

SPINAL MOBILIZATION CHARACTERISTICS: A SCOPING LITERATURE REVIEW OF BIOMECHANICAL PARAMETERS

Short title Literature review of spinal mobilization biomechanical parameters

Authors

Lindsay M Gorrell MChiroprac, PhD*¹

Luana Nyirö DCM¹

Mégane Pasquier DC, PhD^{2,3}

Isabelle Pagé DC, PhD^{4,5}

Nicola R Heneghan PT, PhD⁶

Petra Schweinhardt MD, MChiroMed, PhD¹

Martin Descarreaux DC, PhD^{3,7}

Affiliations

¹ Integrative Spinal Research Group, Department of Chiropractic Medicine, University Hospital Balgrist and University of Zürich, Switzerland

² Department of Anatomy, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, QC, Canada.

³ Institut Franco-Européen de Chiropraxie, Toulouse, France.

⁴ Department of chiropractic, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, QC, Canada

⁵ Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation and Social Integration (Cirris), Centre Intégré Universitaire de Santé et de Services Sociaux de la Capitale-Nationale (CIUSSS-CN), Québec City, QC, Canada

⁶ School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

⁷ Department of Human Kinetics, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, QC, Canada.

*Corresponding Author

Email: lindsaymary.gorrell@uzh.ch; phone: +41 44 510 73 82

ABSTRACT

Background

Spinal mobilization (SMob) is often included in the conservative management of spinal pain conditions

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. as a recommended and effective treatment. While some studies quantify the biomechanical (kinetic)

36 parameters of SMob, interpretation of findings is difficult due to poor reporting of methodological
37 details. The aim of this study was to synthesise the literature describing biomechanical parameters of
38 manually applied SMob.

39 **Methods**

40 This study is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Scoping Reviews
41 (PRISMA-ScR) statement. Databases were searched from inception to October 2022: MEDLINE
42 (Ovid), Embase, CINAHL, ICL, PEDro and Cochrane Library. Data were extracted and reported
43 descriptively for the following domains: general study characteristics, number of and characteristics of
44 individuals who delivered/received SMob, region treated, equipment used and biomechanical
45 parameters of SMob.

46 **Results**

47 Of 7,607 records identified, 36 (0.5%) were included in the analysis. Of these, SMob was delivered to
48 the cervical spine in 13 (36.1%), the thoracic spine in 3 (8.3%) and the lumbopelvic spine in 18 (50.0%)
49 studies. In 2 (5.6%) studies, spinal region was not specified. For SMob applied to all spinal regions,
50 biomechanical parameters were: peak force (0-128N); duration (10-120s); frequency (0.1-4.5Hz); and
51 force amplitude (1-102N).

52 **Conclusions**

53 This study reports considerable variability of the biomechanical parameters of SMob. In studies
54 reporting biomechanical parameters, SMob was most frequently delivered to the lumbar and cervical
55 spine of humans and most commonly peak force was reported. Future studies should focus on the
56 detailed reporting of biomechanical parameters to facilitate the investigation of clinical dose-response
57 effects.

58 **INTRODUCTION**

59 Musculoskeletal disorders, including low back and neck pain, affect most individuals during their lives
60 (1–4). Such disorders are a prominent cause of disability globally (5) and can lead to decreased quality
61 of life and psychological distress (6,7). The global prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders is increasing

62 (8), as are their associated financial and societal costs (9–11). Individuals commonly seek care from
63 various healthcare providers for the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders (12–14) and the use of
64 evidence-based interventions is recommended (12,15–17). Clinical practice guidelines recommend the
65 use of conservative treatments including spinal mobilization (SMob) and/or spinal manipulation (SM)
66 for the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders (18–21). SMob is characterized by the manual application
67 of oscillatory forces with low velocity and variable amplitude and frequency to an articulation (22).
68 SMob can be further described in terms of the movement amplitude (or 'grade') as first described by
69 Maitland (23). Specifically: Grade I involves a small-amplitude movement performed at the beginning
70 of the range of motion (ROM); Grade II is a large-amplitude movement performed within the free range
71 but not moving into any resistance or stiffness; Grade III is a large-amplitude movement performed up
72 to the limit of the range; and Grade IV involves a small-amplitude movement performed at the limit of
73 the range. It has been reported that Grades I and II SMob are often applied with the intention of pain
74 reduction, while Grades III and IV are commonly used to increase ROM (24).

75
76 Transient neurophysiological effects in both the autonomic (e.g. changes in skin temperature and
77 conductance (25,26)) and somatic (e.g. changes in muscle activity (26,27)) nervous systems have been
78 reported in response to SMob. Additionally, beneficial clinical outcomes such as hypoalgesia (25,28–
79 30) and increased ROM (27,31) have been linked to the intervention. However, it is yet to be established
80 if physiological responses to manual therapy (i.e. SMob) are related to clinical outcomes (32).
81 Therefore, the mechanisms underlying the beneficial clinical effects of SMob remain unclear (33,34)
82 and without quantification of the intervention, it is difficult to determine which, if any, biomechanical
83 parameters may influence patient outcomes (35).

84
85 To date, there have been two reviews of SMob biomechanical parameters (22,36) reporting on mean
86 peak forces during SMob delivered in a posterior-anterior (PA) direction. In a 1997 review by
87 Björnsdóttir and colleagues, force application was discussed in a single paragraph, with data reported
88 for SMob delivered to: i) the L3 vertebra by 2 instructors (mean peak force: 33.3N); and ii) an
89 unspecified thoracic level by 2 manual therapists using Grades I (means of the means for the 2

90 therapists: 134.75N) and IV (342.5N) (36). In a 2006 review, Snodgrass and colleagues evaluated the
91 literature for consistency of force application by manual therapists during PA SMob (22). This review
92 reported on mean peak forces in the PA direction for Grades I-IV SMob delivered to the spine
93 (cervical:4; thoracic:3; and lumbar:7) and artificial devices (4). Both reviews highlighted a variability
94 in nomenclature, definitions of biomechanical parameters and force delivery during SMob (22,36).
95 Since the Snodgrass and colleagues review, there has been no further collation or synthesis of SMob
96 biomechanical parameters. Therefore, the aim of this study was to synthesise the existing literature
97 describing biomechanical (kinetic) parameters during the delivery of manually applied SMob.

