

1 Integration of primary contact physiotherapists in the emergency department for
2 individuals presenting with minor musculoskeletal disorders: Protocol for an
3 economic evaluation

4
5 Primary contact physiotherapy in the emergency department: Protocol for an economic
6 evaluation

7
8
9 Rose Gagnon^{1,2}, Luc J. Hébert^{1,2,3}, Jason R. Guertin^{4,5}, Simon Berthelot^{5,6,7}, François
10 Desmeules^{8,9}, Kadija Perreault^{1,2*}

11
12
13 1 Centre interdisciplinaire de recherche en réadaptation et intégration sociale (Cirris), Centre
14 intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux (CIUSSS) de la Capitale-Nationale, Quebec,
15 Quebec, Canada

16 2 Department of Rehabilitation, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval, Quebec, Quebec, Canada

17 3 Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval,
18 Quebec, Quebec, Canada

19 4 Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval,
20 Quebec, Quebec, Canada

21 5 Axe santé des populations et pratiques optimales en santé, Centre de recherche du CHU de
22 Québec – Université Laval, Quebec, Quebec, Canada

23 6 Department of Family Medicine and Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Université
24 Laval, Quebec, Quebec, Canada

25 7 CHU de Québec – Université Laval, Quebec, Quebec, Canada

26 8 School of Rehabilitation, Faculty of Medicine, Université de Montréal, Montreal, Quebec,
27 Canada

28 9 Orthopaedic Clinical Research Unit, Maisonneuve-Rosemont Hospital Research Centre,
29 CIUSSS de l'Est-de-l'Île-de-Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

30

31 * Corresponding author

32 E-mail: kadija.perreault@fmed.ulaval.ca (KP)

33

34 **Abstract**

35 **Objectives:** 1) To compare the average cost of an emergency department (ED) visit for various
36 minor musculoskeletal disorders between two models of care (physiotherapist and ED physician
37 or ED physician alone); 2) To evaluate the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of these
38 two models of care over a 3-month period post-initial visit; and 3) To estimate the ICER of three
39 ED models of care (physiotherapist and ED physician, ED physician alone, physiotherapist
40 alone) over a two-year period.

41 **Methods:** A randomized clinical trial was conducted among individuals (n=78) aged 18 to 80
42 years presenting with a musculoskeletal disorder at a Quebec City (Canada) hospital in 2018-
43 2019. Two models of care were compared: management by a physiotherapist and an ED
44 physician versus usual management by an ED physician. Participants follow-ups were conducted
45 at 1 and 3 months post-initial ED visit. **Obj.1:** The health care costs incurred by the two groups
46 during their ED visit will be calculated using the Time-Driven Activity-Based Costing (TDABC)
47 method and compared using generalized linear models. **Obj. 2:** The cost-utility analysis over a 3-

48 month time horizon will combine economic and clinical variables (estimated through quality-
49 adjusted life years) using a Societal perspective. The results of the cost-utility analysis will be
50 reported using an ICER. **Obj. 3:** The ICER will be estimated using a hybrid decision tree (0-3
51 months post-visit) and Markov model (3-24 months post-visit); the analysis will be conducted
52 from a Societal perspective over a two-year time horizon.

53 **Conclusion:** This study will help to determine which model of care is most efficient for the
54 management of individuals who come to the ED with minor musculoskeletal disorders. The
55 increased involvement of various health professionals in the management of patients in the ED
56 paves the way for the development of new avenues of practice and more efficient organization of
57 services.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 The emergency department (ED) serves as the main gateway and the preferred resource when
61 primary care services are not available, for example in cases of lack of affiliation with a primary
62 care source or inability to see a physician within a reasonable time frame.[1–5] Although pain
63 conditions for which patients decide to go to the ED are varied, they are oftentimes related to a
64 musculoskeletal disorder (MSKD).[6–8]

65 According to the World Health Organization, MSKDs are characterized by "pain (often
66 persistent) and limitations in mobility, dexterity and general functioning".[9] MSKDs can affect
67 joints, bones, muscles, spine and multiple regions of the body.[9,10] The prevalence of these
68 disorders is reported to be significantly higher in women, older people and people with low
69 socio-economic status.[11–15] When they do not receive timely and appropriate care, people

70 with MSKDs tend to make greater use of health care services and resources.[16–22] MSKDs
71 account for up to 12.6% of a country's total health care costs each year [15] and this figure is
72 expected to rise with the increase in obesity, physical inactivity and the aging of the
73 population.[11,23] It is therefore essential to study the costs and clinical effectiveness of
74 interventions aimed at managing MSKDs in order to choose the most efficient ones, including in
75 the ED.

