B.4 Massage

Overview of the PICO structure

Definition of the intervention

Massage is the manual manipulation of soft body tissues to enhance health and well-being. Practised globally, there are more than 80 different forms of massage, many developed in the last 30 years. While massage may be used for a variety of specific indications (e.g., relaxation, comfort at the end of life, relieving pain, enhancing athletic performance), it is undertaken with the general goal of helping the body achieve or increase health and well-being. In the evidence review for this guideline, massage was broadly defined and included any soft-tissue manipulation using hands or another mechanical device and traditional, complementary and integrative (TCI) medicine massage. Massage could be applied to any body part, to the lumbar region only, or to the whole body.

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).							
	 Subgroups: Age (all adults and those aged 60 years and over) Gender and/or sex Presence of leg pain (radicular, non-radicular, mixed) Race/ethnicity - studies of populations who were historically marginalized compared with studies of those who were not Regional economic development - studies carried out in high-income countries compared with studies in low- to middle-income countries 							
Comparators	 a) Placebo/sham b) No or minimal intervention, or where the effect of the intervention can be isolated c) Usual care (described as usual care in the trial) d) Adjuvant therapy, i.e. where the additional effect of an intervention could be isolated 							

Outcomes	Critical outcomes constructs (all adults) Pain Back-specific function/disability General function/disability Health-related quality of life Psychosocial function Social participation Adverse events (as reported in trials) Pain Back-specific function/disability General function/disability Health-related quality of life Psychosocial function Adverse events (as reported in trials) Change in the use of medications Falls
	• Falls

Other Evidence-to-Decision (EtD) considerations

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

Summary of resource considerations	
All adults	Older people

No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made	No evidence identified
based on experience of GDG members	

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	No evidence identified						

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

Domain	All adults	Older people				
Benefits	Small; trivial; uncertain; varies	Small; trivial; uncertain				
Harms	Uncertain	Uncertain				

Balance benefits to harms	Probably favours massage; probably does not favour massage; uncertain	Probably favours massage; probably does not favour massage; uncertain			
Overall certainty	Low; very low	Low; very low			
Values and preferences	Probably important uncertainty or variability; possibly important uncertainty or variability	Probably important uncertainty or variability; possibly important uncertainty or variability			
Resource considerations	Moderate costs; uncertain; varies	Moderate costs; varies			
Equity and human rights	No impact; probably reduced (traction especially); varies	No impact; probably reduced (traction especially); uncertain; varies			
Acceptability	Yes; probably yes; probably no; uncertain; varies	Yes; probably yes; probably no; uncertain; varies			
Feasibility	Yes; probably yes; varies	Yes; probably yes; varies			

GRADE Table 1. What are the benefits and harms of massage in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain) compared with sham massage?

	Certainty assessment						№ c	of patients	Effect			
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecision	Other considerations	Massage	Sham	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Pain intens	sity (higher sco	res mean mo	ore pain)									
Pain intens	Pain intensity (higher scores mean more pain) - Pain in immediate term (1 month)											
51	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	102	103	-	MD 3.07 lower (7.34 lower to 1.21 higher)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
Population	subgroups 1,	2 and 3 - not	reported (no sub	group analysis	was performed)							
Population	subgroup 4: r	egional econ	omic developme	nt								
Low income 12	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	26	25	-	MD 0.7 higher (4.20 lower to 5.60 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
High income 43	randomized trials	seriousª	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	76	78	-	MD 7.6 lower (13.76 lower to 1.48 lower)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
Population	subgroup 4: C	Older adults (over 60 years of	age)								
Older adults ²	randomized trials	serious ^a	serious	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	26	25	-	MD 0.70 lower (4.20 lower to 5.60 higher)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	

Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect			
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecision	Other considerations	Massage	Sham	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Pain intens	ity (higher sco	res mean mo	ore pain) - Pain ir	short term (1-	-3 months)							
34	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^d	none	60	60	-	MD 14.25 lower (20.28 lower to 8.22 lower)	⊕○○ O Very low	
Population	subgroup 1: g	ender and/o	rsex									
Women ⁵	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^d	none	26	25	-	MD 13.30 lower (20.91 lower to 5.69 lower)	⊕○○ O Very low	
Men ⁶	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^d	none	34	35	-	MD 15.85 lower (25.71 lower to 5.98 lower)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
Population	subgroups 2 a	and 3 - not re	ported (no subgre	oup analysis wa	s performed)			!		!		!
Population	subgroup 4: r	egional econ	omic developme	nt								
Low income ⁷	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^d	none	26	25	-	MD 13.30 lower (20.91 lower to 5.69 lower)	⊕○○ O Very low	
High income ⁸	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	very serious ^d	none	34	35	-	MD 15.85 lower (25.71 lower to 5.96 lower)	⊕○○ O Very low	
Population	subgroup 5: C	Older adults		•								

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº c	of patients	Eff	ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecision	Other considerations	Massage	Sham	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Older adults ²	randomized trials	serious ^a	serious	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	26	25	-	MD 13.30 lower (20.91 lower	⊕○○	
										to 5.69 higher)	Very low	
Pain intens	sity (higher sco	res mean mo	ore pain) - Pain ir	intermediate	term (3-6 month	ıs)						
19	randomized trials	seriouse	serious ^f	serious ⁹	very serious ^f	none	7	8	-	MD 10 lower (16.58 lower to 3.42 lower)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Population	subgroups 1,	2 and 3 - not	reported (no sub	group analysis	was performed)							
Population	subgroup 4: r	egional econ	omic developme	nt - not report	ed (no subgroup	analysis was performe	ed, only 1 study	included)				
Pain intens	sity (higher sco	res mean mo	ore pain) - Pain ir	n long term (>6	6 months)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Functionin	g (higher score	es mean mor	e disability) - Fur	nctioning in im	mediate term (1	month)						
410	randomized trials	seriousª	not serious	serious ^h	very serious ^c	none	76	78	-	SMD 0.5 lower (0.96 lower to 0.04 lower)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
Population	subgroups 1,	2, 3 and 4 - n	ot reported (no s	ubgroup analys	sis was performed	d)						
'Functionin	ng (higher scor	es mean mo	re disability) - Fu	nctioning in s	hort term (1-3 m	onths)						
411	randomized trials	serious ^e	not serious	serious ⁱ	very serious ^c	none	98	96	-	SMD 0.4 lower (0.68 lower to 0.11 lower)	⊕○○ O Very low	

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº c	of patients	Eff	ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecision	Other considerations	Massage	Sham	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Population	subgroup 1: g	ender and/o	r sex									
Only women ¹²	randomized trials	serious ^e	not serious	serious ⁱ	very serious ^c	none	26	25	-	SMD 1.33 lower (4.90 lower to 2.24 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Men & Women ¹³	randomized trials	serious ^e	not serious	serious ⁱ	very serious ^c	none	72	71	-	SMD 2.44 lower (4.57 lower to 0.31 lower)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
Population	subgroup 2 ar	nd 3 - not rep	orted (no subgro	up analysis was	s performed)		!		!	!	!	!
Population	subgroup 4: r	egional econ	omic developme	nt								
Low income ¹⁴	randomized trials	serious ^e	not serious	serious ⁱ	very serious ^c	none	38	36	-	SMD 0.49 lower (0.95 lower to 0.03 lower)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
High income ¹⁵	randomized trials	serious ^e	not serious	serious ⁱ	very serious ^c	none	60	60	-	SMD 0.34 lower (0.70 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Population	subgroup 5: C	Older adults (over 60 years of	age)								
Older adults ²	randomized trials	serious ^a	serious	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	26	25	-	MD 0.20 lower (0.75 lower to 0.35 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº c	of patients	Eff	ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecision	Other considerations	Massage	Sham	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
216	randomized trials	seriouse	not serious	serious ⁹	very serious ^d	none	45	44	-	SMD 0.35 lower (0.76 lower to 0.07 higher)	⊕○○ O Very low	
Population	subgroups 1,	2, 3 and 4 - n	ot reported (no s	ubgroup analysi	s was performed	d)						
Functionin	g (higher score	es mean mor	e disability) - Fui	nctioning in Ion	g term (>6 mor	nths)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Quality of L	Life (higher sco	ores mean be	etter QoL)									
Quality of L	Life (higher sco	res mean be	etter QoL) - QoL i	n immediate te	rm (1 month)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Quality of L	Life (higher sco	ores mean be	etter QoL) - QoL i	n short term (1-	3 months)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Quality of L	Life (higher sco	ores mean be	etter QoL) - QoL i	n intermediate	term (3-6 mont	hs)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Quality of L	Life (higher sco	ores mean be	etter QoL) - QoL i	n long term (>6	months)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Fear avoida	ance belief (hig	her scores r	nean more fear a	voidance) - Fea	r avoidance in	immediate term (1 m	nonth)					
2 ¹⁷	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious ^d	none	45	45	-	MD 14 lower (22.84 lower to 5.15 lower)	⊕⊕○ ○ Low	
Population	subgroups 1,	2, 3 and 4 - n	ot reported (no s	ubgroup analysi	s was performed	(b)				!		
Fear avoida	ance belief (hig	jher scores r	nean more fear a	voidance) - Fea	r avoidance in	short term (1-3 mont	ths)					

