

1 **Correlation of Social Determinants of Health and Chronic Nonspecific Low Back Pain; A**  
2 **Brief Report**

3 Running title: SDoH and nonspecific low back pain

4  
5 Authors: Alireza Ebrahimi <sup>1 †\*</sup>, Hyunjoon Rhee <sup>1 †</sup>, Atta Taseh <sup>1</sup>, Hye Chang Rhim<sup>1</sup>, Soheil  
6 Ashkani-Esfahani <sup>1</sup>

7  
8 Affiliations

9 1- Foot & Ankle Research and Innovation Lab (FARIL), Department of Orthopaedic  
10 Surgery, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

11  
12 \*Corresponding Author: Alireza Ebrahimi

13 Address: 158 Boston Post Road, Weston, MA 02493

14 Email:

15  
16 Authors' contribution

17 Conceptualization, Data interpretation, Supervision, Drafting the manuscript, Design, Revisions:  
18 SAE

19 Methodology, Visualization: AE, SAE

20 Data gathering, Data analysis, Data interpretation, Drafting the manuscript, Revisions: AE, HR,  
21 AT

22 † The authors with this symbol contributed equally to this study.

23  
24 - *The paper is not under consideration in the same or substantially similar form in any*  
25 *other journal.*

26 - *All authors have been involved in writing, reviewing, and editing the paper and have*  
27 *approved the paper and agree to its submission and publishing in this journal.*

28 **Correlation of Social Determinants of Health and Chronic Nonspecific Low Back Pain; A**

29 **Brief Report**

30

31

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Low back pain (LBP) ranks as one of the top contributors to disability-adjusted  
3 life years worldwide. Social determinants of health (SDoH) encompass a range of factors that  
4 play a pivotal role in shaping healthcare outcomes. We aimed to examine the differences in  
5 SDoH between patients with acute and chronic non-specific low back pain (NSLBP).

6 **Methods:** This study was a retrospective case-control study on patients who were admitted to  
7 four tertiary hospitals affiliated with Massachusetts General Hospital. Relevant ICD-9 and ICD-  
8 10 codes were used to detect patients with LBP. Patients with specific diagnoses such as  
9 degenerative joint diseases or primary or secondary bone tumors were excluded. SDoH variables  
10 along with the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) and Area Deprivation Index (ADI) were  
11 collected. Wilcoxon rank sum and Chi-square tests were performed to assess the difference  
12 between the cohorts.

13 **Results:** Of 2,278 patients who were labeled as chronic LBP, 17 were included. The number of  
14 female patients was significantly higher ( $P < 0.05$ ). Furthermore, we didn't observe any  
15 considerable difference between these two groups of patients regarding the SDoH, SVI, and ADI  
16 values.

17 **Conclusion:** The prevalence of chronic NSLBP in tertiary healthcare centers might be lower.  
18 SDoH, ADI, and SVI seem not to contribute to the chronicity of NSCLBP. Future research is  
19 needed to further our understanding of the risk factors associated with NSLBP, particularly in  
20 different healthcare settings.

21 **Significance/Implications**

22 Although, SDoH variables are mentioned as risk factors, considering the clinical setting when  
23 applying the knowledge seem to play an important role.

1 **Keywords:** Social Vulnerability Index; Disparity; Area Deprivation Index

2

## 1           **Introduction**

2    Low back pain (LBP) is among the world's leading causes of disability-adjusted life years  
3    (DALYs) (GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators, 2020). Nearly 4 out of 5 adults in the  
4    United States experience LBP at least once in their lifetime (Urits et al., 2019). The estimated  
5    cost of treating the morbidities resulting from LBP exceeds 600 billion annually (Becker &  
6    Childress, 2019). Although LBP is usually self-limited, about 30% becomes chronic lasting more  
7    than 12 weeks (Patrick et al., 2016). It is worth mentioning that the majority of the economic and  
8    psychosomatic burden is due to its chronicity (Patrick et al., 2016). Patients with no established  
9    underlying cause for LBP, such as fractures, infections, and tumors, are labeled non-specific  
10   LBP (NSLBP) with a prevalence of ~5% among all LBP patients (Karran et al., 2020). The  
11   physicians might cautiously diagnose the patients with chronic NSLBP when ruling out all  
12   serious causes of LBP.

