

1 **Clinical Practice Guideline:** **Spinal Manipulation for Treatment of Acute,**
 2 **Sub-Acute, and Chronic Low Back Pain**

3
 4 **Date of Implementation:** **September 18, 2008**

5
 6 **Product:** **Specialty**
 7

8
 9 **POLICY**

10 American Specialty Health – Specialty (ASH) clinical committees have determined that
 11 spinal manipulation for treatment of acute, sub-acute, and chronic low back pain is
 12 established as clinically effective, is professionally recognized, and has a favorable
 13 benefit:risk profile.
 14

15 **PROCESS AND DEFINITIONS**

16 When developing, reviewing, and approving clinical policy, ASH peer-review
 17 committees consider whether the technique/procedure:

- 18 • Is established as clinically effective by:
 - 19 ○ Scientific information published in an acceptable peer-reviewed clinical
 - 20 science resource, and
 - 21 ○ The consensus opinion of the Evidence Evaluation Committee (EEC)
 - 22 when available;
- 23 • Is professionally recognized by:
 - 24 ○ Inclusion in the educational standards accepted by the majority of the
 - 25 professions' educational institutions,
 - 26 ○ Wide acceptance and use of the practice, and
 - 27 ○ Recommendations for use made by healthcare practitioners practicing in
 - 28 the relevant clinical area;
- 29 • Poses a health and safety risk; and
- 30 • Is plausible or implausible
 - 31 ○ A belief, theory, or mechanism of health and disease that can be
 - 32 explained within the existing framework of scientific methods, reasoning,
 - 33 and available knowledge is considered plausible.
 - 34 ○ A treatment intervention or diagnostic procedure that requires the
 - 35 existence of forces, mechanisms, or biological processes that are not
 - 36 known to exist within the current framework of scientific methods,
 - 37 reasoning, and available knowledge is considered implausible.

38
 39 **Substitution harm (indirect harm):** Compromised clinical outcomes caused by:

- 40 • Utilizing a specific diagnostic or therapeutic procedure when the safety, clinical
- 41 effectiveness, or diagnostic utility is either unknown or is known to be unsafe,
- 42 ineffective, or of no diagnostic utility, *instead of* a diagnostic or therapeutic

1 procedure known to be safe, be clinically effective, or to have diagnostic utility;
2 or

- 3 • The utilization of a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure that is substantially less
4 effective or safe than another procedure with established safety, and clinical
5 effectiveness or utility.

6

7 **Labeling effects (non-specific harm):** The harm that results from identifying in a
8 patient a condition or a finding that is not clinically valid.

9

10 **Safe:** The terms “safe” and “safety,” are used only with specific reference to the
11 absence of direct harm. Direct harm would include any injury to a patient caused
12 by the mechanical, thermal, biological, chemical, pharmacological, electrical,
13 electromagnetic, or psycho-dynamic properties of a diagnostic or therapeutic
14 procedure, and as such, the procedure would be considered unsafe.

15

16 **Direct harm:** Any injury to a patient caused by the mechanical, thermal, biological,
17 chemical, pharmacological, electrical, electromagnetic, or psycho-dynamic
18 properties of a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure.

19

20 **Benefit versus risk profile:** The relative effectiveness or utility of a therapeutic
21 intervention or diagnostic procedure versus its potential for direct harm.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Description/Background

Manual therapy is practiced by a variety of health care providers including, but not limited to: chiropractors, osteopaths, physical therapists, and naturopaths. Manual therapists differ with respect to the specific techniques they use, reflecting the diversities in their education, training, and philosophical foundations. Chiropractic spinal manipulation, for example, requires identification of spinal segmental joint dysfunction characterized by altered joint alignment, motion, or physiologic function in an intact spinal motion segment. The primary objectives of chiropractic spinal manipulation in the treatment of back pain are to alleviate musculoskeletal pain, muscle spasm, and functional impairment of the spine. This form of manipulation is a therapeutic procedure characterized by controlled force, leverage, direction, amplitude, and velocity (directional, high velocity, low amplitude thrust) (Peterson & Bergmann, 2002). This is distinguished from the use of the term spinal manipulation by other professions which may include a spectrum of manual therapies such as mobilization, soft tissue manipulation, and muscle-energy techniques.

1 According to a national health care usage survey, chronic low back pain was one of the
 2 most frequent reasons people sought alternative therapy (Eisenberg, et al., 1998). The
 3 main benefit derived from complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) therapy was
 4 symptom relief (Astin, 1998). Of the estimated 42% of the US population who utilized
 5 CAM therapies in 1997, almost one third sought chiropractic treatment (Coulter, et al.,
 6 2002). This reflects an increasing demand for CAM in general and an increasing belief
 7 that CAM therapy is more helpful than conventional medicine for treatment of back pain
 8 (Kessler, et al., 2001; Eisenberg, et al., 2001). In fact, up to 40% of patients with low
 9 back pain chose chiropractic care to address their health care needs (Waddell, 1996).

