**Table E29. Data abstraction of systematic reviews of ultrasound**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, Year** | **Country Number of Centers and Setting** | **Inclusion Criteria** | **Number Randomized, Analyzed Attrition** | **Intervention** | **Study Participants** | **Duration of Pain (acute, subacute, chronic)** |
| Ebadi, 2012 | IranSingle center | 18 to 60 years of age withnonspecific chronic low back painExclude: nerve root systems, systemic disease and specific conditions, medications for psychological problems, pregnant | Randomized: 50Analyzed: 50Attrition: 18% (12%vs. 24%) at 8 weeks | A: Ultrasound 1.5W/cm 2 at 1 MHz; duration based on Grey's formula, 10 sessions over 4 weeks (n=25)B: Sham ultrasound, same technique as A but no US (n=222) | A vs. BMean age: 31 vs. 37 years25% vs. 50% femaleRace: Not reportedPain intensity (mean, 0-100VAS): 47 vs. 49Functional Rating Index(mean, 0-100): 41 vs. 44 | Chronic: All chronic, meanduration 5.8 vs. 8.1 years |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, Year** | **Duration of Followup** | **Results****(list results for acute, subacute, and chronic separately)** | **Adverse Events Including****Withdrawals** | **Funding****Source** | **Quality (Cochrane Back Group)** |
| Ebadi, 2012 | 8 weeks (4 weeks aftercompletion of therapy) | A vs. BPain (mean, 0-100 VAS): 27 vs. 31 at 4 w, 28 vs. 26 at 8 w(p=0.48 for overall effect)Functional Rating Index (mean, 0-100 VAS): 23 vs. 31 at 4 w, 23 vs. 30 at 8 w (p=0.04 for overall effect) | Not reported | TehranUniversity of Medical Sciences | Good |

**Please see Appendix C. Included Studies for full study references.**