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The Royal Dutch Society for Physical Therapy (KNGF) issued a clinical practice guideline for physical therapists that addresses the assessment and treatment of patients with nonspecific neck pain, including cervical radiculopathy, in Dutch primary care. Recommendations were based on a review of published systematic reviews.

During the intake, the patient is screened for serious pathologies and corresponding patterns. Patients with cervical radiculopathy can be included or excluded through corresponding signs and symptoms and possibly diagnostic tests (Spurling test, traction/distraction test, and Upper Limb Tension Test). History taking is done to gather information about patients' limitations, course of pain, and prognostic factors (eg, coping style) and answers to health-related questions.

In case of a normal recovery (treatment profile A), management should be hands-off, and patients should receive advice from the physical therapist and possibly some simple exercises to supplement “acting as usual.”

In case of a delayed/deviant recovery (treatment profile B), the physical therapist is advised to use, in addition to the recommendations for treatment profile A, forms of mobilization and/or manipulation in combination with exercise therapy. Other interventions may also be considered. The physical therapist is advised not to use dry needling, low-level laser, electrotherapy, ultrasound, traction, and/or a cervical collar.

In case of a delayed/deviant recovery with clear and/or dominant psychosocial prognostic factors (treatment profile C), these factors should first be addressed by the physical therapist, when possible, or the patient should be referred to a specialist, when necessary.

In case of neck pain grade III (treatment profile D), the therapy resembles that for profile B, but the use of a cervical collar for pain reduction may be considered. The advice is to use it sparingly: only for a short period per day and only for a few weeks.
In 2012, the Global Burden of Disease Study stated that neck pain is globally the fourth largest physical complaint with regard to years lived with a disability.1 The estimated 1-year incidence of neck pain has been reported to vary from 10.4% to 21.3%.2 Data from 2003 for the Dutch population 25 years old or older showed that the neck is the third most common location for musculoskeletal complaints, after the lower back and the shoulder region.3 The total costs of spinal pain in the Netherlands in 2011 were 1.3 billion euros (1.5% of the total health care costs and 0.2% of the gross domestic product); 40% of these costs were thought to be related to neck pain, and 29% of the total costs were related to primary care, of which physical therapy is a part.4

Background

Definition of Neck Pain and Scope of the Guideline

Neck pain is described as “an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with actual or potential tissue damage” in the neck region, which starts at the superior nuchal line and continues down to the level of the scapular spine.5 Neck pain includes whiplash-associated disorder, cervicogenic headache, and cervical radicular syndrome. Neck pain has been divided into 4 grades by the Neck Pain Task Force (NPTF) (Tab. 1).6 The neck pain guideline covers neck pain grades I to III. Grades I and II include 2 specific subgroups: trauma-related neck pain (previously known as whiplash or whiplash-associated disorder) and work-related neck pain (based on a patient’s statement on the cause or onset of pain).7,8

Clinical Course and Prognosis

In a general population, 50% to 85% of patients with neck pain will report neck pain 1 to 5 years later.9 A Dutch cohort study of patients with neck pain in primary care found that after 1 year, 76% of the patients stated that they were fully recovered or much improved, although 47% reported that they still had some neck pain.10 In about 45% of patients with acute neck pain, the pain and disability decreased in the first 6 weeks, but no further decrease occurred afterward (Figs. 1 and 2).11 Neck pain in the working population seems to be quite persistent and takes a recurrent course; 60% to 80% of workers with neck pain will report neck pain 1 year later.12 In the population with trauma-related neck pain, an improvement in pain and disability mainly occurs within the first 3 months following the accident.13 A systematic review found recovery rates ranging from 16% to 99%.14 Approximately 50% of people with neck pain continue to experience some degree of neck pain 6 to 12 months following an accident.15,16

Prognosis is important in the process of clinical decision making. When the prognosis for a patient is favorable, the intervention may be limited to education and advice; however, a patient with a poor prognosis may need an in-depth evaluation followed by a specific therapy or intervention.15

Method of Guideline Development

The guideline committee was formed in September 2013. The guideline committee consisted of neck pain experts, physical therapists, and epidemiologists. Members were chosen for their expertise on the subject and their experience in previously published guideline development committees. The first author was responsible for collecting the data and drafting the guideline. The other authors were responsible for verifying the statements made in the CPG. The CPG was developed according to the method used for physical therapy guidelines previously issued by the KNFG.20 The method consisted of 5 phases: preparation, development, validation, implementation, and evaluation and update. This article focuses on phases 1 to 3. The AGREE II instrument was used to assist in development.22

