

REVIEW ARTICLE

# Spinal Immobilisation vs. No-Immobilisation in Trauma Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Salma Saloum<sup>1</sup> and Ali Mulhem<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Ernst-Abbe-Hochschule Jena, University of Applied Sciences, Jena, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Continuing Education, University of Oxford, UK*

Correspondence should be addressed to Ali Mulhem, Department of Continuing Education, University of Oxford, UK

Received: 21 March 2022; Accepted: 07 April 2022; Published: 14 April 2022

Copyright © Salma Saloum. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## **ABSTRACT**

### **BACKGROUND**

Despite the common application of pre-clinical immobilisation in trauma patients for many years, the existing evidence for this intervention is still weak. The need for pre-clinical immobilisation and applying the right immobilisation procedures on the right trauma patients is still controversial in the scientific literature.

### **OBJECTIVES**

This systematic review aims to compare different outcomes to answer whether the pre-clinical immobilisation of trauma patients is more effective than no pre-clinical Immobilisation and analyse it critically.

### **METHODS**

A systematic literature search was conducted according to the PRISMA criteria in the PubMed and EMBASE databases with meta-analyses. We searched for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and no randomised studies of intervention (NRSIs, both prospective and retrospective studies) comparing two different groups of trauma patients (pre-clinical immobilisation vs no pre-clinical immobilisation). We set no time or language limitations. Two reviewers screened the title/abstracts and the full texts independently. We resolved any conflicts with discussion.

### **RESULTS**

We identified 2,726 studies from PubMed and EMBASE. After double stage screening, a total of 13 studies were included in the systematic review. Both spinal injuries (OR = 3.69, 95% CI from 1.82 to 7.49) and neurological deficits (OR = 2.67, 95% CI from 1.15 to 6.18) occurred in the pre-clinical immobilised patients significantly more often than non-immobilised. We found higher mortality (OR = 1.97, 95% CI from 1.12 to 3.46) and six

times higher side effects (OR= 6.01, 95% CI from 2.880 to 12.91) in the group of pre-clinical immobilisation compared to the control.

## **CONCLUSION**

Pre-clinical immobilisation seems unable to reduce the neurological deficits, mortality, or spine injuries in trauma patients than no-immobilisation. The side-effects of the intervention are higher than the control. The quality of evidence is low. Regarding this topic, there is a critical need for primary studies in general and randomised controlled trials in specific.

## **KEYWORDS**

Pre-clinical; Spinal immobilisation; Cervical collar; Trauma

## **INTRODUCTION**

Immobilisation of the spine generally and the cervical spine specifically has been an essential part of the pre-clinical management of trauma patients for decades [1,2]. This measure is based on the assumption that it minimises the spine's mobility, reducing the assumed worsening of spinal cord injuries through the transport of the patients. Historically, spinal immobilisation using a spine board and a cervical brace in patients with suspected spinal injuries is since the 1960s a standard measure of the pre-clinical management of trauma patients [3]. Currently, both The American's Advanced Trauma Life Support Policy (ATLS) College of Surgeons as well as the Prehospital Trauma Life Support Policy (PHTLS) from the National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians (NAEMT) recommend the initial inline immobilisation in trauma patients until a cervical brace is in place. Upon closer inspection and interpretation of the guidelines, this measure (inline immobilisation) is considered partly equivalent to an airway safety device. According to the ABCDE scheme, cervical spine immobilisation in managing trauma patients is the same as assessing airways [4].

On the other hand, since the pre-clinical rescue team has no medically precise means to exclude spinal and spinal cord injuries, the team must judge the trauma mechanism and decide for or against the pre-clinical immobilisation. However, there is no unified guideline as a decision-making aid in this regard [5-7]. After all, the decision to perform the immobilisation cannot be alone based on these criteria, and there is still a huge controversy over how should be immobilised. In many situations, the pre-clinical emergency team takes the decision based on subjective judgment. And the supporting evidence of this practice is based only on weak studies or studies of healthy volunteers [1,8-11]. Some authors discussed that only a whole-body immobilisation has a meaningful therapeutic meaning for patients [8,9]. Still, whole-body immobilisation has several side effects, such as restricted lung function [12], difficult airway management [13], and increased intracerebral pressure [14,15]. So, this systematic review aims to examine the evidence of spinal immobilisation and answer whether pre-clinical immobilisation is more effective than no immobilisation in trauma patients in reducing a worsening of the outcomes (neurological deficits, spine injuries, and mortality) that might result from a supposed spine injury. We assume that the pre-clinical spinal immobilisation of trauma patients brings no significant benefits but embodies unwanted side effects. The review question was set according to the PICO scheme and is shown in table 1.

