

1 **Direct access physiotherapy to help manage patients with musculoskeletal disorders in an**
2 **emergency department: results of a randomized controlled trial**

3
4
5 Rose Gagnon, MPT, M.Sc.(C) ^{1,2,3}

6 Kadija Perreault, PT, PhD ^{1,2,3}

7 Simon Berthelot MD, M.Sc., FRCPC CCMF(MU) ^{3,4,5}

8 Eveline Matifat, PT, M.Sc. ^{6,7}

9 François Desmeules, PT, PhD ^{6,7}

10 Bertrand Achou, PhD ⁸

11 Marie-Christine Laroche, OT ⁴

12 Catherine Van Neste, PT ⁴

13 Stéphane Tremblay, M. SW. ⁴

14 Jean Leblond, PhD ^{1,2}

15 Luc J. Hébert, PT, PhD, CD ^{1,2,3}

16
17 **Acknowledgements:**

18 We would like to thank the following persons for their contribution to project implementation:

19 All project participants, Antony Barabé PT, physiotherapist at the Centre Hospitalier de
20 l'Université Laval (CHUL), Myriam Mallet, research professional, Jasmine Martineau who was
21 the senior manager of health care professional services when the project was initiated, and Mathieu
22 Blanchet, MD, FRCPC, head of the CHUL ED department during the duration of the study.

23
24 1 Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation and Social Integration (CIRRIS)

25 2 Centre intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux (CIUSSS) de la Capitale-Nationale

26 3 Université Laval, Departments of Rehabilitation, Medicine and Radiology and Nuclear
27 Medicine, Faculty of Medicine

28 4 CHU de Québec – Université Laval, Québec

29 5 Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec – Université Laval

30 6 Université de Montréal, Faculté de Médecine, École de Réhabilitation

31 7 Maisonneuve-Rosemont Hospital Research Centre, Orthopaedic Clinical Research Unit, Centre
32 de recherche de l'Hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont, CIUSSS de l'Est-de-l'Île-de-Montréal

33 8 HEC Montréal

34

35 **Corresponding Author:** Luc J. Hébert, PT, PhD, CD

36 Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation and Social
37 Integration (CIRRIS)

38 525 Boulevard Wilfrid-Hamel, H-1410

39 Quebec City (QC), Canada G1M 2S8

40 Tel. 1-418 529 9141 ext 6579

41 Email: lucj.hebert@fmed.ulaval.ca

42

43 **Running Title:** Direct access PT in the ED: results from a RCT

44

45 **Keywords:** musculoskeletal disorders, physiotherapy, emergency department, direct access,
46 advanced practice

47

48 **Word Count:** 3566 words

49

50 **Prior Presentations:** Ordre professionnel de la physiothérapie du Québec, 11-09-2019,
51 Montreal; North American Primary Care Research Group, 11-20-2019, Toronto; American
52 Physical Therapy Association Combined Sections Meeting, 02-13-2020, Denver.

53

54 **Funding sources:** Funding for this project was provided by the CHU de Québec-Université
55 Laval, subsidies from LJH and KP and a research grant awarded by the multidisciplinary council
56 of the CHU de Québec – Université Laval in association with the *Fondation du CHU de Québec*.
57 RG received scholarships from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the CIRRIS, the
58 *Ordre professionnel de la physiothérapie du Québec* and the Department of Rehabilitation funds
59 of the Faculty of Medicine at Université Laval. KP is a *Fonds de recherche du Québec-Santé*
60 (FRSQ) Junior 1 Research Scholar.

61

62 **Author contributions:** RG, KP, SB, EM, BA, MCL, CVN, ST and LJH were involved in study
63 concept and design. RG, KP, SB, MCL and LJH were involved in acquisition of the data. RG,
64 KP and LJH were involved in analysis and interpretation of the data. RG drafted the manuscript.
65 KP, SB, EM, FD, BA, MCL, CVN, ST and LJH were involved in critical revision of the
66 manuscript for important intellectual content. JL provided statistical expertise. RG, KP, MCL,
67 CVN, ST and LJH were involved in acquisition of funding.

68

69 **Disclosures:** None

70 The authors report no conflict of interest.

71

72 **Abstract**

73 **Context:** In several countries, physiotherapists (PT) have been integrated within emergency
74 departments (EDs) to help manage patients with musculoskeletal disorders (MSKDs). Still,
75 research on the effects of such initiatives is scarce.

76

77 **Objectives:** To evaluate the effects of direct access PT on MSKD patients consulting the ED in
78 terms of clinical outcomes and use of health care resources.

79

80 **Design, Setting, Participants:** Randomized controlled trial, academic ED in Quebec City
81 (Canada), participants 18-80 years presenting with a minor MSKD.

82

83 **Intervention:** Direct access PT at the ED

84

85 **Control:** Emergency Physicians lead management (EP).

86

87 **Main Outcome Measure:** Clinical outcomes (pain, interference of pain on function) and use of
88 resources (ED return visit, interventions, diagnostic tests, consultations) were compared between

89 groups at ED discharge and after 1 and 3 months using two-way ANOVAs, log-linear analysis
90 and χ^2 tests.

91

92 **Results:** Seventy-eight patients suffering from MSKDs were included (40.2 ± 17.6 years old;
93 44% women). Participants in the PT group (n=40) had statistically lower levels of pain and pain
94 interference at 1- and 3-months. They were recommended fewer imaging tests (38% vs. 78%;
95 $p < .0001$) and prescription medication (43% vs. 67%; $p = .030$) at ED discharge, had used less
96 prescription medication (32% vs. 72%; $p = .002$) and had revisited significantly less often the ED
97 (0% vs. 21%; $p = .007$) at 1-month than those in the EP group (n=38). At 3 months, the PT group
98 had used less over-the-counter medication (19% vs. 43%; $p = .034$).