We searched for studies on the prognosis for patients with neck pain, accuracy of diagnostic tests, and effectiveness of therapeutic interventions within the domains of physical therapy and manual therapy.21,23–25 These interventions have all been described by the KNFG and are (in alphabetical order) cervical collar, cognitive behavioral treatment, dry needling, education, electrotherapy, exercise, joint mobilization, kinesiology tape, low-level laser therapy, manipulation, massage, neurodynamics, pillow, thermal agents, traction, shock wave, and workplace interventions.25

Best evidence was sought from recent systematic reviews, randomized controlled trials, and prospective observational studies.20 We used recent documents from the NPTF6-9,12,15,26–35 and the International Collaboration on Neck Pain13,16–18,36; recently published guidelines, such as the guideline from the Canadian Chiropractic Association and...


Table 1. Neck Pain Task Force Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Neck pain and associated disorders with no signs or symptoms suggestive of major structural pathology and no or minor interference with activities of daily living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>No signs or symptoms of major structural pathology but major interference with activities of daily living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>No signs or symptoms of major structural pathology but presence of neurologic signs, such as decreased deep tendon reflexes, weakness, or sensory deficits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Signs or symptoms of major structural pathology; major structural pathologies include (but are not limited to) fracture, vertebral dislocation, injury to the spinal cord, infection, neoplasm, or systemic disease, including inflammatory arthropathies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The authors appraised all included articles for quality. Articles were assessed using generally accepted and appropriate tools, such as QUADAS for diagnostic tests and PEDro for randomized controlled trials. All intervention studies were assessed as having high, unclear, or low risk of bias and subsequently appraised for quality using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation system. The levels of evidence are presented in Table 2.

Evidence based on randomized controlled trials begins as high-quality evidence, but confidence in the evidence may be decreased for several reasons, including:

- Study limitations (studies have a high risk of bias)
- Inconsistency of results (studies show clinical or statistical heterogeneity)
- Indirectness of evidence (the study population differs from the target population of the guideline)
- Imprecision (too few studies or included patients, eg, < 300 patients or events)

- Reporting bias, publication bias, or a fatal flaw

Once evidence was graded, it was translated into recommendations for clinicians. When the clinical experience of the guideline committee had a role in the recommendations, this is explicitly stated. Cost-effectiveness did not influence the recommendations, and none of the guideline committee members had any conflict of interest besides working partly in primary care. The recommendations were formulated to reflect the evidence. For example, the term “is recommended” was used when evidence indicated that the intervention was effective, and the term “is not recommended” was used when evidence indicated that the intervention was not effective. In the case of weak or unclear evidence, the term “may consider” or “may be considered” was used. When possible, the recommendations were stated separately for patients with trauma-related neck pain, work-related neck pain, or neck pain grade III. Table 3 contains a summary of the recommendations.

External Review by Stakeholders

After the first draft was finalized, the board of directors of the KNGF gave feedback on the guideline. This feedback did not result in any changes in the recommendations in the guideline.

The guideline then underwent an external review by stakeholders. These organizations were the Dutch Patients and Clients Federation, the Dutch Association of Manual Therapists, the Dutch General Practitioners Association, the Dutch Society for Psychosomatic Physical Therapy, the Dutch Association for Occupational Physical Therapists, the Dutch Association of Orthopedic Surgeons, the Dutch Association of Rehabilitation Physicians, the Dutch Association of Anesthesiology, and the Association of Dutch Healthcare Insurers.

Next, the KNGF issued a work field analysis, which was performed by 93 physical therapists, to review their opinion of the guideline and its feasibility through a written feedback form. A second method was used to measure the care provided by 20 physical therapists though performance indicators before and after they attended a presentation about the guideline. A focus group meeting with the latter group was held to evaluate the results and experiences. Revisions were made to the document on the basis of the feedback.

The comments from the work field analysis and an update of the search resulted in the final guideline. The guideline and the supporting documents have been published in Dutch at www.fysionet-evidencebased.nl and are accessible for members and nonmembers of the KNGF.

