

UK osteopathic practice in 2019: a retrospective analysis of practice data

Austin Plunkett^{1,‡*}, Carol Fawkes^{1,2,‡}, Dawn Carnes^{1,2,‡}.

¹ Institute of Population Health Sciences. Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry. Yvonne Carter Building, 58 Turner Street, Whitechapel, London, E1 2AB, United Kingdom.

² National Council for Osteopathic Research ^

* Corresponding author. Email: a.j.plunkett@qmul.ac.uk (AP)

‡ These authors contributed equally to this work.

^ Membership of the National Council for Osteopathic Research is described at <https://ncor.org.uk>

Abstract

Background

This study describes osteopathic activity, scope of practice and the osteopathic patient profile in order to understand the role osteopathy plays within the UK health system a decade after our previous survey.

Method

We used a retrospective questionnaire survey design to ask about osteopathic practice and audit patient case notes. All UK registered osteopaths were invited to participate in the survey.

The survey was conducted using a web-based system. Each participating osteopath was asked about themselves, their practice and asked to randomly select and extract data from up to 8 random new patient health records during 2018. All patient related data were anonymised.

Results

The survey response rate was 500 osteopaths (9.4% of the profession) who provided information about 395 patients and 2,215 consultations.

Most osteopaths were self-employed (81.1%; 344/424 responses) working alone either exclusively or often (63.9%; 237/371) and were able to offer 48.6% of patients an appointment within 3 days (184/379).

Patient ages ranged from 1 month to 96 years (mean 44.7 years, Std Dev. 21.5), of these 58.4% (227/389) were female. Infants < 1 years old represented 4.8% (18/379) of patients.

30 The majority of patients presented with musculoskeletal complaints (81.0%; 306/378). Persistent
31 complaints (present for more than 12 weeks before appointment) were the most common (67.9%;
32 256/377) and 41.7% (156/374) of patients had co-existing medical conditions. The most
33 common treatment approaches used at the first appointment were soft-tissue techniques
34 (73.9%; 292/395), articulatory techniques (69.4%; 274/395) and high velocity low amplitude
35 thrust (34.4%; 136/395). The mean number of treatments per patient was 7 (mode 4).

36 **Conclusion**

37 To better understand the role of osteopathy in UK health service delivery, the profession needs to
38 do more research with patients in order to understand their needs and their expected outcomes of
39 care, and for this to inform osteopathic practice and education.

40 **Introduction**

41 Osteopathy has formed part of the provision of regulated musculoskeletal services in the United
42 Kingdom for almost three decades and features as part of both national and international clinical
43 guidelines [1–3]. Although osteopathy is perhaps most recognised for its use of spinal
44 manipulation, osteopathic practise encompasses a range of techniques appropriate to individual
45 patients, and includes also education and advice.

46 In 2009 the National Council for Osteopathic research (NCOR) conducted a survey of osteopaths to
47 describe the full extent of their practise and the patient population consulting for osteopathic care
48 [4]. The survey was based on a standardised data collection (SDC) tool developed by practising
49 osteopaths [5]. Similar work has been undertaken subsequently in Belgium, Spain, Switzerland and
50 Italy to describe osteopathic care in other European countries [6–9].

51 The previous 2009 UK study indicated that the majority of patients sought osteopathic care for low
52 back pain (36%) and neck and shoulder pain (21.8%). The majority were female (56%) and
53 patients ranged between the ages of 0-93 years [4]. This information was useful to understand the
54 actual role and the potential role osteopathy could play in UK health care provision. Since 2009, we
55 anticipated that the role of osteopaths in the UK would have changed in line with infrastructure
56 changes within the provision of national healthcare. In 2012 the UK Government changed the way
57 in which healthcare provision is commissioned [10] with the introduction of a new low back pain
58 pathway and the creation of the First Contact Practitioner role, both of which provided
59 opportunities for osteopaths to work as part of multidisciplinary teams. Additionally, in 2017
60 osteopaths became recognised as part of the Allied Health Professions (AHP) community which has
61 enhanced potential roles for osteopaths within the UK National Health Service (NHS) [11].

62 While the information from the 2009 SDC study has been used extensively to describe the full
63 extent of osteopathic care to other health professionals, it now requires updating to describe the
64 profession as it is in 2020.

