Title: Low back pain service utilization and costs: association with timing of first-line services for individuals initially contacting a primary care provider. A retrospective cohort study

Authors:

David Elton, DC, Optum Labs, Minnetonka, Minnesota USA

Meng Zhang, PhD, Optum Labs, Minnetonka, Minnesota USA

Corresponding author:

David Elton

Optum Labs

5995 Opus Parkway, Minnetonka, MN 55343

Phone: (952) 562-1349

david.elton@optum.com

Abstract

Background: Low back pain (LBP) is prevalent, costly, and a common reason for a visit to a primary care provider (PCP). Guidelines recommend a stepped approach to management.

Objective: For individuals with LBP initially contacting a PCP, examine the association between the incorporation of first-line therapies, use of second- and third-line services and total episode cost.

Design: Retrospective cohort study

Setting/Patients: National sample of individuals with non-surgical LBP occurring in 2017-2019.

Measurements: Independent variables were initial contact with a PCP, and the timing of incorporation of 5 types of first-line therapies. Dependent measures included use of 14 types of health care services and total episode cost.

Results: 8.5% of 118,503 PCPs initially contacted by 308,790 individuals with 347,627 episodes of non-surgical LBP were associated with an episode including any first-line service at any time. 17.5% of episodes included any first-line service at any time. Active care (11.6% of episodes), manual therapy (8.0%) and chiropractic manipulative therapy (7.0%) were the most common first line services. 5.4% of episodes included a first-line service during the first 7 days. These episodes were associated with a modest reduction in the use of prescription pharmaceuticals, with no impact on the use of imaging or spinal injection. First-line services were associated with an increase in total episode cost with the smallest increase associated with chiropractic and osteopathic manipulation. Younger individuals from ZIP codes with higher adjusted gross income were more likely to receive a first-line service in the first 7 days of an episode.

Limitations: As a retrospective observational analysis of associations there are numerous potential confounders and limitations.

Conclusions: Individuals with non-surgical LBP initially contacting a PCP infrequently receive a first-line service, and if received, it is typically in addition to second- and third-line pharmaceutical, imaging, and interventional services. There is an opportunity to improve concordance with the stepped approach to management described in LBP guidelines.

Keywords: Low back pain; pathway; guideline; primary care; initial contact; first provider; active care; manual therapy; manipulation; physical therapist; chiropractor; referral; utilization; cost; value

Introduction

Low back pain (LBP) is common [1-3] and costly [4]. Management of LBP benefits from the availability of high-quality clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) that describe a stepped approach in which services are sequenced into first-, second- and third-line services [5-7]. In the absence of red flags of serious pathology, LBP CPGs generally emphasize individual self-management, non-pharmacological and non-interventional services as first-line approaches [5-7].

LBP is the source of a high proportion of "low-value" care, described as services generating costs without or with minimal beneficial impact on outcomes [8,9]. Examples of low-value care for LBP include overuse of imaging, interventional procedures, and some prescription medications such as opioids [10-13]. Management of LBP that is not concordant with CPGs is associated with the risk of LBP transitioning from an acute to a chronic condition [14].

The initial contact health care provider (HCP) has been used as a method to evaluate variation in service utilization and cost outcomes for LBP [15,16]. For individuals with LBP, initial contact with a chiropractor (DC), physical therapist (PT), licensed acupuncturist (LAc), or doctor of osteopathy (DO) providing manipulative therapy is associated with first-line services being provided more frequently than second- or third-line services [17]. More than half of individuals with LBP initially seek treatment from primary care providers (PCP) and physician specialists (PS) [17], with LBP the second most common reason for a visit to a PCP [18]. When initially contacted by an individual with LBP, PCPs and PSs generally incorporate second- and third-line

services more frequently than CPG recommended first-line services [17]. Several barriers to PCP referral for first-line therapies have been identified [19-24], and comparisons of early versus late referral for first-line therapies reveal mixed results [25-34].

The aim of this retrospective, observational study was to examine the association between the timing of incorporation of active care (AC), manual therapy (MT), chiropractic manipulative therapy (CMT), osteopathic manipulative therapy (OMT), or acupuncture (Acu) services, utilization of other healthcare services, and total episode cost for individuals with non-surgical LBP initially contacting a PCP. The hypothesis was that early incorporation of one or more first-line services would be associated with lower rates of second- and third-line service use, and lower total episode cost.

Methods

Study design, population, setting and data sources

This is a retrospective cohort study of individuals initially contacting a PCP for non-surgical LBP. An analytic database was created by linking multiple databases. An enrollee database included de-identified enrollment records and administrative claims data for individuals with LBP. De-identified HCP demographic information and professional licensure status was included in an HCP database. ZIP code level population race and ethnicity data was extracted from the US Census Bureau [35], adjusted gross income (AGI) data from the Internal Revenue Service [36] and

socioeconomic status (SES) Area Deprivation Index (ADI) data, from the University of Wisconsin Neighborhood Atlas® database [37]. With data linked from various sources, a review was performed to assess compliance with de-identification requirements. Because data was de-identified or a Limited Data Set in compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and customer requirements, the UnitedHealth Group Office of Human Research Affairs Institutional Review Board determined that this study was exempt from ethics review. The study was conducted and reported based on the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines (Supplement – STROBE Checklist) [38].

It was not possible to differentiate whether first-line services were provided by the PCP, accessed by referral from the PCP, accessed by referral from another HCP, or accessed directly by the individual with LBP. Additionally, the analysis was unable to control for potential confounders of the timing of incorporation of first-line services. These include: availability of HCPs offering first-line services convenient to an individual's home, workplace or daily travel routes including public transportation if used, individual preference for specific services or type of HCP including gender or racial concordance, recommendations from family or friends, nuanced clinical complexity not captured in administrative data, anticipated potential out of pocket costs, and appointment availability within a PCP's and individual's timing expectations for HCPs meeting these and other criteria [39]. As an alternative to blurring the line between association and causation through an incomplete adjustment for typical confounders such as age, sex and co-morbidities [40,41] using potentially inadequate approaches such as propensity score matching [42], actual individual demographic and episodic characteristics and associations

are reported for the timing of introduction of each of the five first-line services analyzed in the study.

Cohort selection and unit of analysis

The cohort included individuals aged 18 years and older initially contacting a PCP for a complete episode of LBP commencing and ending during the calendar years 2017-2019. This timeframe was selected to follow the release of the American College of Physicians (ACP) LBP CPG [5] in 2017 and before the influence of the COVID-19 epidemic on care patterns in early 2020. All individuals had continuous medical and pharmacy insurance coverage during the entire study period.

