Accepted Manuscript

Agreement is very low between a clinical prediction rule and physiotherapist assessment for classifying the risk of poor recovery of individuals with acute whiplash injury

Joan Kelly, Carrie Ritchie, Michele Sterling

PII: S2468-7812(18)30099-7

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msksp.2018.11.003>

Reference: MSKSP 1948

To appear in: *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*

Received Date: 29 March 2018

Revised Date: 6 September 2018

Accepted Date: 9 November 2018

Please cite this article as: Kelly, J., Ritchie, C., Sterling, M., Agreement is very low between a clinical prediction rule and physiotherapist assessment for classifying the risk of poor recovery of individuals with acute whiplash injury, *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice* (2018), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msksp.2018.11.003>.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

MANUSCRIPT TITLE: Agreement is very low between a clinical prediction rule and physiotherapist assessment for classifying the risk of poor recovery of individuals with acute whiplash injury

AUTHORS: Joan Kelly^{a,1}, Carrie Ritchie^{b,2} & Michele Sterling^{a,b,3}

^a Menzies Health Institute Queensland, Griffith University, G05, 3.20E Parklands Drive, Southport, Australia 4222

^b Recover Injury Research Centre, NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Recovery Following Road Traffic Injuries, The University of Queensland, Level 7 Oral Health Centre, 288 Herston Road, Herston, Queensland, Australia 4006

¹ Author email: joan.kelly@griffithuni.edu.au

² Author email: c.ritchie@uq.edu.au

³ *Corresponding author:* Professor Michele Sterling, The University of Queensland, Level 7 Oral Health Centre, 288 Herston Road, Herston, Queensland, Australia 4006, phone +61 7 3346 4793, email m.sterling@uq.edu.au

Conflicts of Interest: None declared

Ethical Approval: Ethical approval was granted by Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (2016/553)

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Jacelyn Warren for overseeing the statistical analyses performed in this study

- 1 **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** Agreement is very low between a clinical prediction rule and
- 2 physiotherapist assessment for classifying the risk of poor recovery of individuals with acute
- 3 whiplash injury
- 4

5 **ABSTRACT**

6 **Background:** A prognostic clinical prediction rule (whiplash CPR) has been validated for use in
 7 individuals with acute whiplash associated disorders (WAD). The clinical utility of this tool is
 8 unknown.

9 **Objectives:** To investigate: 1) the level of agreement between physiotherapist- and whiplash
 10 CPR- determined prognostic risk classification of people with acute WAD; 2) which clinical
 11 findings are used by physiotherapists to classify prognostic risk; and 3) whether
 12 physiotherapists plan to differ the number of treatment sessions provided based on prognostic
 13 risk classification.

14 **Design:** Pragmatic, observational

15 **Method:** 38 adults with acute WAD were classified as low, medium, or high risk of poor
 16 recovery by their treating physiotherapist (n=24) at the conclusion of the initial consultation. A
 17 weighted Cohen's kappa examined the agreement between physiotherapist estimated risk
 18 classification and the whiplash CPR. Physiotherapists' reasons for classification were provided
 19 and summarised descriptively. Kruskal-Wallis and post-hoc Dunn's tests compared projected
 20 number of treatment sessions between risk subgroups.

21 **Results:** Physiotherapist agreement with the whiplash CPR occurred in 29% of cases (n=11/38),
 22 which was less than what is expected by chance (K= -0.03; 95%CI -0.17 to 0.12).
 23 Physiotherapists most frequently considered range of movement (n=23/38, 61%), a premorbid
 24 pain condition (n=14/38, 37%), response to initial physiotherapy treatment (n=12/38, 32%),
 25 and pain intensity (n=12/38, 32%) when classifying prognostic risk. The projected number of
 26 treatment sessions was not different between risk groups using classifications provided by the
 27 physiotherapists ($\chi^2(2)=2.69$, $p=0.26$).

28 **Conclusions:** Physiotherapists should consider incorporating the whiplash CPR into current
29 assessment processes to enhance accuracy in prognostic decision-making.

30

31 **Keywords:** Whiplash Injuries, Prognosis, Decision Support Techniques, Clinical Decision Making

32

33

INTRODUCTION

Substantial heterogeneity in the population, complexity in the condition, and modest effect sizes from treatment trials [1, 2], means that clinicians may be faced with uncertainty when making decisions regarding the best course of management for individuals with acute whiplash associated disorders (WAD). The ability to gauge the likely prognosis of patients with acute WAD is important given that up to 50% of those injured will not fully recover, but will develop persistent pain and disability [3, 4]. Appropriate treatment in the early post injury period will likely be critical to facilitate recovery given most recovery (if it occurs) takes place in the first 2 to 3 months following injury [5].

To our knowledge, physiotherapists' ability to identify risk of poor recovery has not been well investigated in people with acute WAD. Predictions of return to work status have been demonstrated to be improved by the addition of physiotherapist judgements to a predictive model that included demographic, psychological and pain variables [6]. However, this study included patients with sub-acute to chronic WAD undergoing a rehabilitation intervention and did not provide indication of the accuracy of predictions about later recovery made in the acute injury stage. Evidence of physiotherapists' accuracy in identifying the prognosis of people with other spinal pain conditions has been inconsistent [7-10]. Cook and colleagues investigated physiotherapist estimation of three patient outcomes two weeks after initial contact, in people with any duration neck and back pain and found significant associations between clinician-predicted and actual disability and patient-reported recovery outcomes, but not resolution of pain [10]. Alternatively, Dagfinrud and colleagues investigated physiotherapist prediction of eight week disability outcome in a neck pain population and concluded that clinician predictions did not add value to the prognostic model [8].

Research indicates that clinicians frequently rely on past experience, pattern recognition and intuition to guide early decision-making [11], which can be misleading and may result in inconsistency [12] and bias [13]. Physiotherapists have a positive attitude towards using evidence based practice [14] and consider clinical prediction rules (CPR) as part of best practice [15]. However there seems to be very low clinical adoption rates of CPRs relating to musculoskeletal pain [15, 16]. A clinical prediction rule (whiplash CPR), to improve the precision of clinicians' prognostic judgements for individuals with acute WAD, was derived and has successfully undergone a retrospective, external validation [17, 18]. Low, medium, and high risk prognostic groups are determined using cut-off scores for an individual's, Neck Disability Index score [19], age and hyperarousal symptoms [20] (**Figure 1.**). Although the final step in the development of a CPR, impact analysis, is currently being investigated [21], the validated CPR may be considered for use with an acute WAD population [22]. Determining the agreement between physiotherapists' estimation and the whiplash CPR's risk groupings is important in informing the utility of the CPR [23]. For example, the whiplash CPR's perceived usefulness and subsequent adoption may be enhanced if agreement is found to be poor, as this would indicate the potential benefit of using the CPR in order to sub-group patients for treatment based on predicted recovery. Conversely, if agreement is good the effort required to implement such a tool may outweigh any potential benefit of use in the clinical setting [11].

