



HAL
open science

Pain knowledge and fear-avoidance beliefs of French osteopathy students and educators towards chronic low back pain: An osteopathic educational institution-based cross-sectional survey

H. Mhadhbi, B. Thierry-Hildenbrand, J. Draper-Rodi, J.E. Esteves, Mathieu Ménard

► To cite this version:

H. Mhadhbi, B. Thierry-Hildenbrand, J. Draper-Rodi, J.E. Esteves, Mathieu Ménard. Pain knowledge and fear-avoidance beliefs of French osteopathy students and educators towards chronic low back pain: An osteopathic educational institution-based cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Osteopathic Medicine*, 2021, 42, pp.61-68. 10.1016/j.ijosm.2021.12.002 . hal-03557557

HAL Id: hal-03557557

<https://hal.science/hal-03557557>

Submitted on 22 Feb 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Title page

Pain knowledge and fear-avoidance beliefs of French osteopathy students and educators towards chronic low back pain: An Osteopathic Educational Institution-based cross-sectional survey.

Hakim Mhadhbi¹, Benoit Thierry-Hildenbrand¹, Jerry Draper-Rodi², Jorge E Esteves^{3,4}
Mathieu Ménard^{1,5}

¹Institut d'Ostéopathie de Rennes – Bretagne (IO-RB), Campus Rennes Atalante Ker-Lann, 50 Rue Blaise Pascal, 35170 Bruz, France.

²University College of Osteopathy (UCO), Research centre, 275 Borough High St, London SE1 1JE, United Kingdom.

³Clinical-Human Research Department, Non-profit Foundation COME Collaboration, Via A. Vespucci 188, 65126, Pescara, Italy.

⁴Malta ICOM Educational, 95, St. Georges Beach Complex, San Gorg Street STJ001, San Gilijan, Malta.

⁵Univ Rennes, M2S - EA 7470, F-35000 Rennes, France.

Correspondence Address

Address correspondence to Mathieu Ménard, Institut d'Ostéopathie de Rennes – Bretagne (IO-RB), 50 rue Blaise Pascal, 35170 Bruz, France, +33 2 99 57 19 62, menard.m@io-rennes.fr

Journal Pre-proof

1 TITLE

2 Pain knowledge and fear-avoidance beliefs of French osteopathy students and
3 educators towards chronic low back pain: *An Osteopathic Educational Institution-*
4 *based cross-sectional survey.*

5
6 ABSTRACT

7 Background: Practitioners' fear-avoidance beliefs can influence positively or negatively
8 therapeutic outcomes in their patients. This study reports pain knowledge and fear-
9 avoidance beliefs of French osteopathy students and educators towards the
10 management of chronic low back pain (cLBP).

11 Methods: An online cross-sectional survey was proposed to educators and students.
12 It included sociodemographic characteristics and two questionnaires: the FABQ-HC to
13 assess beliefs on the effects of physical and work activities for people with cLBP, and
14 the NPQ to assess participants' knowledge of pain.

15 Results: Participants (N=172) had mean FABQ-HC subscale scores of 11.02±4.44
16 (Physical activity) and 24.37±11.78 (Work). The mean NPQ total score was
17 11.90±2.05. There were no significant score differences between students and
18 educators ($p>0.05$). Results showed that Year 4 students (N=65) had a significantly
19 better score ($p<0.05$) at the FABQ-HC Physical Activity than Year 5 students (N=71).
20 Educators (N=36) having less than 10 years of practice in osteopathy had better scores
21 than other educators ($p<0.01$) at the FABQ-HC Work. Educators and students in the
22 study show similar scores to other French HCPs and international osteopaths on the
23 FABQ-HC Physical activity. In contrast, they scored lower on the FABQ-HC Work.

24 Conclusions: The main finding was that educators and students belonging to the same
25 OEI have no significantly different beliefs about cLBP and no significantly differing

26 knowledge of pain. There is potential to improve pain education especially concerning
27 the beliefs around cLBP concerning work activity.

28

29

KEYWORDS

30

31 Osteopathic Medicine

32 Beliefs

33 Chronic pain

34 Low back pain

35 Education

36

37

38

FUNDING SOURCES

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

41

42

BACKGROUND

43 Chronic low back pain (cLBP) has been identified as one of the leading global causes
44 of disability throughout the world associated with significantly reduced quality of life
45 with those affected for both physical and mental aspect [1]. In a recent population-
46 based survey conducted on 17,249 participants in France in 2018, nearly 40% of adults
47 reported chronic low back pain [2].

48 Osteopaths are primary contact practitioners who mainly manage patients with
49 musculoskeletal pain symptoms (62%), located for 42.6% in the spine and with 20% of
50 patients reporting chronic pain [3].

51 Manual therapy is included as second-line non-pharmacological care in the French
52 High Authority for Health (*Haute Autorité de Santé*) guidelines for the management of
53 patients with non-specific low back pain [4]. This is consistent with several non-specific
54 low back pain primary care management recent guidelines [5–8]. Manipulations could
55 provide mild to moderate improvements in pain and function (with generally low to
56 moderate-quality evidence)[9].

57 According to the French decrees relating to education in osteopathy [10]: “*The*
58 *osteopath, in a systemic approach, following osteopathic diagnosis, carries out*
59 *mobilisations and manipulations to manage the somatic dysfunctions of the human*
60 *body [...]*”. In this definition, strong emphasis is put on the physical components of
61 care and less on the behavioural, cognitive or emotional components of osteopathic
62 care that are common to all health care professionals (HCP) [11, 12]. Considering the
63 high number of pain presentations in osteopathic practice [3], it is therefore critical to
64 ensure that osteopaths have efficient training in the neurophysiology and mechanisms
65 of pain and don't hold harmful beliefs regarding cLBP. We therefore felt it was important

66 to assess the pain knowledge and the beliefs of our students and educators in order
67 to take a baseline view.

68 Attitudes and beliefs concerning low back pain amongst musculoskeletal practitioners
69 including osteopaths [13–16], chiropractors [17], physiotherapists [18, 19] and more
70 broadly HCP [20] have often been studied constituting useful comparison literature for
71 our model of education with other models. Previous studies on the attitudes and beliefs
72 of osteopaths towards chronic low back pain (cLPB) in the UK [21] and Spain [22] have
73 hypothesised that osteopaths would have a more biopsychosocial approach towards
74 cLBP patients than other HCP. Moreover, patients seem to report stronger person-
75 centeredness in complementary care than with conventional care [23]. However,
76 results showed that osteopaths' attitudes and beliefs towards cLBP may be no different
77 than those from other HCP [24, 25]. In addition, a modern conceptual approach
78 regarding the neurophysiology of pain is essential in practitioners' skills to adequately
79 explain pain experience of an individual [26–28]. The definition of pain has recently
80 been revised to capture this [29]. A biomedical and mechanistic view of care cannot
81 fully and holistically account for the totality of this experience. Pain education, including
82 its biological, psychological and social dimensions, is a recent part of the French
83 osteopathic curriculum [30]. Undergraduate pain education (Teaching Unit 2.15)
84 amounts to just 20 hours, equating to 0.4% of total teaching time [30].

85 Practitioners' attitudes and beliefs can influence positive (placebo) or negative
86 (nocebo) therapeutic outcomes in their patients [31], may influence their treatment
87 approach [20] and could be detrimental to the recovery of cLBP patients when wrong
88 messages are sent [32]. Beliefs about the body and pain are therefore considered to
89 form key considerations in the treatment of pain-related disabilities [33].

90 The Fear Avoidance Beliefs Questionnaire (FABQ) is used to evaluate patients' beliefs
91 about how physical activity and work affect their low back pain [34]. The FABQ-HC was
92 designed as an adapted version of the FABQ for use with HCP [35]. The FABQ was
93 translated into French in 2004 and its psychometric properties (test-retest reliability,
94 construct validity and responsiveness) are acceptable [36].