10 **Evidence and Research**

11 The effectiveness (including relative effectiveness) of spinal manipulation for low back
 12 pain has been assessed internationally in over 50 randomized controlled trials (RCT) and
 13 over 20 systematic reviews of these trials since 1974. These studies have evaluated
 14 different types of manual therapies by comparing them to reference or sham therapies.
 15 More than a third of the trials (18) evaluated manipulation performed by chiropractors. In
 16 the remaining trials, manipulation/mobilization was performed by doctors of osteopathy,
 17 physiotherapists, medical doctors, and manual therapists (Bronfort, et al., 2004). The
 18 studies were conducted on patients at varying stages within back pain episodes, (i.e.,
 19 acute, subacute and/or chronic). The reviews address nonspecific low back pain with the
 20 exception of two.
 21

22
 23 Eight systematic reviews of randomized trials published prior to 1997 evaluated the
 24 effectiveness of spinal manipulation for the treatment of acute and/or chronic low back
 25 pain (LBP) (Ottenbacher & Di Fabio, 1985; Anderson, et al., 1992; Di Fabio, 1992;
 26 Shekelle, et al., 1992; Koes, et al., 1996; Van Tulder, et al., 1997; Bronfort, 1999; Mior,
 27 2001). Of the seven (7) reviews addressing acute LBP, six (6) favored manipulation
 28 (Ottenbacher & Di Fabio, 1985; Anderson, et al., 1992; Di Fabio, 1992; Shekelle, et al.,
 29 1992; Bronfort, 1999; Van Tulder, et al., 1997), while one found the evidence
 30 inconclusive for manipulation in general (Koes, et al., 1996) and chiropractic in particular
 31 (Assendelft, et al., 1996). The eighth review supported the effectiveness of manipulation,
 32 but did not distinguish acute and chronic LBP (Anderson, et al., 1992). Findings from the
 33 seven (7) reviews evaluating manipulation for the treatment of chronic LBP evolved over
 34 time. The earliest four (4) reviews found inconclusive evidence for effectiveness of
 35 manipulation (Ottenbacher & Di Fabio, 1985; Di Fabio, 1992; Shekelle, et al., 1992;
 36 Koes, et al., 1996). In contrast, the three (3) later reviews found moderate to strong
 37 evidence that manipulation was better than placebo, general medical practice, massage,
 38 bed rest, and analgesics (Van Tulder, 1997; Bronfort, 1999; Mior, 2001). None of the
 39 seven (7) reviews found evidence supporting ineffectiveness of manipulation or an
 40 advantage for standard medical care and other interventions.

1 Several systematic reviews were published between 2002 and 2008. Many of these
2 reviews (Assendelft, et al., 2003; Assendelft, et al., 2004; Cherkin, et al., 2003; Chou &
3 Huffman, 2007; Bronfort, et al., 2008) represent the investigators' specific attempts to
4 address acknowledged biases and shortcomings of the older systematic reviews (e.g.,
5 Assendelft, et al., 1995). These systematic reviews include several recent high quality
6 trials that compared chiropractic manipulation with reference treatments.

7
8 Ferreira, et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis comparing spinal manipulation to
9 NSAIDs. The pooled difference between therapies on a 100-point scale showed that
10 manipulation reduced disability by 7 points and pain by 14 points. For chronic low back
11 pain, the authors concluded no clinically important advantage of spinal manipulation over
12 NSAIDs for disability and found the evidence for pain relief uncertain. For acute low
13 back pain, manipulation was similar to medical care, exercise, and physiotherapy, but
14 manipulation was also little better than placebo and no treatment (Ferreira, et al., 2003).

15
16 Pengel, et al. (2002) found the evidence inconclusive, but suggested that spinal
17 manipulation might be useful for reducing transition from subacute to chronic low back
18 pain. The transition outcome is unique among systematic reviews of manipulation.

19
20 Assendelft, et al. (2003; 2004) reviewed trials published through 2000. They used a
21 random-effects meta-regression to compare the effectiveness of spinal manipulative
22 therapy with other therapies. These investigators concluded that spinal manipulation was
23 more effective than sham treatments. It was neither superior nor inferior to physical
24 therapy/exercise, general practice/analgesics or back school. In a companion review,
25 Cherkin, et al. (2003) made a stronger conclusion that manipulation is as good as the
26 comparison therapies, in addition to being superior to sham interventions.

27
28 Bronfort, et al. (2004) reviewed trials published through 2002. They conducted a best
29 evidence synthesis (Slavin, 1995) which stressed fastidious criteria for formulating levels
30 of evidence based on methodologic quality, quantity of trials, and statistical significance
31 of findings. Statistical pooling of trial results was not conducted because of heterogeneity
32 of patient population, interventions, outcomes, and follow-up time points. The authors
33 did not feel they could pool any trial data because of methodological heterogeneity.
34 Spinal manipulation had to demonstrate at least similarity of therapeutic effect to
35 efficacious treatments or superiority to placebo/sham/ineffective interventions to be
36 classified as an efficacious therapy. The investigators reported high quality evidence to
37 support the effectiveness of manipulation for the relief of both acute and chronic back
38 pain. The comparison interventions in the high quality trials included standard medical
39 care, massage, bed rest, mobilization, physical therapy, soft tissue therapy, home
40 exercise, McKenzie Therapy, an information booklet, and sham procedures. Evidence
41 from lower quality trials was generally consistent with the findings of the higher quality

1 studies. The authors concluded that manipulation is a viable alternative for the treatment
2 of LBP.

