Title: Quantitative sensory testing and association with cervical spine radiculopathy disability: Systematic review.

Michael Mansfield MSc BSc (Hons)¹ Dr sc hum Jan Vollert MSc BSc ^{2 3} Prof. Michael Thacker PhD MSc Grad Dip Phys Grad Dip MNMSD ¹

Affiliations.

¹ Pain Research Cluster; Ageing, Acute and Long Term Conditions Research Group.

Institute of Health and Social Care, London South Bank University, London, United

Kingdom (UK).

² Pain Research, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK.

³ Department of Anaesthesiology, Intensive Care and Pain Medicine, University Hospital Muenster, Muenster, Germany.

Take home messages:

- First systematic review investigating the association between quantitative sensory testing (QST) and disability in adults with cervical spine radiculopathy
- From four studies, there was no association between QST and disability
- There is a need to complete prospective studies investigating this relationship to enhance our understanding of this condition.

Thank you to the Musculoskeletal Association of Chartered Physiotherapists (MACP) for granting me the research award level 3. I am grateful for the research funding which has supported the design, development and writing of our systematic review titled: *'Quantitative sensory testing and association with cervical spine radiculopathy disability: Systematic review'*. I would like to extend my gratitude and thanks to Prof. Mick Thacker and Dr. Jan Vollert for their support throughout this project.

We are delighted that our systematic review has been accepted for publication in *Pain and Rehabilitation* journal. In light of the current working conditions in the middle of a global pandemic, we have planned clinical-academic seminar invitations in the *Pain Research Cluster Group* at London South Bank University.

Cervical spine radiculopathy (CSR) prevalence values range between 1.2 to 5.8 per 1000 people and incidence rates range between 0.8 and 1.8 per 1,000 person-years (1-5). CSR is known to have negative impacts for individuals, families, societies and healthcare systems (6-8). It has a complex clinical presentation with variable phenotype expression (9, 10), resulting in a substantial challenge for clinicians to assess and manage optimally (7, 11). CSR is often associated with multiple overlapping co-morbidities including (but not limited too) psychosocial factors such as depression and anxiety symptoms (12-14). Identifying mechanism-based phenotypes of neuropathic pain states (including spinal radiculopathy) may optimise the diagnosis classification and subsequent management strategies (15-17). There is evidence suggesting lower thresholds to thermal, mechanical and vibration detection for individuals with neuropathic pain presentations such as peripheral neuropathy (for example diabetes), carpal tunnel syndrome (18) and other spinal musculoskeletal disorders, for example cervical spine pain (19). Furthermore, lower threshold to thermal and mechanical pain detection thresholds are also reported (20). To date no systematic review has been undertaken to determine the association between QST and disability in individuals with CSR.

A systematic review was conducted including searches of PubMed (MEDLINE), EMBASE and CINHAL. Quantitative studies investigating CSR populations with QST measurements and association with disability were included. One reviewer conducted the search strategy. Two reviewers independently assessed eligibility of all search results and completed methodological quality assessment using a modified Downs and Black checklist. Data were analysed narratively.

Four studies were included for review (19-22). The quality of these studies was high. There were no statistically significant associations between QST and disability among people with CSR. This systematic review fulfilled the aim of investigating the association between QST and disability in people with CSR. QST protocols and further prospective studies involving patients are likely to enhance our understanding of the clinical presentation of CSR. Further, there is a need to standardise CSR diagnostic criteria.

Reflections and learning points.

Our narrative (descriptive) analysis was based on four heterogenous studies. Despite this, our search strategy was rigorous including large electronic databases, grey literature, hand searching and expert author contacts. Secondly, the measures of disability varied across the included studies and included neck disability index, disability of arm and shoulder and pain disability index. Greater consistency between these measures of disability may have enhanced the analysis and improved external validity to clinical populations. The patient populations across the four studies varied in CSR diagnostic criteria and healthcare locations. Greater consistency and enhanced transparency of CSR diagnostic criteria may have improved the generalisability to clinical practice. Furthermore, only one study recruited from primary practice which limits it application to clinicians working in this setting.

We will continue to ensure that a clear and transparent record of decision making is made for all team members to access, trust a 'critical friend' to provide observations to protocol and final write up and, importantly, continue to acknowledge how valuable reviewers comments are to enhance manuscript submissions – a special thank you to the Pain and Rehabilitation editorial and reviewing team, a pleasure to work with.

Thank you again to the MACP for supporting the research ambitions of it's members, particularly early career researchers. I would be very happy to support members considering applying for future MACP research awards.

Michael Mansfield MSc BSc (Hons) HCPC MCSP MMACP FHEA Michael.mansfield@lsbu.ac.uk

Reference List

1. Bharucha NE, Bharucha AE, Bharucha EP. Prevalence of peripheral neuropathy in the Parsi community of Bombay. Neurology. 1991;41(8):1315-7.

