#### D.1 Systemic pharmacotherapies

#### Overview of the PICO structure

#### **Definition of the intervention**

Systemic pharmacotherapies are medicines that act on the whole body or body systems that involve the entire body, such as the endocrine or/and cardiovascular systems. Systemic pharmacotherapies delivered for short-term and long-term treatment durations were considered.

Systemic pharmacotherapies with long- and short-term treatment duration included:

- Opioid analgesics and mixed agents: short term < 4 weeks, long term ≥ 4 weeks
- Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), including cyclo-oxygenase-2 [COX-2] inhibitors: short term < 12 weeks, long term</li>
   ≥ 12 weeks
- Serotonin norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor (SNRI) antidepressants: short term < 12 weeks, long term ≥ 12 weeks
- Tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs): short term < 12 weeks, long term ≥ 12 weeks
- Anticonvulsants: short term < 12 weeks, long term ≥ 12 weeks</li>
- Skeletal muscle relaxants (SMRs): short term < 12 weeks, long term ≥ 12 weeks
- Glucocorticoids (systemically administered, i.e. not including epidural steroids): no treatment duration restriction applied
- Acetaminophen/Paracetamol: short term < 12 weeks, long term ≥ 12 weeks
- Benzodiazepines: short term < 12 weeks, long term ≥ 12 weeks.</li>

#### **PICO** question

Population and subgroups	Community-dwelling adults (aged 20 years and over) experiencing chronic primary low back pain, with or without leg pain, including older people (aged 60 years and older).
	<ul> <li>Subgroups:         <ul> <li>Age (all adults and those aged 60 years and over)</li> <li>Gender and/or sex</li> </ul> </li> <li>Presence of leg pain (radicular, non-radicular, mixed)</li> <li>Race/ethnicity - studies of populations who were historically marginalized compared with studies of those who were not</li> <li>Regional economic development - studies carried out in high-income countries compared with studies in low- to middle-income countries</li> </ul>
Comparators	a) Placebo/sham b) No drug

<ul><li>Change in the use of medications</li><li>Falls</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>Pain</li> <li>Back-specific function/disability</li> <li>General function/disability</li> <li>Health-related quality of life</li> <li>Psychosocial function</li> <li>Social participation</li> <li>Change in the use of medications</li> <li>Adverse events (as reported in trials) Pain</li> <li>Back-specific function/disability</li> <li>General function/disability</li> <li>Health-related quality of life</li> <li>Psychosocial function</li> <li>Adverse events (as reported in trials)</li> <li>Change in the use of medications</li> </ul>

Other Evidence-to-Decision (EtD) considerations across all systemic pharmacotherapies

Summary of values and preferences		
All adults	Older people	

No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made	
based on experience of GDG members	# Review findings GRADE-CERQual Assessment of
	confidence
	6 Many participants experienced that medication was often the
	only thing that made a difference to the severity of their pain.
	However, they were apprehensive of, or dissatisfied with, medication
	for a number of reasons, often viewing it as a quick fix, temporary
	relief or that it just masked the pain. Many participants were
	apprehensive of taking too many medications, the side effects,
	addiction or did not like how the medications made them feel. Some
	avoided taking medication all together, did not fill their prescriptions
	or adjusted medication themselves because of this. MODERATE

Summary of resource considerations			
All adults	Older people		
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	# Review findings GRADE-CERQual Assessment of confidence 8 In rural Nigeria, participants considered medicines as a legitimate form of treatment (cultural norm that disease was treated and 'cured' with medication) and depended on them to be able to perform daily tasks. Other treatments were looked down on or stigmatized, such as exercise. Some participants took medication only to comply with this cultural norm. However, there was a constant struggle to be able to afford the drugs on which they depended to function normally. LOW		

Summary of equity and human rights considerations		
All adults	Older people	
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	No evidence identified	

Summary of acceptability considerations			
All adults	Older people		
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	# Review findings GRADE-CERQual Assessment of confidence 9 Many participants expressed fear of addiction to medication, especially to opioids. This led them to not fill prescriptions, to adjust the dosage or stop taking the medication often without consulting their health care provider. MODERATE 10 Some participants in rural Nigeria stated that when the locally produced drugs did not work (they felt that they were substandard or counterfeit), they believed they were fake or substandard. These participants believed that foreign imported drugs were stronger and could lead to a cure. LOW		

Summary of feasibility considerations		
All adults	Older people	
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	No evidence identified	

# Summary of judgements by agent

# D.1.1 Opioids

Domain	All adults	Older people
Benefits	Small; moderate	Small; moderate
Harms	Small; moderate; large	Small; moderate; large
Balance benefits to harms	Probably favours opioids; probably does not favour opioids; does not favour opioids	Probably favours opioids; probably does not favour opioids; does not favour opioids
Overall certainty	Moderate	Moderate
Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no
Feasibility	Yes	Yes

## D.1.2 NSAIDs

Benefits	Small; moderate	Small; moderate
Harms	Small; moderate	Small; moderate
Balance benefits to harms	Favours NSAIDs; probably favours NSAIDs	Favours NSAIDs; probably favours NSAIDs
Overall certainty	Moderate	Moderate
Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies

Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no
Feasibility	Yes	Yes

# D.1.3 SNRI antidepressants

Benefits	Small; trivial	Small; trivial
Harms	Small; moderate	Small; moderate
Balance benefits to harms	Probably favours SNRI antidepressants; probably does not favour SNRI antidepressants	Probably favours SNRI antidepressants; probably does not favour SNRI antidepressants
Overall certainty	Low	Low
Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no
Feasibility	Yes	Yes

# D.1.4 Tricyclic antidepressants

Benefits	Trivial; uncertain	Trivial; uncertain
Harms	Uncertain	Uncertain
Balance benefits to harms	Probably does not favour tricyclic antidepressants; does not favour tricyclic antidepressants	Probably does not favour tricyclic antidepressants; does not favour tricyclic antidepressants
Overall certainty	Very low	Very low

Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies				
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies				
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced				
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no				
Feasibility	Yes	Yes				

#### D.1.5 Anticonvulsants

Benefits	Trivial; uncertain; small	Trivial; uncertain					
Harms	Uncertain; moderate	Uncertain; moderate					
Balance benefits to harms	Does not favour anticonvulsants	Does not favour anticonvulsants					
Overall certainty	Very low	Very low					
Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies					
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies					
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced					
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no					
Feasibility	Yes	Yes					

## D.1.6 Skeletal muscle relaxants

Benefits	Small; trivial; uncertain	Small; trivial; uncertain		
Harms	Uncertain	Uncertain		
Balance benefits to harms	Uncertain	Uncertain		
Overall certainty	Low; very low	Low; very low		

Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies				
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies				
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced				
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no				
Feasibility	Yes	Yes				

#### D.1.7 Glucocorticoids

Benefits	Uncertain	Uncertain					
Harms	Uncertain	Uncertain					
Balance benefits to harms	Does not favour glucocorticoids; uncertain	Does not favour glucocorticoids; uncertain					
Overall certainty	Very low	Very low					
Values and preferences	No important uncertainty or variability; varies	No important uncertainty or variability; varies					
Resource considerations	Large costs; moderate costs; varies	Large costs; moderate costs; varies					
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced	No impact; probably reduced					
Acceptability	Yes; probably no	Yes; probably no					
Feasibility	Yes	Yes					

# D.1.8 Paracetamol (acetaminophen)

ETD process not completed since no trials were available.

## D.1.9 Benzodiazepines

ETD process not completed since no trials were available.

# $\underline{\text{GRADE Table 1}}. \textit{ Opioid analgesics (treatment duration} \geq 1 \textit{ month) for chronic primary low back pain at 1 to 6 months versus } \underline{\textit{placebo}}$

			Certainty assessm	nent				S	ummary of fin	dings	
							No. of pa	articipants	Е	Effect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	_
					All Adı	ults	•	·	<del>.</del>	·	<del>.</del>
Pain (mean dif	ference on 0	to 10 scale at 1 to 6	6 months)								
25	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	4416	3689	NA	MD -0.81 (-1.00 to -0.62)	Moderate
Population subg	group: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)°	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	NA	MD -0.3 (95% CI NR)	Very low
Pain (proportion	on with ≥30%	or at least modera	te improvement at 1	to 6 months)	'		'	<u>'</u>		<u>'</u>	
18	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1)e	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	3474	2964	RR 1.35 (1.22 to 1.52)	ARD 16% (11 to 21)	Moderate
Population subg	group: Preser	ce of radicular leg pa	ain				'		'		'
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)°	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2)d	None noted	32	33	RR 1.16 (0.58 to 2.30)	ARD 7.3% (-16 to 31)	Very low
Function (stan	dardized me	an difference at 1 to	6 months)		-	<u>'</u>	-		-		-
16	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1)f	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	2874	2592	NA	SMD -0.21 (-0.32 to -0.11)	Moderate

			Certainty assessn	nent				S	ummary of find	ings	
							No. of pa	articipants	E	fect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1) <sup>c</sup>	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	NA	SMD -0.29 (-0.82 to 0.23)	Very low
Function (prop	ortion with ≥	30% improvement	or Roland Morris Di	sability Question	nnaire (scale 0 to 2	4) score <14 at 1 to	6 months)				
2	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>9</sup>	Consistent	No indirectness	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>h</sup>	None noted	384	409	RR 1.14 (1.04 to 1.25) and RR 1.13 (0.97 to 1.32)	ARD 10% (3 to 17) and 8.7 (-2.4 to 19.7)	Low
Population subg	group: Presend	e of radicular leg pa	nin	-			-		-	-	
No studies											
Quality of life (	mean differer	ice on Short-Form-	·36 or -12 Physical C	Component Score	e or Physical Fund	ction Subscale [sca	le 0 to 100])				
7	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	1014	1065	NA	Mean difference 2.63 (1.62 to 3.86)	High
Population subg	group: Presend	e of radicular leg pa	nin	-					-	-	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1) <sup>c</sup>	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	NA	Mean difference 4.7 (-9.4 to 18.8)	Very low
Quality of life (	mean differer	ice on Short-Form-	-36 or -12 Mental Co	mponent Score	or Mental Health S	ubscale [scale 0 to	100])		'	-	
7	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1) <sup>i</sup>	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	1015	1065	NA	Mean difference -0.11 (-2.02 to 1.96)	Moderate
Population sub	aroun: Presenc	e of radicular leg pa	in				-1				