76 Various models of care have been implemented in the ED and studied in recent years to optimize
77 the management of people presenting with MSKDs. These models of care aim to optimize the
78 flow of patients to and in the ED in three distinct phases: "input" (i.e., flow of patients deciding
79 to come to the ED), "throughput" (i.e., flow of patients while in the ED), and "output" (i.e., flow
80 of patients upon discharge from the ED).[24] Such models of care include for instance fast-track
81 corridors for patients with minor injuries or rapid assessment teams.[25] Some models include
82 the addition of ED nurse practitioners and a variety of health professionals with a usual or
83 extended scope of practice, such as the primary contact physiotherapist or advanced practice
84 physiotherapist.[25]

85 The addition of primary contact physiotherapists in the ED is an emerging model of care that
86 aims to optimize patient flow while in the ED.[25] Several studies conducted in recent years
87 have shown that this model of care is associated with reduced time waited before receiving care,
88 and reduced length of stay in the ED, as well as fewer unnecessary consultations with various
89 health professionals, and less prescriptions of imaging tests and medication, including opioids,
90 and over-the-counter medication.[8,26–29] In addition, this model of care was associated with
91 fewer repeat visits to the ED for a similar condition for up to one month after the initial ED
92 visit.[29] Thus, management by a primary contact physiotherapist appears to be associated with

93 decreased service and resource use, both at the ED and up to several weeks later. However, very
94 few studies having investigated primary contact physiotherapist care in the ED have looked at its
95 cost-effectiveness.

96 Indeed, despite evidence of clinical benefits associated with the presence of a primary contact
97 physiotherapist in the ED (effectiveness), scientific evidence remains rather scarce regarding the
98 cost-effectiveness of this model of care. Two studies conducted in primary care settings (primary
99 care clinic and private clinic) report that primary contact physiotherapist management is
100 associated with a slight increase in health-related quality of life and a decrease in total costs
101 compared to usual management by a family physician.[30,31] In addition, early physiotherapy
102 management was associated with a decrease in total MSKD-related costs for up to two years
103 after initial management.[17,19,32] Two cost-minimization studies conducted in Great Britain
104 looked specifically at the costs associated with the integration of a primary contact
105 physiotherapist in the ED compared to usual management by an emergency physician.

106 According to the study by Richardson et al. (2005, n=766 patients with non-fracture MSKDs),
107 the presence of a primary contact physiotherapist in the ED results in costs equivalent to usual
108 management (emergency physician).[33] Similarly, according to McClellan et al. (2013, n=372
109 patients >16 years of age with a peripheral MSKD), management by a primary contact
110 physiotherapist results in costs at least as high as usual management (emergency physician).[34]

111 Nevertheless, in addition to having been conducted exclusively in Great Britain several years
112 ago, these two studies only measured the costs of the two models of care compared and not their
113 effectiveness, the authors assuming that the two models compared were equivalent in terms of
114 clinical effectiveness. These studies are thus not considered to be formal economic evaluation
115 according to current guidelines, but rather a costing exercise, in that a cost-effectiveness analysis

116 accounts for the uncertainty associated with the effects of the interventions being compared.[35]

117 To our knowledge, no other study has examined the cost-effectiveness of primary contact

118 physiotherapy in the ED. Furthermore, no study has assessed whether involving primary contact

119 physiotherapists in the ED have a long-term impact on use of health system services and

120 resources for persons with minor MSKDs. Consequently, further evidence is needed on the

121 efficiency of integrating a primary contact physiotherapist in the ED compared to usual

122 management by an emergency physician.

123 Therefore, the general objective of this project is to evaluate the efficiency of different models of

124 care for the management of minor MSKDs in the ED. More specifically, the objectives are to:

125 1. Compare the average costs of an ED consultation and care for various MSKDs, according

126 to two models of care:

127 a. Usual management by an emergency physician

128 b. Primary contact physiotherapist management + emergency physician management

129 2. Evaluate the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), from a Societal perspective, of

130 these two ED models of care for the management of MSKDs over a three-month period

131 post-initial ED visit.

132 3. Estimate the ICER between three ED models of care for MSKD management over a two-

133 year period from a Societal perspective:

134 a. Usual management by an emergency physician

135 b. Primary contact physiotherapist management + emergency physician management

136 c. Primary contact physiotherapist management alone

137 **Materials and Methods**

138 **Study design and costing approaches**

139 **Objectives 1 and 2** will be achieved using data collected through a two-arm pilot pragmatic
140 randomized clinical trial (RCT) conducted in the ED of the CHUL, one of the five sites of the
141 CHU de Québec - Université Laval (UL) (Quebec City, Canada) from September 2018 to March
142 2019. This trial aimed to compare the effects of management by a primary contact
143 physiotherapist to usual care provided by an emergency physician for persons presenting with a
144 minor MSKD on their clinical course (pain and pain interference) and the use of resources at ED
145 discharge and after 1 and 3 months post-visit.[29] Two groups of participants were compared:
146 one group managed by a primary contact physiotherapist and an emergency physician and one
147 group managed by an emergency physician alone. The costing approach used for **Objective 1**
148 will be Time-Driven Activity-Based Costing (TDABC), which involves determining the per-
149 minute costs associated with each care process included in a care pathway by multiplying the
150 cost per minute of each care process by its duration. Details on this costing approach and its
151 application to the ED have been described by one of the authors elsewhere.[36] **Objective 2** will
152 be achieved through a cost-utility analysis approach in which health care costs at the ED visit
153 and those reported at the 1- and 3-month follow-ups will be compiled and combined with the
154 utility scores obtained at the same measurement times, from a Societal perspective. Cost-utility
155 analysis is favored in Canada since it uses a generic outcome measure allowing comparison of
156 the health gains associated with several different interventions, such as different models of
157 care.[35]

