

Title: Impact of patient gender on low back pain management before and after the COVID-19 pandemic in commercially insured and Medicare Advantage cohorts. A retrospective cohort study

Authors:

David Elton, DC, Optum, Eden Prairie, Minnesota USA

Meng Zhang, PhD, Optum, Eden Prairie, Minnesota USA

Corresponding author:

David Elton

Optum

11000 Optum Circle, Eden Prairie, MN 55344

Phone: (952) 562-1349

david.elton@optum.com

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Because the data was de-identified or a Limited Data Set in compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and customer requirements, Institutional Review Board approval or waiver of authorization was not required.

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 and UNH stockholders. No other potential conflicts of interest or competing interests exist.

Funding

None

Authors' contributions

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

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Background: Variability in the management of LBP has been extensively studied, however the degree to which this variability is associated with patient gender is less well understood. The purpose of this retrospective cohort study was to examine variability in the management of LBP associated with patient gender in commercially insured (CI) and Medicare Advantage (MA) cohorts before and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods: A US national sample of LBP episodes with a duration of less than 91 days experienced during 2019-2021 was analyzed. Independent variables included patient gender, whether an individual had CI or MA coverage, and the timing of LBP onset during pre-, early, and late COVID time periods. Dependent measures included the percent of individuals initially contacting eighteen types of health care provider (HCP) and receiving twenty-two types of health care services, and total episode cost. Measures associated with female patients were compared with a male patient baseline to examine patient gender related differences.

Results: The study included 222,043 CI and 466,125 MA complete episodes of LBP. 114,322 (51.5%) of the CI and 281,597 (60.4%) of MA episodes were associated with female patients. Individual home address zip code population attributes were nearly identical in both CI and MA cohorts.

During the pre-, early, and late COVID time periods, in both CI and MA cohorts, female patients were less likely than male patients to initially contact DCs (risk ratio (RR) CI pre-COVID 0.88, CI early COVID 0.90, CI late COVID 0.86, MA pre 0.70, MA early 0.70, MA late 0.73) and were more likely to initially contact rheumatologists (2.72, 2.62, 3.20, 2.15, 2.59, 2.08). In the CI cohort during the pre-, early, and late COVID time periods female patients more likely than male

patients to initially contact physical therapists (PT) (RR pre-COVID 1.24, early COVID 1.17, late COVID 1.16) and licensed acupuncturists (LAC) (1.75, 1.53, 2.21).

In both the CI and MA cohorts plain film radiology was the most provided service for both female (32-40% of episodes) and male (31-40%) patients. During all time periods in both CI and MA cohorts female patients were less likely than male patients to receive spinal surgery (risk ratio (RR) CI pre-COVID 0.53, CI early COVID 0.54, CI late COVID 0.53, MA pre- 0.45, MA early 0.46, MA late 0.42), prescription oral steroids (0.75, 0.73, 0.77, 0.82, 0.79, 0.83), and chiropractic manipulative therapy (CMT) (0.87, 0.89, 0.85, 0.70, 0.71, 0.73). In the CI cohort during all time periods female patients more likely than male patients to receive acupuncture (RR pre- 1.41, early 1.48, late 1.48).

Conclusions: In both CI and MA cohorts, and compared to males, females with LBP were less likely to seek treatment from DCs and more likely to seek treatment from Rheumatologists. In the CI cohort females were more likely than males to seek treatment from PTs and LACs. Females with LBP were less likely than males to undergo spinal surgery, receive a prescription oral steroid, or receive CMT.

Keywords: Low back pain; COVID-19; gender, pathway; guideline; initial contact; first provider; utilization; cost; value; commercial; Medicare Advantage

Background

The prevalence, variability, disability, and costs associated with low back pain (LBP) have been thoroughly explored.¹⁻⁷ LBP is associated with almost half of low-value spending, defined as costs incurred with little to no associated benefit.^{8,9} In an effort to improve the value of LBP management, high-quality clinical practice guidelines (CPG) have been developed.^{1,5,6} LBP CPGs emphasize natural history, self-care, and non-pharmaceutical services as first-line approaches.

Addressing disparities in availability and access to healthcare resources, and health outcomes, is an important public health focus.¹⁰⁻¹² The association between patient-provider gender concordance, and clinical and experience outcomes, has revealed mixed results.¹³⁻¹⁹ Specific to the management of LBP, and musculoskeletal conditions generally, gender differences have been identified in prevalence, care seeking, and management.²⁰⁻²⁷ Females have been found to have higher prevalence of LBP than age matched males.^{22,25} Only 33% of LBP CPGs incorporate individual gender into diagnosis or treatment recommendations.²³ Prescription analgesic use for LBP has been found to be similar for females and males.²⁰ For LBP, females have reported responding more favorably than males to acupuncture, while males reported responding more favorably than females to spinal manipulative therapy.¹⁵ While the degree of improvement following spinal surgery has been reported to be similar between females and males, females receive surgery at a more advanced state.^{26,27}

The type of HCP initially contacted, and subsequent care pathways has been utilized to explore variation in management of LBP with PCPs and DCs the most common types of HCP initially contacted by an individual with LBP.²⁸⁻³⁰ The gender distribution among of types of HCP managing LBP is highly variable. Among non-pharmaceutical, non-interventional providers chiropractors (DC)³¹ have the lowest proportion of female providers (32%), while physical therapists (PT)³² and licensed acupuncturists (LAc)³³ are approximately 65% female. Among primary care HCP types, primary care physicians (PCP - 40%)³⁴ and Doctors of Osteopathy (DO - 43%)³⁵ have the lowest proportion of female practitioners, while nurse practitioners (87%)³⁶ and physician assistants (PA - 67%)³⁷ have the highest. Among physician specialist HCP types, orthopedic surgeons (OS – 7%), neurosurgeons (NS – 9%), and pain management physicians (PM – 19%) have the lowest proportion of female practitioners, while rheumatologists (46%), physical medicine and rehabilitation physicians (PMR – 36%), and neurologists (31%) have the highest.³⁴ Radiologists (26%) and emergency medicine physicians (EM – 28%) also consist of a low proportion of female practitioners.³⁴ [Supplement – Provider Type Gender] For individuals with LBP, the degree to which the selection of an initial HCP is influenced by gender concordance has not been investigated.

COVID-19 (COVID), declared a global pandemic on March 11, 2020 by the World Health Organization (WHO)³⁸⁻⁴¹, has been associated with variable public policy responses⁴²⁻⁴⁴ and there are indications that the management of LBP was impacted by COVID.⁴⁵ The degree to which COVID related changes were influenced by the gender of the individual with LBP has not been explored.

The aim of this study was to explore how patient gender is associated with differences in care-seeking for, and the management of, LBP in commercially insured (CI) and Medicare Advantage (MA) cohorts before and after the COVID pandemic. The hypothesis was female patients would prefer seeking care from HCP types with a higher percentage of female providers, and that this would be most evident in HCP types providing hands-on care like DCs, PTs and LAcS.

Methods

This study's cohort, methods, and authors are identical to an earlier study of COVID related changes in the management of LBP in CI and MA cohorts.⁴⁵ Combining the earlier and current paper into a single paper was not feasible. The authors of the earlier study have granted permission to use the following Methods description language.