**Table 1:** Details of the review question per PICO.

<b>Patient</b>	Patients of any age with penetrating or blunt trauma
<b>Intervention</b>	Pre-clinical application of cervical or spinal immobilisation through the emergency team
<b>Control</b>	No pre-clinical immobilisation of any type
<b>Outcomes</b>	Primary: neurological deficits determined through clinical examination at presentation in the treating hospital, Secondary: spine injuries determined through the complete clinical assessment in the treating hospital, mortality at the admission in the treating hospital, and the side-effects including any of the following: increased intracranial pressure, difficult intubation, unnecessary radiation, and pressure bruises.
<b>Time</b>	At the presentation and admission to the treating hospital
<b>Setting</b>	Pre-clinical emergency care
<b>Study Design</b>	Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), and no randomised studies of interventions (NRSIs)

## **METHODS**

We conducted a systematic review according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA statement 2020) [16]. The study protocol was prospectively published in the PROSPERO database under registration number CRD42021233704.

### ***Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria***

We included studies relevant to the research question, reported on spinal or cervical immobilisation in trauma patients of different age groups, exclusively in the pre-clinical setting, and compared two patient groups (immobilisation vs no immobilisation). There were neither time nor language limitations. Another inclusion criterion is the species of the study design. Since RCTs in evidence-based health care are the gold standard to explore an intervention research question [17], these were preferred. However, a lack of RCTs was anticipated by a primary search, so NRSIs were also included. Other study designs such as systematic reviews, case reports, and case series were excluded (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Inclusion and exclusion criteria of the review.

<b>Inclusion Criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion Criteria</b>
Human Studies	Animal Studies
Pre-Clinical Setting	Clinical, In-Hospital Setting
Trauma Patients	Healthy Volunteers
RCTs, NRSIs	Systematic Reviews, Case Reports, Case Series

### ***Literature Search***

We searched PubMed on 20 April 2021 and EMBASE on 08 May 2021. The search strategy was based on various keywords and MeShTerms (Medical Subject headings) directly related to the question. We used search terms such as (“prehospital”), (“spinal trauma”), (“traumatic injury”) AND (“prehospital collar OR “spinal immobili\*” OR “No immobili\*” OR “Preclinical spine immobili\*”). A medical librarian at the University of Jena checked the search strategy per the PRESS guideline statement [18].

### ***Screening***

We imported the citations of the search into the Covidence program. After removing the duplicates, two reviewers (SS and AM) screened the studies independently in two stages, first at the title/abstracts level and then as full texts per inclusion and exclusion criteria. If the reviewers came to a disagreement, an internal discussion followed, which was decided by consensus.

### ***Data Extraction***

One reviewer (SS) extracted data items into an excel spreadsheet, and another reviewer (AM) checked them in a second stage. Extracted data items were: Study ID (name of the first author and year of publication), study design, patient group, type of trauma, type of immobilisation, sample size, number of patients in intervention and control arms, number of drop-outs, and outcome items.

### ***Meta-Analysis***

All statistical calculations for this work were done using StataCorp.2020. Stata statistical software: Release 17<sup>th</sup> College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC. We assumed that the treatment effect is due to real differences in treatment approaches in included studies and whose populations varied. Thus, a random-effects model was chosen to answer the research question in the context of a meta-analysis in systematic literature research [19]. As a random-effects model, we used for the primary and secondary outcomes the Sidik-Jonckman method [20]. We calculated the odds ratio (OR) for each outcome and its 95% confidence interval (95% CI). A value of OR equal to 1 means no differences in the outcome between the intervention and the control groups. Values greater than 1 indicate increasing chances of outcomes in the immobilisation group, and values less than 1 mean that the chances of outcomes are greater in the no immobilisation group.

We also calculated the heterogeneity of the effect estimate (OR) among included studies and presented it as  $I^2$  statistics (from 0% to 100%) [21]. This percentage indicates how much heterogeneity is due to true variability in the effect estimate between studies rather than chance. The results were shown as forest plots for each outcome, with each study represented a small box. The size of the box represents the statistical significance of the associated study. The boxes are shown around a vertical line, “no-effect line”. The overall result of the meta-analysis is presented as a diamond (marked green). The width of the diamond represents the confidence interval of the final result [22].