158 The ICER between the three ED models of care for the management of MSKDs over a two-year
159 period (**Objective 3**) will be estimated using a cost-effectiveness analysis via a hybrid
160 mathematical model. This model will consist of a decision tree covering the period from the
161 initial ED visit up to three months post-initial visit, and a Markov model starting three months
162 post-initial ED visit and ending 24 months (two years) after the ED visit. The decision tree
163 provides a simple and clear illustration of a patient's possible short-term care pathways following
164 a new intervention.[35,37] In addition to reporting the different interventions used, the decision
165 tree also allows for the inclusion of adverse events following the initial intervention, such as a
166 new ED visit for the same condition, and for repeating an intervention over time as needed (e.g.,
167 new visit in the ED a few days after the initial visit and then a new visit two months later for the
168 same condition).[35,37] It also permits to determine the proportion of disability associated with
169 each of the three ED models of care.

170 Several considerations guided the choice of the time horizon for the Markov model. First of all,
171 to be considered chronic, a musculoskeletal disorder must be present for at least three
172 months.[38] Moreover, approximately 30% of people presenting with MSKDs report pain and
173 functional disability lasting more than 12 months after the onset of their condition. Furthermore,
174 studies on MSKD care in primary care or the ED have had follow-up periods ranging from six to
175 24 months (e.g. [26,39–42]). Thus, the Markov model will cover a 24-month period. It will
176 include two-week cycles in order to capture the clinical evolution of the patients included.

177 **Study population**

178 Inclusion and exclusion criteria of the previous pragmatic RCT are described in Box 1. A more
179 detailed version of the study population can be found elsewhere.[29]

Inclusion criteria

- Disorder or pain of musculoskeletal origin peripheral or vertebral
- Aged between 18 and 80 years old
- P3, P4 or P5 Triage Category (classification from the Canadian Triage and Severity Scale)
- Legally able to consent
- Able to understand French and respond to oral or written questionnaires
- Beneficiary of the *Régie de l'assurance-maladie du Québec*

Exclusion criteria

- ✗ Major MSKD (e.g., open fracture, unreduced dislocation, open wound)
- ✗ Red flag (e.g., progressive neurological deficits, infectious symptoms)
- ✗ Associated unstable condition (e.g., pulmonary, cardiac, digestive and/or psychiatric)
- ✗ Condition involving being already hospitalized during the recruitment period or having already been hospitalized for this same condition beforehand
- ✗ Coming from a long-term care centre

180

181 **Box 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the pilot pragmatic randomized clinical trial in**
182 **the ED**

183 **Data collection**

184 Data necessary to achieve **Objectives 1** and **2** were collected at the initial ED visit and at the
185 one- and three-month post-visit follow-ups. While more details of the data collection procedures
186 can be found in our previous paper [29], any person presenting to the ED who met the inclusion
187 and exclusion criteria was seen by a member of the research team who confirmed eligibility,
188 obtained informed consent, and ensured completion of baseline questionnaires. The participant
189 was then randomized to either study group: primary contact physiotherapist + emergency
190 physician management or usual management by the emergency physician alone. After the ED
191 visit was completed, participants were contacted at 1 and 3 months either by phone or email to
192 complete post-visit follow-ups.

193 The study population for the model of care consisting of primary contact physiotherapist
194 management and discharge from the ED (**Objective 3**) was not observed during the pilot
195 pragmatic RCT. Therefore, the parameters needed to represent it (probabilities, costs, measures
196 of effectiveness) will be taken from a literature review, an approach regularly used in economic
197 evaluation.[43] However, the studies from which the metrics will be derived will need to have a
198 sample that meets the same inclusion criteria as those presented in Box 1. Data extracted from
199 the literature will be validated with members of the RCT's research team and with experts in the
200 field of emergency medicine, MSKDs and rehabilitation if necessary during the construction of
201 the hybrid model.[35]

202 **Study outcomes**

203 Primary outcomes used to measure the average cost of an ED visit (**Objective 1**) will be the
204 costs of care processes and the time associated with each care process. This method of costing is
205 routinely used by some members of the research team.[36,44,45] The costs related to ED
206 management (medical and non-medical staff, imaging, medication, consumables, maintenance,
207 etc.) were obtained via a formal request made by a member of the research team to the CHU de
208 Québec – UL Finance Department. The time associated with each care process was calculated by
209 a member of the research team using estimates provided by the CHUL medical and non-medical
210 staff that were validated during an observation period in the ED.[36,44]