95 The Neurophysiology Pain Questionnaire (NPQ) was developed to identify the barriers
96 to reconceptualization of the clinical diagnosis of chronic pain based on the findings
97 that patients have a poor knowledge and some difficulty understanding the
98 neurophysiology of the pain [37]. The main goal of this test is to evaluate the patient's
99 beliefs/conceptions of the pain mechanism. This has been reported as a crucial factor
100 in the pain becoming chronic and could limit the efficacy of therapeutic interventions
101 [37, 38]. The NPQ has been used in several educational studies to assess the
102 understanding of health undergraduate students regarding pain neurophysiology [39–
103 42].

104 Education in osteopathy is evolving towards university standards in France to promote
105 high-quality education and clinical practice [43].

106 To our knowledge, no studies have specifically addressed the attitudes of French
107 osteopathic educators towards cLBP patients. Their beliefs are crucial as they may
108 impact both patients [20] and students' attitudes towards patients. Furthermore, final-
109 year osteopathy students are a population that has often been studied concerning
110 professional identity [44], impact of language they use on patients' beliefs [45],
111 attitudes toward psychosocial risk factors [46], clinical assessment [47–49], and
112 perceived preparedness [50, 51]. However, the beliefs of this specific population in a
113 French OEI towards cLBP has to our knowledge never been evaluated. Our hypothesis

114 is therefore that Year 4 and Year 5 osteopathy students develop the same beliefs as
115 their educators.

116 The aim of this study was to evaluate the pain knowledge and the beliefs towards cLBP
117 of Year 4, Year 5 osteopathy students, and educators at the same French OEI towards
118 the management of cLBP patients via the FABQ-HC and the NPQ.

Journal Pre-proof

119

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Design

121 A cross-sectional quantitative questionnaire-based survey was conducted and
122 reported following the STROBE statement [52] including two versions; one for the
123 students and one for the educators. The survey differed between the two versions only
124 by the sociodemographic part. The study protocol was approved by the XX Research
125 Ethics Committee in June 2020 and met the requirements of the Declaration of Helsinki
126 for research on human beings.

127

Study population

129 Year 4 (n=71) and Year 5 (n=65) osteopathy students of the XX OEI were invited to
130 take part in the study. Information was given about this study during an introductory
131 clinical practice course on the 31st of August 2020 for the Year 4 students and on the
132 14th of September 2020 for Year 5 students. The study was explained and proposed
133 to all educators through the return to campus meeting on the 28th August 2020.

134 Inclusion criteria were being student in Year 4 or Year 5 or being educator in the
135 osteopathy programme of the XX Institute. Exclusion criteria were not being an
136 osteopath for the educators or those (educators and students) who didn't consent to
137 participate. Out of the 36 educators who responded, one was involved in pain science
138 teaching.

139

Measures and instruments

141 The French version of two validated questionnaires were used: the Fear Avoidance
142 Beliefs Questionnaire for Health Care Practitioners (FABQ-HC) and the

143 Neurophysiology of Pain Questionnaire (NPQ) [34, 37]. The survey also included a
144 sociodemographic section.

145 **The sociodemographic questionnaire:** for educators this recorded their age,
146 gender, years of experience as practitioners and educators, whether they achieved a
147 continuing professional development (CPD) course in the field of pain, and education
148 undertaken other than osteopathy. For students, it only included age, gender and
149 previous education before studying osteopathy.

150 **The FABQ** is used to evaluate patients' beliefs about how physical activity and
151 work affect their low back pain [34]. The FABQ was translated into French in 2004 and
152 its psychometric properties (test-retest reliability, construct validity and
153 responsiveness) are acceptable [36]. The adapted version for HCP was used (FABQ-
154 HC) [35]. Its adaptation was made by deleting the word "other" in the introduction of
155 the questionnaire giving this instruction: "these are statements that (other) patients
156 have expressed about their low back pain" [35]. It is a 16-item questionnaire, graded
157 on a 7-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) with two sections. Items
158 1 to 5 assess beliefs about physical activity and items 6 to 16 assess beliefs about
159 work.

160 A cut-off score corresponds to a score above 14 (out of 24) for the Physical Activity
161 subscale and above 34 (out of 42) for the Work subscale [35]. Scores that exceed
162 these values suggest important fear-avoidance beliefs for their relative subscale.

163 **The NPQ** was developed to identify the barriers to reconceptualization of the
164 clinical diagnosis of chronic pain based on the findings that patients have a poor
165 knowledge and some difficulty understanding the neurophysiology of the pain [37]. The
166 main goal of this test is to evaluate the patient's beliefs/conceptions of the pain
167 mechanism. This has been reported as a crucial factor in the pain becoming chronic

168 and could limit the efficacy of therapeutic interventions [37, 38]. It has also been used
169 to assess neurophysiology of pain knowledge in physiotherapy students [53],
170 osteopathy students [40], health care final-year students [54] and osteopaths [14]. A
171 validated version of a 19-item questionnaire was proposed in French in 2015 [38]. The
172 French version of the NPQ has been shown to be acceptable, valid, and with
173 acceptable reliability in patients with chronic spinal pain [55].

174

175 *Setting and data collection*

176 This study was carried out at the XX Institute in August and September 2020.
177 Educators received an email with a link to participate and to respond online (Google
178 Forms) on their smartphone or laptop to the survey during the teachers' back-to-school
179 meeting on the 26th August 2020. Students received a separate email to participate in
180 the study during a clinical course scheduled on the 31st August for Year 4 osteopathy
181 students and on the 12th September 2020 for Year 5 osteopathy students. Educators
182 and students who completed the survey were deemed to consent to participate.

183

184 *Statistical analysis*

185 Raw data was exported from Google Forms into an Excel file (Microsoft Office 2016
186 for PC). Descriptive statistics for each participant for the 3 scores were calculated.
187 Different tests were used to analyse our results. The "R" software (version 4.03 for PC)
188 was used to run the statistical tests. For sample sizes greater than 30, we assumed
189 that the distribution of the sample means was fairly normally distributed according to
190 the central limit theorem. For supposed normal distributions, a p-value using the Fisher
191 test was computed so as to assess the homoscedasticity.

192 In cases of normality and homoscedasticity, we calculated a 95 % confidence interval
193 for the mean for each questionnaire. Furthermore, for comparison of means, a p-value
194 was computed using the Z test (alpha set at $p < 0.05$) and the Cohen's d effect size
195 was calculated.

196 In cases of non-normality or non-homoscedasticity, non-parametric statistics were
197 used to evaluate differences. Thus, we calculated a 95% bootstrapped confidence
198 interval for the mean (1 000 re-samples), and for median comparison, a p-value was
199 computed using the Mann-Whitney test (alpha set at $p < 0.05$) and the Cliff's d effect
200 size was calculated.

201 The FABQ-HC score from different previous studies was compared when applicable
202 with the results from the present study by means of a one-way ANOVA test using
203 summary data.

205 RESULTS

206 *Participants*

207 A total of 172 participants participated with 36 educators, 65 Year 5 students and 71
208 Year 4 students. Response rates were 80% (36/45) for educators, 94% for Year 5
209 students (65/69) and 97% (71/73) for Year 4 students. 59.3% of participants were
210 female (102/172), the mean age was 22.4 ± 1.4 years for Year 4 students, 23.5 ± 1.5
211 years for Year 5 students and 35.9 ± 8.5 years for educators. Educators had a mean
212 of 10.1 ± 6.4 years of experience as osteopaths and 6.8 ± 5.0 years of experience as
213 educators. Details on sociodemographic characteristics for each group are provided in
214 Table 1.

