

CAHE JC Critically Appraised Article Summary

Journal Club criteria

Date of submission	Pilot 2007
Journal Club location	Lyell McEwin Hospital
JC Facilitator	Matt Sutton

Clinical Scenario

Are SIJ belts effective in reducing pelvic pain/ improving quality of life for pregnant women?

Review Question/PICO/PACO

- P** Pregnant women
- I** SIJ belts
- C** Usual care
- O** Pain/QOL

Article/Paper

Carr CA. Use of a Maternity Support Binder for Relief of Pregnancy-Related Back Pain. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynaecologic and Neonatal Nursing*. 2002;32(4):495

Article Methodology:	Cohort
Returned JC on:	Pilot 2007
By CAHE staff member:	Matt Sutton

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Population Pregnancy of 20 weeks or more, age 19 years or older, self-report of LBP over the previous week at least at a "medium" level, no history of preexisting severe back pain or disc disease, able to read and write in English, and able to give informed consent</p> <p>Intervention Lumbosacral orthosis. (Loving Comfort back support). Each woman was instructed in its use; she then gave a return demonstration to assure that she was able to correctly apply and remove it. Women were asked to wear the support for 2 weeks during waking hours.</p> <p>Outcomes Level of current pain; average daily pain; level of worst pain; days per week that pain affects activities; average hours of pain per day; change in pain since it began in this pregnancy; and effect of back pain on activities including family, employment, house and yard work, recreation, exercise, sleep, and sexual activity.</p>
2	✓			A RCT would have been a preferable design to answer the question, and there appears to be no reason the sample could have been randomised, however, a cohort design will still address the study question. Is it worth continuing? YES
3	✓			Whilst recruited in an appropriate way for a cohort study, it should be noted that subjects were consecutively recruited, which does pose questions over the representativeness of the sample to the entire population of interest.
4	✓			Detailed information is provided on the survey instrument used to measure outcomes (p.498) and the measurement process itself.
5	✓			Assessor or patient blinding was not possible, however the possible effects of this are deemed to minimal. Information on the reliability/validity of the outcome measure is provided (p.498).
6		✓		Whilst the authors do provide some commentary on limitations within the discussion, greater consideration of the impact of financial inducement to participation.
7			✓	Whilst complete enough, a follow-up period of 2 weeks does seem particularly short. Whilst seemingly not a key aim of the study, it would be interesting to note any long-term effects from wearing the support, in addition to any short-term pain relief benefits, which are likely to be the most affected by confounding factors.



University of
South Australia

CAHE

Centre for Allied
Health Evidence

a collaborating centre of



THE JOANNA BRIGGS INSTITUTE

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
8				The bottom line result is that the use of the support binder appeared to yield significant benefits in pain status, compared to a group of subjects not using a support binder, and functional ability in women during the 2 nd & 3 rd trimesters of pregnancy.
9				The level of significance was $p < 0.05$. Whilst not all items of interest displayed significant findings, many had p values less than $p < 0.05$ (p.499-500). Confidence intervals are not presented.
10	✓			The level of significance, and consistency of many reported results, renders these results believable; however the magnitude of the results may be affected by the sample size and the non-randomised sampling.
11		✓		The authors themselves note that this was a small study with a lack of randomised sampling, and thus the extent to which the results are more widely applicable is contentious.
12		✓		Based on the literature reported in the introduction, it appears that there is little detailed research specific to this subject.