			Certainty assessr	nent				S	ummary of find	dings	
							No. of pa	ırticipants	E	ffect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)c	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	NA	Mean difference -1.0 (-13.1 to 11.1)	Very low
Psychological	well-being (m	ean difference on	Beck Depression In	ventory [scale 0	to 63])					'	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)c	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	48	55	NA	Mean change fron baseline +13% vs -5.8% (NS)	Very low
Population sub	group: Presend	ce of radicular leg pa	ain				•	•	•		•
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>b</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)°	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	NA	Mean difference 0.6 (-4.0 to 5.2)	Very low
Serious advers	se events (pro	portion with serio	us adverse events a	t 1 to 6 months)						<b>'</b>	
17	RCT	Low	Consistent	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>j</sup>	None noted	3762	3100	RR 1.43 (0.95 to 2.15)	ARD 1% (0 to 1)	Low
Population sub	group: Presend	ce of radicular leg pa	ain						'	'	'
No studies											
Treatment disc	continuation d	lue to adverse eve	nts (proportion with	treatment discor	ntinuation due to a	adverse events at 1	to 6 months)				
24	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1)k	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	4724	3825	RR 1.52 (1.06 to 2.16)	ARD 4% (1 to 8)	Moderate
Population sub	group: Presend	ce of radicular leg pa	ain				-	-		-	-

			Certainty assessr	nent			Summary of findings						
							No. of pa	articipants	Е	ffect	Certainty		
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)			
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)c	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	41	39	RR 3.80 (0.44 to 32.57)	ARD 7% (-3 to 18)	Very low		
Constipation	(proportion wi	ith constipation at	1 to 6 months)					<u>'</u>	'				
22	RCT	Low	Consistent	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	4523	3621	RR 2.74 (2.16 to 3.58)	ARD 7% (4 to 10)	High		
Population sub	bgroup: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain										
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)c	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	RR 9.00 (2.30 to 35.20)	ARD 57% (37 to 77)	Very low		
Headache (pr	oportion with	headache at 1 to 6	months)		-	-			'				
20	RCT	Low	Consistent	No indirectness	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>h</sup>	None noted	4177	3374	RR 1.16 (0.91 to 1.40)	ARD 0% (-1 to 1)	Moderate		
Population sub	bgroup: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain										
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)b	Unable to assess (-1)°	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	RR 1.00 (0.28 to 3.61)	ARD 0% (-18 to 18)	Very low		
Nausea (prop	ortion with na	usea at 1 to 6 mont	:hs)						'				
23	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1) <sup>1</sup>	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	4650	3748	RR 2.06 (1.63 to 2.62)	ARD 9% (5 to 12)	Moderate		
Population sub	bgroup: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain				•			·			
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>b</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)°	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2)d	None noted	28	28	RR 5.00 (0.25 to 99.67)	ARD 7% (-2 to 17)	Very low		

			Certainty assessr	nent				S	ummary of find	dings	
							No. of pa	articipants	E	ffect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
Vomiting (pro	portion with v	omiting at 1 to 6 m	onths)					•			
19	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	3471	2887	RR 2.69 (1.99 to 3.72)	ARD 5% (3 to 7)	High
Population sub	group: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain	-						-	'
No studies											
Pruritus (prop	oortion with p	ruritus at 1 to 6 mo	nths)								
8	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1) <sup>rr</sup>	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	1510	1038	RR 2.63 (1.14 to 6.21)	ARD 7% (-3 to 17)	Moderate
Population sub	group: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain	!			-!				
No studies											
Somnolence (	(proportion wi	ith somnolence at 1	to 6 months)								
18	RCT	Low	Consistent	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	3217	2631	RR 2.36 (1.66 to 3.43)	ARD 5% (2 to 8)	High
Population sub	ngroup: Presen	ce of radicular leg pa	ain				'	'	'	'	'
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)	Unable to assess (-1)c	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	28	28	RR 7.00 (0.92 to 53.23)	ARD 21% (4 to 39)	Very low
All outcomes	,	,	•		·	·	·	<u>'</u>		·	
Population sub	ogroup: Gende	r and/or sex									
Two RCTs stat	ed no treatmer	nt interaction by sex	(data not provided in	the trials)							
Population sub	ogroup: Race/e	thnicity									

	Certainty assessment								Summary of findings				
							No. of participants		Effect		Certainty		
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)			

Two RCTs stated no treatment interaction by race (data not provided in the trials)

Population subgroup: Regional economic development

No data. All trials were conducted in very high income settings

#### Older adults (aged 60 years and over)

All outcomes: No RCT restricted enrolment to persons 60 years or older; 3 RCTs reported no interaction by age (one trial reported similar effects on pain intensity in persons  $\geq$ 65 years and persons  $\leq$ 65 years and reported increased likelihood of experiencing  $\geq$ 30% improvement in pain in both age groups; two trials reported no interaction by age but did not provide data)

#### **Explanations**

- a. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=68%.
- b. Downgraded one level for risk of bias because the only trial was rated fair quality.
- c. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because there was only 1 trial (unable to assess consistency).
- d. Downgraded two levels for imprecision because the number of participants was <100.
- e. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=78%.
- f. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=67%.
- g. Downgraded one level for risk of bias because both one trial was rated poor quality and the other trial was rated fair quality.
- h. Downgraded one level for imprecision because the confidence interval for the RR estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a small effect.
- i. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because l<sup>2</sup>=65%.
- j. Downgraded two levels for imprecision because the confidence interval for the RR estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a large effect.
- k. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=73%.
- I. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=58%.
- m. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=72%.

#### GRADE Table 2. Opioid analgesics (treatment duration <1 month) for chronic primary low back pain at 1 month versus placebo

			Certainty a	assessment			Nº of p	atients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Opioids	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain inte	nsity at <1	month									
<b>1</b> 51,a	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>c</sup>	none	13	12	-	MD <b>2.74 lower</b> (4.21 lower to 1.27 lower)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low
Trials in s	ubgroups s	tratified by gei	nder/sex, race/ethni	city, presence of r	adicular pain or e	conomic development	not identified				
Pain inte	nsity at 1-3	months									
No data											
Function	, health-rel	ated quality of	of life, psychologic	al well-being, so	cial participation	n, change in use of m	nedication or a	dverse events			
No data											
Older adı	ults (aged 6	60 years and	over)								
No data (a	age range f	rom 20 to 60 y	/ears)								

#### **Explanations**

- a. One parallel randomized trial (Ionescu 2016), conducted in Romania, of adults 20-60 years with chronic low back pain. Tramadol (100 mg/day) for seven days compared to placebo. Pain intensity measured as mean difference on a 1-6 visual analogue scale [data transformed to 0-10] at 7 days.
- b. Inconsistency. We downgraded once. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- c. Imprecision. We downgraded twice. This was because there were fewer than 100 participants in the analysis.

#### References

<sup>51</sup> lonescu et al. Effects of tramadol treatment on aerobic exercise capacity in subjects with chronic non-specific low back pain. Palestrica of the third millennium – Civilization and Sport; 2015.

# GRADE Table 3. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (treatment duration $\geq 12$ weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at 3 to 6 months versus <u>placebo</u>

			Certainty asses	sment				Sum	mary of findin	gs	
							No. of p	participants	E	Effect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
					All Adults	-					
Pain (m	ean impro	vement on	0 to 10 scale at 3 to 6 months)								
4	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency <sup>a</sup>	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	805	488	NA	Mean difference -0.76 (-1.31 to -0.24)	Moderate
Pain (pr	oportion v	vith ≥30% ir	mprovement in pain at 3 to 6 months)		'		·		<u>'</u>		,
2	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>b</sup>	None noted	383	271	RR 1.27 (0.87 to 1.71)	ARD 9% (-3 to 18)	Moderate
Functio	n (mean ir	nprovement	t on Roland Morris Disability Question	nnaire [0 to 24 scale] at	3 to 6 months)				-		
4	RCT	Low	Serious inconsistency (-1) <sup>c</sup>	No indirectness	No imprecision	None noted	805	488	NA	Mean difference -1.33 (-2.67 to -0.09)	High
Quality	of life (me	an improve	ment on SF-12 Mental Component Su	mmary [0 to 100 scale]	at 3 to 6 months	;)	·		'	<u>'</u>	,
2	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	No imprecision <sup>d</sup>	None noted	422	217	NA	Mean difference 0.20 (-1.36 to 1.76)	High
Quality	of life (me	an improve	ment on SF-12 Physical Component S	⊔ Summary [0 to 100 scale	at 3 to 6 montl	hs)				<u> </u>	

			Certainty assess	sment				Sumn	nary of finding	JS .	
							No. of pa	rticipants	Е	ffect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
2	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	No imprecision <sup>d</sup>	None noted	422	217	NA	Mean difference 2.56 (0.76 to 4.32)	High
Serious	adverse e	vents (prop	ortion with serious adverse events at	3 to 6 months)							
3	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2)e	None noted	598	381	RR 1.13 (0.38 to 6.81)	ARD 1% (-1 to 3)	Low
Discont	inuation d	ue to advers	se events (proportion with discontinua	ation due to adverse ev	ents at 3 to 6 mo	onths)					
4	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-2)	None noted	808	490	RR 1.10 (0.51 to 2.31)	ARD 1% (-3% to 5)	Low
Nausea	(proportio	n with naus	ea at 3 to 6 months)								
3	RCT	Low	No inconsistency	No indirectness	Very serious imprecision (-1)	None noted	720	449	RR 1.88 (0.81 to 4.85)	ARD 2% (0 to 4)	Low
Populat	ion subgro	oups, for all	outcomes:				'			'	'
Populati	on subgrou	ıp 1: Gender	and/or sex								
No data	(proportion	female rang	ed from 50% to 62%)								
Populati	on subgrou	ıp 2: Race/et	hnicity								
No data											
Populati	on subgrou	ıp 3: Presend	ee of radicular leg pain								
Patients	with radicu	ılar pain were	e excluded from all of the trials								
Populati	on subgrou	ıp 4: Regiona	al economic development								

			Certainty asses	sment				Sum	mary of finding	gs	
							No. of p	articipants	E	Effect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)		
All trials	were condi	ucted in the l	United States								
				Older adu	lts (aged 60 yea	rs and over)					
No data	, for all ou	tcomes (me	an age in the trials ranged from 52 to	53 years)							

#### **Explanations**

- a. Downgraded one level for indirectness because I2=73%.
- b. Downgraded one level for imprecision because the confidence interval for the RR estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a moderate effect (RR ≥1.5).
- c. Downgraded one level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=81%.
- d. Not downgraded for imprecision; although the confidence interval for the mean difference estimate included "no effect," it did not cross the threshold a small effect (mean difference ≥5 points on a 0 to 100 scale).
- e. Downgraded two levels for imprecision because the confidence interval for the RR estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a large effect (RR ≥2.0).