The primary aim of this study was to determine the level of agreement between physiotherapist estimated and whiplash CPR determined prognostic risk classification of people with acute WAD. Secondary aims were to investigate the clinical findings most commonly used by physiotherapists to classify prognostic risk, and gain insight into whether or not physiotherapists plan to provide a different number of treatment sessions based on patient prognostic risk grouping.

82 MATERIALS AND METHODS

83 *Design*

84 A pragmatic cross-sectional study involving quantitative and qualitative surveys was used to
85 determine the agreement between the whiplash CPR and physiotherapists' prognostic risk
86 classification of patients who presented to physiotherapy for routine management of acute
87 WAD.

88 *Participants*

89 Participants comprised two convenience samples: physiotherapists, and patients with acute
90 WAD. Physiotherapist participants were Australian-based private practice clinicians who
91 indicated that they manage individuals with WAD. Professional contacts of the research team,
92 as well as Australian Physiotherapy Association members who practiced within 100 kilometers
93 of a state capital city and had elected to appear on the associated publicly available
94 professional locator service, were invited to participate via email. Specialist physiotherapists
95 who were a fellow of the Australian College of Physiotherapists, had published in the area of
96 WAD, or had taken part in a clinical trial conducted by the research team were excluded as
97 they may have had prior knowledge of the whiplash CPR.

98 Patient participants were adults (≥ 18 years) with acute WAD who presented to a participating
99 physiotherapist for treatment. Patients were invited to participate by their physiotherapist,
100 and were eligible for inclusion if they had a whiplash injury of less than six weeks duration as a
101 result of a motor vehicle crash and a Quebec Task Force Classification of WAD I, II or III.

102 Exclusion criteria comprised WAD IV (fracture or dislocation), concurrent concussion or head
103 injury as a result of the accident, concurrent neck pain unrelated to the accident, and history
104 of cervical spine surgery. Both physiotherapist and patient participants provided written

informed consent prior to inclusion. Ethical approval was granted by XXX XXX Human Research Ethics Committee (2016/553).

Procedures

Prior to enrolling patient participants, all physiotherapists completed a survey of personal demographic characteristics. When a patient presented to their clinical practice with a whiplash injury, the physiotherapist screened the patient against eligibility criteria and sought patient consent to participate in the study. Following patient consent, the physiotherapist assessed and treated the patient participant as per their usual initial clinical consultation. At the conclusion of this session, the patient completed a paper survey that included the whiplash CPR components embedded around questions regarding demographic and clinical characteristics. The physiotherapist returned this survey to the researchers and hence was not blind to the results. The components of the whiplash CPR were embedded amongst the other survey questions to reduce the likelihood of physiotherapists recognising, scoring, and using the whiplash CPR in their prognostic risk classifications.

Physiotherapists completed a different survey that included three questions. First, physiotherapists classified the patient into a prognostic risk group by responding to the question: *Based on your clinical assessment, what outcome do you expect the patient will have in 6 months time?* Standardised explanations that corresponded to each of the whiplash CPR's risk classifications (denoted below in brackets) were provided as answer options:

1. *Patient signs suggest that full recovery is likely* (low risk)
2. *Patient signs are mixed – it's not yet clear whether they will fully recover or have ongoing pain and disability* (medium risk)
3. *Patient signs suggest that ongoing pain and disability are likely* (high risk)

Second, physiotherapists provided reasons for this choice of prognostic risk group by recording up to five factors that they considered when making the aforementioned decision. A final question, *How many times do you anticipate treating this patient before discharge?*, was posed to quantify potential differences in the planned number of treatment sessions between each of the prognostic risk groups, and hence provide some indication of whether or not physiotherapists intend to treat individuals differently based on predicted outcome. All completed surveys were then forwarded to the investigators who compiled CPR component scores to determine whiplash CPR grouping. Physiotherapists were kept naïve to the aims of the study, but were debriefed at its conclusion. The debriefing included asking physiotherapists who had contributed patient prognostic risk classification data whether they had used the whiplash CPR as part of their decision-making.

Sample size

A sample size of 35 physiotherapist ratings was required to achieve 90% power (alpha 0.05) to detect a true Kappa value of 0.41 in a test of $H_0: \text{Kappa} \leq \kappa_0$ vs. $H_1: \text{Kappa} > \kappa_0$ with 3 categories involving frequencies equal to those reported in the whiplash CPR validation study [17]. A Kappa value of 0.41 (moderate agreement) was selected in preference to zero (agreement equal to chance) on the basis that values less than 0.41 may be considered clinically unacceptable [24].

Analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 22). Absolute agreement of prognostic risk classification between physiotherapists and the whiplash CPR was calculated as a percentage ((number matched/total ratings) x 100). Agreement beyond chance was evaluated using a weighted Cohen's Kappa test where <0.00 demonstrates agreement that is less than chance, 0.01 to 0.20 slight agreement, 0.21 to 0.40 fair agreement,

0.41 to 0.60 moderate agreement, 0.61 to 0.80 substantial agreement and >0.80 near perfect agreement [25]. Physiotherapists' statements regarding reasons for classification were summarised descriptively and reported using frequencies. Finally, Kruskal-Wallis [26] and post-hoc Dunn's [27] tests were applied to compare the planned number of treatment sessions between risk subgroups as classified by the physiotherapists and the whiplash CPR.

RESULTS

Participant characteristics

A total of 263 physiotherapists were invited to participate, of which 89 were included in the study. Reasons for non-participation by physiotherapists included; failure to respond to the invitation (n=126), not treating individuals with WAD (n=27), not providing consent (n=19), and being a fellow of the Australian College of Physiotherapists (n=2). Of the 89 included physiotherapist participants, 24 contributed a total of 38 patient prognostic risk groupings between July 2016 and November 2017. Demographic and clinical characteristics of physiotherapists who did, and did not, provide patient data are presented in **Table 1**. One physiotherapist had previous knowledge of the whiplash CPR, but was not familiar with how to use it so their data was included in analyses. All other physiotherapists who contributed patient prognostic risk data were naïve to the whiplash CPR. **Table 2** provides patient participant characteristics.

