

2020

Systematic reviews that include only published data may overestimate the effectiveness of analgesic medicines for low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Matthew K. Bagg

Edel O'Hagan

Pauline Zahara

Benedict Wand

The University of Notre Dame Australia, benedict.wand@nd.edu.au

Markus Hubscher

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/physiotherapy_article



Part of the [Physical Therapy Commons](#), and the [Physiotherapy Commons](#)

This article was originally published as:

Bagg, M. K., O'Hagan, E., Zahara, P., Wand, B., Hubscher, M., Moseley, G., & McAuley, J. H. (2020). Systematic reviews that include only published data may overestimate the effectiveness of analgesic medicines for low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 124, 149-159.

Original article available here:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.12.006>

This article is posted on ResearchOnline@ND at https://researchonline.nd.edu.au/physiotherapy_article/170. For more information, please contact researchonline@nd.edu.au.



Authors

Matthew K. Bagg, Edel O'Hagan, Pauline Zahara, Benedict Wand, Markus Hubscher, G. Lorimer Moseley, and James H. McAuley

Systematic-reviews that include only published data may overestimate the effectiveness of analgesic medicines for low back pain. A systematic-review and meta-analysis.

Matthew K Bagg^{1,2,3}, Edel O'Hagan^{1,2}, Pauline Zahara¹, Benedict M Wand⁴, Markus Hübscher¹, G Lorimer Moseley^{1,5}, James H McAuley^{1,6}

1. Neuroscience Research Australia, Randwick, NSW 2031, Australia m.bagg@neura.edu.au; e.ohagan@neura.edu.au; p.zahara@neura.edu.au; m.huebscher@neura.edu.au; J.McAuley@neura.edu.au
2. Prince of Wales Clinical School, University of New South Wales, Kensington, NSW 2052, Australia
3. New College Village, University of New South Wales, Kensington, NSW 2052, Australia
4. School of Physiotherapy, The University of Notre Dame Australia, Fremantle, WA 6959, Australia, benedict.wand@nd.edu.au
5. School of Health Sciences, University of South Australia, SA 5001, Australia, Lorimer.Moseley@unisa.edu.au
6. School of Medical Sciences, University of New South Wales, Kensington, NSW 2052, Australia

Correspondence to:

Matthew K Bagg

Neuroscience Research Australia

PO Box 1165, Randwick, NSW 2031, Australia

Tel: +61 2 9399 1870

Email: m.bagg@neura.edu.au

Abstract

Objective: Systematic-reviews of analgesics for low back pain generally include published data only. Obtaining data from unpublished trials is potentially important because they may impact effect sizes in meta-analyses. We determined whether including unpublished data from trial registries changes the effect sizes in meta-analyses of analgesics for low back pain.

Study Design and Setting: Trial registries were searched for unpublished data that conformed to the inclusion criteria of n=5 individual source systematic-reviews. We reproduced the meta-analyses using data available from the original reviews then re-ran the same analyses with the addition of new unpublished data.

Results: Sixteen completed, unpublished, trials were eligible for inclusion in four of the source reviews. Data were available for five trials. We updated the analyses for two of the source reviews. The addition of data from two trials reduced the effect size of muscle relaxants, compared to sham, for recent-onset low back pain from -21.71 (95%CI -28.23 to -15.19) to -2.34 (95%CI -3.34 to -1.34) on a 0-100 scale for pain intensity. The addition of data from three trials (one enriched design) reduced the effect size of opioid analgesics, compared to sham, for chronic low back pain from -10.10 (95%CI -12.81 to -7.39) to -9.31 (95%CI -11.51 to -7.11). The effect reduced in the subgroup of enriched design studies, from -12.40 (95%CI -16.90 to -7.91) to -11.34 (95%CI -15.36 to -7.32), and in the subgroup of non-enriched design studies; from -7.27 (95%CI -9.97 to -4.57) to -7.19 (95%CI -9.24 to -5.14).

Conclusion: Systematic-reviews should include reports of unpublished trials. The result for muscle relaxants conflicts with the conclusion of the published review and recent international guidelines. Adding unpublished data strengthens the evidence that opioid analgesics have small effects on persistent low back pain and more clearly suggests these effects may not be clinically meaningful.

Key words: Back pain, analgesics, publication bias, clinical trials (as topic), meta-analysis (as topic)

Word count: 3624

What is New?

What is already known:

- Systematic-reviews and meta-analyses that include unpublished data from trial registries may reach different conclusions to those that exclude unpublished data.

What are the new findings:

- Including unpublished data from trial registries changes the effect sizes reported in recently published meta-analyses of common analgesic medicines for low back pain
- Including unpublished data reduced the estimate of treatment effect in all comparisons for which new data were available.
- Current systematic-reviews of medicines for low back pain likely overestimate the benefits of these interventions

1. Introduction

Evidence from systematic-review and meta-analysis of data from controlled trials has an important role in guideline development and clinical decision-making. It is well-known that not all trials are published promptly, or indeed at all [1–3]. Unpublished data may substantially impact effect sizes when included in published meta-analyses [4–9]. For example, including unpublished data changed the effect size by up to 29% in 14 meta-analyses across cardiovascular medicine, oncology, neurology and rheumatology [5]. Relatedly, published and unpublished data may provide different estimates for the same comparison [10,11]. For example, the effect sizes for comparisons amongst anti-depressant medicines may differ depending on whether the meta-analyses use data that are published, or data from regulatory submissions [10,11].