Study design, population, setting and data sources

This is a retrospective cohort study of individuals seen by one or more HCPs for a complete episode of LBP. Individuals were from a single national insurer administering CI and MA benefit plans. An enrollee database included de-identified enrollment records, and administrative claims data for all inpatient and outpatient services, and pharmacy prescriptions. De-identified in and out-of-network HCP demographic information and professional licensure status were available in an HCP database. ZIP code level 2020 population race and ethnicity data was

obtained from the US Census Bureau,⁴⁶ 2019 adjusted gross income (AGI) data from the Internal Revenue Service,⁴⁷ and 2020 socioeconomic Area Deprivation Index (ADI) data from the University of Wisconsin Neighborhood Atlas[®] database.^{48,49}

With data being 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 ongoing Institutional Review Boards oversight. The study was conducted and reported based on the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines [Supplement – STROBE Checklist].⁵⁰

The impact of numerous unmeasurable and unknown confounders, and confounders of measurable hypothesized confounders were likely amplified by the impact of the COVID pandemic and variable public policy responses.^{43,44} [Supplement – Public Policy] As an alternative to adopting the standard practice of using potentially inadequate approaches such as propensity score matching⁵¹ to control for available yet incomplete potential confounders derived from administrative claims data to attempt to generate causal insights^{52,53}, the study was designed to address a literature gap of presenting actual, unadjusted associations between individual demographic attributes, HCP selection, and episodic characteristics for the management of LBP during the COVID pandemic. These confounders, significant cohort differences, insurance benefit design differences, and a different distribution of episodes

among States resulted in an inability to directly compare CI and MA measures, and no such comparison should be attempted with study data.

Unit of analysis and cohort selection

Episode of care has been shown to be a valid way to organize administrative claims data to summarize care pathways and analyze the rate and timing of use of services provided for a condition.^{30,54} 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 discrete episodes of care.⁵⁵ A complete episode was 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. The episode duration was the number of days between the first and last date of service for an episode.

The cohort consisted of individuals aged 18 years and older with a complete episode of LBP commencing and ending during the calendar years 2019-2021. To align with the timing of the WHO pandemic declaration³⁸⁻⁴¹, the pre-COVID period was defined as episodes starting between 3/1/2019 and 2/29/2020, the early COVID period was 3/1/2020 to 2/28/2021, and the late COVID period was 3/1/2021 to 1/28/2022.

Episodes starting in the pre-COVID period had up to 35 months of post-onset duration potential, episodes starting in the early COVID period had up to 23 months and episodes

starting in the late COVID period had up to 11 months. The resulting different episode volumes and duration distributions in the pre, early and late COVID periods and within and between the CI and MA cohorts was a potential confounder of a variety of study variables. As one example, MA episode durations were approximately double CI durations indicating a greater prevalence of chronic LBP in the MA cohort. To address this potential study limitation, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to evaluate limiting the cohort to episodes with a duration of less than 61 or less than 91 days. Based on the sensitivity analysis, the study was limited to episodes with a duration of less than 91 days. This approach balanced episode volume across pre, early and late COVID periods and reduced or eliminated the original significant difference in episode duration between pre, early and late COVID periods, between the CI and MI cohorts and between male and female patients. This approach may have partially addressed differing LBP clinical complexity in CI and MA cohorts and reduced but did not eliminate episodes crossing the pre, early and post COVID measurement periods. [Supplement – Episode Duration]

Individuals with diagnoses of malignant and non-malignant neoplasms, fractures and other spinal trauma, infection, congenital deformities and scoliosis, autoimmune disorders, osteoporosis, and advanced arthritis were excluded from the analysis. This approach was used to address potential confounders associated the COVID pandemic impacting care seeking behaviors of individuals with a more complex LBP condition differently from individuals with less complex LBP.

Variables

Data preprocessing, table generation, and initial analyses were performed in Python (Python Language Reference, Version 3.7.5., n.d.). A goodness-of-fit analysis was performed using D'Agostino's K-squared test. Non-normally distributed data were reported using the median, interquartile range (IQR), quartile 1 (Q1), and quartile 3 (Q3). Where utilized, p-values do not control for the false discovery rate. Due to the tendency for odds ratios to exaggerate risk in situations where an outcome is relatively common, and as a measure more widely understood in associational analyses, risk ratios (RR) and associated 95% confidence intervals were reported.⁵⁶

The primary independent variables were the individual's gender, timing of LBP onset and type of insurance coverage. Secondary independent variables were the individual home address 5-digit zip code population percent non-Hispanic white (NHW) and ADI. The primary dependent variables were the percent of individuals with LBP initially contacting one of eighteen types of HCP, and the percent of episodes including twenty-two types of health care services. The main secondary dependent variable was the total cost of care for all reimbursed services provided by any HCP during an episode. Total episode cost included costs associated with all services provided for LBP during an episode, including those not specifically identified in the service categories used in the analyses. Costs for services for which an insurance claim was not submitted, and indirect costs associated with missed days at work or reduced productivity, were not available. Additional secondary dependent variables included episode duration and the number of different HCPs seen during an episode. Due to numerous confounders no

attempt was made to calculate the prevalence of LBP during the pre, early and late COVID time periods.

Results

The study included 688,168 complete episodes of LBP, with 222,043 CI and 466,125 MA episodes. Depending on the pre/early/late COVID measurement period, the CI cohort was 51-52% female with a median age of 45-46, and the MA cohort was 60-61% female with a median age of 72-73. While the scaling for the ERG® Risk Score, a measure of illness burden, was different for CI and MA cohorts, within each cohort the median ERG® Risk Score was higher for females across pre/early/late COVID periods. Within the CI and MA cohorts and for all time-periods population attributes for cohort 5-digit home address zip code were nearly identical for females and males. CI median % NHW population was 66%-67%, ADI was 37-41, and AGI was \$74k-\$76k. For MA median % NHW was 67%-70%, ADI was 52-54, and AGI was \$61k-\$63k. Similarly, the number of different HCP seen during an episode and episode duration were similar in CI and MA cohorts, for all time periods and for male and female patients. Within CI and MA cohorts, and for each time-period, male and female patients had similar total episode cost, with both male and female patients experiencing a reduction in total episode cost during the early COVID period. For both male and female patients and for all time periods MA total episode cost was lower than CI. Episodes were from all 50 States; however, this was not a US representative sample and the distribution of episodes among States was different in CI and MA cohorts. [Supplement – States] [Table 1]

In the CI cohort and during all time periods DCs (24%-28% of episodes) and PCPs (20%-23%) were the types of HCP initially contacted by the highest percent of individuals with LBP. In the MA cohort PCPs (30%-35% of episodes) and Hospitals (14%-17%) were most common. [Table 2] Compared to male patients, in the CI cohort females were less likely to initially contact a DC (RR pre-COVID 0.88, early COVID 0.90, late COVID 0.86) or an Emergency Medicine (EM) physician (0.79, 0.78, 0.87). In the CI cohort females were more likely to initially contact a rheumatologist (2.72, 2.62, 3.20), LAc (1.75, 1.53, 2.21), neurologist (1.58, 1.39, 1.56), or PT (1.24, 1.17, 1.16). [Figure 1] In the MA cohort females were less likely to initially contact a DC (RR pre-COVID 0.70), early COVID 0.70, late COVID 0.73) or neurosurgeon (0.63, 0.71, 0.79). In the MA cohort females were more likely to initially contact a rheumatologist (2.15, 2.59, 2.08). [Figure 2]