# GRADE Table 4. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (treatment duration < 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at < 1 to 3 months versus <u>placebo</u>

-	-	_	na	ıra	_		Nº of p	nationts	_	Effect	_
			ρε	ıı a			142 OI P	alients		Lileot	0
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	NSAIDs	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain intens	sity at <1 m	nonth (mean	difference on a 0-1	0 or 0-100 visua	analogue scale	at 2-3 weeks)					
<b>5</b> 56-58,a	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup> 1 <sup>2</sup> = 69%	not serious	not serious	We downgraded the evidence by one level because of imputation. <sup>a</sup>	180	117	-	MD <b>0.77 lower</b> (1.44 lower to 0.1 lower)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Subgroup: g	gender/sex	– not perform	ed (41% female bu	t no stratified anal	yses)	•					
Subgroup: r	adicular pa	in – not perfo	rmed (radicular pair	n excluded or not	reported)						
Subgroup: r	ace/ethnici	ty – not perfo	rmed (74-99% White	e but no stratified	analyses)						
Subgroup: 6	economic d	evelopment –	not performed (All	trials were conduc	ted in high incom	e settings (Australia, L	JSA, Germany,	United Kingdom	n)		
Pain intone	eity at 1_3 n	months (maa	n difference on a (	L-10 scale at 4 we	acke)						

#### Pain intensity at 1-3 months (mean difference on a 0-10 scale at 4 weeks)

2 <sup>40,58,c</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	173	168	-	MD <b>0.44 lower</b> (0.8 lower to 0.07	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
										lower)	

Subgroup: gender/sex – not performed (41% female but no stratified analyses)

Subgroup: radicular pain – not performed (radicular pain excluded or not reported)

Subgroup: race/ethnicity – not performed (74-99% White but no stratified analyses)

Subgroup: economic development – not performed (All trials were conducted in high income settings (Australia, USA, Germany, United Kingdom)

#### Function at <1 month

No data

Function at 1-3 months (mean difference on the 0-24 Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire at 4 weeks)

			pa	ra			Nº of p	patients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	NSAIDs	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>1</b> 58,d	RCT	not serious	seriouse	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	none	64	58	-	MD <b>1.43 lower</b> (2.6 lower to 0.26 lower)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Subgroup:	gender/sex	– not perform	ned (41% female bu	no stratified anal	yses)					-	
Subgroup:	radicular pa	in – not perfo	ormed (radicular pair	excluded or not i	reported)						
Subgroup:	race/ethnici	ty – not perfo	rmed (74-99% White	e but no stratified	analyses)						
Subgroup:	economic d	evelopment -	not performed (All	trials were conduc	ted in high incom	e settings (Australia, l	JSA, Germany,	United Kingdom	)		
Psycholog	gical well-b	eing, social p	participation								
No data											
Change in	medicatio	n use									
			ignificant difference acebo (83/110, 75.59			on of rescue paracetar on.	nol and the othe	er trial <sup>40</sup> significa	ntly lower perce	entage of patients on	Unable to evaluate
Trials in su	bgroups stra	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ty, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified				
Adverse e	vents										
<b>4</b> 40,56,58,g	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>h</sup>	none	79/267 (29.6%)	52/229 (22.7%)	RR 1.10 (0.83 to 1.46)	23 more per 1000 (from 39 fewer to 104 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate
Trials in su	l bgroups stra	latified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ty, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	l onomic development r	ot identified				
Discontinu	uation due	to adverse e	vents								
<b>2</b> 40,58,c	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>e</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>i</sup>	none	4/193 (2.1%)	4/194 (2.1%)	RR 1.01 (0.26 to	<b>0 fewer per 1000</b> (from 15 fewer to 61	⊕○○○ Waratawa
									3.94)	more)	Very low
Trials in su	bgroups str	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ty, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified				

Pruritus

			pa	ıra			Nº of p	patients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	NSAIDs	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>1</b> 58,d	RCT	not serious	seriouse	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	none	0/74 (0.0%)	1/74 (1.4%)	<b>RR 0.33</b> (0.01 to 8.05)	9 fewer per 1000 (from 13 fewer to 95 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in sub	ogroups stra	atified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified				
Nausea											
2 <sup>40,58c</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious	none	5/193 (2.6%)	3/194 (1.5%)	<b>RR 1.62</b> (0.17 to 15.79)	10 more per 1000 (from 13 fewer to 229 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in sub	ogroups stra	atified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified			•	
Constipation	on										
2 <sup>40,58,c</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	4/193 (2.1%)	3/194 (1.5%)	RR 1.26 (0.20 to 7.94)	4 more per 1000 (from 12 fewer to 107 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in sub	ogroups stra	atified by geno	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified				
Dizziness											
2 <sup>40,58,c</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	7/193 (3.6%)	5/194 (2.6%)	RR 1.43 (0.47 to 4.41)	11 more per 1000 (from 14 fewer to 88 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in sub	ogroups stra	atified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified				
Somnolend	ce										
<b>1</b> 58,d	RCT	not serious	seriouse	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	none	1/74 (1.4%)	1/74 (1.4%)	<b>RR 1.00</b> (0.06 to 15.69)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 13 fewer to 199 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in sub	ogroups stra	atified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development r	not identified				
Dry mouth											

			pa	ara			Nº of	patients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	NSAIDs	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>2</b> 40,58,d	RCT	not serious	seriouse	not serious	very serious <sup>i</sup>	none	0/193 (0.0%)	2/194 (1.0%)	<b>RR 0.20</b> (0.01 to 4.16)	8 fewer per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 33 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in sul	bgroups str	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or eco	onomic development r	not identified				
Headache											
2 <sup>40,58,c</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	2/193 (1.0%)	7/194 (3.6%)	RR 0.30 (0.06 to 1.47)	25 fewer per 1000 (from 34 fewer to 17 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in sul	bgroups str	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or eco	onomic development r	not identified				
Vomiting											
2 <sup>40,58,c</sup>	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>e</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>i</sup>	none	0/193 (0.0%)	1/194 (0.5%)	RR 0.34 (0.01 to 8.17)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 5 fewer to 37 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in sul	bgroups str	atified by gene	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or eco	onomic development r	not identified				
Older adul	Its (aged 60	) years and o	ver)								
No data, fo	r all outcom	nes (mean age	e in the trials ranged	I from 51 to 59 year	ars)						

#### **Explanations**

- a. Three trials (Berry 1982, Ghosh 1981, Gurrell 2018), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain (radicular pain excluded or not reported) with mean ages of 51-55. NSAIDs included naproxen (1100 mg/day), diflunisal (100 mg/day), flurbiprofen (300 mg/day), indomethacin (150 mg/day), and naproxen (1000 mg/day). Pain intensity was measured at 2-3 weeks. The two crossover trials each analysed two NSAIDs; therefore, we split the control sample to avoid over-weighting. The two crossover trials only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies. Imputation of the standard deviation was required for the crossover trials, which was taken from the parallel trial. We downgraded the evidence by one level because of this imputation.
- b. Inconsistency. We downgraded once. This was because I2 is greater than 50% and there was insufficient data to conduct stratified/sensitivity analyses (I2 = 69%).
- c. Two parallel trials (Gurrell 2018, Uberall 2012), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain (radicular pain excluded) with mean ages of 51-59. NSAIDs naproxen (1000 mg/day) and flupirtine modified release (400 mg/day). Outcome measured at 4 weeks.
- d. One parallel trial (Gurrell 2018), conducted in the United States, of adults with chronic low back pain (radicular pain excluded) with mean age of 51. Naproxen (1000 mg/day).
- e. Inconsistency. We downgraded once. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- f. Imprecision. We downgraded once. This was because there were fewer than 200 participants in analysis.

- g. Three trials (Berry 1982, Gurrell 2018, Uberall 2012), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain (radicular pain excluded or not reported) with mean ages of 51-59. NSAIDs included naproxen (1100 mg/day), diflunisal (100 mg/day), naproxen (1000 mg/day), and flupirtine modified release (400 mg/day). The crossover trial analysed two NSAIDs; therefore, we split the control sample to avoid over-weighting. The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- h. Imprecision. We downgraded once This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold a small effect.
- i. Imprecision. We downgraded twice. This was because there are more than 200 participants in the single study, but the estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a large effect.
- j. Imprecision. We downgraded twice. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a large effect.

#### References

- <sup>56</sup> Berry et al. Naproxen sodium, diflunisal, and placebo in the treatment of chronic back pain. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases; 1982.
- <sup>57</sup> Ghosh et al. A double-blind crossover trial of indomethacin flurbiprofen and placebo in the management of lumbar spondylosis. Current Therapeutic Research, Clinical and Experimental; 1981.
- 58 Gurrell et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial with the α2/3/5 subunit selective GABAA positive allosteric modulator PF-06372865 in patients with chronic low back pain. PAIN; 2018.
- <sup>40</sup> Uberall et al. Efficacy and safety of flupirtine modified release for the management of moderate to severe chronic low back pain: results of SUPREME, a prospective randomized, double-blind, placebo- and active-controlled parallel-group phase IV study. Current Medical Research and Opinion; 2012.

# $\underline{\text{GRADE Table 5}}. \textit{SNRI antidepressants (treatment duration} \geq 12 \textit{ weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at 3 to 6 months versus } \underline{\textit{placebo}}$

			Certainty asses	sment				S	ummary of findin	gs	
							No. of pa	articipants	Eff	ect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
		<del>.</del>	<del>.</del>		All	Adults	<del>.</del>			·	
Pain (m	ean difference	on 0 to 10 scale at	3 to <6 months)								
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	808	654	NA	Mean difference -0.54 (-0.76 to -0.34)	Moderate
Pain (pı	roportion with	≥30% improvement	t in pain intensity at 3	to <6 months)							
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	812	659	≥30%: RR 1.26 (1.13 to 1.39)	ARD 12% (7 to 17)	Moderate
Functio	n (mean differe	ence on Brief Pain	Inventory Pain Interfe	erence [0 to 10 sc	ale] at 3 to <6 mon	ths)			-		<u>'</u>
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	784	653	NA	Mean difference -0.42 (-0.77 to -0.14) on 0 to 10 scale	Moderate
Quality	of life (mean d	ifference in EuroQo	oL [0 to 1 scale] at 3 t	o <6 months)							
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>b</sup>	None noted	830	667	NA	Mean difference ranged from 0 to 0.05 in 3 RCTs (1 RCT reported no difference; data not provided)	Low