Agreement between the whiplash CPR and physiotherapist prognostic risk classifications

According to the whiplash CPR, 24% (n=9) of patients were classified at low risk of poor recovery, 47% (n=18) at medium risk, and 29% (n=11) at high risk (**Figure 2**). Physiotherapists classified 68% (n=26/38) of patients as being at low risk of poor recovery, 29% (n=11/38) as

medium risk, and 3% (n=1/38) as high risk (**Figure 2**). The absolute agreement between physiotherapists and the whiplash CPR was 29% (n=11/38). The corresponding Cohen's weighted kappa value of -0.03 (95% CI -0.17 to 0.12) indicates agreement less than chance [25].

Physiotherapists' reasons for prognostic risk classification

The factors physiotherapists considered when selecting patients' prognostic risk groups are summarised in **Table 3**. The indicators most frequently reported included range of movement (n=23/38, 61%), a premorbid pain condition (n=14/38, 37%), response to initial physiotherapy treatment (n=12/38, 32%), and pain intensity (n=12/38, 32%). Complete descriptions of prognostic indicators from physiotherapists are provided in the **supplementary material**.

Projected treatment numbers by prognostic risk classification

The estimated number of treatment sessions by prognostic risk grouping are provided in **Table 4**. There was no difference in the number of anticipated treatment sessions with the physiotherapist calculated risk grouping ($\chi^2(2) = 2.69$, $p=0.26$). A significant difference was found between the projected number of sessions when groups were classified by the whiplash CPR ($\chi^2(2)=7.14$, $p=0.028$). Patients classified as high risk by the CPR were projected to receive significantly more sessions than those classified as low risk ($z=-13.5$, $p=0.023$), but there were no differences between low and medium ($z=-7.5$, $p=0.29$), or medium and high ($z=-5.75$, $p=0.52$) risk groups.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that agreement between physiotherapists' estimation of patient prognostic risk classification and that provided by the whiplash CPR is very low and less than what would be expected by chance alone. Physiotherapists used varied factors to classify these judgements of risk. The most commonly nominated were: range of movement compared to normative values; the presence or absence of a premorbid pain condition; a patient's immediate response to initial physiotherapy treatment; and patient reported pain intensity. The number of treatment sessions estimated by the physiotherapists were significantly larger in the high risk group compared to the low risk group, when using the whiplash CPR's classification, but not different amongst risk groups using classifications provided by the physiotherapists.

To our knowledge, agreement between clinician-rated prognosis and that of a predictive tool has been investigated in only two other studies. Hill and colleagues [28] reported fair agreement between nine clinicians (general practitioners, physiotherapists and pain management specialists) and the STarT Back Screening Tool in individuals with low back pain (absolute agreement=47%, $\kappa=0.22$). Brunner and colleagues [29] described similar results (absolute agreement=41%) when comparing physiotherapists (n=20) against the same screening tool. These greater levels of agreement compared to our study, may be explained by methodological differences. Clinicians in the study by Hill and colleagues provided prognostic risk groupings after reviewing a video-recorded comprehensive patient examination that was performed by a clinical expert. This assessment may have elicited additional information to what would ordinarily be gleaned, and was likely exempt from the time-pressures of routine physiotherapy practice, a factor accommodated in the present study. While Brunner and colleagues used a pragmatic study design that was more similar to what we employed, physiotherapist participants were informed of the study aims and provided with a copy of the STarT Back Screening Tool prior to commencement, which may have aided familiarisation.

Most agreement in the current study occurred in the low risk group (73%, n=8/11), which may be explained by the high frequency that physiotherapists nominated patients to this classification (68%, n=26/38). This possible over estimation of the number of individuals likely to recover, combined with underestimation of those at high risk of poor recovery (3%, n=1/38), indicates that physiotherapists may be overly optimistic about patient outcomes. This optimism is at odds with what is currently known about WAD recovery. Consistent international data indicate that irrespective of treatment provided, approximately 50% of injured individuals will experience persistent pain and disability, and up to 30% will have moderate to severe symptoms [3, 4]. While optimism may be important, in that providing reassurance of a good prognosis may enhance patient outcomes [30], the lack of agreement between physiotherapist judgement and current evidence about prognosis indicates that physiotherapists may not be accurate in predicting patient outcomes. Inclusion of the whiplash CPR as part of physiotherapy assessment may therefore aid prognostic decision-making and subsequent patient communication.

There were no differences in estimated treatment numbers between physiotherapist-classified prognostic risk groups, indicating that physiotherapists may not use prognostic information to inform treatment decisions as has been suggested in previous literature [12]. However, physiotherapists did anticipate providing more sessions to 'high risk' patients when they were classified by the whiplash CPR. The need to provide more intensive treatment to patients at high risk of poor recovery is in line with clinical practice guidelines [31]. Further assessment and possible onward referral of these individuals is recommended [31], which would lead to the provision of a greater number of treatment sessions. It is interesting that these differences in proposed treatment numbers occurred despite physiotherapists having not identified any of these patients as being at high risk of poor recovery. It may be that physiotherapists' inherently recognised that these individuals could require more intensive treatment to

facilitate recovery, but did not associate this with the potential for poor recovery. Alternatively, other factors such as constraints associated with insurance or medical claims, may have influenced physiotherapists' estimation of treatment session numbers. The reasons for selecting a specific number of treatments were not evaluated in the present study, and hence further investigation using qualitative interviews may help clarify these differences.

The median projected number of treatment sessions was higher than anticipated for those in both the physiotherapist and whiplash CPR-classified low risk groups. While results of the whiplash CPR do not direct the number of treatment sessions, patients in the low risk group are very likely to experience complete and rapid recovery [5, 17], and hence are unlikely to receive further benefit from intensive input. The results of a recent clinical trial indicated that the provision of six physiotherapy sessions provided no additional benefit to long term patient outcomes and was less cost effective, when compared to a single physiotherapy advice session [1]. Further, a review of epidemiological studies indicated that over-treatment early after a whiplash injury may be detrimental, potentially resulting in delayed recovery and iatrogenic disability [32]. Education on the potential risks of over-treatment is needed so that physiotherapists consider reducing on-going treatment to patients who have a good prognosis.

The physiotherapists in our study infrequently nominated recognised prognostic indicators for acute WAD outcomes. Evidence consistently shows that initial pain intensity and disability are predictive of poor recovery [33, 34], yet pain intensity was considered in only 32% of cases, disability was considered in 16% of cases, and the concurrent consideration of pain intensity and disability occurred in only 5.3% of cases. These findings are consistent with a previous study using clinical vignettes, where only 8% of Australian physiotherapists (n=7/91) could correctly identify these prognostic indicators [35]. Factors with less or inconsistent evidence, such as range of movement, a premorbid pain condition, and immediate patient response to

initial physiotherapy treatment, were more frequently nominated by the physiotherapists. The results of both studies indicate that the research evidence has not been successfully translated into clinical practice. This issue may be specific to WAD, given other studies have demonstrated that physiotherapists are cognisant of prognostic indicators for individuals with non-specific neck [36], and low back [37] pain. Other studies have shown that health care providers (mostly physiotherapists) appreciate the importance of identifying prognostic risk factors for WAD [38] but it was not determined if they could nominate specific prognostic indicators. The reasons for this apparent lack of knowledge for WAD prediction is unclear but should be further investigated.