215 *** Insert Table 1 about here ***

216

217 *Comparative score between sociodemographic groups on the two questionnaires*

218 Results showed that Year 4 students have a significantly lower score ($p < 0.0116$; CI
219 95% [0.10 -3,08], $d = 0.36$) at the FABQ-HC Physical Activity than the Year 5 students
220 (10.39 ± 3.93 vs 11.98 ± 4.80). However, there were no differences between these two
221 groups for the FABQ-HC Work (24.90 ± 4.39 vs 23.54 ± 6.37) and the NPQ ($11.94 \pm$
222 1.95 vs 12.31 ± 2.13).

223 No differences were found between Year 4 students and educators for FABQ-HC
224 Physical Activity ($p > 0.05$, CI95% [1.70;1.97], $d = 0.03$), for the FABQ-HC Work ($p >$
225 0.05 , CI95% [2.52;2.72], $d = 0.02$) and for the NPQ ($p > 0.05$, CI95% [0.47;1.19], $d =$
226 0.18).

227 Additionally, between Year 5 students and educators, results did not show differences
228 for the FABQ-HC Physical Activity ($p = 0.30$, IC 95% [0.52;3.43], $d = 0.30$), for the
229 FABQ-HC Work ($p = 0.35$, CI95% [1.60;4.13], $d = 0.19$) and for the NPQ ($p > 0.34$,
230 CI95% [0.20;1.55], $d = 0.31$). All results are presented in Table 2.

231 *** *Insert Table 2 about here* ***

232

233 *Impact of level of education, years of osteopathic experience and previous pain CPD*
234 *on the two questionnaires*

235 Significant differences were found between students' previous education level with the
236 FABQ-HC Physical Activity ($p=0.0262$, $d=-0.27$): Year 4 students with a bachelor's
237 degree had a significantly better score ($p < 0.0017$; CI95% [5.45-9,36], $d=0.58$) at the
238 FABQ-HC Physical Activity (7.00 ± 3.57) than Year 5 students without a bachelor's
239 degree (11.08 ± 3.70).

240 However, there were no differences for the two other questionnaires FABQ-HC
241 Physical Work ($p=0.4483$; CI95% [23.09-26.82], $d=0.03$) and NPQ ($p=0.3409$; CI95%

242 [9.82-13.00], $d=-0.08$). Additionally, no significant differences were found in Year 5
243 students for any of the questionnaires.

244 A significantly better score was attained by educators who had less than 10 years of
245 experience as osteopaths ($p<0.00001$, $d=0.01$) for the FABQ-HC Work (23.44 ± 7.63)
246 versus educators who graduated more than 10 years ago (26.17 ± 6.64).

247 No significant differences were found between the mean scores of the years of
248 experience as an educator or previous pain CPD for any of the three scores. All results
249 are presented in the Table 3.

250 *** *Insert Table 3 about here* ***

251 *** *Insert Table 4 about here* ***

252

253

DISCUSSION

254 This study explored the pain knowledge and the fear-avoidance beliefs of
255 undergraduate students and educators from one French OEI on the management of
256 patients with cLBP. The primary findings of this study indicate that the educators and
257 students shared similar beliefs about cLBP and have no significantly differing
258 knowledge of pain.

259 *Summary of findings and comparison to known literature*

260 This is the first study to evaluate French osteopaths' pain knowledge and beliefs
261 towards cLBP in educators and Year 4 and Year 5 osteopathy students and to compare
262 students to their educators on the basis of two validated French-version at a single
263 institution. This provides a useful basis to evaluate the curriculum, for offering an
264 update of knowledge to educators, for assessing the students' skills acquisition in this
265 area and overall for improving the level of education according to evidence-based data.
266 Regarding the part of the FABQ that explores beliefs about exercise and low back pain,
267 educators did not have statistically different scores to French rheumatologists [56] and

268 French general practitioners [35] as illustrated in table 4. This is a quite honourable
269 result. It seems to show that osteopaths in our OEI (students and educators) do not
270 have more deleterious beliefs than HCP who are among those who receive the most
271 patients with musculoskeletal pain.

272 By comparison, regarding the FABQ-HC related to work-related beliefs, the educators
273 scored lower than Spanish osteopaths [22] and French rheumatologists [56] and
274 French general practitioners [35]. This result was unexpected and is hard to explain.
275 However, we can hypothesise that osteopaths in France who are not fully HCP do not
276 want to oppose a medical leave issued by a medical doctor. They may therefore tend
277 not to favour a return to work if a general practitioner has indicated a work interruption.
278 Educators who graduated as osteopaths less than 10 years ago showed significantly
279 better results at the FABQ-HC Work (23.44 ± 7.63) than those who graduated more
280 than 10 years ago (26.17 ± 6.64). Regarding these results, we did not find similar
281 results specific to educators in the literature. However, this is consistent with previous
282 studies that showed that osteopaths with less time as practitioners tend to have a more
283 evidence-based attitude towards cLBP [21]. In France, the osteopathy programme has
284 mainly evolved a lot during the past ten years in terms of quantity and quality. More
285 newly trained osteopaths may have benefited from programmes that are more in line
286 with current recommendations.

287 Regarding the NPQ score, French educators had higher pain knowledge score than
288 Spanish health science students [41], but lower scores than Australian osteopaths [14].
289 In addition, educators who have undertaken specific CPD on pain do not appear to
290 have different scores from those who have not whether on both FABQ-HC or NPQ.
291 There is potential to improve pain education to optimise educators' knowledge in this
292 field. The results did not show any significant differences in scores between students

293 and educators for the three questionnaires. It means that students who do rotations in
294 the clinic (Year 4 and Year 5 students) and their educators share similar beliefs.
295 Educators could therefore create these beliefs in students during the first three pre-
296 clinical years. However, this remains hypothetical.

297 This result is more surprising from the point of view of the NPQ as we expected
298 educators to have higher scores. It would be valuable to repeat this study in the future
299 as the recent osteopathic curriculum changes put more emphasis on certain
300 fundamental knowledge related to pain (allostasis, biopsychosocial model,
301 interoception, enactivist approach to pain, predictive processing models of perception)
302 that was not present before [30, 57].

303 Significant differences were found between students' previous level of education with
304 the FABQ-HC Physical Activity: students with a bachelor's degree had a significantly
305 better score at the FABQ-HC Physical Activity (9.60 ± 5.35) than students without a
306 bachelor's degree (11.42 ± 4.23).

307 Year 4 students unexpectedly scored significantly higher than Year 5 students did on
308 the FABQ-HC physical activity score. The implementation of the new evidence-based
309 lectures over the last two years may be starting to bring positive changes. However,
310 20% of the Year 4 students had at least a Bachelor's degree on beginning the
311 osteopathic curriculum. Previous education before studying osteopathy had the
312 greatest impact on the FABQ physical activity score (these students have an average
313 of 7.00 ± 3.57 versus 11.08 ± 3.70 for the rest of the class). Most of these came with a
314 sports sciences background that could have had a positive effect on beliefs concerning
315 physical activity. Moreover, 32% of Year 5 students scored above the cut-off on FABQ
316 Physical Activity compared to 11% of Year 4 students.

317 The other scores did not differ between Year 4 and Year 5 students. The subscale
318 score for the work part of the FABQ is significantly lower than for physiotherapy
319 students [58] or for French rheumatologists [56] and French general practitioners [35].
320 There appears to be a possibility for improvement in the teaching of beliefs regarding
321 low back pain and work as the scores of both students and educators appeared to be
322 significantly higher than those found in the literature. All European cLBP guidelines
323 deliver similar messages for the management of non-specific pain: keeping active,
324 continuing or returning to work and avoiding bed rest [59]. This is consistent with a
325 previous study that found that UK osteopathy students may have attitudes that are not
326 aligned with European guidelines [60].