211 As part of the cost-utility analysis (**Objective 2**) and hybrid mathematical model (**Objective 3**),
212 the efficiency of the ED models of care will be assessed using an incremental cost-effectiveness
213 ratio (ICER). The resulting ICER will be reported in terms of incremental cost per quality-
214 adjusted life years (QALY) gained, between the models of care. The total cost of the ED visit for
215 each individual obtained within **Objective 1** will be added to the individual follow-up costs

216 recorded via the self-administered follow-up questionnaires completed by participants at 1 and 3
217 months during the pilot pragmatic RCT and averaged to obtain an average 3-month individual
218 cost for each model of care (**Objective 2 & 3 – decision tree**). The questionnaires provided data
219 on resources used by each participant during follow-up such as ED re-visits for the same
220 condition, number of consultations with other health professionals, etc. Costs associated with
221 each of the resources used will be drawn from data from the *Régie de l'assurance-maladie du*
222 *Québec* (RAMQ) (fees of the emergency physician and other physicians consulted, drugs,
223 imaging tests) and from a search of the grey literature (costs of the fees of the primary contact
224 physiotherapist and other health professionals consulted, and of technical aids).[46] Mean utility
225 scores were obtained at the initial visit [47] and at 1 and 3 months using the EQ-5D-5L, a generic
226 standardized questionnaire designed to measure health status in an economic and clinical
227 evaluation.[48] The EQ-5D-5L has been found to be reliable, valid, and sensitive to
228 change.[49,50] The efficiency values and the costs from 3 to 24 months required to run the
229 Markov model (**Objective 3**) for the three models of care will be taken from the literature.

230 **Data analysis and interpretation of results**


231 As part of **Objective 1**, a mapping of the care pathways encountered will be completed for each
232 type of MSKD encountered in our study population (i.e., low back pain, neck pain, upper limb,
233 lower limb) (Fig 1). The unit cost of each of the resources, consumables and indirect costs
234 required in each process of care of the care pathway will be calculated and multiplied by the
235 duration of each process to obtain the cost related to each process of care present in the care
236 pathway. The costs associated with each process will be summed to obtain the total cost of the
237 ED care pathway specific to each MSKD and each model of care (i.e., emergency physician or
238 primary contact physiotherapist management). A generalized linear model with a Gamma

239 distribution and log link will be used to test whether there is a significant difference in the costs
 240 of managing equivalent MSKDs between the two models of care.[51,52]



242 **Fig 1. Mapping of a hypothetical care pathway in the ED using the Time-Driven Activity-**
 243 **Based Costing**


244 The decision tree (**Objective 3**) will include all the interventions and services possibly used by a
 245 participant following the initial visit to the ED for each model of care considered (Fig 2). The
 246 conditional probability of ending up in each of the terminal nodes of the decision tree will be
 247 used to calculate the proportion of disability associated with each model (Fig 2).The disability
 248 proportions obtained for each model of care will be used to determine the number of individuals
 249 in each state at entry in the Markov model (Fig. 3). The Markov model will then be used to
 250 calculate the long-term costs and effectiveness over 2 years of each of the model of care based
 251 on the level of disability estimated in the decision tree.[35,37]



252

253 **Fig 2. Hypothetical decision tree covering the period from ED visit to three months post**

254 **initial ED visit**



255

256 **Fig 3. Projected Markov model covering the period from three to 24 months post initial ED**
257 **visit**

258 Both the cost-utility analysis (**Objective 2**) and the hybrid mathematical model (**Objective 3**)
259 will be conducted from a Societal perspective. Results obtained via the EQ-5D-5L at 1 and 3
260 months (**Objective 2 & 3 – decision tree**) will be converted to utility scores using the Canadian
261 conversion algorithm developed by Xie et al.[53] As the 3-month retention rate for the pilot
262 pragmatic trial was 80% [29], some participants' data are missing (service and resource use,
263 costs, utility scores). Missing data will be imputed using the Missing not at random (MNAR)
264 multiple imputation method.[54] Uncertainty in cost and effectiveness measures for the cost-

265 utility analysis (**Objective 2**) will be obtained using non-parametric bootstrap resampling with
266 replacement. Uncertainty in the hybrid model parameters (probabilities, costs, and efficiency)
267 (**Objective 3**) will be obtained via a probabilistic sensitivity analysis performed using a Monte
268 Carlo simulation. Both uncertainties will be represented visually using a cost-effectiveness
269 diagram, cost-effectiveness acceptability curve, and cost-effectiveness acceptability frontier.[35]
270 Subgroup analyses of men and women and by MSKD category (spine, upper extremity, and
271 lower extremity) will also be performed for both objectives ($p < .05$).