3
4 Woodhead and Clough (2005) determined that the evidence supported manipulation as a
5 treatment for low back pain, particularly for chronic patients. Keller, et al. (2007)
6 conducted a meta-analysis of randomized trials published through 2005. They computed
7 a pooled effect size for manipulation for acute and for chronic low back pain. They found
8 that manipulation had only a small to moderate effect size advantage over NSAIDs. This
9 is not a negative finding in the light of the relative health risks of the two interventions.

10
11 Chou, et al. (2007) conducted a review of nonpharmacological treatments in developing a
12 clinical practice guideline for the American Pain Society and the American College of
13 Physicians. Randomized trials published by 2006 were included. The authors found
14 evidence from systematic reviews and randomized trials supporting their
15 recommendation of spinal manipulation for the treatment of acute and chronic low back
16 pain.

17
18 Bronfort, et al. (2008) updated their best evidence synthesis for chronic low back pain
19 (trials through 2007). The new trials were of moderate to high quality. The studies
20 showed manipulation to be superior to medicine and acupuncture, and found that the
21 addition of manipulation to medical care improved back function in the short and long
22 term. Bronfort, et al. found that the updated review strengthened the evidence supporting
23 the effectiveness of spinal manipulation. They concluded that the preponderance of the
24 evidence for effectiveness and the low risk of serious adverse events support
25 manipulation as a treatment option for chronic low back pain. Furthermore, manipulation
26 is “at least as effective as other efficacious and commonly used interventions” (Bronfort,
27 et al., 2008).

28
29 Licciardone, et al. (2005) studied osteopathic manipulative treatment; spinal
30 manipulation is confounded with other therapies in this review. Hettinga, et al. (2008)
31 concluded that a combination of manipulation and mobilization was efficacious but
32 spinal manipulation alone was not. Most reviews identified effectiveness for
33 manipulation alone; the difference in inference can be explained by atypical study
34 selection and evidence synthesis methods. Ernst and Canter (2006) wrote what they
35 called an unbiased systematic review of systematic reviews. This paper has been
36 extensively criticized and discredited by authors with diverse backgrounds and expertise
37 (Bronfort, et al., 2006).

38
39 Vroomen, et al. (2000) noted some evidence for effectiveness for the treatment of
40 sciatica. Bronfort, et al. (2004) was more cautious because of the lower quality of the two
41 supporting trials; Lisi, et al. (2005) found definitive conclusions were premature. In
42 contrast, Luijsterburg, et al. (2007) found that spinal manipulation had no value for the
43 care of radicular syndrome based on the same two trials. However, the treatment effect

1 size data abstracted from the two randomized trials reviewed on the subject were
2 dissimilar to the treatment effect data abstracted by Bronfort, et al. (2008).

3
4 A large practice-based, nonrandomized study comparing chiropractic and medical care
5 supports the generalizability of RCT findings to general practice (Haas, et al., 2004;
6 Haas, et al., 2005). This study found a clinically important advantage for chiropractic
7 care (manipulation with adjunct soft tissue work and physical modalities) for chronic low
8 back pain and a small advantage for the care of acute low back pain. The study suggested
9 the greatest relative effectiveness for the subgroup of patients with pain radiating below
10 the knee. Bronfort et al. (2014) completed a study that concurred with the Hass et al.
11 study. They determined that for patients with back related leg pain (BRLP), SMT plus
12 home exercise and advice was more effective than home exercise and advice alone after
13 12 weeks, but the benefit was sustained only for some secondary outcomes at 52 weeks.

14
15 According to an updated Cochrane review (2013), spinal manipulative therapy (SMT) is no
16 more effective in participants with acute low-back pain than inert interventions, sham SMT,
17 or when added to another intervention. SMT also appears to be no better than other
18 recommended therapies. The authors state that given the limited number of studies per
19 comparison, outcome, and time interval, future research is required. In another updated
20 Cochrane review (2011) on SMT for chronic low back pain, high-quality evidence suggests
21 that there is no clinically relevant difference between SMT and other interventions for
22 reducing pain and improving function in patients with chronic low-back pain. Evidence was
23 of varying quality showing that SMT has a significant short-term effect on pain relief and
24 functional status when added to another intervention.