			Certainty asse	ssment					Summary of finding	js	
							No. of p	articipants	Effe	ct	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator		Absolute (95%CI)	
Psycho	logical well-bei	ng (mean differen	ces on SF-36 Mental	Health score [0	to 100 scale] at 3 to	<6 months)		:			
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>b</sup>	None noted	830	667	NA	Mean difference ranged from no difference to 4.88 points in 4 RCTs	Low
Nork (n	nean difference	s on the Work Pro	ductivity and Activit	y Impairment ab	senteeism scale at 3	to <6 months)					
3	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>c</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)	None noted	543	550	NA	No differences	Low
Serious	adverse event	(proportion with s	serious adverse ever	t at 3 to <6 mon	ths)	'	'		<u>'</u>		
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)	None noted	832	667	RR 1.33 (0.55 to 5.86)	ARD 1% (-1 to 3)	Very low
Discont	inuation due to	adverse events (	proportion with disco	ontinuation due	to adverse event at 3	3 to <6 months)	'		<u>'</u>		
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	832	667	RR 2.33 (1.62 to 3.36)	ARD 7% (3 to 12)	Moderate
<b>l</b> ausea	(proportion wi	th nausea at 3 to <	6 months)		·				·		
ļ	RCT	Moderate (-1)a	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	834	665	RR 4.59 (2.80 to 7.48)	ARD 10% (6 to 15)	Moderate
Constip	ation (proporti	on with constipati	on at 3 to <6 months	)					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	834	665	RR 2.59 (1.22 to 5.89)	ARD 4% (0 to 7)	Moderate
Dizzine	ss (proportion	with dizziness at 3	to <6 months)								

			Certainty asse	ssment				8	Summary of finding	js .	
							No. of pa	articipants	Effe	ct	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator		Absolute (95%CI)	
4	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	834	665	RR 2.28 (1.14 to 5.98)	ARD 3% (0 to 5)	Moderate
Somno	lence (proportion	on with somnolend	ce at 3 to <6 months)		'			<u> </u>	'	·	
3	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>d</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	719	544	RR 2.67 (1.38 to 5.01)	ARD 5% (-2 to 13)	Moderate
Popula	tion subgroups	, for all outcomes:							·		
Populat	ion subgroup 1:	Gender and/or sex									
No data	(proportion fem	ale in the trials rang	ed from 11% to 61%)								
Populat	ion subgroup 2:	Race/ethnicity									
No data											
Populat	ion subgroup 3:	Presence of radicul	ar leg pain								
NI- 4-4-	(all trials exclud	led patients with rad	licular leg pain except	one trial in which	12% had radicular lov	back pain and on	e trial that did not	report inclusion of	persons with radi	cular pain	

#### Older adults (aged 60 years and over)

No data, for all outcomes (mean age in the trials ranged from 46 to 59 years)

All trials were conducted in high income settings

#### Explanations:

- a. Downgraded 1 level for risk of bias because 3 of 4 trials (encompassing 70% of participants) were rated fair quality.
  b. Downgraded 1 level for imprecision because the risk estimates in the trials included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a small effect.
  c. Downgraded 1 level for risk of bias because 2 of 3 trials (encompassing 63% of participants) were rated fair quality.
  d. Downgraded 1 level for risk of bias because 2 of 3 trials (encompassing 64% of participants) were rated fair quality.

# GRADE Table 6. SNRI antidepressants (treatment duration < 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at < 1 to 3 months versus <u>placebo</u>

			Certainty ass	sessment			№ of patier	ts		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain intensity	y at <1 mon	th (mean diffe	erence on a 0-10 s	cale at 3 weeks)							
<b>2</b> 67,70,a	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>c</sup> 1 <sup>2</sup> = 65%	not serious	very serious <sup>s</sup>	none	69	73	-	MD <b>1.1 lower</b> (2.62 lower to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low
Subgroup: gei	nder/sex – n	ot performed (	0 to 58% female bu	ut no stratified anal	yses)						
Subgroup: rac	dicular pain –	not performed	d (some studies inc	cluded radicular pa	in but no stratified	analyses)					
Subgroup: rac	ce/ethnicity –	not performed	d (White ranged fro	m 85% to 98% but	no stratified analys	ses)					
Subgroup: eco	onomic deve	lopment – not	performed (All trial	s were conducted	in high income sett	tings)					
Pain intensity	y at 1-3 mor	nths (mean di	fference on a 0-10	scale at 4-8 week	(S)						
<b>4</b> 66,67,69,70,e	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>c</sup> I <sup>2</sup> = 51%	not serious	seriousf	none	107	124	-	MD <b>0.23 lower</b> (1.18 lower to 0.71 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low
Subgroup: gei	nder/sex – n	ot performed (	0 to 58% female bu	ut no stratified anal	yses)	!			!		!
Subgroup: rac	dicular pain -	not performed	d (some studies inc	cluded radicular pa	in but no stratified	analyses)					
Subgroup: rac	ce/ethnicity –	not performed	d (White ranged fro	m 85% to 98% but	no stratified analys	ses)					
Subgroup: eco	onomic deve	lopment – not	performed (All trial	s were conducted	in high income sett	tings)					
Function at <	1 month										
No data											
Function at 1	-3 months (	standardized	mean difference	on the 0-100 Osw	estry Disability In	dex at 8 weeks)					

			Certainty ass	sessment			№ of patier	ts		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>1</b> 67,h	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>i</sup>	not serious	very serious	none	41	46	-	SMD <b>0.15 lower</b> (0.57 lower to 0.27 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low
Trials in subg	roups stratific	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity,	oresence of radicul	ar pain or econom	ic development not	identified			-	
Quality of life	e at <1 mont	th									
No data											
Quality of life	e at 1-3 mon	ths (standard	ized mean differe	nce on the Physic	cal Health sub-sca	ale of the Short-Fo	rm 36 at 4 weeks)				
170,1	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>i</sup>	not serious	very seriousi	none	21	21	-	SMD <b>0.46 higher</b> (0.16 lower to 1.07 higher)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subg	roups stratifi	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radicul	ar pain or econom	ic development not	identified	!			
Psychologic	al well-being	g at <1 month	(mean difference	on the 0-60 Mont	gomery Asberg D	epression Rating	Scale at 3 weeks)				
<b>1</b> 67,h	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	seriousi	not serious	very seriousi	none	35	37	-	MD <b>0.5 lower</b> (3.5 lower to 2.5 higher)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subg	roups stratifi	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicul	ar pain or econom	ic development not	identified				
Psychologic 8 weeks)	al well-being	g at 1-3 month	ns (standardized n	nean difference [o	questionnaires in	clude 0-60 Montgo	mery Asberg Depress	sion Rating S	Scale, Mental H	lealth sub-scale of the Short	-Form 36] at
2 <sup>67,70,a</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>s</sup>	none	65	69	-	SMD <b>0.08 higher</b> (0.26 lower to 0.42 higher)	⊕○○ ○ Very low

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº of patien	ts		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Social partici	ipation										
<b>N</b> o data											
Medication u	se										
One trial <sup>70</sup> rep	orted that re	scue medicati	on use did not diffe	r between groups.							Not evaluated
Trials in subgr	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified				
Adverse ever	nts										
466,67,69,70,e	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>c</sup>	not serious	seriousf	none	83/118 (70.3%)	82/129 (63.6%)	<b>RR 1.12</b> (0.85 to 1.48)	<b>76 more per 1000</b> (from 95 fewer to 305 more)	⊕○○ O Very low
Trials in subgr	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified				
Serious adve	erse events										
<b>3</b> 67-69,n	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	0/79 (0.0%)	2/82 (2.4%)	<b>RR 0.34</b> (0.04 to 3.21)	16 fewer per 1000 (from 23 fewer to 54 more)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subgr	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified		-		
Discontinuat	ion due to a	dverse event	 \$								
366-68,0	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>s</sup>	none	13/93 (14.0%)	3/98 (3.1%)	RR 4.50 (1.32 to 15.28)	<b>107 more per 1000</b> (from 10 more to 437 more)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subgr	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified		•		
Nausea											

			Certainty ass	essment			№ of patier	its		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>3</b> 67,69,70,p	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriouss	none	20/96 (20.8%)	6/97 (6.2%)	RR 3.21 (1.33 to 7.73)	<b>137 more per 1000</b> (from 20 more to 416 more)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subgi	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicu	lar pain or econom	ic development not	identified				
Constipation	1										
466,67,69,70,e	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	15/118 (12.7%)	10/129 (7.8%)	<b>RR 1.75</b> (0.84 to 3.65)	58 more per 1000 (from 12 fewer to 205 more)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subgi	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicu	lar pain or econom	ic development not	identified				
Dizziness											
367,69,70,p	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	7/96 (7.3%)	6/97 (6.2%)	<b>RR 1.17</b> (0.22 to 6.19)	<b>11 more per 1000</b> (from 48 fewer to 321 more)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subgi	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicu	lar pain or econom	ic development not	identified				
Somnolence											
<b>3</b> 66,67,69,q	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriousf	none	15/87 (17.2%)	24/100 (24.0%)	<b>RR 0.85</b> (0.55 to 1.31)	<b>36 fewer per 1000</b> (from 108 fewer to 74 more)	⊕○○ ○ Very low
Trials in subg	roups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicu	lar pain or econom	ic development not	identified				
Dry mouth											

			Certainty ass	sessment			№ of patier	nts		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>4</b> 66,67,69,70,e	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>c</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	25/118 (21.2%)	21/129 (16.3%)	RR 2.65 (0.45 to 15.76)	<b>269 more per 1000</b> (from 90 fewer to 1000 more)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low
Trials in subgi	l roups stratifi	l ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified				
Headache											
2 <sup>67,69,r</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriouss	none	4/65 (6.2%)	15/68 (22.1%)	<b>RR 0.28</b> (0.10 to 0.78)	159 fewer per 1000 (from 199 fewer to 49 fewer)	⊕○○
											Very low
	roups stratific	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, p	presence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified				
Vomiting	i	i	i		i	i	1		•		i
<b>1</b> 67,h	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious	not serious	very serious	none	4/45 (8.9%)	0/48 (0.0%)	RR 9.59 (0.53 to 173.18)	<b>0 fewer per 1000</b> (from 0 fewer to 0 fewer)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low
Trials in subgi	ı roups stratifi	ed by gender/s	ı ex, race/ethnicity, <sub>l</sub>	presence of radicul	ı lar pain or economi	ic development not	identified				
Pruritus											
267,69,r	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	1/65 (1.5%)	1/68 (1.5%)	<b>RR 1.02</b> (0.11 to 9.52)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 13 fewer to 125 more)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low
Trials in subg	roups stratific	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity,	oresence of radicul	ar pain or economi	ic development not	identified		!		!
Older adults	(aged 60 ye	ars and over)									
No data, for a	Il outcomes	(mean age in t	he trials ranged fro	m 52 to 59 years)							