272 **Ethical considerations and data management**

273 Ethical approval for the collection of the necessary data was obtained from the Research Ethics
274 Committee of the CHU de Québec - UL (approval number: MP-20-2019-4307). The randomized
275 clinical trial was also registered with the US National Institutes of Health (#NCT04009369).
276 Each participant signed a written consent form prior to participation. All data collected will be
277 kept in a secure repository and destroyed thereafter. All members of the research team signed a
278 confidentiality agreement.

279 **Discussion**

280 The overall aim of this project is to evaluate the costs of different models of care for the
281 management of MSKDs in the ED. This will be achieved through three specific objectives: 1) to
282 compare the average costs of an ED consultation and care for various MSKDs; 2) to evaluate the
283 incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of two ED models of care for the management of
284 MSKDs over a three-month period post-initial ED visit; and 3) to estimate the ICER between ED
285 models of care for the management of MSKDs over a two-year period.

286 Until now, there has been no formal economic evaluation of the inclusion of a primary contact
287 physiotherapist in the ED compared with usual practice (emergency physician). The only studies
288 that have been done on the subject have assumed that the effectiveness of the primary contact
289 physiotherapist's management in the ED is equivalent to that of usual care by the emergency
290 physician. However, several studies have reported that primary contact physiotherapist
291 management can reduce the use of services and resources during the ED stay.[8,26–29,55] This
292 research project will fill an important need in the literature by providing an in-depth analysis of
293 the costs and efficiency of the considered models of care . Indeed, this project will help identify
294 the most efficient ED model of care. These models of care also have the potential to improve the
295 quality of services offered to people with MSKDs, their clinical evolution and their quality of
296 life. The increased use of various health professionals in the management of patients in contexts
297 such as the ED can pave the way for the development of new avenues of practice and potentially
298 more efficient organization of services that will benefit the population.

299 This study is associated with some potential limitations. First of all, the data needed to carry out
300 **Objectives 1 and 2** were mostly obtained from a pilot pragmatic randomized clinical trial.
301 Therefore, the results obtained should be interpreted with caution. The small sample size (n=78)
302 could possibly limit analyses on the number of plausible branches in the final decision tree as
303 well as the amount of subgroup analysis that will be performed. In addition, although high, the
304 retention rate at the 3-month follow-up of the randomized clinical trial was 80% [29], which
305 implies that some data related to the use of services and resources, costs and health-related
306 quality of life will be missing. However, this limitation will be mitigated using multiple
307 imputation methods.[54] Sensitivity analyses will also be performed to assess the robustness of
308 the results obtained. Finally, it may be difficult to obtain some of the data on medium- and long-

309 term costs and measures of effectiveness for the ED models of care studied in **Objective 3** from
310 the scientific literature. Nevertheless, estimates can be obtained by soliciting the opinions of
311 experts in the fields of MSKD management and emergency medicine, as this method is regularly
312 used in modeling.[35]

313 As for knowledge translation, following the project, formal presentations will be made to all key
314 stakeholders at the CHU (emergency physicians, physiotherapists, nurses, orderlies, patient
315 representatives and administrators) on site or remotely to present the results of the study and
316 discuss lessons learned and future avenues. The results of this project will also be shared with
317 provincial stakeholders (professional associations, patient associations and governments). They
318 will also be disseminated at national and international scientific conferences on economics,
319 health services organization and emergency services. Four manuscripts will be published in peer-
320 reviewed journals. If successful, this project will help guide economic evaluations for a large-
321 scale, multi-center trial aiming to improve the management of people presenting with a MKSD
322 in the ED.

323 **Acknowledgements**

324 The authors would like to thank the following persons for their contributions: project
325 participants, Antony Barabé, PT, physiotherapist at the Centre Hospitalier de l'Université Laval
326 (CHUL), the entire team of managers at the *Direction des services multidisciplinaires* of the
327 CHU de Québec – Université Laval (Marie-Christine Laroche, Catherine Van Neste, Marie-
328 Claude Brodeur and Stéphane Tremblay) for their support throughout the implementation of the
329 project and its realization.