25 26 **Safety**

27 The potential risk of a major complication due to spinal manipulation is rare (Terrett &
28 Kleynhans, 1992; Hurwitz, et al., 1996). The risk of cauda equina is estimated to be about
29 1 per 100 million for lumbar manipulations (Haldeman & Rubenstein, 1992). More
30 common however is transient local muscle and/or joint soreness (Senstad, et al., 1997).
31 This is in sharp contrast to the reported risks associated with medication in general where
32 220,000 deaths are reported each year or the significant risks associated with medications
33 commonly used in the management of spinal pain. It has been reported that there may be
34 as many as 10,000 to 20,000 fatalities (Lazarou, et al., 1998; Weingart, et al., 2000) as
35 well as multiple organ systems adversely affected by the commonly used NSAIDS
36 (Carson & Willett, 1993; Wolfe, et al., 1999). COX-2 inhibitors (Bombardier, et al.,
37 2000) as well as the relatively benign analgesic acetaminophen (Whitcomb & Block,
38 1994) have also been associated with serious GI, cardiovascular and hepatic problems at
39 rates that are orders of magnitude greater than complications due to spinal manipulation.
40 A more detailed discussion including contraindications may be found in Bronfort, et al.
41 (2008).

1 Two systematic reviews addressed safety of manipulation for lumbar disc herniations.
 2 Lisi, et al. (2005) found limited evidence of safety. Oliphant (2004) concluded, “The
 3 apparent safety of spinal manipulation, especially when compared with other “medically
 4 accepted” treatments for LDH [lumbar disc herniation], should stimulate its use in the
 5 conservative treatment plan of LDH.”

6 7 **Conclusions**

- 8
- 9 1) Spinal manipulation may be superior to placebo and no treatment for nonspecific
 10 low back pain in a subgroup of patients.
 - 11
 - 12 2) Spinal manipulation is at least as good as other efficacious and commonly used
 13 therapies for nonspecific low back pain. Adding SMT to other treatments appears
 14 to improve treatment outcomes and doesn’t increase cost.
 - 15
 - 16 3) There s some evidence of effectiveness for SMT for the treatment of back related
 17 leg pain.
 - 18
 - 19 B) Systematic reviews must be interpreted with caution because of lack of uniformity of
 20 review design and interpretation of evidence.
 - 21
 - 22 1) Findings depend on type of review performed, rules of evidence, threshold for
 23 important treatment effect, quality scoring system and interpretation, and the
 24 inclusion/exclusion of some studies.
 - 25
 - 26 2) There is insufficient clinical homogeneity (treatment regimen, comparison group,
 27 outcomes, follow-up time points, and patients) to perform meaningful meta-
 28 analysis.
 - 29
 - 30 C) Preventive and maintenance care with spinal manipulation have yet to be justified.
 - 31
 - 32 D) Further dose-response studies are required to identify an optimal range of visits,
 33 number and type of adjunct therapies, and concentration of care including visit
 34 patterns.
 - 35
 - 36 E) Well-defined subgroups of low back pain must be identified and studied.
 - 37
 - 38 F) Severe adverse events are extremely rare. Most complications are mild and of short
 39 duration.
 - 40
 - 41 G) Overall, the preponderance of evidence supports the use of spinal manipulation for
 42 the treatment of low back pain.

- 1 1) Spinal manipulation is recommended for acute and chronic low back pain.
 2
 3 2) Spinal manipulation has both short-term and long-term benefit.
 4

5 **References**

- 6 Anderson R, Meeker W, Wirick B, Mootz R, Kirk D, Adams A. A meta-analysis of
 7 clinical trials of spinal manipulation. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1992;15:181-94.
 8
 9 Andersson GBJ. Epidemiological features of chronic low-back pain. *Lancet*
 10 1999;354:581-5.
 11
 12 Arkuszewski J. Joint blockage: a disease, a syndrome, or a sign. *Man Med* 1988;3:132-4.
 13
 14 Assendelft WJJ, Koes BW, Knipschild PG, Bouter LM. The relationship between
 15 methodological quality and conclusions in reviews of spinal manipulation. *JAMA*
 16 1995;274:1942-8.
 17
 18 Assendelft WJJ, Koes BW, van der Heijden G, Bouter LM. The effectiveness of
 19 chiropractic for treatment of low back pain. An update and attempt at statistical
 20 pooling. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1996;19:499-507.
 21
 22 Assendelft WJJ, Morton SC, Yu EI, Suttorp MJ, Shekelle PG. Spinal manipulative
 23 therapy for low back pain. A meta-analysis of effectiveness relative to other
 24 therapies. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;138:871-81.
 25
 26 Assendelft WJJ, Morton SC, Yu EI, Suttorp MJ, Shekelle PG. Spinal manipulative
 27 therapy for low-back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2004;(1):CD000447. DOI:
 28 10.1002/14651858.CD000447.pub2.
 29
 30 Astin JA. Why patients use alternative medicine. *JAMA* 1998;279:1548-53.
 31
 32 Bialosky JE, George SZ, Horn ME, Price DD, Staud R, Robinson ME. Spinal
 33 manipulative therapy-specific changes in pain sensitivity in individuals with low
 34 back pain (NCT01168999). *J Pain*. 2014 Feb;15(2):136-48.
 35
 36 Black N. Why we need observational studies to evaluate the effectiveness of health care.
 37 *BMJ* 1996;312:1215-8.
 38
 39 Boal RW, Gillette RG. Central neuronal plasticity, low back pain and spinal manipulative
 40 therapy. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2004;27:314-26.

