

NKR 45 for ikke-kirurgisk behandling af nyopståede uspecifikke nakkesmerter

| AMSTAR    | PICO/PIR      | List relevant outcomes   | Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant outcomes? | 1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? | 2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? | 3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? | 4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? | 5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? | 6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? | 7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? | 8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? | 9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of the studies appropriate? | 10. Was the likelihood of bias assessed? | 11. Was the conflict of interest | Notes   |
|-----------|---------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---|
| Observer  | Citation      | PICO/PIRO name   |  |                                       |   |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |                                  |   |
| Konsensus | Binder, 1.2,3 | <p>outcomes</p> <p>Smerter,</p> <p>med nakkesmerter tilbydes træning i tillæg til anden behandling? 2 funktionsevne (NDI), "return to work",</p> <p>Komplikatione</p> <p>r</p> | nej  | Yes                                   | Yes   | Yes   | Can't answer  | No   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | No   | No                                       |                                  | <p>En forfatter! Kun 1 reference vedr. ny episode NS, resten blandede, de fleste kroniske ptt. Ukklart om de tale rom kronisk eller akutte smerter, så svært at vurdere om den passer 100% på de vi skal kigge på og ser generelt ud til at det meste er på kroniskenakkesmerter: Kun for Whiplash (senere spørgsmål i reviewet) definere man specifikt at der er tale om akutte smerter i en del af reviewet</p> |

NKR 45 for ikke-kirurgisk behandling af nyopståede uspecifikke nakkesmerter  
AMSTAR

| Observer  | Citation    | PICO/PIRO no. | List relevant outcomes                                       | Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant outcomes? | 1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? | 2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? | 3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? | 4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? | 5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? | 6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? | 7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? | 8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? | 9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate? | 10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? | 11. Was the conflict of interest included? | Notes  |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Konsensus | Gross, 2015 | 1,4           | Smerter, funktionsevne (NDI), "return to work", Kompikatione | ikke muligt  | Yes                                   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | 27 studier (RCT) ingen akutte NS. Minimal fokus på akutte smerter (1 studie på akutte, 1 med akut til kronisk og 1 subakut og 16 med kroniske. |

NKR 45 for ikke-kirurgisk behandling af nyopståede uspecifikke nakkesmerter  
AMSTAR

| Observer  | Citation      | PICO/PIRO   | List relevant outcomes | Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant outcomes? | 1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? | 2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? | 3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? | 4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? | 5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? | 6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? | 7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? | 8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? | 9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of the studies appropriate? | 10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? | 11. Was the conflict of interest included? | Notes   |
|-----------|---------------|---|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Konsensus | Leaver, 2010  | Bør patienter med nakkesmerter tilbydes 2 ledmobiliserte teknikker i tillæg til anden behandling? | outcomes               | nej  | No                                    | Yes   | Yes   | No  | No   | Yes   | Yes  | No   | Yes  | No   | Yes  | 33 studier, med betydelig heterogenitet, kun 1 pilotstudie vedr. Akutte/subakutte NS                            |
| Konsensus | Huisman, 2013 | Bør patienter med nakkesmerter tilbydes 2 ledmobiliserte teknikker i tillæg til anden behandling? | outcomes               | nej  | Yes                                   | No  | Yes   | No  | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Not applicable   | Yes  | Can't answer                               | 11 studier heraf 5 artikler vedr. Akutte/subakutte NS RCT. Ret blandet patienter med kroniske og akutte smerter |

NKR 45 for ikke-kirurgisk behandling af nyopståede uspecifikke nakkesmerter  
AMSTAR

| Observer  | Citation     | PICO/PIRO   | List relevant outcomes      | Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant outcomes? | 1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? | 2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? | 3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? | 4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? | 5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? | 6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? | 7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? | 8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? | 9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate? | 10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? | 11. Was the conflict of interest included? | Notes           |             |              |
|-----------|--------------|---|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Gross-    |              | name<br>PICO 2: Bør patienter med nakkesmerter tilbydes ledmobiliserende teknikker i tillæg til anden behandling.   | Smerte,                     |  |                                       |   |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |                 | 51 studier, |              |
| Konsensus |              | PICO 10: Bør patienter med nakkesmerter tilbydes smertestillende medicin frem for træning/ledmobilerende teknikker? | livskvalitet, komplikatione | ja   | Yes                                   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | heraf 5 studier |             |              |
|           | manipulation |   | r                           |  |                                       |   |   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |                 | vedr. Akut/ | subakutte MS |

NKR 45 for ikke-kirurgisk behandling af nyopståede uspecifikke nakkesmerter  
AMSTAR

| Observer  | Citation    | PICO/PIRO | List relevant outcomes | Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant outcomes? | 1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? | 2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? | 3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? | 4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? | 5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? | 6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? | 7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? | 8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? | 9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate? | 10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? | 11. Was the conflict of interest included? | Notes |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Konsensus | Gross, 2012 | Pico 5    |                        | Yes  | Yes                                   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Can't answer   | Yes  | Yes  |       |

NKR 45 for ikke-kirurgisk behandling af nyopståede uspecifikke nakkesmerter  
AMSTAR

| Observer  | Citation   | PICO/PIRO | List relevant outcomes | Was meta-analysis performed for the relevant outcomes? | 1. Was an 'a priori' design provided? | 2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction? | 3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed? | 4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion? | 5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided? | 6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided? | 7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented? | 8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions? | 9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate? | 10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed? | 11. Was the conflict of interest included? | Notes |
|-----------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Konsensus | Patel 2012 | PICO 7    | no                     | no   | Yes                                   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  | No   | Yes  |       |