98

99

METHODOLOGY

100 This scoping literature review is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Scoping
101 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) statement (37). The protocol was developed by an experienced, international
102 and interprofessional team and was prospectively registered at the Open Science Framework Registry
103 (<https://osf.io/3mqjs/>). The original study design and subsequent search were conducted with the
104 intention to capture information concerning the biomechanical parameters of both SMob and SM.
105 Protocol deviations included that: i) due to the large quantity of data published on the topic, it was
106 decided to report the biomechanical parameters of SMob and SM separately; and ii) studies reporting
107 on SMob delivered to animals were excluded as it was unknown how biomechanically comparable
108 SMob delivery would be to that delivered to humans. Due to the separate reporting of SMob and SM
109 data in different manuscripts, several sections of the methods described here mirror those in the
110 manuscript reporting on SM data (under peer-review).

111

Eligibility criteria

113 Eligibility criteria were developed using the Sample, Phenomenon of Interest, Design, Evaluation,
114 Research Type (SPIDER) search concept tool (38).

115

Inclusion criteria

117 S – the sample population was humans (of any age) and non-humans (e.g. instrumented tool, manikin);
118 PI – the phenomenon of interest was manually delivered SMob and/or SM, delivered by any regulated
119 health professional (e.g. physiotherapist or chiropractor) or student enrolled at an accredited institution;
120 D – observational study designs (e.g. case series studies, cohort and case-control studies);
121 E – kinetic variables of the intervention (e.g. force-time profile); and
122 R – original quantitative research data from studies utilizing SMob and/or SM as either the sole
123 intervention or as a comparator.

124

125 **Exclusion criteria**

126 Exclusion criteria were: i) SMob and/or SM delivered by a mechanical instrument or device; ii) all other
127 therapeutic modalities; iii) manuscript not published in English, French or German; and iv) studies that
128 had been retracted, were secondary analyses, trial registrations, protocols, clinical practice guidelines,
129 commentaries, editorials, conference proceedings or single case studies.

130

131 **Search strategy**

132 The search strategy was created by subject specific and methodological experts, with the assistance of
133 an experienced medical and health sciences librarian. MEDLINE(Ovid), Embase, CINAHL, ICL,
134 PEDro and Cochrane Library databases were searched from inception to 4 October 2022. The first
135 author (LG) screened the reference lists of included studies to ensure that all relevant literature was
136 captured. The following search terms and derivatives were adapted for each search engine: (spine,
137 spinal, manipulation, mobilization or mobilisation, musculoskeletal, chiropractic, osteopathy,
138 physiotherapy, naprapathy, force, motor skill, biomechanics, dosage, dose-response, education,
139 performance, psychomotor, back, neck, spine, thoracic, lumbar, pelvic, cervical, sacral). Search
140 strategies for all databases are provided in S1 Appendix.

141

142 **Study selection process**

143 Records retrieved from the electronic searches were exported to the Rayyan© online platform (2022)
144 (39) and duplicates were removed. Beginning with title and abstract review, groups of two authors (LG

145 and LN; LG and IP; LG and MP) independently screened studies in a step-wise process. Full-texts of
146 the remaining studies were then retrieved and screened independently by groups of two authors (LG
147 and LN; LG and IP). Disagreements regarding study inclusion that could not be resolved by consensus
148 were resolved by a third author (MD).

149

150 **Data extraction**

151 Data were extracted from eligible studies by groups of two independent authors (LG and LN; LG and
152 MP). These data included: i) general study characteristics (e.g. title, author, year and country of
153 publication and type of study); ii) general study information (e.g. individual who delivered the
154 intervention [e.g. clinician, student], professional qualification of individual delivering the intervention
155 [e.g. physiotherapist, chiropractor], years of clinician experience/number of student hours, number of
156 clinicians/students who delivered SMob or SM, recipient [e.g. human, manikin], number of recipients,
157 whether the intervention was SMob [and grade of mobilization] or SM, the region treated [e.g. cervical,
158 thoracic] and the measurement equipment used to record biomechanical parameters of the intervention);
159 and iii) biomechanical parameters of SMob (e.g. peak force, SMob duration and frequency and force
160 amplitude). Data reporting on SM is submitted for publication elsewhere (manuscript under peer-
161 review).

162

163 **Definitions**

164 In this study, the following definitions were used:

- 165 • Peak force: the maximum applied force during a single SMob, reported as the mean of the force
166 peaks that occurred during a specified period of the intervention.
- 167 • Duration: the time period of SMob delivery.
- 168 • Frequency: the rate of force oscillation during repeated applications.
- 169 • Force amplitude: the difference between the minimum and maximum forces applied during the
170 intervention (i.e. the difference between a peak force and trough), reported as the mean of the
171 force amplitudes that occurred during a specified period of SMob.

- 172 • Metrological details: descriptions of the suitability (e.g. accuracy, precision, sensitivity) of the
173 measurement equipment to quantify the biomechanical parameters of SMob (40).

174

175 **Data synthesis**

176 Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation and range) were used to report data. Any deviations
177 from this (such as the use of 95% confidence intervals or the reporting of median and interquartile
178 range) are explicitly indicated and reflect how the data were reported in the original studies. Microsoft
179 Excel (Office 365, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, USA) was used to calculate frequencies and
180 proportions of trials reporting on each of the specified domains mentioned above.

181

182 In order to manage the substantial volume of data presented in this study, the following decisions were
183 made regarding how to best report the data: i) for studies reporting forces measured in 3-dimensions
184 (3D) and including the resultant forces (i.e. the total forces applied), only the resultant forces are
185 reported; ii) for studies measuring forces applied in 3D but not including the resultant forces, only the
186 forces measured in the primary direction of the applied force are reported in the tables (e.g. for prone
187 PA thoracic SMob, the vertical forces are reported). Regarding the reporting of metrological data, a
188 consensus was reached by two authors (LG and MD) as to whether adequate information was provided.
189 In cases where metrological details were discussed (e.g. it was stated that measurement equipment
190 accuracy was good) but it was not clear if this statement was based on data (or what data), this was
191 recorded as metrological details were not provided. No assessment of study quality was performed.

192

193 **RESULTS**

194 The electronic searches returned 7,607 records, with 3,981 unique records remaining after de-
195 duplication (n=3,626) (Figure 1). Following title/abstract screening, 247 full-texts were screened. Of
196 these, 146 reports were excluded (e.g. did not report biomechanical parameters: 56), leaving 101
197 included studies. Of these, 36 reported on SMob and were included in the analysis. A list of these studies
198 is provided in S2 Appendix and the reference number cited in the tables refers to this list.

