguë. D/2004/10.273/6.
4. Leucoréduction. Une mesure envisageable dans le cadre de la politique nationale de sécurité des transfusions sanguines. D/2004/10.273/8.
5. Evaluation des risques préopératoires. D/2004/10.273/10.
6. Validation du rapport de la Commission d'examen du sous financement des hôpitaux. D/2004/10.273/12.
7. Recommandation nationale relative aux soins prénatals: Une base pour un itinéraire clinique de suivi de grossesses. D/2004/10.273/14.
8. Systèmes de financement des médicaments hospitaliers: étude descriptive de certains pays européens et du Canada. D/2004/10.273/16.
9. Feedback: évaluation de l'impact et des barrières à l'implémentation – Rapport de recherche: partie I. D/2005/10.273/02.
10. Le coût des prothèses dentaires. D/2005/10.273/04.
11. Dépistage du cancer du sein. D/2005/10.273/06.
12. Etude d'une méthode de financement alternative pour le sang et les dérivés sanguins labiles dans les hôpitaux. D/2005/10.273/08.
13. Traitement endovasculaire de la sténose carotidienne. D/2005/10.273/10.
14. Variations des pratiques médicales hospitalières en cas d'infarctus aigu du myocarde en Belgique. D/2005/10.273/12.
15. Evolution des dépenses de santé. D/2005/10.273/14.
16. Etude relative aux coûts potentiels liés à une éventuelle modification des règles du droit de la responsabilité médicale. Phase II : développement d'un modèle actuariel et premières estimations. D/2005/10.273/16.
17. Evaluation des montants de référence. D/2005/10.273/18.
18. Utilisation des itinéraires cliniques et guides de bonne pratique afin de déterminer de manière prospective les honoraires des médecins hospitaliers: plus facile à dire qu'à faire.. D/2005/10.273/20
19. Evaluation de l'impact d'une contribution personnelle forfaitaire sur le recours au service d'urgences. D/2005/10.273/22.
20. HTA Diagnostic Moléculaire en Belgique. D/2005/10.273/24, D/2005/10.273/26.
21. HTA Matériel de Stomie en Belgique. D/2005/10.273/28.
22. HTA Tomographie par Emission de Positrons en Belgique. D/2005/10.273/30.
23. HTA Le traitement électif endovasculaire de l'anévrisme de l'aorte abdominale (AAA). D/2005/10.273/33.
24. L'emploi des peptides natriurétiques dans l'approche diagnostique des patients présentant une suspicion de décompensation cardiaque. D/2005/10.273/35
25. Endoscopie par capsule. D2006/10.273/02.
26. Aspects médico-légaux des recommandations de bonne pratique médicale. D2006/10.273/06.
27. Qualité et organisation des soins du diabète de type 2. D2006/10.273/08.
28. Recommandations provisoires pour les évaluations pharmacoéconomiques en Belgique. D2006/10.273/11.
29. Recommandations nationales Collège d'oncologie : A. cadre général pour un manuel d'oncologie B. base scientifique pour itinéraires cliniques de diagnostic et traitement, cancer colorectal et cancer du testicule. D2006/10.273/13.
30. Inventaire des bases de données de soins de santé. D2006/10.273/15.
31. Health Technology Assessment : l'antigène prostatique spécifique (PSA) dans le dépistage du cancer de la prostate. D2006/10.273/18.
32. Feedback: évaluation de l'impact et des barrières à l'implémentation - Rapport de recherche: partie II. D2006/10.273/20.
33. Effets et coûts de la vaccination des enfants Belges au moyen du vaccin conjugué antipneumococcique. D2006/10.273/22.
34. Trastuzumab pour les stades précoces du cancer du sein. D2006/10.273/24.

35. Etude relative aux coûts potentiels liés à une éventuelle modification des règles du droit de la responsabilité médicale – Phase III : affinement des estimations. D/2006/10.273/27.
36. Traitement pharmacologique et chirurgical de l'obésité. Prise en charge résidentielle des enfants sévèrement obèses en Belgique. D/2006/10.273/29.
37. Health Technology Assessment Imagerie par Résonance Magnétique. D/2006/10.273/33.
38. Dépistage du cancer du col de l'utérus et recherche du Papillomavirus humain (HPV). D/2006/10.273/36
39. Evaluation rapide de technologies émergentes s'appliquant à la colonne vertébrale : remplacement de disque intervertébral et vertébro/cyphoplastie par ballonnet. D/2006/10.273/39.
40. Etat fonctionnel du patient: un instrument potentiel pour le remboursement de la kinésithérapie en Belgique? D/2006/10.273/41.
