



**TITLE: Cervical Spine Splint for Cervical Stabilization: Clinical and Cost-Effectiveness**

**DATE:** 19 August 2010

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS:**

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of cervical spine splints compared to traditional cervical spine collars for patient stabilization in the pre-hospital setting?
2. What is the cost-effectiveness of cervical spine splints for patient stabilization in the pre-hospital setting?

**METHODS:**

A limited literature search was conducted on key health technology assessment resources, including PubMed, the Cochrane Library (Issue 7, 2010), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, ECRI (Health Devices Gold), EuroScan, international health technology agencies, and a focused Internet search. The search was limited to English language articles published between Jan 1, 2005 and Aug 9, 2010. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. Internet links were provided, where available.

**RESULTS:**

HTIS reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and economic evaluations.

No relevant health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, or economic evaluations were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of cervical spine splints compared to traditional cervical spine collars for patient stabilization. Information that may be of interest has been included in the appendix.

**Disclaimer:** The Health Technology Inquiry Service (HTIS) is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. HTIS responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. HTIS responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

**Copyright:** This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. **This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only.** It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

**Links:** This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners' own terms and conditions.

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:**

No relevant literature was identified; therefore no summary can be presented regarding the clinical effectiveness of cervical spine splints compared to traditional cervical spine collars for patient stabilization.

**REFERENCES SUMMARIZED:**

**Health technology assessments**

No literature identified.

**Systematic reviews and meta-analyses**

No literature identified.

**Randomized controlled trials**

No literature identified.

**Non-randomized studies**

No literature identified.

**Economic evaluations**

No literature identified.

**PREPARED BY:**

Health Technology Inquiry Service

Email: [htis@cadth.ca](mailto:htis@cadth.ca)

Tel: 1-866-898-8439

**APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:**

**Systematic reviews**

1. Ahn H, Singh J, Nathens A, Macdonald RD, Travers A, Tallon J, et al. Pre-Hospital Care Management of a Potential Spinal Cord Injured Patient: A Systematic Review of the Literature and Evidence-Based Guidelines. J Neurotrauma. 2010 Jun 16. [PubMed: PM20175667](#)

**Non-randomized studies- healthy patients**

2. Hostler D, Colburn D, Seitz SR. A comparison of three cervical immobilization devices. Prehosp Emerg Care. 2009 Apr;13(2):256-60. [PubMed: PM19291567](#)

**Additional references**

3. Sprague D. Trial study of the XCollar. EMS News [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2010 Aug 9];25(2):3. Available from: <http://www.acgov.org/ems/Newsletter/2009-2012/newsletter201002.pdf>  
*See page 3*
4. XCollar and NeXsplint pediatric use [Internet]. Carpinteria (CA): Emegear LLC; 2010. [cited 2010 Aug 9]. Available from: [http://www.cmrescue.com/prod\\_techinfo/NeXsplint.pdf](http://www.cmrescue.com/prod_techinfo/NeXsplint.pdf)