99

100 **Conclusion:** Patients presenting with a MSKD to the ED with direct access to a PT had better
101 clinical outcomes and used less services and resources than those in the usual care group after
102 ED discharge and up to 3 months after discharge. The results of this study support the
103 implementation of such models of care for the management of this population.

104

105 **Abstract word count:** 293 words

106

107 **Trial Registration:** This trial is registered at the US National Institutes of Health
108 (ClinicalTrials.gov) #NCT04009369

109

110 **Ethical approval:** This trial was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the CHU de
111 Québec - Université Laval #MP-20-2019-4307

112

113

114 **Introduction**

115 Musculoskeletal disorders (MSKDs) are highly prevalent and are often associated with pain,
116 stiffness, loss of joint mobility, deformity and/or physical limitations. ¹ MSKDs are one of the
117 major drivers of increases in years lived with disability, low back pain alone being the worldwide
118 leading cause of this worrisome finding. ² Direct costs of MSKDs are rapidly increasing,
119 including costs for consultations with healthcare professionals, imaging tests and medication. ^{3,4}
120 Indirect costs, such as loss of productivity, are however considered to be the largest contributing
121 factor to MSKDs expenditures. ⁴ For low back pain, inflation-adjusted societal costs were
122 estimated at 26.40 billion USD in the United Kingdom and 81.24 billion USD in the United
123 States in 2015. ⁵

124 The emergency department (ED) remains one of the most common setting patients turn to when
125 presenting a MSKD. ⁶ For example, in Australia, up to 25% of ED presentations are for MSKDs.
126 ⁷ In Canada, 9% of patients presenting to the ED suffer from low back pain. ⁸ Numerous reasons
127 have been put forward to explain why persons go to the ED for such conditions. In a 2007
128 American survey, more than 40% of patients believed that their primary care provider was
129 incapable of correctly managing MSKDs. ⁹ Other reasons include lack of access to a general
130 practitioner (office closed, absence of a general practitioner, no health care insurance plan),
131 functional loss (impaired walking), feeling that current pain was different from other episodes,
132 desire for quick pain relief or additional investigation including imaging tests, as well as advice
133 of others to consult the ED. ¹⁰

134 Therefore, MSKDs may contribute to ED overcrowding which is a major problem in health
135 systems worldwide. ¹¹ This phenomenon has numerous consequences such as prolonged lengths
136 of stay, increased rates of patients leaving the ED without being seen, increased medical errors,

137 increased mortality among ambulatory and non-ambulatory patients and decreased patient
138 satisfaction.¹²⁻¹⁶ In order to reduce ED overcrowding and associated long wait times,
139 physiotherapists (PT) have been integrated in EDs in several countries to manage patients with
140 MSKDs directly after triage by the ED nurse, in models often referred to as direct access or
141 advanced practice physiotherapy in the ED, depending on the context.^{17,18} Access to
142 physiotherapy services in a timely manner for MSKDs has been associated with a decrease in
143 psychological symptoms, decreased risks of developing persistent pain, decreased costs and
144 utilization of the health care services.¹⁹⁻²⁴ Country-wide initiatives to integrate PTs in EDs in
145 Australia and the UK have been found to reduce wait times, length of stay, the prescription of
146 unnecessary consultations and useless diagnostic tests.^{7,17,25,26} Some studies show promising
147 results regarding diagnostic agreement between PTs and ED physicians or other specialists²⁷ and
148 high patient satisfaction regarding PT care in the ED.²⁸ However, to the best of our knowledge,
149 to date, only three randomized controlled trials assessing the effects of the integration of PTs in
150 EDs have been performed.²⁹⁻³¹ Furthermore, very few studies have measured the effects over
151 time on the clinical course of patients and the use of services and resources.

152 Therefore, to address this shortcoming in the current state of knowledge, the objectives of our
153 project were to compare the effects of direct access physiotherapy to usual care provided by an
154 emergency physician (EP) for ED patients presenting with a MSKD on the clinical course of
155 patients (pain and pain interference) and the use of resources at ED discharge and at 1 and 3
156 months.

157

158

159 **Methods**

160 **Study design**

161 A randomized controlled trial was carried out at the CHU de Québec - Université Laval within
162 the *Centre Hospitalier de l'Université Laval* (CHUL), an academic ED located in Quebec City
163 (Canada). Two groups of participants were recruited over a 24-week period between September
164 2018 and March 2019: one group of participants having direct access to a PT (Gr-PT) and a
165 control group (Gr-CTL) managed according to usual practice by the EP. To control for the types
166 of MSKD between groups, participants were stratified according to the area of the body affected
167 (lumbar spine and lower limb or thoracic spine, cervical spine and upper limb). Block
168 randomization was used to assign them to either group. The feasibility of the randomization
169 method was validated during a three-day observation period before data collection. The
170 randomization sequence was generated by the principal investigator (LJH) and group allocation
171 was unveiled by RG who opened a sealed envelope at the ED after triage by the ED nurse and
172 patient enrollment. Follow-ups at 1 and 3 months were made either by mail or over-the-phone.
173 The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the CHU de Québec - Université
174 Laval and registered at the US National Institutes of Health #NCT04009369.

175 **Study population**

176 Eligible patients presented to the ED with a potential peripheral or vertebral minor MSKD,
177 traumatic or not, and were given a triage score of 3 (urgent), 4 (less urgent) or 5 (non urgent)
178 according to the Canadian Emergency Department Triage and Acuity Scale classification.³²
179 Further inclusion criteria were: 1) being aged between 18 and 80 years, 2) having the ability to
180 legally consent to participate, 3) understanding French to complete the study questionnaires

181 either orally or in writing, and 4) being a beneficiary of the provincial health insurance plan
182 (*Régie de l'assurance maladie du Québec*). Patients were excluded if they presented with a
183 major MSKD requiring emergent care (e.g. open fracture, dislocation, open wound), a red flag
184 (e.g. progressive neurological disorder, infectious symptoms), a concomitant unstable clinical
185 condition (e.g. pulmonary, cardiac, digestive and/or psychiatric), or if they were currently
186 hospitalized or lived in a long-term care facility.