41. Indicateurs de qualité cliniques. D/2006/10.273/44.
42. Etude des disparités de la chirurgie électorale en Belgique. D/2006/10.273/46.
43. Mise à jour de recommandations de bonne pratique existantes. D/2006/10.273/49.
44. Procédure d'évaluation des dispositifs médicaux émergents. D/2006/10.273/51.
45. HTA Dépistage du Cancer Colorectal : état des lieux scientifique et impact budgétaire pour la Belgique. D/2006/10.273/54.
46. Health Technology Assessment. Polysomnographie et monitoring à domicile des nourrissons en prévention de la mort subite. D/2006/10.273/60.
47. L'utilisation des médicaments dans les maisons de repos et les maisons de repos et de soins Belges. D/2006/10.273/62
48. Lombalgie chronique. D/2006/10.273/64.
49. Médicaments antiviraux en cas de grippe saisonnière et pandémique. Revue de littérature et recommandations de bonne pratique. D/2006/10.273/66.
50. Contributions personnelles en matière de soins de santé en Belgique. L'impact des suppléments. D/2006/10.273/69.
51. Besoin de soins chroniques des personnes âgées de 18 à 65 ans et atteintes de lésions cérébrales acquises. D/2007/10.273/02.
52. Rapid Assessment: Prévention cardiovasculaire primaire dans la pratique du médecin généraliste en Belgique. D/2007/10.273/04.
53. Financement des soins Infirmiers Hospitaliers. D/2007/10 273/06
54. Vaccination des nourrissons contre le rotavirus en Belgique. Analyse coût-efficacité
55. Valeur en termes de données probantes des informations écrites de l'industrie pharmaceutique destinées aux médecins généralistes. D/2007/10.273/13
56. Matériel orthopédique en Belgique: Health Technology Assessment. D/2007/10.273/15.
57. Organisation et Financement de la Réadaptation Locomotrice et Neurologique en Belgique D/2007/10.273/19
58. Le Défibrillateur Cardiaque Implantable.: un rapport d'évaluation de technologie de santé D/2007/10.273/22
59. Analyse de biologie clinique en médecine général. D/2007/10.273/25
60. Tests de la fonction pulmonaire chez l'adulte. D/2007/10.273/28
61. Traitement de plaies par pression négative: une évaluation rapide. D/2007/10.273/31
62. Radiothérapie Conformationnelle avec Modulation d'intensité (IMRT). D/2007/10.273/33.
63. Support scientifique du Collège d'Oncologie: un guideline pour la prise en charge du cancer du sein. D/2007/10.273/36.
64. Vaccination HPV pour la prévention du cancer du col de l'utérus en Belgique: Health Technology Assessment. D/2007/10.273/42.
65. Organisation et financement du diagnostic génétique en Belgique. D/2007/10.273/45.
66. Drug Eluting Stents en Belgique: Health Technology Assessment. D/2007/10.273/48.
67. Hadronthérapie. D/2007/10.273/51.
68. Indemnisation des dommages résultant de soins de santé - Phase IV : Clé de répartition entre le Fonds et les assureurs. D/2007/10.273/53.
69. Assurance de Qualité pour le cancer du rectum – Phase I: Recommandation de bonne pratique pour la prise en charge du cancer rectal D/2007/10.273/55
70. Etude comparative des programmes d'accréditation hospitalière en Europe. D/2008/10.273/02
71. Recommandation de bonne pratique clinique pour cinq tests ophtalmiques. D/2008/10.273/05
72. L'offre de médecins en Belgique. Situation actuelle et défis. D/2008/10.273/08

73. Financement du programme de soins pour le patient gériatrique dans l'hôpital classique : Définition et évaluation du patient gériatrique, fonction de liaison et évaluation d'un instrument pour un financement approprié. D/2008/10.273/12
74. Oxygénothérapie Hyperbare: Rapid Assessment. D/2008/10.273/14.
75. Guideline pour la prise en charge du cancer oesophagien et gastrique: éléments scientifiques à destination du Collège d'Oncologie. D/2008/10.273/17.
76. Promotion de la qualité de la médecine générale en Belgique: status quo ou quo vadis ? D/2008/10.273/19.
77. Orthodontie chez les enfants et adolescents D/2008/10.273/21
78. Recommandations pour les évaluations pharmacoéconomiques en Belgique. D/2008/10.273/24.
79. Remboursement des radioisotopes en Belgique. D/2008/10.273/27.
80. Évaluation des effets du maximum à facturer sur la consommation et l'accessibilité financière des soins de santé. D/2008/10.273/36.