			Certainty ass	essment			Nº c	of patients	Eff	ect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecision	Other considerations	Massage	Sham	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
218	randomized trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious ^d	none	45	45	-	MD 13.5 lower (22.86 lower to 4.14 lower)	⊕⊕○ ○ Low	
-	• • •		ot reported (no s		·	d) intermediate term (3	-6 months)					
Teal avoid	ance belief (ing	nier scores i	-	,	a avoidance in	intermediate term (5	-o months,					
Fear avoida	ance belief (hig	her scores r		voidance) - Fea		long term (> 6 montl	ns)	-	-	-	-	

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardized mean difference

Explanations

- a. Downgraded for selection bias (unclear treatment allocation), performance bias (unclear co-interventions and compliance), and selective outcome reporting bias.
- b. Downgraded because Kim 2021 only included participants >65 years of age and only women (and responsible for >50% of the weight in the meta-analysis); in 4 out of 5 studies (80% of the weight) massage of the spine was used, while Quinn 2008 (17% of the weight) used a different form of massage (reflexology foot massage representative of the points in the spine).
- c. Downgraded by one level because there were very few participants (ca. 200), and downgraded by one level based on a relatively broad 95% CI.
- d. Downgraded by one level because there were very few participants (ca. 100), and downgraded by one level based on a relatively broad 95% CI.
- e. Downgraded by for selection bias (unclear treatment allocation) and performance bias (unclear co-interventions).
- f. Downgraded by because just one small study examined this treatment comparison.
- g. Downgraded by because Quinn 2008 used a different form of massage (reflexology foot massage representative of the points in the spine).
- h. Downgraded by because all the studies were single-centre; high income; and intervention is different for one study (Quinn 2008 (15% of the weight)).
- i. Downgraded by because all the studies were single-centre; some low, some high income; and the intervention was different across the studies (myofascial release, foot reflexology, acupressure).

References

- 1. Arguisuela 2017, Arguisuela 2019, Geisser 2015, Kim 2021, Quinn 2008
- 2. Kim 2021
- 3. Arguisuela 2017, Arguisuela 2019, Geisser 2015, Quinn 2008
- Arguisela 2017, Kim 2021, Quinn 2008
- Kim 2021

- 6. Arguisela 2017, Quinn 2008
- 7. Kim 2021
- 8. Arguisuela 2017, Quinn 2008
- 9. Quinn 2008
- 10. Arguisuela 2017, Arguisuela 2019, Geisser 2015, Quinn 2008
- 11. Ajimsha 2014, Arguisuela 2017, Kim 2021, Quinn 2008
- 12. Kim 2021
- 13. Ajimsha 2014, Arguisuela 2017, Quinn 2008
- 14. Ajimsha 2014
- 15. Arguisuela 2017, Kim 2021, Quinn 2008
- 16. Arguisuela 2017, Quinn 2008
- 17. Arguisuela 2017, Arguisuela 2019
- 18. Arguisuela 2017, Arguisuela 2019

GRADE Table 2. What are the benefits and harms of massage in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain) compared with no intervention?

No trials

GRADE Table 3. What are the benefits and harms of massage in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain) compared with <u>usual care</u>?