65 **Aim**

66 The aim of this study is to provide the osteopathic community, patients, the public and other health
67 care professionals with a descriptive profile of osteopathic practice, the osteopathic patient

68 population and the care they receive from osteopaths. This study will help to formulate teaching
69 goals, plan ongoing continuing professional development activities, identify national research
70 priorities, provide data for stakeholder negotiation and ultimately to optimise patient care.

71 **Method**

72 **Design**

73 We used a retrospective questionnaire survey design to: i) ask about osteopaths and their
74 osteopathic practice and ii) audit patient case notes. The survey was a practice review, a type of
75 service evaluation using the principles of audit [12]. The retrospective design meant that we were
76 evaluating actual recorded data, therefore some data may be missing in patient records. This type
77 of design can help to understand actual practice as reflected by the record keeping of the
78 osteopaths.

79 **Population and setting**

80 All osteopaths in the UK are required to be registered with the General Osteopathic Council (GOsC),
81 a statutory body set up for patient protection. Osteopaths must undergo training at a recognised
82 osteopathic education institution or be trained to an equivalent standard elsewhere so that the
83 practicing osteopath is capable and able to comply with the Osteopathic Practice Standards [13]. All
84 registered osteopaths were invited to participate in the study. There were 5,341 registered
85 osteopaths during 2019 (www.osteopathy.org.uk). Only information about patients and osteopaths
86 in the private health sector setting was sought for this study. A very small proportion of osteopaths
87 work in the National Health Service (NHS), data about and from the NHS was not collected as part
88 of this study.

89 **The questionnaire survey**

90 The survey questions were mainly derived from the original standardised data collection survey
91 conducted in 2009 [4] and from a survey commissioned by the GOsC [14]. The questionnaire
92 consisted of three parts, described in S1 File. Part A contained information about the survey and
93 asked for consent to participate. Part B asked about the osteopath respondent. Part C asked about
94 osteopathic patients and practice, based on data collected through review of patient records from
95 the year 2018.

96 Study data were collected and managed using the Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap)
97 software, a secure, web-based application designed to support data capture for research studies
98 [15].

99 **Recruitment**

100 All GOsC osteopaths registered as practicing were invited to participate in this online-survey. They
101 were invited by email by the GOsC at the request of the National Council for Osteopathic Research
102 (NCOR), the funding body and research team, as well as by emails directly from NCOR. The survey
103 was promoted on social media (Facebook and Twitter) and in the osteopathic profession magazines
104 (*The Osteopath* and *Osteopathy Today*) to promote the survey and encourage participation.

105 Osteopaths were informed that they could use their participation in the survey as part of their
106 continuing professional development (CPD).

107 The REDCap survey platform allocated a random ID to participants so they could return to the
108 survey and continue later. Those who wished to participate in the survey were asked to provide
109 their consent online before commencing the survey. Once section A was completed, the system
110 automatically registered them as participants and opened section B of the survey.

111 We also asked osteopaths who did not want to participate their reasons for
112 non-participation where relevant. Reminders were sent by email after one month and two
113 months.

114

115 **Health record sample selection**

116 We required the osteopaths to give us data about new patients throughout the year in 2018.
117 Selecting patients from both new and returning encounters may lead to an over-
118 representation of those consulting more frequently (i.e. those seeking care more often are
119 more likely to be selected), therefore we decided to profile only new patients.

120 To select records, we provided each osteopaths with a random date from 2018, generated by a
121 third-party provider of true random data [16]. Participants were instructed to find the first new
122 patient on or after the provided random date.

123 **Anonymity**

124 **Osteopath anonymity**

125 All participants were provided with a unique identifier for use when returning to the survey. The
126 survey database was only consulted where an osteopath forgot or lost their study identifier
127 number. In order to ensure that no unique combination of data could be used to identify any
128 individual osteopath, personal data was collected in ranges. For example, age-ranges were collected
129 rather than ages, and data regarding years in practice was collected in 2-year ranges.

130 Section B of the questionnaire was not linked in any way to section C, thereby reassuring
131 participants that their responses regarding patient care and management could not be used to
132 identify them.

133 **Patient anonymity**

134 The separation of part B from part C contributed to ensuring patient anonymity. Directly
135 identifiable patient data was not collected in order to ensure patient anonymity. Osteopaths were
136 asked not to include records where a patient's health might be an identifying factor, e.g. very rare
137 disease. All data was combined and analysed, no individual information is presented in isolation as
138 a case.

