









	Patient Name	Date
	This questionnaire will give your provider informa Please answer every section by marking the one section apply, please mark the one statement tha	tion about how your back condition affects your everyday life. statement that applies to you. If two or more statements in one t most closely describes your problem.
	Pain Intensity	Personal Care
	③ The pain comes and goes and is very mild.	I do not have to change my way of washing or dressing in order to avoid pain.
	① The pain is mild and does not vary much.	① I do not normally change my way of washing or dressing even though it causes some pain.
	The pain comes and goes and is moderate.	Washing and dressing increases the pain but I manage not to change my way of doing it. Washing and dressing increases the pain and I find it processary to change my way of doing it.
<u> </u>	 The pain is moderate and opes and is very severe. 	Washing and cressing increases the pain and nink in necessary to change my way or comp. Because of the pain I am unable to do some washing and dressing without help.
Oswestry Disability	The pain is very severe and does not vary much.	Because of the pain I am unable to do any washing and dressing without help.
	Sleeping	Lifting
Ouestionnaire:	I get no pain in bed.	② I can lift heavy weights without extra pain.
Questionnune.	① I get pain in bed but it does not prevent me from sleeping well.	① I can lift heavy weights but it causes extra pain.
	(2) Because of pain my normal sleep is reduced by less than 20%.	(2) Pain prevents me from lifting heavy weights off the floor. (3) Pain prevents me from lifting heavy weights off the floor, but I can manage.
0-20 = mild	Because of pain my normal sleep is reduced by less than 75%.	if they are conveniently positioned (e.g., on a table).
	S Pain prevents me from sleeping at all.	Pain prevents me from lifting heavy weights off the floor, but I can manage light to medium weights if they are conveniently opsitioned.
21-40 = moderate		 I can only lift very light weights.
	Sitting	Traveling
11.8.110 - covoro	I can sit in any chair as long as I like.	© I get no pain while traveling.
+ i & up = severe	① I can only sit in my favorite chair as long as I like.	① I get some pain while traveling but none of my usual forms of travel make it worse.
•	② Pain prevents me from sitting more than 1 hour. ③ Data securets me from sitting more than 1/2 hour.	② I get extra pain while traveling but it does not cause me to seek alternate forms of travel.
	 Pain prevents me from sitting more than 10 minutes. 	④ Pain restricts all forms of travel except that done while lying down.
	I avoid sitting because it increases pain immediately.	③ Pain restricts all forms of travel.
	Standing	Social Life
	③ I can stand as long as I want without pain.	My social life is normal and gives me no extra pain.
	① I have some pain while standing but it does not increase with time.	① My social life is normal but increases the degree of pain. ② Pain has no significant affact on my social life apart from limiting my more
	 Cannot stand for longer than 1 nour without increasing pain. I cannot stand for longer than 1/2 hour without increasing pain. 	energetic interests (e.g., dancing, etc).
	I cannot stand for longer than 10 minutes without increasing pain.	③ Pain has restricted my social life and I do not go out very often.
	③ I avoid standing because it increases pain immediately.	Pain has restricted my social life because of the pain. I have harriv any social life because of the pain.
		 (a) I nave naroly any social ine because of the period
	Walking	Changing degree of pain
	I have no pain while walking.	My pain is rapidly getting better.
	① I have some pain while walking but it doesn't increase with distance.	(1) My pain fluctuates but overall is definitely getting better. (2) My pain fluctuates but overall is definitely getting better.
	(3) I cannot waik more than 1 mile without increasing pain.	 My pain seems to be getting better our improvement is srow. My pain is neither petting better or worse.
	I cannot walk more than 1/4 mile without increasing pain.	My pain is gradually worsening.
	I cannot walk at all without increasing pain.	My pain is rapidly worsening. Back
		Index





Study	Reliability	Sensitivity	Specificity	LR+	LR-	QUADAS Score (0–14)
Laslett & Williams ²⁵	0.82	NT	NT	NA	NA	NA
Dreyfuss et al. ¹³	0.64	36	50	0.72	1.28	10
Kokmeyer et al. ²³	0.67	NT	NT	NA	NA	NA
Damen et al. ¹¹	NT	62	72	2.2	0.53	8
Ostagaard & Andersson ³⁶	NT	80	81	4.21	0.25	5
Broadhurst & Bond ⁶	NT	80	100	NA	NA	9
Albert et al. ¹	0.70	84–93 [*]	98	46.5	0.07-0.16	7
Laslett et al. ²⁴	NT	88	69	2.8	0.17	12
Arab et al. ²	0.60 right 0.40 left	NT	NT	NA	NA	NA
Ozgocmen et al. ^{37*} (Right)	NT	55	70	1.91	0.62	10
Ozgocmen et al. ^{37*} (Left)	NT	45	86	3.29	0.63	10
Gutke et al. ¹⁸	NT	88	89	8.0	0.13	7
Comments: One of the few si neutral adduction and at 90 de °Ozgocmen et al. ³⁷ assessed p	croiliac tests the egrees of flexion atients with acu	at exhibits fair sen: te sacroilitis.	sitivity. To accuratel	y perform the	test make sure	the thigh is held in



























































