		Certair	nty assessme	ent			Nº of p	atients	E	ffect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsist ency	Indirectnes s	Imprecisi on	Other consideratio ns	Massage	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Pain intensi	ty (higher scores	mean more pain)										
Pain intensi	ty (higher scores	mean more pain)	- Pain in imn	nediate term (1	month)							
11	randomized trials	serious ^a	serious ^b	serious ^c	very serious ^b	none	30	24	-	MD 5 lower (16.44 lower to 6.44 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Population :	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgro	oup analysis wa	s performed)							
Pain intensi	ty (higher scores	mean more pain)	- Pain in sho	rt term (1-3 mo	onths)							
22	randomized trials	serious ^d	not serious	serious ^c	very serious ^e	none	95	69	-	MD 12.19 lower (20.16 lower to 4.22 lower)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Population :	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgr	oup analysis wa	s performed)							
Pain intensi	ty (higher scores	mean more pain)	- Pain in inte	rmediate term	(3-6 months)							
1 ³	randomized trials	serious ^d	seriousb	serious ^c	very serious ^b	none	57	45	-	MD 2.9 lower (14.16 lower to 8.36 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Population :	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgr	oup analysis wa	s performed)							
Pain intensi	ty (higher scores	mean more pain)	- Pain in long	g term (>6 mon	iths)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Functioning	ı (higher scores m	ean more disabil	ity)			1			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	1
Functioning	(higher scores m	ean more disabil	ity) - Functio	ning in immedi	ate term (1 m	onth)						

		Certai	nty assessme	ent			№ of	patients	Е	ffect				
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsist ency	Indirectnes s	Imprecisi on	Other consideratio ns	Massage	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance		
14	randomized trials	serious ^a	serious ^b	serious ^c	very serious ^b	none	30	24	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.6 lower to 0.48 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low			
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgr	oup analysis wa	s performed)		•	•	•		•	•		
Functioning	Functioning (higher scores mean more disability) - Functioning in short term (1-3 months)													
35 randomized trials serious not serious very serious none serious ser														
Population s	subgroups 1 and 2	2 - not reported (no subgroup a	nalysis was per	formed)	•		•	•			•		
Population s	subgroup 3: prese	nce of radicular	leg pain											
Radicular pain ⁶	randomized tria	als serious ^f	not serio	ous not serie	ous ve serie	ous ^g non	е	363	202	(0.8 to	MD 0.59 ower 30 lower 5 0.37 ower)	w		
Radicular pain not presented ⁷	randomized tri	als serious ^f	not serio	ous not serie	ous ve serio	,	е	363	202	(0.6 to	MD 0.37 ower 59 lower 50 0.06 ower)	-		
Population s	subgroup 4: regio	nal economic de	velopment - r	not reported (ne	o subgroup ar	nalysis was perfo	rmed)	ļ		!	i	!		
Functioning	(higher scores m	ean more disabil	ity) - Functio	ning in interme	ediate term (3	-6 months)								
28	randomized trials	serious ^f	not serious	not serious	very serious ⁹	none	325	178	-	SMD 0.34 lower (0.52 lower to 0.15 lower)	⊕○○○ Very low			

		Certair	nty assessme	ent			Nº of p	atients	E	ffect			
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsist ency	Indirectnes s	Imprecisi on	Other consideratio ns	Massage	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance	
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgro	oup analysis wa	s performed)								
Functioning	(higher scores m	ean more disabil	ity) - Functio	ning in long ter	rm (>6 month	is)							
19 randomized trials seriousb seriousb not serious very seriousb none 268 132 - SMD 0.18 lower (0.46 lower to 0.09 higher) Population subgroups 1, 2, 3 and 4 - not reported (no subgroup analysis was performed)													
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgro	oup analysis wa	s performed)								
Quality of Lif	fe (higher scores	mean better QoL)										
Quality of Life	fe (higher scores	mean better QoL) - QoL in im	mediate term (1 month)								
110	randomized trials	serious ^f	serious ^b	seriousº	very serious ^b	none	30	24	-	SMD 0.99 lower (1.56 lower to 0.42 lower)	⊕○○○ Very low		
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgro	oup analysis wa	s performed)								
Quality of Lif	fe (higher scores	mean better QoL) - QoL in sho	ort term (1-3 m	onths)								
111	randomized trials	serious ^f	serious ^b	serious ^c	very serious ^c	none	57	45	-	SMD 0.33 lower (0.72 lower to 0.07 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low		
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgro	oup analysis wa	s performed)								
Quality of Lif	fe (higher scores	mean better QoL) - QoL in inte	ermediate term	(3-6 months)							
112	randomized trials	serious ^f	serious ^b	serious ^c	very serious ^c	none	57	45	-	SMD 0.12 lower (0.51 lower to 0.27 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low		
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgro	oup analysis wa	s performed)								