Episode of care was selected as the unit of analysis. Episodes have been shown to be a valid way to organize administrative claims data associated with a condition [43]. The *Symmetry® Episode Treatment Groups® (ETG®)* and *Episode Risk Groups® (ERG®)* version 9.5 methodologies and definitions were used to translate administrative claims data into episodes, which have been reported as a valid measurement for comparison of HCPs based on cost of care [44]. A previous study found a low risk of misclassification bias associated with using episode of care as the unit of analysis [17].

The analysis included complete episodes defined as having at least 91-day pre- and 61-day post-episode clean periods during which no services were provided by any HCP for any LBP

diagnosis. Excluded from the analysis were LBP episodes including a surgical procedure, or associated with diagnoses of malignant and non-malignant neoplasms, fractures and other spinal trauma, infection, congenital deformities and scoliosis, autoimmune disorders, osteoporosis, and advanced arthritis. These exclusions were made to address a potential study limitation of individuals with more complex conditions, or presenting with red flags of potential serious pathology, confounding the analysis of timing of incorporation of first-line non-pharmacological and non-interventional services.

Variables

Data preprocessing, table generation, and initial analyses were performed using Python (*Python Language Reference, Version 3.7.5.*, n.d.). A goodness of fit analysis was conducted using D'Agostino's K-squared test. Non-normally distributed data are reported using the median and interquartile range (IQR).

The primary independent variables were initial contact with a PCP, and the timing of incorporation of AC, MT, CMT, OMT, or Acu services. The following Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®) codes were used to identify first-line services. AC – 97110, 97112, 97530. MT – 97140. CMT – 98940 to 98942. OMT – 98925 to 98929. Acu – 97810, 97811, 97813, 97814. For LBP, these are the most frequently provided first-line services recommended by CPGs and covered by commercial insurance [17]. Passive therapies were excluded from the definition of first-line services. The timing of incorporation of AC, MT, CMT, OMT, or Acu

services was based on the number of days after the initial visit with a PCP when a first-line service was first billed by any HCP.

The PCP HCP category consisted of Family Practice, Internal Medicine, General Medicine and OBGYN physician types, along with Nurse Practitioner and Physician Assistant HCPs. The study cohort was able to access all PCP HCP types directly without a referral. The analyses included a random effect to address variation in decision-making among individual HCPs of the same type.

The primary dependent variable was the rate and timing of use of 14 types of health care services segmented into first-, second-, and third-line service categories based on the ACP LBP CPG as a primary source for the designation [5]. Secondary dependent variables included the total cost of care for all reimbursed services provided by any HCP during an episode, the number of different HCPs seen during an episode, and episode duration measured in days. Total episode cost included costs associated with all services provided for an episode of LBP, including those not specifically identified in the 14 categories used in the analyses. Costs for services for which an insurance claim was not submitted were not available. The episode duration was the number of days between the first and last date of service for each episode.

Bivariate analyses were performed comparing episode attributes associated with timing of introduction of AC, MT, CMT, OMT, or Acu services. The bivariate reference baseline was episodes that did not include a specific first-line service. Fisher's Exact test (p value of .001) was

used for comparing the percent of episodes including a service, and Mann Whitney U test (p value of .001) was used for measures reported using median and IQR.

Role of Funding Source

None

Results

The sample included 308,790 individuals, with a median age of 47 (Q1 36, Q3 55), and 53.9% females. These individuals were associated with 347,627 complete non-surgical LBP episodes involving 118,503 unique PCPs. There were $208,459,561 in reimbursed health care expenditures with a median total cost per episode of $145 (Q1 $47, Q3 $426). The median pre-episode clean period was 619 days (Q1 403, Q3 853). The median number of days between sequential episodes was 211 (Q1 121, Q3 348). The median post-episode clean period was 432 days (Q1 266, Q3 687) (Table 1). Individuals were from all 50 States and some U.S. territories (Supplement - State).

82.5% of non-surgical LBP episodes did not include a first-line service at any time during an episode. For the 17.5% of episodes that included any first-line service at any time during an episode, AC (11.5% of episodes), MT (8.0%) and CMT (7.0%) were most common. Individuals

were more likely to receive skeletal muscle relaxants (34.1% of episodes), prescription NSAIDs (33.8%), radiography (23.2%), opioids (20.7%) and MRI (8.2%) (Table 2).

Within the first 7 days of an episode 5.4% of episodes included one or more of the five first-line services with AC (3.1% of episodes), MT (2.0%) and CMT (1.5%) being most common. When introduced in the first 7 days, first-line services were generally associated with a reduction in pharmacological services and an increase in radiology, MRI, and spinal injection services. A first-line service introduced 8-14 days into an episode was associated with a statistically significant but not clinically meaningful reduction in rate of NSAID and opioid prescribing, along with an increase in in the rate of spinal imaging and injections. When a first-line service was introduced 15+ days into an episode the rates of pharmacological, imaging and injection service use were higher than if a first-line service was never provided (Table 2). This is illustrated for AC in Figure 1.

Episodes with a first-line service introduced in the first 7 days were associated with younger individuals, with a lower *ERG*® risk score, from zip codes with lower deprivation, higher AGI, and greater availability of a DC or PT. Among individual first-line services, Acu was most strongly associated with lower deprivation, higher AGI, lower percent non-Hispanic white population, and greater availability of LAcs (Figure 2)(Table 3).

Compared to episodes without a first-line service, total episode cost was higher when any first-line service was provided at any time, except for OMT provided within the first 7 days of an

episode. The total episode cost increase was lowest for introduction of CMT and OMT (Figure 3). Episode duration increased as first-line services were introduced later in an episode (Table 3).

Discussion

Most individuals with non-surgical LBP initially contact a PCP [17]. These individuals receive a CPG recommended non-pharmaceutical first-line service at any time in less than 20% of episodes. For the individuals receiving a first-line service within the first 7 days of the episode there may be a modest reduction in some prescription pharmacological services. A first-line service introduced more than 7 days into an episode is not associated with a clinically meaningful reduction in any second- or third-line service. Introduction of a first-line service is associated with higher total episode cost, with CMT and OMT associated with the lowest cost increase.

As a retrospective cohort study of associations, several limitations must be kept in mind. The cohort had continuous highly uniform commercial insurance coverage and the processing of administrative claims data included extensive quality and actuarial control measures, nonetheless, data errors, variability in benefit plan design, variability in enrollee cost-sharing responsibility, and missing information were potential sources of confounding or bias. Although the commercial insurer HCP database is under continual validation it may have included errors or missing information regarding the identification of PCPs. Summarizing total episode cost has potential limitations associated with insurance coverage, nature of network participation, and

alternative reimbursement models. While individuals from all 50 states and most US territories were included, providing a measure of generalizability, the cohort did not describe a U.S representative sample.

A risk of selection bias is present due to the limited ability to control for individual preference for type of initial contact HCP, individual expectations or requests for specific health care services, and potentially meaningful differences in clinical complexity of individuals with LBP seeking treatment from a PCP. These limitations were partially addressed by excluding LBP episodes associated with significant pathology and by focusing on only non-surgical LBP episodes.