13   Early intervention was found to improve patient-reported pain scores and functional outcomes in  
14   NSLBP (Yeganeh et al., 2017). Previous studies have recognized different risk factors such as  
15   obesity and smoking to be associated with the chronicity of LBP (Shemory et al., 2016; Stevans  
16   et al., 2021). According to the literature, the majority of symptoms in specific LBP are rooted in  
17   underlying medical or pathoanatomical reasons, whereas the symptoms of NSLBP were found to  
18   be highly related to psychosomatic problems and individual characteristics of the patients (Kent  
19   & Kjaer, 2012; Werneke & Hart, 2001).

20   Social determinants of health (SDoH) refer to the social, economic, educational, cultural, and  
21   environmental factors that could affect individuals' health (WHO, 2023). These factors  
22   contribute to healthcare outcomes and could lead to health inequities, which are defined as  
23   preventable or modifiable differences in the health status of various subgroups of populations

1 caused by socioeconomic status (SES) (WHO, 2023). The Global Commission on Social  
2 Determinants of Health (CSDH) has highlighted the importance of tackling inequities by  
3 improving individuals' living conditions, addressing inequitable resources, and understanding  
4 and measuring the problem (WHO, n.d.). During the past few decades, the impacts of SDoH on  
5 various musculoskeletal disorders, specifically LBP, have been studied (Guillemin et al., 2014).  
6 A recent systematic review of multiple studies reported that educational and economic status had  
7 a positive correlation with spine surgery outcomes in patients with LBP (Yap et al., 2022).  
8 Another review with a much larger population mentioned that a range of interdependent and  
9 independent correlations could be found between LBP management outcomes and SDoH  
10 variables, including gender, marital status, and place of living (Karran et al., 2020). Previous  
11 studies showed that social determinants of health might define the outcomes of patients with  
12 chronic LBP, however, the relationship of these factors to chronic NSLBP is yet to be elaborated.  
13 Based on these pieces of evidence, and to the best of our knowledge, studies on the correlation of  
14 SDoH and the outcomes of NSLBP are scarce. We assumed that these patients, since the  
15 underlying cause for their LBP has not been well defined, are at higher risk of being neglected,  
16 mismanaged, and thus, facing further complications. Hence, understanding the factors that could  
17 influence the management process of these patients seems to be of great importance. The current  
18 study aimed to compare SDoH in patients with acute and chronic NSLBP. We hypothesized that  
19 SDoH could play a predictive role in chronicity in NSLBP and help providers plan for  
20 prevention or early intervention.

## 21 **Material and Methods**

### 22 *1.1. Study Design and Population*

1 This study was a retrospective case-control study on patients who were admitted to four tertiary  
2 hospitals and clinics affiliated with our institution between the years 2016 and 2022. We used the  
3 relevant ICD-9 and ICD-10 codes to detect patients with LBP in our enterprise data warehouse  
4 (EDW) using the Research Patient Data Registry Application (RPDR) (Supplementary 1). We  
5 extracted all the encounters of patients who were 18 years old or older and had complaints of  
6 LBP in their orthopaedic or physical therapy (PT) visits. The patients with specific diagnoses  
7 such as degenerative joint diseases, disk fractures, scoliosis, disk stenosis, and primary or  
8 secondary bone tumors affecting disks were excluded. We also excluded the patients who didn't  
9 have at least two visits and the patients with a history of spine surgery. The inclusion and  
10 exclusion criteria are summarized in Table 1. Finally, the resulting dataset was reevaluated  
11 manually by two expert orthopaedic researchers.

**Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria.**

|                    |               |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Inclusion criteria | Acute NSLBP*  | Age $\geq$ 18<br>Patients with at least two orthopaedic/physiotherapy visits happening over a period of < 6 weeks: The first visit was due to LBP, and the pain was resolved in the second visit |
|                    | Chronic NSLBP | Patients with at least two visits happening over a period of $\geq$ 12 weeks, and complaining of LBP**                                                                                           |
| Exclusion criteria |               | Patients with specific diagnosis (e.g. DJD***, Fracture, Scoliosis)<br>Patients with history of spinal surgery<br>Patients with missing SDoH information                                         |

\*Non-specific Low Back Pain

\*\* Low Back Pain

\*\*\* Degenerative Joint Disease

12

## 13 1.2. Social Determinants of Health

14 We gathered SDoH variables including age, gender, marital status, race, ethnicity, type of  
15 insurance, and variables related to the lifestyle and daily habits of the patients. Social  
16 vulnerability index (SVI) and area deprivation index (ADI) are based on the Zip code of patients'  
17 location and were collected from open-source databases (Angelidou et al., 2021).

1 The social vulnerability index (SVI), which is a composite of different factors affecting the  
2 outcomes of patients with different diseases, was collected from the Agency for Toxic  
3 Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) website (ATSDR, 2022). SVI encompasses 4 main  
4 categories including, socioeconomic status (SES), household composition and disability,  
5 minority status and language, and housing and transportation (16). Patients' scores for SES,  
6 household characteristics, minority status, and transportation type were also gathered from the  
7 same resource (16). It is noteworthy to mention that each of these categories also contains  
8 different factors. Subsequently, SVI evaluates 15 criteria based on their relative influence  
9 (weights) on health. The metric scores the individuals from 0 (defined as lowest vulnerability) to  
10 1 (defined as highest vulnerability) based on ZIP code Tabulation Areas (ZCTAs) (16).  
11 Additionally, the national percentile and state decile area deprivation index (ADI) of the patients  
12 were gathered from the online resource designed by the Center for Health Disparities Research,  
13 University of Wisconsin (University of Wisconsin, n.d.). ADI values are provided as state decile  
14 rankings at a block group level from 1 to 10, where 1 being the lowest level of disadvantage and  
15 10 being the highest level of disadvantage. Furthermore, national percentiles of ADI scores were  
16 collected, where the lowest score of 1 shows the least disadvantaged group, and the highest score  
17 of 100 shows the most disadvantaged group. These pieces of data are based on counties, which is  
18 more general than the geographical specificity of SVI, and are calculated according to the  
19 American Community Survey (ACS) 2020 (17). Although SVI and ADI are more  
20 comprehensive and are becoming more popular than crude data of median income, we also  
21 gathered the patients' median income based on Zip code from the United States Census Bureau  
22 website (United States Census Bureau, n.d.).

### 23 1.3. *Statistical Analysis*

1 The descriptive measures were reported as numbers, percentages, median, and interquartile range  
2 (IQR) where applicable. Wilcoxon rank sum and Chi-square tests were performed to assess the  
3 difference between the cohorts. All statistical analyses were done using the SPSS® Software  
4 version. 28, and P-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

#### 5 1.4. *Ethical consideration*

6 All the patients' identifiers were removed in this study, and the protocol of the study was  
7 approved by the institutional review board (IRB no. 2023P000728).

### 8 **Results**

9 Overall, 51,636 patients were diagnosed with LBP between 2012 and 2022 at four tertiary  
10 hospitals affiliated with our institution. Of 2,278 patients who were labeled as chronic LBP using  
11 the aforementioned methodology, 17 patients were chronic NSLBP. From those with acute  
12 NSLBP (n = 1115), a randomly selected cohort of 17 patients was used as a comparison group  
13 (Figure 1).

14 Table 2 represents the demographics of patients who had acute and chronic NSLBP. The results  
15 of the present study showed that the number of female patients with chronic NSLBP was  
16 significantly higher than their male counterparts (P < 0.05). Furthermore, we didn't observe any  
17 considerable difference between these two groups of patients in smoking and alcohol use, SVI,  
18 SES, household characteristics, minority status, housing type and transportation, ADI, and  
19 median income (Table 3).