330 References

- 331 1. Roberge D, Larouche D, Pineault R. L'URGENCE HOSPITALIÈRE : UN SUBSTITUT À
332 LA PREMIÈRE LIGNE? 2007; 12.
- 333 2. Carret MLV, Fassa AG, Kawachi I. Demand for emergency health service: factors associated
334 with inappropriate use. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2007;7: 131. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-7-131
- 335 3. Carret MLV, Fassa ACG, Domingues MR. Inappropriate use of emergency services: a
336 systematic review of prevalence and associated factors. *Cad Saude Publica.* 2009;25: 7–28.
337 doi:10.1590/s0102-311x2009000100002
- 338 4. Kraaijvanger N, Rijpsma D, van Leeuwen H, Edwards M. Self-referrals in the emergency
339 department: reasons why patients attend the emergency department without consulting a
340 general practitioner first—a questionnaire study. *Int J Emerg Med.* 2015;8: 46.
341 doi:10.1186/s12245-015-0096-x
- 342 5. Uscher-Pines L, Pines J, Kellermann A, Gillen E, Mehrotra A. Emergency department visits
343 for nonurgent conditions: systematic literature review. *Am J Manag Care.* 2013;19: 47–59.
- 344 6. Idil H, Kilic TY, Toker İ, Dura Turan K, Yesilaras M. Non-urgent adult patients in the
345 emergency department: Causes and patient characteristics. *Turk J Emerg Med.* 2018;18: 71–
346 74. doi:10.1016/j.tjem.2017.10.002
- 347 7. Fact Sheets | BMUS: The Burden of Musculoskeletal Diseases in the United States. 2013
348 [cited 10 Jan 2020]. Available: <https://www.boneandjointburden.org/fact-sheets>
- 349 8. Bird S, Thompson C, Williams KE. Primary contact physiotherapy services reduce waiting
350 and treatment times for patients presenting with musculoskeletal conditions in Australian
351 emergency departments: an observational study. *Journal of Physiotherapy.* 2016;62: 209–
352 214.
- 353 9. World Health Organization (WHO). Musculoskeletal conditions. [cited 15 Feb 2021].
354 Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/musculoskeletal-conditions>
- 355 10. Ledoux E, Denis D. Enquête québécoise sur des conditions de travail, d'emploi et de santé et
356 de sécurité du travail (EQCOTESST). Perspectives interdisciplinaires sur le travail et la
357 santé. 2011 [cited 13 Jun 2019]. doi:10.4000/pistes.1831
- 358 11. Cieza A, Causey K, Kamenov K, Hanson SW, Chatterji S, Vos T. Global estimates of the
359 need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic
360 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet.* 2020;396: 2006–2017.
361 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32340-0
- 362 12. Wijnhoven HAH, de Vet HCW, Picavet HSJ. Prevalence of Musculoskeletal Disorders Is
363 Systematically Higher in Women Than in Men. *The Clinical Journal of Pain.* 2006;22: 717–
364 724. doi:10.1097/01.ajp.0000210912.95664.53

- 365 13. Treaster DE, Burr D. Gender differences in prevalence of upper extremity musculoskeletal
366 disorders. *Ergonomics*. 2004;47: 495–526. doi:10.1080/00140130310001638171
- 367 14. Urwin M, Symmons D, Allison T, Brammah T, Busby H, Roxby M, et al. Estimating the
368 burden of musculoskeletal disorders in the community: the comparative prevalence of
369 symptoms at different anatomical sites, and the relation to social deprivation. *Annals of the*
370 *Rheumatic Diseases*. 1998;57: 649–655. doi:10.1136/ard.57.11.649
- 371 15. March L, Smith EUR, Hoy DG, Cross MJ, Sanchez-Riera L, Blyth F, et al. Burden of
372 disability due to musculoskeletal (MSK) disorders. *Best Practice & Research Clinical*
373 *Rheumatology*. 2014;28: 353–366. doi:10.1016/j.berh.2014.08.002
- 374 16. Horn ME, Brennan GP, George SZ, Harman JS, Bishop MD. A value proposition for early
375 physical therapist management of neck pain: a retrospective cohort analysis. *BMC Health*
376 *Serv Res*. 2016;16. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1504-5
- 377 17. Childs JD, Fritz JM, Wu SS, Flynn TW, Wainner RS, Robertson EK, et al. Implications of
378 early and guideline adherent physical therapy for low back pain on utilization and costs.
379 *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2015;15: 150. doi:10.1186/s12913-015-0830-3
- 380 18. Ehrmann-Feldman D, Rossignol M, Abenhaim L, Gobeille D. Physician Referral to Physical
381 Therapy in a Cohort of Workers Compensated for Low Back Pain. *Phys Ther*. 1996;76: 150–
382 156. doi:10.1093/ptj/76.2.150
- 383 19. Fritz JM, Childs JD, Wainner RS, Flynn TW. Primary Care Referral of Patients With Low
384 Back Pain to Physical Therapy: Impact on Future Health Care Utilization and Costs. *Spine*.
385 2012;37: 2114–2121. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31825d32f5
- 386 20. Gellhorn AC, Chan L, Martin B, Friedly J. Management Patterns in Acute Low Back Pain:
387 the Role of Physical Therapy. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012;37: 775–782.
388 doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181d79a09
- 389 21. Kucera KL, Lipscomb HJ, Silverstein B. Medical care surrounding work-related back injury
390 claims among Washington State Union Carpenters, 1989--2003. *Work*. 2011;39: 321–330.
391 doi:10.3233/WOR-2011-1180
- 392 22. Zigenfus GC, Yin J, Giang GM, Fogarty WT. Effectiveness of Early Physical Therapy in the
393 Treatment of Acute Low Back Musculoskeletal Disorders. *Journal of Occupational and*
394 *Environmental Medicine*. 2000;42: 35.
- 395 23. Storheim K, Zwart J-A. Musculoskeletal disorders and the Global Burden of Disease study.
396 *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2014;73: 949–950. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2014-
397 205327
- 398 24. Asplin BR, Magid DJ, Rhodes KV, Solberg LI, Lurie N, Camargo CA. A conceptual model
399 of emergency department crowding. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2003;42: 173–180.
400 doi:10.1067/mem.2003.302