Analgesic medicines are a common treatment for the management of low back pain (LBP) [12–16] and recent systematic-reviews of analgesic medicines [17–25], with a single exception [23], only include published data. Clinical trial registries provide publicly accessible records of unpublished trials and are recommended information sources for systematic-review teams [26,27]. Despite this, a systematic literature search indicates the effect of including unpublished data on the effect size of published meta-analyses of analgesic medicines for LBP remains unknown.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of including publicly available unpublished data, identified through ClinicalTrials.gov and the World Health Organisation International Clinical Trial Registry Platform (ICTRP), on the effect sizes of published meta-analyses of the most commonly prescribed analgesic medicines for LBP.

2. Methods

This review represents a supplementary analysis of five previously published systematic-reviews.

2.1 Published meta-analyses used in this study

We investigated systematic-reviews of paracetamol [19], non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) [20,21], muscle relaxant medicines [18], and opioid analgesics [17] for people with LBP. These were the five most recently published systematic-reviews at the time of writing the protocol. Furthermore, these medicines are the most commonly prescribed for LBP [12,13,15,16,28–30] and, with the exception of paracetamol, are recommended in recent international guidelines for the management of LBP [31].

2.2 Search and selection process for unpublished data

Two authors independently extracted details of the inclusion criteria used in each of the previous systematic-reviews (see eTable 1). Disagreements were resolved by discussion. Arbitration by a third author was available if required. We developed a catalogue of analgesic medicines listed on the World Health Organisation Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical classification system and currently licensed in either Australia, Europe or the United States [32–34] (eTable 2). We adapted the Saragiotto [19] and Enthoven [21] reviews' search strategies for the ICTRP and ClinicalTrials.gov, adding the medicines from the catalogue. For three reviews that did not search trial registries [17,18,20], we developed separate search strategies *de novo*, using search terms for LBP and the catalogued medicines. We used each strategy to search the ICTRP and ClinicalTrials.gov for all trial records registered to the 6th of June 2017 – the most recent search date from the included source systematic-reviews. A summary of the search strategies can be found in eTable 3.

We screened records against the previously extracted inclusion criteria for each review. Two authors independently screened the title, keywords, and record description and subsequently independently screened the full-record; defined as the full web-page, and any downloadable documents. Disagreements were resolved by discussion. Arbitration by a third author was available if required.

MKB verified the additional criteria for inclusion in this study that trials must have been i) registered and ii) unpublished prior to the date of the last search by the respective source systematic-review. Trials were judged unpublished when: i) the full record contained no listed publications, ii) the downloaded dataset (where available) contained no listed publications and iii) independent searches of PubMed [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed], Google Scholar [scholar.google.com.au/] and Google Search [www.google.com.au/webhp] using the record registration number returned no results. The search and selection process is displayed in adapted Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) diagrams [35] in eFigures 1-5. We also noted records of trials that were terminated or on-going, at the time of the relevant review, in these diagrams.

2.3 Extraction and management of unpublished data

Two authors independently extracted all available data from full-records into a customised spreadsheet using the same methods and data items as the previous reviews. This included imputing missing standard deviations. The data availability status of eligible records is described in the adapted PRISMA diagrams (eFigures 1-5). We did not contact the sponsors listed on trial registry records to request additional data.

2.4 Outcomes

The primary outcome in this study is the percentage change in effect size for the effect of an analgesic medicine on a pain outcome in the previous review when available unpublished data are included. We also reported the change in heterogeneity variance with the addition of new unpublished data.

2.5 Data analysis

Two authors independently extracted data from each source systematic-review. We used these data to reproduce the published meta-analyses for the effect of an analgesic medicine on a pain outcome. We checked the forest plots against those in the original articles to verify accuracy. We added all available new data from the trial registry records and calculated a pooled effect for the unpublished data subgroup and a total pooled effect for the published and unpublished data combined. We calculated the percentage change in effect size between the original meta-analysis and the meta-analysis that combined published and unpublished data, following previously described methods [5]. We tested the difference between the original and the combined meta-analyses using the Z-test implemented in Revman 5.3 [36,37]. We described heterogeneity in each meta-analysis with the heterogeneity variance, Tau^2 .

2.6 Changes to the protocol and imputed data.

We used the full catalogue of analgesic medicines because the previous reviews [17–21] did not report their inclusion criteria for interventions in greater detail than medicine class, e.g. muscle relaxants. We also included hydrocodone, which was not on the World Health Organisation Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical classification system, because it was included in the review of opioid analgesics [17]. Searches for records of hydrocodone trials were conducted on the 14th of June 2018. We searched ‘back pain’ in *Condition* instead of in *Title* [19,38] for the paracetamol search strategy.

We imputed standard deviations for the following studies: EUCTR2012-001920-36, NCT01358526 and NCT01455519. NCT00671502 reported between group differences and 95% confidence intervals for the outcome score. We attempted to impute standard deviations by calculating the standard error and then the standard deviation. However, the confidence intervals were not symmetrical, suggesting the original data were skewed. We used the change score and the standard deviation from NCT00671879 and adjusted the difference in change scores to match the between group differences in outcome in NCT00671502. We tested the influence of excluding NCT00671502 in sensitivity analyses. We determined *post hoc* to report the change in the heterogeneity parameter and the change in sample size, in addition to the change in effect size, for each of the meta-analyses.