In the CI cohort, during the pre, early, and late COVID periods plain film radiology (36%-40% of episodes), chiropractic manipulative treatment (CMT) (24%-29%), prescription NSAIDs (22%-23%), active care (AC) (20%-23%), and prescription skeletal muscle relaxants (18%-23%) were the only services provided for at least 15% of episodes. In the MA cohort, during the pre, early, and late COVID periods plain film radiology (31%-38% of episodes), prescription NSAIDs (19%-21%), and prescription opioids (15%-17%) were provided during at least 15% of episodes. In the late COVID period MRI was provided for 16%-18% of episodes in the MA cohort. [Table 3] Compared to male patients, in the CI cohort females were less likely to receive spinal surgery (RR pre-COVID 0.53, early COVID 0.53, late COVID 0.53), oral steroids (0.75, 0.73, 0.77), gabapentins (0.79, 0.79, 0.77), chiropractic manipulative therapy (0.87, 0.89, 0.86), passive

therapy (0.87, 0.89, 0.85), skeletal muscle relaxants (0.85, 0.88, 0.89), MRI (0.88, 0.88, 0.89), spinal injections (0.87, 0.84, 0.87), or prescription opioids (0.88, 0.90, 0.92). In the CI cohort females were more likely to receive acupuncture (RR pre-COVID 1.41, early COVID 1.48, late COVID 1.48). [Figure 3] In the MA cohort females were less likely to receive initially spinal surgery (RR pre-COVID 0.45, early COVID 0.46, late COVID 0.42), chiropractic manipulative therapy (0.70, 0.71, 0.73), oral steroids (0.82, 0.79, 0.83), MRI (0.87, 0.87, 0.88), skeletal muscle relaxants (0.93, 0.95, 0.91), and spinal injections (0.94, 0.91, 0.94). In the MA cohort females were more likely to receive plain film radiology (RR pre-COVID 1.07, early COVID 1.05, late COVID 1.07) and prescription NSAIDs (1.07, 1.08, 1.07). [Figure 4]

The sub analysis of gender variability in the type of HCP initially contacted by individual zip code 5-digit zip code population ADI and percent NHW revealed two types of HCP, DCs and rheumatologists, with significant differences in both CI and MA during all time intervals.

[Supplement – Table 2 Initial HCP By ADI] Females were significantly less likely to initially contact a DC in both CI and MA, and during all time periods. In the CI cohort and compared to males, females in zip codes with 0-50% NHW (low % white) population and 51-100 ADI (high deprivation) were least likely to initially contact a DC. This was also observed in the MA cohort during the late COVID period. [Figure 5]

The sub analysis of gender variability in the type of services received for LBP by individual zip code 5-digit zip code population NHW and ADI revealed females in the 51-100% NHW (high % white) 0-50 ADI (low deprivation) were significantly less like than males to receive chiropractic

manipulative treatment, prescription skeletal muscle relaxants, prescription oral steroids, MRI scans, spinal injections, or spinal surgery in both CI and MA during all time intervals.

[Supplement – Table 3 Services by ADI] [Figure 6]

The sub analysis of gender variability in the type of services received for LBP by the type of HCP initially contacted revealed numerous significant but not clinically meaningful differences.

[Supplement – Table 1 – Population By Type of HCP][Supplement – Table 3 – Services By Type of HCP] An example of a clinically meaningful difference was for the three types of HCP most commonly initially contacted, for both the CI and MA cohorts, females with LBP initially contacting a PCP or OS were significantly less likely to receive chiropractic manipulative treatment (CMT). [Figure 7]

Discussion

The degree to which individual gender appeared to influence care seeking for and management of LBP was surprising, with results consistent across pre- and post-COVID periods and in both CI and MA cohorts. With DCs being a common type of HCP initially contacted by individuals with LBP and having total episode attributes aligned with LBP CPGs, the finding that females are less likely than males to initially contact a DC, a finding amplified in low-income, non-white zip codes, is important. Similarly, females with LBP initially contacting a PCP or OS are less likely than males to receive CMT. The degree to which these and other findings are associated with variation in the proportion of female practitioners making up a type of HCP warrants further

study to examine HCP gender concordance preference in the management of LBP. This seems particularly plausible for the non-pharmaceutical “hands-on” HCP types like DC, PT and LAc. Additional significant and potentially important findings warranting additional exploration include female patients with LBP being less likely than males to receive spinal surgery, an oral steroid, an MRI scan, or a spinal injection. The degree to which this represents differences in clinical complexity vs. differences in management approaches warrants additional study.

There are numerous limitations and potential confounders to consider. This is particularly true for a study examining gender specific patterns in care seeking for and management of LBP during the pre and post COVID periods in CI and MA cohorts. Variation in the rate of COVID infections by date and geography⁵⁷ and corresponding local COVID public health policies^{42,43,58-60} are two examples. More specifically for LBP, confounders associated with the avoidance of elective spine surgery⁶¹, reluctance to seek in-person hands on care, reduced capacity of primary care⁶² and emergency departments⁶³, and reluctance to use of public transportation^{64,65} are additional potential confounders. While a strength of the study is the national scope and inclusion of CI and MA cohorts, this was not a representative sample of the U.S., and the CI and MA cohort distributions were not identical. The potential confounders associated with the heterogenous nature of CI and MA coverage and cohorts and differing proportion of CI and MA episodes from each State made it impossible to directly compare and interpret observed CI and MA differences in the type of HCP initially contacted by individuals with LBP and subsequent management of LBP.

This study corroborated, expanded on, and contrasted with the findings of other studies. Previous research has demonstrated patient-physician gender concordance preference for primary care and emergency medicine HCP types.^{13,14} The current study of care seeking patterns among individuals with LBP indicates there may be a gender concordance preference among a wider range of HCP types. An earlier study of individuals with LBP found that compared to males, females experienced a greater reduction in pain with acupuncture and less reduction in pain with spinal manipulative therapy.¹⁵ While the current study did not examine pain reduction of specific services, the study did find that compared to males, females are more likely to seek treatment from LACs and less likely to seek treatment from DCs. The interaction between gender preference, gender concordance and efficacy of selected treatments warrants additional study. For the pharmaceutical management of LBP an earlier study found a similar rate of prescribing and distribution of pharmaceutical analgesic types for female and male patients. NSAIDs were the most common analgesic prescribed for both females and males, and with males more likely to be prescribed strong opioids. The current study corroborates and expands on this to include additional classes of pharmaceutical prescribed for LBP. An earlier study of individuals undergoing surgical management of lumbar degenerative conditions found that compared to males, females had worse pre- and post-operative pain and similar or greater improvement following the surgical procedure. The current study found that compared to males, in both the CI and MA cohorts and in the pre- and post-COVID periods, females with LBP were significantly less likely to undergo a surgical procedure. The study was not able to determine whether this difference represented females were less likely to have a condition for

which a surgical intervention was necessary, or whether in females the pain threshold for performing surgery was higher than in males with a similar condition.