## **RESULTS**

### ***Results of Search***

We found thirteen studies that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Figure 1 shows the PRISMA flow chart of the literature search. There were two separate studies published in 2009 using the same population. In the first report, the authors aimed to determine whether there was a link between the pre-clinical cervical spine immobilisation and mortality in patients with penetrated neck trauma. The authors examined a total of 153 trauma patients from the New Orleans Charity Hospital [23]. The authors explored the relationship between cervical immobilisation and the resulting neurological sequelae in trauma patients in the second report. However, they used the same population as the first study plus a small group of patients (43 Patients) from Hurley Hospital [24]. Using the same patient group for several studies is inherently legitimate, but using them in the systematic review and meta-analysis is statistically incorrect. Thus, we included the two reports as one study with the two outcomes (mortality and neurological deficits).

We divided another report into two sub-studies and included them in the meta-analysis [25]. This study compared two patient groups using a pre-clinical protocol for selective spinal immobilisation. According to this protocol, a group of patients was classified as positive for pre-clinical immobilisation, and the second one was judged

negatively. Positive and negative assessment groups were divided into two subgroups (pre-clinical immobilisation vs no pre-clinical immobilisation). Because of this subdivision, we divided it into two sub-studies to reduce the risk of bias [25].



\*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

\*\*If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools. <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

**Figure 1:** PRISMA flow chart.

### *Characteristics of Included Studies*


Table 3 provides an overview of the included studies and their most important properties. As expected by our primary search, there was a lack of randomised controlled trials. Thus, we included eleven retrospective and two prospective studies. Most studies reported on pre-clinical immobilisation in adults. Only four studies included two age groups (adults and children), and one study reported exclusively on pre-clinical immobilisation in children [26]. Another study did not give any age specification [27].

**Table 3:** Characteristics of included studies.

Study ID	Study Design	Age Group (Year)	Type of Trauma	Type of Immobilisation
Hauswald M (1998) [5]	R	Adult	Blunt	Spinal
Kapus KR (1998) [28]	R	Adult	Penetrating	Cervical
Burton JH 2005 [29]	R	(0 - 109)	Blunt	Cervical or Spinal
Domeier RM (2005) [25]	P	(0 - 104)	Blunt	Spinal
Vanderlan WB 2009 [23,24]	R	(>17)	Penetrating	Spinal
Haut ER (2010) [30]	R	(>= 0)	Penetrating	Cervical
Lin HL (2010) [31]	R	(10 - 96)	Blunt	Cervical
Leonard J (2012) [26]	P	(<18)	Blunt	Cervical or Spinal
Postma ILE (2013) [27]	R	NA	Blunt or Penetrating	Cervical or Spinal
Schubl SD (2016) [32]	R	Adult	Penetrating	Spinal
Tatum JM (2017) [33]	R	(>= 18)	Blunt	Cervical
Drain J (2020) [34]	R	Adult	Blunt or Penetrating	Cervical
Asha SE (2021) [35]	R	Adult	Blunt	Cervical

**Primary Outcome**


Of the thirteen included studies, only four provided information on neurological deficits (indicating any failure of neurological function such as impaired consciousness, paraplegia, complete quadriplegia or sensibility disturbance). The overall pooled effect estimate indicates that pre-clinical immobilisation is associated with neurological deficits almost three times more in patients with trauma than no immobilisation. Although the  $I^2$  statistics are 72%, the amount of true heterogeneity could be attributed to the fact that only one study differs significantly from the others [32], as shown in Figure 2.




**Figure 2:** Forest plot of the primary outcome (neurological deficits).

### Secondary Outcomes


Spine injuries were also more common in the intervention group (OR = 3.69 and 95% CI from 1.82 to 7.49), as shown in Figure 3. The mortality was also almost twice higher in the intervention group (OR = 1.97 and 95% CI from 1.12 to 3.46). The heterogeneity was less than observed in the primary outcome with  $I^2$  statistics of 45%, as shown in Figure 4. On the other hand, the side-effects were significantly higher in the immobilisation group (OR = 6.01 and 95% CI from 2.80 to 12.91). These side-effects included unnecessary radiation through computer tomography, difficult or false intubation (Figure 5).



**Figure 3:** Forest plot of the secondary outcome (spine injuries).



**Figure 4:** Forest plot of the secondary outcome (mortality).



**Figure 5:** Forest plot of the secondary outcome (side-effects).

## **DISCUSSION**

This report is the first systematic review that includes a meta-analysis of different outcomes related to pre-clinical spinal or cervical immobilisation compared to no immobilisation to the best of our knowledge. All previous reviews were critical or included only a subgroup of patients [1,2,11].