187 **Study recruitment**

188 Potential participants were identified based on information collected by the triage nurse and
189 included within the electronic information system used at the CHUL to register patients. After
190 identification in the system, the research coordinator (RG) went to the waiting room to speak
191 with the patient, verify eligibility, describe the research project, answer questions, and obtain a
192 written informed consent. Each participant was then allocated to either group via the previously
193 stated randomization procedure. All refusals were recorded and documented.

194 **Study interventions**

195 Participants in the PT group were initially assessed by a PT following nurse triage. After
196 obtaining a brief history of the injury and of clinical signs and symptoms, the PT performed a
197 brief physical examination of each patient. Interventions were then recommended based on the
198 clinical analysis and physiotherapy diagnosis, including advice, technical aids, imaging,
199 prescribed or over-the-counter medication, and consults with other healthcare professionals.
200 Immediately after each consultation, the PT filled a standardized form containing a summary of
201 the initial assessment, including diagnosis, and the recommended clinical management. He also
202 completed his usual clinical note in the patient's medical record. The form and a copy of the note

203 were then added to the ED consultation request. In the context of this innovative study, the
204 CHUL internal policy was to have every patient presenting to the ED seen by the ED physician
205 prior to discharge. The EP was free to use the PT's recommendations or not but was encouraged
206 to consult and discuss with the PT, if judged relevant. As for participants in the control group,
207 they received usual care consisting in the ED physician assessment followed by their choice of
208 interventions that were documented in the patient's file.

209 **Measures**

210 Our primary outcomes were pain interference on function and pain intensity which were
211 measured before ED management and at 1- and 3-months post ED visit. They were measured
212 using the *Brief Pain Inventory* (BPI) and the *Numeric Pain Rating Scale* (NPRS), respectively,
213 both tools having been recognized as being reliable, valid and responsive.³³⁻³⁷ They were
214 administered using paper format at the ED. Secondary variables related to utilization of services
215 and resources at ED discharge were documented from the above-mentioned forms and patient's
216 paper and electronic record. They included the following: types of interventions recommended
217 (advice and education, exercises, technical aid, hospitalization, medication), healthcare
218 professionals consulted, and imaging tests recommended. The BPI, NPRS, ED return visits,
219 hospitalization rate, number and types of consultations, imaging tests and medication used were
220 collected at 1- and 3-months following ED discharge using a self-reported online questionnaire
221 sent to participants via email or through structured telephone interviews, according to patient
222 preference and availability.

223

224

225 **Data analysis and sample size**

226 Descriptive statistics were used to characterize participants. Two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov
227 tests and χ^2 tests were used to compare characteristics of participants between groups at baseline.

228 We used non-parametric repeated-measures analyses of variance (two-way ANOVAs) for
229 longitudinal data (R software, 3.6.1; package nparLD, 2.1; proc fl.LD.fl) to measure differences
230 between groups over time for BPI and NPRS scores (2 groups x 3 times). These analyses are
231 more robust than parametric and semiparametric procedures as they can accept a change in
232 distribution over time, are unaffected by extreme values and can be used with smaller samples or
233 ordinal scales.³⁸ Furthermore, nparLD ANOVAs are designed so that there is no need to impute
234 values when patients are lost to follow-up. Hence, per-protocol analyses were conducted.^{38,39}


235 Multiway frequency analysis were performed to compare secondary variables between groups
236 across time points (SPSS 25, proc hiloglinear).⁴⁰ χ^2 tests were used to compare data between
237 groups at each time point individually (producing exact p-values). The α criterion was set at .05
238 for all statistical analyses.

239 An a priori sample size was based on the minimum clinically important difference (MCID) of the
240 BPI estimated to be 1.00.^{41,42} Using G*Power 3.1.9.2, we estimated a required sample-size of 45
241 participants per group based on $\alpha=0.05$, effect size=0.66, power $[1-\beta]=0.80$, standard deviation 1
242 (SD1)=1.43, SD2=1.59 BPI points, MCID=1.00 BPI points, loss to follow-up=20%.

243

244

245



249 **Figure 1. CONSORT Flow Diagram of participants through the trial**

251 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study participants (n=78)**

| Characteristics | CTL (n=38) | PT (n=40) |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Age (yrs), mean (SD) ¹ | 44.08 (17.3) | 36.55 (17.3) |
| Gender, n males (%) ² | 26 (68.4) | 18 (45.0) |
| Triage category in ED, n (%) | | |
| Urgent (P3) | 16 (42.1) | 16 (40.0) |
| Semi-urgent (P4) | 21 (55.3) | 24 (60.0) |
| Non-urgent (P5) | 1 (2.6) | 0 (0) |
| Living arrangements, n (%) | | |
| Alone | 8 (21.1) | 10 (25.0) |
| With family/Spouse | 30 (78.9) | 30 (75.0) |
| Occupation, n (%) | | |
| Medical leave due to present complaint | 2 (5.3) | 3 (7.5) |
| Medical leave for other reason | 3 (7.9) | 0 (0) |
| Working Full time | 19 (50.0) | 18 (45.0) |
| Working Part time | 4 (10.5) | 2 (5.0) |
| Student | 3 (7.9) | 10 (25.0) |
| Other | 7 (18.4) | 7 (17.5) |
| Loss of wages since onset, yes n (%) | 3 (7.9) | 3 (7.5) |
| Personal income, n (%) | | |
| 1\$ - 49 999\$ | 24 (63.2) | 25 (62.5) |
| 50 000\$ - 99 999\$ | 11 (28.9) | 11 (27.5) |
| ≥ 100 000\$ | 1 (2.6) | 0 (0) |
| Highest level of education completed, n (%) | | |
| Primary or High School | 14 (36.8) | 5 (12.5) |
| College or University | 24 (63.2) | 34 (85.0) |
| Time since onset of symptoms, n weeks (%) | | |
| 0-2 | 32 (84.2) | 30 (75.0) |
| 3-12 | 1 (2.6) | 4 (10.0) |
| > 12 | 4 (10.5) | 4 (10.0) |
| Don't know | 1 (2.6) | 1 (2.5) |
| Other health conditions, yes n (%) | 18 (47.4) | 13 (32.5) |
| Mode of arrival in the ED, n (%) | | |
| Ambulance | 7 (18.4) | 6 (15.0) |
| Private or public transport | 29 (76.3) | 28 (70.0) |
| Foot | 1 (2.6) | 6 (15.0) |
| Other | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Registered to a family physician, n (%) | 30 (78.9) | 33 (82.5) |
| Pain catastrophizing, mean (SD) | 22.4 (11.8) § | 18.3 (13.2) † |