This study expands on an earlier study revealing a low proportion of individuals with LBP initially contacting a PCP have timely incorporation of guideline-adherent non-pharmacologic and non-interventional therapies [17]. This study corroborates previous studies that found earlier use of first-line therapies may be associated with a reduction in use of low value services and prescription pharmaceuticals, including opioids [30,31,45]. The study finding that the benefits of early use of first-line therapies are most evident if initiated within 7 days of initially contacting a PCP corroborates a similar finding [28], has potentially important translation implications, and warrants additional study.

Previous studies have found that administrative burden and the cost of non-pharmacologic therapies are perceived as referral barriers by PCPs [21,22]. This study found first-line therapies are

generally incorporated in addition to, rather than as an alternative to, second- and third-line therapies. When used in this way it was not surprising that first-line therapies were associated with higher total episode cost. Incorporating first-line therapies as an alternative to low value second- and third-line therapies may help address PCP concerns about the cost of non-pharmacological therapies. Additional potential barriers to accessing non-pharmacologic health care services that may impact PCP referral include limited or lack of benefit coverage, wait times for treatment, transportation barriers, the need to secure time away from work to participate in multiple visits, and individual characteristics [20,46].

Previous studies exploring the association between PCP referral of individuals with LBP for first-line therapies have examined referral for "chiropractic" or "physical therapy" [25,30,31,45], terms that conflate HCP type and types of health care services that may or may not be provided. This study expands on this earlier work in two ways. First, this study examines the timing of introduction of specific health care services independent of the type of HCP providing the service. Second, this study includes an analysis of the timing of introduction of OMT and Acu services.

Conclusion

A PCP is commonly the initial HCP consulted by an individual with LBP. High quality CPGs recommend a stepped approach in which favorable natural history, self-care, and non-pharmacological services are emphasized as first-line approaches for individuals without red

flags of serious pathology. This study reveals second- and third-line pharmaceutical, imaging, and interventional services are commonly provided for individuals with LBP initially contacting a PCP. CPG recommended first-line services are infrequently provided, particularly early in an episode when the potential benefits are greatest. With PCPs frequently consulted for LBP, addressing the high rate of non-guideline concordant LBP care is important. A variety of individual, local socioeconomic, and HCP availability factors, challenging for a PCP to address in the limited time available during a visit, may present barriers to the timely incorporation of CPG recommended first-line services. A plain language summary of LBP CPGs available to individuals before a visit with a PCP may help improve alignment between CPG recommendations and individual expectations and preferences, making it easier for PCPs to suggest and individuals to follow through on recommendations to incorporate first-line services.

References

1. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, et al. What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. *Lancet*. Jun 9 2018;391(10137):2356-2367. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30480-X
2. Diseases GBD, Injuries C. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*. Oct 17 2020;396(10258):1204-1222. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-9
3. Buchbinder R, van Tulder M, Oberg B, et al. Low back pain: a call for action. *Lancet*. Jun 9 2018;391(10137):2384-2388. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30488-4
4. Dieleman JL, Cao J, Chapin A, et al. US Health Care Spending by Payer and Health Condition, 1996-2016. *JAMA*. Mar 3 2020;323(9):863-884. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.0734
5. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, et al. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. Apr 4 2017;166(7):514-530. doi:10.7326/M16-2367
6. Meroni R, Piscitelli D, Ravasio C, et al. Evidence for managing chronic low back pain in primary care: a review of recommendations from high-quality clinical practice guidelines. *Disabil Rehabil*. Apr 2021;43(7):1029-1043. doi:10.1080/09638288.2019.1645888
7. Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, et al. Prevention and treatment of low back pain: evidence, challenges, and promising directions. *Lancet*. Jun 9 2018;391(10137):2368-2383. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30489-6
8. Schwartz AL, Landon BE, Elshaug AG, Chernew ME, McWilliams JM. Measuring low-value care in Medicare. *JAMA Intern Med*. Jul 2014;174(7):1067-76. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.1541
9. Reid RO, Rabideau B, Sood N. Low-Value Health Care Services in a Commercially Insured Population. *JAMA Intern Med*. Oct 1 2016;176(10):1567-1571. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.5031
10. Colla CH, Morden NE, Sequist TD, Schpero WL, Rosenthal MB. Choosing wisely: prevalence and correlates of low-value health care services in the United States. *J Gen Intern Med*. Feb 2015;30(2):221-8. doi:10.1007/s11606-014-3070-z
11. Cassel CK, Guest JA. Choosing wisely: helping physicians and patients make smart decisions about their care. *JAMA*. May 2 2012;307(17):1801-2. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.476
12. Buchbinder R, Underwood M, Hartvigsen J, Maher CG. The Lancet Series call to action to reduce low value care for low back pain: an update. *Pain*. Sep 2020;161 Suppl 1:S57-S64. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001869
13. AlEissa SI, Tamai K, Konbaz F, et al. SPINE20 A global advocacy group promoting evidence-based spine care of value. *Eur Spine J*. Aug 2021;30(8):2091-2101. doi:10.1007/s00586-021-06890-5
14. Stevans JM, Delitto A, Khoja SS, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Transition From Acute to Chronic Low Back Pain in US Patients Seeking Primary Care. *JAMA Netw Open*. Feb 1 2021;4(2):e2037371. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.37371
15. Fritz JM, Kim J, Dorius J. Importance of the type of provider seen to begin health care for a new episode low back pain: associations with future utilization and costs. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 2016;22(2):247-252. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12464
16. Kazis LE, Ameli O, Rothendler J, et al. Observational retrospective study of the association of initial healthcare provider for new-onset low back pain with early and long-term opioid use. *BMJ Open*. Sep 20 2019;9(9):e028633. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028633
17. Elton D, Kosloff TM, Zhang M, et al. Low back pain care pathways and costs: association with the type of initial contact health care provider. A retrospective cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2022:2022.06.17.22276443. doi:10.1101/2022.06.17.22276443