139 **Pilot testing**

140 To assure external validity we asked osteopaths, stakeholders and researchers (10 people in total)
141 to comment on and test the questionnaire's face and content validity. For internal validity, we pre-
142 tested the software for reliability of health record selection, data entry and data extraction.

143 **Sampling and sample size**

144 In the previous survey of osteopaths during 2009, a 9.4% response rate was achieved: 342
145 osteopaths participated contributing data about 1,630 patients. For 2019, a representative sample
146 of osteopaths was estimated at 359 from 5,341 registered osteopaths using a confidence interval
147 of 95% with a 5% margin of error). Using a 10% response rate a minimum of 3,590 osteopaths
148 needed to be contacted. However, for the sake of inclusiveness all registered osteopaths were
149 invited to take part as we were asking osteopaths to review fewer patient records than the last data
150 collection exercise (up to 8, whereas in the previous survey we asked for 10).

151 **Statistical analysis**

152 Descriptive statistics were used to describe both the osteopaths, osteopathic patients and
153 osteopathic practice. Statistical analysis was conducted using the reporting functionality built into
154 REDCap where possible. Where this was not possible OpenOffice's *LibreOffice Calc* and the Python
155 programming language were used. Continuous variables are presented where feasible as means
156 with standard deviations. Categorical data are presented as frequencies with percentages.
157 Percentages were rounded to two decimal places.

158 Both fully-completed and partially-completed patient records were included for analysis.
159 Consequently, patient-related statistics have variable total responses.

160 Data describing the demographic characteristics of the UK's register of osteopaths was obtained
161 from the General Osteopathic Council (GOsC) to determine representativeness.

162 **Managing missing data**

163 For data extraction from the health records, respondents were given the opportunity to
164 answer 'don't know/can't tell from records'. For other questions, osteopaths were permitted
165 to leave an entry blank and provide a text for explanation. Partial data occurred when a
166 participant stopped answering the survey questions before completion.

167 **Ethics and Governance**

168 The study protocol was reviewed and written approval was provided by the Queen Mary,
169 University of London Ethics of Research Committee Panel D, reference "QMERC2019/23", on 23rd
170 May 2019.

171 **Informed consent from participating osteopaths**

172 All participating osteopaths were asked to read the information about the study and provide their
173 consent in the first section of the survey prior to engaging in the study.

174 **Data security and protection**

175 Data protection was guaranteed at the level of data handling and data hosting via the firewalled
176 university servers, and was encrypted in transit over the Internet. Data was entirely anonymous
177 and IP addresses were not made available. The full dataset was only made accessible to the study
178 staff and the staff responsible for the survey software.

179 All was handled in accordance General Data Protection Regulation laws and guidance set therein,
180 anonymised and used in accordance with the guidance set out in Health and Social Care Act 2012
181 on Good Clinical Practice in research.

182 **Results**

183 **Survey participation data**

184 During 2019, all 5,341 osteopaths registered with the GOsC were invited to participate in the
185 survey. 500 osteopaths provided data for analysis, representing 9.4% of registered osteopaths.
186 They contributed information about 395 patients and 2,215 consultations.

187 The most frequent age-range for respondents was 51-55 years old (22.9%; 95/415). The median
188 age fell within the age-group 46-50 years. Females represented 59.1% (n=254) and 98.6%
189 (423/429) gained their qualification to practice in the UK. The median 'years in practice' fell in the
190 range 19-20 years in practice.

191 **Practice data**

192 The number of patients seen during the week (Monday to Friday) varied from 2 to 105 with modes
193 of 20 and 30. Nearly two-thirds (63.3%) of osteopaths did not see patients at weekends. The
194 number of *new* patients seen throughout the week varied from 0 to 80 with a mean of 7.

195 Just under half of patient appointments (48.6%; 184/379) were available within 3 days, with only
196 6.9% (26/379) of appointment waiting times being longer than a week. The most commonly-
197 experienced waiting time was 2-3 days (33.0%; 125/379).

198 Most patients paid for their appointments themselves (88.4%; 327/370).

199 The majority (81.1%) of osteopaths (344/424) were self-employed. There were 12.7% associate
200 osteopaths who did not have a contract of employment (54/424) and 4.3% with a contract of
201 employment (18/424).