20



1

**Table 2. Comparison of the demographic data of patients with acute versus chronic non-specific low back pain.**

| Variable        | Chronic (n = 17)                                                                              | Acute (n = 17)                                                                            | P-value * |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Age (years old) | Median (Q1-Q3)<br>61 (45.5-68.5)                                                              | Median (Q1-Q3)<br>52 (45.5-62.5)                                                          | 0.538     |
| Gender          | N (Percentage)<br>Male: 6 (35.3%)<br>Female: 11 (64.7%)                                       | N (Percentage)<br>Male: 12 (70.6%)<br>Female: 5 (29.4%)                                   | 0.039     |
| Marital status  | N (Percentage)<br>Single: 4 (23.5%)<br>Married: 8 (47.1%)<br>Widowed/Divorced: 5 (29.4%)      | N (Percentage)<br>Single: 10 (58.8%)<br>Married: 5 (29.4%)<br>Widowed/Divorced: 2 (11.8%) | 0.445     |
| Race            | N (Percentage)<br>White: 12 (70.6%)<br>Black: 1 (5.9%)<br>Asian: 1 (5.9%)<br>Other: 3 (17.6%) | N (Percentage)<br>White: 13 (76.5%)<br>Black: 0<br>Asian: 4 (23.5%)<br>Other: 0           | 0.12      |
| Ethnicity       | N (Percentage)<br>Not Hispanic: 15 (88.2%)<br>Hispanic: 1 (5.9%)<br>Other: 1 (5.9%)           | N (Percentage)<br>Not Hispanic: 16 (94.1%)<br>Hispanic: 0<br>Other: 1 (5.9%)              | 0.597     |
| Insurance       | N (Percentage)<br>Medicare: 6 (35.3%)<br>Private: 10 (58.8%)<br>Other: 1 (5.9%)               | N (Percentage)<br>Medicare: 6 (35.3%)<br>Private: 11 (64.7%)<br>Other: 0                  | 0.592     |
| BMI             | Median (IQR)<br>26.3 (20.42-29.13)                                                            | Median (IQR)<br>23.9 (20.82-28.91)                                                        | 0.657     |
| Smoking         | N (Percentage)<br>Never: 10 (58.8%)<br>Former: 5 (29.4%)<br>Smoker: 2 (11.7%)                 | N (Percentage)<br>Never: 14 (82.3%)<br>Former: 2 (11.7%)<br>Smoker: 1 (5.9%)              | 0.319     |
| Alcohol         | N (Percentage)<br>Never: 7 (41.1%)<br>Occasionally: 1 (5.9%)<br>Regularly: 9 (52.9%)          | N (Percentage)<br>Never: 11 (64.7%)<br>Occasionally: 2 (11.7%)<br>Regularly: 4 (23.5%)    | 0.207     |

\* Wilcoxon rank sum test was performed for the comparison of numerical variables, and Chi-square test were conducted for nominal variables.

2

3

**Table 3. Social determinants of health in patients with acute and chronic non-specific low back pain.**

| <b>Variable</b>                                  | <b>Chronic<br/>Median (Q1-Q3)</b> | <b>Acute<br/>Median (Q1-Q3)</b> | <b>P-value<br/>*</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Overall Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) **      | 0.28 (0.27-0.78)                  | 0.28 (0.26-0.58)                | 0.379                |
| Socioeconomic Status **                          | 0.19 (0.12-0.65)                  | 0.19 (0.11-0.44)                | 0.53                 |
| Household Characteristics **                     | 0.22 (0.11-0.35)                  | 0.22 (0.06-0.35)                | 0.851                |
| Minority Status **                               | 0.63 (0.58-0.84)                  | 0.63 (0.55-0.66)                | 0.753                |
| Housing Type and Transportation **               | 0.75 (0.70-0.94)                  | 0.75 (0.53-0.82)                | 0.615                |
| Area Deprivation Index (National Percentile) *** | 23 (11.5-30)                      | 23 (9-45)                       | 0.381                |
| Area Deprivation Index (State Decile) ***        | 6 (3-7)                           | 6 (2-8.5)                       | 0.588                |
| Median Income (IQR) ****                         | 106153 (69276-116865)             | 90315 (68230-115749)            | 0.653                |

\* Wilcoxon rank sum test was performed for the comparison.