199 Figure 1: PRISMA flow-chart.

200

201 Of the 36 included studies, most were published in the 10-year period from 2003 to 2012 (n=13, 36.1%)
 202 in Australia (n=13, 36.1%) (Table 1). Typically, the study design was cross-sectional (n=26, 72.2%),
 203 with SMob delivered by a clinician only (i.e. no students were involved) (n=24, 66.7%) whose
 204 profession was a physiotherapist (n=27, 75.0%). In the 31 (86.1%) studies in which SMob was delivered
 205 by clinicians, clinical experience was unclear in 14 (45.2%) studies and when it was reported, clinicians
 206 with more than 5 years' experience most commonly delivered SMob (n=10, 32.3%). When SMob was
 207 delivered by a student (n=12, 33.3%), the number of SMob training hours was not reported in any
 208 (n=12, 100.0%) study. Most frequently, the number of individuals (i.e. clinicians and/or students)
 209 delivering SMob was between 1 and 49 (n=29, 80.6%), with 12 (33.3%) of these studies involving only
 210 1 to 2 individuals delivering SMob. SMob was delivered to adults (18 to 65 years) in 20 (55.6%) studies,
 211 with the demographics of the cohort to which SMob was delivered not reported in 8 (22.2%) studies.
 212 The number of individuals receiving SMob was reported as between 1 and 49 in 28 (77.8%) studies,
 213 with only 1 to 2 individuals receiving SMob in 10 (27.8%) studies. SMob was most commonly delivered
 214 to the lumbopelvic spine (n=18, 50.0%) and the cervical spine (n=13, 36.1%), and the SMob 'technique'
 215 was reported in all but one study (n=35, 97.2%). Biomechanical parameters were measured at the
 216 patient-table interface in 16 (44.4%) studies, another interface (e.g. thumbnail of the clinician) in 6
 217 (16.7%) studies, the clinician-patient interface in 5 (13.9) studies and the clinician-ground interface in
 218 4 (11.1%) studies. Metrological data of the measurement equipment were reported in 27 (75.0%)
 219 studies. Regarding biomechanical parameters, the following were reported: peak force in 35 (97.2%);
 220 SMob duration in 12 (33.3%); SMob frequency in 16 (44.4%); and amplitude of force in 11 (30.6%)
 221 studies.

222

223 Table 1: Overall summary of studies reporting on the biomechanical parameters of spinal mobilization
 224 (SMob) (n=36).
 225

Year, n=36	n, (%)	Individual who received SMob, n=36	n, (%)
2013 to 2022	12 (33.3)	Adult (18-65yr)	20 (55.6)
2003 to 2012	13 (36.1)	Geriatric (>65yr)	1 (2.8)
1993 to 2002	10 (27.8)	Instrumented tool/force plate	4 (11.1)

Before 1993	1 (2.8)	Manikin	1 (2.8)
Country, n=36		Mixed	2 (5.6)
Australia	13 (36.1)	Unclear	8 (22.2)
Canada	6 (16.7)	Number of individuals receiving SMob, n=36	
England	6 (16.7)	1 or 2	10 (27.8)
Ireland	1 (2.8)	0 to 49	28 (77.8)
Malaysia	1 (2.8)	50 to 99	5 (13.9)
South Africa	1 (2.8)	Not reported	3 (8.3)
Unclear	1 (2.8)	Region SMob delivered to, n=36	
USA	7 (19.4)	Cervical	13 (36.1)
Study type, n=36		Thoracic	3 (8.3)
Cross-sectional	26 (72.2)	Lumbopelvic	18 (50.0)
Prospective	10 (27.8)	Other	2 (5.6)
Individual who delivered SMob, n=36		Technique reported, n=36	
Practitioner	24 (66.7)	Yes	35 (97.2)
Student	5 (13.9)	No	1 (2.8)
Both	5 (13.9)	Measurement interface, n=36	
Unclear	2 (5.6)	Patient-table	16 (44.4)
Profession, n=36		Clinician-patient	5 (13.9)
Physiotherapist	27 (75.0)	Clinician-ground	4 (11.1)
Chiropractor	5 (13.9)	Table-ground	3 (8.3)
Unclear	4 (11.1)	Both clinician-patient & patient-table	1 (2.8)
Experience (clinician) n=31		Other	6 (16.7)
>5yr	10 (32.3)	Unclear	3 (8.3)
Mixed	7 (22.6)	Metrological data reported, n=36	
Unclear	14 (45.2)	Reported	27 (75.0)
Hours of training (student) n=12		Not reported	9 (25.0)
Reported	0 (0.0)	Peak force, n=36	
Not reported	12 (100.0)	Reported	35 (97.2)
Number of individuals delivering SMob, n=36		Not reported	1 (2.8)
1 or 2	12 (33.3)	Duration of mobilization, n=36	
1 to 49	29 (80.6)	Reported	12 (33.3)
50 to 99	2 (5.6)	Not reported	24 (66.7)
100 to 149	2 (5.6)	Frequency of mobilization, n=36	
>150	1 (2.8)	Reported	16 (44.4)
Not reported	2 (5.6)	Not reported	20 (55.6)
		Amplitude of force, n=36	
		Reported	11 (30.6)
		Not reported	25 (69.4)

226 Abbreviations: n: number of studies, SMob: spinal mobilization, y: year, >: greater than, <: less than.

227

228 **Cervical spine**

229 Of the 11 (84.6%) studies that reported on SMob delivered to the cervical spine of humans, the

230 following biomechanical parameters were reported: i) peak force: 0-128N; ii) duration: 60s; iii)

231 frequency: 0.28-2.4Hz; and iv) force amplitude: 14.4-52.5N (Tables 2 & 3; S3 Appendix, Table A). Of

232 the 2 (15.4%) studies that reported on SMob delivered to non-humans (i.e. human analogue manikin:1;

233 instrumented tool:1) peak force 42-181N was reported.

234

235 **Thoracic spine**

236 Of the 2 (66.7%) studies that reported on SMob delivered to the thoracic spine of humans, the following
237 biomechanical parameters were reported: i) peak force: 297-323N; ii) duration: 3x60s; and iii)
238 frequency: 0.47-0.53Hz (Tables 3 & 4; S3 Appendix, Table B). In the one (33.3%) study that reported
239 on SMob delivered to 12 T5-8 sections of human cadavers: i) peak force: 106-223N; and ii) frequency:
240 0.5Hz were reported.

241

242 **Lumbopelvic spine**

243 Of the 17 (94.4%) studies that reported on SMob delivered to the lumbar spine of humans, the following
244 biomechanical parameters were reported: i) peak force: 3-430N; ii) duration: 10-120s; iii) frequency:
245 0-5Hz; and iv) force amplitude: 1-102N (Tables 3 & 5; S3 Appendix, Table C). In the one (33.3%)
246 study that reported on SMob delivered to an instrumented tool: i) peak force: 36-119N; and ii) duration:
247 30s were reported.