		Certair	nty assessme	ent			Nº of p	oatients	E	ffect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsist ency	Indirectnes s	Imprecisi on	Other consideratio ns	Massage	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Quality of Li	fe (higher scores	mean better QoL) - QoL in lor	ıg term (>6 moı	nths)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Depression	(higher scores me	ean more depress	sion)									
Depression	(higher scores me	ean more depress	sion) - Depre	ssion in immed	liate term (1 ı	month)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Depression	(higher scores me	an more depress	sion) - Depre	ssion in short t	erm (1-3 mor	nths)						
113	randomized trials	serious ^f	serious ^b	serious ^c	very serious ^c	none	57	45	-	MD 3.4 lower (7.45 lower to 0.65 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgr	oup analysis wa	s performed)	I						
Depression	(higher scores me	an more depress	sion) - Depre	ssion in interm	ediate term (3-6 months)						
114	randomized trials	serious ^f	serious ^b	seriousº	very serious ^c	none	57	45	-	MD 1.2 lower (5.1 lower to 2.7 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Population s	subgroups 1, 2, 3	and 4 - not repor	ted (no subgr	oup analysis wa	s performed)							
Depression	(higher scores me	an more depress	sion) - Depre	ssion in long te	erm (>6 mont	hs)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardized mean difference

Explanations

- a. Downgraded due to high risk of performance bias (patients and clinicians were not blinded to the intervention).
- b. Downgraded because just one study examined this comparison.
- c. Downgraded because single-center study with few participants.
 d. Downgraded by two levels due to high risk of selection bias (treatment allocation), performance bias (patients and clinicians were not blinded to the intervention), and unclear risk for selective outcome reporting bias.
- e. Downgraded because relatively few participants were included (ca. 200).

- f. Downgraded due to high risk of selection bias (treatment allocation), and high risk of performance bias (patients and clinicians were not blinded to the intervention),
- g. Downgraded because few participants were included (ca. 550).

References

- Kobayashi 2019
 Kobayashi 2019, Poole 2017
- 3. Poole 2017
- Kobayashi 2019
 Cherkin 2011, Kobayashi 2019, Poole 2007
- 6. Cherkin 2011
- 7. Kobayashi 2019, Poole 2007
- 8. Cherkin 2011, Poole 2007
- 9. Cherkin 2011
- 10. Kobayashi, 2019
- 11. Poole 2007
- 12. Poole 2007
- 13. Poole 2007
- 14. Poole 2007

GRADE Table 4. What are the benefits and harms of massage as an <u>adjuvant therapy</u> in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain)?

			Certainty as	ssessment			Nº of p	atients	Effe	ct		
№ of studie s	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Other considerations	Massage as Adjuvant therapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolut e (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Pain inte	ensity (higher	scores mea	n more pain)									
Pain inte	ensity (higher	r scores mea	n more pain) - Pa	in in immediat	e term (1 mon	th)						
41	randomize d trials	serious ^a	serious ^b	not serious	very serious ^c	none	123	123	-	MD 2.35 lower (10.54 lower to 5.83 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Populat	ion subgroup	s 1, 2, 3 and	4 - not reported (no subgroup ar	nalysis was per	formed)	!	ļ.	!	!	!	l
Pain inte	ensity (higher	r scores mea	n more pain) - Pa	nin in short terr	n (1-3 months							
42	randomize d trials	serious ^d	serious ^b	not serious	very serious ^c	none	108	109	-	MD 8.13 lower (13.93 lower to 2.33 lower)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Populati	ion subgroup	s 1, 2, 3 and	4 - not reported (no subgroup ar	nalysis was per	formed)				1	I	
			ılts (over 60 year		<u> </u>	·						
Older adults ⁷	randomize d trials	serious ^a	serious ^b	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none	22	23		MD 13.40 lower (21.84 lower to 4.96 lower)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	