Results

In the Netherlands, a patient with neck pain can be referred to a physical therapist by a general practitioner or a medical specialist. The patient can also consult a physical therapist without a referral; this is called direct access to physical therapist services. The guideline was constructed according to the different phases of the physical therapist assessment: intake, physical examination, analysis, treatment, and evaluation of treatment.

Intake

During the first consultation, the patient will undergo a screening procedure to assess whether physical therapist treatment is indicated. The physical therapist first evaluates complaints and symptoms and checks for any red flags. Red flags are patterns of signs or symptoms (warning signs) that may indicate...
serious pathology requiring further medical diagnostics. Red flags (Tab. 4) may indicate a specific pathology, such as neck pain grade IV.

The physical therapist analyzes, within the clinical reasoning process, whether the red flags are consistent with the patient's complaints on the basis of age, sex, incidence and prevalence, information on onset of complaints, and signs and symptoms. If red flags are present and not explicable by a known pattern of neck pain, then the patient must be referred to a general practitioner or return to his or her general practitioner. The evidence supporting the red flags for neck pain is weak and inconsistent because many red flags are rather generic (such as unexplained weight loss) and have high false positivity rates. If no red flags are present, then the diagnostic process continues with an intake.

Dutch physical therapists cannot refer patients for diagnostic imaging; this task is reserved for general practitioners or medical specialists. The use of diagnostic imaging to rule in or rule out a specific serious pathology (grade IV) has low to moderate reliability. A remarkable situation in diagnostic imaging is the relatively high proportion of positive findings in people who are healthy. A negative Upper Limb Tension Test for the nervus medianus, the Spurling test (a combination of side bending and extension of the cervical spine), and the traction/distraction test.63 A negative Upper Limb Tension Test result is considered to be valid as a highly sensitive test (sensitivity range = 0.72–0.97; specificity range = 0.11–0.35) for ruling out cervical radiculopathy.63,64 The Spurling test (sensitivity range = 0.90–1.00; specificity range = 0.94–1.00) and the traction/distraction test (sensitivity = 0.44; specificity range = 0.90–0.97) are considered to be valid as specific tests for ruling in cervical radiculopathy.63-65

Other clinical tests are not recommended in the physical examination of the neck because they vary and are not very standardized. That is why their accuracy is quite variable and overall insufficient.64 This does not mean that physical examination should not take place. In the clinical reasoning process, the physical examination aims to further refine the diagnostic hypothesis on the basis of the findings from the intake—for example, to rule in or rule out a certain hypothesis. Furthermore, it also aims to quantify the level of physical functional limitations and to assess secondary factors that could negatively influence the recovery process. Common forms of physical examination are inspection at rest, inspection during movement, and assessment of physical functions such as joint function, muscle control, and movement patterns. In an evaluation of the validity of physical examination or provocation tests, the reliability of the procedure is also an issue. Studies evaluating the reliability of physical examination of the neck often find low to moderate reliability (kappa = 42%-82%).66,67

Analysis

When the physical therapist finds no reason to suspect neck pain grade IV during the intake, he or she will have to differentiate among neck pain grades I, II, and III. When neurologic signs, such as numbness, paresthesia, and muscle weakness, are found during the intake and the physical examination, the patient likely has neck pain grade III (radiculopathy). In this case, the physical

The initial aim in the diagnostic process is to identify the patient's problems by formulating an initial hypothesis about the diagnosis and further refining this hypothesis (clinical reasoning). During history taking, the physical therapist gathers information about the patient's deficits in body structure and functions, limitations in daily activity, and restrictions of participation. Also, it is important to gather information about the patient's environmental and personal factors that can lead to chronicity. It is known that certain psychosocial factors can negatively influence neck pain.

During the diagnostic process, the physical therapist helps the patient to structure treatment goals and health management strategies on the basis of clinical data, the patient's preferences, and professional knowledge and judgment. The physical therapist tries to quantify the information from the intake, when necessary, with measurement instruments, if available. The physical therapist is advised to use the numeric pain rating scale69-76 to quantify pain and the Patient-Specific Functional Scale69,71 to quantify limitations in activity.

During the intake, it is important to identify possible neck pain grade III because the approach and policy are different from those for neck pain grades I and II. Possible neck pain grade III will be accompanied by certain signs and symptoms in addition to the pain66; sensory symptoms in the arm, such as paresthesia and numbness; sensory changes; cervical range of motion described as limited and painful; and motor disturbances, such as upper limb weakness and/or muscle atrophy.