81. Assurance de qualité pour le cancer rectal – phase 2: développement et test d'un ensemble d'indicateurs de qualité. D/2008/10.273/39
82. Angiographie coronaire par tomomodensitométrie 64-détecteurs chez les patients suspects de maladie coronarienne. D/2008/10.273/41
83. Comparaison internationale des règles de remboursement et aspects légaux de la chirurgie plastique D/2008/10.273/44
84. Les séjours psychiatriques de longue durée en lits T. D/2008/10.273/47
85. Comparaison de deux systèmes de financement des soins de première ligne en Belgique. D/2008/10.273/50.
86. Différenciation de fonctions dans les soins infirmiers :possibilités et limites D/2008/10.273/53
87. Consommation de kinésithérapie et de médecine physique et de réadaptation en Belgique. D/2008/10.273/55
88. Syndrome de Fatigue Chronique : diagnostic, traitement et organisation des soins. D/2008/10.273/59.
89. Evaluation des certains nouveaux traitements du cancer de la prostate et de l'hypertrophie bénigne de la prostate. D/2008/10.273/62
90. Médecine générale: comment promouvoir l'attraction et la rétention dans la profession ? D/2008/10.273/64.
91. Appareils auditifs en Belgique: health technology assessment. D/2008/10.273/68
92. Les infections nosocomiales en Belgique : Volet I, Etude Nationale de Prévalence. D/2008/10.273/71.
93. Détection des événements indésirables dans les bases de données administratives. D/2008/10.273/74.
94. Soins maternels intensifs (Maternal Intensive Care) en Belgique. D/2008/10.273/78.
95. Implantation percutanée des valvules cardiaques dans le cas de maladies valvulaires congénitales et dégénératives: A rapid Health Technology Assessment. D/2007/10.273/80.
96. Construction d'un index médical pour les contrats privés d'assurance maladie. D/2008/10.273/83.
97. Centres de réadaptation ORL/PSY : groupes cibles, preuves scientifiques et organisation des soins. D/2009/10.273/85.
98. Évaluation de programmes de vaccination généraux et ciblés contre l'hépatite A en Belgique. D/2008/10.273/89.
99. Financement de l'hôpital de jour gériatrique. D/2008/10.273/91.
100. Valeurs seuils pour le rapport coût-efficacité en soins de santé. D/2008/10.273/95.
101. Enregistrement vidéo des interventions chirurgicales par endoscopie : une évaluation rapide. D/2008/10.273/98.
102. Les infections nosocomiales en Belgique: Volet II: Impact sur la mortalité et sur les coûts. D/2009/10.273/100.
103. Réformes dans l'organisation des soins de santé mentale : étude d'évaluation des 'projets thérapeutiques' - 1er rapport intermédiaire. D/2009/10.273/05.
104. Chirurgie assistée par robot: health technology assessment. D/2009/10.273/08
105. Soutien scientifique au Collège d'Oncologie: recommandations pour la pratique clinique dans la prise en charge du cancer du pancréas. D/2009/10.273/11
106. Imagerie par résonance magnétique : analyse de coûts. D/2009/10.273/15
107. Indemnisation des dommages résultant de soins de santé. Phase V: impact budgétaire de la transposition du système français en Belgique. D/2009/10.273/17

- 108. Le Tiotropium dans le traitement des BronchoPneumopathies Chroniques Obstructives: Health Technology Assessment. D/2009/10.273/19
- 109. A propos de la valeur de l'EEG et des potentiels évoqués dans la pratique clinique. D/2009/10.273/22
- 110. La tomographie par émission de positrons en Belgique: une mise à jour. D/2009/10.273/25
- 111. Interventions pharmaceutiques et non pharmaceutiques dans la maladie d'Alzheimer : une évaluation rapide. D/2009/10.273/28
- 112. Politiques relatives aux maladies orphelines et aux médicaments orphelins. D/2009/10.273/31
- 113. Le volume des interventions chirurgicales et son impact sur le résultat : étude de faisabilité basée sur des données belges. D/2009/10.273/34.
- 114. Valves endobronchiales dans le traitement de l'emphysème pulmonaire avancé: un rapid Health Technology Assessment. D/2009/10.273/38
- 115. Organisation des soins palliatifs en Belgique. D/2009/10.273/41
- 116. Evaluation rapide des implants inter-épineux et des vis pédiculaires pour la stabilisation dynamique de la colonne vertébrale lombaire. D/2009/10.273/45
- 117. Utilisation des coagulomètres portables chez les patients sous anticoagulants oraux: Health technology Assesment. D/2009/10.273/48.
- 118. Avantages, désavantages et faisabilité de l'introduction de programmes "P4Q" en Belgique. D/2009/10.273/51.
- 119. Douleur cervicales atypiques: diagnostic et traitement. D/2009/10.273/55.