18. Finley CR, Chan DS, Garrison S, et al. What are the most common conditions in primary care? *Systematic review*. 2018;64(11):832-840.
19. Zheng P, Kao MC, Karayannis NV, Smuck M. Stagnant Physical Therapy Referral Rates Alongside Rising Opioid Prescription Rates in Patients With Low Back Pain in the United States 1997-2010. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. May 1 2017;42(9):670-674. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000001875
20. Stevens GL. Behavioral and access barriers to seeking chiropractic care: a study of 3 New York clinics. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. Oct 2007;30(8):566-72. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2007.07.015
21. Roseen EJ, Conyers FG, Atlas SJ, Mehta DH. Initial Management of Acute and Chronic Low Back Pain: Responses from Brief Interviews of Primary Care Providers. *J Altern Complement Med*. Mar 2021;27(S1):S106-S114. doi:10.1089/acm.2020.0391
22. Penney LS, Ritenbaugh C, Elder C, Schneider J, Deyo RA, DeBar LL. Primary care physicians, acupuncture and chiropractic clinicians, and chronic pain patients: a qualitative analysis of communication and care coordination patterns. *BMC Complement Altern Med*. Jan 25 2016;16:30. doi:10.1186/s12906-016-1005-4
23. Greene BR, Smith M, Allareddy V, Haas M. Referral patterns and attitudes of primary care physicians towards chiropractors. *BMC Complement Altern Med*. Mar 1 2006;6:5. doi:10.1186/1472-6882-6-5
24. Coulter ID, Singh BB, Riley D, Der-Martirosian C. Interprofessional referral patterns in an integrated medical system. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. Mar-Apr 2005;28(3):170-4. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2005.02.016
25. Wirth B, Riner F, Peterson C, et al. An observational study on trajectories and outcomes of chronic low back pain patients referred from a spine surgery division for chiropractic treatment. *Chiropr Man Therap*. 2019;27:6. doi:10.1186/s12998-018-0225-8
26. Rundell SD, Gellhorn AC, Comstock BA, Heagerty PJ, Friedly JL, Jarvik JG. Clinical outcomes of early and later physical therapist services for older adults with back pain. *Spine J*. Aug 1 2015;15(8):1744-55. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2015.04.001
27. Ojha HA, Wyrsta NJ, Davenport TE, Egan WE, Gellhorn AC. Timing of Physical Therapy Initiation for Nonsurgical Management of Musculoskeletal Disorders and Effects on Patient Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. Feb 2016;46(2):56-70. doi:10.2519/jospt.2016.6138
28. Liu X, Hanney WJ, Masaracchio M, et al. Immediate Physical Therapy Initiation in Patients With Acute Low Back Pain Is Associated With a Reduction in Downstream Health Care Utilization and Costs. *Physical Therapy*. 2018;98(5):336-347. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzy023
29. Halfpap J, Riebel L, Tognoni A, Coller M, Sheu RG, Rosenthal MD. Improving Access and Decreasing Healthcare Utilization for Patients With Acute Spine Pain: Five-Year Results of a Direct Access Clinic. *Mil Med*. Mar 12 2022;doi:10.1093/milmed/usac064
30. Fritz JM, Lane E, McFadden M, et al. Physical Therapy Referral From Primary Care for Acute Back Pain With Sciatica : A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ann Intern Med*. Jan 2021;174(1):8-17. doi:10.7326/M20-4187
31. Fritz JM, Kim M, Magel JS, Asche CV. Cost-Effectiveness of Primary Care Management With or Without Early Physical Therapy for Acute Low Back Pain: Economic Evaluation of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Mar 2017;42(5):285-290. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000001729
32. Foster NE, Konstantinou K, Lewis M, et al. Stratified versus usual care for the management of primary care patients with sciatica: the SCOPiC RCT. *Health Technol Assess*. Oct 2020;24(49):1-130. doi:10.3310/hta24490
33. Elder C, DeBar L, Ritenbaugh C, et al. Comparative Effectiveness of Usual Care With or Without Chiropractic Care in Patients with Recurrent Musculoskeletal Back and Neck Pain. *J Gen Intern Med*. Sep 2018;33(9):1469-1477. doi:10.1007/s11606-018-4539-y

34. Bezdjian S, Whedon JM, Russell R, Goehl JM, Kazal LA, Jr. Efficiency of primary spine care as compared to conventional primary care: a retrospective observational study at an Academic Medical Center. *Chiropr Man Therap*. Jan 6 2022;30(1):1. doi:10.1186/s12998-022-00411-x
35. Bureau USC. ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. Accessed July 8, 2020. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=United%20States&g=0100000US&y=2018&tid=ACSDP1Y2018.DP05&hidePreview=true.
36. Service IR. US Department of Treasury SOI tax stats - individual income tax statistics - 2017 ZIP code data. Accessed July 20, 2020. https://www.irs.gov/statistics/soi-tax-stats-individual-income-tax-statistics-2017-zip-code-data-soi.
37. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible - The Neighborhood Atlas. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 28 2018;378(26):2456-2458. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1802313
38. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg*. Dec 2014;12(12):1495-9. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013
39. National Academies of Sciences E, and Medicine. *Health-Care Utilization as a Proxy in Disability Determination*. 2 Factors That Affect Health-Care Utilization. National Academies Press 2018.
40. Smith GD, Ebrahim S. Data dredging, bias, or confounding. *BMJ*. Dec 21 2002;325(7378):1437-8. doi:10.1136/bmj.325.7378.1437
41. Hernan MA. The C-Word: Scientific Euphemisms Do Not Improve Causal Inference From Observational Data. *Am J Public Health*. May 2018;108(5):616-619. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2018.304337
42. King G NR. Why Propensity Scores Should Not Be Used for Matching. *Political Analysis*. 2019;27(4):435-454. doi:10.1017/pan.2019.11
43. Peterson C, Grosse SD, Dunn A. A practical guide to episode groupers for cost-of-illness analysis in health services research. *SAGE Open Med*. 2019;7:2050312119840200. doi:10.1177/2050312119840200
44. Insight O. Symmetry episode treatment groups: measuring health care with meaningful episodes of care. 2012.
45. Fritz JM, Childs JD, Wainner RS, Flynn TW. Primary care referral of patients with low back pain to physical therapy: impact on future health care utilization and costs. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Dec 1 2012;37(25):2114-21. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31825d32f5
46. MacKay C, Hawker G, Jaglal S. A qualitative study exploring the barriers and facilitators to optimal physical therapy management of early knee osteoarthritis symptoms. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*. 2017;25:S396. doi:10.1016/j.joca.2017.02.681

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The UnitedHealth Group Office of Human Research Affairs Institutional Review Board

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The data are proprietary and are not available for public use but, under certain conditions, may be made available to editors and their approved auditors under a data-use agreement to confirm the findings of the current study.

Competing interests

At the time of manuscript submission **DE** and **MZ** are UnitedHealth Group employees. **DE** is a UNH stockholder. No other potential conflicts of interest or competing interests exist.