One of the strengths of this study was the pragmatic approach used. Testing physiotherapists who were blind to the tool in question, and operating in real clinical settings across multiple geographical locations, likely provided a more accurate assessment of agreement than what has been reported in the past [28, 29]. However, some methodological limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. First, the cross-sectional design employed cannot be used to ascertain physiotherapists' accuracy in predicting patient outcomes. While poor agreement with the whiplash CPR and infrequent use of established prognostic indicators provides some indication that physiotherapists may be inaccurate, a prospective cohort study is needed to investigate the predictive capacity of physiotherapists in this respect. Second, the extent to which the included sample is representative of Australian physiotherapists may be limited. Although the majority of registered physiotherapists are Australian Physiotherapy Association members (approximately 82%, n=25 000/30 388) [39, 40], membership includes only those who have paid an annual subscription fee, and inclusion on the professional locator service occurs on an "opt-in" basis. Further, while limiting invitation to physiotherapists who practiced in high density population areas may have captured those most likely to treat individuals with acute WAD, the applicability of these

results to physiotherapists in regional locations is not clear. Finally, although the exclusion of physiotherapists with potentially greater expertise in the management of WAD (i.e. specialist physiotherapists), was advantageous in reducing the potential for contamination of the agreement data, this may have led to an underestimation of both physiotherapist agreement with the whiplash CPR and frequency of using established prognostic indicators. However, the included physiotherapists are likely to be representative of clinicians who provide early management to this population, given it is advocated that, if needed, clinicians with expertise in managing WAD provide a peer-review role later in care [31].

CONCLUSIONS

The agreement between physiotherapist-estimated prognostic risk grouping and that provided by the whiplash CPR was very low, and less than that expected by chance. Physiotherapists appeared overly optimistic about the number of individuals that would fully recovery and did not identify any patients classified by the whiplash CPR as being at high risk of poor recovery. Given that the whiplash CPR has been validated, incorporation of the tool into current assessment processes may help physiotherapists make better-informed decisions on whether or not patients are at risk of poor recovery. Strategies that address current barriers to knowledge translation are needed to facilitate increased uptake of the whiplash CPR [41]. Specifically, instruction on how and when to use the tool, the provision of flexible platforms for delivery, and guidance on how to communicate the CPR's results to patients may aid future clinical use [42]. Reduced uncertainty in prognostic decision-making may improve the ability of physiotherapists to provide reassurance to patients who are at low risk of poor recovery. Further, physiotherapists' confidence in the effectiveness of providing fewer treatment sessions to these individuals may be enhanced.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank XXX XXX for overseeing the statistical analyses performed in this study

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest: None

Data Sharing Statement: The complete record of physiotherapists' qualitative descriptions of clinical findings used to classify patient prognostic risk groupings is available as online supplementary material. Anonymised quantitative data can be provided to interested researchers by contacting the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

1. Lamb, S.E., et al., *Emergency department treatments and physiotherapy for acute whiplash: a pragmatic, two-step, randomised controlled trial*. The Lancet, 2013. **381**(9866): p. 546-556.
2. Jull, G., et al., *Management of acute whiplash: a randomized controlled trial of multidisciplinary stratified treatments*. Pain, 2013. **154**(9): p. 1798-1806.
3. Carroll, L.J., et al., *Course and prognostic factors for neck pain in whiplash-associated disorders (WAD): results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000–2010 Task Force on neck pain and its associated disorders*. Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics, 2009. **32**(2): p. S97-S107.
4. Sterling, M., G. Jull, and J. Kenardy, *Physical and psychological factors maintain long-term predictive capacity post-whiplash injury*. Pain, 2006. **122**(1): p. 102-108.
5. Sterling, M., J. Hendrikz, and J. Kenardy, *Developmental trajectories of pain/disability and PTSD symptoms following whiplash injury*. Pain, 2010. **150**(1): p. 22-28.
6. Scott, W. and M.J. Sullivan, *Validity and determinants of clinicians' return to work judgments for individuals following whiplash injury*. Psychological Injury and Law, 2010. **3**(3): p. 220-229.
7. Hancock, M.J., et al., *Can rate of recovery be predicted in patients with acute low back pain? Development of a clinical prediction rule*. European Journal of Pain, 2009. **13**(1): p. 51-55.

8. Dagfinrud, H., et al., *The predictive validity of the Örebro Musculoskeletal Pain Questionnaire and the clinicians' prognostic assessment following manual therapy treatment of patients with LBP and neck pain*. *Manual Therapy*, 2013. **18**(2): p. 124-129.
9. Abbott, J.H. and E.-M. Kingan, *Accuracy of physical therapists' prognosis of low back pain from the clinical examination: a prospective cohort study*. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy*, 2014. **22**(3): p. 154-161.
10. Cook, C.E., et al., *Can experienced physiotherapists identify which patients are likely to succeed with physical therapy treatment?* *Archives of Physiotherapy*, 2015. **5**(1): p. 1-9.
11. McGinn, T.G., et al., *Users' guides to the medical literature: XXII: how to use articles about clinical decision rules*. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000. **284**(1): p. 79-84.
12. Liao, L. and D.B. Mark, *Clinical prediction models: are we building better mousetraps?* *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 2003. **42**(5): p. 851-853.
13. Kleinmuntz, B., *Why we still use our heads instead of formulas: toward an integrative approach*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1990. **107**(3): p. 296.
14. Iles, R. and M. Davidson, *Evidence based practice: a survey of physiotherapists' current practice*. *Physiotherapy Research International*, 2006. **11**(2): p. 93-103.
15. Knox, G.M., S.J. Snodgrass, and D.A. Rivett, *Physiotherapy clinical educators' perceptions and experiences of clinical prediction rules*. *Physiotherapy*, 2015. **101**(4): p. 364-372.
16. Haskins, R., et al., *Physiotherapists' knowledge, attitudes and practices regarding clinical prediction rules for low back pain*. *Manual Therapy*, 2014. **19**(2): p. 142-151.
17. Ritchie, C., et al., *External validation of a clinical prediction rule to predict full recovery and ongoing moderate/severe disability following acute whiplash injury*. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 2015. **45**(4): p. 242-250.
18. Ritchie, C., et al., *Derivation of a clinical prediction rule to identify both chronic moderate/severe disability and full recovery following whiplash injury*. *Pain*, 2013. **154**(10): p. 2198-2206.
19. Vernon, H. and S. Mior, *The Neck Disability Index: a study of reliability and validity*. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*, 1991. **14**(7): p. 409-415.
20. Foa, E.B., et al., *The validation of a self-report measure of posttraumatic stress disorder: the Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale*. *Psychological Assessment*, 1997. **9**(4): p. 445.
21. Rebbeck, T., et al., *Implementation of a guideline-based clinical pathway of care to improve health outcomes following whiplash injury (Whiplash ImPaCT): protocol of a randomised, controlled trial*. *Journal of Physiotherapy*, 2016. **62**(2): p. 111.
22. Kelly, J., C. Ritchie, and M. Sterling, *Clinical prediction rules for prognosis and treatment prescription in neck pain: a systematic review*. *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*, 2017. **27**: p. 155-164.
23. Brehaut, J.C., I.G. Stiell, and I.D. Graham, *Will a new clinical decision rule be widely used? The case of the Canadian C-Spine Rule*. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 2006. **13**(4): p. 413-420.
24. Sim, J. and C.C. Wright, *The kappa statistic in reliability studies: use, interpretation, and sample size requirements*. *Physical Therapy*, 2005. **85**(3): p. 257-268.
25. Viera, A.J. and J.M. Garrett, *Understanding interobserver agreement: the kappa statistic*. *Family Medicine*, 2005. **37**(5): p. 360-363.
26. Kruskal, W.H. and W.A. Wallis, *Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis*. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1952. **47**(260): p. 583-621.

