

# Why Not OMT?

## Practitioner Exposure to Osteopathic Manipulation Could Lead to More Utilization of OMT

Yaser Elqutub, DO, Rebecca Eary, DO, MPH, Zaiba Jetpuri, DO, MBA, Sarah Woods, PHD



#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to evaluate whether exposure of Osteopathic Manipulative Therapy (OMT), such as targeted OMT training, amongst family medicine faculty physicians at a large academic program is associated with knowledge, comfort, and interest in OMT.

#### BACKGROUND

#### **Clinical Context**

OMT has repeatedly been shown to be an effective first line adjuvant treatment for various disease states, including musculoskeletal-related pain, however OMT remains largely underutilized.

#### HYPOTHESIS

Lifetime exposures to OMT are associated with knowledge, comfort, and interest in OMT. Practicing academic physicians who undergo a targeted OMT training session will report more knowledge, comfort, and interest in OMT.

## **METHODS**

#### **Design / Intervention**

- 17 question pre and post survey emailed to faculty using Redcap including items assessing knowledge, comfort, and interest. Some questions used a Likert scale of 1-10.
- A targeted hour-long training session of OMT was done via Zoom, which included videos. A pre survey was administered before the training, and a post survey with similar questions was also administered after the training session.

#### Analysis

- Descriptive statistics were completed to characterize the sample and examine pre- and post-survey scores.
- Bivariant correlations were calculated to estimate the association between baseline OMT exposure and physician knowledge, comfort, and interest in OMT.
- Correlations were deemed significant at p <.05.</li>

|                          | Pre test<br>N=15 | Post test<br>N=10 |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| <u>Sex</u>               |                  |                   |
| Male                     | 4                | 6                 |
| Female                   | 11               | 3                 |
| Years in training        |                  |                   |
| 0-9                      | 7                | 3                 |
| 10-19                    | 1                | 1                 |
| 20+                      | 7                | 5                 |
| <u>Type of physician</u> |                  |                   |
| <u>degree</u>            |                  |                   |
| MD                       | 15               | 10                |
| DO                       | 0                | 0                 |
| Exposure to OMT          |                  |                   |
| Trained with DOs in      | 12               | 7                 |
| Residency                |                  |                   |
| <b>Previous Lectures</b> | 11               | 5                 |
| Live Demonstrations      | 11               | 7                 |
| CME                      | 0                | 0                 |
| Videos                   | 2                | 1                 |
| Articles                 | 3                | 2                 |
| Received OMT             | 8                | 8                 |
| Personally               |                  |                   |
| Referred to OMT          | 14               | 9                 |
| -If no, why not?         | Unsure of who    |                   |
|                          | or how to refer  |                   |
|                          |                  |                   |

Table 1. Sample Demographics and Exposures to OMT

#### RESULTS

| Likert<br>scale<br>(1-10) | Theory & Concepts |      |      |      |      |      |      | vledge<br>entation |      |      |      |      |      | wledge<br>iveness |      |      |      |      |
|---------------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|
|                           | Pre               | Post | Pre  | Post | Pre  | Post | Pre  | Post               | Pre  | Post | Pre  | Post | Pre  | Post              | Pre  | Post | Pre  | Post |
| Mean                      | 3.78              | 7.22 | 3.00 | 6.56 | 5.44 | 7.22 | 3.22 | 6.89               | 2.78 | 6.67 | 2.89 | 6.67 | 4.33 | 7.44              | 3.89 | 7.00 | 8.00 | 8.44 |
| SD                        | 2.53              | 1.48 | 2.18 | 1.13 | 2.88 | 1.56 | 2.11 | 1.76               | 2.05 | 1.94 | 1.83 | 1.58 | 2.12 | 1.51              | 2.71 | 2.42 | 1.23 | 1.13 |
| Range                     | 1-8               | 6-10 | 1-6  | 5-8  | 2-10 | 5-10 | 1-7  | 4-9                | 1-6  | 4-10 | 1-6  | 5-9  | 1-8  | 5-10              | 1-9  | 3-10 | 6-10 | 7-10 |
|                           | _                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |                    |      |      |      |      |      |                   |      |      |      |      |

Table 2. Pre and Post Survey Descriptive Statistics

|                        | Knowledge Theory & Concepts |      |      | Knowledge Documentation | Knowledge iCD10 |      | Knowledge<br>Effectiveness | Comfort<br>Supervising | Interest<br>in<br>Learning |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------|------|-------------------------|-----------------|------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Pearson<br>Correlation | .856                        | .737 | 230  | .762                    | .692            | .618 | .757                       | .592                   | 077                        |
| Sig.<br>(2-tailed)     | .003                        | .023 | .552 | .017                    | .039            | .076 | .018                       | .093                   | .844                       |
| N                      | 9                           | 9    | 9    | 9                       | 9               | 9    | 9                          | 9                      | 9                          |

Table 3. Correlations Between Baseline Lifetime Exposure to OMT and Knowledge, Comfort, and Interest

- 16 total faculty physicians participated in the study (15 took the pre survey, 10 took the post survey, only 9 completed both pre and post surveys)
- Analysis included only those who completed pre and post survey (N=9)
- Of those who completed the study, all were MD's, and all had referred at least 1 patient to receive OMT
  as a form of treatment in the past.
- Those who only took the pre or post survey did not significantly vary in responses compared to those who took both surveys.

## DISCUSSION

- Total lifetime exposure to OMT was significantly associated with physicians' knowledge about the practice and purpose of OMT.
- Lifetime exposure was not significantly associated with interest in learning OMT or knowledge about application of OMT.
- There was an increase in the mean of every category assessed after participating in the OMT training course.
- One of the barriers to referring patients to OMT identified in this study included not having the knowledge of who or how to refer

#### Limitations/Weakness

Sample size of participants were too small. A larger number is needed to make findings more significant.

### CONCLUSIONS

- Training in OMT may improve a physician's knowledge, comfort, and interest in OMT.
- Since exposure is correlated to knowledge of OMT, it may be that more exposure and awareness of OMT in the medical field could ultimately lead to better utilization of OMT.
- Given the evidence supporting the use of OMT in various applications,
   Osteopathic curriculum should be taught in Allopathic curriculum and
   included in recommendations for first-line treatments (i.e MSK-related
   pain, etc) of various pathologies.