252 1: p<.05, 2: p<.01, §: n=35, †: n=39, CTL: Control group, PT: PT group, Yrs: years, ED:
 253 Emergency department

254 **Participants**

255 Overall, 579 participants were assessed for eligibility between September 2018 and March 2019
256 and 78 were recruited (Figure 1). Ten participants declined to participate because they wanted to
257 be exclusively managed by the EP. Two participants did not receive the allocated intervention in
258 the EP group because they left the ED before seeing the EP, but they still participated in the 1-
259 and 3-months follow-ups. Fifteen participants were lost to follow-up at 1 month (follow-up rate:
260 80.86% [CTL group: 84.22%; PT group: 77.5%]) but 4 of them were successfully contacted at 3
261 months. Sixteen participants were lost to follow-up at 3 months (follow-up rate: 79.47% [CTL
262 group: 80.0%; PT group: 78.95%]). No adverse event was reported.

263 Regarding baseline characteristics, there were no statistically significant differences between
264 groups for all variables, except for age ($p=.007$) and gender ($p=.043$) (Table 1). There were more
265 women in the PT group and their mean age was significantly lower. Hence, we used these
266 characteristics as covariates in our analysis.

267 **Effect of direct access PT on pain intensity and pain interference**

268 Our analysis showed significant group effect, time effect and group x time effect on the BPI and
269 NPRS scores (Table 2, Figures 2a.-2b.). Both groups showed significant improvements over time
270 (NPRS: $p<.0001$, BPI: $p<.0001$; Table 2), but participants in the PT group had a greater
271 improvement at the 1- and 3-month follow-ups compared to the CTL group (NPRS: $p=.0005$,
272 BPI: $p=.048$; Table 2). Both groups achieved minimal clinically important differences for the
273 NPRS (MCID: 1.3 points) and BPI scores (MCID 1.0 points) at 1 month, but scores in the PT
274 group were significantly lower than those in the CTL group (Table 2, Figures 3a.-3b.).
275 Differences in scores in the PT group remained significantly lower than those in the CTL group
276 at 3 months; mean scores of participants seen by the PT were 2.9 times lower for the NPRS and

277 2.6 times lower for the BPI compared to the control group at the 3-month follow-up (Table 2).
 278 To calculate the effect size, Glass's *delta* were used since the standard deviation of both groups
 279 were statistically different.

280 **Table 2. Pain intensity and pain interference at baseline, 1- and 3-month follow-ups**


| | | CTL | n | PT | n | Glass Δ | ATS | DF | p-value | Post-hoc p-values |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------|----|-----------|----|----------------|--------|------|---------|------------------------|
| NPRS mean (SD) | Group X | | | | | | 6.68 | 1 | .0097 | .676 ---* |
| | Time | | | | | | 137.44 | 1.94 | <.0001 | |
| | Interaction | | | | | | 7.70 | 1.94 | .00053 | |
| | Pre | 6.7 (2.2) | 38 | 6.9 (2.0) | 39 | | | | | |
| | Post* | 5.6 (3.0) | 13 | 5.5 (2.7) | 32 | | | | | |
| | 1 month | 3.7 (2.9) | 32 | 1.8 (2.4) | 31 | - 0.655 | | | .0062 | |
| | 3 months | 2.6 (2.7) | 30 | 0.9 (1.8) | 32 | - 0.630 | | | .0014 | |
| BPI mean (SD) | Group X | | | | | | 9.77 | 1 | .0018 | .582 .0033 .0078 |
| | Time | | | | | | 66.69 | 1.83 | <.0001 | |
| | Interaction | | | | | | 3.13 | 1.83 | .048 | |
| | Pre | 4.4 (1.8) | 38 | 4.1 (2.3) | 40 | | | | | |
| | 1 month | 3.0 (2.3) | 32 | 1.6 (2.1) | 31 | - 0.609 | | | | |
| | 3 months | 1.8 (2.0) | 30 | 0.7 (1.4) | 32 | - 0.550 | | | | |

281 Pre: Pre-intervention, Post: Post-intervention, SD: Standard Deviation, CTL: Control Group, PT:
 282 PT Group, ATS: Anova-Type Statistics, DF: Degrees of Freedom
 283 NPRS: Numeric Pain Rating Scale (0-10, 0=no pain), BPI: Brief Pain Inventory (0-10, 0=no pain
 284 interference on function)
 285 *Since the post-intervention NPRS questionnaires were filled by the CTL group after seeing the
 286 EP and given that 1) the research coordinator (RG) had sometimes already left and 2) few of
 287 them were sent back (n=13), the pre-intervention NPRS scores were used for the multivariate
 288 analysis. However, mean post-intervention NPRS scores are also reported.

