

Overview of Optimal Diagnosis and Management of Low Back Pain in Family Practice

¹Seham saed saad alrubaie, ²Loaiee Faisal Ibrahim Halawani,

³Sami Meshal M Althobaiti, ⁴Saleh mousa saleh althagafi,

⁵Turki Muteb Saaed Alotaibi, ⁶Hassan M Almalki, ⁷Huda Daifalkareem M Alsaadi,

⁸Manal Saeed Al Bogami

Abstract: Between 49% and 90% of individuals in industrialized countries will experience a minimum of one episode of low pain in the back (LBP) throughout their lifetime. We aimed by this overview to evaluate the diagnosis and management of Low back pain in Primary care through family practice. This descriptive review summarizes current efficiency on primary care setting and about knowledge of the diagnosis and treatment of Low Back Pain, treatment outcome, several studies of LBP in primary care were identified through electronic searches of Medline, Cinahl, Embase, Psychlit, until November 2016. The search also included checking the reference lists of retrieved papers. Low back pain is very typical. When possible, the most proper diagnostic technique is to look for specific biomechanical causes and identify potential structural pain generator(s). Most signs deal with fairly immediately with little intervention, but recurrence prevails.

Patient history and physical examination are very important in differentiating potential etiologies and immediately recognizing red flags representing more severe conditions, along with yellow flags that may puzzle both medical diagnosis and diagnosis. Findings need to follow known pathologic procedures. Pain that is irregular with known patterns of disease represents an important yellow flag and requires careful re-evaluation. Because of the high incidence of radiologic irregularities in asymptomatic persons, diagnostic imaging must be purchased only when really necessary. Founded gaps plainly exists amongst primary care professionals with respect to the diagnosis and treatment of LBP, particularly in the evaluation of red flag conditions, use of diagnostic imaging and recommendations given to patients concerning active treatments.

Keywords: Medline, Cinahl, Embase, Psychlit, Low back pain.

1. INTRODUCTION

Between 49% and 90% of individuals in industrialized countries will experience a minimum of one episode of low pain in the back (LBP) throughout their lifetime ^(1,2,3,4,5). Back pain is the most regular cause of activity limitation in people aged below 45 years. Around 90% of all people experience low pain in the back at some time, ⁽⁶⁾ and approximately 50% of working adults have back pain each year ⁽⁷⁾.

Many patients who miss work because of pain in the back return within 3 months. Typically, 60% to 70% recover by 6 weeks and 80% to 90% by 12 weeks. After 12 weeks, even more healing is slow. Lifetime recurrence rates of as high as 85% have been documented ⁽⁸⁾. Reported rates of low back pain are generally greater for white persons than for other racial groups ⁽⁸⁾. Biopsychosocial factors such as existence of depression symptoms, previous history of back problem ⁽⁹⁾. Pain will resolve within 2 weeks for the majority of these people. However, 20% to 44% of patients, especially those with a history of LBP, will experience additional episodes within a year, and more than three-quarters will experience a reoccurrence at some point in their lives. Its management can be intricate and costly ⁽¹⁰⁾ due to the fact that back pain is more typically reoccurring than intense and self-limiting. Up to 25% of patients with pain in the back look for assistance from a healthcare service provider, with nearly three-quarters of these patients providing to either a chiropractic practitioner or a doctor. When it comes to persistent LBP, 91% of patients consult a doctor and 25% see a chiropractic

specialist⁽⁵⁾. Medical care doctors undertake the initial examination in 65% of LBP cases and frequently ultimately become the sole service provider for these patients^(3,11). The majority of patients tend to visit more than one supplier⁽¹²⁾, and in between 10% and 50% of patients get physiotherapy⁽¹³⁾.

We aimed by this overview to evaluate the diagnosis and management of Low back pain in Primary care through family practice

2. METHODOLOGY

This descriptive review summarizes current efficiency on primary care setting and about knowledge of the diagnosis and treatment of Low Back Pain, treatment outcome, several studies of LBP in primary care were identified through electronic searches of Medline, Cinahl, Embase, Psychlit, until November 2016. The search also included checking the reference lists of retrieved papers.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We have identified several studies that involve the evaluation of LBP management and diagnosis in family practice, most studies showed beside the proper diagnosis and treatment of LBP, the challenges facing primary care setting in managing this condition and its complications.