#### **Explanations**

- a. One parallel trial (Dickens 2000) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day) and duloxetine (up to 120 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- b. Risk of bias. We downgraded two levels. This was because more than 50% of participants come from studies with high risk of bias.
- c. Inconsistency. We downgraded one level. This was because I2 is greater than 50% and not explained by stratified/sensitivity analyses due to limited data.
- d. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a large effect.
- e. Three parallel trials (Atkinson 1999, Dickens 2000, NCT01225068) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20-30 mg/day), milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day), and duloxetine (up to 120 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- f. Imprecision. We downgraded one level. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a small effect.
- g. Two parallel trials (Atkinson 1998, Atkinson 1999), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 46-49. TCA antidepressants included nortriptyline (up 100 mg/day) and maprotiline (up to 150 mg/day).
- h. One parallel trial (Dickens 2000), conducted in the United Kingdom, of adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 45. Paroxetine (20 mg/day).
- i. Inconsistency. We downgraded one level. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- j. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because there were fewer than 100 participants in the analysis.
- k. Two parallel trials (Atkinson 1998, Pheasant 1983), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 46-47. TCA antidepressants included nortriptyline (up to 100 mg/day) and amitriptyline (up to 150 mg/day).
- I. One crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in Austria, of adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 58 years. The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- m. One parallel trial (Atkinson 1998), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean age of 46 years. TCA antidepressant was nortriptyline (up to 100 mg/day).
- n. Two parallel trials (Dickens 2000, NCT01225068) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 37-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day), milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day), and duloxetine (60 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- o. Two parallel trials (Atkinson 1999, Dickens 2000) and one crossover trial (Johnson 2011), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 37-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20-30 mg/day) and duloxetine (60 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- p. Two parallel trials (Dickens 2000, NCT01225068) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day), milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day), and duloxetine (up to 120 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- q. Three parallel trials (Atkinson 1999, Dickens 2000, NCT01226068), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 37-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20-30 mg/day) and milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day).
- r. Two parallel trials (Dickens 2000, NCT01225068), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day) and milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day).
- s. Imprecision. We downgraded one level. This was because there were fewer than 200 participants in the analysis.

#### References

- <sup>67</sup> Dickens et al. The relationship between pain and depression in a trial using paroxetine in sufferers of chronic low back pain. Psychosomatics; 2000.
- 70 Schukro et al. Efficacy of duloxetine in chronic low back pain with a neuropathic component: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled crossover trial. Anesthesiology; 2016.
- <sup>69</sup> NCT01225068. Effect of milnacipran in chronic neuropathic low back pain. 2012.
- 66 Atkinson et al. Effects of noradrenergic and serotonergic antidepressants on chronic low back. PAIN; 1999.
- <sup>71</sup> Atkinson et al. A placebo-controlled randomized clinical trial of nortriptyline for chronic low. PAIN; 1998.
- <sup>72</sup>Pheasant et al. Amitriptyline and chronic low-back pain. A randomized double-blind crossover study. Spine; 1983.
- <sup>68</sup>Johnson et al. Effects of duloxetine and placebo in patients with chronic low back pain. The Journal of Pain: 2011.

# <u>GRADE Table 7</u>. Tricyclic antidepressants (treatment duration $\geq$ 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at 3 to 6 months versus <u>placebo</u>

		Certainty asse	essment				8	Summary of findin	gs	
						No. of pa	articipants	Effe	ect	Certainty
Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)		
	<del>'</del>	<u>'</u>		All	Adults		<u>'</u>	<del>'</del>	'	
ean difference	on 0 to 10 scale a	t 3 to <6 months)								
RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>b</sup>	None noted	161	133	NA	0.72), -0.40 (-0.56 to 1.36), and	
ean difference	on 0 to 10 scale a	t 6 months)			'				'	'
RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	72	74	NA	Mean difference -0.78 (-1.6 to 0.01)	Low
roportion with	≥30% or >75% imp	provement in pain int	ensity at 3 to <6	months)					<u>'</u>	
RCT	Moderate (-1)e	No inconsistency	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>f</sup>	None noted	67	55	≥30%: RR 1.23 (0.72 to 2.11) >75%: RR 1.28 (0.43 to 3.85)	≥30%: ARD 10% (-13 to 33) 1.23 (0.72 to 2.11) >75%: ARD 5% (-17 to 27)	Low
	ean difference  RCT  ean difference  RCT	ean difference on 0 to 10 scale a  RCT Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup> ean difference on 0 to 10 scale a  RCT Low  roportion with ≥30% or >75% imp	ean difference on 0 to 10 scale at 3 to <6 months)  RCT Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup> No inconsistency  ean difference on 0 to 10 scale at 6 months)  RCT Low Unable to assess (-1) <sup>c</sup> roportion with ≥30% or >75% improvement in pain into	ean difference on 0 to 10 scale at 3 to <6 months)  RCT	Study design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision  All ean difference on 0 to 10 scale at 3 to <6 months)  RCT Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup> No inconsistency Direct Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>b</sup> ean difference on 0 to 10 scale at 6 months)  RCT Low Unable to assess Direct Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>d</sup> roportion with ≥30% or >75% improvement in pain intensity at 3 to <6 months)  RCT Moderate (-1) <sup>e</sup> No inconsistency Direct Serious imprecision imprecision Serious imprecision or Serious imprecision imprecision	Study design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations  All Adults  ean difference on 0 to 10 scale at 3 to <6 months)  RCT Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup> No inconsistency Direct Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>b</sup> RCT Low Unable to assess Direct Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>d</sup> Proportion with ≥30% or >75% improvement in pain intensity at 3 to <6 months)  RCT Moderate (-1) <sup>e</sup> No inconsistency Direct Serious imprecision None noted imprecision None noted imprecision None noted imprecision	Study design   Risk of bias   Inconsistency   Indirectness   Imprecision   Other considerations   Intervention	No. of participants   No. of participants	No. of participants   Effective	No. of participants   Effect

			Certainty asse	ssment				5	Summary of fin	dings	
							No. of p	articipants		Effect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
2	RCT	Moderate (-1)e	No inconsistency	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>f</sup>	None noted	109	107	NA	Mean difference -0.77 (-1.87 to 0.33) on BPI and -1.62 (-2.88 to -0.36) on RDQ	Low
Functio	on (mean differe	ence on Roland Mo	orris Disability Quest	ionnaire [0 to 24	scale] at 6 months	)	,			'	
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)9	None noted	72	74	NA	Mean difference -0.98 (-2.42 to 0.46)	Low
Quality	of life (mean d	ifference in EuroQ	oL [0 to 1 scale] at 3	to <6 months)		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		'		
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)9	None noted	72	74	NA	Mean difference -0.03 (-0.11 to 0.07)	Low
Quality	of life (mean d	ifference in EuroQ	oL [0 to 1 scale] at 6	months)		<u> </u>			,		
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1) <sup>c</sup>	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>9</sup>	None noted	72	74	NA	Mean difference -0.05 (-0.004 to 0.10)	Low
Psycho	logical well-be	ing (mean differen	ces on Beck Depress	sion Inventory [0	to 63] at 3 to <6 m	onths)				•	
	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision	None noted	72	74	NA	Mean difference	Low

			Certainty asses	ssment				9	Summary of find	ings	
							No. of p	articipants	Е	ffect	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>g</sup>	None noted	72	74	NA	Mean difference -0.93 (-3.34 to 1.49)	Low
Work (p	proportion with	work absence at 3	3 to <6 months)						_		
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>g</sup>	None noted	51	50	NA	Adjusted OR 0.86 (0.32 to 2.31)	Low
Work (p	proportion with	work absence at 6	6 months)								
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>h</sup>	None noted	44	43	NA	Adjusted OR 1.51 (0.43 to 5.38)	Very low
Serious	adverse event	(proportion with	serious adverse even	t at 3 to <6 mont	hs)						
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>i</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)°	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>h</sup>	None noted	38	33	RR 2.62 (0.11 to 62.10)	ARD 3% (-5 to 10)	Very low
Modera	te to severe ad	verse events (proj	oortion with any mod	erate to severe a	dverse event at 6 n	nonths)			-		
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)i	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>g</sup>	None noted	72	74	26.5% vs 31.8% (p=0.58)	ARD -5% (CI not available)	Very low
Discon	tinuation due to	adverse events (	proportion with disco	ontinuation due t	o adverse event at	3 to <6 months)		·	•		
2	RCT	Moderate (-1)i	Serious inconsistency (-1) <sup>j</sup>	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>k</sup>	None noted	90	59	RR 3.15 (0.45 to 21.94)	ARD 15% (-12 to 42)	Very low

			Certainty asses	ssment				9	Summary of finding	js .	
							No. of pa	articipants	Effe	ct	Certainty
No. of RCTs	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intervention	Comparator		Absolute (95%CI)	
1	RCT	Low	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>g</sup>	None noted	72	74	RR 1.03 (0.43 to 2.44)	ARD 0% (-10 to 11)	Very low
Nausea	(proportion wi	th nausea at 3 to	<6 months)		<u>'</u>			<u>'</u>			
1	RCT	Moderate (-1)i	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>h</sup>	None noted	38	33	RR 0.29 (0.01 to 6.90)	ARD -3% (-1 <sup>-1</sup> to 5)	Very low
Constip	ation (proporti	on with constipati	on at 3 to <6 months								
2	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>i</sup>	No inconsistency	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>k</sup>	None noted	68	55	RR 7.24 (0.95 to 55.39)	ARD 12% (3 to 20)	Very low
Somno	ence (proportion	on with somnolen	ce at 3 to <6 months)								
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>i</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)c	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>h</sup>	None noted	38	33	RR 0.87 (0.06 to 13.35)	ARD 0% (-8 to 7)	Very low
Dry mo	uth (proportion	with dry mouth a	t 3 to <6 months)		<u>'</u>		<u>'</u>	,			
2	RCT	Moderate (-1)i	No inconsistency	Direct	No imprecision	None noted	68	55	RR 3.87 (1.20 to 12.49)	ARD 15% (1 to 29)	Moderate
Populat	tion subgroups	, for all outcomes	:	<u> </u>	'	•	'	'			
Populati	ion subgroup 1:	Gender and/or sex									
No data	(proportion fem	ale in the trials rang	ged from 11% to 61%)								
Populati	ion subgroup 2:	Race/ethnicity									
No data											
Populati	ion subgroup 3:	Presence of radicul	lar leg pain								

	No. of participants	Effect	Certainty
No. of RCTs Study design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Inter	ntervention Comparator	Relative Absolute (95%CI)	

No data (all trials excluded patients with radicular leg pain except one trial in which 12% had radicular low back pain and one trial that did not report inclusion of persons with radicular pain

Population subgroup 4: Regional economic development

All trials were conducted in high income settings

#### Older adults (aged 60 years and over)

No data, for all outcomes (mean age in the trials ranged from 46 to 59 years)

#### **Explanations**

- a. Downgraded 1 level for risk of bias because two of three trials (encompassing 50% of participants) were rated fair quality.
- b. Downgraded 1 level for imprecision because the confidence intervals for the estimates in the individual trials included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a small (≥0.5 on a 0 to 10 scale) or moderate (≥1 on a 0 to 10 scale) effect.
- c. Downgraded 1 level for inconsistency because there was only 1 trial (unable to assess inconsistency).
- d. Downgraded 1 level for imprecision because the confidence interval for the estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a moderate effect.
- e. Downgraded 1 level for risk of bias because both trials were rated fair quality.
- f. Downgraded 1 level for imprecision because the confidence intervals for the estimates in the individual trials included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for clinically relevant (greater than small) effects.
- g. Downgraded 1 level for imprecision because there were <200 participants.
- h. Downgraded 2 levels for imprecision because there were <100 participants.
- i. Downgraded 1 level for risk of bias because the only trial was rated fair quality.
- j. Downgraded 1 level for inconsistency because I<sup>2</sup>=88%.
- k. Downgraded 2 levels for imprecision because the confidence interval for the estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a large effect (RR ≥2.0).