\*\* The data relating to these variables were gathered from Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) website: [https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/interactive\\_map.html](https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/interactive_map.html)

\*\*\* The data relating to these variables were gathered from Center for Health Disparities Research, University of Wisconsin website: <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/>

\*\*\*\* The data for these variables were gathered from the United States Census Bureau website: <https://data.census.gov/>

## 1           **Discussion**

2   The pathophysiology of NSLBP and the risk factors contributing to the development and  
3   progression of the disease are still unclear. There is also a lack of data regarding the  
4   epidemiology of NSLBP among both acute and chronic cases. A few studies have delved into  
5   assessing the prevalence of chronic NSLBP and reported a range of 7-80% (Chiwaridzo &  
6   Naidoo, 2014). In the present study, the ratio of patients with chronic NSLBP to all the patients  
7   found to have chronic LBP was about 1%. One possible explanation for the lower rate could be  
8   that our centers are tertiary facilities, and there is a higher possibility that patients are diagnosed  
9   with an actual diagnosis rather than NSLBP. Among different SDoH-related factors, gender  
10   showed a significant difference between the acute and chronic cohorts of NSLBP. While our low  
11   population can limit the generalizability of our outcomes, our results showed that the female  
12   gender can be a predictor of chronicity in our population with NSLBP. Consistent with our  
13   outcomes, Bento et al. showed that the prevalence of LBP is considerably higher in female  
14   (60.9%) than the male (39.0%) participants of their cross-sectional study (Bento et al., 2020). Lu  
15   et al. investigated multiple risk factors and reported female gender along with ten other factors  
16   that are of predictive value (Lu et al., 2023). Another study by Gok et al. also confirmed that  
17   gender has an influence on inflammatory criteria of LBP (Gok et al., 2022).

18   Previous studies on the effect of SDoH on LBP are mostly focused on a specific domain and it is  
19   difficult to draw conclusions from them because of the controversial results. Several studies  
20   underlined the effect of educational level and income status in this patient population (Park et al.,  
21   2023; Takahashi et al., 2018). A recent systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of  
22   SDoH on LBP by Karran et al. showed that disparities in socioeconomic status and educational  
23   attainment significantly contribute to chronic LBP (5). On the contrary, Ramond et al included

1 18 cohorts in a systematic review and reported no association between most social and socio-  
2 occupational factors with chronic low back pain (Ramond et al., 2011). Our results also did not  
3 reveal any significance regarding the effect of SVI and its subscales including socioeconomic  
4 status on the chronicity of the condition. One possibility could be that because our data were  
5 collected in a referral setting, there might exist a disparity in referring patients to such centers.  
6 According to a study by Olah et al, the likelihood of being offered a primary care appointment is  
7 significantly higher when patients represent themselves as having high socioeconomic status  
8 (Olah et al., 2013).

9 This study has several limitations to be mentioned. Despite the advantages of SVI and ADI,  
10 accurately predicting the score for each individual was impossible as the data gathered according  
11 to ZCTAs. The individuals might live in a neighborhood that is not representative of their  
12 income, education, and other determinants of health. Also, SVI scores are given to geographical  
13 locations that are grouped into counties, which in many cases cover a vast region that may elicit  
14 disparities of the social status within the counties. Our study was done on a limited cohort that  
15 might not represent different populations at national and global levels. The centers involved in  
16 the current study are considered referral centers, and the rate of patients with NSLBP might not  
17 be representative of the patients receiving care in primary care centers. Further studies on larger  
18 sample sizes are suggested to address these limitations.

## 19 **Conclusion**

20 In conclusion, the risk factors contributing to the chronicity of NSLBP are still to be  
21 investigated, and there is still a lack of comprehensive data on its epidemiology. The present  
22 study suggests that the prevalence of chronic NSLBP in tertiary healthcare centers might be  
23 lower compared to primary and secondary clinics. Despite the limitations of this low sample size

1 study, our findings indicate that female gender could be considered as a risk factor for chronicity  
2 of NSLBP patients. Further research is needed to further our understand of the risk factors  
3 associated with NSLBP, particularly in different patient populations and healthcare settings.