248

249 **No region specified**

250 Of the 2 (5.6%) studies that reported on SMob delivered to an unspecified region, the following
251 biomechanical parameters were reported: i) peak force: 2-361N; ii) duration: 20s; and iii) frequency:
252 28-32 cycles/min (Tables 3 & 6; S3 Appendix, Table D).

253 Table 2: Summary of studies reporting on the biomechanical parameters of spinal mobilization (SMob) delivered to the cervical spine of humans (n=11) and
 254 non-humans (i.e. human analogue manikins, instrumented tools) (n=2).

Author/s Year, Country	SMob delivery Profession (n)	Experience	Recipient/s (n)	Location/s	Technique/s Grade/s	Interface/s	Equipment	Metrological data
Humans								
Conradie et al 2004, South Africa ⁷	Clin Physio (16)	NR	Adult (1)	C6	PA I	Clin-pat	Pressure sensor	No
Snodgrass et al 2006, Australia ²⁸	Clin Physio (10)	Mixed	Adult (1)	C2/C7	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	No
Snodgrass et al 2009, Australia ²⁹	Clin Physio (116)	>5y	Adult (35)	C2/C7	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	Yes
Snodgrass et al 2010, Australia ^{30,31}	Clin & Stud Physio (336)	Clin: NR Stud: NR (no clin exper)	Adult (67)	C2/C7	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	Yes
Snodgrass et al 2010, Australia ³¹	Stud Physio (120)	NR (2-4 y)	Adult (32)	C2/C7	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	Yes
Gudavalli et al 2013, USA ¹³	Clin Chiro (4)	NR	Adult (9)	C5/C6	C distract NA	Pat-table	Force plate	No
Snodgrass et al 2014, Australia ³³	Clin Physio (1)	>5y	Adult (64)	MP (C3-7)	PA III	Pat-table	Load cells	No
Gudavalli et al 2015, USA ¹⁵	Clin Chiro (NR)	NR	Adult (45)	Occi/C5	C distract NA	Pat-table	Force plate	No
Gudavalli et al 2015, USA ¹⁶	Clin Chiro (2)	>5y	Adult (48)	Occi/C5	C distract NA	Pat-table	Force plate	No
Kope et al 2018, Canada ¹⁹	Clin Physio (5)	>5y	NR (NR)	C5/C6	PA III	Clin thumbnail	Strain gauge	No
Chia et al 2021, Malaysia ⁴	Clin Physio (1)	NR	NR (30)	C6	PA I-IV	NR	Pressure sensor	No
Non-humans								
Buckingham et al 2007, Australia ³	Clin & Stud Physio (36)	Clin: Mixed Stud: NR (4 th y)	Manikin (1)	C6	PA NR	In manikin	Strain gauge	No
Walsh et al 2011, Ireland ³⁵	Stud Physio (40)	NR (final y)	Instrumented tool (1)	C7	PA III	Instrumented tool	Pinch-grip analyser	No

255 Abbreviations: C: cervical, Chiro: chiropractor, Clin: clinician, distract: distraction, exper: experience, Mixed: experience of clinicians both > and < 5 years, MP: most painful,
 256 (n): number of participants, NA: not applicable, NR: not reported, Occi: occiput, PA: posterior-anterior, Pat: patient, Physio: physiotherapist, SMob: spinal mobilization, Stud:
 257 students, y: years, >: greater than.

258
 259
 260

261 Table 3: Summary of biomechanical parameters reported by region for studies reporting on spinal mobilization (SMob) (n=36).

	Location of measurement n (%)	Metrologic data reported n (%)	Peak force reported n (%) [range (N)]	Duration reported n (%) [range (s)]	Frequency reported n (%) [range (Hz)]	Force amplitude reported n (%) [range (N)]
Humans (n=11)	Patient-table: 8 (72.7) Clinician-patient: 1 (9.1) NR: 1 (9.1) Other: 1 (9.1)	3 (27.3)	11 (100.0) [0-128]	1 (9.1) 60	6 (54.5) [0.3-2.4]	4 (36.4) [14.4-52.5]
Non-humans (n=2)	Within device: 1 (50.0) Clinician-device: 1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0) [42-181]	0 (0.0) [NA]	0 (0.0) [NA]	0 (0.0) [NA]
Humans (n=2)	Clinician-patient: 1 (50.0) Clinician-patient & patient-table: 1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0) [297-323]	1 (50.0) 3x60	1 (50.0) [28-32 ^A]	0 (0.0) [NA]
Non-humans (n=1)	Clinician-device & table-ground: 1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0) [106-223]	0 (0.0) [NA]	1 (100.0) 0.5	0 (0.0) [NA]
Humans (n=17)	Patient-table: 7 (41.2) Clinician- ground: 4 (23.5) Table-ground: 3 (17.6) Clinician-patient: 2 (11.8) NR: 1 (5.9)	3 (17.6)	16 (94.1) [3-430]	8 (47.1) [10-120]	7 (41.2) [0.1-4.5]	7 (41.2) [1-102]
Non-humans (n=1)	Device-table: 1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0) [36-119]	1 (100.0) 30	0 (0.0) [NA]	0 (0.0) [NA]
Non-humans (n=2)	Within device: 1 (50.0) Clinician-device & Clinician-ground: 1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0) [2-361]	1 (50.0) 20	1 (50.0) [28-32 ^A]	NR

262 Abbreviations: Hz: Hertz, N: Newtons, n: number of studies, NA: not applicable, NR: not reported, Other: clinician thumb nailbed, s: seconds, SMob: spinal mobilization, Δ:
263 data are reported as cycles/minute.

264

265 Table 4: Summary of studies reporting on the biomechanical parameters of spinal mobilization (SMob) delivered to the thoracic spine of humans (n=2) and
266 non-humans (i.e. partial cadaveric sections) (n=1).

Author/s Year, Country	SMob delivery Profession (n)	Experience	Recipient/s (n)	Location/s	Technique/s Grade/s	Interface/s	Equipment	Metrological data
Humans								
Zegarra-Parodi et al 2016, NR ³⁶	NR NR (1)	NR	Adult (32)	T1	Lateral glide via lamina NR (5/40/80% of PPT)	Clin-pat	Pressure sensor	No

Funabashi et al 2021, Canada ¹⁰	Clin Chiro (1)	>5y	Geriatric (18)	T1-12	Clin choice 4	Clin-pat Pat-table	Load cells Force plate	Yes
Non-humans								
Sran et al 2004, Canada ³⁴	Clin Physio (2)	NR	Cadaveric sections T5-8 (12)	T6	PA NR	Clin-pat Table-floor	Pressure sensor	No

267 Abbreviations: Chiro: chiropractor, Clin: clinician, (n): number of participants, NR: not reported, PA: posterior-anterior, Pat: patient, Physio: physiotherapist, PPT: pressure
268 pain threshold, SMob: spinal mobilization, T: thoracic, y: years, >: greater than.
269

270 Table 5: Summary of studies reporting on the biomechanical parameters of spinal mobilization (SMob) delivered to the lumbopelvic spine of humans (n=17)
271 and non-humans (i.e. instrumented tools) (n=1).