# <u>GRADE Table 8</u>. Tricyclic antidepressants (treatment duration < 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at <1 to 3 months versus <u>placebo</u>

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº of pat	ients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti- depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain intensity	at <1 mont	:h									
No data											
Pain intensity	at 1-3 mon	ths (mean di	fference on a 0-10 s	cale at 8 weeks)							
<b>2</b> 66,71,g	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriouss	none	58	72	-	MD <b>0.69 lower</b> (1.36 lower to 0.03 lower)	⊕○○○ Very low
Subgroup: radio	ular pain –	not performe	female ranged from ( d (radicular pain rang d (White ranged from	ed from 8 to 19%	in three trials but n	o stratified analyses)					
			performed (all trials								
Function at <1	month										
No data											
Function at 1-3	months (	standardized	mean difference [q	uestionnaires inc	lude Sickness Im	pact Profile, 5-ques	tion ordinal scale	at 6-8 weeks	s)		
<b>2</b> 71,72,k	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>t</sup>	none	47	49	-	SMD <b>0.16 lower</b> (0.91 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Subgroup: geno	ler/sex – no	ot performed (	female ranged from (	0% to 75% but no	stratified analyses)		•	•	•		•
Subgroup: radio	ular pain –	not performe	d (radicular pain rang	jed from 8 to 19%	in three trials but n	o stratified analyses)					
Subgroup: race	ethnicity –	not performed	d (White ranged from	78% to 85% but n	o stratified analyse	es)					
Subgroup: econ	omic deve	lopment – not	performed (all trials	were conducted in	high-income count	tries)					
Quality of life a	ıt <1 mont	h									

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº of pat	ients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti- depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
No data											
Quality of life a	it 1-3 mon	ths (standard	lized mean differend	ce on the Quality	of Wellbeing scal	e at 8 weeks)					
1 <sup>71,m</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>i</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>t</sup>	none	38	40	-	SMD <b>0.2 higher</b> (0.25 lower to 0.64 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgrou	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	sex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	pain or economic	development not ider	ntified				
Psychological	well-being	at <1 month									
No data											
Psychological	well-being	at 1-3 month	ns (standardized me	an difference on	the Beck Depres	sion Inventory at 8 w	veeks)				
1 <sup>71,m</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>i</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>t</sup>	none	38	40	-	SMD <b>0.4 lower</b> (0.85 lower to 0.05 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgrou	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	sex, race/ethnicity, pro	esence of radicula	pain or economic	development not ider	ntified				•
Social participa	ation										
No data											
Change in med	lication us	e									
One trial <sup>72</sup> repor	ted that av	erage analges	sic usage was signific	cantly lower during	on amitriptyline co	ompared to placebo (4	1.7 versus 8.7 per v	veek, p < 0.00	5).		Not evaluated
Trials in subgrou	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	sex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	pain or economic	development not ider	ntified				
Adverse events	s										
2 <sup>66,71,g</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>s</sup>	none	46/48 (95.8%)	60/61 (98.4%)	RR 0.99 (0.91 to 1.06)	<b>10 fewer per 1000</b> (from 89 fewer to 59 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgrou	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	sex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	pain or economic	development not ider	ntified				
Discontinuatio	n due to a	dverse event	s								

			Certainty ass	essment			№ of pati	ients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti- depressants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>2</b> 66,71,g	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious° I² = 75%	not serious	very serious <sup>s</sup>	none	11/71 (15.5%)	4/76 (5.3%)	<b>RR 2.50</b> (0.18 to 35.62)	<b>79 more per 1000</b> (from 43 fewer to 1000 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgro	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	sex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	r pain or economic	development not ide	ntified			•	
Constipation											
<b>2</b> <sup>66,71,g</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriouss	none	22/48 (45.8%)	13/61 (21.3%)	RR 2.14 (1.21 to 3.78)	243 more per 1000 (from 45 more to 592 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgro	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	r pain or economic	development not ide	ntified			I	ļ
Somnolence											
<b>2</b> 66,71,g	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriouss	none	33/48 (68.8%)	35/61 (57.4%)	RR 1.23 (0.94 to 1.62)	<b>132 more per 1000</b> (from 34 fewer to 356 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgro	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	r pain or economic	development not ide	ntified				I.
Dry mouth											
2 <sup>66,71,g</sup>	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	not serious	seriouss	none	40/48 (83.3%)	37/61 (60.7%)	RR 1.38 (1.08 to 1.74)	230 more per 1000 (from 49 more to 449 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in subgro	ups stratifie	ed by gender/s	ex, race/ethnicity, pr	esence of radicula	r pain or economic	development not ide	ntified			•	•
Older adults (a	ged 60 ye	ars and over)									
No data, for all	outcomes (	mean age in t	he trials ranged from	30 to 49 years)							

a. One parallel trial (Dickens 2000) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day) and duloxetine (up to 120 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.

b. Risk of bias. We downgraded two levels. This was because more than 50% of participants come from studies with high risk of bias.

- c. Inconsistency. We downgraded one level. This was because I2 is greater than 50% and not explained by stratified/sensitivity analyses due to limited data.
- d. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a large effect.
- e. Three parallel trials (Atkinson 1999, Dickens 2000, NCT01225068) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20-30 mg/day), milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day), and duloxetine (up to 120 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- f. Imprecision. We downgraded one level. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a small effect.
- g. Two parallel trials (Atkinson 1998, Atkinson 1999), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 46-49. TCA antidepressants included nortriptyline (up 100 mg/day) and maprotiline (up to 150 mg/day).
- h. One parallel trial (Dickens 2000), conducted in the United Kingdom, of adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 45. Paroxetine (20 mg/day).
- i. Inconsistency. We downgraded one level. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- j. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because there is no pooled estimate and fewer than 100 participants in the study.
- k. Two parallel trials (Atkinson 1998, Pheasant 1983), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 46-47. TCA antidepressants included nortriptyline (up to 100 mg/day) and amitriptyline (up to 150 mg/day).
- I. One crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in Austria, of adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 58 years. The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- m. One parallel trial (Atkinson 1998), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean age of 46 years, TCA antidepressant was nortriptyline (up to 100 mg/day).
- n. Two parallel trials (Dickens 2000, NCT01225068) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 37-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day), milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day), and duloxetine (60 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- o. Two parallel trials (Atkinson 1999, Dickens 2000) and one crossover trial (Johnson 2011), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 37-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20-30 mg/day) and duloxetine (60 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- p. Two parallel trials (Dickens 2000, NCT01225068) and one crossover trial (Schukro 2016), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day), milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day), and duloxetine (up to 120 mg/day). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- q. Three parallel trials (Atkinson 1999, Dickens 2000, NCT01226068), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 37-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20-30 mg/day) and milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day).
- r. Two parallel trials (Dickens 2000, NCT01225068), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 45-58. SNRI antidepressants included paroxetine (20 mg/day) and milnacipran (up to 200 mg/day).
- s. Imprecision. We downgraded one level. This was because there were fewer than 200 participants in the analysis.
- t. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because there were fewer than 100 participants in the analysis.

#### References

- <sup>67</sup> Dickens et al. The relationship between pain and depression in a trial using paroxetine in sufferers of chronic low back pain. Psychosomatics; 2000.
- 70 Schukro et al. Efficacy of duloxetine in chronic low back pain with a neuropathic component; a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled crossover trial, Anesthesiology; 2016.
- <sup>69</sup> NCT01225068. Effect of milnacipran in chronic neuropathic low back pain. 2012.
- <sup>66</sup> Atkinson et al. Effects of noradrenergic and serotonergic antidepressants on chronic low back. PAIN; 1999.
- <sup>71</sup> Atkinson et al. A placebo-controlled randomized clinical trial of nortriptyline for chronic low. PAIN; 1998.
- <sup>72</sup>Pheasant et al. Amitriptyline and chronic low-back pain. A randomized double-blind crossover study. Spine: 1983.
- 68 Johnson et al. Effects of duloxetine and placebo in patients with chronic low back pain. The Journal of Pain; 2011

# GRADE Table 9. Anticonvulsants (gabapentin) with treatment duration $\geq 12$ weeks for chronic primary low back pain at 3 to < 6 months versus <u>placebo</u>

			Certainty assessm	nent				Sui	mmary of finding	s	
							No. of pa	articipants	Effe	ect	Certainty
No. of RCTs/ studies	Types of RCTs or other study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations (eg publication bias)	Intervention	Comparator		Absolute (95%CI)	
					All Adul	ts					
Pain (mean dif	fference on 0 to	o 10 scale at 3 to <	6 months)								
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>c</sup>	None noted	55	53	NA	No difference (p=0.42, data otherwise not provided)	Very low
Pain (proportion	on with ≥30% i	mprovement in pa	in at 3 to <6 months	;)		_					
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)c	None noted	55	53	36% vs 36% (p=1.00, CI NR)	ARD 0% (CI NR)	Very low
Psychological	well-being (me	ean difference on	Beck Depression Inv	ventory [0 to 63 s	cale] at 3 to <6 mo	nths)	·			•	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)°	None noted	55	53	NA	No difference (p=0.52), data otherwise not provided)	Very low