Authors' contributions

Study conception and design; **DE**. Data acquisition; **DE, MZ.** Data analysis and interpretation; **DE, MZ.** Draft or substantially revise manuscript; **DE, MZ.**

Registration: N/A

Funding Source: None

List of Abbreviations:

LBP – Low back pain

US – United States

CPG – Clinical practice guideline

PCP – Primary care provider

PS – Physician specialist

DC – Doctor of Chiropractic

PT – Physical Therapist

HCP – Health care provider

IQR – Interquartile range

AGI – Adjusted Gross Income

ADI – Area Deprivation Index

STROBE – Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

CPT® - Current Procedural Terminology

ETG® – Episode Treatment Group®

ERG® – Episode Risk Group®

ACP – American College of Physicians

PA – Physician Assistant

CMT – Chiropractic manipulative treatment

OMT – Osteopathic manipulative treatment

AC – Active care

MT – Manual therapy

Acu - Acupuncture

Table 1 - Cohort characteristics - % or Median (Q1,Q3)	
# of Individuals	308790
# of Episodes	347627
# of PCP health care providers (HCPs)	118503
Total cost	208459561
Individuals with low back pain	
% Female	53.9%
Age	47 (36, 55)
ERG ® risk score	1.5 (0.7, 2.9)
Individual home address zip code population attributes	
% non-Hispanic white	72.1% (50.0%, 85.4%)
Area Deprivation Index (ADI)	48 (31, 65)
Household Adjusted Gross Income (AGI)	61410 (48643, 84035)
HCP per 1000 population - DC	0.21 (0.08, 0.41)
HCP per 1000 population - PT	0.16 (0.03, 0.38)
HCP per 1000 population - LAc	0.00 (0.00, 0.02)
Episode attributes	
Total cost	$145 (47, 426)
# of HCP seen	2 (1, 3)
Episode duration - days	22 (1, 148)
Clean period - before initial episode - days	619 (403, 853)
Clean period - between sequential episodes - days	211 (121, 348)
Clean period - after final episode - days	432 (266, 687)

Table 2 - Non-surgical LBP initially contacting PCP - episodic service use by number of days (d) into episode when first line service first incorporated															
Measure	Episodes		First Line					Passive Therapy	Second Line				Third Line		
	Count	%	AC	MT	CMT	OMT	Acu		Rx - NSAID	Rx - MM Relaxant	Imaging - Radiography	Imaging - MRI	Rx-Opioid	Spinal Injection	Imaging - CT
Total	***347627***	***100.0%***	***11.5%***	***8.0%***	***7.0%***	***1.4%***	***0.3%***	***5.7%***	***33.8%***	***34.1%***	***23.2%***	***8.2%***	***20.7%***	***4.4%***	***1.4%***
Any First Line Service															
Not Provided - Reference	**286918**	**82.5%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.2%**	**33.8%**	**34.7%**	**20.4%**	**6.3%**	**20.7%**	**3.4%**	**1.3%**
0-7d	18700	5.4%	62.1%	44.8%	32.2%	20.1%	1.6%	30.0%	21.5%	26.5%	27.1%	9.1%	13.2%	7.0%	1.1%
8-14d	6754	1.9%	78.1%	54.3%	30.9%	1.8%	1.5%	31.8%	31.3%	36.1%	41.5%	14.5%	18.0%	6.3%	1.4%
15-28d	8546	2.5%	74.8%	52.1%	34.2%	2.4%	1.4%	31.0%	34.8%	34.5%	42.0%	18.9%	20.1%	7.2%	1.8%
29-60d	9716	2.8%	66.9%	46.6%	44.3%	2.4%	1.4%	32.8%	36.9%	32.7%	41.4%	22.5%	22.6%	9.3%	2.0%
61-90d	5196	1.5%	56.9%	38.2%	57.0%	2.7%	1.2%	33.1%	39.6%	31.8%	35.8%	20.9%	24.5%	10.2%	2.0%
>90d	11797	3.4%	61.7%	41.0%	51.9%	2.3%	1.7%	34.9%	47.2%	33.2%	41.6%	24.7%	29.6%	13.4%	3.0%
Active Care (AC)															
Not Provided - Reference	**307602**	**88.5%**	**0.0%**	**1.1%**	**5.0%**	**1.3%**	**0.2%**	**2.1%**	**33.5%**	**34.1%**	**20.6%**	**6.3%**	**20.6%**	**3.5%**	**1.3%**
0-7d	10623	3.1%	100.0%	61.9%	20.6%	2.8%	0.8%	33.4%	24.3%	28.4%	32.4%	11.7%	13.6%	8.9%	1.3%