The original meta-analysis of muscle relaxants [18] includes a single trial titled *Berry 1988*. Whereas, two trials, Berry 1988a [39] and Berry 1988b [40], are reported in the ‘Characteristics of included studies’ table. We obtained the paper for Berry 1988a [39] and followed the original reviews’ [18] methods to add Berry 1988a [39] to the meta-analysis. We also evaluated the impact of unpublished data on this meta-analysis.

2.7 Ethics and transparency

This study did not require ethical approval. It is a re-analysis of published systematic-reviews, using data publicly available online. Our protocol is publicly accessible on the Open Science Framework [38] and any discrepancies from the study as originally planned have been explained in the preceding section. We have omitted the secondary outcome reported in the protocol for clarity of presentation.

3. Results

3.1 Paracetamol – Saragiotto et al.

We retrieved 66 records via the ICTRP and 76 via ClinicalTrials.gov. We screened 54 unique trial records, excluded 52 and screened the full-record of the remaining two trials. We excluded both records as one trial was published and the other was registered after the date of the last search (eFigure 1).

3.2 NSAIDs – Enthoven et al.

We retrieved 103 records via the ICTRP and 94 via ClinicalTrials.gov. We screened 117 unique trial records, excluded 82 and screened the full-record of the remaining 35 trials. Five records were eligible for inclusion in the Enthoven review [21]. We did not include any of these trials as, at the time of the Enthoven review [21], two trials had been terminated, a single trial was on-going, a single trial had unknown status and the single completed trial did not have any data available (eFigure 2).

3.3 NSAIDs – Machado et al.

The same 117 records were screened as for the Enthoven review. We excluded 64 records and screened the full-record of the remaining 53 trials. Ten records were eligible for inclusion in the Machado review [20]. We did not include any of these trials as, at the time of the Machado review [20], four trials were on-going, a single trial had been terminated, a single trial had unknown status and numeric outcome data were not available for the four completed trials (eFigure 3).

3.4 Muscle Relaxants – Abdel Shaheed et al.

3.4.1 Results of the search

We retrieved 45 records via the ICTRP and 43 via ClinicalTrials.gov. We screened 57 unique trial records, excluded 31 and screened the full-record of the remaining 26 trials. Eight records were eligible for inclusion in the Abdel Shaheed review [18]. We excluded 6 records as, at the time of the Abdel Shaheed review [18], two trials were on-going, two trials had been terminated, a single trial had unknown status and one of the three completed trials did not have data available. Data were available for two of the three completed trials (NCT00671879 and NCT00671502) (eFigure 4). We included these two records in the updated meta-analysis.

3.4.2 Planned analysis

NCT00671879 (n=805) and NCT00671502 (n=840) contributed an additional 1645 participants, an increase of 238.59%. We reproduced the meta-analysis of the effect (mean difference) of muscle relaxant medicines on a 0-100 mm pain intensity scale, compared to a placebo medicine. The inclusion of unpublished data from NCT00671879 and NCT00671502 reduced the pooled effect size by 89.22%, from -21.71 (95%CI -28.23 to -15.19) to -2.34 (95%CI -3.34 to -1.34). Tau^2 reduced from 32.79 to 1.11 (Figure 1). The Chi^2 test for a difference in effect size between the published and unpublished subgroups was statistically significant ($Chi^2=39.36$, $p<.00001$). These data are summarised in Table 1.




Figure 1. Effect of muscle relaxants on pain; short term; acute low back pain. Effect size is mean difference, calculated using random effects inverse variance model in RevMan 5.3.

Outcome is 0-100 pain-intensity scale. 95% CIs for the unpublished data subgroup are not visible at this resolution. Placebo group Total was split to incorporate multi-arm trials as per [18]. Medicines in published data subgroup are as per [18]. NCT00671502_a and NCT00671879_a are carisoprodol 500mg SR, _b are carisoprodol 700mg SR.

Table 1. Number of additional, unpublished trials retrieved from trial registries and change in effect size when available data are added to the published meta-analysis. Methods for searching, selection and analysis of unpublished trials from trial registries followed exactly those used in the original reviews.

Medicine	Number of trials (Number of subjects randomised)				Outcome (scale)	Effect Size			Weight of new trials (%)	Change in effect size (%)	Direction of change in effect size	Change in statistical significance	Change in clinical meaningfulness	Test for difference between subgroups
	Included in original SR (all)	Unpublished trials eligible for inclusion in original SR	Unpublished, completed	Unpublished, completed, data available		Original SR (95%CI)	Original SR [reproduced] (95%CI)	Unpublished data added						
Paracetamol [19]	3 (n=1825)	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	nil	nil	nil	NA
NSAIDs [21]	13 (n=4807)	5	1 (n=127)	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	nil	nil	nil	NA
NSAIDs [20]	35 (n=6065)	10	4 (n=1699)	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	nil	nil	nil	NA
Muscle Relaxants [18]	15 (n=3362)	8	3 (n=1841)	2 (n=1680)	Pain intensity, short term (0-100)	-21.3 (-29 to -13.5)	-21.71 (-28.23 to -15.19)	-2.34 (-3.34 to -1.34)	92.9	89.22	Decrease efficacy	nil	Yes	Chi ² =39.36 p<.00001
Opioids [17] Combination	20 (n=6869)	11	8 (n=3251)	3 (n=1273)	Pain intensity, short term (0-100)	-10.10 (-12.8 to -7.4)	-10.10 (-12.81 to -7.39)	-9.31 (-11.51 to -7.11)	21.1	7.82	Decrease efficacy	nil	nil	Chi ² =4.98 p=.03
Opioids [17] Enriched	9 (n=2996)	6	6 (n=2579)	1 (n=601)	Pain intensity, short term (0-100)	-12.40 (-16.9 to -7.9)	-12.40 (-16.90 to -7.91)	-11.34 (-15.36 to -7.32)	13	8.55	Decrease efficacy	nil	nil	Chi ² =7.67 p=.006
Opioids [17] Nonenriched	11 (n=3873)	5	2 (n=672)	2 (n=672)	Pain intensity, short term (0-100)	-7.3 (-10 to -4.6)	-7.27 (-9.97 to -4.57)	-7.19 (-9.24 to -5.14)	18.8	1.1	Decrease efficacy	nil	nil	Chi ² =0.15 p=.70