Author/s Year, Country	SMob delivery Profession (n)	Experience	Recipient/s (n)	Location/s	Technique/s Grade/s	Interface/s	Equipment	Metrological data
Humans								
Lee et al 1990, Australia ²¹	Stud Physio (53)	NR (3 rd y)	NR (1)	L3	PA II	Table-ground	Force plate	No
Petty 1995, England ²³	Clin Physio (1)	NR	Adult (18)	L3	PA IV	Clin-ground	Force plate	No
Harms & Bader 1997, England ¹⁷	Clin Therapist (30)	NR	Adult (1)	L3	PA I-IV/endfeel	Pat-table	Load cells	No
Harms et al 1999, England ¹⁸	Clin Therapist (1)	<5y	Adult (61)	L3	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	No
Goodsell et al 2000, Australia ¹²	Clin Physio (1)	NR	Mixed ages (26)	MP	PA NR	Pat-table	Load cells	No
Allison et al 2001, Australia ¹	Clin Physio (1)	NR	Adult (24)	L3	PA NR	NR	Force transducer	No
Chiradejnant et al 2001, Australia ⁵	Clin Physio (3)	NR	NR (3)	L3	PA II/IV	Pat-table	Load cells	No
Chiradejnant et al 2002, Australia ⁶	Clin Physio (10)	NR	Mixed ages (80)	L1-5	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	Yes
Cook et al 2002, USA ⁸	Clin Physio (23)	Mixed	Adult (2)	L3	PA I-IV	Clin-ground	Force plate	No
Cook 2003, USA ⁹	Clin Physio (22)	Mixed	NR (2)	L3	PA I-IV	Clin-ground	Force plate	No
Krekoukias et al 2009, England ²⁰	NR Therapist (1)	NR	Adult (36)	L3	PA NR	Clin-ground	Force plate	No
Sheaves et al 2011, Australia ²⁵	Stud Physio (62)	NR (3 rd y)	NR (62)	L3	PA II	Pat-table	NR	Yes
Snodgrass & Odelli	Clin & Stud Physio (27)	Clin: >5y Stud: NR	NR (26)	L3	PA I-IV	Pat-table	Load cells	Yes

2012, Australia ³²								
Shum et al 2013, England ²⁶	Clin Physio (1)	>5y	Adult (39)	L4	PA III	Table-ground	Force plate	No
Gudavalli & Cox 2014, USA ¹⁴	Clin Chiro (10)	Mixed	Adult (4)	NR	Cox FD NA	Clin-pat	Force transducer	No
Gagnon et al 2016, Canada ¹¹	Clin & Stud Physio (8)	Clin: >5y Stud: NR (4 th y)	Adult (5)	L2/L4	PA I-IV	Table-ground	Force plate	No
Petersen et al 2020, USA ²²	Stud Physio (24)	NR (1 st y)	Adult (24)	L3	PA III/IV	Clin-pat	Pressure sensor	No
Non-humans								
Björnsdóttir & Kumar 2003, Canada ²	Clin & Stud Physio (20)	Clin: >5y Stud: NR (< 1y grad)	Instrumented tool (1)	NR	PA II	Pat-table	Load cell	No

272 Abbreviations: Chiro: chiropractor, Clin: clinician, FD: flexion-distraction, Grad: graduation, L: lumbar, Mixed: experience of clinicians both > and < 5 years, MP: most painful
273 level, (n): number of participants, NR: not reported, PA: posterior-anterior, Pat: patient, Physio: physiotherapist, Stud: students, SMob: spinal mobilization, y: years, >: greater
274 than, <: less than.

275
276 Table 6: Summary of studies reporting on the biomechanical parameters of spinal mobilization (SMob) delivered to non-humans (i.e. instrumented tools) with
277 no region specified (n=2).

Author/s Year, Country	SMob delivery Profession (n)	Experience	Recipient/s (n)	Location/s	Technique/s Grade/s	Interface/s	Equipment	Metrological data
Non-humans								
Simmonds et al 1995, Canada ²⁷	Clin Physio (10)	>5y	Instrumented tool (1)	NA	PA I-V	In tool	Pinch-grip analyser	No
Petty & Messenger 1996, England ²⁴	Clin Physio (1)	NR	Instrumented tool (1)	NA	PA NR	Clin-tool Clin-ground	Pinch-grip analyser Force platform	No

278 Abbreviations: Clin: clinician, (n): number of participants, NA: not applicable, NR: not reported, PA: posterior-anterior, Physio: physiotherapist, SMob: spinal mobilization, y:
279 years, >: greater than.

280

281

DISCUSSION

282 This scoping review comprehensively synthesizes the existing evidence describing biomechanical
283 parameters during the delivery of manually applied SMob, underscoring the substantial variability
284 observed in these parameters. This finding is consistent with the results of two previous reviews
285 reporting on SMob peak forces delivered in a PA direction (22,36), despite the current study having a
286 larger scope of reporting (i.e. duration, frequency and force amplitude in addition to peak forces). The
287 observed heterogeneity in the reported biomechanical parameters of SMob is likely attributable to
288 several factors, such as differences in the: i) 'technique' used (e.g. PA vs oscillatory distractive
289 techniques); ii) measurement equipment used (e.g. force plate vs. pressure pad); iii) location of
290 biomechanical parameter measurement (e.g. clinician-patient vs. patient-table); iv)
291 individuals/equipment to which SMob was applied (e.g. body mass index (BMI), equipment materials);
292 and v) individuals who delivered SMob (e.g. experience). However, without detailed descriptions of
293 each of these domains, it is not possible to know if the identified biomechanical parameter variability
294 is related to methodological and/or reporting differences, inherent differences in SMob application or,
295 some other factor (41). Additionally, with the continued increase in the reporting on SMob
296 biomechanical parameter data, it is imperative that detailed descriptions are reported in manuscripts to
297 allow readers the opportunity to assess for themselves possible reasons for differences in the data.