			Certainty assessm	ent				Su	mmary of findir	ngs	
							No. of pa	articipants	Е	ffect	Certainty
No. of RCTs/ studies	Types of RCTs or other study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations (eg publication bias)	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)c	None noted	55	53	RR 0.19 (0.02 to 1.60)	ARD -8% (-16 to 1)	Very low
Discontinuatio	n due to adver	rse events (propor	tion with discontinu	ation due to adve	rse event at 3 to <	6 months)	·				-
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	55	53	RR 1.35 (0.46 to 3.99)	ARD 3% (-9 to 15)	Very low
Concentration	difficulties (pr	oportion with con	centration difficultie	s at 3 to <6 month	ıs)						
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)c	None noted	55	53	RR 3.37 (1.48 to 7.70)	ARD 27% (11 to 42)	Very low
Dizziness (pro	portion with di	zziness at 3 to <6	months)		<u> </u>						
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)d	None noted	55	53	RR 1.65 (0.96 to 2.84)	ARD 17% (-0.5 to 35)	Very low
Dry mouth (pro	oportion with d	Iry mouth at 3 to <	6 months)		<u>'</u>		_			_	_
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1)°	None noted	55	53	RR 2.12 (1.11 to 4.04)	ARD 21% (4 to 38)	Very low
Sedation (prop	oortion with se	dation at 3 to <6 m	nonths)	·							
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2) <sup>d</sup>	None noted	55	53	RR 1.84 (0.99 to 3.43)	ARD 17% (0.6 to 34)	Very low
Loss of balance	ce (proportion	with loss of baland	ce at 3 to <6 months	)							

			Certainty assessm	ent				Su	mmary of findi	ngs	
							No. of pa	rticipants	E	Effect	Certainty
No. of RCTs/ studies	Types of RCTs or other study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations (eg publication bias)	Intervention	Comparator	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Serious imprecision (-1) <sup>c</sup>	None noted	55	53	RR 8.67 (2.11 to 35.57)	ARD 29% (16 to 42)	Very low
Nausea/vomiti	ng (proportion	with nausea/vom	ting at 3 to <6 mont	ns)	<u>'</u>	'	'	<u>'</u>			'
1	RCT	Moderate (-1) <sup>a</sup>	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)	None noted	55	53	RR 0.84 (0.33 to 2.16)	ARD -2% (-15 to 11)	Very low
Population su	bgroups, for al	l outcomes:									
Population sub	group 1: Gende	r and/or sex									
No data (propo	rtion female in t	ne trial was 23%)									
Population sub	group 2: Race/e	thnicity									
No data											
Population sub	group 3: Presen	ce of radicular leg p	oain								
No data (43% d	of patients had r	adicular pain; no ar	alysis stratified by pre	esence of radicular p	oain)						
Population sub	group 4: Region	al economic develo	ppment								
		in the United States	<u>,                                      </u>								

## Older adults (aged 60 years and over)

No data, for all outcomes (mean age in the trial was 56 years)

### **Explanations**

- a.
- b.
- Downgraded one level for risk of bias because the only trial was rated fair quality.

  Downgraded one level for inconsistency because there was only one trial (unable to assess consistency).

  Downgraded one level for imprecision because the number of participants was <100.

  Downgraded two levels for imprecision because the confidence interval for the estimate included "no effect" and crossed the threshold for a large effect (RR ≥2). d.

## GRADE Table 10. Anticonvulsants (treatment duration < 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at < 1 to 3 months versus <u>placebo</u>

			Certainty as	ssessment			№ of patie	nts		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-convulsants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain inten	sity at <1 m	onth (measure	ed on a 0-10 scale	at 3 weeks)							
277,79,a	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	none	72	72	-	MD <b>0.16 lower</b> (1.05 lower to 0.72 higher)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified			•	
Pain inten	sity at 1-3 n	nonths (measu	red on a 0-10 sca	le at 6-10 weeks)							
<b>3</b> 77-79,c	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>d</sup> I <sup>2</sup> = 53%	not serious	not serious	none	103	106	-	MD <b>0.89 lower</b> (1.72 lower to 0.06 lower)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate
Subgroup:	gender/sex -	not performed	I (38%-55% female	but no stratified a	analyses)		•				
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by race/et	thnicity, presence o	f radicular pain or	economic develop	oment not identified					
Function a	at <1 month										
No data											
Function a	at 1-3 month	ns (measured o	on the 0-50 Oswes	try Disability Ind	lex at 10 weeks)						
<b>1</b> 79,e	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>9</sup>	none	48	48	-	MD <b>4.9 lower</b> (7 lower to 2.8 lower)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified			•	
Quality of	life at < 1 m	onth									
No data											
Quality of	life at 1-3 m	onths (measu	red on the Genera	I Health Percept	ions sub-scale of	the Short-Form 36 a	at 10 weeks)				

			Certainty as	ssessment			№ of patie	nts		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-convulsants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
<b>1</b> 79,e	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>9</sup>	none	48	48	-	MD <b>3.5 higher</b> (0.88 higher to 6.12 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified	'			
Psycholog	gical well-be	eing at < 1 mon	th								
No data											
Psycholog	gical well-be	ing at 1-3 mor	ths (measured or	the Mental Heal	th Perceptions su	b-scale of the Shor	t-Form 36 at 10 weeks	s)			
<b>1</b> 79,e	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>g</sup>	none	48	48	-	MD <b>5.4 higher</b> (3.14 higher to 7.66 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econ	omic development no	t identified				
Social par	ticipation										
No data											
Change in	medication	use									
trial <sup>78</sup> repo		rage number of					ase and fell from 5.14 t and there was a small				Not evaluated
Trials in su	ıbgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified				
Adverse e	vents										
<b>1</b> 77,h	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>g</sup>	none	9/24 (37.5%)	2/24 (8.3%)	<b>RR 4.50</b> (1.08 to 18.69)	<b>292 more per 1000</b> (from 7 more to 1000 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified				
Discontinu	uation due t	o adverse eve	nts								

			Certainty as	sessment			№ of patie	ents		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-convulsants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
177,h	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>9</sup>	none	1/24 (4.2%)	0/24 (0.0%)	RR 3.00 (0.13 to 70.16)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 fewer)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	tidentified				
Nausea											
2 <sup>77,78,i</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	8/55 (14.5%)	7/58 (12.1%)	<b>RR 1.23</b> (0.48 to 3.14)	28 more per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 258 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	tidentified				
Constipati	ion										
2 <sup>777,78,i</sup>	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	1/55 (1.8%)	1/58 (1.7%)	<b>RR 1.05</b> (0.11 to 9.80)	1 more per 1000 (from 15 fewer to 152 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified	'			
Dizziness											
277,78,i	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious	none	10/79 (12.7%)	3/82 (3.7%)	<b>RR 3.08</b> (0.47 to 20.20)	<b>76 more per 1000</b> (from 19 fewer to 702 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified				
Headache											
377-79,c	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	7/103 (6.8%)	4/106 (3.8%)	<b>RR 1.58</b> (0.49 to 5.10)	22 more per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 155 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified	•	-	•	
Somnolen	се										

			Certainty as	ssessment			№ of patie	nts		Effect				
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Anti-convulsants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty			
<b>3</b> 77-79,c	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>j</sup>	none	6/103 (5.8%)	0/106 (0.0%)	RR 5.15 (0.91 to 29.08)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 fewer)	⊕⊕○○ Low			
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	r/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified	•						
Pruritus														
<b>1</b> 78,k	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>f</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>g</sup>	none	0/31 (0.0%)	1/34 (2.9%)	<b>RR 0.36</b> (0.02 to 8.63)	19 fewer per 1000 (from 29 fewer to 224 more)	⊕○○○ Very low			
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gender	/sex, race/ethnicity	, presence of radi	cular pain or econo	omic development no	t identified	!						
Older adu	Older adults (aged 60 years and over)													
No data, fo	No data, for all outcomes (mean age in the trials ranged from 42 to 49 years)													

#### **Explanations**

- a. One parallel trial (Muehlbacher 2006) and one crossover trial (McCleane 2000), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 42-49. Anticonvulsants included topiramate (up to 300 mg/day) and gabapentin (individualized dosage of 15 mg/kg to the nearest 300 mg). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies. b. Imprecision. We downgraded one level. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a small effect.
- c. Two parallel trials (Muehlbacher 2006, McCleane 2001) and one crossover trial (McCleane 2000), conducted in high-income countries, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 42-49.

  Anticonvulsants included topiramate (up to 300 mg/day) and gabapentin (one trial used a dosage of up to 1200 mg/day, and one trial used an individualized dosage of 15 mg/kg to the nearest 300 mg). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- d. Inconsistency. We downgraded one level. This was because 12 is greater than 50% and is not explained by stratified/sensitivity analyses.
- e. One parallel trial (Muehlbacher 2006), conducted in Germany, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean age of 49 years. Anticonvulsant was topiramate (up to 300 mg/day).
- f. Inconsistency. We downgraded one level. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- g. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because there is no pooled estimate and fewer than 100 participants in the study.
- h. One crossover trial (McCleane 2000), conducted in Ireland, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean age of 42 years. Anticonvulsant was gabapentin (individualized dosage of 15 mg/kg to the nearest 300 mg). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- i. One parallel trial (McCleane 2001) and one crossover trial (McCleane 2000), conducted in Ireland, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages of 42-44. Anticonvulsants included gabapentin (one trial used a dosage of up to 1200 mg/day, and one trial used an individualized dosage of 15 mg/kg to the nearest 300 mg). The crossover trial only reported group-level data, which we analysed in the same way as parallel studies.
- j. Imprecision. We downgraded two levels. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a large effect.
- k. One parallel trial (McCleane 2001), conducted in Ireland, of adults with chronic low back pain with mean age of 44 years. Anticonvulsant was gabapentin (dosage of up to 1200 mg/day).

#### References

- 79 Muehlbacher et al. Topiramate in treatment of patients with chronic low back pain: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Clinical Journal of Pain; 2006.
- <sup>77</sup> McCleane. Gabapentin reduces chronic benign nociceptive pain: a double-blind, placebo-controlled cross-over study. The Pain Clinic; 2000.

78 McCleane. Does gabapentin have an analgesic effect on background, movement and referred pain? A randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled study. The Pain Clinic; 2001.