Our review showed that pre-clinical spinal immobilisation of trauma patients is accompanied by higher neurological deficits, mortality and spine injuries than no immobilisation. This observation could be attributed to the fact that most pre-clinical emergency teams tend to apply this intervention on patients who would have spine injuries, which predispose those patients to more neurological deficits and deaths. And since we could not be able to find RCTs, these observations are inherited with the risk of selection bias of NRSIs. However, this risk of bias was low in the pioneered study of Hauswald, who found that pre-clinical spinal immobilisation of blunt trauma patients brings no or only a minimal effect on the neurological outcomes [5]. Although it was an observational study, the fact of choosing two places with different pre-clinical management approaches (one with and another without immobilisation) leaves little space for selection bias.

On the other hand, our results showed that the side-effects are more common in patients with immobilisation which the selection bias could not influence. More side-effects in the immobilisation group were also noted in a study by Mobbs and a review by Nunez-Patino. They reported an association between cervical spine immobilisation and increased intracranial pressure after head injury [14,15].

Applying pre-clinical spinal immobilisation is still based on emergency teams' subjective judgment with no strong evidence. Although the sole application of the cervical brace has been obsolete for a long time [8], this systematic review included six studies where this measure was the only immobilisation technique. That means the difference between immobilisation and restriction of movement for the emergency personnel is still unclear, indicating that relying on emergency teams' subjective judgment is insufficient.

Our review showed a great amount of heterogeneity in reporting the outcomes among included studies. This attributed to including different subgroups per trauma type and age. Regarding the trauma subtype, all included studies in this review showed the negative effect of pre-clinical spinal immobilisation in penetration trauma patients, in line with the new Danish guidelines [9,36].

All other previous reviews about pre-clinical immobilisation found no RCTs investigating its effect on trauma patients and concluded the uncertainty of applying this intervention to improve the outcomes [1,2,11].

Our review has some limitations. The search strategy was not applied comprehensively. However, we searched the two Cochrane recommended databases (Medline and Embase). We think that extending the search databases would not change the overall conclusions of this review. Another limitation is not conducting a risk of bias evaluation or grading of the evidence. However, finding no RCTs will automatically downgrade the certainty of the evidence of the efficiency of pre-clinical immobilisation.

## **CONCLUSION**

To conclude, the life of patients with schizophrenia in the Arabic world and particularly in Palestine, is complicated. Barriers as the presence of occupation, lacking awareness about mental illness, stigma, inconsistent availability of medications, absence of multidisciplinary teamwork, insufficient specialists, fragmented mental health system, lack of budget and others stand in the face of implementing efficient and effective intervention and rehabilitation services to improve the quality of life in schizophrenia patients and move toward the recovery process. The priority of the Palestinian health care system should be toward improving the quality of care based on evidence-based practice interventions. These interventions should be culturally sensitive to resilience and Sumud culture which has a promise to enhance schizophrenia patients' recovery.

## **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

SS is the principal author; she designed the protocol of the review, served as the first reviewer and drafted the main manuscript, AM is the corresponding author; he served as the second reviewer, conducted the meta-analysis, and contributed to editing the manuscript, JW is the senior author, he reviewed the final version of the manuscript.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

This review and meta-analysis has been conducted as part of the BSc program in Ernst-Abbe-Hochschule Jena, University of Applied Sciences, Jena, Germany.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Hood N and Considine J (2015) Spinal immobilisation in pre-hospital and emergency care: A systematic review of the literature. *Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal* 18(3): 118-137.
2. Sundstrøm T, Asbjørnsen H, Habiba S et al. (2014) Prehospital use of cervical collars in trauma patients: A critical review. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 31(6): 531-540.
3. White IV CC, Domeier RM, Millin MG et al. (2014) EMS spinal precautions and the use of the long backboard-resource document to the position statement of the National Association of EMS Physicians and the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma. *Prehospital Emergency Care* 18(2): 306-314.
4. National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians (US) (2003) Pre-hospital trauma life support committee, American college of surgeons, committee on trauma. PHTLS-basic and advanced prehospital trauma life support.
5. Hauswald M, Ong G, Tandberg D et al. (1998) Out-of-hospital spinal immobilization: Its effect on neurologic injury. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 5(3): 214-219.
6. Hoffman JR, Mower WR, Wolfson AB et al. (2000) Validity of a set of clinical criteria to rule out injury to the cervical spine in patients with blunt trauma. *New England Journal of Medicine* 343(2): 94-99.
7. Vaillancourt C, Stiell IG, Beaudoin T et al. (2009) The out-of-hospital validation of the Canadian C-spine rule by paramedics. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 54(5): 663-671.
8. Chandler DR, Nemejc C, Adkins RH et al. (1992) Emergency cervical-spine immobilization. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 21(10): 1185-1188.