202 Most osteopaths (63.9%; 237/371) worked alone often or exclusively.

203 **Patient characteristics**

204 **Age and gender of patients**

205 More females than males sought osteopathic care 58.4% vs 41.6% (227 vs 167 records).

206 The age profile of patients showed that 53.8% of patients were between 30 and 60 years old. Nearly
207 10% were under 10 years old and of these 4.8% were under 1 years old.

208 **Fig. 1 Age profile of patients**

209 **Previous experience of osteopathy**

210 Over half of patients had not seen an osteopath before (57.7%; 226/392). Of those who *had* seen an
211 osteopath before, just over half (51.4%; 75/146) had seen a different osteopath previously.

212 **Presenting complaint**

213 The patient's main presenting complaints were musculoskeletal pain or dysfunction (81%;
214 306/378).

215 **Table 1. Patient main presenting complaint**

Patient main presenting complaint	Count (n)	%
Musculoskeletal pain or dysfunction	306	81.0
Infancy-related complaints	18	4.8
Neurological	16	4.2
Other (see below)	9	2.4
Ear-nose-throat	6	1.6
Gastrointestinal	5	1.3
Psychological	4	1.1
Prevention/maintenance	3	0.8
Urogenital	2	0.5
Rheumatological	2	0.5
Cardiovascular	2	0.5
Respiratory	1	0.3
Obstetrical	1	0.3
General/non-specific	1	0.3
Endocrinological	1	0.3
Dentistry/orthodontics	1	0.3
Total	378	

216

217 The "other" main presenting complaints were reported as: reflux; overall wellbeing; nerve pain
218 post shingles; clenching teeth; allergies; migraine; ME / CFS; checkup.

219 **Co-existing conditions**

220 41.7% (156/374) of patients had current co-existing conditions diagnosed by a medical
221 practitioner. The most common co-existing conditions were: hypertension ($n=41$); arthritis ($n=31$);
222 anxiety($n=22$); asthma ($n=19$); migraine ($n=16$); diabetes ($n=14$); irritable bowel syndrome ($n=13$).

223 **Symptom duration**

224 The most common duration of symptoms for the presenting complaint before attending an
225 appointment was 1-4 weeks (21.5%; 81/377), while 67.9% (256/377) of patients experienced
226 persistent symptoms (13 weeks or longer).

227 **Fig 2: For how long the patient had this complaint, including previous episodes**

228 **Consultation data**

229 Just over half of treatment approaches used at first appointment and at second appointments
230 comprised of soft tissue, articulatory, high-velocity low-amplitude (HVLA) thrust, stretching,
231 and/or muscle energy techniques (51.6% and 56.5% respectively).

232 In almost half the recorded appointments osteopaths reported providing self-management advice
233 and strategies (49.4%; 516/1,045). This comprised of stretching exercise, advice concerning
234 physical activity, general physical activity, application of cold, and strengthening exercise.

235

236

237 **Table 2: Treatment approaches (first and second appointment)**

Treatment approaches	1 st appt Count (n=395)	%	2 nd appt Count (n=395)	%
Soft tissue techniques	292	73.9	243	61.5
Articulatory techniques	274	69.4	220	55.7
HVLA thrust	136	34.4	100	25.3
Exercise - stretching	130	32.9	79	20
Muscle energy	115	29.1	82	20.8
Self-management	106	26.8	58	14.7
Cranial techniques	91	23	77	19.5
Lifestyle advice	87	22	42	10.6
Inhibition techniques (e.g. trigger points)	75	19	46	11.7
General osteopathic treatment (GOT)	71	18	48	12.2
Exercise - strengthening	67	17	46	11.7
Functional technique	60	15.2	41	10.4
Myofascial release (MFR)	40	10.1	30	7.6
Other	36	9.1	12	3
Relaxation	34	8.6	15	3.8
Biodynamic approach	31	7.9	32	8.1
Exercise - proprioception	28	7.1	23	5.8
Dry needling	27	6.8	18	4.6
Self-medication advice	27	6.8	11	2.8
Visceral	20	5.1	11	2.8
Strain/counterstrain	18	4.6	16	4
Dietary advice	15	3.8	3	0.8
Mindfulness	15	3.8	4	1
Pain neuroscience education (PNE)	12	3	5	1.3
Electro-therapy	11	2.8	11	2.8
Acupuncture	4	1	2	0.5
Psychological treatment	3	0.8	1	0.3
No hands-on treatment	3	0.8	0	0
Applied or clinical kinesiology	2	0.5	3	0.8
Orthotics	2	0.5	2	0.5
Nutrition therapy	2	0.5	1	0.3
Injections	0	0	0	0
Prescription of medication	0	0	0	0
Bio-resonance therapy	0	0	0	0
Herbal medicine	0	0	0	0
Homeopathy	0	0	0	0
Hypnosis	0	0	0	0