327 *Applications for education and practice*

328 One of the challenges of training adults is to find a way of facilitating the transition from
329 academic learning to training for their future profession. It is essential to ensure that
330 osteopaths adopt an appropriate attitude towards low back pain based on non-harmful
331 beliefs to deliver appropriate treatment to their patients. Indeed, clinicians with positive
332 attitudes are more likely to follow management guidelines. [61]. There was no effect
333 on any score for the educators having taken CPD dedicated to pain. However, we had
334 no information concerning what type of CPD had been completed, its content, or when
335 it was completed. There is potential to improve pain education in osteopaths and future
336 osteopathy curricula in France.

337 In addition, guidelines can sometimes be perceived as threats to professional identity
338 [62, 63] by some osteopaths and particularly by some educators according to their own
339 attitudes towards the osteopathic principles and their further application in clinical
340 context [64].

341 To address these barriers requires some educational strategies to contribute
342 meaningfully to the attitudes of future professionals with new models and theoretical
343 frameworks for osteopathic care [65]. To shape a professional identity [66] as a person-
344 centred living tradition of care [67] with specific strategies by the worldwide community
345 of practice depends on whether osteopathy is regulated at an academic level [68] or
346 not [69]. It must positively consider the rich diversity of practice and education as a
347 piece of the puzzle [70], finding a way between osteopathic principles and evidence
348 [57].

349 *Study limitations*

350 This study explored the knowledge and fear-avoidance beliefs towards cLBP of a
351 single OEI; it did not represent the characteristics of the overall osteopathic population
352 of students and educators in France. Moreover, no previous studies have explored
353 these scores in other French OEIs; it is not possible to know if the results characterised
354 an average score or not and if educators represented a specific population in terms of
355 knowledge and beliefs. Assessing knowledge, perceptions, beliefs and attitudes to
356 pain management and care among osteopathy students is essential to determine the
357 effectiveness of current pain education. However, it is also a challenge as there is no
358 gold standard instrument to assess these elements [71].

359 The FABQ-HC was developed in France [35, 56] with groups of rheumatologists and
360 general practitioners, never used for French osteopaths and is not the most used
361 instrument in the literature making comparisons difficult. The most widely-used
362 questionnaires in the literature are the HC-PAIRS [72] and the PABS.PT [73] which
363 are not yet translated, culturally adapted or validated in French.

364 *Perspectives for research*

365 Future research will assess attitudes, beliefs towards cLBP and pain knowledge in the
366 same participants as part of a longitudinal study. The simple methodology developed
367 in this study is easy to implement [74]. It will be used to assess the effectiveness and
368 the impact of the training provided at the OEI. These first results constitute also a useful
369 baseline comparison for future research. This can also be used as a simple tool to
370 evaluate the impact of a future specific CPD on pain knowledge and beliefs towards
371 cLBP on osteopaths.

372

373

CONCLUSION

374 This is the first study to explore the pain knowledge and the fear-avoidance beliefs
375 towards cLBP of French osteopaths. This study supports the hypothesis that educators
376 and students belonging to the same OEI share similar beliefs about cLBP and
377 knowledge of pain. Previous education in sports science seems related to better scores
378 concerning cLBP and physical activity for students whereas previous CPD had no
379 effects on any score for the educators.

380 There is potential to improve pain education especially concerning the beliefs
381 regarding cLBP concerning work. Future studies should focus on establishing strong
382 methodologies to assess effectively osteopathy students' attitudes and beliefs allowing
383 for feedback on the education provided. This could lay the foundations for a new
384 generation of clinicians that will graduate with positive beliefs and attitudes towards
385 pain and a background in best practices that should lead to better inter-professional
386 cooperation for the benefit of chronic pain sufferers.

387

388

389

390 **References**

- 391 [1] Vos, T.; Flaxman, A. D.; Naghavi, M.; Lozano, R.; Michaud, C.; Ezzati, M.; Shibuya, K.;
 392 Salomon, J. A.; Abdalla, S.; Aboyans, V.; et al. Years Lived with Disability (YLDs) for 1160 Sequelae
 393 of 289 Diseases and Injuries 1990–2010: A Systematic Analysis for the Global Burden of Disease
 394 Study 2010. *The Lancet*, **2012**, *380* (9859), 2163–2196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61729-2)
 395 [6736\(12\)61729-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61729-2).
- 396 [2] Husky, M. M.; Ferdous Farin, F.; Compagnone, P.; Fermanian, C.; Kovess-Masfety, V.
 397 Chronic Back Pain and Its Association with Quality of Life in a Large French Population Survey.
 398 *Health Qual. Life Outcomes*, **2018**, *16* (1), 195. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-018-1018-4>.
- 399 [3] Dubois, T.; Coatmellec, J.; Berthiller, J.; Landurier, G. Osteopathy in France: A Demographic
 400 and Epidemiologic Descriptive Analysis of French Osteopaths' Patients. *OIA Paris*, **2012**.
- 401 [4] HAS. *Prise En Charge Du Patient Présentant Une Lombalgie Commune*; Recommandation de
 402 bonne pratique; 2019.
- 403 [5] Qaseem, A.; Wilt, T. J.; McLean, R. M.; Forciea, M. A.; Clinical Guidelines Committee of the
 404 American College of Physicians; Denberg, T. D.; Barry, M. J.; Boyd, C.; Chow, R. D.; Fitterman, N.;
 405 et al. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice
 406 Guideline From the American College of Physicians. *Ann. Intern. Med.*, **2017**, *166* (7), 514–530.
 407 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-2367>.
- 408 [6] Stochkendahl, M. J.; Kjaer, P.; Hartvigsen, J.; Kongsted, A.; Aaboe, J.; Andersen, M.;
 409 Andersen, M. Ø.; Fournier, G.; Højgaard, B.; Jensen, M. B.; et al. National Clinical Guidelines for
 410 Non-Surgical Treatment of Patients with Recent Onset Low Back Pain or Lumbar Radiculopathy. *Eur.*
 411 *Spine J. Off. Publ. Eur. Spine Soc. Eur. Spinal Deform. Soc. Eur. Sect. Cerv. Spine Res. Soc.*, **2018**, *27*
 412 (1), 60–75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-017-5099-2>.
- 413 [7] National Guideline Centre (UK). *Low Back Pain and Sciatica in Over 16s: Assessment and*
 414 *Management*; National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Clinical Guidelines; National
 415 Institute for Health and Care Excellence (UK): London, 2016.
- 416 [8] van Wambeke, P.; Desomer, A.; Jonckheer, P.; Depreitere, B. The Belgian National Guideline
 417 on Low Back Pain and Radicular Pain: Key Roles for Rehabilitation, Assessment of Rehabilitation
 418 Potential and the PRM Specialist. *Eur. J. Phys. Rehabil. Med.*, **2020**, *56* (2), 220–227.
 419 <https://doi.org/10.23736/S1973-9087.19.05983-5>.
- 420 [9] Almeida, M.; Saragiotto, B.; Richards, B.; Maher, C. G. Primary Care Management of Non-
 421 Specific Low Back Pain: Key Messages from Recent Clinical Guidelines. *Med. J. Aust.*, **2018**, *208* (6),
 422 272–275. <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja17.01152>.
- 423 [10] *Décret N° 2007-435 Du 25 Mars 2007 Relatif Aux Actes et Aux Conditions d'exercice de*
 424 *l'ostéopathie*; 2007.
- 425 [11] Di Blasi, Z.; Harkness, E.; Ernst, E.; Georgiou, A.; Kleijnen, J. Influence of Context Effects
 426 on Health Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *Lancet Lond. Engl.*, **2001**, *357* (9258), 757–762.
 427 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(00\)04169-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(00)04169-6).
- 428 [12] Hartvigsen, J.; Hancock, M. J.; Kongsted, A.; Louw, Q.; Ferreira, M. L.; Genevay, S.; Hoy,
 429 D.; Karppinen, J.; Pransky, G.; Sieper, J.; et al. What Low Back Pain Is and Why We Need to Pay
 430 Attention. *The Lancet*, **2018**, *391* (10137), 2356–2367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)30480-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30480-X)
 431 [X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30480-X).
- 432 [13] Bar-Zaccay, A.; Bailey, D. The Attitudes and Beliefs of UK Osteopaths towards the