8-14d	5249	1.5%	100.0%	64.2%	14.9%	0.6%	0.9%	31.6%	31.0%	37.2%	44.1%	16.1%	16.6%	6.7%	1.4%
15-28d	6535	1.9%	100.0%	64.0%	17.0%	1.0%	0.9%	31.1%	35.7%	36.6%	47.7%	22.6%	19.6%	8.2%	2.1%
29-60d	6675	1.9%	100.0%	61.0%	23.1%	1.0%	0.9%	33.3%	39.3%	36.0%	49.5%	29.8%	23.6%	12.0%	2.4%
61-90d	3029	0.9%	100.0%	57.1%	31.9%	1.0%	0.7%	34.4%	43.7%	37.1%	46.5%	32.0%	27.5%	15.0%	2.7%
>90d	7914	2.3%	100.0%	56.5%	32.7%	1.6%	1.4%	37.0%	50.2%	37.1%	48.2%	33.0%	32.0%	17.2%	3.8%
Manual Therapy (MT)															
Not Provided - Reference	**319792**	**92.0%**	**4.9%**	**0.0%**	**5.8%**	**1.4%**	**0.2%**	**3.0%**	**33.6%**	**34.1%**	**21.6%**	**6.9%**	**20.6%**	**3.8%**	**1.3%**
0-7d	6893	2.0%	84.9%	100.0%	20.1%	1.0%	1.4%	38.8%	23.6%	28.0%	29.9%	11.5%	13.2%	8.0%	1.0%
8-14d	3511	1.0%	92.4%	100.0%	14.0%	0.8%	1.3%	34.6%	31.3%	37.8%	41.7%	16.2%	17.0%	7.3%	1.6%
15-28d	4720	1.4%	91.8%	100.0%	14.2%	1.0%	1.0%	33.8%	34.2%	36.0%	45.4%	20.7%	18.1%	7.8%	2.1%
29-60d	4981	1.4%	88.3%	100.0%	20.3%	1.1%	1.5%	35.6%	39.2%	37.6%	48.3%	30.1%	23.8%	11.6%	2.3%
61-90d	2202	0.6%	85.6%	100.0%	27.5%	1.3%	1.6%	37.4%	44.3%	37.7%	46.3%	32.1%	26.3%	15.5%	2.3%
>90d	5528	1.6%	84.8%	100.0%	30.7%	1.6%	2.2%	40.6%	50.0%	38.2%	49.0%	34.4%	31.7%	17.8%	4.0%
Manipulation - Chiropractic (CMT)															
Not Provided - Reference	**323199**	**93.0%**	**9.5%**	**6.8%**	**0.0%**	**1.4%**	**0.2%**	**3.1%**	**33.8%**	**34.6%**	**22.6%**	**8.1%**	**20.7%**	**4.1%**	**1.4%**
0-7d	5378	1.5%	41.7%	26.3%	100.0%	0.6%	1.0%	43.7%	23.4%	30.8%	31.5%	7.4%	16.3%	8.7%	1.2%
8-14d	2024	0.6%	37.1%	23.4%	100.0%	0.9%	1.3%	41.0%	29.4%	32.0%	36.1%	9.7%	21.4%	6.8%	1.2%
15-28d	2856	0.8%	35.9%	22.3%	100.0%	0.8%	1.1%	40.4%	32.1%	29.3%	29.7%	10.0%	21.8%	5.8%	1.1%
29-60d	4401	1.3%	35.2%	23.2%	100.0%	0.7%	1.2%	39.9%	32.4%	25.8%	29.6%	9.5%	20.2%	5.4%	1.2%
61-90d	3042	0.9%	32.5%	20.6%	100.0%	0.7%	0.6%	39.4%	34.3%	25.1%	26.1%	8.8%	20.2%	5.7%	1.0%
>90d	6727	1.9%	39.1%	25.1%	100.0%	1.1%	1.4%	41.8%	42.7%	27.3%	35.4%	14.5%	25.0%	9.4%	1.7%
Manipulation - Osteopathic (OMT)															
Not Provided - Reference	**342891**	**98.6%**	**11.5%**	**8.0%**	**7.1%**	**0.0%**	**0.3%**	**5.7%**	**34.0%**	**34.3%**	**23.4%**	**8.3%**	**20.8%**	**4.4%**	**1.4%**
0-7d	3710	1.1%	11.1%	4.8%	3.3%	100.0%	0.4%	6.9%	11.6%	15.1%	9.0%	3.2%	7.5%	2.9%	0.5%
8-14d	124	0.0%	16.1%	10.5%	6.5%	100.0%	1.6%	8.1%	25.0%	37.9%	33.1%	8.9%	16.9%	8.9%	0.8%
15-28d	205	0.1%	17.1%	9.8%	7.3%	100.0%	0.5%	11.7%	27.3%	32.2%	22.9%	9.8%	18.0%	10.7%	0.5%
29-60d	239	0.1%	16.7%	12.1%	3.8%	100.0%	1.3%	9.6%	31.4%	34.3%	25.1%	12.6%	27.2%	14.2%	2.1%
61-90d	143	0.0%	18.9%	7.0%	5.6%	100.0%	1.4%	7.7%	28.7%	34.3%	22.4%	12.6%	26.6%	9.8%	2.8%
>90d	315	0.1%	29.2%	20.0%	12.4%	100.0%	1.6%	15.2%	35.6%	41.3%	30.8%	23.2%	32.4%	20.3%	1.3%
Acupuncture (Acu)															
Not Provided - Reference	**346720**	**99.7%**	**11.4%**	**7.9%**	**7.0%**	**1.4%**	**0.0%**	**5.7%**	**33.8%**	**34.2%**	**23.2%**	**8.2%**	**20.7%**	**4.4%**	**1.4%**
0-7d	215	0.1%	33.5%	42.3%	18.6%	4.7%	100.0%	46.5%	15.8%	20.5%	20.9%	11.2%	13.5%	7.4%	0.5%
8-14d	81	0.0%	37.0%	44.4%	25.9%	2.5%	100.0%	35.8%	29.6%	24.7%	30.9%	22.2%	23.5%	8.6%	0.0%
15-28d	110	0.0%	41.8%	37.3%	29.1%	0.9%	100.0%	41.8%	26.4%	30.9%	28.2%	18.2%	23.6%	8.2%	0.9%
29-60d	139	0.0%	40.3%	51.1%	33.8%	2.2%	100.0%	32.4%	36.7%	27.3%	31.7%	24.5%	21.6%	12.2%	0.7%
61-90d	90	0.0%	42.2%	51.1%	25.6%	3.3%	100.0%	40.0%	33.3%	25.6%	28.9%	20.0%	34.4%	11.1%	4.4%
>90d	272	0.1%	50.4%	49.6%	41.2%	2.9%	100.0%	39.3%	44.9%	32.0%	33.1%	25.4%	27.6%	15.4%	2.2%