Adjust	Area	Left	Right	Bilat	Technique	Indicated by:	Tende	Modifier	Quality
L L	Occiput	4	Г	Г	Impulse IQ	Indicated by reduced Cervical Rotation	Г		
	C1								
▼	C2	N	Г	Г	Impulse IQ	Indicated by reduced Cervical Rotation	Г		
	C3								
₽	C4	Г	Г	5	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Cervical Spinous Compression	Г		
R	C5			R	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Cervical Spinous Compression			
	C6	Г	Г	L L	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Cervical Spinous Compression	Г		
N	C7			R	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Cervical Spinous Compression			
	T1	Г	Г	L L	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Thoracic Spinous Compression	Г		
R	T2			R	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Thoracic Spinous Compression			
E	Т3	Г	Г	Г			Г		
	T4								
F	T5	Г	Г	Г			Г		
	T6								
₽	T7	Г	Г	되	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Thoracic Spinous Compression	Г		
V	T8			P	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Thoracic Spinous Compression			
Γ.	Т9	Г	Г	Г			Г		
	T10								
	T11	Г	Г	Г			Г		
	T12								
П	L1	Г	Г	Г			Г		
	L2								
₽	L3	Г	Г	▼	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Lumbar Spinous Compression	Г		
	L4				Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Lumbar Spinous Compression			
₽	L5	F	Г	₽	Impulse IQ	Indicated by positive Lumbar Spinous Compression	Г		
V	Right SI				Impulse IQ	Indicated by pain on palpation	A	mild	(quality: sharp)
□	Left SI	5	Г	Г	Impulse IQ	Indicated by pelvic asymmetry	5	mild	(quality: sharp)
₽	Sacrum		R		Impulse IQ	Indicated by pelvic asymmetry			
Г	Coccyx	Г	Г	Г			Г		
	Scapula								
Ţ.	Trochanter	Г	Г	5	Impulse IQ	Indicated by joint hypomobility	Г		
	Quadratus Lumb								











Postural Assessme	ent			
Reliability of Postural	Assessment			
			ICC of K	Interpretation
			.81-1.0	Substantial agreement
			.6180	Moderate agreement
			.4160	Fair agreement
			.1140	Slight agreement
			.010	No agreement
Test and Study	Description and Positive Findings	Population		Inter-examiner Reliability
Forward head ³⁴	"Yes" if the patient's external auditory meatus was anteriorly deviated (anterior to the lumbar spine)			κ =10 (20,00)
Excessive shoulder protraction ³⁴	"Yes" if the patient's acromions were anteriorly deviated (anterior to the lumbar spine)			$\kappa = .83$ (.51, 1.0)
C7-T2 excessive kyphosis ³⁴	Recorded as "normal" (no deviation),	chanical neck pai	in K	$\kappa = .79$ (.51, 1.0)
T3-5 excessive kyphosis ³⁴	"excessive kyphosis," or "diminished ky- phosis." Excessive kyphosis was defined			κ = .69 (.30, 1.0)
T3-5 decreased kyphosis ³⁴	as an increase in the convexity, and di-			κ = .58 (.22, .95)
T6-10 excessive kyphosis ³⁴	tening of the convexity of the thoracic			κ = .90 (.74, 1.0)
T6-10 decreased kyphosis ³⁴	spine (at each segmental group)			κ = .90 (.73, 1.0)
Kyphosis ^{as}	With patient standing, examiner in- spects posture from the side. Graded as "present" or "absent"			κ = .21
Scoliosis ¹⁵	With patient standing, examiner runs finger along spinous processes. Patient bends over and examiner assesses height of paraspinal musculature. Graded as "present" or "absent"	111 adults age ≥ with chronic low pain and 20 asyn tomatic patients	: 60 back np-	κ = .33
Functional leg length discrepancy ³⁵	Compare bilateral iliac crest height with patient standing. Graded as "symmetri-			κ = .00