Conclusions

Care seeking for and management of LBP is different among female and male patients. Females with LBP are less likely than males to seek initial treatment from a DC, and if initially contacting a PCP or OS are less likely to subsequently see a DC. Females are more likely than males to initially contact a Rheumatologist. Females with LBP are less likely than males to receive spinal surgery or injections, MRI, oral steroids, or CMT. The degree to which findings were associated with individual preference for HCP gender concordance could not be determined.

List of Abbreviations:

LBP – Low back pain

CI – Commercial Insurance

MA – Medicare Advantage

US – United States

WHO – World Health Organization

CPG – Clinical practice guideline

HCP – Health care provider

ADI – Area Deprivation Index

AGI – Adjusted Gross Income

NHW – Non-Hispanic White

STROBE – Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

ETG[®] – Episode Treatment Group[®]

ERG[®] – Episode Risk Group[®]

SD – Standard deviation

IQR – Interquartile range

RR – Risk ratio

Q1 – 1st Quartile

Q3 – 3rd Quartile

PCP – Primary care provider

PA – Physician’s Assistant

DC – Doctor of Chiropractic

PT – Physical Therapist

LAc – Licensed Acupuncturist

OS – Orthopedic Surgeon

PM – Pain Management

EM – Emergency Medicine

CMT – Chiropractic manipulative treatment

References

1. 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
2. Beyera GK, O'Brien J, Campbell S. Health-care utilisation for low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of population-based observational studies. *Rheumatol Int*. Oct 2019;39(10):1663-1679. doi:10.1007/s00296-019-04430-5
3. Briggs AM, Huckel Schneider C, Slater H, et al. Health systems strengthening to arrest the global disability burden: empirical development of prioritised components for a global strategy for improving musculoskeletal health. *BMJ Global Health*. 2021;6(6):e006045. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006045
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. 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
6. 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
7. Thorson D CR, Massey M, Mueller B, Peterson S, Kramer C. . Adult Acute and Subacute Low Back Pain. Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement; 2018:
8. 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
9. Traeger A, Buchbinder R, Harris I, Maher C. Diagnosis and management of low-back pain in primary care. *CMAJ*. Nov 13 2017;189(45):E1386-E1395. doi:10.1503/cmaj.170527
10. Cameron KA, Song J, Manheim LM, Dunlop DD. Gender disparities in health and healthcare use among older adults. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. Sep 2010;19(9):1643-50. doi:10.1089/jwh.2009.1701
11. Manuel JI. Racial/Ethnic and Gender Disparities in Health Care Use and Access. *Health Serv Res*. Jun 2018;53(3):1407-1429. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12705
12. Marmot M. Social determinants of health inequalities. *Lancet*. Mar 19-25 2005;365(9464):1099-104. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(05)71146-6
13. Chekijian S, Kinsman J, Taylor RA, et al. Association between patient-physician gender concordance and patient experience scores. Is there gender bias? *Am J Emerg Med*. Jul 2021;45:476-482. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2020.09.090
14. Fink M, Klein K, Sayers K, et al. Objective Data Reveals Gender Preferences for Patients' Primary Care Physician. *J Prim Care Community Health*. Jan-Dec 2020;11:2150132720967221. doi:10.1177/2150132720967221
15. Kizhakkeveettil A, Rose KA, Kadar GE, Hurwitz EL. An Exploratory Analysis of Gender as a Potential Modifier of Treatment Effect Among Patients in a Randomized Controlled Trial of Integrative Acupuncture and Spinal Manipulation for Low Back Pain. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*. 2019/03/01/ 2019;42(3):177-186. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmpt.2018.11.005>
16. Milani SA, Howrey B, Rodriguez MA, Samper-Ternent R, Wong R. Gender differences in activity-limiting pain trajectories over a 17-year period in the Mexican Health and Aging Study. *PAIN*. 2022;163(2):e285-e292. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002292
17. Scheid TL, Smith GH. Is physician-patient concordance associated with greater trust for women of low socioeconomic status? *Women & Health*. 2017/07/03 2017;57(6):631-649. doi:10.1080/03630242.2016.1202881

18. Takeshita J, Wang S, Loren AW, et al. Association of Racial/Ethnic and Gender Concordance Between Patients and Physicians With Patient Experience Ratings. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(11):e2024583-e2024583. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.24583
19. Tsugawa Y, Jena AB, Figueroa JF, Orav EJ, Blumenthal DM, Jha AK. Comparison of Hospital Mortality and Readmission Rates for Medicare Patients Treated by Male vs Female Physicians. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2017;177(2):206-213. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7875
20. Prescribing Analgesics for Low Back Pain: Is There a Gender Difference? *Journal of Women's Health*. 2022;31(1):79-83. doi:10.1089/jwh.2021.0039
21. Bento TPF, Genebra C, Maciel NM, Cornelio GP, Simeão S, Vitta A. Low back pain and some associated factors: is there any difference between genders? *Braz J Phys Ther*. Jan-Feb 2020;24(1):79-87. doi:10.1016/j.bjpt.2019.01.012
22. Overstreet DS, Strath LJ, Jordan M, et al. A Brief Overview: Sex Differences in Prevalent Chronic Musculoskeletal Conditions. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Mar 3 2023;20(5)doi:10.3390/ijerph20054521
23. Rathbone T, Truong C, Haldenby H, et al. Sex and gender considerations in low back pain clinical practice guidelines: a scoping review. *BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine*. 2020;6(1):e000972. doi:10.1136/bmjsem-2020-000972
24. Sad SA, Start AR. Primary care providers' experiences treating low back pain. *Journal of Osteopathic Medicine*. 2022;122(5):263-269. doi:doi:10.1515/jom-2021-0229
25. Wáng YX, Wáng JQ, Káplár Z. Increased low back pain prevalence in females than in males after menopause age: evidences based on synthetic literature review. *Quant Imaging Med Surg*. Apr 2016;6(2):199-206. doi:10.21037/qims.2016.04.06
26. MacLean MA, Touchette CJ, Han JH, Christie SD, Pickett GE. Gender differences in the surgical management of lumbar degenerative disease: a scoping review. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine SPI*. 01 Jun. 2020 2020;32(6):799-816. doi:10.3171/2019.11.Spine19896
27. Siccoli A, Staartjes VE, de Wispelaere MP, Schröder ML. Gender differences in degenerative spine surgery: Do female patients really fare worse? *Eur Spine J*. Oct 2018;27(10):2427-2435. doi:10.1007/s00586-018-5737-3
28. 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>
29. 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
30. 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 (preprint). *medRxiv*. 2022:2022.06.17.22276443. doi:10.1101/2022.06.17.22276443
31. (NBCE) NBoCE. *Practice Analysis of Chiropractic 2020*. 2020. <https://www.nbce.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-Practice-Analysis-of-Chiropractic-2020-3.pdf>
32. Association APT. *APTA Physical Therapy Workforce Analysis*. 2020. Accessed 4/27/2023. <https://www.apta.org/contentassets/5997bfa5c8504df789fe4f1c01a717eb/apta-workforce-analysis-2020.pdf>
33. Zippia. *Licensed Acupuncturist Demographics and Statistics in the US*. 2023. Accessed 4/27/2023. <https://www.zippia.com/licensed-acupuncturist-jobs/demographics/>
34. Association AM. 2020 Physician Specialty Data Report. AMA Physician Masterfile (December 2019) Accessed 4/27/2023. <https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/workforce/data/active-physicians-sex-and-specialty-2019>