			Certainty as	sessment			№ of p	atients	Effec	t		
№ of studie s	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Other considerations	Massage as Adjuvant therapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolut e (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pain inte	ensity (higher	scores mea	n more pain) - Pa	in in long term	(> 6 months)							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Function	ning (higher s	cores mean	more disability)		•							
Function	ning (higher s	cores mean	more disability)	Functioning in	n immediate te	erm (1 month)						
43	randomize d trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	very serious	none	123	123	-	SMD 0.38 lower (0.63 lower to 0.13 lower)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low	
Populati	on subgroup	s 1, 2, 3 and	4 - not reported (no subgroup an	alysis was perf	ormed)						
Function	ning (higher s	cores mean	more disability)	Functioning in	n short term (1	-3 months)						
24	randomize d trials	serious ^a	serious ^e	not serious	very serious ^e	none	56	56	-	SMD 0.86 lower (1.90 lower to 0.17 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low	
Populati	on subgroup	s 1, 2, 3 and	4 - not reported (no subgroup an	alysis was perf	ormed)				•		
Function	ning (higher s	cores mean	more disability)	Functioning in	n intermediate	term (3-6 months)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Function	ning (higher s	cores mean	more disability)	Functioning in	n long term (>6	6 months)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

			Certainty as	sessment			№ of p	atients	Effe	ct		
№ of studie s	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Other considerations	Massage as Adjuvant therapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolut e (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
Quality o	of Life (higher	scores mea	n better QoL)									
Quality o	of Life (higher	scores mea	n better QoL) - Q	oL in immedia	te term (1 mon	nth)						
1 5	randomize d trials	serious ^a	serious ^e	not serious	very serious ^e	none	56	56	-	MD 1.00 higher (-8.24 lower to 10.24 higher)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low	
Populati	on subgroup	s 1, 2, 3 and	4 - not reported (no subgroup an	alysis was perf	ormed)						
Quality o	of Life (higher	scores mea	n better QoL) - Q	oL in short ter	m (1-3 months	s)						
26	randomize d trials	serious ^a	serious ^e	not serious	very serious ^e	none	56	56	-	MD 1.48 lower (-7.12 lower to 4.26 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	
Populati	on subgroup	s 1, 2, 3 and	4 - not reported (no subgroup an	alysis was perf	formed)						
Populati	on subgroup	5: Older adu	Its (over 60 years	s of age)								
Older adults ⁷	randomize d trials	seriousª	serious ^b	serious ^b	very serious ^c	none		22	23	MD 3.52 lower (10.74 lower to 3.7 higher)	⊕○○ ○ Very low	
Quality o	of Life (higher	scores mea	n better QoL) - Q	oL in intermed	iate term (3-6	months)						
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quality o	of Life (higher	scores mea	n better QoL) - Q	oL in long tern	n (>6 months)							

			Certainty as	ssessment			№ of p	atients	Effe	ct		
№ of studie s	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Other considerations	Massage as Adjuvant therapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolut e (95% CI)	Certainty	Importance
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardized mean difference

Explanations

- a. Downgraded for high risk of bias (performance bias (patients and clinicians were not blinded to the intervention)).
- b. Downgraded for substantial statistical heterogeneity (I-squared>75%).
- c. Downgraded because there were very few participants (ca. 200).
- d. Downgraded for selection bias (because the treatment allocation was unclear for >50% weight of studies), and high risk of performance bias.
- e. Downgraded by one level because just one study with a small number of participants examined this comparison, and downgraded by one level based on a relatively broad 95%CI

References

- 1. Ali-Khorsand 2019, Bellido-Fernandez 2021, Boff 2020, Shu 2021
- 2. Ali-Khorsand 2019, Boff 2020, Ozsoy 2019, Zheng 2012
- 3. Ali-Khorsand 2019, Bellido-Fernandez 2021, Boff 2020, Shu 2021
- 4. Ali-Khorsand 2019, Boff 2020
- 5. Boff 2020
- 6. Boff 2020, Ozsoy 2019
- 7. Ozsoy 2019