- 1 Bogduk N, Jull G. The theoretical pathology of acute locked back: a basis for
2 manipulative therapy. *Man Med* 1985;23:77-81.
3
- 4 Bolton PS. Reflex effects of vertebral subluxations: the peripheral nervous system. an
5 update. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2000;23:101-3.
6
- 7 Bombardier C, Laine L, Reicin A, Shapiro D, Burgos-Vargas R, Davis B, Day RFMB,
8 Hawkey CJ, Hochber MC, Kvien TK, Schnitzer TJ. Comparison of upper
9 gastrointestinal toxicity of rofecoxib and naproxen in patients with rheumatoid
10 arthritis. VIGOR Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343:1520-8.
11
- 12 Brennan PC, Triano JJ, McGregor M, Kokjohn K, Hondras MA, Brennan DC. Enhanced
13 neutrophil respiratory burst as a biological marker for manipulation forces: duration
14 of the effect and association with substance P and tumor necrosis factor. *J*
15 *Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1992;15:83-9.
16
- 17 Bronfort G. Spinal manipulation: current state of research and its indications. *Neurologic*
18 *Clinics of North America* 1999;17:91-111.
19
- 20 Bronfort G, Haas M, Evans RL, Bouter LM. Efficacy of spinal manipulative therapy for
21 low back and neck pain: a systematic review and best evidence synthesis. *Spine J*
22 *2004;4:335-56.*
23
- 24 Bronfort G, Haas M, Evans R. The clinical effectiveness of spinal manipulation for
25 musculoskeletal conditions. In Haldeman S, Dagenais S, editors. *Principles and*
26 *practice of chiropractic*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2005. p. 147-66.
27
- 28 Bronfort G, Haas M, Moher D, Bouter LM, Van Tulder MW, Triano J, Assendelft WJ,
29 Evans RL, Dagenais S, Rosner A. Review conclusions by Ernst and Canter regarding
30 spinal manipulation refuted. *Chiropr Osteopat* 2006;14:14. [Full-Text]
31
- 32 Bronfort G, Haas M, Evans R, Kawchuk G, Dagenais S. Evidence-informed management
33 of chronic low back pain with spinal manipulation and mobilization. *Spine J*
34 *2008;8:213-225.*
- 35 Bronfort G, Hondras MA, Schulz CA, Evans RL, Long CR, Grimm R. Spinal
36 manipulation and home exercise with advice for subacute and chronic back-related
37 leg pain: a trial with adaptive allocation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2014 Sep 16;161(6):381-91
38
- 39 Budgell BS. Reflex effects of subluxation: the autonomic nervous system. *J Manipulative*
40 *Physiol Ther* 2000;23:104-6.

- 1 Carson JL, Willett LR. Toxicity of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: An overview of
2 the epidemiological evidence. *Drugs* 1993;46(Suppl 1):243-8.
- 3
- 4 Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Street JH, Barlow W. Predicting poor outcomes for back pain
5 seen in primary care using patients' own criteria. *Spine* 1996;21:2900-7.
- 6
- 7 Cherkin DC, Sherman KJ, Deyo RA, Shekelle PG. A review of the evidence for the
8 effectiveness, safety, and cost of acupuncture, massage therapy, and spinal
9 manipulation for back pain. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;138:898-906.
- 10
- 11 Chou R, Huffman LH. Nonpharmacologic therapies for acute and chronic low back pain:
12 a review of the evidence for an American Pain Society/American College of
13 Physicians Clinical Practice Guideline. *Ann Intern Med* 2007;147:492-504.
- 14
- 15 Chou R, Qaseem A, Snow V, Casey D, Cross JT, Jr., Shekelle P, Owens DK. Diagnosis
16 and treatment of low back pain: a joint clinical practice guideline from the American
17 College of Physicians and the American Pain Society. *Ann Intern Med*
18 2007;147:478-91.
- 19
- 20 Colle F, Rannou F, Revel M, Fermanian J, Poiraudeau S. Impact of quality scales on
21 levels of evidence inferred from a systematic review of exercise therapy for low back
22 pain. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2002;83:1745-52.
- 23
- 24 Coulter ID, Hurwitz EL, Adams AA, Genovese BJ, Hays R, Shekelle PG. Patients using
25 chiropractors in North America. *Spine* 2002;27:291-8.
- 26
- 27 Croft PR, Macfarlane GJ, Papageorgiou AC, Thomas E, Silman AJ. Outcome of low
28 back pain in general practice: a prospective study. *BMJ* 1998;316:1356-9.
- 29
- 30 Descarreaux M, Blouin JS, Drolet M, Papadimitriou S, Teasdale N. Efficacy of
31 preventive spinal manipulation for chronic low-back pain and related disabilities: a
32 preliminary study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2004;27:509-14.
- 33
- 34 DeVocht JW, Pickar JG, Wilder DG. Spinal manipulation alters electromyographic
35 activity of paraspinal muscles: a descriptive study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*
36 2005;28:465-71.
- 37
- 38 Di Fabio RP. Efficacy of manual therapy. *Phys Ther* 1992;72:853-64.
- 39
- 40 Dishman JD, Ball KA, Burke J. Central Motor Excitability Changes After Spinal
41 Manipulation: A transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *J Manipulative Physiol*
42 *Ther* 2002;25:January1-9.

