### **Coccyx Manipulation Statistics**

The statistics from 87 consecutive coccyx and pelvic pain patients treated using manipulation and acupuncture by Dr Michael Durtnall at Sayer Clinic Kensington: London during early 2012

#### The patient cohort

Total (n=87)	
male	25% (n=22)
age	37 (+/-11) years (Range: 13-69 years)
BMI	23.9 (+/- 4.8) (Range: 17.2-46.1)
Pain	4 (+/- 1) (scale: 1-5)
Months since onset	28 (+/-43) months (Range: 1-288)
Months to improvement	3 (+/- 3) months (Range: 0-16)
Improvement	72.8 (+/- 27.7) (Range: 0-100)
Treatment times to max improvement	6.5 (+/- 3.8) (Range: 0-20)

#### Age & gender distribution (overall cohort)



Average age: 37 75% female patients

#### Age & BMI (overall cohort)



No significant correlation between age & BMI

#### Months since onset (overall cohort)



46% of patients come within a year of onset 18% of patients come after >3 years of onset

## Comparing patients with onset <1 year vs >3years



- No significant difference in % improvement of patients <1 year since onset when compared to patients >3 years since onset
- No significant difference in months to reach maximum improvement
- No significant difference in treatment times to reach maximum improvement

#### % Improvement (overall cohort)



- Overall average improvement 73%
- While 69% improved more than 70%

#### Treatment times to maximum improvement



- A large proportion of patients (42%) needed 3-5 treatments to reach maximum improvement
- while the overall average was 7 treatments to maximum improvement

#### Months to Improvement (Overall cohort)



#### Pain (overall cohort)



69% of patients are in severe pain (pain scale scores 4 & 5)

#### Trauma (overall cohort)



Clear distinction between a large fraction of patients with severe trauma (37%) and a large proportion of patients with no trauma (38%)

### Conclusions

# Comparing patients with low vs high improvement

## Descriptives of extreme improvement categories

	100% imp (n=19)	<50% imp (n=16)
Gender	63% female (n=12)	75% female (n=12)
Age	33 (+/-7) years 17-45 years	35 (+/- 9) years Range: 23-53 years
BMI	22.7 (+/- 3.6) Range: 17.2-29.7	26.2 (+/- 6.3) Range: 19.9-46.1
Pain	3.79 (+/- 1.08)	4.19 (+/-0.98)
Months since onset	17 (+/- 21) months Range: 1-84 months	28 (+/- 29) months Range: 5-96 months
Sedentary	2 (+/- 2) Range: 0-5	4 (+/- 1) Range 1-5
Education	3.3 (+/- 1.2) Range (1-5)	4.0 (+/- 1.2) Range: 2-5
Patient motivation	4.3 (+/- 1.2) Range: 1-5	2.1 (+/- 1.6) Range: 0-5
TTMS to max imp	8 (+/- 5) Range: 2-20	5 (+/- 3) Range: 0-13
Trauma	3.2 (+/- 2.1) Range: 0-5	2.4 (+/- 2.4) Range: 0-5
Months to Imp	3.8 (+/- 4.2) months Range: 0.5-16	2.1 (+/- 1.6) months Range: 0-7

#### Age & BMI



No significant difference in average age of high (100%) and low (<50%) improvers, BUT significant difference in BMI (p=0.043) of low improvers (average: 26.2) compared to high improvers (average: 22.7)

#### Pain



Trend to higher pain in low improvers (average: 4.2) vs slightly lower pain in high improvers (average: 3.8)



Strong significant difference (p=0.001) in sedentary level of high improvers (average: 2) compared to low improvers (average: 4)



Trend towards higher education in high improvers (average: 4.0) compared to low improvers (average 3.3)



Clear significant difference (p<0.001) in patient motivation of high improvers (average: 4.3) compared to low improvers (average: 2.1)

#### TTMS to max IMP & mths to max imp



Significant difference in treatment times to maximum improvement in high improvers (average: 8) compared to low improvers (average: 5), but no significant difference in months to reach the maximum improvement in both groups

#### Comparing no trauma vs severe trauma patients

#### Descriptives no trauma vs severe trauma patients

	No Trauma (n=33)	Severe Trauma (n=32)
Gender	66.7% female	87.5% female
Age	36 (+/- 11 years) Range: 13-60	35 (+/- 10 Years) Range: 17-57
BMI	25 (+/- 4) Range: 19-33	23 (+/- 5) Range: 19-46
Pain	4 (+/- 1) Range: 1-5	4 (+/- 1) Range: 2-5
Months since onset	23 (+/- 38) Range: 1-216	24 (+/- 25) Range: 1-96
Sedentary	4.1 (+/- 1.4) Range: 0-5	2.7 (+/- 1.6) Range: 0-5
Education	3.6 (+/- 1.1) Raneg: 1-5	3.8 (+/- 1.2) Range: 1-5
Patient motivation	2.8 (+/- 1.4) Range: 1-5	3.6 (+/- 1.6) Range: 0-5
Improvement	66.5 (+/- 30.1) Range: 0-100	71.7% (+/- 28.2%) Raneg: 0-100
TTMS to max improvement	5.8 (+/- 3.2) Range: 1-5	6.8 (+/- 3.8) Range: 1-5
Months to improvement	2.8 (+/- 1.4) Range: 0-9 months	2.8 (+/- 2.6) Range: 0.5 -14

Age



- More normal age distribution
- 66.7% are female



- 75% of patients with severe trauma are between 20-30 years of age
- 87.5% are female

#### BMI



No significant difference in BMI between no trauma (average: 25) and severe trauma patients (average: 23) Pain



No significant difference in pain score between patients with no trauma and severe trauma, although a high proportion of the severe trauma patients was also in severe pain (53%) compared to 39% of patients without trauma

#### Sedentary



Strong significant difference (p=0.008) in sedentary levels between patients with severe trauma (average: 2.7) and no trauma (average: 4.1)





No significant difference in education between patients with no and severe trauma

#### Patient motivation



Clear trend towards higher patient motivation in the severe trauma group (average: 3.6) compared to the no trauma patient group (average: 2.9), with 68% of severe trauma patients being highly motivated (scores >4) compared to only 30% of non trauma patients

## Number of treatments to maximum improvement & months to maximum improvement



Trend towards more frequent treatments required to achieve maximum improvement in severe trauma patients (average: 6.8) compared to patients without trauma (average:5.8), no significant difference in time (months) required to achieve maximum improvement

#### Improvement



A smaller proportion of severe trauma patients (9.4%) showed less than 40% improvement compared to 18.2% of patients without trauma that showed less than 40% improvement, similarly 25% of severe trauma patients improved 100% whereas only 12.1% of the patients without trauma recovered fully

#### Conclusions

Dr JY Maigne found a mild effectiveness - approx 25% - with 3 treatment sessions of intrarectal manipuation in chronic coccydynia in his 2006 paper

#### COMPARED with:

My RESULTS of 73% of patients improving between 70-100% over an average of less than 7 treatments using specific manipulation, medical acupuncture, physical therapy and robust exercise.

I need to publish a well designed study in SPINE to get the ball rolling internationally to educate and change the worldwide medical approach to mechanical coccyx conditions - effectively to stop seeing it as normal to treat a simple mechanical problem as a depression or pain problem by prescribing drugs to suppress pain and neurological activity which depresses and lead patients to become obese, miserable and destined to become victims who suffer long-term.