298

Detailed reporting of the intervention is necessary

300 It is unknown if meaningful clinical differences between different types of SMob 'technique' (e.g. PA
301 vs. oscillatory distraction) and/or grades of SMob exist (35). To assess this in future studies, there should
302 be a detailed description of the applied SMob, including an explicit explanation of how the grade of
303 SMob was defined. In the current review, detailed descriptions of SMob were not consistently provided.
304 Specifically, there was large variation in the detail of SMob reporting and in many studies, replication
305 of the intervention would be impossible based on the (lack of) details provided. Despite the existence
306 of established reporting guidelines for health-related interventions (41), this lack of detail is not unique
307 to SMob, existing also for interventions including SM (SM manuscript under peer-review) and dry

308 needling (48). It is recommended that a specific guideline for the standardized reporting of SMob,
309 similar to that for the standardized reporting of SM (49), is developed to improve the reporting of SMob
310 interventions. Indeed the (development and) use of such a guideline would go some way to improving
311 the generally poor level of manual therapy trials reporting (50).

312

313 **Factors possibly responsible for reported heterogeneity of SMob biomechanical parameters**

314 It is not yet fully understood why forces measured at the clinician-patient and patient-table interfaces
315 differ (42,43). However, as differences do exist, it is important for authors to report where and how
316 biomechanical parameters were measured as results from studies measuring forces at different
317 interfaces are not directly comparable. Furthermore, the terminology used should enable replication of
318 study methodologies in future investigations and would be facilitated by the detailed reporting of
319 biomechanical parameter definitions and calculations (e.g. was the peak force measured directly by the
320 equipment or, was it mathematically estimated?). Without such details, it is impossible to compare
321 biomechanical parameters between studies. Furthermore, it has been reported that demographics (e.g.
322 sex, height and BMI) influence the application of manual therapy treatments (i.e. SMob and SM) (44–
323 47). Specifically, these interventions are delivered more forcefully to males with a higher BMI. In
324 summary, the interface of measurement, equipment used, terminology and SMob recipients should be
325 systematically reported in detail to allow for both replication in future studies and reader judgement of
326 the clinical relevance of reported results.

327

328 **Do biomechanical parameters matter clinically?**

329 It has been reported that biomechanical parameters of SMob (e.g. peak force and force amplitude) differ
330 between students and experienced clinicians (45). Specifically, students apply less force, more slowly.
331 Similar differences are also reported in the SM literature (51), further suggesting that the detailed
332 reporting of the clinical experience of the individual delivering the intervention is necessary.
333 Furthermore, Gorgos and colleagues reported on the reliability of inter-clinician and intra-clinician
334 forces applied during joint mobilisation in a systematic review (52). The authors concluded that while

335 there is variability in the application of force between different clinicians, individual clinicians apply
336 forces consistently. Despite such between-clinician differences in SMob force application, the literature
337 shows that recipients experience beneficial clinical outcomes from various forms of manual therapy
338 (including SMob) despite considerable differences in the biomechanical parameters of the applied
339 interventions (e.g. low velocity, variable amplitude SMob vs. high velocity, low amplitude SM)
340 (35,53,54). Additionally, some authors suggest that there is a threshold of 'dosage' (in terms of
341 biomechanical parameters such as force and/or rate of force application), rather than an optimal
342 intervention approach (i.e. SMob vs SM), required to elicit beneficial clinical outcomes (55,56).
343 However, to our best knowledge, this subject has not been systematically investigated and no reference
344 standards (i.e. ranges of biomechanical parameters) for SMob application have been published (52).
345 Furthermore, the lack of detailed description of biomechanical parameters limits the generalizability of
346 results reported by both individual studies, and their subsequent syntheses, to clinical practice as it
347 remains unclear exactly what 'dosage' was applied (48). By exhaustively collating the existing literature,
348 the current review provides a first step towards the development of such reference standards. However,
349 the systematic biomechanical quantification of SMob is required to first establish if 'dosage' is related
350 to physiological responses (e.g. changes in the autonomic and somatic nervous systems) and/or clinical
351 outcomes (e.g. hypoalgesia).

352 **Strengths and limitations:**

353 This review is the first to synthesise SMob biomechanical parameter data beyond peak force (including
354 also duration, frequency and force amplitude) and includes 21 additional studies since the publication
355 of the most recent 2006 review (22). The review was conducted by an international and interprofessional
356 team and reported according to the (PRISMA-ScR) statement (37). The study provides a first step
357 towards the systematic and detailed reporting of SMob interventions, which is necessary to investigate
358 the relationship between the application of SMob and its' observed clinical outcomes.

359

360 It is possible that there was unintentional exclusion of studies reporting on the parameters of interest.
361 However, it is unlikely that seminal studies were excluded for several reasons: i) a comprehensive

362 search strategy was developed by an international, interprofessional team with relevant methodological
363 and clinical expertise with the assistance of an experienced medical sciences librarian; ii) the search
364 strategy was piloted and refined prior to being used; and iii) the review was conducted in a systematic
365 fashion (i.e. using groups of two independent reviewers and data extractors). While it was intended that
366 only original quantitative research data from studies utilizing SMob would be reported, it was not
367 always clear as to whether reported data were previously published in part or fully. However, in
368 instances where this was unclear, the decision was made to include the data. This decision ensured that
369 the current review reported exhaustively on all studies reporting biomechanical parameters of SMob. It
370 is recommended that secondary analyses of data are transparently reported as such (57,58), with citation
371 of the original publication, allowing readers to identify that the data has been previously published and
372 to interpret for themselves the impact of the re-reported data.

373

374

CONCLUSION

375 This study has, as a first step, synthesised the current state of manually applied SMob biomechanical
376 parameter reporting. Most studies reported on SMob delivered to human lumbar or cervical spines, with
377 peak force the most commonly reported parameter. Other reported parameters included duration,
378 frequency and force amplitude. These findings highlight that considerable variability exists in the
379 literature regarding SMob biomechanical parameters. Future studies should focus on the detailed
380 reporting of biomechanical parameters which may facilitate the systematic investigation of dose-
381 response effects clinically and the future development of reference standards (e.g. ranges of forces) for
382 optimal intervention delivery.

383

384

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

385

386 The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. XX (The University of XX) for her assistance with the
387 literature search.