3.4.3 Sensitivity analysis – inclusion of NCT00671879 only

The inclusion of unpublished data from NCT00671879 only, reduced the pooled effect size by 69.09% to -6.71 (95%CI -8.86 to -4.56). τ^2 reduced from 32.79 to 3.29.

3.4.4 Additional analyses

3.4.4.1 Inclusion of Berry 1988a in original meta-analysis

The inclusion of Berry 1988a reduced the pooled effect size of the original meta-analysis from -21.71 (95%CI -28.23 to -15.19) to -17.98 (95%CI -26.72 to -9.25). τ^2 increased from 32.79 to 102.53.

3.4.4.2 Inclusion of unpublished data to meta-analysis containing Berry 1988a

The inclusion of unpublished data from NCT00671879 and NCT00671502 reduced the pooled effect size by 87.15% to -2.31 (95%CI -3.30 to -1.31). τ^2 reduced from 102.53 to 1.10.

3.4.4.3 Sensitivity analysis – inclusion of NCT00671879 only to meta-analysis containing Berry 1988a

The addition of unpublished data from NCT00671879 only, reduced the effect size by 64.46% to -6.39 (95%CI -8.48 to -4.29). τ^2 reduced from 102.53 to 3.27.

3.5 Opioid analgesics – Abdel Shaheed et al.

3.5.1 Results of the search

We retrieved 114 records via the ICTRP and 153 via ClinicalTrials.gov. We screened 138 unique trial records, excluded 43 records and screened the full-record of the remaining 95 trials. Eleven trials were eligible for inclusion in the Abdel Shaheed review [17]. We excluded eight records as, at the time of the Abdel Shaheed review [17], a single trial was on-going, a single trial had been terminated, a single trial had unknown status and data were not available for five of the eight completed trials. Data were available for three of the eight completed trials (EUCTR2012-

001920-36, NCT01358526, NCT01455519) (eFigure 5). We included these three records in the updated meta-analyses.

3.5.2 Planned analysis

The original review [17] conducted meta-analyses of the short- and intermediate-term effects of single-ingredient opioid analgesics and of the intermediate-term effect of opioid/simple analgesic combinations on a 0-100 mm pain intensity scale, compared to a placebo medicine. These analyses considered enriched-enrolment (participants are selected based on response to open-label intervention, following which they are randomised to continue or withdraw from the intervention [41]) and non-enriched (conventional) designs as separate subgroups as well as a combined analysis of both enriched and non-enriched designs. We did not retrieve any new data for effects in the intermediate term, nor for combination formulations. Thus, we only reproduced the meta-analyses of the short-term effect of single-ingredient opioid analgesic medicines.

NCT01358526 contributed an additional 600 participants to the enriched designs analysis, an increase of 135.52%. The inclusion of unpublished data from NCT01358526 reduced the pooled effect size of the enriched designs meta-analysis by 8.55% from -12.40 (95%CI -16.90 to -7.91) to -11.34 (95%CI -15.36 to -7.32). Tau^2 reduced from 33.51 to 29.71 (Figure 2). The difference in effect size between the published and unpublished trials was statistically significant ($\text{Chi}^2=7.67$, $p=.006$) (Table 1).




Figure 2. Single ingredient opioid analgesic vs placebo. Short term. Enriched design. Effect size is mean difference, calculated using random effects inverse variance model in RevMan 5.3. Outcome is 0-100 pain-intensity scale. Placebo group Total was split to incorporate multi-arm trials as per [17]. Medicines in published data subgroup are as per [17]. NCT01358526 is oxycodone/naloxone.

EUCTR2012-001920-36 (n=607) and NCT01455519 (n=26) contributed an additional 633 participants to the non-enriched designs analysis, an increase of 136.59%. The inclusion of unpublished data from EUCR2012-001920-36 and NCT01455519 reduced the pooled effect size of the non-enriched designs meta-analysis by 1.1% from -7.27 (95%CI -9.97 to -4.57) to -7.19 (95%CI -9.24 to -5.14). Tau² reduced from 3.63 to zero (Figure 3). There was no difference identified in effect size between the published and unpublished trials (Chi²=0.15, p=.70) (Table 1).