- 401 25. Wylie K, Crilly J, Toloo GS, FitzGerald G, Burke J, Williams G, et al. Review article:
402 Emergency department models of care in the context of care quality and cost: a systematic
403 review. *Emerg Med Australas*. 2015;27: 95–101. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.12367
- 404 26. de Gruchy A, Granger C, Gorelik A. Physical therapists as primary practitioners in the
405 emergency department: six-month prospective practice analysis. *Physical therapy*. 2015;95:
406 1207.
- 407 27. Heywood JW. Specialist physiotherapists in orthopaedic triage-the results of a military spinal
408 triage clinic. *Journal of the Royal Army Medical Corps*. 2005;151: 152–156.
- 409 28. Sohil P, Hao PY, Mark L. Potential impact of early physiotherapy in the emergency
410 department for non-traumatic neck and back pain. *World J Emerg Med*. 2017;8: 110–115.
411 doi:10.5847/wjem.j.1920-8642.2017.02.005
- 412 29. Gagnon R, Perreault K, Berthelot S, Matifat E, Desmeules F, Achou B, et al. Direct-access
413 physiotherapy to help manage patients with musculoskeletal disorders in an emergency
414 department: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Academic Emergency Medicine*.
415 2021;28: 848–858. doi:10.1111/acem.14237
- 416 30. Bornhöft L, Thorn J, Svensson M, Nordeman L, Eggertsen R, Larsson MEH. More cost-
417 effective management of patients with musculoskeletal disorders in primary care after direct
418 triaging to physiotherapists for initial assessment compared to initial general practitioner
419 assessment. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*. 2019;20. doi:10.1186/s12891-019-2553-9
- 420 31. Denninger TR, Cook CE, Chapman CG, McHenry T, Thigpen CA. The Influence of Patient
421 Choice of First Provider on Costs and Outcomes: Analysis From a Physical Therapy Patient
422 Registry. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2017;48: 63–71. doi:10.2519/jospt.2018.7423
- 423 32. Magel J, Kim J, Fritz JM, Freburger JK. Time Between an Emergency Department Visit and
424 Initiation of Physical Therapist Intervention: Health Care Utilization and Costs. *Physical
425 Therapy*. 2020;100: 1782–1792. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzaa100
- 426 33. Richardson B, Shepstone L, Poland F, Mugford M, Finlayson B, Clemence N. Randomised
427 controlled trial and cost consequences study comparing initial physiotherapy assessment and
428 management with routine practice for selected patients in an accident and emergency
429 department of an acute hospital. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2005;22: 87–92.
430 doi:10.1136/emj.2003.012294
- 431 34. McClellan CM, Cramp F, Powell J, Bengler JR. A randomised trial comparing the cost
432 effectiveness of different emergency department healthcare professionals in soft tissue injury
433 management. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3: e001116. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001116
- 434 35. Lignes directrices de l'évaluation économique des technologies de la santé au Canada.
435 Ottawa: ACMTS; 2017 Mar p. 80 pages. Report No.: 4e édition. Available:
436 [https://www.cadth.ca/fr/a-propos-de-acmts/comment-nous-procedons/lignes-directrices-en-](https://www.cadth.ca/fr/a-propos-de-acmts/comment-nous-procedons/lignes-directrices-en-matiere-de-methodologie/lignes-directrices-de-evaluation-economique)
437 [matiere-de-methodologie/lignes-directrices-de-evaluation-economique](https://www.cadth.ca/fr/a-propos-de-acmts/comment-nous-procedons/lignes-directrices-en-matiere-de-methodologie/lignes-directrices-de-evaluation-economique)