238

240 Patient use of other healthcare modalities

241 36.6% of patients (138/377) had previous treatment or undergone investigations for the
242 presenting episode, although only 14.8% (56/379) of patients were referred from another
243 healthcare practitioner. Referrals were most frequently received from medical general
244 practitioners (28.6%;16/56).

245 Table 3: Professions referring patients to osteopaths

Professions referring patients to osteopaths	Count (n)	%
General practitioner	16	28.6
Complementary therapist	12	21.4
Another osteopath (including an assistant)	10	17.9
Another medical specialist	7	12.5
Physiotherapist	4	7.1
Midwife	4	7.1
Another allied health professional	1	1.8
Don't know/can't tell from records	1	1.8
Dentist	1	1.8
Total	56	

246
247 There were 27 reports of osteopaths referring patients to other healthcare professions, with
248 medical general practitioner again being the most common (55.6%; 15/27).

249 Patient symptoms

250 55.3% of symptoms reported by patients were of slow or insidious onset (208/376), 23.9%
251 (90/376) were acute/ sudden (non-traumatic) and 17.6% (66/376) were from a traumatic onset.
252 In 12 responses (3.2%) the onset was unknown or was not recorded.

253

254 **Discussion**

255 **Overall summary of findings**

256 The survey response rate was 9.4%, responders were most frequently aged between 45 and
257 55 years with extensive experience, and were mostly female. The osteopaths worked mostly
258 alone from Monday to Friday and were able to offer about half their patients an appointment within
259 3 days.

260 Patients were typically in their mid-forties and 58% were female. Over half of the new patients
261 had not seen an osteopath before (58%).

262 The large majority of patients (81%) presented with musculoskeletal complaints. 67.9% of these
263 were persistent complaints, and 42% of patients had co-existing medical conditions. 36.6% of
264 patients had received previous treatment or investigations for their presenting episode. Medical
265 general practitioners (GPs) were the most frequent referrals and referrers were to and from GPs
266 (55.6% and 28.6% of referrals respectively).

267 The most common treatment approaches used were soft-tissue techniques, articular
268 techniques and high velocity low amplitude thrust.

269 The mean number of treatments per patient was 7 (mode 4).

270 **Comparison with the survey of osteopaths on 2009**

271 The OsteoSurvey 2019 employed REDCap survey software to support data collection in contrast to
272 the 2009 standardised data collection (SDC) study where osteopaths filled out paper
273 questionnaires. This did not affect response rates: in 2009, 394 osteopaths responded (9.4% of the
274 profession at the time) and 500 osteopaths responded in 2019 (9.4% of the profession).

275 In the decade between this survey and the last and earlier studies on profiles of osteopathic care,
276 patient characteristics have remained broadly similar for adult age profiles, gender and presenting
277 complaints (Burton, 1981; Pringle and Tyreman, 1993; Hinkley and Drysdale, 1995; GOsC, 2001;
278 McIlwraith, 2003; Fawkes *et al.*, 2010). The presence of co-morbidities is also similar: in 2019,
279 41.7% of patients reported a range of comorbidities; within this number the most frequent were
280 hypertension (11.0%), arthritis (8.3%), anxiety (5.9%), and asthma (5.1%). This profile is quite
281 similar to that reported in 2009 where patients reported hypertension (11.7%), asthma (6.6%),
282 arthritis (5.7%) and anxiety (3.6%) as the most frequent comorbidities. Previous osteopathic
283 experience remains at around 40%. Self-referral is still the most common route to treatment with
284 82.6% of patients being self-referred in 2019 compared with 79.9% in 2009.

285 Management of symptoms in both surveys included a broad range of interventions used e.g. soft
286 tissue techniques (78% in 2009 and 73.9% in 2019); articulation (72% in 2009 and 69.4% in
287 2019); HVLA thrust techniques (37.7% in 2009 and 34.4% in 2019), and cranial techniques (25.8%
288 in 2009 and 23.0% in 2019). The data showed continued emphasis of the promotion of self-
289 management options including education, advice, and exercise in keeping with recommendations in
290 current guidelines [3].