289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297

298

a)




299

300

301

b)



302

303

304

Figure 2. Violin plot of the scores for each group at baseline, 1 and 3 months.

a) BPI scores and b) NPRS scores

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320


321

322 CTL: Control group
323 PT: PT group
324 BPI: Brief Pain Inventory (0-10, 0=no pain interference on function)
325 NPRS: Numeric Pain Rating Scale (0-10, 0=no pain)
326

327

328


a)



329

330

b)



331

332

333

334

**Figure 3. Mean scores for each group at baseline, 1 and 3 months.
a) BPI scores and b) NPRS scores**

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344 CTL: Control group

345 PT: PT group

346 *: $p < .05$

347 BPI: Brief Pain Inventory (0-10, 0=no pain interference on function)

348 NPRS: Numeric Pain Rating Scale (0-10, 0=no pain)

349

350

351 **Comparisons of use of services and resources**

352 We found significant differences between groups at ED discharge regarding proportions of
353 prescription and over-the-counter medication and imaging tests (only recommended in the case
354 of the PT but autonomously prescribed in the case of the EP). The PT recommended significantly
355 less prescribed medication ($p=.030$; Figures 4a.-5) and imaging tests ($p<.0001$) but more over-
356 the-counter medication ($p<.0001$) than the EP at the ED. After 1 month, participants in the PT
357 group had returned significantly less often to the ED ($p=.007$) and had used less prescription
358 medication ($p=.002$), including opioids ($p=.043$), than participants in the control group (Figures
359 4b.-5). There were no differences in the use of over-the-counter medication ($p=.102$), other
360 professionals consulted ($p=.269$), and imaging tests administered ($p=.477$). At 3 months,
361 participants in the PT group used less over-the-counter medication than participants in the EP
362 group ($p=.034$), but there were no significant differences in ED return visits ($p=.484$),
363 prescription medication ($p=.234$), imaging tests used ($p=.150$) and consultations with another
364 professional ($p=.503$) (Figures 4c.-5). No differences were found in hospitalization rates between
365 groups at all time points (at discharge $p=.474$; 1-month $p=.738$; 3-month no hospitalization in
366 both groups). As seen on the Figure 5, overall, at all times, the proportion of use of services and
367 resources between groups was higher in the ED group compared to the PT groups for all services
368 and resources except for the over-the-counter medication (OTCM) and the imaging tests (IT).

369

370

371


372

373

374

375

a)




376

377

378

b)



379

380

381

382

383

384


385

386

387

388

c)



389


390

391

392

Figure 4. Proportion of services and resources recommended by each provider
a) During ED visit, b) After 1 month and c) Between the 1- and 3-month follow-ups

393 CTL: Control group
394 PT: PT group
395 *: $p < .05$
396 ERV: ED return visits
397 HOS: Hospitalization
398 PM: Prescription medication
399 OPI: Opioids
400 OTCM: Over-the-counter medication
401 CWAP: Consultation with another professional
402 IT: Imaging tests
403
404



405

406 **Figure 5. Proportion of use of services and resources between groups at baseline (□), 1 (▲)**
 407 **and 3 months (●).**

408

409

410

411

412

413

414 Values represent the difference between proportions in the PT group and proportions in the EP
415 group at each time point.

416

417 *: $p < .05$

418 ERV: ED return visits

419 HOS: Hospitalization

420 PM: Prescription medication

421 OTCM: Over-the-counter medication

422 CWAP: Consultation with another professional

423 IT: Imaging tests

424

425 **Discussion**

426 The aim of our study was to compare the effects of direct access PT for patients presenting to an
427 ED for a MSKD to usual management provided by an EP on the clinical course of participants
428 (pain and pain interference) and use of services and resources after ED discharge and at 1 and 3
429 months post-discharge.

430 In this study, participants in the PT group presented significantly lower pain intensity and pain
431 interference than those in the EP group at 1 and 3 months. Significant differences in scores were
432 found between the PT and the EP group (main effect of group) and between our measures at each
433 time point (main effect of time): scores in the PT group were statistically lower than those in the
434 EP group and both groups showed significant improvement over time. These differences
435 between our groups persisted over time (interaction effect), helping to confirm that the changes
436 in scores observed over time were significantly different depending on group allocation. Indeed,
437 mean pain intensity level in the PT group dropped by 6.0 points between baseline and the 3-
438 months follow-up and mean pain interference on function dropped by 3.4 points. This later
439 finding largely exceeds clinically important differences (1.3 NPRS points; 1.00 BPI points),
440 which represents important clinical benefits.^{34,41} Comparatively, NPRS scores dropped by 4.1
441 points and BPI scores by 2.6 points in the CTL group. These differences in scores could be
442 partially explained by the quality of the reinsurance and education given by the PT.⁴³ Other
443 studies show mixed results for pain outcomes. In a study by Lau et al., patients seen by the PT
444 expressed significantly less pain at discharge from the ED and within one week of discharge, but
445 these differences were no longer significant at the 1-month follow-up.²⁹ Other studies on direct
446 access PT or advanced practice in the ED report no significant differences in pain levels at
447 baseline and up to six months after ED visit.^{30,44-46} More broadly, studies concerning early

448 access to PT in various clinical settings also suggest mixed results, patients with early access
449 presenting either a significant decrease or no change at all in their pain level after six months.
450 ^{20,21,26} However, as reported by Kilner et al., most of these studies are of poor methodological
451 quality and considered as low-level evidence. ⁴⁷ To our knowledge, this is the first study
452 presenting data on pain interference for patients managed by a PT in the ED.

453 Furthermore, use of several services and resources was significantly lower for participants in the
454 PT group compared to those in the EP group at discharge, 1 and 3 months. At discharge,
455 participants in the EP (control) group had been prescribed about 40% more diagnostic imaging
456 tests than what was recommended by the PT. These results are consistent with others found in
457 the literature. ^{44,48} In recent clinical guidelines, imaging is discouraged for patients presenting
458 with MSKDs unless a serious pathology is suspected or if imaging is likely to change
459 management. ^{49,50} According to Baker et al., approximately 40% of imaging referrals for patients
460 presenting with a non-traumatic MSKD to the ED is inconsistent with guideline
461 recommendations. ⁵¹ Moreover, when looking at the PT's assessment, Décarry et al. found high
462 inter-rater agreement for common knee disorders between the diagnosis made by the PT using
463 only a musculoskeletal examination and the physician's diagnosis made using both
464 musculoskeletal examination and imaging. The musculoskeletal examination performed by the
465 PT has also been found to be of high diagnostic validity. ²⁷ Thus, it is possible that the
466 differences observed in the PT's recommendation for imaging may be due in part to the more
467 comprehensive physical examination performed or greater adherence to clinical practice
468 guidelines. No adverse outcomes were reported in both groups. There were no differences
469 between groups for use of imaging tests at 1 and 3 months, suggesting that direct access PT
470 management was appropriate an at least equivalent to that of the EP.