Passive Interve	rtevbral Motion			
Reliability of Asses	sing Limited or Excessive Pas	sive Interverte	bral Motion	
			ICC or ĸ	Interpretation
			.81-1.0	Substantial agreement
			.6180	Moderate agreement
			.4160	Fair agreement
			.1140	Slight agreement
			.010	No agreement
Test and Study	Description and Positive Findings	Population	Reliability	
Upper lumbar segmen- tal mobility ³⁶	$ \begin{array}{c} (\text{Spinous}) \text{ Inter-examiner } \kappa = .03\\$		miner $\kappa = .02$ (27, caminer $\kappa = .17$ (14, examiner $\kappa =01$	
Lower lumbar segmen- tal mobility ³⁶	facets of each lumbar vertebra. Mobility of each segment is judged as "normal" or "restricted"	low back pain	(Spinous) Inter-exa .27) (Left facet) Inter-ex .06) (Right facet) Inter- (41,.18)	miner $\kappa =05$ (36, kaminer $\kappa =17$ (41, examiner $\kappa =12$
Identifying the least mobile segment ³⁷	With patient prone, examiner applies a posteroanterior force to	29 patients with	Inter-examiner ĸ =	.71 (.48, .94)
Identifying the most mobile segment ³⁷	the spinous process of each lumbar vertebra	pain	Inter-examiner κ =	.29 (13, .71)
Posterior to anterior (PA) stiffness ³⁸			In tra-examiner κ = In tra-examiner (±1 In ter-examiner κ =	= .54 level) κ = .64

Passive Interv	ertebral Motion (continued)			
Reliability of Asse	essing Limited or Excessive Passive Int	ervertebral Mo	tion	
			ICC or ĸ	Interpretation
			.81-1.0	Substantial agreement
			.6180	Moderate agreement
			.4160	Fair agreement
			.1140	Slight agreement
			.0 10	No agreement
Test and Study	Description and Positive Findings	Population	Reliab i	lity
Determination of seg- mental fixations ⁴⁰	Passive motion palpation is performed and the segment is considered fixated if a hard end- feel is noted during the assessment at to	60 asymptom- atic volunteers	intra-e: 09 t inter-e: 06 t	kaminer κ ranged from o .39 kaminer κ ranged from o .17
Passive motion palpation ⁴¹		21 symptomatic and 25 asymp- tomatic subjects	Inter-examiner κ = ranged from03 to .23 with a mean of .07	
Segmental mobility testing ⁴²	With patient side-lying with hips and knees flewed, examiner assesses mobility while pas- sively moving the patient. Examiner determines whether mobility of the segment is "de- creased," "normal," or "increased"	71 patients with low back pain	Inter-ø	caminer $\kappa = .54$
Hypermobility at any level ³¹	With patient prone, examiner applies a pos- teroanterior force to the spinous process of	49 patients with low back pain re- ferred for flexion-extension radiographs	inter-ex	saminer $\kappa = .48$ (.35, .61)
Hypomobility at any level ³¹	 each lumbar vertebra. Mobility of each segment is judged as "normal," "hypermobile," or "hypomobile" 		Inter-ex	aminer κ = .38 (.22, .54)
Determination of pos- teroanterior spinal stiffness ⁴⁰	Five raters tested lumbar spinal levels for pos- teroanterior mobility and graded each on an 11-point scale ranging from "markedly reduced stiffness" to "markedly increased stiffness"	40 asymptom- atic individuals	Inter-examiner ICC in the first study = .55 (.32, .79) Inter-examiner ICC in the seco study = .77 (.57, .89)	caminer ICC in the first = .55 (.32, .79) caminer ICC in the second = .77 (.57, .89)
Posteroanterior mo- bility testing ⁴⁴	With the patient prone, examiner evaluates posteroanterior motion mobility. Mobility is scored on a 9-point scale ranging from "severe excess motion" to "no motion" and the pres- ence of pain is recorded	18 patients with low back pain	inter-ø .39)	caminer ICC = .25 (.00,