- 433 Management of Low Back Pain: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2018**, 28, 42–47.
434 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2018.03.006>.
- 435 [14] Fitzgerald, K.; Vaughan, B.; Fleischmann, M.; Austin, P. Pain Knowledge, Attitudes and
436 Beliefs of Australian Osteopaths Drawn from a Nationally Representative Sample of the Profession. *J.*
437 *Bodyw. Mov. Ther.*, **2020**, 0 (0). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbmt.2020.06.022>.
- 438 [15] Sampath, K. K.; Darlow, B.; Tumilty, S.; Shillito, W.; Hanses, M.; Devan, H.; Thomson, O. P.
439 Barriers and Facilitators Experienced by Osteopaths in Implementing a Biopsychosocial (BPS)
440 Framework of Care When Managing People with Musculoskeletal Pain – A Mixed Methods
441 Systematic Review Protocol. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**.
442 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.01.001>.
- 443 [16] Van Biesen, T.; Alvarez, G. Beliefs about Chronic Low Back Pain amongst Osteopaths
444 Registered in Spain: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.03.002>.
- 446 [17] Innes, S. I.; Werth, P. D.; Tuchin, P. J.; Graham, P. L. Attitudes and Beliefs of Australian
447 Chiropractors' about Managing Back Pain: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Chiropr. Man. Ther.*, **2015**, 23
448 (1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12998-015-0062-y>.
- 449 [18] Alshehri, M. A.; Alzahrani, H.; Alotaibi, M.; Alhowimel, A.; Khoja, O. Physiotherapists' Pain
450 Attitudes and Beliefs towards Chronic Low Back Pain and Their Association with Treatment
451 Selection: A Cross-Sectional Study. *BMJ Open*, **2020**, 10 (6), e037159.
452 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-037159>.
- 453 [19] Gardner, T.; Refshauge, K.; Smith, L.; McAuley, J.; Hübscher, M.; Goodall, S.
454 Physiotherapists' Beliefs and Attitudes Influence Clinical Practice in Chronic Low Back Pain: A
455 Systematic Review of Quantitative and Qualitative Studies. *J. Physiother.*, **2017**, 63 (3), 132–143.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphys.2017.05.017>.
- 457 [20] Darlow, B.; Fullen, B. M.; Dean, S.; Hurley, D. A.; Baxter, G. D.; Dowell, A. The Association
458 between Health Care Professional Attitudes and Beliefs and the Attitudes and Beliefs, Clinical
459 Management, and Outcomes of Patients with Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review. *Eur. J. Pain*
460 *Lond. Engl.*, **2012**, 16 (1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2011.06.006>.
- 461 [21] Macdonald, R. J. D.; Vaucher, P.; Esteves, J. E. The Beliefs and Attitudes of UK Registered
462 Osteopaths towards Chronic Pain and the Management of Chronic Pain Sufferers - A Cross-Sectional
463 Questionnaire Based Survey. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2018**, 30, 3–11.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2018.07.003>.
- 465 [22] Van Biesen, T.; Alvarez, G. Beliefs about Chronic Low Back Pain amongst Osteopaths
466 Registered in Spain: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, 36, 3–10.
467 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.03.002>.
- 468 [23] Foley, H.; Steel, A.; Adams, J. Perceptions of Person-Centred Care amongst Individuals with
469 Chronic Conditions Who Consult Complementary Medicine Practitioners. *Complement. Ther. Med.*,
470 **2020**, 52, 102518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctim.2020.102518>.
- 471 [24] Moran, R. W.; Rushworth, W. M.; Mason, J. Investigation of Four Self-Report Instruments
472 (FABT, TSK-HC, Back-PAQ, HC-PAIRS) to Measure Healthcare Practitioners' Attitudes and Beliefs
473 toward Low Back Pain: Reliability, Convergent Validity and Survey of New Zealand Osteopaths and
474 Manipulative Physiotherapists. *Musculoskelet. Sci. Pract.*, **2017**, 32, 44–50.
475 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msksp.2017.08.008>.
- 476 [25] Pincus, T.; Foster, N. E.; Vogel, S.; Santos, R.; Breen, A.; Underwood, M. Attitudes to Back

- 477 Pain amongst Musculoskeletal Practitioners: A Comparison of Professional Groups and Practice
 478 Settings Using the ABS-Mp. *Man. Ther.*, **2007**, *12* (2), 167–175.
 479 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2006.06.005>.
- 480 [26] Kreiner, D. S.; Matz, P.; Bono, C. M.; Cho, C. H.; Easa, J. E.; Ghiselli, G.; Ghogawala, Z.;
 481 Reitman, C. A.; Resnick, D. K.; Watters, W. C.; et al. Guideline Summary Review: An Evidence-
 482 Based Clinical Guideline for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Low Back Pain. *Spine J.*, **2020**, *20* (7),
 483 998–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2020.04.006>.
- 484 [27] Lewis, J. S.; Cook, C. E.; Hoffmann, T. C.; O’Sullivan, P. The Elephant in the Room: Too
 485 Much Medicine in Musculoskeletal Practice. *J. Orthop. Sports Phys. Ther.*, **2020**, *50* (1), 1–4.
 486 <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2020.0601>.
- 487 [28] Lin, I.; Wiles, L.; Waller, R.; Goucke, R.; Nagree, Y.; Gibberd, M.; Straker, L.; Maher, C. G.;
 488 O’Sullivan, P. P. B. What Does Best Practice Care for Musculoskeletal Pain Look like? Eleven
 489 Consistent Recommendations from High-Quality Clinical Practice Guidelines: Systematic Review. *Br.*
 490 *J. Sports Med.*, **2020**, *54* (2), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2018-099878>.
- 491 [29] Raja, S. N.; Carr, D. B.; Cohen, M.; Finnerup, N. B.; Flor, H.; Gibson, S.; Keefe, F. J.; Mogil,
 492 J. S.; Ringkamp, M.; Sluka, K. A.; et al. The Revised International Association for the Study of Pain
 493 Definition of Pain: Concepts, Challenges, and Compromises. *Pain*, **2020**.
 494 <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001939>.
- 495 [30] *Décret N° 2014-1505 Du 12 Décembre 2014 Relatif à La Formation En Ostéopathie*; 2014.
- 496 [31] Kaptchuk, T. J.; Hemond, C. C.; Miller, F. G. Placebos in Chronic Pain: Evidence, Theory,
 497 Ethics, and Use in Clinical Practice. *BMJ*, **2020**, *370*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1668>.
- 498 [32] Rainville, J.; Smeets, R. J. E. M.; Bendix, T.; Tveito, T. H.; Poiraudau, S.; Indahl, A. J. Fear-
 499 Avoidance Beliefs and Pain Avoidance in Low Back Pain--Translating Research into Clinical
 500 Practice. *Spine J. Off. J. North Am. Spine Soc.*, **2011**, *11* (9), 895–903.
 501 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2011.08.006>.
- 502 [33] Caneiro, J. P.; Bunzli, S.; O’Sullivan, P. Beliefs about the Body and Pain: The Critical Role in
 503 Musculoskeletal Pain Management. *Braz. J. Phys. Ther.*, **2020**.
 504 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjpt.2020.06.003>.
- 505 [34] Waddell, G.; Newton, M.; Henderson, I.; Somerville, D.; Main, C. J. A Fear-Avoidance
 506 Beliefs Questionnaire (FABQ) and the Role of Fear-Avoidance Beliefs in Chronic Low Back Pain and
 507 Disability. *Pain*, **1993**, *52* (2), 157–168. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3959\(93\)90127-b](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3959(93)90127-b).
- 508 [35] Coudeyre, E.; Rannou, F.; Tubach, F.; Baron, G.; Coriat, F.; Brin, S.; Revel, M.; Poiraudau,
 509 S. General Practitioners’ Fear-Avoidance Beliefs Influence Their Management of Patients with Low
 510 Back Pain. *Pain*, **2006**, *124* (3), 330–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2006.05.003>.
- 511 [36] Chaory, K.; Fayad, F.; Rannou, F.; Lefèvre-Colau, M.-M.; Fermanian, J.; Revel, M.;
 512 Poiraudau, S. Validation of the French Version of the Fear Avoidance Belief Questionnaire. *Spine*,
 513 **2004**, *29* (8), 908–913. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200404150-00018>.
- 514 [37] Moseley, L. Unraveling the Barriers to Reconceptualization of the Problem in Chronic Pain:
 515 The Actual and Perceived Ability of Patients and Health Professionals to Understand the
 516 Neurophysiology. *J. Pain*, **2003**, *4* (4), 184–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1526-5900\(03\)00488-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1526-5900(03)00488-7).
- 517 [38] Osinski, T.; Bardefsson, Y. Traduction française du Neurophysiology of Pain Questionnaire.
 518 *Kinésithérapie Rev.*, **2015**, *15* (158), 55–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kine.2014.11.067>.
- 519 [39] Fitzgerald, K.; Devonshire, E.; Vaughan, B. Pain Knowledge, Attitudes and Beliefs of Allied