Cells with red text denote that service usage was not significantly different from the reference of no first line service (Fisher's Exact $p > 0.001$)
Cells with black text denote that service usage was significantly different than the reference of no first line service (Fisher's Exact $p < 0.001$)

Table 3 - Individual, local population and episode attributes associated with individuals with low back pain initially contacting a Primare Care Provider (PCP) by timing of incorporation of first line services

Timing Days (d)	PCPs		Episodes		Episode Attributes Median (Q1,Q3)		Individuals Median (Q1,Q3)		Individual Home Address Zip Code Population Attributes Median (Q1,Q3)					
												HCP per 1000 Population		
	Count	% PCPs	Count	% Episodes	Total Cost	Duration	Age	*ERG* ® Risk	% NHW	ADI	AGI	DC	PT	LAc
Total	118503	100.0%	347627	100.0%	145 (47,426)	22 (1,148)	47 (36,55)	1.5 (0.7,2.9)	72.1% (50.0,85.4)	48 (31,65)	61410 (48643,84035)	0.21 (0.08,0.41)	0.16 (0.03,0.38)	0 (0,0.02)
Any First Line Service														
Not Provided	**108414**	**91.5%**	**286918**	**82.5%**	**116 (30,259)**	**4 (1,121)**	**47 (36,55)**	**1.5 (0.7,2.9)**	**71.4% (48.9,85.1)**	**49 (32,65)**	**60566 (48011,82222)**	**0.20 (0.08,0.39)**	**0.15 (0.03,0.37)**	**0 (0,0.02)**
0-7d	11612	9.8%	18700	5.4%	501 (203,1157)	38 (8,125)	44 (34,54)	1.3 (0.7,2.7)	74.8% (56.6,86.2)	42 (26,59)	68394 (52928,97335)	0.27 (0.12,0.48)	0.20 (0.06,0.46)	0 (0,0.03)
8-14d	6171	5.2%	6754	1.9%	762 (379,1498)	50 (27,139)	45 (35,54)	1.4 (0.7,2.7)	75.1% (56.5,86.6)	43 (27,60)	67162 (52380,93247)	0.25 (0.11,0.47)	0.19 (0.05,0.46)	0 (0,0.03)
15-28d	7871	6.6%	8546	2.5%	764 (354,1640)	66 (37,164)	46 (36,55)	1.5 (0.8,2.9)	74.7% (55.8,86.5)	44 (27,60)	66817 (52255,92844)	0.26 (0.11,0.46)	0.19 (0.05,0.44)	0 (0,0.03)
29-60d	8924	7.5%	9716	2.8%	739 (295,1811)	98 (58,201)	46 (36,55)	1.7 (0.9,3.2)	75.1% (55.1,87.0)	45 (29,61)	64784 (51217,89811)	0.25 (0.10,0.47)	0.18 (0.05,0.43)	0 (0,0.03)
61-90d	4936	4.2%	5196	1.5%	643 (225,1683)	146 (93,251)	47 (36,56)	1.9 (1.0,3.4)	76.0% (57.9,87.9)	47 (31,62)	63716 (50674,85989)	0.26 (0.12,0.47)	0.19 (0.04,0.44)	0 (0,0.02)
> 90d	10683	9.0%	11797	3.4%	822 (309,2051)	245 (176,332)	49 (39,57)	2.3 (1.3,3.9)	75.9% (56.9,87.7)	47 (30,63)	63385 (50533,87275)	0.24 (0.11,0.46)	0.17 (0.04,0.42)	0 (0,0.02)
Active Care														
Not Provided	**112115**	**94.6%**	**307602**	**88.5%**	**122 (35,280)**	**8 (1,133)**	**47 (36,55)**	**1.5 (0.7,2.9)**	**71.9% (49.6,85.4)**	**49 (32,65)**	**60703 (48253,82262)**	**0.21 (0.08,0.40)**	**0.15 (0.03,0.38)**	**0 (0,0.02)**
0-7d	7398	6.2%	10623	3.1%	759 (381,1582)	43 (16,129)	44 (34,54)	1.3 (0.7,2.7)	72.8% (53.5,84.7)	40 (24,57)	72233 (53910,103665)	0.27 (0.12,0.49)	0.20 (0.06,0.47)	0 (0,0.04)
8-14d	4791	4.0%	5249	1.5%	894 (490,1714)	47 (27,120)	45 (34,54)	1.3 (0.6,2.6)	73.8% (54.8,85.4)	41 (25,58)	69194 (53050,96263)	0.25 (0.11,0.47)	0.20 (0.05,0.47)	0 (0,0.03)
15-28d	6059	5.1%	6535	1.9%	967 (515,1948)	60 (37,143)	46 (35,55)	1.5 (0.7,2.9)	73.2% (53.3,85.3)	41 (25,59)	69368 (53052,97366)	0.25 (0.10,0.46)	0.20 (0.06,0.46)	0 (0,0.03)
29-60d	6232	5.3%	6675	1.9%	1116 (533,2363)	94 (58,189)	47 (36,56)	1.7 (0.9,3.3)	72.7% (51.9,84.8)	43 (26,59)	66879 (51677,94349)	0.24 (0.10,0.46)	0.19 (0.05,0.43)	0 (0,0.03)
61-90d	2934	2.5%	3029	0.9%	1216 (538,2553)	140 (95,240)	47 (36,56)	2.1 (1.1,3.6)	72.9% (53.4,85.2)	45 (28,60)	65746 (50839,91154)	0.24 (0.10,0.45)	0.19 (0.05,0.43)	0 (0,0.03)
> 90d	7345	6.2%	7914	2.3%	1306 (602,2837)	251 (180,337)	50 (39,57)	2.5 (1.3,4.2)	73.5% (53.5,85.8)	45 (28,61)	65469 (51213,92303)	0.24 (0.10,0.45)	0.18 (0.05,0.43)	0 (0,0.03)
Manual Therapy														
Not Provided	**114109**	**96.3%**	**319792**	**92.0%**	**129 (38,317)**	**12 (1,138)**	**47 (36,55)**	**1.5 (0.7,2.9)**	**72.0% (49.7,85.4)**	**49 (32,65)**	**60894 (48385,82599)**	**0.21 (0.08,0.40)**	**0.15 (0.03,0.38)**	**0 (0,0.02)**
0-7d	4831	4.1%	6893	2.0%	735 (354,1549)	43 (16,132)	44 (34,54)	1.4 (0.7,2.7)	72.5% (53.5,84.3)	37 (22,55)	73748 (54742,106258)	0.27 (0.12,0.49)	0.21 (0.06,0.47)	0 (0,0.04)
8-14d	3278	2.8%	3511	1.0%	919 (513,1809)	49 (29,122)	46 (35,55)	1.3 (0.7,2.6)	73.2% (54.5,85.0)	39 (24,57)	70928 (53327,100566)	0.25 (0.11,0.47)	0.21 (0.07,0.50)	0 (0,0.04)
15-28d	4430	3.7%	4720	1.4%	966 (528,1939)	60 (38,140)	46 (35,55)	1.4 (0.7,2.8)	72.9% (53.1,84.8)	40 (24,57)	69846 (53237,98820)	0.24 (0.10,0.46)	0.20 (0.06,0.47)	0 (0,0.04)
29-60d	4723	4.0%	4981	1.4%	1177 (564,2463)	93 (58,187)	47 (36,56)	1.8 (0.9,3.2)	72.8% (52.4,85.1)	42 (25,58)	67741 (52488,95975)	0.25 (0.10,0.46)	0.20 (0.06,0.46)	0 (0,0.03)
61-90d	2144	1.8%	2202	0.6%	1306 (604,2594)	141 (98,245)	47 (37,56)	2.1 (1.1,3.7)	72.7% (53.6,84.6)	43 (26,58)	67046 (52617,94565)	0.25 (0.11,0.46)	0.20 (0.06,0.47)	0 (0,0.03)
> 90d	5247	4.4%	5528	1.6%	1438 (647,3049)	254 (183,341)	50 (39,57)	2.4 (1.3,4.1)	73.4% (53.4,85.6)	44 (27,60)	66189 (51318,93818)	0.24 (0.11,0.45)	0.20 (0.06,0.45)	0 (0,0.03)
Manipulation - Chiropractic														
Not Provided	**114298**	**96.5%**	**323199**	**93.0%**	**135 (40,375)**	**14 (1,132)**	**47 (36,55)**	**1.5 (0.7,2.9)**	**71.5% (49.4,85.1)**	**49 (31,65)**	**61236 (48445,83903)**	**0.21 (0.08,0.40)**	**0.15 (0.03,0.38)**	**0 (0,0.02)**