The usual classification of low back pain is related to the duration of the complaints (acute, subacute, and persistent), although these terms are defined in various methods^(42,43). Low back pain, in general, is assumed to have a favorable course with a duration of a couple of weeks, although it often regressions. In a few of the cases the episodes of low pain in the back will last some weeks longer, and may sometimes become chronic^(42,43,44). This classification cannot take into account some scientifically important elements of the course of low back pain. Low back pain typically runs a reoccurring course that is neither intense nor persistent,⁴ and second of all, the clinical issues in low back pain consist of both pain and practical disability, which might both vary in their severity^(42,45,46). The treatment of patients with low neck and back pain in general practice constitutes an extra issue. Both current onset and chronic cases are presented, indicating that patients have actually already undergone some part of the course at the moment they choose to seek advice from the general practitioner. Studying the course of low back pain presented in basic practice must also consist of gathering info on the pre-clinical course^(42,43).

Medical diagnosis and referral of patients with LBP in Family practice:

various studies from various nations revealed that, a lot of family physicians asked their patients about the initiating occasion and performed a health examination in accordance with guideline recommendations, but the assessment of red flags was less than ideal^(10,13,14). However, it is uncertain whether the particularly low scores for evaluating warnings in the Bishop and Wing⁽¹⁰⁾ study were due to unfamiliarity with the term 'warnings' or lack of knowledge of the principle. Another research study⁽¹⁴⁾ found that even though 40% of doctors and 25% of physiotherapists were unfamiliar with the term 'warnings', most of specialists reported assessing for considerable pathology in their patients. Physiotherapists typically had greater rates of compliance than doctors with respect to carrying out an adequate health examination and evaluating for red flags.

Referral of patients with severe or persistent LBP to an expert by family doctor was typically managed in accordance with standard recommendations^(10,15,16,17), although in one study⁽¹⁶⁾ the existence of sciatica increased the likelihood of a recommendation that was not supported by abnormal findings in patients with acute LBP. In two research studies^(18,19), a significant minority of doctors (6% to 45%) thought that the existence of danger signs such as saddle anesthesia or neurological signs at several levels did not warrant urgent referral to a medical facility.

While in between 21% and 28% of physicians tend to inappropriately order x-rays for severe LBP^(13,16,17), viewpoints about the usefulness of other diagnostic tests for intense and chronic LBP by the majority of physicians, physio therapists and chiropractic doctors were mostly in line with guideline recommendations^(10,11,13,16,17,19,20). The rates of guideline-concordant behaviour amongst doctors with respect to diagnostic imaging had the tendency to be greater for patients with chronic LBP compared to those with acute LBP. When sciatica was present in addition to chronic or severe LBP, doctors were more likely to request unneeded diagnostic imaging^(16,19).

Based proof suggestions for Family medical professionals in diagnosis and management of LBP:

A variety of research studies^(22,23,24,25,26) have actually reported the proportion of patients with LBP who receive diagnostic tests, referrals or treatments that are not consistent with current guideline suggestions. It is often not clear from

these research studies how numerous and exactly what types of professionals are responsible for these practices. The present report methodically evaluated studies that identified differences in standard compliance in accordance with discipline, which allowed the identification of knowledge spaces peculiar to particular specialist groups.

Twelve of the previous mentioned studies utilized self-reported answers to questionnaires, which do not always show what respondents in fact do in practice and may overestimate their concurrence with released guidelines^(13,15). In addition, massive specialist studies are vulnerable to action predisposition and the dependability of participant actions is not guaranteed⁽²⁶⁾. On the other hand, while information from the two research studies^(10,27) that utilized chart review might be more trusted and consistent than those originated from studies, the outcomes are less generalizable. In addition, these research studies are restricted by the possible effects of local norms, and their reliance on the accuracy and completeness of medical records for the veracity of the retrospectively obtained information⁽²⁵⁾.

