Dear Sir,

I read with interest the review by Paciaroni and Bogousslavsky [1], titled ‘Cerebrovascular Complications of Neck Manipulation’, in your February 2009 edition. I would like to thank the authors for what, overall, I found to be quite a balanced and fair review and subsequent discussion of the literature relevant to this subject.

One aspect of the authors’ review does, however, concern me. I suspect that the search strategy which the authors used in collecting data for their review may, to some extent, have biased their findings. Specifically, I am concerned that although the authors note in their introduction that ‘In fact, it [spinal manipulation] is commonly used by osteopaths, physiotherapists and physicians and is the hallmark treatment of manual therapists’, their search strategy included both the terms ‘manual therapy’ and ‘chiropractic’, but did not include either ‘physiotherapy’, ‘osteopathy’ or the word ‘physician’.

Additionally, the only key word listed by the authors which is associated with any one profession was ‘chiropractic therapy’.

In all fairness, if, as the authors state, spinal manipulation is commonly used by osteopaths, physiotherapists and physicians and is the hallmark treatment of manual therapists, should not reference to those professions also be included in the review’s search strategy?

Again, I thank the authors for their contribution and look forward to their response.
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