Figure 3. Single ingredient opioid analgesic vs placebo. Short term. Nonenriched design. Effect size is mean difference, calculated using random effects inverse variance model in RevMan 5.3. Outcome is 0-100 pain-intensity scale. Placebo group Total was split to incorporate multi-arm trials as per [17]. Medicines in published data subgroup are as per [17]. EUCR2012-001920-36_a is cebranopadol 200mg, _b is cebranopadol 400mg, _c is cebranopadol 600mg, _d is tapentadol and NCT01455519 is hydromorphone ER.

NCT01358526 (n=600), EUCR2012-001920-36 (n=607) and NCT01455519 (n=26) contributed an additional 1233 participants to the combined designs analysis, an increase of 136.1%. For the combined analysis of both enriched and non-enriched designs the inclusion of unpublished data from EUCR2012-001920-36, NCT01358526, and NCT01455519 reduced the pooled effect size by 7.82% from -10.10 (95%CI -12.81 to -7.39) to -9.31 (95%CI -11.51 to -7.11). Tau² reduced from 19.73 to 14.46 (Figure 4). The difference in effect size between the published and unpublished trials was statistically significant (Chi²=4.98, p=.03) (Table 1).




Figure 4. Single ingredient opioid analgesic vs placebo. Short term. Enriched and nonenriched designs. Effect size is mean difference, calculated using random effects inverse variance model in RevMan 5.3. Outcome is 0-100 pain-intensity scale. Placebo group Total was split to incorporate multi-arm trials as per [17]. Medicines in published data subgroup are as per [17]. NCT01358526 is oxycodone/naloxone, EUCTR2012-001920-36_a is cebranopadol 200mg, _b is cebranopadol 400mg, _c is cebranopadol 600mg, _d is tapentadol and NCT01455519 is hydromorphone ER.

4. Discussion

We aimed to determine the effect of including publicly available, unpublished data from trial registries on the effect sizes of published meta-analyses of the most commonly used analgesic medicines for LBP. We clearly show that such data reduced the effect sizes of muscle relaxant

and opioid-analgesic medicines for LBP. These results have implications for future evidence synthesis and for the interpretation of evidence in this field.

The biggest impact of including unpublished trial registry data was observed for muscle relaxant medicines - an 87% decrease in effect size. The minimal clinically important difference between groups for back pain intensity is considered to be 10 points on a 0-100 point scale [24,42]. The original review reported an effect size greater than this [-21.71 (95%CI -28.23 to -15.19)] [18]. However, the addition of unpublished data yielded a revised effect size that, although statistically significant, was well short of the clinically meaningful threshold [-2.34 (95%CI -3.34 to -1.34)] and with much less heterogeneity. Clearly, adding unpublished data changes the precision and clinical meaning of the effect size. The Abdel Shaheed study [18] is the largest and most recent review of these medicines for LBP. Updates of this review or future syntheses of evidence for these medicines should include unpublished data.

These implications extend to future clinical guidelines. Clinical guidelines have an important role in directing the use of appropriate interventions in practice. The recommendations are often informed by systematic-reviews. The current American College of Physicians/American Pain Society clinical guideline for the management of LBP makes a strong recommendation for the use of muscle relaxant medicines for recent-onset LBP [43]. This recommendation is based on data from a systematic-review, published in 2003 [44], and additional update searches [24]. Although data were analysed differently, the 2003 review reported an effect of a similar magnitude as that reported in the recent review sampled in our study. We note that the updated search included unpublished data sources, although none were identified for muscle relaxants. Clearly, guideline developers should search for and include unpublished data if conducting systematic-reviews or be more cautious of their interpretation of pooled estimates taken from systematic-reviews that do not include unpublished data.

We have also shown that the effect estimates for opioid analgesic medicines reduced with the inclusion of unpublished data. The authors of the original review concluded that opioid analgesics probably do not provide clinically meaningful effects at recommended doses based on the results of the combined designs analysis [-10.10 (95%CI -12.81 to -7.39)] [17]. The reduced size and heterogeneity and improved precision of the effect estimate [-9.31 (95%CI -11.51 to -7.11)] with the inclusion of unpublished data substantiate the conclusion of the original review.

Our results also have implications for the judgements of confidence in evidence that are made by systematic review teams. These judgements interpret the meta-analytic effect estimates in the context of possible bias, observed heterogeneity and missing data. A well-known framework for making these judgements is GRADE [45]. The original analyses of muscle relaxants and opioid analgesics were both judged using the GRADE framework; whereby the review teams judged the evidence to be high quality for the effect of muscle relaxant medicines [18] and moderate quality for the effect of opioid analgesic medicines [17] on short term pain intensity, compared to a placebo medicine. In both cases, the additional unpublished trials have implications for the judgement of confidence in the effect estimates from the updated analyses. However, examination of these implications is beyond the scope of this study.

Our work has a number of strengths. We prospectively registered and followed a protocol [38], now recommended practice in the clinical pain sciences [46]. We have reported all protocol deviations and *post hoc* decisions, to facilitate clear understanding of our work. We used sensitive search strategies for a large number of currently licensed analgesic medicines. We reproduced the methods of the previous reviews as precisely as possible, which increases the likelihood that our results are due to the influence of the unpublished data and not to the reproduction process. Additionally, we extracted data in duplicate and cross-checked all of our analyses.