291 The costs of treatment were met by individuals in 88.4% of cases in 2019 compared with 89.1% in
292 2009. In 2019, 4.6% of patients had their treatment costs met by insurance schemes, 0.5% by their
293 employer and 0.5% by the NHS. In 2009, 6.6% of patients had their treatment funded by health
294 insurance schemes, 0.6% by their employer, and 0.6% by the NHS. Access to treatment not funded
295 by individuals has remained static in the past decade. While there may be a variety of reasons for
296 this, access to treatment still remains limited by ability to pay.

297 However there are some changes. In the 2019 Osteosurvey, 13.2% (50/379) were under 20 years
298 compared with 8.6% in 2009; and 4.7% were under 1 year in 2019 compared to 2.1% in 2009
299 suggesting an increase in consultations for much younger children.

300 Prior to attending an osteopathic practice in 2009, 48% of patients reported they had consulted
301 their GP, compared with 41.3% (95/230) in 2019. In 2009, a total of 29% of patients had received
302 previous treatment and investigations through the NHS including prescribed medication (20.1%),
303 imaging (13.9%), hospital outpatient treatment (10.9%), and hospital inpatient treatment (1.3%).
304 In contrast in 2019, 23.3% of patients reported undergoing imaging, and 6.1% had other forms of
305 investigations including blood tests and urinalysis. The relationship between private and publicly
306 funded care systems are closely linked.

307 Patients attending osteopathic practices in 2019 reported they experienced a range of symptoms
308 including musculoskeletal pain and dysfunction (81.0%) and non-musculoskeletal symptoms
309 (19.0%). In contrast, in 2009, 95.1% of patients reported musculoskeletal symptoms, with 4.3% of
310 symptoms being non-musculoskeletal, indicating perhaps a greater diversity of care offered in 2019
311 and /or an increase in demand for non-musculoskeletal care.

312 Waiting time to access treatment has changed. In 2019, 48.6% of patients were seen within 3 days
313 as opposed to 71% of patients in 2009. In 2009 there were around 6 osteopaths per 100,000 in the
314 UK population and in 2019, 8 per 100,000. Despite this apparent increase in osteopaths, quick
315 access to an osteopath has fallen which may indicate increased demand or limited availability, for
316 example indicated by the working hours mostly between 10.00am - 4.00pm Monday to Friday.

317 In 2019, 67.9% of patients presented with persistent symptoms (13 weeks or longer). This
318 included data concerning any previous symptom episode. In 2009 patients were asked about the
319 duration of symptoms for their current episode which was 13 weeks or longer for 32.5% of
320 patients. Both figures represent large numbers of patients with persistent symptoms.

321 Other additional differences noted are changes to the management landscape. Osteopaths are
322 implementing management approaches which demonstrate packages of care, as recommended by
323 clinical guidelines [3]. This suggests a growing awareness of the use of evidence by clinicians. The
324 clinician cohort who completed the survey may be more confident in their practices and motivated
325 to engage in initiatives which demonstrate the full extent of osteopathic care.

326 **Comparison with other countries**

327 In a recent review of osteopathic care globally [21], the findings about osteopathic practice were
328 similar at an international level. Osteopaths internationally work roughly the same number of
329 hours per week, see similar numbers of patients per week, and osteopathic practitioners are most
330 likely to work in one location and frequently on their own (with the exception of Italy). The vast
331 majority of patients across the UK and central Europe are seen within one week. Musculoskeletal

332 conditions (lower back and neck pain) account for the highest proportion of patient complaints
333 across all countries. In central Europe the preferred techniques used by osteopaths were for the
334 more gentle techniques such as osteopathy in the cranial field, visceral, functional and biodynamic
335 techniques compared with the UK and Australian data that showed a preference towards more
336 structural techniques such as soft tissue manipulation, articulation/mobilisation and spinal
337 manipulation techniques. The UK compares with other countries showing that patients who most
338 commonly attend osteopathic practitioners were employed/self-employed adults and more likely
339 to be women than men.

340 **Strengths and limitations**

341 Male participants were slightly under-represented in OsteoSurvey. In 2018 the GOsC register was
342 comprised of 49% male osteopaths as opposed to the 41% male respondents in the survey, and
343 when we compared the age profile of registered osteopaths and responders, osteopaths between
344 the ages of 26 and 35 years were also under-represented.