471 At ED discharge, participants in the PT group were also recommended on average 25% less
472 often prescription medication but around 60% more over-the-counter medication than those in
473 the control group. Furthermore, participants in the PT group had used 40% less prescription
474 medication at 1 month, including opioids, and 25% less over-the-counter medication at 3 months
475 compared to the EP group. In agreement with certain clinical guidelines, acetaminophen, anti-
476 inflammatory drugs or opioids should not be recommended to patients presenting with a MSKD
477 as their efficacy is questionable and they tend to be associated with poorer outcomes.^{49,50}
478 Providers should prioritize modalities such as advice to stay active, individualized patient
479 education and supervised exercise.^{49,50} As for ED return visits, no participant in the PT group
480 had returned to the ED in the first 3 months after their ED visit. Comparatively, 21% of
481 participants seen by the EP at 1 month had returned to the ED. To our knowledge, this is the first
482 time that an effect on ED return visits and medication use is measured in a study comparing the
483 effects of management of MSKD by a PT or an EP in ED. The differences in ED return visits
484 rates might be partially explained by the different training and approaches used by the two care
485 providers. As mentioned above, current guidelines recommend providing education or
486 information to encourage self-management and to inform and reassure patients about their
487 condition.⁴⁹ Patients should also be offered individualised education in addition to usual care.⁵⁰
488 For example, pain neuroscience education for MSKDs has been found to reduce pain and
489 improve patient knowledge of pain, improve function, enhance movement and minimize
490 healthcare utilization.⁵² It has been shown that PTs have higher levels of knowledge in
491 managing MSKDs than medical students, physician interns, residents and all physician
492 specialists except for orthopaedists⁵³. Participants in the PT group may have then felt better

493 equipped and empowered to manage their condition which may have reduced perceived need for
494 further services and resources over time.

495 **Limitations**

496 We found significant differences in age and gender between our groups at baseline, the PT group
497 having younger participants and more women. Such differences in allocation might have been
498 caused by the stratification used when randomizing participants as we stratified only according
499 to the area of the body affected and not by gender or age. Women have been found to report
500 higher pain intensity and disability than men for the same condition, to seek more medical care,
501 to cope less efficiently with pain and to be managed differently, also receiving more prescription
502 medication and at higher doses than men.^{54,55} Since there were more women in the PT group
503 than the EP group, the positive effects of the PT intervention over time might have been under-
504 estimated. However, we used age and gender as covariates in our analysis and hence controlled
505 for this limitation. Also, the groups may have differed for other baseline characteristics that were
506 only present in few participants, thus preventing us from verifying whether a statistical
507 difference was present.

508 Sample size in our study is relatively small. We must then be reasonably careful with the
509 generalization of the results, although sufficient statistical power was obtained. Moreover, we
510 only had a 20% loss to follow-up. It is possible that quality of the data may have been
511 compromised by recall bias and lack of completeness of the notes written by each of the
512 professionals involved. Another limitation, implicitly imposed from an ethical point of view, is
513 that we did not include a group receiving no treatment at all, hence preventing us from
514 comparing the evolution of our participants with the expected natural healing process overtime.
515 Also, for feasibility reasons, longer-term follow-up of participants was not carried out.

516 **Conclusion**

517 The results of this study suggest that direct access PT in the ED for patients presenting with a
518 MSKD is associated with greater improvements in pain intensity and pain interference and less
519 use of several services and resources, such as ED return visits, imaging tests, prescription and
520 over-the-counter medication. Further multicentric trials are needed to confirm these findings.
521 Moreover, future studies should include an economic analysis to ascertain if PT management in a
522 direct access setting in an ED is cost-effective.