- 520 Health Learners Across Three Curricular Models. *Health Prof. Educ.*, **2020**, 6 (4), 552–563.
521 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpe.2020.09.001>.
- 522 [40] Fitzgerald, K.; Fleischmann, M.; Vaughan, B.; de Waal, K.; Slater, S.; Harbis, J. Changes in
523 Pain Knowledge, Attitudes and Beliefs of Osteopathy Students after Completing a Clinically Focused
524 Pain Education Module. *Chiropr. Man. Ther.*, **2018**, 26, 42. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12998-018-0212-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12998-018-0212-0)
525 0.
- 526 [41] Adillón, C.; Lozano, È.; Salvat, I. Comparison of Pain Neurophysiology Knowledge among
527 Health Sciences Students: A Cross-Sectional Study. *BMC Res. Notes*, **2015**, 8 (1), 592.
528 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1585-y>.
- 529 [42] Bareiss, S. K.; Nare, L.; McBee, K. Evaluation of Pain Knowledge and Attitudes and Beliefs
530 from a Pre-Licensure Physical Therapy Curriculum and a Stand-Alone Pain Elective. *BMC Med.*
531 *Educ.*, **2019**, 19 (1), 375. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1820-7>.
- 532 [43] European Committee for Standardization. *Osteopathic Healthcare Provision — Main Element*
533 *— Complementary Element*; 2014.
- 534 [44] Clarkson, H. J.; Thomson, O. P. ‘Sometimes I Don’t Feel like an Osteopath at All’ - a
535 Qualitative Study of Final Year Osteopathy Students’ Professional Identities. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*,
536 **2017**, 26, 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2017.09.001>.
- 537 [45] Thomson, O. P.; Collyer, K. ‘Talking a Different Language’: A Qualitative Study of Chronic
538 Low Back Pain Patients’ Interpretation of the Language Used by Student Osteopaths. *Int. J.*
539 *Osteopath. Med.*, **2017**, 24, 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2016.11.002>.
- 540 [46] Delion, T. P. E.; Draper-Rodi, J. University College of Osteopathy Students’ Attitudes
541 towards Psychosocial Risk Factors and Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Qualitative Study. *Int. J.*
542 *Osteopath. Med.*, **2018**, 29, 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2018.04.006>.
- 543 [47] Esteves, J. E.; Bennison, M.; Thomson, O. P. Script Concordance Test: Insights from the
544 Literature and Early Stages of Its Implementation in Osteopathy. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2013**, 16 (4),
545 231–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2013.05.001>.
- 546 [48] Vaughan, B.; Florentine, P.; Carter, A. Introducing a Portfolio Assessment in a Pre-
547 Professional Osteopathy Program. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2014**, 17 (2), 129–134.
548 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2013.06.003>.
- 549 [49] Vaughan, B.; Morrison, T. Assessment in the Final Year Clinical Practicum of an Australian
550 Osteopathy Program. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2015**, 18 (4), 278–286.
551 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2015.04.001>.
- 552 [50] Luciani, E.; Dun, P. L. S. van; Esteves, J. E.; Lunghi, C.; Petracca, M.; Papa, L.; Merdy, O.;
553 Jäkel, A.; Cerritelli, F. Learning Environment, Preparedness and Satisfaction in Osteopathy in Europe:
554 The PreSS Study. *PLOS ONE*, **2015**, 10 (6), e0129904. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0129904>.
- 555 [51] Subramaniam, P.; Eaton, S.-A.; Cranfield, J.; Mulcahy, J.; McLaughlin, P.; Morrison, T.;
556 Vaughan, B. Osteopathic Graduates Perceptions of Stress and Competence – A Longitudinal Study.
557 *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2015**, 18 (1), 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2014.10.007>.
- 558 [52] von Elm, E.; Altman, D. G.; Egger, M.; Pocock, S. J.; Gøtzsche, P. C.; Vandenbroucke, J. P.
559 The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement:
560 Guidelines for Reporting Observational Studies. *The Lancet*, **2007**, 370 (9596), 1453–1457.
561 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(07\)61602-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61602-X).
- 562 [53] Cox, T.; Louw, A.; Puentedura, E. J. An Abbreviated Therapeutic Neuroscience Education