35. Association AO. *Osteopathic Medical Profession (OMP) Report*. 2022. <https://osteopathic.org/about/aoa-statistics/>
36. Zippia. *Certified Nurse Practitioner Demographics and Statistics in the US*. 2023. <https://www.zippia.com/certified-nurse-practitioner-jobs/demographics/>
37. Zippia. *Physician Assistant Demographics and Statistics in the US*. 2023. <https://www.zippia.com/physician-assistant-jobs/demographics/>
38. Bedford J, Enria D, Giesecke J, et al. COVID-19: towards controlling of a pandemic. *Lancet*. Mar 28 2020;395(10229):1015-1018. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30673-5
39. Cheng ZJ, Shan J. 2019 Novel coronavirus: where we are and what we know. *Infection*. Apr 2020;48(2):155-163. doi:10.1007/s15010-020-01401-y
40. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed*. Mar 19 2020;91(1):157-160. doi:10.23750/abm.v91i1.9397
41. Sohrabi C, Alsafi Z, O'Neill N, et al. World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *Int J Surg*. Apr 2020;76:71-76. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2020.02.034
42. MultiState - COVID-19 state and local policy dashboard. Accessed 12/06/2022. <https://www.multistate.us/research/covid/public>.
43. Raifman J, Nocka K, Jones D, et al. COVID-19 US state policy database. <https://statepolicies.com/>
44. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies - Oxford COVID19 Government Response Tracker. *Nature Human Behaviour* doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8> https://github.com/OxCGRT/USA-covid-policy/blob/master/data/OxCGRTUS_timeseries_all.xlsx
45. Elton D, Zhang M. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on low back pain management in commercially insured and Medicare Advantage cohorts. A retrospective cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2023:2023.05.15.23289993. doi:10.1101/2023.05.15.23289993
46. US Census Bureau - ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. Accessed 12/14/2022. <https://data.census.gov/table?q=United+States&g=0100000US&y=2020>
47. Internal Revenue Service - US Department of Treasury SOI tax stats - individual income tax statistics - 2019 ZIP code data. Accessed 12/14/2022. <https://www.irs.gov/statistics/soi-tax-stats-individual-income-tax-statistics-2019-zip-code-data-soi>
48. University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health - 2020 Area Deprivation Index v2.0. Accessed 12/6/2022. <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/>
49. 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
50. 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
51. King G, Nielsen R. Why Propensity Scores Should Not Be Used for Matching. *Political Analysis*. 2019;27(4):435-454. doi:10.1017/pan.2019.11
52. 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
53. Smith GD, Ebrahim S. Data dredging, bias, or confounding. *BMJ*. Dec 21 2002;325(7378):1437-8. doi:10.1136/bmj.325.7378.1437
54. 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
55. Insight O. Symmetry episode treatment groups: measuring health care with meaningful episodes of care. 2012.

56. Viera AJ. Odds ratios and risk ratios: what's the difference and why does it matter? *South Med J*. Jul 2008;101(7):730-4. doi:10.1097/SMJ.0b013e31817a7ee4
57. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) - COVID Data Tracker. https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#compare-trends_comptrends-deaths-cum-rate-lin
58. Ledesma JR, Zou L, Chrysanthopoulou SA, Giovenco D, Khanna AS, Lurie MN. Community Mitigation Strategies, Mobility, and COVID-19 Incidence Across Three Waves in the United States in 2020. *Epidemiology*. Jan 1 2023;34(1):131-139. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000001553
59. Turvy A. State-Level COVID-19 Symptom Searches and Case Data: Quantitative Analysis of Political Affiliation as a Predictor for Lag Time Using Google Trends and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Data. *JMIR Form Res*. Dec 23 2022;6(12):e40825. doi:10.2196/40825
60. Ying YH, Lee WL, Chi YC, Chen MJ, Chang K. Demographics, Socioeconomic Context, and the Spread of Infectious Disease: The Case of COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Feb 15 2022;19(4)doi:10.3390/ijerph19042206
61. Michel CR, Dijanic C, Sudah S, Kerrigan D, Cohen J. Has Public Interest in Elective Spine Surgery Returned to Pre-COVID 19 Levels? A Google Trends Analysis. *Cureus*. Mar 2022;14(3):e22858. doi:10.7759/cureus.22858
62. Krist AH, DeVoe JE, Cheng A, Ehrlich T, Jones SM. Redesigning Primary Care to Address the COVID-19 Pandemic in the Midst of the Pandemic. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2020;18(4):349-354. doi:10.1370/afm.2557
63. Baugh JJ, Yun BJ, Searle E, et al. Creating a COVID-19 surge clinic to offload the emergency department. *Am J Emerg Med*. Jul 2020;38(7):1535-1537. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2020.04.057
64. Carrion D, Colicino E, Pedretti NF, et al. Neighborhood-level disparities and subway utilization during the COVID-19 pandemic in New York City. *Nat Commun*. Jun 17 2021;12(1):3692. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-24088-7
65. Kroesen M, De Vos J, Le HTK, Ton D. Exploring attitude-behaviour dynamics during COVID-19: How fear of infection and working from home influence train use and the attitude toward this mode. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract*. Jan 2023;167:103560. doi:10.1016/j.tra.2022.103560

Table 1 - Cohort, population and episode attributes for complete low back pain episodes <91 days duration