345 The response rate for this survey was not as high as we would have liked but the overall sample
346 size for patients was sufficient for our analysis. We chose a retrospective audit of patient records
347 which may have proved difficult for some clinicians as their records may not have contained the
348 necessary information to complete the questionnaire. However, we thought this may be a finding in
349 itself to highlight areas where record keeping could be improved. Overall the amount of missing
350 data did not highlight any particular area of poor record keeping.

351 We have been able to compare some data from the 2009 and 2019 surveys, and this is the first
352 assessment of this nature within the profession to describe any change over time.

353 **Future Research**

354 Other surveys suggest that awareness of osteopathy by the population remains low. An
355 independent survey conducted by YouGov indicated that 57% of people who had not seen an
356 osteopath wanted assurances on a recognised level of education and training, 65% expected good
357 quality advice and treatment, and 90% wanted evidence of effectiveness or recommendation [22].
358 After the 2009 survey a recommendation was made for the profession to develop a system for
359 independent outcome data collection. This has resulted in the development of the Patient Reported
360 Outcome Measurement (PROMs) system. This system has collected some encouraging outcome
361 data collected directly from patients and independent to the clinician delivering care [23].
362 Promoting the findings of the PROMs data and information concerning clinicians from the
363 OsteoSurvey 2019 study will start to fill the information gap identified by patients.

364 Profiling osteopaths, their patients and the nature and type of care helps to describe the profession
365 which is useful for providing information for the profession, its regulatory body, its education
366 institutions and its professional body and for informing other health care practitioners about
367 osteopathy. However, more data is needed about patients, to understand their expectations,
368 experiences and outcomes this information would enable practitioners and the profession as a
369 whole to reflect on the nature and type of care they give and its impact on patients.

370 **Conclusions**

371 The future of the UK osteopathic profession will depend on its ability to adapt to the changing
372 health care needs of the nation. Traditionally osteopaths have filled these gaps for example for

373 persistent pain and other conditions not well managed within the NHS or by pharmaceuticals.
374 There is some indication of flexibility and adaptability which could be enhanced through education,
375 training and active marketing to reflect demographic changes and areas where health service
376 provision is not meeting demand. As the aging UK population grows, demand for care for persistent
377 musculoskeletal conditions and other age related disorders will increase, for osteopathy to
378 maintain and sustain its presence it will need to ensure it offers patients a unique experience and
379 health and wellbeing benefit.

380 To better understand the role of osteopathy in UK health service delivery, the profession needs to
381 do more research with patients in order to understand their needs and their expected outcomes of
382 care, and for this to inform osteopathic practice and education.

383 **Acknowledgements**

384 The working group: Steve Vogel, Martin Pendry, Phil Bright, Maria Fitzgerald

385 **References**

- 386 1. Airaksinen O, Brox JI, Cedraschi C, Hildebrandt J, Klüber-Moffett J, Kovacs F, et al. Chapter 4
387 European guidelines for the management of chronic nonspecific low back pain. *Eur Spine J.*
388 2006;15: s192–s300. doi:10.1007/s00586-006-1072-1
- 389 2. van Tulder M, Becker A, Bekkering T, Breen A, del Real MTG, Hutchinson A, et al. Chapter
390 3European guidelines for the management of acute nonspecific low back pain in primary
391 care. *Eur Spine J.* 2006;15: s169–s191. doi:10.1007/s00586-006-1071-2
- 392 3. Health and Care Excellence NI for. Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: Assessment and
393 management. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2016. Available from:
394 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng59>
- 395 4. Fawkes CA, Leach CMJ, Mathias S, Moore AP. A profile of osteopathic care in private
396 practices in the United Kingdom: A national pilot using standardised data collection. *Manual
397 Therapy.* 2014;19: 125–130. doi:10.1016/j.math.2013.09.001
- 398 5. Fawkes C, Leech J, Mathias S, Moore A. Standardised data collection within osteopathic
399 practice in the UK: Development and first use of a tool to profile osteopathic care in 2009.
400 National Council for Osteopathic Research, University of Brighton; 2010 Jun. Available from:
401 [https://www.ncor.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/standardised_data_collection_fina
402 lreport_24062010.pdf](https://www.ncor.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/standardised_data_collection_finalreport_24062010.pdf)
- 403 6. van Dun PLS, Nicolaie MA, Messem AV. State of affairs of osteopathy in the Benelux: Benelux
404 Osteosurvey 2013. *International Journal of Osteopathic Medicine.* 2016;20: 3–17.
405 doi:10.1016/j.ijosm.2016.01.003
- 406 7. Alvarez Bustins G, López Plaza P-V, Carvajal SR. Profile of osteopathic practice in Spain:
407 Results from a standardized data collection study. *BMC Complement Altern Med.* 2018;18.
408 doi:10.1186/s12906-018-2190-0