Variation in Evaluation and Treatment of LBP in Family practice:

Low back pain is managed by many different health care service providers. Family doctor, internists, General practitioners, neurologists, rheumatologists, emergency situation physicians, and neurological and orthopedic cosmetic surgeons all see patients with back issues. Nonallopathic service providers of back care consist of osteopathic physicians, chiropractic specialists, physiotherapists, acupuncturists, and massage therapists. Among patients who use natural medicine, back problems are the most regularly reported medical condition⁽²⁸⁾, and making use of natural medicine is increasing⁽²⁹⁾. Provided the variety of healthcare providers who manage low back pain, variation in the assessment and management of pain in the back is not unexpected. Rates of hospitalization and surgical treatment for low back pain vary widely by geographical region^(30,31,32,33).

Couple of research studies have actually compared outcomes and costs of severe low neck and back pain amongst different providers. Depending upon the company the patient initially sees, distinctions in using diagnostic technology (plain x-rays, computed tomography [CT], or magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] imaging), treatments, and recommendation to other specialists offering back care might result. In one large study comparing medical care practitioners, chiropractors, and orthopedic cosmetic surgeons, diagnostic testing, intensity and nature of treatments, general cost of care, and patient fulfillment were shown to vary commonly among various supplier groups⁽³⁴⁾. In spite of distinctions in resource usage and satisfaction with care, patient results were remarkably similar amongst the various specialist groups.

Even among similarly trained service providers, distinctions in practice style might affect the quality and expense of take care of low pain in the back. In a big health care organization, the practice styles of 44 primary care physicians were categorized by the frequency of pain medication prescriptions and recommendations for bed rest⁽³⁵⁾. Long-lasting outcomes were comparable across doctors, lower costs and higher patient satisfaction were associated with doctors who prescribed less medication and bed rest.

Offered the frequency of the issue, the variation in its examination and treatment, and its usually excellent prognosis, improving the efficiency of take care of patients with neck and back pain in primary care is required⁽³⁶⁾. Due to the fact that the etiology of many acute low neck and back pain remains uncertain, the initial examination concentrates on omitting unusual but potentially major causes, and determining patients at greater risk for prolonged symptoms. Initial management for many patients includes procedures for sign relief, education, and peace of mind about the favorable nature. For patients with indications of radiculopathy, potentially severe reasons for neck and back pain, or risk elements for prolonged signs, diagnostic screening, referral, and alternative treatments might be suggested. This evaluation focuses on the majority of patients with severe nonspecific symptoms, however comprehensive conversations of less typical reasons for intense low back pain are available^(37,38,39,40,41).

4. CONCLUSION

Low back pain is very typical. When possible, the most proper diagnostic technique is to look for specific biomechanical causes and identify potential structural pain generator(s). Most signs deal with fairly immediately with little intervention, but recurrence prevails.

Patient history and physical examination are very important in differentiating potential etiologies and immediately recognizing red flags representing more severe conditions, along with yellow flags that may puzzle both medical diagnosis and diagnosis. Findings need to follow known pathologic procedures. Pain that is irregular with known patterns

of disease represents an important yellow flag and requires careful re-evaluation. Because of the high incidence of radiologic irregularities in asymptomatic persons, diagnostic imaging must be purchased only when really necessary. Found gaps plainly exists amongst primary care professionals with respect to the diagnosis and treatment of LBP, particularly in the evaluation of red flag conditions, use of diagnostic imaging and recommendations given to patients concerning active treatments. Guidelines are often used to develop standards of care and offer a standard for evidence-based practice, however the outcomes of today report demonstrated that their directives are not constantly hearkened. While it is not possible to determine or change the personal viewpoint of a health care education, professional and experience might ultimately erode obstructive mindsets and beliefs that might adversely impact patient care.