## GRADE Table 11. Skeletal muscle relaxants (treatment duration < 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at < 1 to 4 months versus placebo

			Certainty as	sessment			Nº of pa	atients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Muscle Relaxants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain inten	sity at <1 m	onth (propo	rtion of participants a	t 3 weeks with ≥	50% difference in p	re- and post-treatn	nent scores on a (	0-10 scale)			
<b>1</b> 81,a	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>c</sup>	none	11/15 (73.3%)	4/16 (25.0%)	RR 2.93 (1.19 to 7.23)	<b>483 more per 1000</b> (from 47 more to 1000 more)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by geno	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	oresence of radic	ular pain or economic	c development not i	dentified		•		
Pain inten	sity at 1-4 m	nonths (mea	n difference on 0 to 1	0 scale at 16 wee	eks)						
<b>1</b> 80,d	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>c</sup>	none	15	16	-	MD <b>0.5 higher</b> (1.59 lower to 2.59 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radic	ular pain or economic	c development not i	dentified				
Pain inten	sity at 1-4 m	nonths (prop	ortion of participants	at 8-16 weeks w	rith ≥50% in pre- an	d post-treatment s	cores [two trials]	or <4 out of 10	one trial])		
<b>3</b> 81-83,e	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>h</sup>	none	30/58 (51.7%)	9/60 (15.0%)	<b>RR 3.18</b> (1.27 to 7.95)	<b>327 more per 1000</b> (from 41 more to 1000 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radic	ular pain or economic	c development not i	dentified				
Function	at <1 month										
No data											
Function	at 1-4 month	s (standard	ized mean difference	on the Roland M	orris Disability Que	stionnaire at 16 we	eeks)				
<b>1</b> 80,d	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>c</sup>	none	16	16	-	SMD <b>0.43 SD higher</b> (0.28 lower to 1.13 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	bgroups stra	tified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radic	ular pain or economic	c development not in	dentified	1			

			Certainty as	sessment			Nº of pa	atients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Muscle Relaxants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Function	at 1-4 month	s (proportio	on of participants at 8-	16 weeks with "	significant improve	ment" [defined dif	ferently across st	udies] on the Os	westry Disabilit	y Index)	
<b>3</b> 1,3,4,e	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious <sup>h</sup>	none	37/58 (63.8%)	10/58 (17.2%)	RR 3.49 (1.92 to 6.35)	<b>429 more per 1000</b> (from 159 more to 922 more)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate
Trials in su	ubgroups stra	tified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radic	ular pain or economic	development not i	dentified			,	
Quality of	f life at <1 mo	onth									
No data											
Quality of	f life at 1-4 m	onths (mear	n difference on 0 to 10	00 visual analog	ue scale [lower sco	res better] at 16 we	eeks)				
<b>1</b> 80,d	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>c</sup>	none	15	16	-	MD <b>0.33 higher</b> (20.68 lower to 21.34 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	ubgroups stra	tified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radic	ular pain or economic	development not i	dentified				
Psycholog	gical well-be	ing									
No data											
Inability to	o work at 1-4	months (m	ean difference in num	ber of sick leave	e days due to low ba	ack pain at 16 wee	ks)				
<b>1</b> 80,d	RCT	not serious	serious <sup>b</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>c</sup>	none	15	16	-	MD <b>4 lower</b> (14.37 lower to 6.37 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in su	ubgroups stra	tified by gend	der/sex, race/ethnicity,	presence of radic	ular pain or economic	development not i	dentified	•			
Change in	n medication	use									
No data											
Adverse e	events (prop	ortion of par	ticipants with any ad	verse event up t	o 16 weeks)						
<b>4</b> 80-83,f	RCT	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious <sup>g</sup>	none	3/76 (3.9%)	4/77 (5.2%)	<b>RR 0.81</b> (0.12 to 5.60)	10 fewer per 1000 (from 46 fewer to 239 more)	⊕⊕○○ Low

Certainty assessment								atients			
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Muscle Relaxants	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Older adu	ts (aged 60	years and o	ver)								
No data (m	ean ages in	the trial rang	ed from 38 to 50 years)								

#### **Explanations**

- a. One parallel randomized trial (Foster 2001), conducted in the USA, of adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 47 years. Botulinum toxin A delivered via single administration in paravertebral muscles.
- b. Inconsistency. We downgraded once. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- c. Imprecision. We downgraded twice. This was because there is no pooled estimate and fewer than 100 participants in the single study.
- d. One crossover randomized trial (Cogne 2017), conducted in France, of adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 38 years. Botulinum toxin A delivered via single administration in paravertebral muscles. The crossover trial was analysed like a parallel trial.
- e. Three parallel randomized trials (Foster 2001, Jazayeri 2011, Machado 2016). Two conducted in high-income countries (USA) and one conducted in Iran, including adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages ranging from 42 to 50 years. Botulinum toxin A delivered via single administration in paravertebral muscles.
- f. Three parallel randomized trials (Foster 2001, Jazayeri 2011, Machado 2016) and one crossover trial (Cogne 2017). Three conducted in high-income countries (USA, France) and one conducted in Iran, including adults with chronic low back pain with mean ages ranging from 38 to 50 years. Botulinum toxin A delivered via single administration in paravertebral muscles. The crossover trial was analysed like a parallel trial. g. Imprecision. We downgraded twice. This was because the pooled estimate crosses the null and the threshold for a large effect.
- h. Imprecision. We downgraded one. This was because there were fewer than 200 participants in the analysis.

#### References

- 81 Foster et al. Botulinum toxin A and chronic low back pain: a randomized, double-blind study. Neurology; 2001.
- 80 Cogné et al. Are paraspinous intramuscular injections of botulinum toxin a (BoNT-A) efficient. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders; 2017.
- 83 Machado et al. Abobotulinum toxin A in the treatment of chronic low back pain. Toxins; 2016.
- 82 Jazaveriet al. Efficacy of botulinum toxin type A for treating chronic low back pain. Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 2011.

## <u>GRADE Table 12</u>. Skeletal muscle relaxants (treatment duration < 12 weeks) for chronic primary low back pain at < 1–3 months versus <u>no</u> <u>treatment</u>

			Certainty a	ssessment			№ of p	patients		Effect	
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Muscle relaxants	No treatment	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Pain intens	sity at < 1 r	month (mean	difference on 0 to	10 scale at 3 we	eks)						
<b>1</b> 84,a	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>c</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	20	20	-	MD <b>0.2 lower</b> (1.48 lower to 1.08 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in sub	bgroups stra	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development	not identified				
Pain intens	sity at 1-3 r	months (mea	n difference on 0 t	o 10 scale at 10	weeks)						
<b>1</b> 84,a	RCT	very serious <sup>b</sup>	serious <sup>c</sup>	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	15	16	-	MD <b>0.5 higher</b> (1.59 lower to 2.59 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low
Trials in sul	bgroups stra	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development	not identified			-	
Function a	it <1 month	l									
No data											
Function a	t 1-3 mont	hs (mean dif	ference on the 0-2	4 Roland Morris	Disability Questi	onnaire at 10 weeks					
184,a	RCT	very	serious	not serious	very serious <sup>d</sup>	none	16	16		SMD 0.43 SD higher	⊕000
		serious <sup>b</sup>								(0.28 lower to 1.13 higher)	Very low
Trials in sul	bgroups stra	atified by gen	der/sex, race/ethnic	ity, presence of ra	dicular pain or ec	onomic development	not identified				
Quality of	life, psycho	ological well-	being, social part	cipation, change	in use of medic	ations or adverse ev	ents				
No data or	not reported	d									
Older adul	ts (aged 60	years and o	ver)								
No data (m	ean age in	the trial was 5	55 years)								

#### **Explanations**

- a. One parallel randomized trial (Zaringhalam 2010), conducted in Iran, of male adults with chronic low back pain with a mean age of 55 years. Baclofen (30 mg/day) for 5 weeks compared to no treatment.
- b. Risk of bias. We downgraded twice. This was because all participants were from a trial rated at high risk of bias due to lack of blinding of participants and care givers.
- c. Inconsistency. We downgraded once. This was because there is only one study and inconsistency cannot be assessed.
- d. Imprecision. We downgraded twice. This was because there is no pooled estimate and fewer than 100 participants in the single study.

#### References

84 Zaringhalam et al. Reduction of chronic non-specific low back pain: a randomized controlled clinical trial on acupuncture and baclofen. Chinese Medicine; 2010.

## GRADE Table 13. Systemic glucocorticoids (any treatment duration) for chronic primary low back pain versus <u>placebo</u>

			Certainty assess		Summary of findings						
				No. of participants		Effect		Certainty			
No. of RCTs/ studies	Types of RCTs or other study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations (eg publication bias)	Intervention	Comparat	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)	
					All Adult	s					
Pain (prop	ortion with full s	symptom relief or	greatly improved sym	ptoms at <2 week	s)						
1	RCT	Unclear (-1)ª	Unable to assess (-1) <sup>b</sup>	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)°	None noted	38	53	RR 1.30 (0.94 to 1.78)	16% (-3.4 to 36)	Very low
Psycholog	gical wellbeing (p	proportion with wo	rse mood at <2 week	s)			·		·		·
1	RCT	Unclear (-1)ª	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)°	None noted	38	53	RR 1.39 (0.90 to 2.16)	16% (-4.9 to 36)	Very low
Hyperglyc	aemia (proportio	on with blood suga	r increase of at least	50 mg/dL at <2 we	eeks)	<u>'</u>	<u>'</u>	<u>'</u>	<u>'</u>		'
1	RCT	Unclear (-1)ª	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)°	None noted	38	53	RR 0.95 (0.54 to 1.69)	-1.6% (-21 to 18)	Very low
Weight ga	in (proportion wi	ith weight gain ≥1	5 kg at <2 weeks)	<u>'</u>			<u> </u>				_
1	RCT	Unclear (-1)ª	Unable to assess (-1) <sup>b</sup>	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)°	None noted	38	53	RR 0.99 (0.63 to 1.57)	-0.5% (-21 to 20)	Very low
Gastrointe	estinal symptoms	s (proportion with	gastrointestinal symp	otoms at <2 weeks	s)						
1	RCT	Unclear (-1)ª	Unable to assess (-1)b	Direct	Very serious imprecision (-2)°	None noted	38	53	RR 3.49 (0.71 to 17.03)	9.4% (-2.5 to 21)	Very low
Population	n subgroups, for	all outcomes:	-	·	•	•	•	-	•	<del>.</del>	

			Certainty asses	Summary of findings									
				No. of pa	rticipants	Effect		Certainty					
No. of RCTs/ studies	Types of RCTs or other study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations (eg publication bias)	Intervention	Comparat	Relative (95%CI)	Absolute (95%CI)			
Population	subgroup 1: Gen	der and/or sex		·		:	:	:		:	:		
No data (po	opulation 31% fen	nale)											
Population	subgroup 2: Race	e/ethnicity											
No data													
Population	subgroup 3: Pres	ence of radicular le	eg pain										
All nationts	had radicular leg	pain											

## Population subgroup 4: Regional economic development

The only trial was conducted in Germany

### Older adults (aged 60 years and over)

No data, for all outcomes (mean age in the single trial was 47 years)

#### Explanations:

- Downgraded one level for risk of bias because the only trial had unclear risk of bias.

  Downgraded one level for inconsistency because there was only one trial (unable to assess consistency).

  Downgraded two levels for imprecision because there were fewer than 100 participants.