- 1 Eisenberg DM, Davis RB, Ettner SL, Appel S, Wilkey S, Van Rompay M, Kessler RC.
2 Trends in alternative medicine use in the United States, 1990-1997. JAMA
3 1998;280:1569-75.
4
- 5 Eisenberg DM, Kessler RC, Van Rompay M, Kaptchuk TJ, Wilkey S, Appel S, Davis
6 RB. Perceptions about complementary therapies relative to conventional therapies
7 among adults who use both: results from a national survey. Ann Intern Med
8 2001;135:344-51.
9
- 10 Ernst E, Canter PH. A systematic review of systematic reviews of spinal manipulation. J
11 R Soc Med 2006;99:189-93.
12
- 13 Ernst E, Harkness E. Spinal manipulation: a systematic review of sham-controlled,
14 double-blind, randomized clinical trials. J Pain Symptom Manage 2001;22:879-89.
15
- 16 Evans DW. Mechanisms and effects of spinal high velocity, low amplitude thrust
17 manipulation: previous theories. J Manipulative Physiol Ther 2002;25:251-62.
18
- 19 Eysenck HJ. Meta-analysis and its problems. BMJ 1994;309:789-92.
20
- 21 Feinstein AR. Meta-analysis: statistical alchemy for the 21st century. J Clin Epidemiol
22 1995;48:71-9.
23
- 24 Ferreira ML, Ferreira PH, Latimer J, Herbert R, Maher CG. Does spinal manipulative
25 therapy help people with chronic low back pain? Aust J Physiother 2002;48:277-84.
26
- 27 Ferreira ML, Ferreira PH, Latimer J, Herbert R, Maher CG. Efficacy of spinal
28 manipulative therapy for low back pain of less than three months' duration. J
29 Manipulative Physiol Ther 2003;26:593-601.
30
- 31 Gillette RG. A speculative argument for the coactivation of diverse somatic receptor
32 populations by forceful chiropractic adjustments. Man Med 1987;3:1-14.
33
- 34 Haas M, Bronfort G, Evans RL. Chiropractic clinical research: progress and
35 recommendations. J Manipulative Physiol Ther 2006;29:695-706.
36
- 37 Haas M, Goldberg B, Aickin M, Ganger B, Attwood M. A practice-based study of
38 patients with acute and chronic low back pain attending primary care and chiropractic
39 physicians: two-week to 48-month follow-up. J Manipulative Physiol Ther
40 2004;27:160-9.

- 1 Haas M, Group E, Kraemer DF. Dose-response for chiropractic care of chronic low
2 back pain. *Spine J* 2004;4:574-83.
3
- 4 Haas M, Sharma M, Stano M. Cost-effectiveness of medical and chiropractic care for
5 acute and chronic low back pain. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2005;28:555-63.
6
- 7 Haldeman S, Rubinstein SM. Cauda equina syndrome in patients undergoing
8 manipulation of the lumbar spine. *Spine* 1992;17:1469-73.
9
- 10 Haldeman S. Neurological effects of the adjustment. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*
11 2000;23:112-4.
12
- 13 Hart LG, Deyo RA, Cherkin DC. Physician office visits for low back pain. *Spine*
14 1995;20:11-9.
15
- 16 Heikkila H, Johansson M, Wenngren BI. Effects of acupuncture, cervical manipulation
17 and NSAID therapy on dizziness and impaired head repositioning of suspected
18 cervical origin. *Manual Therapy* 2000;5:151-7.
19
- 20 Herzog W. Mechanical, physiologic, and neuromuscular considerations of chiropractic
21 treatments. In Lawrence DJ, Cassidy JD, McGregor M, Meeker WC, Vernon HT,
22 editors. *Advances in Chiropractic*. Volume 3 ed. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book; 1995.
23 p. 269-85.
24
- 25 Herzog W, ed. *Clinical biomechanics of spinal manipulation*. New York: Churchill
26 Livingstone; 2000.
27
- 28 Hestbaek L, Leboeuf-Yde C, Manniche C. Low back pain: what is the long-term course?
29 A review of studies of general patient populations. *Eur Spine J* 2003;12:149-65.
30
- 31 Hettinga DM, Hurley DA, Jackson A, May S, Mercer C, Roberts L. Assessing the effect
32 of sample size, methodological quality and statistical rigour on outcomes of
33 randomised controlled trials on mobilisation, manipulation and massage for low back
34 pain of at least 6 weeks duration. *Physiotherapy* 2008;94:97-104.
35
- 36 Hurwitz EL, Aker PD, Adams AH, Meeker WC, Shekelle PG. Manipulation and
37 mobilization of the cervical spine. *Spine* 1996;21:1746-60.
38
- 39 Ianuzzi A, Khalsa PS. Comparison of human lumbar facet joint capsule strains during
40 simulated high-velocity, low-amplitude spinal manipulation versus physiological
41 motions. *Spine J* 2005;5:277-90.