#### 4 **Research funding**

5 None declared.

#### 6 **Author contributions**

7 All authors have accepted responsibility for the entire content of this manuscript and approved its  
8 submission.

#### 9 **Competing interests**

10 Authors state no conflict of interest.

#### 11 **Informed consent**

12 Informed consent was obtained from all individuals included in this study.

#### 13 **Ethical approval**

14 The local Institutional Review Board has approved the protocol of the study (IRB no.  
15 2023P000728).

16

#### 17 **References**

18 Angelidou, A., Sullivan, K., Melvin, P. R., Shui, J. E., Goldfarb, I. T., Bartolome, R.,  
19 Chaudhary, N., Vaidya, R., Culic, I., Singh, R., Yanni, D., Patrizi, S., Hudak, M. L.,  
20 Parker, M. G., & Belfort, M. B. (2021). Association of Maternal Perinatal SARS-CoV-2  
21 Infection With Neonatal Outcomes During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Massachusetts.  
22 *JAMA Network Open*, 4(4), e217523.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.7523>

- 1 ATSDR. (2022, December 1). *Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)*.  
2 [https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/interactive\\_map.html](https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/interactive_map.html)
- 3 Becker, B. A., & Childress, M. A. (2019). Nonspecific Low Back Pain and Return To Work.  
4 *American Family Physician, 100*(11), 697–703.
- 5 Bento, T. P. F., Genebra, C. V. dos S., Maciel, N. M., Cornelio, G. P., Simeão, S. F. A. P., &  
6 Vitta, A. de. (2020). Low back pain and some associated factors: Is there any difference  
7 between genders? *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy, 24*(1), 79–87.  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjpt.2019.01.012>
- 9 Chiwaridzo, M., & Naidoo, N. (2014). Prevalence and associated characteristics of recurrent  
10 non-specific low back pain in Zimbabwean adolescents: A cross-sectional study. *BMC*  
11 *Musculoskeletal Disorders, 15*, 381. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-15-381>
- 12 GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. (2020). Global burden of 369 diseases and  
13 injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: A systematic analysis for the Global  
14 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet (London, England), 396*(10258), 1204–1222.  
15 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30925-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-9)
- 16 Gok, K., Erol, K., Kılıc, G., Kılıc, E., & Ozgocmen, S. (2022). Gender differences in the  
17 discriminative value of inflammatory low back pain criteria. *ARP Rheumatology, 1*(4),  
18 293–299.
- 19 Guillemin, F., Carruthers, E., & Li, L. C. (2014). Determinants of MSK health and disability—  
20 Social determinants of inequities in MSK health. *Best Practice & Research. Clinical*  
21 *Rheumatology, 28*(3), 411–433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.berh.2014.08.001>

- 1 Karran, E. L., Grant, A. R., & Moseley, G. L. (2020). Low back pain and the social determinants  
2 of health: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *PAIN*, *161*(11), 2476.  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001944>
- 4 Kent, P., & Kjaer, P. (2012). The efficacy of targeted interventions for modifiable psychosocial  
5 risk factors of persistent nonspecific low back pain—A systematic review. *Manual*  
6 *Therapy*, *17*(5), 385–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2012.02.008>
- 7 Lu, W., Shen, Z., Chen, Y., Hu, X., Ruan, C., Ma, W., & Jiang, W. (2023). Risk factors analysis  
8 and risk prediction model construction of non-specific low back pain: An ambidirectional  
9 cohort study. *Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research*, *18*(1), 1–13.
- 10 Olah, M. E., Gaisano, G., & Hwang, S. W. (2013). The effect of socioeconomic status on access  
11 to primary care: An audit study. *Cmaj*, *185*(6), E263–E269.
- 12 Park, H.-J., Choi, J.-Y., Lee, W. M., & Park, S.-M. (2023). Prevalence of chronic low back pain  
13 and its associated factors in the general population of South Korea: A cross-sectional  
14 study using the National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys. *Journal of*  
15 *Orthopaedic Surgery and Research*, *18*(1), 1–12.
- 16 Patrick, N., Emanski, E., & Knaub, M. A. (2016). Acute and Chronic Low Back Pain. *Medical*  
17 *Clinics of North America*, *100*(1), 169–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcna.2015.08.015>
- 18 Ramond, A., Bouton, C., Richard, I., Roquelaure, Y., Baufreton, C., Legrand, E., & Huez, J.-F.  
19 (2011). Psychosocial risk factors for chronic low back pain in primary care—A  
20 systematic review. *Family Practice*, *28*(1), 12–21.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmq072>