- 563 Session Improves Pain Knowledge in First-Year Physical Therapy Students but Does Not Change
 564 Attitudes or Beliefs. *J. Man. Manip. Ther.*, **2017**, 25 (1), 11–21.
 565 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10669817.2015.1122308>.
- 566 [54] Mukoka, G.; Olivier, B.; Ravat, S. Level of Knowledge, Attitudes and Beliefs towards
 567 Patients with Chronic Low Back Pain among Final Year School of Therapeutic Sciences Students at
 568 the University of the Witwatersrand - A Cross-Sectional Study. *South Afr. J. Physiother.*, **2019**, 75 (1),
 569 683. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajp.v75i1.683>.
- 570 [55] Demoulin, C.; Brasseur, P.; Roussel, N.; Brereton, C.; Humblet, F.; Flynn, D.; Van Beveren,
 571 J.; Osinsky, T.; Donneau, A.-F.; Crielaard, J.-M.; et al. Cross-Cultural Translation, Validity, and
 572 Reliability of the French Version of the Neurophysiology of Pain Questionnaire. *Physiother. Theory
 573 Pract.*, **2017**, 33 (11), 880–887. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2017.1359865>.
- 574 [56] Poiraudau, S.; Rannou, F.; Le Henanff, A.; Coudeyre, E.; Rozenberg, S.; Huas, D.;
 575 Martineau, C.; Jolivet-Landreau, I.; Revel, M.; Ravaud, P. Outcome of Subacute Low Back Pain:
 576 Influence of Patients' and Rheumatologists' Characteristics. *Rheumatol. Oxf. Engl.*, **2006**, 45 (6), 718–
 577 723. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/kei231>.
- 578 [57] Ménard, M.; Draper-Rodi, J.; Merdy, O.; Wagner, A.; Tavernier, P.; Jacquot, E.; Mhadhbi, H.
 579 Finding a Way between Osteopathic Principles and Evidence-Based Practices: Response to Esteves et
 580 Al. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.07.006>.
- 581 [58] Domenech, J.; Sánchez-Zuriaga, D.; Segura-Ortí, E.; Espejo-Tort, B.; Lisón, J. F. Impact of
 582 Biomedical and Biopsychosocial Training Sessions on the Attitudes, Beliefs, and Recommendations
 583 of Health Care Providers about Low Back Pain: A Randomised Clinical Trial. *PAIN*, **2011**, 152 (11),
 584 2557–2563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2011.07.023>.
- 585 [59] Airaksinen, O.; Brox, J. I.; Cedraschi, C.; Hildebrandt, J.; Klaber-Moffett, J.; Kovacs, F.;
 586 Mannion, A. F.; Reis, S.; Staal, J. B.; Ursin, H.; et al. Chapter 4 European Guidelines for the
 587 Management of Chronic Nonspecific Low Back Pain. *Eur. Spine J.*, **2006**, 15 (Suppl 2), s192–s300.
 588 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-006-1072-1>.
- 589 [60] Stokoe, J.; Rajendran, D. Are Student Attitudes to Back Pain Aligned with European
 590 Guidelines? A Survey within UK Osteopathic Educational Institutions (OElS) Using the Attitudes to
 591 Back Pain Scale for Musculoskeletal Practitioners (ABS-Mp). *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2010**, 13 (3),
 592 130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2010.07.030>.
- 593 [61] Rainville, J.; Carlson, N.; Polatin, P.; Gatchel, R. J.; Indahl, A. Exploration of Physicians'
 594 Recommendations for Activities in Chronic Low Back Pain. *Spine*, **2000**, 25 (17), 2210–2220.
- 595 [62] Figg-Latham, J.; Rajendran, D. Quiet Dissent: The Attitudes, Beliefs and Behaviours of UK
 596 Osteopaths Who Reject Low Back Pain Guidance – A Qualitative Study. *Musculoskelet. Sci. Pract.*,
 597 **2017**, 27, 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2016.10.006>.
- 598 [63] Inman, J.; Thomson, O. P. Complementing or Conflicting? A Qualitative Study of Osteopaths'
 599 Perceptions of NICE Low Back Pain and Sciatica Guidelines in the UK. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2019**,
 600 31, 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2019.01.001>.
- 601 [64] Kasiri-Martino, H.; Bright, P. Osteopathic Educators' Attitudes towards Osteopathic
 602 Principles and Their Application in Clinical Practice: A Qualitative Inquiry. *Man. Ther.*, **2016**, 21,
 603 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2015.09.003>.
- 604 [65] Esteves, J. E.; Zegarra-Parodi, R.; van Dun, P.; Cerritelli, F.; Vaucher, P. Models and
 605 Theoretical Frameworks for Osteopathic Care – A Critical View and Call for Updates and Research.
 606 *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, 35, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.01.003>.

- 607 [66] Alvarez, G.; Biesen, T. V.; Roura, S. Professional Identity in the Evolution of Osteopathic
608 Models: Response to Esteves et Al. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, *36*, 58–59.
609 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.05.001>.
- 610 [67] Steel, A.; Foley, H.; Redmond, R. Person-Centred Care and Traditional Philosophies in the
611 Evolution of Osteopathic Models and Theoretical Frameworks: Response to Esteves et Al. *Int. J.*
612 *Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, *36*, 60–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.03.001>.
- 613 [68] Santiago, R.; Campos, B.; Moita, J.; Nunes, A. Response to: Models and Theoretical
614 Frameworks for Osteopathic Care - A Critical View and Call for Updates and Research. *Int. J.*
615 *Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, *37*, 52–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.07.001>.
- 616 [69] Nesi, J. Models and Theoretical Frameworks for Osteopathic Care – A Critical View and Call
617 for Updates and Research. *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, *36*.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.05.006>.
- 619 [70] Sampath, K. K.; Fairs, E. A Piece of the Puzzle: Response to Esteves et Al. *Int. J. Osteopath.*
620 *Med.*, **2020**, *38*, 39–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.10.010>.
- 621 [71] Esteves, J. E.; Zegarra-Parodi, R.; Dun, P. van; Cerritelli, F.; Vaucher, P. Models and
622 Theoretical Frameworks for Osteopathic Care – A Critical View and Call for Updates and Research.
623 *Int. J. Osteopath. Med.*, **2020**, *35*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2020.01.003>.
- 624 [72] Rainville, J.; Bagnall, D.; Phalen, L. Health Care Providers' Attitudes and Beliefs about
625 Functional Impairments and Chronic Back Pain. *Clin. J. Pain*, **1995**, *11* (4), 287–295.
626 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00002508-199512000-00006>.
- 627 [73] Ostelo, R. W. J. G.; Stomp-van den Berg, S. G. M.; Vlaeyen, J. W. S.; Wolters, P. M. J. C.; de
628 Vet, H. C. W. Health Care Provider's Attitudes and Beliefs towards Chronic Low Back Pain: The
629 Development of a Questionnaire. *Man. Ther.*, **2003**, *8* (4), 214–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1356-689x\(03\)00013-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1356-689x(03)00013-4).
- 631 [74] Evans, J. R.; Mathur, A. The Value of Online Surveys. *Internet Res.*, **2005**, *15* (2), 195–219.
632 <https://doi.org/10.1108/10662240510590360>.
- 633

	Year 4 students	Year 5 students	Educators
Number	71	65	36
Age - mean in years (SD)	22.4 (1.4)	23.5 (1.5)	35.9 (8.5)
Gender women N (%)	48 (68)	45 (69)	9 (25)
Education's grade equal or higher than a bachelor's degree for students N (%)	12 (17)	8 (12)	/
Years of experience as an osteopath mean (SD)	/	/	10.1 (6.4)
Years of experience as an educator mean (SD)	/	/	6.8 (5.0)
Previous pain CPD N (%)	/	/	10 (27.8)

Table 1 - Sociodemographic characteristics of the population evaluated

Category	FABQ-HC PHYSICAL ACTIVITY		FABQ-HC PHYSICAL WORK		NPQ
	Mean (SD)	Cut-off score >14 % (N)	Mean (SD)	Cut-off score >34 % (N)	Mean (SD)
Year 4 students (N = 71)	10.39 (3.93)	11.26 (8)	24.90 (4.39)	1.41 (1)	11.94 (1.95)
Year 5 students (N = 65)	11.98 (4.80)	32.31 (21)	23.54 (6.37)	3.08 (2)	11.63 (2.19)
Educators (N = 36)	10.53 (4.87)	19.44 (7)	24.81 (7.39)	5.56 (2)	12.31 (2.13)
TOTAL	11.02 (4.44)	20.93 (36)	24.37 (5.78)	2.91 (5)	11.90 (2.05)
Year 4 students vs Year 5 students					
CI95%	[0.10 ; 3.08]		[-0.49 ; 3.22]		[-0.39 ; 1.02]
Unilateral Z-test (p-value)	p = 0.018		p = 0.075		p = 0.190
Effect size (Cohen's d)	d = 0.36		d = 0.25		d = 0.15
Year 4 students vs Educators					
CI95%	[-1.70 ; 1.97]		[-2.52 ; 2.72]		[-0.47 ; 1.19]
Unilateral Z-test (p-value)	p = 0.44		p = 0.47		p = 0.20
Effect size (Cohen's d)	d = 0.03		d = 0.02		d = 0.18
Year 5 students vs Educators					
CI95%	[-0.52 ; 3.43]		[-1.60 ; 4.13]		[-0.20 ; 1.55]
Unilateral Z-test (p-value)	p = 0.07		p = 0.19		p = 0.07
Effect size (Cohen's d)	d = 0.30		d = 0.19		d = 0.31

Table 2 - Mean (SD) and Cut-off score of each questionnaires (FABQ-HC Activity, Work and NPQ) for the three groups (Year 4 students, Year 5 stu

idents and Educators) and comparison of scores between each groups (CI 95%, p-value and effect sizes were reported).