	Female			Male		
	Pre-COVID	Early COVID	Late COVID	Pre-COVID	Early COVID	Late COVID
Commercially Insured (CI)						
Episodes	34739	39913	39670	32419	38137	37165
Individuals	33606	38828	39454	31413	37159	36887
# Unique HCPs	26543	30621	30574	24790	28950	28465
Total Cost	\$29,495,314	\$32,349,078	\$31,660,150	\$30,872,398	\$35,591,352	\$33,438,641
Individual Attributes - % or Median (Q1, Q3)						
% Female	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Age	45 (32, 55)	45 (32, 55)	46 (33, 56)	45 (33, 55)	45 (33, 56)	46 (34, 56)
ERG® Risk Score	1.3 (0.6, 2.6)	1.3 (0.7, 2.8)	1.5 (0.7, 3.0)	0.9 (0.4, 2.0)	1.0 (0.4, 2.2)	1.1 (0.5, 2.4)
Individual Home Address 5-digit Zip Code Attributes - Median (Q1, Q3)						
% Non-Hispanic White (NHW)	65.6% (46.1%, 78.9%)	66.1% (46.1%, 79.3%)	65.7% (45.8%, 79.2%)	66.5% (48.0%, 79.5%)	66.8% (48.5%, 79.9%)	66.7% (47.6%, 79.9%)
Area Deprivation Index (ADI)	37 (19, 58)	39 (21, 59)	39 (20, 59)	38 (20, 59)	41 (21, 60)	39 (20, 59)
Household Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) - 1000s	76 (56, 114)	74 (55, 109)	75 (55, 111)	76 (56, 113)	74 (55, 109)	75 (56, 112)
Total Episode Attributes - Median (Q1, Q3)						
Cost	\$243 (90, 676)	\$216 (65, 616)	\$249 (77, 686)	\$247 (98, 720)	\$225 (79, 664)	\$250 (87, 724)
# Healthcare Providers Seen	1 (1) (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)
Duration (days)	13 (1, 43)	12 (1, 44)	14 (1, 45)	11 (1, 41)	10 (1, 42)	12 (1, 43)
Medicare Advantage (MA)						
Episodes	85801	91648	104148	55457	60758	68313
Individuals	83130	89318	103744	53811	59222	68055
# Unique HCPs	52825	57114	63216	37776	41637	46073
Total Cost	\$35,798,319	\$36,819,803	\$46,218,948	\$27,570,808	\$28,666,681	\$35,878,297
Individual Attributes - % or Median (Q1, Q3)						
% Female	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Age	72 (67, 78)	72 (67, 78)	73 (68, 79)	72 (67, 77)	72 (67, 78)	72 (68, 78)
ERG® Risk Score	1.0 (0.5, 1.7)	1.0 (0.5, 1.8)	1.1 (0.5, 1.9)	0.9 (0.4, 1.7)	1.0 (0.5, 1.8)	1.1 (0.5, 1.9)
Individual Home Address 5-digit Zip Code Attributes - Median (Q1, Q3)						
% Non-Hispanic White (NHW)	66.8% (44.7%, 81.0%)	67.4% (45.5%, 81.3%)	68.2% (46.6%, 81.6%)	69.4% (48.2%, 82.4%)	70.0% (49.0%, 82.8%)	70.5% (49.7%, 82.8%)
Area Deprivation Index (ADI)	53 (33, 70)	54 (35, 71)	53 (35, 71)	52 (33, 69)	53 (34, 70)	52 (33, 70)
Household Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) - 1000s	61 (49, 83)	61 (49, 81)	61 (49, 82)	63 (50, 85)	62 (50, 84)	63 (50, 85)
Total Episode Attributes - Median (Q1, Q3)						
Cost	\$129 (34, 386)	\$110 (30, 348)	\$143(35, 433)	\$135 (36, 419)	\$119 (32, 382)	\$153 (38, 463)
# Healthcare Providers Seen	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)
Duration (days)	15 (1, 49)	12 (1, 49)	16 (1, 51)	15 (1, 48)	14 (1, 49)	17 (1, 50)

Within CI and MA, compared to males for the same time period, cells in red indicate females are not significantly different - Mann-Whitney U test (p=0.05)

Table 2 - Type of healthcare provider initially contacted for low back pain - duration <91 days

		% of Episodes Where Type of HCP Was Initially Contacted						Risk Ratio and 95% Confidence Interval Comparing Female to Male		
		Pre-COVID		Early COVID		Late COVID		Pre-COVID	Early COVID	Late COVID
		F	M	F	M	F	M			
Commercial Insurance (CI)										
Episodes		34739	32419	39913	38137	39670	37165			
Non-Rx	DC	25.0%	28.3%	25.4%	28.2%	23.5%	27.3%	0.88 (0.86, 0.90)	0.90 (0.88, 0.92)	0.86 (0.84, 0.88)
	PT	4.2%	3.4%	3.4%	2.9%	3.6%	3.1%	1.24 (1.15, 1.34)	1.17 (1.08, 1.27)	1.16 (1.08, 1.26)
	LAc	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	1.75 (1.27, 2.41)	1.53 (1.07, 2.20)	2.21 (1.57, 3.11)
Primary Care	PCP	20.4%	20.4%	22.5%	21.5%	19.8%	19.7%	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	1.05 (1.02, 1.07)	1.01 (0.98, 1.04)
	Nurse	5.6%	5.5%	6.0%	5.5%	5.9%	5.4%	1.03 (0.97, 1.09)	1.09 (1.03, 1.15)	1.10 (1.04, 1.16)
	PA	4.8%	5.4%	4.5%	5.0%	4.7%	5.0%	0.89 (0.84, 0.95)	0.89 (0.84, 0.95)	0.94 (0.89, 1.00)
	DO	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.06 (0.76, 1.47)	0.71 (0.53, 0.96)	1.22 (0.88, 1.67)
Physician Specialist	OS	8.6%	8.5%	8.4%	8.7%	8.8%	8.9%	1.02 (0.97, 1.07)	0.97 (0.92, 1.01)	1.00 (0.95, 1.04)
	PMR	3.2%	3.2%	2.8%	2.8%	2.7%	2.9%	1.01 (0.93, 1.10)	1.00 (0.92, 1.09)	0.93 (0.86, 1.02)
	PM	1.8%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.13 (1.01, 1.26)	0.98 (0.88, 1.09)	1.00 (0.89, 1.11)
	Neuro	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	1.58 (1.27, 1.97)	1.39 (1.14, 1.71)	1.56 (1.25, 1.95)
	Rheum	0.7%	0.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.7%	0.2%	2.72 (2.11, 3.50)	2.62 (2.09, 3.29)	3.20 (2.51, 4.07)
	NS	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.88 (0.67, 1.14)	0.97 (0.76, 1.24)	0.67 (0.53, 0.85)
	MD Oth	1.4%	1.4%	1.7%	1.8%	1.5%	1.7%	1.02 (0.90, 1.16)	0.93 (0.84, 1.03)	0.88 (0.79, 0.99)
Emergency Medicine/ Urgent Care	Hosp	10.9%	9.5%	9.9%	9.1%	11.7%	10.2%	1.14 (1.09, 1.19)	1.09 (1.04, 1.13)	1.15 (1.10, 1.19)
	Rad	8.8%	7.6%	8.8%	7.7%	10.7%	9.2%	1.16 (1.10, 1.22)	1.15 (1.09, 1.20)	1.16 (1.11, 1.21)
	EM	2.3%	2.9%	2.2%	2.8%	2.4%	2.8%	0.79 (0.72, 0.87)	0.78 (0.72, 0.86)	0.87 (0.80, 0.95)
	UC	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.95 (0.81, 1.11)	0.99 (0.85, 1.15)	0.95 (0.81, 1.11)
Medicare Advantage (MA)										
Episodes		85801	55457	91648	60758	104148	68313			
Non-Rx	DC	8.2%	11.7%	7.4%	10.5%	8.0%	10.9%	0.70 (0.68, 0.72)	0.70 (0.68, 0.72)	0.73 (0.71, 0.75)
	PT	3.6%	3.4%	2.7%	2.8%	3.4%	3.2%	1.06 (1.01, 1.13)	0.98 (0.93, 1.05)	1.06 (1.01, 1.12)
	LAc	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1.23 (0.84, 1.80)	1.03 (0.69, 1.53)	1.17 (0.87, 1.58)
Primary Care	PCP	31.8%	31.1%	35.3%	34.4%	29.7%	29.3%	1.02 (1.00, 1.04)	1.03 (1.01, 1.04)	1.01 (1.00, 1.03)
	Nurse	6.4%	5.7%	7.0%	6.1%	6.6%	5.6%	1.11 (1.07, 1.16)	1.15 (1.10, 1.19)	1.17 (1.12, 1.21)
	PA	4.4%	4.5%	4.5%	4.4%	4.6%	4.7%	0.98 (0.94, 1.03)	1.03 (0.98, 1.08)	0.98 (0.94, 1.02)
	DO	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1.07 (0.80, 1.44)	1.02 (0.75, 1.38)	0.98 (0.75, 1.27)
Physician Specialist	OS	6.5%	6.4%	6.3%	6.4%	6.7%	6.8%	1.00 (0.96, 1.05)	0.98 (0.95, 1.02)	0.99 (0.95, 1.02)
	PMR	2.3%	2.3%	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%	2.0%	0.98 (0.92, 1.05)	1.01 (0.94, 1.09)	1.01 (0.95, 1.08)
	PM	2.9%	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	2.6%	0.99 (0.93, 1.05)	1.01 (0.95, 1.08)	0.97 (0.91, 1.03)
	Neuro	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	1.06 (0.92, 1.23)	1.07 (0.93, 1.22)	1.06 (0.92, 1.21)
	Rheum	1.0%	0.5%	1.0%	0.4%	0.8%	0.4%	2.15 (1.87, 2.47)	2.59 (2.24, 3.00)	2.08 (1.81, 2.38)
	NS	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.63 (0.52, 0.77)	0.71 (0.59, 0.87)	0.79 (0.65, 0.95)
	MD Oth	1.7%	2.0%	2.1%	2.5%	1.7%	2.3%	0.83 (0.76, 0.89)	0.85 (0.79, 0.90)	0.75 (0.70, 0.80)
Emergency Medicine/ Urgent Care	Hosp	15.9%	14.7%	14.6%	13.8%	17.5%	16.3%	1.09 (1.06, 1.11)	1.06 (1.03, 1.09)	1.07 (1.05, 1.10)
	Rad	11.9%	11.2%	11.4%	10.9%	13.2%	12.4%	1.06 (1.03, 1.10)	1.05 (1.02, 1.08)	1.07 (1.04, 1.09)
	EM	1.9%	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	0.97 (0.90, 1.04)	0.90 (0.83, 0.97)	0.93 (0.87, 1.00)
	UC	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	1.26 (1.08, 1.48)	0.96 (0.82, 1.12)	1.09 (0.94, 1.26)