Our work has some limitations. We restricted the scope of unpublished data sources to trial registrations. There are multiple sources of data from controlled clinical trials; websites, regulatory agencies, direct contact with trialists, and data sharing networks [26,47,48]. The sample we have drawn may not be representative of all unpublished data. Our work relied on accurate reporting of the identified trials' data on the registries. The availability and veracity of trial registry data are known considerations [49–54]. We note that the reported standard deviations for NCT00671879 are smaller than other trials in the analyses of muscle relaxant medicines (Figure 1). We may have been able to obtain data or clarification had we contacted the sponsors of the relevant trials. However, access to data and clarification is not universal, may incur restrictions and often require significant effort to obtain, with no guarantee of success [47,48,55,56]. These are relevant considerations for review production teams. Further, we aimed only to determine the influence of unpublished data, rather than update the previous reviews. For these reasons, we are confident that the restriction of our sampling to trial registries is justified. We welcome further work to evaluate the influence of other sources of unpublished data.

We developed a catalogue of medicines for this study. We note that eperisone is a muscle relaxant medicine included in the Abdel Shaheed review [18] but not in our catalogue. We searched *post hoc* for trials of eperisone for back pain and identified 14 trials. Three of these trials do not meet the inclusion criteria for this study and 11 do not have data available. Thus, the exclusion of eperisone does not impact our conclusions.

We established publication status using a three-step rule. There is the potential that we misclassified studies as unpublished that have in fact been published. This is most likely because the published report does not include the trial registry identification number. We note that

alternative methods for identifying publication status have been reported [8,50,56–60]. These exhibit some overlap with our methods, primarily the use of the trial identification number. Regardless of the methods used, accurate reporting is important to facilitate understanding of these judgements. This standard of reporting is in line with recommendations [35,61–63].

We note that five systematic-reviews of analgesic medicines for LBP have been published [22–25,64] subsequent to the registration of our protocol. Four of these reviews [22–25] searched trial registries for reports of unpublished trials (although, no trials were available for meta-analysis). This indicates that research practice in the field may be changing. The results of our study provide the first evidence to support this change in practice.

5. Conclusion

Most systematic-reviews of analgesic medicines for LBP do not include unpublished data from clinical trial registries. Including unpublished data in recent meta-analyses reduced the estimate of treatment effect in all comparisons for which new data were available. This suggests that current systematic-reviews of medicines for LBP likely overestimate the benefits of these drugs.

6. Acknowledgements:

6.1 Data access:

Our protocol is publicly accessible on the Open Science Framework. We did not use statistical code to generate the results. The full dataset for our study is available through the corresponding author.

6.2 Declarations of Interest:

MKB is supported by a NeuRA PhD Candidature Scholarship and Supplementary Scholarship and was supported during this work by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship and a UNSW Research Excellence Award. MKB has received travel support to speak about pain neuroscience and rehabilitation (Chiropractor's Association of Australia), pain communication, and engagement with research evidence (Memorial University of Newfoundland). EOH is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship and a NeuRA PhD Candidature Supplementary Scholarship. GLM is supported by an NHMRC Principal Research Fellowship, ID1061279. GLM receives royalties for books and speaker's fees for lectures about pain and rehabilitation. GLM received payment for contributions to Pfizer's web-based pain education strategy. GLM has received honoraria and travel support from Pfizer for two lectures and for participation in the ASIA Masterclass on Neuropathic Pain. These contributions did not mention medicines. GLM has also received travel support from Grünenthal to attend a European CRPS minimum standards of care summit. This contribution did not involve medicines. GLM has received support from Kaiser Permanente (USA), workers' compensation boards in Australia, North America and Europe, Noigroup Australasia, Agile Physiotherapy (USA), Results Physiotherapy (USA), the International Olympic Committee, Arsenal Football Club and the Port Adelaide Football Club. BMW has received lecture fees from Manual Concepts and The Australian Physiotherapy Association. These contributions did not mention medicines. The aforementioned funding bodies and organisations

had no role in the conception or writing of the manuscript and there are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

7. References

- [1] Hopewell S, Loudon K, Clarke MJ, Oxman AD, Dickersin K. Publication bias in clinical trials due to statistical significance or direction of trial results. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;5–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000006.pub3>.
- [2] Canestaro WJ, Hendrix N, Bansal A, Sullivan SD, Devine EB, Carlson JJ. Favorable and publicly funded studies are more likely to be published: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;92:58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.08.004>.
- [3] Dwan K, Gamble C, Williamson PR, Kirkham JJ. Systematic Review of the Empirical Evidence of Study Publication Bias and Outcome Reporting Bias - An Updated Review. *PLoS One* 2013;8. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066844>.
- [4] Hopewell S, McDonald S, Clarke MJ, Egger M. Grey literature in meta-analyses of randomized trials of health care interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000010.pub3>.
- [5] Baudard M, Yavchitz A, Ravaud P, Perrodeau E, Boutron I. Impact of searching clinical trial registries in systematic reviews of pharmaceutical treatments: methodological systematic review and reanalysis of meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2017;356. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j448>.
- [6] Schmucker CM, Blümle A, Schell LK, Schwarzer G, Oeller P, Cabrera L, et al. Systematic review finds that study data not published in full text articles have unclear impact on meta-analyses results in medical research. *PLoS One* 2017;12:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176210>.
- [7] Hart B, Lundh A, Bero L. Effect of reporting bias on meta-analyses of drug trials: reanalysis of meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2012;344:d7202. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d7202>.
- [8] Wilson LM, Sharma R, Dy SM, Waldfogel JM, Robinson KA. Searching ClinicalTrials.gov did not change the conclusions of a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;90:127–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.07.009>.