- 1 Keller TS, Colloca CJ. Mechanical force spinal manipulation increases trunk muscle
2 strength assessed by electromyography: a comparative clinical trial. *J Manipulative*
3 *Physiol Ther* 2000;23:585-95.
4
- 5 Keller A, Hayden J, Bombardier C, van TM. Effect sizes of non-surgical treatments of
6 non-specific low-back pain. *Eur Spine J* 2007; Doc No DOI 10.1007/s00586-007-
7 0379-x.
8
- 9 Kessler RC, Davis RB, Foster DF, Van Rompay M, Walters EE, Wilkey S, Kaptchuk TJ,
10 Eisenberg DM. Long-term trends in the use of complementary and alternative
11 medical therapies in the United States. *Ann Intern Med* 2001;135:262-8.
12
- 13 Khalsa PS, Ge W. Encoding of tensile stress and strain during stretch by muscle
14 mechano-nociceptors. *Muscle Nerve* 2004;30:216-24.
15
- 16 Koes BW, Assendelft WJJ, van der Heijden G, Bouter LM. Spinal manipulation for low
17 back pain. An updated systematic review of randomized clinical trials. *Spine*
18 1996;21:2860-73.
19
- 20 Lawrence RC, Helmick CG, Arnett FC, Deyo RA, Felson DT, Giannini EH, Heyse SP,
21 Hirsch R, Hochberg MC, Hunder GG, Liang MH, Pillemer SR, Steen VD, Wolfe F.
22 Estimates of the prevalence of arthritis and selected musculoskeletal disorders in the
23 United States. *Arthritis Rheum* 1998;41:778-99.
24
- 25 Lazarou JL, Pomeranz BH, Corey PN. Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized
26 patients. A meta-analysis of prospective studies. *JAMA* 1998;279:1200-5.
27
- 28 Leboeuf-Yde C, Hestbaek L. Maintenance care in chiropractic - what do we know?
29 *Chiropr Osteopat* 2008;16:3.
30
- 31 Leigh JP, Markowitz SB, Fahs M, Shin C, Landrigan PJ. Occupational injury and illness
32 in the United States. Estimates of costs, morbidity, and mortality. *Arch Intern Med*
33 1997;157:1557-68.
34
- 35 Licciardone JC, Brimhall AK, King LN. Osteopathic manipulative treatment for low back
36 pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *BMC*
37 *Musculoskelet Disord* 2005;6:43.
38
- 39 Lisi AJ, Holmes EJ, Ammendolia C. High-velocity low-amplitude spinal manipulation
40 for symptomatic lumbar disk disease: a systematic review of the literature. *J*
41 *Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2005;28:429-42.

- 1 Luijsterburg PA, Verhagen AP, Ostelo RW, van Os TA, Peul WC, Koes BW.
2 Effectiveness of conservative treatments for the lumbosacral radicular syndrome: a
3 systematic review. *Eur Spine J* 2007;16:881-99.
4
- 5 Meeker WC, Haldeman S. Chiropractic: a profession at the crossroads of mainstream and
6 alternative medicine. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;136:216-27.
7
- 8 Mior S. Manipulation and mobilization in the treatment of chronic pain. *Clin J Pain*
9 2001;17 Suppl 4:S70-S76.
10
- 11 Office of Technology Assessment. The impact of randomized clinical trials on health
12 policy and medical practice: background. Washington, DC: U.S. Congress Office of
13 Technology Assessment, OTA-BP-H-22; 1983.
14
- 15 Oliphant D. Safety of spinal manipulation in the treatment of lumbar disk herniations: a
16 systematic review and risk assessment. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2004;27:197-
17 210.
18
- 19 Ottenbacher KJ, Di Fabio RP. Efficacy of spinal manipulation/mobilization therapy. A
20 meta-analysis. *Spine* 1985;10:833-7.
21
- 22 Pengel HM, Maher CG, Refshauge KM. Systematic review of conservative interventions
23 for subacute low back pain. *Clin Rehabil* 2002;16:811-20.
24
- 25 Peterson DH, Bergmann TF. Chiropractic technique: principles and practice. 2nd ed. St.
26 Louis: Mosby; 2002.
27
- 28 Pickar JG. Neurophysiologic issues of the subluxation lesion. *Top Clin Chiropr* 2001;8:9-
29 15.
30
- 31 Pickar JG. Neurophysiological effects of spinal manipulation. *Spine J* 2002;2:357-71.
32
- 33 Pickar JG, Wheeler JD. Response of muscle proprioceptors to spinal manipulative-like
34 loads in the anesthetized cat. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2001;24:2-11.
35
- 36 Posadzki P. Is spinal manipulation effective for pain? An overview of systematic reviews.
37 *Pain Med.* 2012 Jun;13(6):754-61.
38
- 39 Rabin A, Shashua A, Pizem K, Dickstein R, Dar G. A clinical prediction rule to identify
40 patients with low back pain who are likely to experience short-term success following
41 lumbar stabilization exercises: a randomized controlled validation study. *J Orthop*
42 *Sports Phys Ther.* 2014 Jan;44(1):6-B13.