**Physical Examination**

Differentiating between neck pain grades I and II and neck pain grade III can be done during the physical examination, when specific provocation or reduction tests can be used. Research has shown that the following tests are the most valid: the Upper

---

**Figure 1.**

Time course of pain.

**Figure 2.**

Time course of disability.
The physical therapist uses the information from history taking to analyze the pain severity, limitations in activity, and restriction of participation. On the basis of the data collected, the patient’s health problem can be analyzed. When the physical therapist assumes that the patient will have delayed recovery, he or she should look for any factors that may explain the persistent nature of the neck pain episode. The physical therapist should assess whether the prognostic factors found during history taking can be influenced and/or whether therapy can be given according to the guideline. The use of questionnaires to quantify psychosocial prognostic factors may be considered.66–71

On the basis of the history taking and the findings of the physical examination, the physical therapist assigns a treatment profile to the patient. The guideline committee recommends the use of the following treatment profiles: profile A, neck pain grade I/II, normal course; profile B, neck pain grade I/II, delayed course without dominant psychosocial influence; profile C, neck pain grade I/II, delayed course with dominant psychosocial influence; profile D, neck pain grade III.

**Table 2. Quality of Evidence and Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Level</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Any estimate of effect is very uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For treatment profile B, the physical therapist's goals are to guide the patient to a quick return to normal daily activity and to prevent chronicity. The following treatments have, on average, a moderate level of evidence showing a positive effect, in contrast to a placebo or other treatments, and are therefore recommended: mobilization,72–74 manipulation,72–74 and exercise therapy.75 The recommended intervention is a combination of these.76 There is a very low level of evidence that information and education for patients with neck pain is effective, but in the opinion of the guideline committee, it is an essential part of therapy.18,50

A physical therapist may consider the following treatments for a patient with neck pain, preferably in addition to the recommended treatment: cognitive behavioral treatment/graded activity,77 cervical collar for patients with neck pain grade III,18,50 massage,45 neurodynamics or neural tissue management,41 pillow,18 kinesiology tape,78–80 thermal agents,36 and workplace interventions.81 The level of evidence for these treatments is low or very low. These treatments have small effects, in contrast to other treatments or placebo. The studies reporting on these treatments were of low quality, showed small effect sizes, or showed conflicting evidence.

The level of evidence for the following treatments is low or very low: dry needling,82–84 low-level laser,36,85,86 electrotherapy,36,48,87 ultrasound,36,42,87 traction,47 and cervical collar for neck pain grades I and II.18,50 These treatments have no effects, in contrast to other treatments or placebo. These treatments are not recommended for patients with neck pain. Studies on these interventions did not show any additional benefit over that of a placebo or another intervention.

For treatment profile C, the therapy corresponds to that for profile B. The difference is the dominant psychosocial influence (psychosocial prognostic factors). Because these factors are regarded as being “responsible” for the delayed course of the neck pain, they should be addressed prior to (or simultaneously with) the application of other interventions. A physical therapist may consider addressing these factors, when possible, or may refer a patient to a specialist, when necessary.

For treatment profile D, the therapy resembles that for profile B but differs in the use of the cervical collar. Such a collar may be considered for pain reduction in this patient population but only when used sparsely, for a short period per day for a few weeks.

**Evaluation of Treatment**

The treatment is ended as soon as the agreed-upon treatment goals have been achieved. Even if the goals have not been achieved, the treatment will have to be concluded at some stage. For instance, it is not useful to continue the treatment if no progress has been made after 6 weeks because the chances of achieving progress after this period are small. This scenario must be discussed explicitly with the patient before the final treatment session; the discussion should address whether the patient will be referred to a general practitioner.

The effectiveness of the treatment must be evaluated during the course of the treatment and at the final session. Besides an evaluation of the patient’s goals, the use of the following measurement instruments at intake is recommended: the numeric pain rating scale for pain; the Patient-Specific Functional Scale for patient-specific complaints; and other instruments used during the intake, provided that these are suitable for evaluation. Both the numeric pain rating scale and the Patient-Specific Functional Scale have a minimal clinically important change of 2 points. This