Pre=Pre-COVID period, Early=first 12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID

PCP=primary care physician, PA=physician assistant, DO=doctor of osteopathy, DC=doctor of chiropractic, PT=physical therapist, LAc=licensed acupuncturist, OS=orthopedic surgeon, PMR=physical medicine and rehabilitation, PM=pain management, Neuro=neurologist, Rheum=rheumatologist, NS=neurosurgeon, MD-Oth=other physician specialists, Hosp=hospital, Rad=radiologist, EM=emergency medicine, UC=urgent care

For risk ratio, cells in red indicate the confidence interval includes 1 and likelihood of HCP being initially contacted is not different than the male reference for the same time period

Table 3 - Type of healthcare services provided for low back pain with duration <91 days

		% of episodes including service						RR (95% CI) comparing female to male		
		Pre-COVID		Early COVID		Late COVID		Pre-COVID	Early COVID	Late COVID
		F	M	F	M	F	M			
Commercial Insurance (CI)										
At least 1 service		34739	32419	39913	38137	39670	37165			
First Line	Manipulation - Chiropractic	25.0%	28.7%	25.5%	28.5%	23.9%	27.9%	0.87 (0.85, 0.89)	0.89 (0.87, 0.91)	0.86 (0.84, 0.88)
	Active Care	22.8%	22.6%	20.1%	20.6%	21.6%	21.6%	1.01 (0.98, 1.04)	0.98 (0.95, 1.00)	1.00 (0.97, 1.02)
	Manual Therapy	14.9%	14.0%	12.4%	12.2%	13.1%	12.4%	1.07 (1.03, 1.11)	1.02 (0.98, 1.06)	1.06 (1.02, 1.10)
	Passive Therapy	12.9%	14.7%	11.8%	13.2%	10.8%	12.6%	0.87 (0.84, 0.91)	0.89 (0.86, 0.92)	0.85 (0.82, 0.89)
	Manipulation - Osteopathic	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.89 (0.75, 1.06)	1.07 (0.89, 1.28)	1.17 (0.97, 1.42)
	Acupuncture	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	1.41 (1.14, 1.75)	1.48 (1.16, 1.87)	1.48 (1.19, 1.83)
Second Line	Imaging - Radiography	37.4%	37.5%	35.9%	36.0%	39.7%	39.5%	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)
	Rx NSAID	22.1%	22.8%	23.0%	22.6%	22.4%	22.0%	0.97 (0.94, 1.00)	1.01 (0.99, 1.04)	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)
	Rx Muscle Relaxant	19.2%	22.7%	19.7%	22.3%	18.3%	20.6%	0.85 (0.82, 0.87)	0.88 (0.86, 0.91)	0.89 (0.86, 0.91)
	Imaging - MRI	9.9%	11.2%	9.5%	10.8%	11.6%	12.8%	0.88 (0.84, 0.92)	0.88 (0.84, 0.92)	0.90 (0.87, 0.94)
	Rx Oral Steroid	9.6%	12.9%	8.5%	11.7%	7.7%	10.1%	0.75 (0.71, 0.78)	0.73 (0.70, 0.76)	0.77 (0.73, 0.80)
	Rx Gabapentin	1.4%	1.7%	1.5%	1.9%	1.4%	1.8%	0.79 (0.70, 0.89)	0.79 (0.71, 0.87)	0.77 (0.69, 0.86)
	Rx All Other	6.2%	5.9%	7.0%	6.2%	6.3%	6.2%	1.06 (1.00, 1.12)	1.13 (1.07, 1.19)	1.02 (0.96, 1.08)
Third Line	Rx Opioid	8.8%	9.9%	9.0%	10.0%	8.4%	9.1%	0.88 (0.84, 0.93)	0.90 (0.86, 0.94)	0.92 (0.88, 0.97)
	Spinal Injection	4.9%	5.7%	4.8%	5.7%	5.2%	5.9%	0.87 (0.81, 0.92)	0.84 (0.79, 0.89)	0.87 (0.82, 0.93)
	Imaging - CT	2.4%	2.6%	2.3%	2.8%	2.7%	3.0%	0.93 (0.85, 1.03)	0.80 (0.73, 0.88)	0.92 (0.84, 1.00)
	Spinal Surgery	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%	0.53 (0.43, 0.64)	0.54 (0.45, 0.65)	0.53 (0.44, 0.65)
Medicare Advantage (MA)										
At least 1 service		85801	55457	91648	60758	104148	68313			
First Line	Manipulation - Chiropractic	9.3%	13.2%	8.3%	11.8%	9.2%	12.5%	0.70 (0.68, 0.73)	0.71 (0.68, 0.73)	0.73 (0.71, 0.75)
	Active Care	12.9%	12.9%	10.4%	10.9%	13.1%	13.0%	1.00 (0.97, 1.03)	0.96 (0.93, 0.99)	1.01 (0.98, 1.03)
	Manual Therapy	6.5%	6.3%	5.1%	5.1%	6.1%	5.9%	1.03 (0.99, 1.07)	1.00 (0.95, 1.04)	1.04 (1.00, 1.08)
	Passive Therapy	2.2%	2.3%	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	0.95 (0.89, 1.02)	0.88 (0.81, 0.95)	0.95 (0.89, 1.02)
	Manipulation - Osteopathic	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	1.31 (1.08, 1.59)	1.08 (0.89, 1.31)	1.05 (0.87, 1.27)
	Acupuncture	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	1.19 (0.97, 1.48)	1.10 (0.89, 1.37)	1.12 (0.95, 1.33)
Second Line	Imaging - Radiography	35.4%	33.1%	32.3%	30.8%	37.6%	35.1%	1.07 (1.05, 1.08)	1.05 (1.03, 1.06)	1.07 (1.06, 1.09)
	Rx NSAID	20.7%	19.4%	20.9%	19.4%	19.4%	18.2%	1.07 (1.04, 1.09)	1.08 (1.06, 1.10)	1.07 (1.04, 1.09)
	Rx Muscle Relaxant	12.8%	13.8%	13.0%	13.7%	13.0%	14.3%	0.93 (0.90, 0.95)	0.95 (0.92, 0.97)	0.91 (0.89, 0.93)
	Imaging - MRI	13.2%	15.2%	13.0%	15.0%	16.0%	18.3%	0.87 (0.85, 0.89)	0.87 (0.84, 0.89)	0.88 (0.86, 0.89)
	Rx Oral Steroid	8.0%	9.7%	6.6%	8.4%	6.1%	7.3%	0.82 (0.80, 0.85)	0.79 (0.76, 0.82)	0.83 (0.80, 0.86)
	Rx Gabapentin	2.3%	2.5%	2.1%	2.2%	1.7%	1.9%	0.91 (0.85, 0.97)	0.98 (0.91, 1.05)	0.90 (0.84, 0.97)
	Rx All Other	12.2%	11.5%	14.8%	13.8%	12.0%	11.5%	1.07 (1.04, 1.10)	1.07 (1.04, 1.10)	1.04 (1.01, 1.07)
Third Line	Rx Opioid	16.4%	16.7%	16.4%	16.4%	15.1%	15.7%	0.98 (0.96, 1.01)	1.00 (0.97, 1.02)	0.96 (0.94, 0.99)
	Spinal Injection	8.1%	8.6%	7.6%	8.4%	8.7%	9.2%	0.94 (0.90, 0.97)	0.91 (0.88, 0.95)	0.94 (0.92, 0.97)
	Imaging - CT	6.2%	6.0%	6.2%	6.1%	7.0%	7.1%	1.03 (0.98, 1.07)	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)	0.99 (0.96, 1.03)
	Spinal Surgery	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.9%	0.3%	0.8%	0.45 (0.39, 0.51)	0.46 (0.41, 0.53)	0.42 (0.37, 0.48)