27. Dunn, O.J., *Multiple comparisons among means*. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1961. **56**(293): p. 52-64.
28. Hill, J.C., et al., *Comparing the STarT Back Screening Tool's subgroup allocation of individual patients with that of independent clinical experts*. Clinical Journal of Pain, 2010. **26**(9): p. 783-787.
29. Brunner, E., et al., *Physical therapists' ability to identify psychological factors and their self-reported competence to manage chronic low back pain*. Physical Therapy, 2018: p. pzy012-pzy012.
30. Pincus, T., et al., *Cognitive and affective reassurance and patient outcomes in primary care: a systematic review*. Pain, 2013. **154**(11): p. 2407-2416.
31. State Insurance Regulatory Authority, *Guidelines for the management of acute whiplash-associated disorders – for health professionals*. 2014, State Insurance Regulatory Authority: Sydney, Australia.
32. Côté, P. and S. Soklaridis, *Does early management of whiplash-associated disorders assist or impede recovery?* Spine, 2011. **36**: p. S275-S279.
33. Walton, D.M., et al., *Risk factors for persistent problems following acute whiplash injury: update of a systematic review and meta-analysis*. Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy, 2013. **43**(2): p. 31-43.
34. Sarraimi, P., et al., *Factors predicting outcome in whiplash injury: a systematic meta-review of prognostic factors*. Journal of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, 2017. **18**(1): p. 9-16.
35. Ng, T.S., et al., *Physiotherapists' beliefs about whiplash-associated disorder: a comparison between Singapore and Queensland, Australia*. Physiotherapy Research International, 2014.
36. Hill, J.C., et al., *Predictors of poor outcome in patients with neck pain treated by physical therapy*. Clinical Journal of Pain, 2007. **23**(8): p. 683-690.
37. Bishop, A. and N.E. Foster, *Do physical therapists in the United Kingdom recognize psychosocial factors in patients with acute low back pain?* Spine, 2005. **30**(11): p. 1316-1322.
38. Bandong, A.N., et al., *Referral to specialist physiotherapists in the management of whiplash associated disorders: perspectives of healthcare practitioners*. Musculoskeletal Science and Practice, 2018. **34**: p. 14-26.
39. Physiotherapy Board of Australia, *Physiotherapy Board of Australia: Registrant Data June 2018*. 2018: Available from <https://www.physiotherapyboard.gov.au/About/Statistics.aspx>.
40. Australian Physiotherapy Association. *About the APA*. [cited 2018 29th August]; Available from: http://www.physiotherapy.asn.au/APAWCM/The_APA/About_the_APA/APAWCM/The_APA/About_the_APA/About_Us.aspx?hkey=2d62e215-1771-4162-bced-3a94d8902af0.
41. Stander, J., K. Grimmer, and Y. Brink, *Training programmes to improve evidence uptake and utilisation by physiotherapists: a systematic scoping review*. BMC Medical Education, 2018. **18**(1): p. 14.
42. Kelly, J., et al., *Health practitioners' perceptions of adopting clinical prediction rules in the management of musculoskeletal pain: a qualitative study in Australia*. BMJ Open, 2017. **7**(8): p. e015916.

447 **Table 1.** Characteristics of physiotherapist participants

	Physiotherapists that contributed patient prognostic risk classifications (n=24)	Physiotherapists that did not contribute patient prognostic risk classifications (n=65)
Mean age (SD)	33.4 (8.87)	35.7 (9.24) [^]
Male gender (%)	15 (62.5)	40 (61.5)
Highest physiotherapy qualification		
<i>Pre-professional training (%)</i>	16 (66.7)	41 (63.1)
<i>Clinical specialisation postgraduate (%)</i>	8 (33.3)	22 (33.8)
<i>Postgraduate by research (%)</i>	0 (0)	2 (3.08)
Practice location		
<i>Australian Capital Territory (%)</i>	2 (8.33)	4 (6.15)
<i>New South Wales (%)</i>	1 (4.17)	6 (9.23)
<i>Queensland (%)</i>	2 (8.33)	4 (6.15)
<i>Tasmania (%)</i>	1 (4.17)	0 (0)
<i>Victoria (%)</i>	3 (12.5)	26 (40.0)
<i>Western Australia (%)</i>	15 (62.5)	25 (38.5)
Mean clinical practice years (SD)	9.28 (8.15)	11.6 (9.38)
Mean number of patients with WAD seen per year (SD)	9.25 (7.22)	7.36 (6.20) [^]
Mean number of prognostic classifications provided to study (SD)	1.58 (0.72)	0 (0)
SD = standard deviation, WAD = whiplash associated disorder, [^] missing values (n=64)		