9. Horodyski M, DiPaola CP, Conrad BP et al. (2011) Cervical collars are insufficient for immobilizing an unstable cervical spine injury. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine* 41(5): 513-519.
10. Kreinest M, Gliwitzky B, Goller S et al. (2016) Pre-clinical spinal immobilisation. Friend or foe of trauma patients?. *Notfall & Rettungsmedizin* 19(1): 41-47.
11. Kwan I, Bunn F, Roberts IG (2001) Spinal immobilisation for trauma patients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2).
12. Totten VY and Sugarman DB (1999) Respiratory effects of spinal immobilization. *Prehospital Emergency Care* 3(4): 347-352.
13. Goutcher CM and Lochhead V (2005) Reduction in mouth opening with semi-rigid cervical collars. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 95(3): 344-348.
14. Mobbs RJ, Stoodley MA, Fuller J (2002) Effect of cervical hard collar on intracranial pressure after head injury. *ANZ Journal of Surgery* 72(6): 389-391.
15. Nunez-Patino RA, Rubiano AM, Godoy DA (2020) Impact of cervical collars on intracranial pressure values in traumatic brain injury: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Neurocritical Care* 32(2): 469-477.
16. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM et al. (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *International Journal of Surgery* 88: 105906.
17. Mad P, Felder-Puig R, Gartlehner G (2008) Randomized controlled trials. *Vienna Medical Weekly* 158(7): 234-239.
18. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM et al. (2016) PRESS peer review of electronic search strategies: 2015 guideline statement. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 75: 40-46.
19. Borenstein M (2019) Issues and myths about statistical models. Borenstein M (Eds.), In. *common mistakes in meta-analysis and how to avoid them*. New Jersey: Biostat, Inc. 43-74.
20. IntHout J, Ioannidis J, Borm GF (2014) The Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method for random effects meta-analysis is straightforward and considerably outperforms the standard DerSimonian-Laird method. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 14(1): 1-12.
21. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ et al. (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 327(7414): 557-560.
22. Weckmann G, Chenot JF, Reber KC (2015) Reading and interpreting meta-analyses: A practical guide. *Journal of General Practice* 91(11): 469-473.
23. Vanderlan WB, Tew BE, McSwain Jr NE (2009) Increased risk of death with cervical spine immobilisation in penetrating cervical trauma. *Injury* 40(8): 880-883.
24. Vanderlan WB, Tew BE, Seguin CY et al. (2009) Neurologic sequelae of penetrating cervical trauma. *Spine* 34(24): 2646-2653.
25. Domeier RM, Frederiksen SM, Welch K (2005) Prospective performance assessment of an out-of-hospital protocol for selective spine immobilization using clinical spine clearance criteria. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 46(2): 123-131.
26. Leonard JC, Mao J, Jaffe DM (2012) Potential adverse effects of spinal immobilization in children. *Prehospital Emergency Care* 16(4): 513-518.

27. Postma IL, Weel H, Heetveld MJ et al. (2013) Mass casualty triage after an airplane crash near Amsterdam. *Injury* 44(8): 1061-1067.
28. Kaups KL and Davis JW (1998) Patients with gunshot wounds to the head do not require cervical spine immobilization and evaluation. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery* 44(5): 865-867.
29. Burton JH, Dunn MG, Harmon NR et al. (2006) A statewide, prehospital emergency medical service selective patient spine immobilization protocol. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery* 61(1): 161-167.
30. Haut ER, Kalish BT, Efron DT et al. (2010) Spine immobilization in penetrating trauma: More harm than good?. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery* 68(1): 115-121.
31. Lin HL, Lee WC, Chen CW et al. (2011) Neck collar used in treatment of victims of urban motorcycle accidents: Over-or underprotection?. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 29(9): 1028-1033.
32. Schubl SD, Robitsek RJ, Sommerhalder C et al. (2016) Cervical spine immobilization may be of value following firearm injury to the head and neck. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 34(4): 726-729.
33. Tatum JM, Dhillon NK, Ko A et al. (2017) Refusal of cervical spine immobilization after blunt trauma: Implications for initial evaluation and management: A retrospective cohort study. *International Journal of Surgery* 48: 228-231.
34. Drain J, Wilson ES, Moore TA et al. (2020) Does prehospital spinal immobilization influence in hospital decision to obtain imaging after trauma?. *Injury* 51(4): 935-941.
35. Asha SE, Curtis K, Healy G et al. (2021) Neurologic outcomes following the introduction of a policy for using soft cervical collars in suspected traumatic cervical spine injury: A retrospective chart review. *Emergency Medicine Australasia* 33(1): 19-24.
36. Maschmann C, Jeppesen E, Rubin MA et al. (2019) New clinical guidelines on the spinal stabilisation of adult trauma patients—consensus and evidence based. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine* 27(1): 1-10.