- 409 8. Vaucher P, Macdonald RJD, Carnes D. The role of osteopathy in the Swiss primary health
410 care system: A practice review. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8: e023770. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-
411 023770
- 412 9. Cerritelli F, Dun PLS van, Esteves JE, Consorti G, Sciomachen P, Lacorte E, et al. The Italian
413 Osteopathic Practitioners Estimates and RATES (OPERA) study: A cross sectional survey.
414 *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14: e0211353. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0211353
- 415 10. Health and Social Care Act 2012. 2012. Available from:
416 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/7/contents/enacted>
- 417 11. NHS, Chief Allied Health Professions Officer. Allied Health Professions into Action: Using
418 Allied Health Professionals to transform health, care and wellbeing. NHS England; 2017 Jan.
419 Available from: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ahp-action-
420 transform-hlth.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ahp-action-transform-hlth.pdf)
- 421 12. Twycross A, Shorten A. Service evaluation, audit and research: What is the difference? *Evid
422 Based Nurs*. 2014;17: 65–66. doi:10.1136/eb-2014-101871
- 423 13. General Osteopathic Council. Osteopathic Practice Standards. 2019. Available from: [https://
424 standards.gosc.org.uk](https://standards.gosc.org.uk)
- 425 14. KPMG. Report A: How do osteopaths practice? 2011. Available from:
426 [https://www.osteopathy.org.uk/news-and-resources/document-library/continuing-
427 fitness-to-practise/kpmg-report-a-how-do-osteopaths-practise-ozone/](https://www.osteopathy.org.uk/news-and-resources/document-library/continuing-fitness-to-practise/kpmg-report-a-how-do-osteopaths-practise-ozone/)
- 428 15. Harris P, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, J Conde. REDCap: Research electronic data
429 capture. Vanderbilt University; 2018. Available from: <https://www.project-redcap.org/>
- 430 16. Haahr M. RANDOM.ORG: True Random Number Service. 2020. Available from:
431 <https://random.org>
- 432 17. Burton AK. Back pain in osteopathic practice. *Rheumatology (Oxford, England)*. 1981;20:
433 239–246. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/20.4.239
- 434 18. Pringle M, Tyreman S. Study of 500 patients attending an osteopathic practice. *Br J Gen
435 Pract*. 1993;43: 15–18. Available from: <https://bjgp.org/content/43/366/15>
- 436 19. Hinkley H, Drysdale I. Audit of 1000 patients attending the clinic of the British College of
437 Naturopathy and Osteopathy. *he British Osteopathic Journal*. 1995;16: 17–22.
- 438 20. General Osteopathic Council. Snapshot survey 2001 results. 2001 Dec. Available from:
439 [https://www.osteopathy.org.uk/news-and-resources/document-library/research-and-
440 surveys/snapshot-survey-2001-results-dec-2001/](https://www.osteopathy.org.uk/news-and-resources/document-library/research-and-surveys/snapshot-survey-2001-results-dec-2001/)
- 441 21. Carnes D, Ellwood J. Osteopathy and Osteopathic Medicine: A Global review 2020. In
442 progress.
- 443 22. General Osteopathic Council. Keeping up standards. *The Osteopath*. Nov 2018;21: 9.
444 Available from: [https://www.osteopathy.org.uk/news-and-resources/document-library/
445 the-osteopath/the-osteopath-magazine-novemberdecember-2018/](https://www.osteopathy.org.uk/news-and-resources/document-library/the-osteopath/the-osteopath-magazine-novemberdecember-2018/). Accessed 11 Dec 2018.

446 23. Fawkes C, Froud R, Carnes D. Measuring patient outcome using data capture by mobile app.
447 Trials. 2015;16: P27. doi:10.1186/1745-6215-16-S1-P27

448 **Supporting information**

449 **Supplementary File 1: Questionnaire survey content.**

450