REFERENCES

- [1] Van Tulder M, Koes B, Bombardier C. Low back pain. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol.* 2002;16:761–75.
- [2] Margarido MS, Kowalski SC, Natour J, Ferraz MB. Acute low back pain: Diagnostic and therapeutic practices reported by Brazilian rheumatologists. *Spine.* 2005;30:567–71.
- [3] Devereaux MW. Low back pain. *Prim Care.* 2004;31:33–51.
- [4] Woolf AD, Pfleger B. Burden of major musculoskeletal conditions. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2003;81:646–56.
- [5] Nyiendo J, Haas M, Goldberg B, Sexton G. Pain, disability, and satisfaction outcomes and predictors of outcomes: A practice-based study of chronic low back pain patients attending primary care and chiropractic physicians. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 2001;24:433–9.
- [6] Frymoyer JD. Back pain and sciatica. *N Engl J Med* 1988; 318: 291–300. Medline
- [7] Nachemson AL. Newest knowledge of low back pain. A critical look. *Clin Orthop* 1992; Jun: 8–20.
- [8] Research on low back pain and common spinal disorders [monograph on the Internet]. Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health. of outcome in acute and subchronic low back trouble. *Spine* 1995; 20: 722–8.
- [9] Van Tulder M, Koes B. Low back pain (chronic) *Am Fam Physician.* 2006;74:1577–9.
- [10] Bishop PB, Wing PC. Compliance with clinical practice guidelines in family physicians managing worker's compensation board patients with acute lower back pain. *Spine J.* 2003;3:442–50.
- [11] Werner EL, Ihlebaek C, Skouen JS, Laerum E. Beliefs about low back pain in the Norwegian general population: Are they related to pain experiences and health professionals? *Spine.* 2005;30:1770–6.
- [12] Poitras S, Blais R, Swaine B, Rossignol M. Management of work-related low back pain: A population-based survey of physical therapists. *Phys Ther.* 2005;85:1168–81.
- [13] Di Iorio D, Henley E, Doughty A. A survey of primary care physician practice patterns and adherence to acute low back problem guidelines. *Arch Fam Med.* 2000;9:1015–21.
- [14] Overmeer T, Linton SJ, Holmquist L, Eriksson M, Engfeldt P. Do evidence-based guidelines have an impact in primary care? A cross-sectional study of Swedish physicians and physiotherapists. *Spine.* 2005;30:146–51.
- [15] Coudeyre E, Rannou F, Tubach F, et al. General practitioners' fear-avoidance beliefs influence their management of patients with low back pain. *Pain.* 2006;124:330–7.
- [16] Webster BS, Courtney TK, Huang YH, Matz S, Christiani DC. Physicians' initial management of acute low back pain versus evidence-based guidelines. Influence of sciatica. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2005;20:1132–5.
- [17] Buchbinder R, Jolley D. Improvements in general practitioner beliefs and stated management of back pain persist 4.5 years after the cessation of a public health media campaign. *Spine.* 2007;32:E156–E162.
- [18] Little P, Smith L, Cantrell T, Chapman J, Langridge J, Pickering R. General practitioners' management of acute back pain: A survey of reported practice compared with clinical guidelines. *BMJ.* 1996;312:485–8.
- [19] Negrini S, Politano E, Carabalona R, Mambrini A. General practitioners' management of low back pain: Impact of clinical guidelines in a non-English-speaking country. *Spine.* 2001;26:2727–33.