523

524 **References**

- 525 1. Agel J, Akesson K, Amadio PC, Anderson M, Rasker JJ. The burden of musculoskeletal conditions
526 at the start of the new millennium. 2003 [cited 2019 Jun 28]; Available from:
527 [https://research.utwente.nl/en/publications/the-burden-of-musculoskeletal-conditions-at-the-start-of-](https://research.utwente.nl/en/publications/the-burden-of-musculoskeletal-conditions-at-the-start-of-the-new-)
528 [the-new-](https://research.utwente.nl/en/publications/the-burden-of-musculoskeletal-conditions-at-the-start-of-the-new-)
- 529 2. GBD 2015 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global, regional, and
530 national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 310 diseases and injuries, 1990-
531 2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet Lond Engl*
532 2016;388(10053):1545–602.
- 533 3. Lin C-WC, Haas M, Maher CG, Machado LAC, van Tulder MW. Cost-effectiveness of general
534 practice care for low back pain: a systematic review. *Eur Spine J* 2011;20(7):1012–23.
- 535 4. Bornhöft L, Thorn J, Svensson M, Nordeman L, Eggertsen R, Larsson MEH. More cost-effective
536 management of patients with musculoskeletal disorders in primary care after direct triaging to
537 physiotherapists for initial assessment compared to initial general practitioner assessment. *BMC*
538 *Musculoskelet Disord* [Internet] 2019 [cited 2019 May 8];20(1). Available from:
539 <https://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-019-2553-9>
- 540 5. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, et al. What low back pain is and why we need to pay
541 attention. *The Lancet* 2018;391(10137):2356–67.
- 542 6. Jordan KP, Kadam UT, Hayward R, Porcheret M, Young C, Croft P. Annual consultation
543 prevalence of regional musculoskeletal problems in primary care: an observational study. *BMC*
544 *Musculoskelet Disord* 2010;11(1):144.
- 545 7. Bird S, Thompson C, Williams KE. Primary contact physiotherapy services reduce waiting and
546 treatment times for patients presenting with musculoskeletal conditions in Australian emergency
547 departments: an observational study. *J Physiother* 2016;62(4):209–14.
- 548 8. Institut canadien d’information sur la santé. SNISA - Nombre de visites au service d’urgence et
549 durée de séjour par province et territoire, 2015-2016. 2016;
- 550 9. Gaieski DF, Mehta S, Hollander JE, Shofer F, Bernstein J. Low-severity Musculoskeletal
551 Complaints Evaluated in the Emergency Department. *Clin Orthop* 2008;466(8):1987–95.
- 552 10. Stafford V, Greenhalgh S, Davidson I. Why do patients with Simple Mechanical Back Pain seek
553 Urgent Care? *Physiotherapy* 2014;100(1):66–72.
- 554 11. Di Somma S, Paladino L, Vaughan L, Lalle I, Magrini L, Magnanti M. Overcrowding in emergency
555 department: an international issue. *Intern Emerg Med* 2015;10(2):171–5.
- 556 12. Epstein SK, Huckins DS, Liu SW, et al. Emergency department crowding and risk of preventable
557 medical errors. *Intern Emerg Med* 2012;7(2):173–80.
- 558 13. Forero R, Man N, Ngo H, et al. Impact of the four-hour National Emergency Access Target on 30
559 day mortality, access block and chronic emergency department overcrowding in Australian
560 emergency departments. *Emerg Med Australas* 2019;31(1):58–66.

- 561 14. Bernstein SL, Aronsky D, Duseja R, et al. The Effect of Emergency Department Crowding on
562 Clinically Oriented Outcomes. *Acad Emerg Med* 2009;16(1):1–10.
- 563 15. Santos E, Cardoso D, Queirós P, Cunha M, Rodrigues M, Apóstolo J. The effects of emergency
564 department overcrowding on admitted patient outcomes: a systematic review protocol. *JBIM Database*
565 *Syst Rev Implement Rep* 2016;14(5):96.
- 566 16. Carter EJ, Pouch SM, Larson EL. The Relationship Between Emergency Department Crowding and
567 Patient Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2014;46(2):106–15.
- 568 17. de Gruchy A, Granger C, Gorelik A. Physical Therapists as Primary Practitioners in the Emergency
569 Department: Six-Month Prospective Practice Analysis. *Phys Ther* 2015;95(9):1207–16.
- 570 18. Morris J, Vine K, Grimmer K. Evaluation of performance quality of an advanced scope
571 physiotherapy role in a hospital emergency department. *Patient Relat Outcome Meas* 2015;6:191–
572 203.
- 573 19. Foster NE, Hartvigsen J, Croft PR. Taking responsibility for the early assessment and treatment of
574 patients with musculoskeletal pain: a review and critical analysis. *Arthritis Res Ther*
575 2012;14(1):205.
- 576 20. Wand BM, Bird C, McAuley JH, Doré CJ, MacDowell M, De Souza LH. Early Intervention for the
577 Management of Acute Low Back Pain: A Single-Blind Randomized Controlled Trial of
578 Biopsychosocial Education, Manual Therapy, and Exercise. *Spine* 2004;29(21):2350–6.
- 579 21. Nordeman L, Nilsson B, Møller M, Gunnarsson R. Early Access to Physical Therapy Treatment
580 for Subacute Low Back Pain in Primary Health Care: A Prospective Randomized Clinical Trial.
581 *Clin J Pain* 2006;22(6):505–11.
- 582 22. Childs JD, Fritz JM, Wu SS, et al. Implications of early and guideline adherent physical therapy for
583 low back pain on utilization and costs. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015;15:150.
- 584 23. Ojha HA, Wyrsta NJ, Davenport TE, Egan WE, Gellhorn AC. Timing of Physical Therapy
585 Initiation for Nonsurgical Management of Musculoskeletal Disorders and Effects on Patient
586 Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2016;46(2):56–70.
- 587 24. Deslauriers S, Déry J, Proulx K, et al. Effects of waiting for outpatient physiotherapy services in
588 persons with musculoskeletal disorders: a systematic review. *Disabil Rehabil* 2019;0(0):1–10.
- 589 25. Heywood JW. Specialist physiotherapists in orthopaedic triage—the results of a military spinal triage
590 clinic. *J R Army Med Corps* 2005;151(3):152–156.
- 591 26. Sohil P, Hao PY, Mark L. Potential impact of early physiotherapy in the emergency department for
592 non-traumatic neck and back pain. *World J Emerg Med* 2017;8(2):110–5.
- 593 27. Décary S, Fallaha M, Pelletier B, et al. Diagnostic validity and triage concordance of a
594 physiotherapist compared to physicians' diagnoses for common knee disorders. *BMC*
595 *Musculoskelet Disord* 2017;18(1):445.