- [9] Dechartres A, Atal I, Riveros C, Meerpohl J, Ravaud P. Association Between Publication Characteristics and Treatment Effect Estimates. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;169:385. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-1517>.
- [10] Turner EH, Matthews AM, Linardatos E, Tell RA, Rosenthal R. Selective Publication of Antidepressant Trials and Its Influence on Apparent Efficacy. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:252–60. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc080313>.
- [11] Trinquart L, Abbé A, Ravaud P. Impact of reporting bias in network meta-analysis of antidepressant placebo-controlled trials. *PLoS One* 2012;7:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0035219>.
- [12] Gore M, Tai KS, Sadosky A, Leslie D, Stacey BR. Use and Costs of Prescription Medications and Alternative Treatments in Patients with Osteoarthritis and Chronic Low Back Pain in Community-Based Settings. *Pain Pract* 2012;12:550–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-2500.2012.00532.x>.
- [13] Hart OR, Uden RM, McMullan JE, Ritchie MS, Williams TD, Smith BH. A study of National Health Service management of chronic osteoarthritis and low back pain. *Prim Health Care Res Dev* 2015;16:157–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1463423614000140>.
- [14] Williams CM, Maher CG, Hancock MJ, McAuley JH, McLachlan AJ, Britt H, et al. Low back pain and best practice care: A survey of general practice physicians. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170:271–7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2009.507>.
- [15] Ivanova JI, Birnbaum HG, Schiller M, Kantor E, Johnstone BM, Swindle RW. Real-world practice patterns, health-care utilization, and costs in patients with low back pain: the long road to guideline-concordant care. *Spine J* 2011;11:622–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2011.03.017>.
- [16] Mathieson S, Valenti L, Maher CG, Britt H, Li Q, McLachlan AJ, et al. Worsening trends in analgesics recommended for spinal pain in primary care. *Eur Spine J* 2018;27:1136–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-017-5178-4>.

- [17] Abdel Shaheed C, Maher CG, Williams KA, Day R, McLachlan AJ. Efficacy, Tolerability, and Dose-Dependent Effects of Opioid Analgesics for Low Back Pain. *JAMA Intern Med* 2016;176:958. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.1251>.
- [18] Abdel Shaheed C, Maher CG, Williams KA, McLachlan AJ. Efficacy and tolerability of muscle relaxants for low back pain: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Pain* 2017;21:228–37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejp.907>.
- [19] Saragiotto BT, Machado GC, Ferreira ML, Pinheiro MB, Abdel Shaheed C, Maher CG. Paracetamol for low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012230>.
- [20] Machado GC, Maher CG, Ferreira PH, Day RO, Pinheiro MB, Ferreira ML. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for spinal pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2017;76:1269–78. <https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-210597>.
- [21] Enthoven WT, Roelofs PD, Deyo RA, van Tulder MW, Koes BW. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for chronic low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012087>.
- [22] Shanthanna H, Gilron I, Rajarathinam M, AlAmri R, Kamath S, Thabane L, et al. Benefits and safety of gabapentinoids in chronic low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLoS Med* 2017;14:1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002369>.
- [23] Mathieson S, Kasch R, Maher CG, Pinto RZ, McLachlan AJ, Koes BW, et al. Combination drug therapy for the management of low back pain and sciatica; systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Pain* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2018.06.005>.
- [24] Chou R, Deyo R, Friedly J, Skelly A, Weimer M, Fu R, et al. Systemic Pharmacologic Therapies for Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review for an American College of Physicians Clinical Practice Guideline. *Ann Intern Med* 2017. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-2458>.

- [25] Enke O, New HA, New CH, Mathieson S, McLachlan AJ, Latimer J, et al. Anticonvulsants in the Treatment of Low Back Pain and Lumbar Radicular Pain: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *CMAJ* 2018;190(19):786–93. <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.171333>.
- [26] Isojarvi J, Wood H, Lefebvre C, Glanville J. Challenges of identifying unpublished data from clinical trials: Getting the best out of clinical trials registers and other novel sources. *Res Synth Methods* 2018:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1294>.
- [27] Higgins JPT, Lasserson T, Chandler J, Tovey D, Churchill R. *Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews*. London: 2016.
- [28] Shmagel A, Ngo L, Ensrud K, Foley R. Prescription Medication Use among Community-Based US Adults with Chronic Low Back Pain: a Cross-Sectional Population Based Study. *J Pain* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2018.04.004>.
- [29] Thackeray A, Hess R, Dorius J, Brodke D, Fritz J. Relationship of Opioid Prescriptions to Physical Therapy Referral and Participation for Medicaid Patients with New-Onset Low Back Pain. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2017;30:784–94. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2017.06.170064>.
- [30] Michaleff ZA, Harrison C, Britt H, Lin CWC, Maher CG. Ten-year survey reveals differences in GP management of neck and back pain. *Eur Spine J* 2012;21:1283–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-011-2135-5>.
- [31] Oliveira CB, Maher CG, Pinto RZ, Traeger AC, Lin CWC, Chenot JF, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the management of non-specific low back pain in primary care: an updated overview. *Eur Spine J* 2018;27:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-018-5673-2>.
- [32] Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods n.d. <http://tga-search.clients.funnelback.com/s/search.html?query=&collection=tga-artg>.
- [33] Drugs@FDA n.d. www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/daf/index.cfm.