0-7d	3945	3.3%	5378	1.5%	419 (205,970)	53 (12,166)	44 (34,54)	1.4 (0.7,2.7)	77.5% (61.3,87.8)	43 (28,60)	67145 (52483,91992)	0.27 (0.12,0.48)	0.20 (0.06,0.46)	0 (0,0.03)
8-14d	1954	1.6%	2024	0.6%	446 (202,1009)	81 (28,203)	45 (35,54)	1.6 (0.8,3.0)	78.2% (61.4,89.4)	46 (31,62)	63355 (51700,86319)	0.25 (0.11,0.47)	0.16 (0.04,0.41)	0 (0,0.02)
15-28d	2750	2.3%	2856	0.8%	388 (173,964)	99 (38,220)	47 (36,55)	1.7 (0.9,3.2)	78.3% (61.3,89.2)	47 (31,62)	63750 (51809,86126)	0.27 (0.12,0.50)	0.19 (0.04,0.43)	0 (0,0.02)
29-60d	4171	3.5%	4401	1.3%	375 (154,890)	115 (60,225)	45 (35,54)	1.7 (0.9,3.1)	78.1% (61.4,89.6)	48 (32,63)	63592 (51304,85282)	0.27 (0.11,0.50)	0.16 (0.04,0.41)	0 (0,0.00)
61-90d	2923	2.5%	3042	0.9%	333 (140,863)	154 (92,259)	46 (36,55)	1.7 (0.9,3.1)	79.1% (62.8,89.7)	49 (32,64)	62847 (50680,82055)	0.27 (0.13,0.51)	0.18 (0.04,0.45)	0 (0,0.00)
> 90d	6268	5.3%	6727	1.9%	488 (206,1271)	246 (175,332)	47 (37,56)	2.1 (1.2,3.5)	78.1% (61.4,89.2)	48 (32,64)	62880 (50870,85319)	0.26 (0.11,0.48)	0.17 (0.04,0.42)	0 (0,0.00)
Manipulation - Osteopathic														
Not Provided	**118052**	**99.6%**	**342891**	**98.6%**	**144 (46,425)**	**22 (1,148)**	**47 (36,55)**	**1.5 (0.7,2.9)**	**72.0% (49.9,85.3)**	**48 (31,65)**	**61401 (48609,83971)**	**0.21 (0.08,0.41)**	**0.15 (0.03,0.38)**	**0 (0,0.02)**
0-7d	1446	1.2%	3710	1.1%	147 (68,334)	2 (1,66)	44 (34,54)	1.3 (0.6,2.5)	76.1% (58.8,87.0)	46 (29,63)	64072 (51304,89385)	0.26 (0.12,0.47)	0.18 (0.04,0.41)	0 (0,0.03)
8-14d	119	0.1%	124	0.0%	394 (191,870)	31 (14,101)	47 (36,54)	1.5 (0.7,2.7)	74.1% (54.1,84.8)	45 (29,64)	62697 (48718,90962)	0.26 (0.12,0.52)	0.21 (0.02,0.45)	0 (0,0.04)
15-28d	190	0.2%	205	0.1%	394 (175,887)	61 (28,198)	45 (35,55)	1.9 (1.0,3.5)	74.8% (61.6,86.1)	47 (35,61)	61668 (51116,82276)	0.27 (0.11,0.47)	0.20 (0.07,0.36)	0 (0,0.02)
29-60d	226	0.2%	239	0.1%	496 (226,1530)	108 (57,236)	46 (37,55)	1.9 (1.0,3.4)	76.6% (59.4,86.4)	45 (25,63)	65895 (49651,99542)	0.22 (0.12,0.45)	0.16 (0.03,0.37)	0 (0,0.03)
61-90d	138	0.1%	143	0.0%	412 (168,1014)	177 (90,260)	46 (36,56)	1.8 (0.9,3.4)	74.3% (58.9,86.1)	47 (32,60)	62938 (51007,89006)	0.28 (0.16,0.47)	0.22 (0.09,0.46)	0 (0,0.04)
> 90d	290	0.2%	315	0.1%	815 (310,2473)	262 (184,340)	48 (38,56)	2.7 (1.4,4.4)	76.4% (61.9,86.8)	46 (26,62)	64092 (50964,90170)	0.26 (0.11,0.47)	0.18 (0.06,0.43)	0 (0,0.02)
Acupuncture														
Not Provided	**118309**	**99.8%**	**346720**	**99.7%**	**145 (47,422)**	**22 (1,147)**	**47 (36,55)**	**1.5 (0.7,2.9)**	**72.1% (50.0,85.4)**	**48 (31,65)**	**61401 (48631,83943)**	**0.21 (0.08,0.41)**	**0.16 (0.03,0.38)**	**0 (0,0.02)**
0-7d	166	0.1%	215	0.1%	542 (255,1265)	43 (14,145)	48 (40,54)	1.6 (0.8,2.8)	67.2% (47.6,79.1)	24 (11,39)	84646 (66326,136421)	0.27 (0.11,0.53)	0.24 (0.12,0.63)	0.04 (0,0.14)
8-14d	79	0.1%	81	0.0%	1108 (501,2514)	77 (30,217)	45 (36,53)	1.5 (0.7,3.2)	68.1% (51.7,81.1)	29 (15,47)	78991 (56303,120292)	0.27 (0.14,0.47)	0.21 (0.08,0.59)	0.05 (0,0.15)
15-28d	108	0.1%	110	0.0%	756 (408,2168)	64 (28,157)	46 (37,55)	1.7 (0.8,3.3)	67.8% (49.3,79.1)	27 (14,44)	84954 (56025,131826)	0.30 (0.14,0.53)	0.37 (0.13,0.73)	0.03 (0,0.12)
29-60d	138	0.1%	139	0.0%	1525 (583,2635)	106 (64,238)	46 (36,55)	1.8 (1.0,3.2)	64.5% (43.7,77.4)	27 (11,43)	90255 (62621,143830)	0.21 (0.11,0.43)	0.24 (0.09,0.50)	0.05 (0,0.15)
61-90d	89	0.1%	90	0.0%	1199 (457,2818)	154 (93,272)	41 (34,52)	1.7 (0.9,3.5)	63.8% (41.8,77.7)	27 (14,42)	78448 (59761,103484)	0.26 (0.12,0.47)	0.21 (0.07,0.44)	0.04 (0,0.12)
> 90d	269	0.2%	272	0.1%	1283 (591,3116)	253 (184,346)	49 (38,57)	2.1 (1.1,3.6)	68.7% (47.7,82.7)	30 (15,45)	76739 (59511,114516)	0.27 (0.13,0.49)	0.23 (0.09,0.52)	0.02 (0,0.08)

ERG®=Episode Risk Group, NHW=Non-Hispanic White, ADI=Area Deprivation Index, AGI=Adjusted Gross Income, HCP=Health Care Provider, DC=Doctor of Chiropractic, PT=Physical Therapist, LAc=Licensed Acupuncturist

Cells with red text denote that the effect of first line service timing on measured attributes was found not to be significantly different from that of No First Line or Not Provided reference - (Mann-Whitney U $p > 0.001$)
Cells with black text denote that the effect of first line service timing on measured attributes was found to be significantly different from that of No First Line or Not Provided reference (ref) - (Mann-Whitney U $p < 0.001$)



Figure 1. For individuals with low back pain initially contacting a PCP, percent of LBP episodes including second and third services associated with number of days (d) into an episode when active care is initially introduced



Figure 2. For individuals with low back pain initially contacting a PCP, Area Deprivation Index (ADI) of the individual's home address zip code associated with median (Q1, Q3) number of days (d) into an episode when first line services are initially introduced



Figure 3. For individuals with low back pain initially contacting a PCP, median (Q1, Q3) total episode cost associated with number of days (d) into an episode when first line services are initially introduced