Journal Pre-proof

	FABQ-HC PHYSICAL ACTIVITY	FABQ-HC PHYSICAL WORK	NPQ
Education's grade equal or higher than a bachelor's degree (students only)			
Yes (N = 20) - Mean (SD)	9.60 (5.35)	24.75 (4.37)	11.70 (2.44)
No (N = 116) - Mean (SD)	11.42 (4.23)	24.16 (5.61)	11.81 (2.01)
Mean difference	1.82	-0.59	0.11
Test Fisher (5 %)	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity
Size effect : d Cliff	d = - 0.27	d = 0.06	d = -0.02
CI (95%) (yes)	[7.10 ; 12.10]	[22.70 ; 26.80]	[10.56 ; 12.84]
CI (95%) Bootstrap (yes)	[7.45 ; 11.45]	[23.15 ; 26.40]	[10.90 ; 12.75]
CI (95%) Bootstrap (no)	[10.65 ; 12.19]	[23.14 ; 25.18]	[11.44 ; 12.18]
Mann-Whitney test (one tailed)	p = 0.0262	p = 0.3264	p = 0.4483
Years of experience as an osteopath			
< 10 (N = 18) - Mean (SD)	9.94 (4.87)	23.44 (7.63)	12.78 (1.93)
≥ 10 (N = 18) - Mean (SD)	11.11 (4.66)	26.17 (6.64)	11.83 (2.15)
Mean difference	1.17	2.73	-0.95
Test Mann-Whitney (5%)	0.07	p < .00001	p = 0.31
Test Fisher (5 %)	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity
CI (95%) Bootstrap (< 10)	[7.78 ; 13.33]	[20.11 ; 28.89]	[10.94 ; 12.67]
CI (95%) Bootstrap (≥10)	[7.72 ; 13.39]	[22.28 ; 28.56]	[11.22 ; 13.50]
Size effect : d Cliff	d = -0.02	d = 0.01	d = -0.03
Years of experience as an educator			
< 10 (N = 25) - Mean (SD)	9.88 (5.02)	24.12 (7.96)	12.28 (2.24)
≥ 10 (N = 11) - Mean (SD)	12.00 (3.82)	26.36 (6.64)	12.36 (2.16)
Mean difference	2.12	2.24	0.08
Test Mann-Whitney (5%)	p = 0.11	p = 0.35	p = 0.34
Test Fisher (5 %)	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity
CI (95%) Bootstrap (< 10)	[8.72 ; 12.40]	[21.48 ; 27.24]	[11.40 ; 12.96]
CI (95%) Bootstrap (≥10)	[9.45 ; 13.91]	[23.55 ; 29.45]	[11.27 ; 13.55]
Size effect : d Cliff	d = 0.25	d = 0.03	d = 0.01
Previous pain CPD (educators only)			
Yes (N=10) - Mean (SD)	10.50 (4.00)	23.50 (7.54)	12.40 (2.68)
No (N = 26) - Mean (SD)	10.54 (5.38)	25.31 (7.69)	12.27 (2.05)
Mean difference	0.04	1.81	-0.13
Test Fisher (5 %)	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity	homoscedasticity
Size effect : d Cliff	d = 0.02	d = -0.17	d = 0.02
CI (95%) Bootstrap (yes)	[8.30 ; 12.60]	[20.00 ; 27.80]	[11.00 ; 13.90]
CI (95%) Bootstrap (no)	[8.58 ; 12.42]	[22.38 ; 27.92]	[11.50 ; 13.00]
Mann-Whitney test (one tailed)	p = 0.4801	p = 0.2236	p = 0.4801

Table 3 - Impact of educational (bachelor degree) and professional determinants (years of osteopath, years of educators, CPD) on each measured scores (FABQ-HC Activities, Work and NPQ). N

Mean, SD and statistical analysis were reported.

Journal Pre-proof

Questionnaires	Studies	Present study	Van Biesen (2020)	Kennedy (2014)	Kennedy (2014)	Domenech (2011)	Burnett (2009)	Burnett (2009)	Burnett (2009)	Coudeyre (2006)	Poiraudeau (2006)
FABQ-HC	Population	Osteopathy students + educators	Final-year osteopathy students + Osteopaths	Nursing students	Medical students	Physiotherapy students	Physiotherapy students	Physiotherapy students	Physiotherapy students	General practitioners	Rheumatologists
	Participants	172	70	101	64	87	53	44	59	864	266
	Country	France	Spain	Ireland	Ireland	Spain	Australia	Singapore	Taiwan	France	France
FABQ-HC Physical Activity	Mean Score (SD)	11.02 (4.44)	10.69 (5.4)	12.52 (5.8)	11.19 (5.3)	14.3 (5.1)	6.3 (5.1)	11.1 (5.2)	12.2 (4)	9.6 (4.8)	9.2 (4.4)
	p-value (effect size)	vs Educators	0.4405 (0.04)	0.0238 (0.37)	0.2651 (0.13)	0.000095 (0.76)	0.000079 (0.85)	0.3057 (0.11)	0.0869 (0.37)	0.1315 (0.19)	0.0611 (0.29)
	p-value (effect size)	vs year 4 students	0.3486 (0.07)	0.0022 (0.43)	0.1572 (0.17)	<0.00001 (0.86)	<0.00001 (0.90)	0.2156 (0.16)	0.0051 (0.46)	0.055 (0.18)	0.0139 (0.28)
	p-value (effect size)	vs year 5 students	0.0733 (0.25)	0.2583 (0.10)	0.1876 (0.16)	0.0023 (0.47)	<0.00001 (1.15)	0.1877 (0.18)	0.384 (0.05)	0.00006 (0.50)	0.00001 (0.60)
FABQ-HC Work	Mean Score (SD)	24.37 (5.78)	22.29 (7.35)	/	/	20.2 (7.7)	/	/	/	17.5 (6.7)	16.7 (6.9)
	p-value (effect size)	vs Educators	0.049 (0.34)	/	/	0.0012 (0.61)	/	/	/	<0.00001 (1.04)	<0.00001 (1.13)
	p-value (effect size)	vs year 4 students	0.0052 (0.43)	/	/	<0.00001 (0.75)	/	/	/	<0.00001 (1.31)	<0.00001 (1.42)
	p-value (effect size)	vs year 5 students	0.1446 (0.18)	/	/	0.0021 (0.47)	/	/	/	<0.00001 (0.92)	<0.00001 (1.03)

Table 4 – FABQ-HC Physical activity and Work from previous studies. Mean score (SD) and p-value for each comparison study

Findings

- Educators and students belonging to the same OEI have no significantly different beliefs about cLBP and no significantly differing knowledge of pain.
- Educators and students show similar scores to other French HCPs and foreign osteopaths on the FABQ-HC Physical activity but they scored lower on the FABQ Work.
- There is potential to improve pain education and the French osteopathy curriculum in France especially concerning the beliefs around cLBP in relation to work.

Journal Pre-proof

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

JDR provides continuing professional development courses in France on the biopsychosocial model and as Head of CPD at UCO he provides CPDs to some French Osteopathic Educational Institutions. JE is an associate editor at IJOM and has had no role in review or decision making with respect to this manuscript.