- [34] European Medicines Agency search portal n.d.
http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/includes/medicines/medicines_landing_page.jsp&mid=.
- [35] Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP a, et al. The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:W-65-W-94.
- [36] Borenstein M, Hedges L V, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Chichester, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.; 2009.
- [37] Higgins JPT, Green S. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 2011. <http://handbook.cochrane.org/>.
- [38] Bagg MK, O'Hagan E, Wand BM, Hübscher M, Moseley GL, McAuley JH. Does data from trial registries influence effect size? A sensitivity analysis of recent meta-analyses of pharmacological interventions for pain in people with low back pain [Study Protocol]. *Open Sci Framew* 2017.
- [39] Berry H, Hutchinson DR. A Multicentre Placebo-controlled Study in General Practice to Evaluate the Efficacy and Safety of Tizanidine in Acute Low-back Pain. *J Int Med Res* 1988;16:75–82.
- [40] Berry H, Hutchinson DR. Tizanidine and ibuprofen in acute low-back pain: results of a double-blind multicentre study in general practice. *J Int Med Res* 1988;16:83–91.
- [41] Katz N. Enriched Enrollment Randomized Withdrawal Trial Designs of Analgesics Focus on Methodology. *Clin J Pain* 2009;25:797–807.
- [42] Busse JW, Bartlett SJ, Dougados M, Johnston BC, Guyatt GH, Kirwan JR, et al. Optimal Strategies for Reporting Pain in Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: Recommendations from an OMERACT 12 Workshop. *J Rheumatol* 2015;42:1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.3899/jrheum.141440>.

- [43] Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, Forciea MA. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 2017. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-2367>.
- [44] Van Tulder MW, Touray T, Furlan AD, Solway S, Bouter LM. Muscle relaxants for non-specific low-back pain (Review). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004252>.
- [45] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Schünemann HJ. GRADE : what is “quality of evidence” and why is it important to clinicians? *Br Med J* 2008;336:995–8.
- [46] Lee H, Lamb SE, Bagg MK, Toomey E, Cashin AG, Moseley GL. Reproducible and replicable pain research. *Pain* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001254>.
- [47] Goldacre B, Lane S, Mahtani KR, Heneghan C, Onakpoya I, Bushfield I, et al. Pharmaceutical companies’ policies on access to trial data, results, and methods: Audit study. *BMJ* 2017;358:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3334>.
- [48] Goldacre B, Gray J. OpenTrials: Towards a collaborative open database of all available information on all clinical trials. *Trials* 2016;17:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-016-1290-8>.
- [49] Huser V, Cimino JJ. Linking ClinicalTrials.gov and PubMed to Track Results of Interventional Human Clinical Trials. *PLoS One* 2013;8:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0068409>.
- [50] Hartung DM, Zarin DA, Guise J-M, McDonagh M, Paynter R, Helfand M. Reporting Discrepancies Between the ClinicalTrials.gov Results Database and Peer-Reviewed Publications. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;160:477–84.
- [51] Huić M, Marušić M, Marušić A. Completeness and changes in registered data and reporting bias of randomized controlled trials in ICMJE journals after trial registration policy. *PLoS One* 2011;6. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0025258>.
- [52] DeVito NJ, Bacon S, Goldacre B. Compliance with legal requirement to report clinical

- trial results on ClinicalTrials.gov: a cohort study. *Lancet* 2020;395:361–9.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)33220-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)33220-9).
- [53] Zarin DA, Tse T, Williams RJ, Rajakannan T. Update on trial registration 11 years after the ICMJE policy was established. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:383–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMSr1601330>.
- [54] Anderson ML, Chiswell K, Peterson ED, Tasneem A, Topping J, Califf RM. Compliance with results reporting at ClinicalTrials.gov. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:1031–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1409364>.
- [55] Herder M, Doshi P, Lemmens T. Precedent pushing practice: Canadian court orders release of unpublished clinical trial data. *BMJ Opin* 2018.
<https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2018/07/19/precedent-pushing-practice-canadian-court-orders-release-of-unpublished-clinical-trial-data/>.
- [56] Bashir R, Bourgeois FT, Dunn AG. A systematic review of the processes used to link clinical trial registrations to their published results. *Syst Rev* 2017;6.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-017-0518-3>.
- [57] Altman DG, Furberg CD, Grimshaw JM, Shanahan DR. Linked publications from a single trial: A thread of evidence. *Trials* 2014;15:1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-15-369>.
- [58] Meddings K. Linking clinical trials = enriched metadata and increased transparency. *Crossref Blog* 2016. <https://www.crossref.org/blog/linking-clinical-trials--enriched-metadata-and-increased-transparency/>.
- [59] Shanahan D, Meddings K. Clinical trial data and articles linked for the first time. *Crossref Blog* 2016. <https://www.crossref.org/blog/linked-clinical-trials-are-here/>.
- [60] Shanahan D. Threaded Publications: one step closer. *Med* 2014.
<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/on-medicine/2014/01/31/threaded-publications-one-step-closer/>.

- [61] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:264–9.
- [62] Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;4:1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1>.
- [63] Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2015;349:g7647–g7647. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647>.
- [64] Tucker H-R, Scaff K, McCloud T, Carlomagno K, Daly K, Garcia A, et al. Harms and benefits of opioids for management of non-surgical acute and chronic low back pain: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2019;bjsports-2018-099805. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2018-099805>.