2. Braddom RL, Spitz L, Rivner MH. Frequency of radiculopathies in motor vehicle accidents. Muscle Nerve. 2009;39(4):545-7.

3. Khedr EM, Fawi G, Abbas MA, El-Fetoh NA, Zaki AF, Ahmed MA, et al. Prevalence of cervical and lumbosacral compressive radiculopathies in Qena governorate/Egypt: Population-based survey. Clin Neurol Neurosurg. 2018;175:112-20.

4. Radhakrishnan K, Litchy WJ, O'Fallon WM, Kurland LT. Epidemiology of cervical radiculopathy. A population-based study from Rochester, Minnesota, 1976 through 1990. Brain : a journal of neurology. 1994;117 (Pt 2):325-35.

5. Mansfield M, Smith T, Spahr N, Thacker M. Cervical spine radiculopathy epidemiology: A systematic review. Musculoskeletal Care. 2020.

6. Iyer S, Kim HJ. Cervical radiculopathy. Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med. 2016;9(3):272-80.

7. Kjaer P, Kongsted A, Hartvigsen J, Isenberg-Jorgensen A, Schiottz-Christensen B, Soborg B, et al. National clinical guidelines for non-surgical treatment of patients with recent onset neck pain or cervical radiculopathy. Eur Spine J. 2017;26(9):2242-57.

8. Salemi G, Savettieri G, Meneghini F, Di Benedetto ME, Ragonese P, Morgante L, et al. Prevalence of cervical spondylotic radiculopathy: a door-to-door survey in a Sicilian municipality. Acta Neurol Scand. 1996;93(2-3):184-8.

9. Nicotra A, Khalil NM, O'Neill K. Cervical radiculopathy: discrepancy or concordance between electromyography and magnetic resonance imaging? Br J Neurosurg. 2011;25(6):789-90.

10. Tampin B, Briffa NK, Slater H. Self-reported sensory descriptors are associated with quantitative sensory testing parameters in patients with cervical radiculopathy, but not in patients with fibromyalgia. European journal of pain (London, England). 2013;17(4):621-33.

11. Thoomes EJ, van Geest S, van der Windt DA, Falla D, Verhagen AP, Koes BW, et al. Value of physical tests in diagnosing cervical radiculopathy: a systematic review. The spine journal : official journal of the North American Spine Society. 2018;18(1):179-89.

12. Gutman G, Rosenzweig DH, Golan JD. Surgical Treatment of Cervical Radiculopathy: Metaanalysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Spine. 2018;43(6):E365-e72.

13. Woods BI, Hilibrand AS. Cervical radiculopathy: epidemiology, etiology, diagnosis, and treatment. Journal of spinal disorders & techniques. 2015;28(5):E251-9.

14. Murray CJ, Barber RM, Foreman KJ, Abbasoglu Ozgoren A, Abd-Allah F, Abera SF, et al. Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) for 306 diseases and injuries

and healthy life expectancy (HALE) for 188 countries, 1990-2013: quantifying the epidemiological transition. Lancet (London, England). 2015;386(10009):2145-91.

15. Vardeh D, Mannion RJ, Woolf CJ. Toward a Mechanism-Based Approach to Pain Diagnosis. J Pain. 2016;17(9 Suppl):T50-69.

16. Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. Pain. 2011;152(3 Suppl):S2-15.

17. Haanpaa M, Attal N, Backonja M, Baron R, Bennett M, Bouhassira D, et al. NeuPSIG guidelines on neuropathic pain assessment. Pain. 2011;152(1):14-27.

18. Schmid AB, Hailey L, Tampin B. Entrapment Neuropathies: Challenging Common Beliefs With Novel Evidence. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2018;48(2):58-62.

19. Tampin B, Slater H, Hall T, Lee G, Briffa NK. Quantitative sensory testing somatosensory profiles in patients with cervical radiculopathy are distinct from those in patients with nonspecific neck-arm pain. Pain. 2012;153(12):2403-14.

20. Moloney N, Hall T, Doody C. Sensory hyperalgesia is characteristic of nonspecific arm pain: a comparison with cervical radiculopathy and pain-free controls. Clin J Pain. 2013;29(11):948-56.

21. Chien A, Eliav E, Sterling M. Whiplash (grade II) and cervical radiculopathy share a similar sensory presentation: an investigation using quantitative sensory testing. Clin J Pain. 2008;24(7):595-603.

22. Vaegter HB, Palsson TS, Graven-Nielsen T. Facilitated Pronociceptive Pain Mechanisms in Radiating Back Pain Compared With Localized Back Pain. J Pain. 2017;18(8):973-83.