RR=risk ratio, CI=confidence interval

For risk ratio, cells in red indicate the confidence interval includes 1 and likelihood of the % of episodes including a service is not different than the pre-COVID reference




Figure 1 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing females to males for the type of health care provider initially contacted by commercially insured individuals with low back pain with episode lasting <91 days

Pre=pre-COVID period, Early=0-12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID, PCP=primary care provider, Nur=nurse, PA=physician assistant, DO=doctor of osteopathy, DC=doctor of chiropractic, PT=physical therapist, LAC=licensed acupuncturist, OS=orthopedic surgeon, PMR=physical medicine and rehabilitation, PM=pain management, Neuro=neurologist, Rheum=rheumatologist, NS=neurosurgeon, Oth=other physician specialist, Hosp=hospital, Rad=radiologist, EM=emergency medicine, UC=urgent care




Figure 2 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing females to males for the type of health care provider initially contacted by medicare advantage insured individuals with low back pain with episode lasting <91 days

Pre=pre-COVID period, Early=0-12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID, PCP=primary care provider, Nur=nurse, PA=physician assistant, DO=doctor of osteopathy, DC=doctor of chiropractic, PT=physical therapist, LAc=licensed acupuncturist, OS=orthopedic surgeon, PMR=physical medicine and rehabilitation, PM=pain management, Neuro=neurologist, Rheum=rheumatologist, NS=neurosurgeon, Oth=other physician specialist, Hosp=hospital, Rad=radiologist, EM=emergency medicine, UC=urgent care




Figure 3 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing females to males for the type of health care services provided for commercially insured individuals with low back pain with episode lasting <91 days

Pre=pre-COVID period, Early=0-12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID, CMT=chiropractic manipulative therapy, AC=active care, MT=manual therapy, PT=passive therapy, Acu=acupuncture, OMT=osteopathic manipulative therapy, Imag Rad=radiology, MM Rlx=skeletal muscle relaxant, Imag MRI=MRI scan, Gaba=gabapentin, Oth=other prescription medication, Inj=injection, Imag-CT=CT scan, Surg=surgical procedure




Figure 4 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing females to males for the type of health care services provided for medicare advantage insured individuals with low back pain with episode lasting <91 days

Pre=pre-COVID period, Early=0-12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID, CMT=chiropractic manipulative therapy, AC=active care, MT=manual therapy, PT=passive therapy, Acu=acupuncture, OMT=osteopathic manipulative therapy, Imag Rad=radiology, MM Rlx=skeletal muscle relaxant, Imag MRI=MRI scan, Gaba=gabapentin, Oth=other prescription medication, Inj=injection, Imag-CT=CT scan, Surg=surgical procedure




Figure 5 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing **commercially insured females to males for the likelihood to select a chiropractor as the initial type of healthcare provider seen for an episode of low back pain with episode lasting <91 days**

Pre=pre-COVID period, Early=0-12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID, ADI=Area Deprivation Index of individual's home address 5-digit zip code, NHW=percent of the individual's home address 5-digit zip code population that is non-Hispanic white




Figure 6 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing **females to males** living in zip codes with **51-100 Area Deprivation Index (ADI)** and **0-50% non-Hispanic white (NHW) population** for the type of healthcare service provided for an episode of low back pain with a duration of <91 days

Pre=pre-COVID period, Early=0-12 months post-COVID, Late=13-24 months post-COVID, CI=commercially insured, MA=medicare advantage insured




Figure 7 - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval comparing **females to males** for services provided during the late COVID period (March to December 2021) for episodes of low back pain with a duration of <91 days and initial contact with either a Doctor of Chiropractic (DC), Primary Care Physician (PCP), or Orthopedic Surgeon (OS)

CI=commercially insured, MA=medicare advantage insured