therapist is advised to consult the patient’s general practitioner to report the findings and discuss the treatment options.
Table 3.
Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation and Quality of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Classification | It is recommended that clinicians classify patients as:  
Grade I: neck pain and associated disorders with no signs or symptoms suggestive of major structural pathology and no or minor interference with activities of daily living  
Grade II: no signs or symptoms of major structural pathology but major interference with activities of daily living  
Grade III: no signs or symptoms of major structural pathology but presence of neurologic signs, such as decreased deep tendon reflexes, weakness, or sensory deficits  
Grade IV: signs or symptoms of major structural pathology; major structural pathologies include (but are not limited to) fracture, vertebral dislocation, injury to the spinal cord, infection, neoplasm, or systemic disease, including inflammatory arthropathies  
Recommendation based on expert opinion |
| Exclusion of neck pain grade IV | It is recommended that clinicians use red flags as a means to identify serious pathological conditions. Red flags are indicators for serious pathological conditions. These conditions include fracture, vertebral artery dissection, spinal cord injury, cervical myelopathy, infection, neoplasm, and systemic disease.  
Recommendation based on low quality of evidence |
| Inclusion or exclusion of neck pain grade III | It is recommended that clinicians use the Spurling test and the traction/distraction test to rule in neck pain grade III and the upper limb tension test to rule out neck pain grade III.  
Recommendation based on high quality of evidence |
| Course of the pain | It is recommended that clinicians determine the course of the neck pain. For normal recovery, neck pain should decrease in the first 3 wk and limitation in daily activity should decrease in the first 6 wk.  
Recommendation based on expert opinion |
| Subgrouping | It is recommended that clinicians subgroup all patients (grades I–IV), when applicable, as having trauma-related neck pain or work-related neck pain. These subgroups are known to have different prognostic factors that might influence their recovery.  
Recommendation based on high quality of evidence |
| Prognosis | It is recommended that clinicians identify factors that might influence a delayed recovery. These factors, when modifiable, should be addressed in the course of treatment.  
Recommendation based on expert opinion |
| Outcome measure | It is recommended that clinicians use the numeric pain rating scale and the Patient-Specific Functional Scale to quantify a patient’s baseline status relative to pain, function, and disability and to monitor a patient’s status throughout the course of treatment.  
Recommendation based on expert opinion |
| Treatment profile | On the basis of history taking and physical examination, a patient should be assigned a treatment profile: profile A, neck pain grade I/II, normal course; profile B, neck pain grade I/II, delayed course without dominant psychosocial influence; profile C, neck pain grade I/II, delayed course with dominant psychosocial influence; profile D, neck pain grade III.  
Recommendation based on expert opinion |
| Intervention: cervical mobilization or manipulation combined with exercise therapy | It is recommended that clinicians primarily apply cervical mobilization or manipulation combined with exercise therapy in patients with neck pain grade I or II.  
Recommendation based on high quality of evidence |
| Intervention: dry needling, low-level laser, electrotherapy, ultrasound, traction, and cervical collar | It is not recommended that clinicians use dry needling, low-level laser, electrotherapy, ultrasound, or traction for patients with neck pain grades I, II, and III and cervical collar for patients with neck pain grades I and II.  
Recommendation based on low quality of evidence |
| Intervention: other | Clinicians may consider the use of cognitive behavioral treatment/graded activity, massage, neurodynamics or neural tissue management, pillow, kinesiology tape, thermal agents, and workplace interventions for patients with neck pain grades I, II, and III and cervical collar for patients with neck pain grade III when the primarily advised treatments are ineffective or not sufficiently effective.  
Recommendation based on low quality of evidence |
cutoff is used to measure a patient’s improvement.59,88

Discussion

Limitations of the Guideline
The CPG is primarily based on systematic reviews performed by the Cochrane network, the International Collaboration on Neck Pain, and the NPTF; this choice was made because of limitations in time and funds. Other stakeholders, including patients, were invited after the first concept was finalized. To strengthen support, it would be better to include these stakeholders at an earlier stage. In this guideline, profile C was used when recovery was delayed on the basis of psychosocial factors. No evidence was available for this choice, and no evidence that addressing these psychosocial factors will lead to recovery from neck pain is available. The same can be said for addressing other prognostic factors.

The CPG is issued for Dutch physical therapist practice. This means that only interventions that are within the professional domain of Dutch physical therapists, as defined by the KNGF, are included. The validation process also took place only in the Netherlands. Both factors may influence the international generalizability of the guideline.