448

449

450 **Table 2.** Characteristics of patient participants

	Mean (SD) or frequency (%) n=38
Age (years)	42.7 (14.4)
Female gender	32 (84.2)
Days since motor vehicle crash	12.5 (9.65)
Neck pain intensity (10 cm visual analogue scale)	
<i>Past 24 hours</i>	4.68 (21.3)
<i>Past 7 days</i>	5.15 (22.8)*
Neck Disability Index score (%)	35.3 (16.7)
Self-perceived expectation of recovery (0-10)	8.96 (1.40)^
Depression Anxiety Stress Scales – 21 item score	
<i>Total score</i>	14.1 (13.9)
<i>Depression subscale score</i>	3.49 (4.96)
<i>Anxiety subscale score</i>	4.45 (4.68)
<i>Stress subscale score</i>	6.18 (5.10)
Work status at time of physiotherapy consult	
<i>Usual hours</i>	18 (51.4)^
<i>Reduced hours</i>	6 (17.1)^
<i>Not working due to whiplash associated disorder</i>	5 (14.3)^
<i>Not applicable (unemployed or retired)</i>	6 (17.1)^
Compensation claim	
<i>Compulsory Third Party insurance</i>	20 (52.6)
<i>Workers Compensation</i>	3 (7.89)
<i>Other compensation scheme</i>	2 (5.26)
<i>None</i>	13 (34.2)

451 SD = standard deviation, *missing value (n=37), ^missing values (n=35)

452

453

454 **Table 3.** Factors used by physiotherapists when choosing patient prognostic risk classification

Category	Prognostic indicator	Example description from physiotherapists	Frequency (%)
Symptoms	Pain		
	<i>Intensity</i>	"Extremely high levels of self-reported pain"	12 (32)
	<i>Multiple sites/spread of</i>		
	<i>Other</i>	"Bilateral symptoms and headaches"	10 (26)
	Disability	"Low irritability"	2 (5.3)
	<i>NDI score</i>		
	<i>ADLs</i>	"Low score [Neck Disability Index] (16%)"	6 (16)
	<i>Work</i>		
	Other	"Currently very functional"	8 (21)
		"Returned to full work duties"	6 (16)
Physical impairments		"Additional symptoms (vertigo, nausea)"	2 (5.3)
	Cold hyperalgesia	"No cold hypersensitivity"	1 (2.6)
	Range of movement	"Minimal active ROM restriction in neck"	23 (61)
	Neurological deficits	"Nil neurological signs or symptoms"	9 (24)
Psychological factors	Other	"Increased sensitivity to touch"	2 (5.3)
	Expectation of recovery	"Positive about likelihood of recovery"	7 (18)
	Posttraumatic stress symptoms		
	<i>IES score</i>	"Low [Impact of Events Scale] score"	2 (5.3)
	<i>Other</i>	"Low emotional response to traumatic event"	7 (18)
	Anxiety	"Low anxiety levels"	1 (2.6)
	Kinesiophobia	"Low [Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia]"	3 (7.9)
	OMPSQ score	"Low modified Orebro score (18/100)"	4 (11)
	Attitude or motivation for recovery	"Patient's attitude towards recovery – excellent"	9 (24)
	Understanding of condition	"Fair understanding of condition"	2 (5.3)
	Other/non specified	"Nil yellow flags"	7 (18)
Past medical history	Premorbid condition		
	<i>Pain</i>	"Past history of neck pain prior to whiplash"	14 (37)
	<i>Psychological</i>		
	<i>Other</i>	"Major depressive disorder"	5 (13)
	Premorbid medication	"Medical illnesses which could affect neck pain"	4 (11)
	Fitness or activity levels		
		"Isn't taking regular medication"	1 (2.6)
Health care utilisation		"Patient is fit and active"	7 (18)
	Time to seek care	"Sought treatment one day after MVC"	3 (7.9)

Recovery	Recovery pre-care	"Pain and movement improved by 50% in 5 days"	4 (11)
	Response to treatment		
	<i>Signs and symptoms</i>		
	<i>Other</i>	"Responsive to first treatment"	12 (32)
Socio-demographics		"High rapport"	4 (11)
	Age	"Less than 50 [years] of age"	6 (16)
	Other	"Post-menopausal"	4 (11)
Crash related factors	Collision force	"Low force accident"	2 (5.3)
Compensation factors	Legal representation	"Not interested about engaging a solicitor"	1 (2.6)

NDI = Neck Disability Index, ADLs = activities of daily living, ROM = range of movement, IES = Impact of Events Scale, OMPSQ = Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire, MVC = motor vehicle crash

Table 4. Anticipated number of treatment sessions provided by physiotherapists and categorised by prognostic risk classification

	Low risk	Medium risk	High risk
Median number of treatments by physiotherapist classification (IQR)	7.5 (5)	10 (9.5)	8 (0)
Median number of treatments by whiplash CPR classification (IQR)	6 (1.5)*	9 (4)	10 (14)*
CPR = clinical prediction rule, IQR = interquartile range, *significant difference ($p < 0.05$)

Figure 1. The whiplash clinical prediction rule to identify low, medium, and high risk of poor recovery in whiplash-injured individuals. Adapted from Ritchie et al 2013 [18] (Permission to be granted from Wolters Kluwer Health). PDS = Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale, yrs = years, PPV = positive predictive value, CI = confidence interval

Figure 2. Patient prognostic risk groupings as classified by the whiplash CPR in comparison to groupings classified by physiotherapists. CPR = clinical prediction rule, n = number

Supplementary material. Physiotherapist description of clinical findings used to classify patient prognostic risk groupings

Category	Prognostic Indicator		Description provided by PTs	Prognostic risk group - PT (CPR)	PT #	pt #
Symptoms	Pain	Intensity	Extremely high levels of self-reported pain	Medium (High)	1	1
			[Visual Analogue Scale] 0-1/10 pain levels	Low (Medium)	1	2
			Low levels self-reported pain	Low (Medium)	1	10
			Pain	Low (Medium)	19	24
			Constant unchanged base of [cervical] spine and upper [thoracic] spine pain 4-5/10	Low (Medium)	41	30
			Reported moderate pain pre-treatment that is "tolerable"	Low (High)	43	23
			Mild to [moderate] pain reported	Low (Medium)	43	29
			Low baseline pain at time of [motor vehicle accident]	Low (Medium)	46	16
			Immediate high level pain at time of accident	Medium (High)	47	36
			No immediate pain - symptoms started 1/2 hour post [motor vehicle accident]	Medium (High)	47	37
			High pain severity/irritability	Medium (High)	67	21
			High [Visual Analogue Score] score	Low (Medium)	87	26
		Multiple sites or spread of	Not experiencing associated headaches	Low (Medium)	1	2
			Intermittent incidence of headache	Low (Medium)	37	11
			Nil distal referral symptoms	Medium (Low)	41	30
			Low upper limb pain	Low (Medium)	46	16
			Widespread pain	Medium (High)	47	36
			Widespread pain	Medium (High)	47	37
			No peripheral symptoms*	Low (Low)	53	25
			Referred pain limited to upper and posterior shoulder	Low (High)	68	27
			Bilateral symptoms and headaches	Low (High)	68	27
			Pain localised to [cervical] spine	Low (Medium)	78	33
	Other		Low irritability	Low (High)	44	12
			Variable and changing symptoms/pain	Medium (High)	49	31
	Disability	Neck Disability	Low score [Neck Disability Index] (16%)	Low (Medium)	1	10