- 438 36. Berthelot S, Mallet M, Blais S, Moore L, Guertin JR, Boulet J, et al. Adaptation of time-
439 driven activity-based costing to the evaluation of the efficiency of ambulatory care provided
440 in the emergency department. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open*. 2022;3: e12778.
441 doi:10.1002/emp2.12778
- 442 37. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the*
443 *Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. Oxford University Press; 2015.
- 444 38. Kovačević I, Kogler VM, Turković TM, Dunkić LF, Ivanec Ž, Petek D. Self-care of chronic
445 musculoskeletal pain – experiences and attitudes of patients and health care providers. *BMC*
446 *Musculoskelet Disord*. 2018;19: 1–10. doi:10.1186/s12891-018-1997-7
- 447 39. Caffrey A, Smart KM, FitzGerald O. Physiotherapist-Led Triage at a Rheumatology-Based
448 Musculoskeletal Assessment Clinic: an 18-Month Service Evaluation of Activity and
449 Outcomes. *ACR Open Rheumatol*. 2019;1: 213–218. doi:10.1002/acr2.1022
- 450 40. Downie F, McRitchie C, Monteith W, Turner H. Physiotherapist as an alternative to a GP for
451 musculoskeletal conditions: a 2-year service evaluation of UK primary care data. *Br J Gen*
452 *Pract*. 2019;69: e314–e320. doi:10.3399/bjgp19X702245
- 453 41. Lau PM-Y, Chow DH-K, Pope MH. Early physiotherapy intervention in an Accident and
454 Emergency Department reduces pain and improves satisfaction for patients with acute low
455 back pain: a randomised trial. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2008;54: 243–249.
- 456 42. Bornhöft L, Larsson ME, Nordeman L, Eggertsen R, Thorn J. Health effects of direct
457 triaging to physiotherapists in primary care for patients with musculoskeletal disorders: a
458 pragmatic randomized controlled trial. *Therapeutic Advances in Musculoskeletal Disease*.
459 2019;11: 1759720X1982750. doi:10.1177/1759720X19827504
- 460 43. O’Brien B. Economic Evaluation of Pharmaceuticals: Frankenstein’s Monster or Vampire of
461 Trials? *Medical Care*. 1996;34: DS99–DS108.
- 462 44. Berthelot S, Mallet M, Baril L, Dupont P, Bissonnette L, Stelfox H, et al. P017: A time-
463 driven activity-based costing method to estimate health care costs in the emergency
464 department. *Canadian Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2017;19: S83–S83.
465 doi:10.1017/cem.2017.219
- 466 45. Berthelot S, Breton M, Guertin JR, Archambault PM, Berger Pelletier E, Blouin D, et al. A
467 Value-Based Comparison of the Management of Ambulatory Respiratory Diseases in Walk-
468 in Clinics, Primary Care Practices, and Emergency Departments: Protocol for a Multicenter
469 Prospective Cohort Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2021;10: e25619. doi:10.2196/25619
- 470 46. Jacobs P, Budden A, Lee KM. Guidance document for the costing of health care resources in
471 the Canadian setting. Ottawa: CADTH; 2016 Mar p. 50. Report No.: 2nd edition. Available:
472 https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/CP0009_CADTHCostingGuidance.pdf

- 473 47. Gagnon R, Perreault K, Guertin JR, Berthelot S, Achou B, Hébert LJ. Health-Related
474 Quality of Life of Patients Presenting to the Emergency Department with a Musculoskeletal
475 Disorder. *CEOR*. 2022;14: 91–103. doi:10.2147/CEOR.S348138
- 476 48. EQ-5D User Guides – EQ-5D. [cited 18 Sep 2019]. Available:
477 <https://euroqol.org/publications/user-guides/>
- 478 49. Bilbao A, García-Pérez L, Arenaza JC, García I, Ariza-Cardiel G, Trujillo-Martín E, et al.
479 Psychometric properties of the EQ-5D-5L in patients with hip or knee osteoarthritis:
480 reliability, validity and responsiveness. *Qual Life Res*. 2018;27: 2897–2908.
481 doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1929-x
- 482 50. Conner-Spady BL, Marshall DA, Bohm E, Dunbar MJ, Loucks L, Al Khudairy A, et al.
483 Reliability and validity of the EQ-5D-5L compared to the EQ-5D-3L in patients with
484 osteoarthritis referred for hip and knee replacement. *Qual Life Res*. 2015;24: 1775–1784.
485 doi:10.1007/s11136-014-0910-6
- 486 51. Manning WG, Mullahy J. Estimating log models: to transform or not to transform? *Journal*
487 *of Health Economics*. 2001; 34.
- 488 52. Thompson SG, Nixon RM. How Sensitive Are Cost-Effectiveness Analyses to Choice of
489 Parametric Distributions? *Med Decis Making*. 2005;25: 416–423.
490 doi:10.1177/0272989X05276862
- 491 53. Xie F, Pullenayegum E, Gaebel K, Bansback N, Bryan S, Ohinmaa A, et al. A Time Trade-
492 off-derived Value Set of the EQ-5D-5L for Canada. *Med Care*. 2016;54: 98–105.
493 doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000000447
- 494 54. RUBIN DB. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*. 1976;63: 581–592.
495 doi:10.1093/biomet/63.3.581
- 496 55. Matifat E, Méquignon M, Cunningham C, Blake C, Fennelly O, Desmeules F. Benefits of
497 Musculoskeletal Physical Therapy in Emergency Departments: A Systematic Review. *Phys*
498 *Ther*. 2019;99: 1150–1166. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzz082
- 499