- 596 28. Matifat E, Perreault K, Roy J-S, et al. Concordance between physiotherapists and physicians for
597 care of patients with musculoskeletal disorders presenting to the emergency department. *BMC*
598 *Emerg Med* 2019;19(1):67.
- 599 29. Lau PM-Y, Chow DH-K, Pope MH. Early physiotherapy intervention in an Accident and
600 Emergency Department reduces pain and improves satisfaction for patients with acute low back
601 pain: a randomised trial. *Aust J Physiother* 2008;54(4):243–9.
- 602 30. Richardson B, Shepstone L, Poland F, Mugford M, Finlayson B, Clemence N. Randomised
603 controlled trial and cost consequences study comparing initial physiotherapy assessment and
604 management with routine practice for selected patients in an accident and emergency department of
605 an acute hospital. *Emerg Med J EMJ* 2005;22(2):87–92.
- 606 31. McClellan CM, Cramp F, Powell J, Bengler JR. A randomised trial comparing the cost effectiveness
607 of different emergency department healthcare professionals in soft tissue injury management. *BMJ*
608 *Open* 2013;3(1):e001116.
- 609 32. Beveridge R, Clarke B, Janes L, et al. L'échelle canadienne de triage & de gravité pour les
610 départements d'urgence Guide d'implantation. *Can J Emerg Med* 1999;1(3).
- 611 33. Jensen MP, McFarland CA. Increasing the reliability and validity of pain intensity measurement in
612 chronic pain patients. *Pain* 1993;55(2):195–203.
- 613 34. Bijur PE, Latimer CT, Gallagher EJ. Validation of a Verbally Administered Numerical Rating Scale
614 of Acute Pain for Use in the Emergency Department. *Acad Emerg Med* 2003;10(4):390–2.
- 615 35. Michener LA, Snyder AR, Leggin BG. Responsiveness of the numeric pain rating scale in patients
616 with shoulder pain and the effect of surgical status. *J Sport Rehabil* 2011;20(1):115–28.
- 617 36. Mendoza T, Mayne T, Rublee D, Cleeland C. Reliability and validity of a modified Brief Pain
618 Inventory short form in patients with osteoarthritis. *Eur J Pain* 2006;10(4):353–353.
- 619 37. Tan G, Jensen MP, Thornby JI, Shanti BF. Validation of the brief pain inventory for chronic
620 nonmalignant pain. *J Pain* 2004;5(2):133–7.
- 621 38. Noguchi K, Gel YR, Brunner E, Konietzschke F. **nparLD** : An R Software Package for the
622 Nonparametric Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Factorial Experiments. *J Stat Softw* [Internet] 2012
623 [cited 2020 Mar 11];50(12). Available from: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v50/i12/>
- 624 39. Brunner E, Domhof S, Langer F. Nonparametric analysis of longitudinal data in factorial
625 experiments. J. Wiley; 2002.
- 626 40. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS, Ullman JB. Using multivariate statistics. Pearson Boston, MA; 2007.
- 627 41. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Wyrwich KW, et al. Interpreting the Clinical Importance of Treatment
628 Outcomes in Chronic Pain Clinical Trials: IMMPACT Recommendations. *J Pain* 2008;9(2):105–21.
- 629 42. Mease PJ, Spaeth M, Clauw DJ, et al. Estimation of minimum clinically important difference for
630 pain in fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Care Res* 2011;63(6):821–6.

- 631 43. Matifat E, Méquignon M, Cunningham C, Blake C, Fennelly O, Desmeules F. Benefits of
632 Musculoskeletal Physical Therapy in Emergency Departments: A Systematic Review. *Phys Ther*
633 2019;99(9):1150–66.
- 634 44. Schulz P, Prescott J, Shifman J, Fiore J, Holland A, Harding P. Comparing patient outcomes for
635 care delivered by advanced musculoskeletal physiotherapists with other health professionals in the
636 emergency department-A pilot study. *Australas Emerg Nurs J AENJ* 2016;19(4):198–202.
- 637 45. McClellan CM, Greenwood R, Bengner JR. Effect of an extended scope physiotherapy service on
638 patient satisfaction and the outcome of soft tissue injuries in an adult emergency department. *Emerg*
639 *Med J EMJ* 2006;23(5):384–7.
- 640 46. Bornhöft L, Larsson ME, Nordeman L, Eggertsen R, Thorn J. Health effects of direct triaging to
641 physiotherapists in primary care for patients with musculoskeletal disorders: a pragmatic
642 randomized controlled trial. *Ther Adv Musculoskelet Dis* 2019;11:1759720X1982750.
- 643 47. Kilner E. What evidence is there that a physiotherapy service in the emergency department
644 improves health outcomes? A systematic review. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2011;16(1):51–8.
- 645 48. Sutton M, Govier A, Prince S, Morphett M. Primary-contact physiotherapists manage a minor
646 trauma caseload in the emergency department without misdiagnoses or adverse events: an
647 observational study. *J Physiother* 2015;61(2):77–80.
- 648 49. Lin I, Wiles L, Waller R, et al. What does best practice care for musculoskeletal pain look like?
649 Eleven consistent recommendations from high-quality clinical practice guidelines: systematic
650 review. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;54(2):79–86.
- 651 50. Stochkendahl MJ, Kjaer P, Hartvigsen J, et al. National Clinical Guidelines for non-surgical
652 treatment of patients with recent onset low back pain or lumbar radiculopathy. *Eur Spine J*
653 2018;27(1):60–75.
- 654 51. Baker B, Kessler K, Kaiser B, et al. Non-traumatic musculoskeletal pain in Western Australian
655 hospital emergency departments: A clinical audit of the prevalence, management practices and
656 evidence-to-practice gaps. *Emerg Med Australas* 2019;31(6):1037–44.
- 657 52. Louw A, Zimney K, Puenteadura EJ, Diener I. The efficacy of pain neuroscience education on
658 musculoskeletal pain: A systematic review of the literature. *Physiother Theory Pract*
659 2016;32(5):332–55.
- 660 53. Childs JD, Whitman JM, Sizer PS, Puglia ML, Flynn TW, Delitto A. A description of physical
661 therapists' knowledge in managing musculoskeletal conditions. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*
662 2005;6:32.
- 663 54. Fullerton EF, Doyle HH, Murphy AZ. Impact of sex on pain and opioid analgesia: a review. *Curr*
664 *Opin Behav Sci* 2018;23:183–90.
- 665 55. Mills SEE, Nicolson KP, Smith BH. Chronic pain: a review of its epidemiology and associated
666 factors in population-based studies. *BJA Br J Anaesth* 2019;123(2):e273–83.

667