- [20] Bishop A, Foster NE, Thomas E, Hay EM. How does the self-reported clinical management of patients with low back pain relate to the attitudes and beliefs of health care practitioners? A survey of UK general practitioners and physiotherapists. *Pain*. 2008;135:187–95.
- [21] Linton SJ, Vlaeyen J, Ostelo R. The back pain beliefs of health care providers: Are we fear-avoidant? *J Occup Rehabil*. 2002;12:223–32.
- [22] Ehrmann-Feldman D, Rossignol M, Abenham L, Gobeille D. Physician referral to physical therapy in a cohort of workers compensated for low back pain. *Phys Ther*. 1996;76:150–6.
- [23] Frankel BS, Moffett JK, Keen S, Jackson D. Guidelines for low back pain: Changes in GP management. *Fam Pract*. 1999;16:216–22.
- [24] Schers H, Braspenning J, Drijver R, Wensing M, Grol R. Low back pain in general practice: Reported management and reasons for not adhering to the guidelines in The Netherlands. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2000;50:640–4.
- [25] Tacci JA, Webster BS, Hashemi L, Christiani DC. Healthcare utilization and referral patterns in the initial management of new-onset, uncomplicated low back workers' compensation disability claims. *J Occup Environ Med*. 1998;40:958–63.
- [26] Tacci JA, Webster BS, Hashemi L, Christiani DC. Clinical practices in the management of new-onset, uncomplicated low back workers' compensation disability claims. *J Occup Environ Med*. 1999;41:397–404.
- [27] Armstrong MP, McDonough S, Baxter GD. Clinical guidelines versus clinical practice in the management of low back pain. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2003;57:9–13.
- [28] Eisenberg DM, Kessler RC, Foster C, et al. Unconventional medicine in the United States. Prevalence, costs, and patterns of use. *N Engl J Med*. 1993;328:246–52.
- [29] Eisenberg DM, Davis RB, Ettner SL, et al. Trends in alternative medicine use in the United States, 1990–1997: results of a follow-up national survey. *JAMA*. 1998;280:1569–75.
- [30] Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Loeser JD, Bush T, Waddell G. An international comparison of back surgery rates. *Spine*. 1994;19:1201–6.
- [31] Ciol MA, Deyo RA, Howell E, Kreif S. An assessment of surgery for spinal stenosis: time trends, geographic variations, complications, and reoperations. *J Am Ger Soc*. 1996;44:285–90.
- [32] Taylor VM, Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Kreuter W. Low back pain hospitalization. Recent United States trends and regional variations. *Spine*. 1994;19:1207–13.
- [33] Volinn E, Mayer J, Diehr P, Van Koeveering D, Connell FA, Loeser JD. Small area analysis of surgery for low-back pain. *Spine*. 1992;17:575–81.
- [34] Carey TS, Garrett J, Jackman A, McLaughlin C, Fryer J, Smucker DR. The outcomes and costs of care for acute low back pain among patients seen by primary care practitioners, chiropractors, and orthopedic surgeons. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;333:913–7.
- [35] Von Korff M, Barlow W, Cherkin D, Deyo RA. Effects of practice style in managing back pain. *Ann Intern Med*. 1994;121:187–95.
- [36] Bigos SJ, Bowyer OR, Braen GR, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline no. 14. Rockville, Md: Department of Health and Human Services; 1994. Acute low back problems in adults. AHCPR publication no. 95-0642.
- [37] Batchelor TT, Louis DN. A 67-year-old woman with the cauda equina syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. 1997;337:1829–37.
- [38] Deyo RA. Early diagnostic evaluation of low back pain. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1986;1:328–38.
- [39] Deyo RA, Loeser JD, Bigos SJ. Herniated lumbar intervertebral disk. *Ann Intern Med*. 1990;112:598–603.
- [40] Fritz JM, Delitto A, Welch WC, Erhard RE. Lumbar spinal stenosis: a review of current concepts in evaluation, management, and outcomes measurements. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1998;79:700–8.
- [41] Frymoyer JW. Back pain and sciatica. *N Engl J Med*. 1988;318:291–300.

- [42] Spitzer WO, LeBlanc FE, Dupuis M, et al. Scientific approach to the assessment and management of activityrelated spinal disorders. A monograph for clinicians. Report of the Quebec Task Force on Spinal Disorders. Spine 1987;12 (suppl):S1–59.
- [43] Von Kor V M. Studying the natural history of back pain. Spine 1994;19:2041–6S.
- [44] Andersson GBJ. The epidemiology of spinal disorders. In: Frymoyer JW, ed. The adult spine; principles and practice. New York: Raven Press, 1991.
- [45] Von Kor V M, Dwarkin SF, LeResche L. Graded classification of chronic pain: An epidemiologic evaluation. Pain 1990;40:279–91.
- [46] Allen DB, Waddell G. An historical perspective on low back pain and disability. Acta Orthop Scand 1989;60 (supp 1234):1–23.
- [47] Waddell G. A new clinical model for the treatment of low-back pain. Spine 1987;12:632–44.