- 1 Rubinstein SM, van Middelkoop M, Assendelft WJ, de Boer MR, van Tulder MW.
2 Spinal manipulative therapy for chronic low-back pain: an update of a Cochrane
3 review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011 Jun;36(13):E825-46.
4
- 5 Rubinstein SM, Terwee CB, Assendelft WJ, de Boer MR, van Tulder MW. Spinal
6 manipulative therapy for acute low back pain: an update of the cochrane review.
7 *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013 Feb 1;38(3):E158-77.
8
- 9 Rubinstein SM, Terwee CB, Assendelft WJ, de Boer MR, van Tulder MW. Spinal
10 manipulative therapy for acute low back pain: an update of the cochrane review.
11 *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013 Feb 1;38(3):E158-77.
12
- 13 Senstad O, Leboeuf-Yde C, Borchgrevink C. Frequency and characteristics of side effects
14 of spinal manipulative therapy. *Spine* 1997;22:435-41.
15
- 16 Shekelle P, Adams A, Chassin M, Hurwitz E, Brook R. Spinal manipulation for low-back
17 pain. *Ann Intern Med* 1992;117:590-8.
18
- 19 Shekelle, P.G. (1991). *The appropriateness of spinal manipulation for low back pain*.
20 Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
21
- 22 Slavin RE. Best evidence synthesis: an intelligent alternative to meta-analysis. *J Clin*
23 *Epidemiol* 1995;48:9-18.
24
- 25 Summaries for patients: the effectiveness of spinal manipulation relative to other
26 therapies for low back pain. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;138:I33.
27
- 28 Terrett A, Kleynhans A. Complications from manipulation of the low back. *Chiro J Aust*
29 1992;22(4):129-40.
30
- 31 Triano JJ. Biomechanics of spinal manipulative therapy. *Spine J* 2001;1:121-30.
32
- 33 Van Tulder MW, Koes BW, Bouter LM. Conservative treatment of acute and chronic
34 nonspecific low back pain. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials of the
35 most common interventions. *Spine* 1997;22:2128-56.
36
- 37 Vavrek DA, Sharma R, Haas M. Cost analysis related to dose-response of spinal
38 manipulative therapy for chronic low back pain: outcomes from a randomized
39 controlled trial. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2014 Jun;37(5):300-11.

- 1 Vernon HT, Dhimi MS, Howley TP, Annett R. Spinal manipulation and beta-endorphin:
2 a controlled study of the effect of spinal manipulation plasma beta-endorphin levels
3 in normal males. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1986;9:115-23.
4
- 5 von Heymann WJ, Schloemer P, Timm J, Muehlbauer B. Spinal high-velocity low
6 amplitude manipulation in acute nonspecific low back pain: a double-blinded
7 randomized controlled trial in comparison with diclofenac and placebo. *Spine*
8 (Phila Pa 1976). 2013 Apr 1;38(7):540-8.
9
- 10 Von Korff M, Saunders K. The course of back pain in primary care. *Spine* 1996;21:2833-
11 7.
12
- 13 Vroomen PCAJ, De Krom MCTFM, Slofstra PD, Knottnerus JA. Conservative treatment
14 of sciatica: a systematic review. *J of Spinal Dis* 2000;13:463-9.
15
- 16 Waddell G. Low back pain: a twentieth century health care enigma. *Spine* 1996;21:2820-
17 5.
18
- 19 Walker BF, Hebert JJ, Stomski NJ, Losco B, French SD. Short-term usual chiropractic
20 care for spinal pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Spine* (Phila Pa 1976). 2013 Nov
21 15;38(24):2071-8.
22
- 23 Weingart SN, Wilson RM, Gebberd RW, Harrison B. Epidemiology of medical error.
24 *BMJ* 2000;320:774-7.
25
- 26 Whitcomb DC, Block GD. Association of acetaminophen hepatotoxicity with fasting and
27 ethanol use. *JAMA* 1994;272:1845-50.
28
- 29 Wolfe MM, Lichtenstein DR, Singh G. Gastrointestinal toxicity of non-steroidal anti-
30 inflammatory drugs. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:1888-99.
31
- 32 Woodhead T, Clough A. A systematic review of the evidence for manipulation in the
33 treatment of low back pain. *J of Orthop Med* 2005;27:99-120.