	Index score	Low [Neck Disability Index] and outcome measures	Low (Low)	19	14
		Low [Neck Disability Index]	Low (Medium)	19	24
		Very high [Neck Disability Index] and [Impact of Events Scale]*	Medium (High)	47	36
		High [Neck Disability Index]	Medium (High)	47	37
		[Neck Disability Index] 34% indicates only mild-moderate disability	Low (Medium)	64	20
	Activities of daily living	Patient reports mild limitation in [activities of daily living] (Prolonged hand overhead only)	Low (Medium)	1	8
		Minimal changes to usual activities	Low (Medium)	4	4
		Doesn't let pain stop her doing daily tasks	Low (Medium)	5	5
		Currently very functional	Low (Low)	7	6
		Sleeping normally*	Low (Medium)	37	11
		Continuing with life/work*	Low (Medium)	44	38
		Low avoidance of activity from day to day*	Low (High)	44	12
		Amount of disability - still currently working and independent self-care*	Medium (High)	67	21
	Work	Returned to full work duties	Low (Medium)	1	2
		Patient has already made full [return to work] and leisure activities and lifting	Low (Medium)	1	8
		[Returned to work] (modified duties)	Low (Medium)	37	11
		Continuing with life/work*	Low (Medium)	44	38
		Returned to work	Low (Medium)	46	16
		Amount of disability - still currently working and independent self-care**	Medium (High)	67	21
	Other	Mild severity of symptoms	Low (Medium)	4	4
		Additional symptoms (vertigo, nausea)	Medium (High)	49	31
Physical impairments	Cold hyperalgesia	No cold hypersensitivity	Low (Low)	53	25
	Range of movement	Highly reduced active/passive [range of movement] in all directions (0-20 degrees)	Medium (High)	1	1
		Full [range of movement] (end range 'stretch' limitation only)	Low (Medium)	1	2
		Patient reports mild pain or 'stretch' with movement	Low (Medium)	1	8
		Near full [range of movement] in [cervical] spine	Low (Medium)	1	8
		Near normal [active range of movement] all directions	Low (Medium)	1	10
		Full [cervical range of movement]	Low (Medium)	4	22
		Near full [cervical range of movement]	Low (Low)	6	7

		Near [full range of cervical movement]	Low (Medium)	6	17
		Low [range of movement]	Low (Medium)	19	24
		Minimal active [range of movement] restriction in neck	Low (Low)	22	9
		Greater than 45 degrees [cervical] rotation (unilateral). [Full range or movement] otherwise	Low (Medium)	37	11
		Neck [active range of movement] left [equals] right (pain restriction not stiffness)	Low (Low)	41	19
		Pain 3/52 with shoulder [active range of movement] and [cervical] spine [active range of movement]	Low (Medium)	41	30
		Satisfactory [range of movement] 1 [day] post [motor vehicle accident]	Low (Medium)	43	29
		Satisfactory [range of movement] for 2 [weeks] post [motor vehicle accident]	Low (High)	43	23
		Good neck [range of movement]	Low (Medium)	46	18
		Reasonable neck and shoulder [range of movement]	Medium (High)	47	37
		Fair [cervical range of movement] (greater than 50% rotation on initial assessment)	Low (Medium)	64	20
		Reduced [range of movement] [cervical/thoracic spine]	Medium (High)	67	21
		Full [cervical range of movement]	Low (Medium)	78	33
		Full [range of movement]	Low (Low)	78	34
		Quite restricted [range of movement]	Low (Medium)	87	26
		Very good initial [range of movement] presentation	Low (Medium)	89	35
	Neurological deficits	Lack of [upper limb] neurological signs	Low (Medium)	37	11
		Nil neurological signs or symptoms	Low (Low)	41	19
		Nil [pins and needles], numbness, burning sensations	Medium (Low)	41	30
		Minimal cervical radiculopathy and reducible*	Low (High)	43	23
		[Neurological] testing [no abnormality detected]	Low (Medium)	46	18
		No peripheral symptoms*	Low (Low)	53	25
		No [neurological] symptoms	Low (Medium)	64	20
		No [neurological] signs and symptoms	Low (High)	68	27
	Other	No neurological symptoms	Low (Low)	78	34
		Increased sensitivity to touch	Medium (Low)	41	30
		Tolerance to palpation (6/10)	Low (High)	68	27
Psychological factors	Expectation of recovery	Positive about likelihood of recovery	Low (Medium)	4	22
		Positive outlook	Low (Medium)	5	5

Posttraumatic stress symptoms	Impact of Events Scale	Good patient perceived expectations for recovery	Low (Medium)	46	16
		Low [Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire score] and positive outlook*	Medium (High)	47	36
		Positive outlook by [patient] regarding outcome	Low (Medium)	78	33
		Positive outlook	Low (Low)	78	34
		Patient outlook on prognosis - positive	Low (Medium)	89	35
	Other	Very high [Neck Disability Index] and [Impact of Events Scale]*	Medium (High)	47	36
		Low [Impact of Events Scale] score	Low (Low)	53	25
		Lack of yellow flags/psychological distress*	Low (Low)	19	14
		Yellow flags (anxiety driving, nightmares)	Low (Medium)	19	24
		Sleeping normally*	Low (Medium)	37	11
		Low psychological distress from [motor vehicle accident]	Low (High)	44	12
		Low emotional response to traumatic event	Low (Medium)	44	38
		Pain delayed until 12 hours (?shock)	Medium (High)	49	31
		States that she is quite stressed about the accident	Medium (High)	88	28
Anxiety		Low anxiety levels	Low (Low)	78	34
Kinesiophobia		Low avoidance of activity from day to day*	Low (High)	44	12
		Very guarded and rigid with movements	Medium (High)	47	36
		Low [Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire] and [Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia]*	Medium (High)	47	37
Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire score		Belief/understanding around pain (short form [Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire] score 71)	Medium (High)	1	1
		Low [Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire score] and positive outlook*	Medium (High)	47	36
		Low [Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire] and [Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia]	Medium (High)	47	37
		Low modified [Orebro Musculoskeletal Pain Screening Questionnaire] score (18/100)	Low (Low)	53	25
Attitude or motivation for recovery		Very open to information, taking advice and education	Medium (High)	2	3
		Patient's attitude towards recovery - excellent	Low (Medium)	4	4
		Keen to resume normal activities	Low (Medium)	4	22
		Optimistic and positive attitude	Low (Medium)	6	17
		Positive attitude	Low (Low)	6	7
		Patient's understanding of condition and positive attitude*	Low (Low)	7	6