Posteroanterior mo- bility testing ⁴⁴	With the patient prone, examiner evaluates posteroanterior motion mobility. Mobility is scored on a 9-point scale ranging from "severe excess motion" to "no motion," and the pres- ence of pain is recorded	18 patients with low back pain	Inter-examiner ICC = .25 (.00, .39)
Segmental mobility testing ⁴⁵	With patient prone, examiner applies an anteri- orly directed force over the spinous process of the segment to be tested. Examiner grades the mobility as "hypermobile," "normal," or "hypomobile"	63 patients with current low back pain	Inter-examiner ĸ ranged from 20 to .26 depending on level tested
Identification of a misaligned vertebra ⁴¹	Static palpation is used to determine the rela- tionship of one vertebra to the vertebra below	21 symptomatic and 25 asymp- tomatic subjects	Inter-examiner κ ranged from 04 to .03 with a mean of .00
Detection of a seg- mental lesion T11-L5/S1 ⁴⁶	Two clinicians used visual postural analysis, pain descriptions, leg length discrepancy, neu- rological examination, motion palpation, static palpation, and any special orthopaedic tests to determine the level of segmental lesion.	19 patients with chronic mechan- ical low back pain	Intra-examiner $\kappa=08$ to .43 Inter-examiner $\kappa=16$ to .25



Test and Study	Description and Positive	Population	Reliability		
	Findings		Intra-examiner	Inter-examiner	
Spring test T10-T747	With patients in the prone po-		κ = .73 (.39-1.0)	к = .12 (1841)	
Spring test L2-T1147	sition the therapist applies a posteroanterior force to the	84 subjects, of whom 53% reported experi- encing low back symptoms within the last 12 months	к = .78 (.49-1.0)	κ = .36 (.0766)	
Spring test L5-L3-47	spinous processes of T7-L5. The pressure of each force is held for 20 seconds. Considered positive if the force produces pain		κ = .56 (.1894)	κ = .41 (.1270)	
Pain with upper lumbar mobility testing ³⁶	With patient prone, examiner applies a posteroanterior force to the spinous processes and	39 patients with low back pain	(Spinous) Inter-examiner κ = .21 (10,.53) (Left facet) Inter-examiner κ = .46 (.17,.75) (Right facet) Inter-examiner κ = .38 (.06,.69)		
Pain with lower lumbar mobility testing ³⁶	lumbar facets of each lumbar vertebra. Response at each segment is judged as "painful" or "not painful"		(Spinous) Inter-exam (Left facet) Inter-exa (Right facet) Inter-exa	tiner $\kappa = .57$ (.32, .83) miner $\kappa = .73$ (.51, .95) taminer $\kappa = .52$ (.25, .79)	
Pain provocation45	With patient prone, examiner applies an anteriorly directed	63 patients with current low back pain	Inter-examiner k ranged from .25 to .55 de- pending on the segmental level tested		
Pain during mobility testing ³¹	force over the spinous pro- cesses of the segment to be tested. Considered positive if pain is reproduced	49 patients with low back pain referred for flexion-extension radiographs	Inter-examiner κ = .57 (.43, .71)		

LITERATURE REVIEW MANUAL EXAMINATION OF THE SPINE: A SYSTEMATIC CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW OF REPRODUCIBILITY Mette Jensen Stochkendahl, DC,^ä Henrik Wulff Christensen, DC, MD, PhD,^b Jan Hartvigsen, DC, PhD,^c Werner Vach, PhD,^d Mitchell Haas, DC, MA,^e Lise Hestbaek, DC, PhD,^f Nan Adams, DC, MS, MSEd,^g and Gert Bronfort, DC, PhD^h ABSTRACT Objective: Poor reproducibility of spinal palpation has been reported in previously published literature, and authors of recent reviews have posted criticism on study quality. This article critically analyzes the literature pertaining to the interand intraobserver reproducibility of spinal palpation to investigate the consistency of study results and assess the level of evidence for reproducibility. Methods: Systematic review and meta-analysis were performed on relevant literature published from 1965 to 2005, identified using the electronic databases MEDLINE, MANTIS, and CINAHL and checking of reference lists. Descriptive data from included articles were extracted independently by 2 reviewers. A 6-point scale was constructed to assess the methodological quality of original studies. A meta-analysis was conducted among the high-quality studies to investigate the consistency of data, separately on motion palpation, static palpation, osseous pain, soft tissue pain, soft tissue changes, and global assessment. A standardized method was used to determine the level of evidence. **Results:** The quality score of 48 included studies ranged from 0% to 100%. There was strong evidence that the interobserver reproducibility of osseous and soft tissue pain is clinically acceptable ($\kappa \ge 0.4$) and that intraobserver reproducibility of soft tissue pain and global assessment are clinically acceptable. Other spinal procedures are either not reproducible or the evidence is conflicting or preliminary. (J Manipulative Physiol Ther 2006;29:475-485) Key Indexing Terms: Reproducibility of Results; Palpation; Literature Review; Diagnostic Tests; Spine; Meta-Analysis

