- 1 Shemory, S. T., Pfefferle, K. J., & Gradisar, I. M. (2016). Modifiable Risk Factors in Patients  
2 With Low Back Pain. *Orthopedics*, *39*(3), e413-416. [https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-](https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20160404-02)  
3 [20160404-02](https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20160404-02)
- 4 Stevans, J. M., Delitto, A., Khoja, S. S., Patterson, C. G., Smith, C. N., Schneider, M. J.,  
5 Freburger, J. K., Greco, C. M., Freel, J. A., Sowa, G. A., Wasan, A. D., Brennan, G. P.,  
6 Hunter, S. J., Minick, K. I., Wegener, S. T., Ephraim, P. L., Friedman, M., Beneciuk, J.  
7 M., George, S. Z., & Saper, R. B. (2021). Risk Factors Associated With Transition From  
8 Acute to Chronic Low Back Pain in US Patients Seeking Primary Care. *JAMA Network*  
9 *Open*, *4*(2), e2037371. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.37371>
- 10 Takahashi, A., Kitamura, K., Watanabe, Y., Kobayashi, R., Saito, T., Takachi, R., Kabasawa, K.,  
11 Oshiki, R., Tsugane, S., & Iki, M. (2018). Epidemiological profiles of chronic low back  
12 and knee pain in middle-aged and elderly Japanese from the Murakami cohort. *Journal of*  
13 *Pain Research*, 3161–3169.
- 14 United States Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Census Data*.
- 15 University of Wisconsin. (n.d.). *Area Deprivation Index (ADI)*. Neighborhood Atlas®.  
16 <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/>
- 17 Urits, I., Burshtein, A., Sharma, M., Testa, L., Gold, P. A., Orhurhu, V., Viswanath, O., Jones,  
18 M. R., Sidransky, M. A., Spektor, B., & Kaye, A. D. (2019). Low Back Pain, a  
19 Comprehensive Review: Pathophysiology, Diagnosis, and Treatment. *Current Pain and*  
20 *Headache Reports*, *23*(3), 23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11916-019-0757-1>
- 21 Werneke, M., & Hart, D. L. (2001). Centralization phenomenon as a prognostic factor for  
22 chronic low back pain and disability. *Spine*, *26*(7), 758–764; discussion 765.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200104010-00012>



- 1 WHO. (n.d.). *Commission on Social Determinants of Health*. Commission on Social  
2 Determinants of Health, 2005-2008. Retrieved May 11, 2023, from  
3 [https://www.who.int/initiatives/action-on-the-social-determinants-of-health-for-](https://www.who.int/initiatives/action-on-the-social-determinants-of-health-for-advancing-equity/world-report-on-social-determinants-of-health-equity/commission-on-social-determinants-of-health)  
4 [advancing-equity/world-report-on-social-determinants-of-health-equity/commission-on-](https://www.who.int/initiatives/action-on-the-social-determinants-of-health-for-advancing-equity/world-report-on-social-determinants-of-health-equity/commission-on-social-determinants-of-health)  
5 [social-determinants-of-health](https://www.who.int/initiatives/action-on-the-social-determinants-of-health-for-advancing-equity/world-report-on-social-determinants-of-health-equity/commission-on-social-determinants-of-health)
- 6 WHO. (2023, May 11). *Social Determinants of Health (SDH)*. World Health Organization.  
7 <https://www.who.int/health-topics/social-determinants-of-health>
- 8 Yap, Z. L., Summers, S. J., Grant, A. R., Moseley, G. L., & Karran, E. L. (2022). The role of the  
9 social determinants of health in outcomes of surgery for low back pain: A systematic  
10 review and narrative synthesis. *The Spine Journal: Official Journal of the North*  
11 *American Spine Society*, 22(5), 793–809. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2021.11.013>
- 12 Yeganeh, M., Baradaran, H. R., Qorbani, M., Moradi, Y., & Dastgiri, S. (2017). The  
13 effectiveness of acupuncture, acupressure and chiropractic interventions on treatment of  
14 chronic nonspecific low back pain in Iran: A systematic review and meta-analysis.  
15 *Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice*, 27, 11–18.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctcp.2016.11.012>
- 17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

1

2

3

4




Figure 1. Recruitment Flowchart