388

389

REFERENCES

- 390 1. Hoy DG, Protani M, De R, Buchbinder R. The epidemiology of neck pain. *Best Pract Res Clin*
391 *Rheumatol.* 2010 Dec;24(6):783–92.
- 392 2. Hoy D, Bain C, Williams G, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, et al. A systematic review of the global
393 prevalence of low back pain. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2012 Jun;64(6):2028–37.
- 394 3. Meucci RD, Fassa AG, Faria NMX. Prevalence of chronic low back pain: systematic review. *Rev*
395 *Saúde Pública.* 2015;49.
- 396 4. Kazeminasab S, Nejadghaderi SA, Amiri P, Pourfathi H, Araj-Khodaei M, Sullman MJM, et al.
397 Neck pain: global epidemiology, trends and risk factors. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2022 Jan
398 3;23(1):26.
- 399 5. Safiri S, Kolahi AA, Cross M, Hill C, Smith E, Carson-Chahhoud K, et al. Prevalence, Deaths, and
400 Disability-Adjusted Life Years Due to Musculoskeletal Disorders for 195 Countries and Territories
401 1990–2017. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2021 Apr 1;73(4):702–14.
- 402 6. Froud R, Patterson S, Eldridge S, Seale C, Pincus T, Rajendran D, et al. A systematic review and
403 meta-synthesis of the impact of low back pain on people’s lives. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2014
404 Feb 21;15(1):50.
- 405 7. Safiri S, Kolahi AA, Hoy D, Buchbinder R, Mansournia MA, Bettampadi D, et al. Global, regional,
406 and national burden of neck pain in the general population, 1990-2017: systematic analysis of the
407 Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *BMJ.* 2020 Mar 26;368:m791.
- 408 8. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi M, Abbasifard M, et al. Global burden of 369
409 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the
410 Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet.* 2020 Oct 17;396(10258):1204–22.

- 411 9. Dieleman JL, Cao J, Chapin A, Chen C, Li Z, Liu A, et al. US Health Care Spending by Payer and
412 Health Condition, 1996-2016. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 3;323(9):863–84.
- 413 10. Chen N, Fong DYT, Wong JYH. Health and Economic Outcomes Associated With
414 Musculoskeletal Disorders Attributable to High Body Mass Index in 192 Countries and Territories
415 in 2019. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023 Jan 20;6(1):e2250674–e2250674.
- 416 11. Power JD, Perruccio AV, Paterson JM, Canizares M, Veillette C, Coyte PC, et al. Healthcare
417 Utilization and Costs for Musculoskeletal Disorders in Ontario, Canada. *J Rheumatol*. 2022
418 Jul;49(7):740–7.
- 419 12. Corp N, Mansell G, Stynes S, Wynne-Jones G, Morsø L, Hill JC, et al. Evidence-based treatment
420 recommendations for neck and low back pain across Europe: A systematic review of guidelines.
421 *Eur J Pain*. 2021 Feb 1;25(2):275–95.
- 422 13. Risetti M, Gambugini R, Testa M, Battista S. Management of non-specific thoracic spine pain: a
423 cross-sectional study among physiotherapists. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2023 May
424 19;24(1):398.
- 425 14. Beliveau PJH, Wong JJ, Sutton DA, Simon NB, Bussièrès AE, Mior SA, et al. The chiropractic
426 profession: a scoping review of utilization rates, reasons for seeking care, patient profiles, and care
427 provided. *Chiropr Man Ther*. 2017 Nov 22;25(35).
- 428 15. Babatunde OO, Jordan JL, Van der Windt DA, Hill JC, Foster NE, Protheroe J. Effective treatment
429 options for musculoskeletal pain in primary care: A systematic overview of current evidence. *PloS*
430 *One*. 2017;12(6):e0178621.
- 431 16. Lin I, Wiles L, Waller R, Goucke R, Nagree Y, Gibberd M, et al. What does best practice care for
432 musculoskeletal pain look like? Eleven consistent recommendations from high-quality clinical
433 practice guidelines: systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020 Jan 1;54(2):79.

- 434 17. Foster NE, Hartvigsen J, Croft PR. Taking responsibility for the early assessment and treatment of
435 patients with musculoskeletal pain: a review and critical analysis. *Arthritis Res Ther*. 2012 Feb
436 29;14(1):205.
- 437 18. George SZ, Fritz JM, Silfies SP, Schneider MJ, Beneciuk JM, Lentz TA, et al. Interventions for the
438 Management of Acute and Chronic Low Back Pain: Revision 2021. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*.
439 2021 Nov 1;51(11):CPG1–60.
- 440 19. Blanpied PR, Gross AR, Elliott JM, Devaney LL, Clewley D, Walton DM, et al. Neck Pain:
441 Revision 2017. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2017 Jul 1;47(7):A1–83.
- 442 20. Bussieres AE, Stewart G, Al-Zoubi F, Decina P, Descarreaux M, Haskett D, et al. Spinal
443 Manipulative Therapy and Other Conservative Treatments for Low Back Pain: A Guideline From
444 the Canadian Chiropractic Guideline Initiative. *J Manip Physiol Ther*. 2018 Mar 29;
- 445 21. Bussieres AE, Stewart G, Al-Zoubi F, Decina P, Descarreaux M, Hayden J, et al. The treatment of
446 neck pain-associated disorders and whiplash-associated disorders: a clinical practice guideline. *J*
447 *Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2016 Oct;39(8):523–64.
- 448 22. Snodgrass SJ, Rivett DA, Robertson VJ. Manual Forces Applied During Posterior-to-Anterior
449 Spinal Mobilization: A Review of the Evidence. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2006
450 May;29(4):316–29.
- 451 23. Maitland, GD. *Vertebral manipulation*. 5th ed. London: Butterworth; 1986.
- 452 24. Maitland, GD. *Maitland's vertebral manipulation*. 6th ed. Oxford, England: Butterworth-
453 Heinemann; 2001.
- 454 25. Hegedus EJ, Goode A, Butler RJ, Slaven E. The neurophysiological effects of a single session of
455 spinal joint mobilization: does the effect last? *J Man Manip Ther*. 2011 Aug;19(3):143–51.

- 456 26. Sterling M, Jull G, Wright A. Cervical mobilisation: concurrent effects on pain, sympathetic
457 nervous system activity and motor activity. *Man Ther.* 2001 May;6(2):72–81.
- 458 27. Ali MN, Sethi K, Noohu MM. Comparison of two mobilization techniques in management of
459 chronic non-specific low back pain. *J Bodyw Mov Ther.* 2019 Oct;23(4):918–23.
- 460 28. Schmid A, Brunner F, Wright A, Bachmann LM. Paradigm shift in manual therapy? Evidence for
461 a central nervous system component in the response to passive cervical joint mobilisation. *Man*
462 *Ther.* 2008 Oct;13(5):387–96.
- 463 29. Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Price DD, Robinson ME, George SZ. The mechanisms of manual therapy
464 in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain: a comprehensive model. *Man Ther.* 2009;14(5):531–8.
- 465 30. Alonso-Perez JL, Lopez-Lopez A, La Touche R, Lerma-Lara S, Suarez E, Rojas J, et al.
466 Hypoalgesic effects of three different manual therapy techniques on cervical spine and
467 psychological interaction: A randomized clinical trial. *J Bodyw Mov Ther.* 2017;21(4):798–803.
- 468 31. Hidalgo B, Pitance L, Hall T, Detrembleur C, Nielens H. Short-term effects of Mulligan
469 mobilization with movement on pain, disability, and kinematic spinal movements in patients with
470 nonspecific low back pain: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.*
471 2015 Aug;38(6):365–74.
- 472 32. Pasquier M, Daneau C, Marchand AA, Lardon A, Descarreaux M. Spinal manipulation frequency
473 and dosage effects on clinical and physiological outcomes: a scoping review. *Chiropr Man Ther.*
474 2019 May 22;27(1):23.
- 475 33. Matesanz-García L, Schmid AB, Cáceres-Pajuelo JE, Cuenca-Martínez F, Arribas-Romano A,
476 González-Zamorano Y, et al. Effect of Physiotherapeutic Interventions on Biomarkers of
477 Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review of Preclinical Literature. *J Pain.* 2022 Nov;23(11):1833–
478 55.