Similarities to and Differences From International Guidelines
A recently updated CPG on neck pain, issued by the Orthopedic Section of the American Physical Therapy Association (APTA), shows similarities concerning treatment advice but differs in the subgrouping of patients.89 Whereas we used grades I to IV, as advised by the NPTF, the APTA guideline uses the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems. The prognostic factors can be found in both guidelines. The APTA CPG recommends more tools to appraise these constructs. Also, the APTA CPG places more emphasis on clinical prediction rules, whereas the Dutch CPG does not address these at all because they are not regarded as valid enough to be recommended. Both guidelines address the same treatments: manual therapy, exercise, multimodal treatments, education, and physical agents (dry needling, laser, ultrasound, and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation). The Dutch CPG for physical therapists provides less direction on the form of manipulation, exercise, or other modalities and when to use each form. Among the differences in treatment recommendations are that dry needling and laser are not recommended in the Dutch CPG.

The Ontario Protocol for Traffic Injury Management (OPTIMA) published a guideline in 2016.89 This guideline focuses on the same grades of neck pain but limits the duration of neck pain to 6 months. In the recommendations of treatments, OPTIMA makes a distinction between 0 to 3 months and 3 to 6 months. The Dutch guideline does not make that distinction. The OPTIMA guideline also recommends the use of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs, electrotherapy, acupuncture, and botulin toxin injections. These treatments are not regarded as physical therapist treatments in the Netherlands. Two differences in recommended treatments are that laser is a treatment for consideration in the OPTIMA guideline, but the Dutch guideline advises against its use. Also, the use of a cervical collar may be considered in the Dutch guideline but not in the OPTIMA guideline.

This CPG is available in full (in Dutch) at www.fysionet-evidencebased.nl.
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Table 4.
Red Flags Per Possible Serious Pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Pathology</th>
<th>Corresponding Red Flags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fracture</td>
<td>Older age, history of trauma, corticosteroid use, osteoporosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebral artery dissection</td>
<td>Cerebrovascular symptoms or signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury to the spinal cord or cervical myelopathy</td>
<td>Neurologic symptoms, eg, widespread neurologic signs in both arms or in the leg(s), such as sensory deficits or loss of muscle strength in the limbs and bowel and bladder dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection (including urinary tract infection or skin infection)</td>
<td>Symptoms and signs of infection (eg, fever, night sweats), risk factors for infection (eg, underlying disease process, immunosuppression, penetrating wound, intravenous drug abuse, exposure to infectious diseases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoplasm</td>
<td>History of malignancy, failure to improve with 1 mo of treatment, unexplained weight loss, age of &gt; 50 y, dysphagia, headache, vomiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic disease (herpes zoster, ankylosing spondylitis, inflammatory arthritis, rheumatic arthritis)</td>
<td>Headache, fever, unilateral skin rash, burning pain, itching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Canadian Spine Society, the American Physical Therapy Association (APTA), shows similarities concerning treatment advice but differs in the subgrouping of patients. Whereas we used grades I to IV, as advised by the NPTF, the APTA guideline uses the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems. The prognostic factors can be found in both guidelines. The APTA CPG recommends more tools to appraise these constructs. Also, the APTA CPG places more emphasis on clinical prediction rules, whereas the Dutch CPG does not address these at all because they are not regarded as valid enough to be recommended. Both guidelines address the same treatments: manual therapy, exercise, multimodal treatments, education, and physical agents (dry needling, laser, ultrasound, and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation). The Dutch CPG for physical therapists provides less direction on the form of manipulation, exercise, or other modalities and when to use each form. Among the differences in treatment recommendations are that dry needling and laser are not recommended in the Dutch CPG.

The Ontario Protocol for Traffic Injury Management (OPTIMA) published a guideline in 2016. This guideline focuses on the same grades of neck pain but limits the duration of neck pain to 6 months. In the recommendations of treatments, OPTIMA makes a distinction between 0 to 3 months and 3 to 6 months. The Dutch guideline does not make that distinction. The OPTIMA guideline also recommends the use of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs, electrotherapy, acupuncture, and botulin toxin injections. These treatments are not regarded as physical therapist treatments in the Netherlands. Two differences in recommended treatments are that laser is a treatment for consideration in the OPTIMA guideline, but the Dutch guideline advises against its use. Also, the use of a cervical collar may be considered in the Dutch guideline but not in the OPTIMA guideline.

This CPG is available in full (in Dutch) at www.fysionet-evidencebased.nl.
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