			[Patient] self-motivated (exercises 3-4 [times] per week independently)	Low (High)	36	13
			Eager to RTW and ADLs - high motivation to get better	Low (High)	43	23
			High motivation with [return to work] and [activities of daily living]	Low (Medium)	43	29
	Understanding of condition		Patient's understanding of condition and positive attitude*	Low (Low)	7	6
			Fair understanding of condition	Low (Medium)	44	38
	Other/non specified		Few psychosocial factors	Low (Medium)	1	10
			Poor social history (unemployed since car accident 1996 (back pain), family disputes*	Medium (High)	2	3
			Minimal psychosocial factors/yellow flags	Low (Medium)	4	4
			Nil yellow flags	Low (Low)	5	15
			Lack of yellow flags/psychological distress*	Low (Low)	19	14
			Patient beliefs (fair)	Low (High)	36	13
			No yellow flags identified	Low (Medium)	87	26
Past medical history	Premorbid condition	Pain	No previous injury history	Medium (High)	1	1
			Significant past history (chronic pain, anxiety, depression, drug addiction)*	Medium (High)	2	3
			Past history of neck pain prior to whiplash	Low (Medium)	5	5
			No previous neck pain	Low (Medium)	6	17
			No previous neck injuries	Low (Low)	7	6
			First incidence of cervical spine injury	Low (Low)	41	19
			[Minimum] past history of injury including whiplash	Low (Medium)	46	16
			Responsive co-morbid [low back pain]*	Low (Medium)	46	18
			Migraine history*	Medium (High)	49	32
			Fibromyalgia*	Medium (High)	49	32
			No previous history of neck pain	Low (Medium)	64	20
			Past history of neck pain/injury 5 [years] ago (no residual symptoms but known [osteoarthritis])	Medium (High)	67	21
			No past history of [cervical] pain	Low (Low)	78	34
			Nil previous cervical injury	Medium (High)	88	28
		Psychological	Significant past history (chronic pain, anxiety, depression, drug addiction)*	Medium (High)	2	3
			Recent admission for attempted suicide	High (Medium)	49	32
			Major depressive disorder	High (Medium)	49	32

	Other	Psychosocial/emotional factors - known past history of psychological factors	Medium (High)	67	21	
		Pre-existing depression and anxiety	Medium (High)	88	28	
		Medical illnesses which could affect neck pain	Low (Medium)	5	5	
		Young healthy adult with nil co-morbidities*	Low (Low)	41	19	
		Migraine history*	High (Medium)	49	32	
		Fibromyalgia*	High (Medium)	49	32	
	Premorbid medication	Isn't taking regular medication	Low (Medium)	1	8	
	Fitness or activity levels	Pre-injury levels of activity/fitness (moderate level of weekly fitness activity)	Medium (High)	1	1	
		Patient is fit and active	Low (Low)	5	15	
		Very fit and healthy (Pilates instructor and personal trainer)	Low (Medium)	6	17	
		Very active prior to accident	Low (Low)	6	7	
		Fit and healthy prior to accident	Low (Low)	7	6	
		Moderate/high previous activity and fitness levels	Low (Low)	19	14	
		Patient very fit (Zumba instructor)	Medium (High)	88	28	
Health care utilisation	Time to seek care	Sought treatment one day after [motor vehicle accident]	Low (Low)	22	9	
		Has commenced early medical intervention with [general practitioner]	Low (Low)	22	9	
		No [physiotherapy] input in a relatively long time (2 weeks to seek treatment)	Low (Medium)	87	26	
Recovery	Recovery pre-care	Was self-medicating voltaren 3/day but doesn't feel necessary to continue	Low (Medium)	1	2	
		Pain and movement improved by 50% within 5 days	Low (Low)	5	15	
		Symptoms improving	Low (Low)	6	7	
		No need for pain relief today (date of [first assessment])	Low (Medium)	6	17	
	Response to treatment	Signs and symptoms	Responsive to first treatment	Low (Low)	19	14
			Responded well to manual therapy (increased post treatment neck [range of movement])	Low (Low)	22	9
			Improved [cervical range of movement] after treatment	Low (High)	36	13
			Reduction in headache immediately post treatment	Low (High)	36	13
			Minimal cervical radiculopathy and reducible*	Low (High)	43	23
			Good response post initial treatment (decreased headache, increased [range of movement])	Low (High)	43	23
			Cervical radiculopathy reducible	Low (Medium)	43	29

			High improvement on session 1	Low (High)	44	12	
			High response to treatment	Low (Medium)	44	38	
			Responsive co-morbid [low back pain]	Low (Medium)	46	18	
			Significant symptom reduction with self-management techniques	Low (Low)	53	25	
			Responsive to treatment	Low (Medium)	89	35	
			Other	Compliant with advice given	Low (Low)	22	9
			High rapport	Low (Medium)	44	38	
			Low irritability - tolerance to [treatment]	Low (High)	68	27	
			High awareness of positioning with exercises	Low (Medium)	89	35	
			Socio-demographic variables	Age	Young	Low (Low)	7
Low age	Low (Low)	19			14		
Age of patient (fair)	Low (High)	36			13		
Young healthy adult with nil co-morbidities*	Low (Low)	41			19		
Less than 50 [years] of age	Low (Medium)	43			29		
Young age	Low (Medium)	87			26		
Other	Poor social history (unemployed since car accident 1996 (back pain), family disputes*	Medium (High)		2	3		
	[Activities of daily living] not requiring repetitive computer screen time	Low (Low)		41	19		
	Post-menopausal	Medium (High)		49	31		
	Works part time as a pharmacy assistant	Medium (High)		88	28		
Crash related factors	Collision force	Impact from behind was significant (trailer also attached to vehicle)	Medium (High)	49	31		
		Low force accident	Low (Medium)	78	33		
Compensation		Not interested about engaging a solicitor	Low (Medium)	4	22		

CPR = clinical prediction rule, PT = physiotherapist, # = identification number, pt = patient, *description duplicated in another category

HIGHLIGHTS

- Agreement between physiotherapist- and whiplash CPR- determined prognostic risk classification was very low
- Physiotherapists were overly optimistic regarding patient outcomes
- The whiplash CPR may aid physiotherapist prognostic judgements
- Strategies to enhance use of the whiplash CPR and prognostic indicators are needed