- 479 34. Lascurain-Aguirrebeña I, Newham D, Critchley DJ. Mechanism of Action of Spinal Mobilizations:
480 A Systematic Review. *Spine*. 2016 Jan;41(2):159–72.
- 481 35. Aoyagi K, Heller D, Hazlewood D, Sharma N, dos Santos M. Is spinal mobilization effective for
482 low back pain?: A systematic review. *Complement Ther Clin Pract*. 2019;34:51–63.
- 483 36. Bjornsdottir SV, Kumar S. Posteroanterior spinal mobilization: state of the art review and
484 discussion. *Disabil Rehabil*. 1997 Feb;19(2):39–46.
- 485 37. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for
486 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018 Oct
487 2;169(7):467–73.
- 488 38. Cooke A, Smith D, Booth A. Beyond PICO: the SPIDER tool for qualitative evidence synthesis.
489 *Qual Health Res*. 2012 Oct;22(10):1435–43.
- 490 39. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for
491 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016 Dec 5;5(1):210.
- 492 40. Mercier MA, Rousseau P, Funabashi M, Descarreaux M, Pagé I. Devices Used to Measure Force-
493 Time Characteristics of Spinal Manipulations and Mobilizations: A Mixed-Methods Scoping
494 Review on Metrologic Properties and Factors Influencing Use. *Front Pain Res [Internet]*. 2021;2.
495 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpain.2021.755877>
- 496 41. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of
497 interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide.
498 *BMJ*. 2014 Mar 7;348:g1687.
- 499 42. Mikhail J, Funabashi M, Descarreaux M, Page I. Assessing forces during spinal manipulation and
500 mobilization: factors influencing the difference between forces at the patient-table and clinician-
501 patient interfaces. *Chiropr Man Ther*. 11 10;28(1):57.

- 502 43. Kirstukas SJ, Backman JA. Physician-applied contact pressure and table force response during
503 unilateral thoracic manipulation. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 1999 Jun;22(5):269–79.
- 504 44. Passmore SR, Malone Q, MacNeil B, Sanli E, Gonzalez D. Differing Characteristics of Human-
505 Shaped Visual Stimuli Affect Clinicians’ Dosage of a Spinal Manipulative Thrust on a Low-
506 Fidelity Model: A Cross-Sectional Study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 2022 Mar;45(3):171–8.
- 507 45. Snodgrass SJ, Rivett DA, Robertson VJ, Stojanovski E. A comparison of cervical spine
508 mobilization forces applied by experienced and novice physiotherapists. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.*
509 2010 Jul;40(7):392–401.
- 510 46. Harms MC, Innes SM, Bader DL. Forces measured during spinal manipulative procedures in two
511 age groups. *Rheumatology.* 1999 Mar;38(3):267–74.
- 512 47. Chiradejnant A, Latimer J, Maher CG. Forces applied during manual therapy to patients with low
513 back pain. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 2002 Jul;25(6):362–9.
- 514 48. Kearns GA, Brismée JM, Riley SP, Wang-Price S, Denninger T, Vugrin M. Lack of standardization
515 in dry needling dosage and adverse event documentation limits outcome and safety reports: a
516 scoping review of randomized clinical trials. *J Man Manip Ther.* 2023 Apr;31(2):72–83.
- 517 49. Groeneweg R, Rubinstein SM, Oostendorp RAB, Ostelo RWJG, van Tulder MW. Guideline for
518 Reporting Interventions on Spinal Manipulative Therapy: Consensus on Interventions Reporting
519 Criteria List for Spinal Manipulative Therapy (CIRCLE SMT). *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.*
520 2017;40(2):61–70.
- 521 50. Alvarez G, Sola I, Sitja-Rabert M, Fort-Vanmeerhaeghe A, Gich I, Fernandez C, et al. A
522 methodological review revealed that reporting of trials in manual therapy has not improved over
523 time. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 5;121:32–44.
- 524 51. Descarreaux M, Dugas C, Raymond J, Normand MC. Kinetic analysis of expertise in spinal
525 manipulative therapy using an instrumented manikin. *J Chiropr Med.* 2005 Mar 1;4(2):53–60.

- 526 52. Gorgos KS, Wasylyk NT, Van Lunen BL, Hoch MC. Inter-clinician and intra-clinician reliability
527 of force application during joint mobilization: a systematic review. *Man Ther.* 2014 Apr;19(2):90–
528 6.
- 529 53. Coulter ID, Crawford C, Vernon H, Hurwitz EL, Khorsan R, Booth MS, et al. Manipulation and
530 Mobilization for Treating Chronic Nonspecific Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-
531 Analysis for an Appropriateness Panel. *Pain Physician.* 2019 Mar;22(2):E55–70.
- 532 54. Coulter ID, Crawford C, Hurwitz EL, Vernon H, Khorsan R, Suttrop Booth M, et al. Manipulation
533 and mobilization for treating chronic low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Spine*
534 *J Off J North Am Spine Soc.* 5;18(5):866–79.
- 535 55. Snodgrass SJ, Rivett DA, Sterling M, Vicenzino B. Dose optimization for spinal treatment
536 effectiveness: a randomized controlled trial investigating the effects of high and low mobilization
537 forces in patients with neck pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2014 Mar;44(3):141–52.
- 538 56. Gorrell LM, Beath K, Engel RM. Manual and instrument applied cervical manipulation for
539 mechanical neck pain: a randomized controlled trial. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 2016;39(5):319–
540 29.
- 541 57. Swart E, Schmitt J. STandardized Reporting Of Secondary data Analyses (STROSA) - Vorschlag
542 für ein Berichtsformat für Sekundärdatenanalysen. *Qualitätsmessung.* 2014 Jan 1;108(8):511–6.
- 543 58. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, the CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated
544 guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMC Med.* 2010 Mar 24;8(1):18.

545

Identification of studies via databases and registers



Figure