

II) Chiropractic Guideline for Spine Radiography for the Assessment of Spinal Subluxation in Children and Adults

RECOMMENDATION

Radiography is indicated for the qualitative and quantitative assessment of the biomechanical components of vertebral subluxation. When using radiography, a baseline value for subluxation displacement should be determined prior to the initiation of and at the cessation of a program of chiropractic treatment interventions. In this manner, patient response to care can be accurately determined.

Supporting Evidence: For all radiographic views combined (not separated out as in Section X): Clinical Levels I-V, Biomechanics, Reliability Class 1 and 2, and Validity.

PCCRP Evidence Grade: Clinical Studies = B, C, and PCCRP Consensus Opinion = D, Biomechanics, Reliability and Validity Studies = a.

A. Introduction to General Radiography

Radiography is a proven procedure for visualizing human anatomy and in particular spinal structures. The goal of radiography in chiropractic is to:

1. Make an assessment of spinal subluxation;
2. Make a determination of spinal health including the presence of any soft tissue injury, presence of any fractures, and the presence of any bony pathologies;
3. Make an assessment of any spinal instabilities;
4. Make an assessment any disc and other degenerative changes.

Historically, Palmer termed the use of radiography in chiropractic to assess the spine as 'Spinography'. The term Spinography provides for a Chiropractic focus and is defined as:

Spinography is the chiropractic art of analyzing x-rays for the following purposes:

1. *Finding potential subluxations.*
2. *Understanding the anatomy to give the most appropriate adjustment.*
3. *Developing the most appropriate plan of care for the patient.*

In the current PCCRP guidelines, we will use the term 'Spinography' and spinal radiography/x-ray analysis by the Doctor of Chiropractic interchangeably; the intended meaning is as defined by Palmer. Since the Doctor of Chiropractic has studied courses in x-ray physics, radiographic positioning, radiographic safety, radiographic diagnosis, and radiographic geometric line drawing analysis, he/she is expected to have a license to practice that is controlled by a government agency (State and Provincial Chiropractic Boards). As such, the chiropractic practitioner is expected to adhere to the local laws pertaining to x-ray equipment, x-ray safety, and all other such items that are concomitant with x-ray privileges granted by a government.

Some specific items of importance for the Chiropractic practitioner are listed here. These items include:

1. Principles of radiation protection, including shielding of various body parts, lead aprons, etc,
2. Proper screens and cassettes,
3. Proper film identification (patient name, age, date, clinic),
4. Proper identification of direction (left, right, oblique, etc),
5. Best visualization with a minimal exposure,

6. Appropriate Collimation,
7. Appropriate technique charts with exposure factors,
8. Radiographs should be reviewed before a patient is released for that day to insure that positioning and film quality is at an optimum.

B. Indications for Spine Radiography in Children and Adults

The main focus of this document is the following list of patient conditions that warrant a radiographic evaluation for the assessment of spinal subluxation. This evaluation for the assessment is independent of any “Red Flags” assessment. For the assessment of spinal subluxations, the Chiropractor becomes aware of conditions which affect the safety and appropriateness of chiropractic care by conducting a consultation that should include a personal history, family history, present complaints, and any recent or past traumas. Additionally, an orthopedic, neurological, range of motion (ROM), and a postural examination may be helpful. Indications for spine radiographic examinations include, but are not limited to:

1. Abnormal posture,
2. Spinal Subluxation (as defined in this document),
3. Spinal deformity (eg, scoliosis, hyper-kyphosis, hypo-kyphosis, etc...),
4. Trauma, especially trauma to the spine,
5. Birth Trauma (eg, forceps, vacuum extraction, caesarean section etc...),
6. Restricted or abnormal motion,
7. Abnormal gait,
8. Axial pain,
9. Radiating pain (eg, upper extremity, intercostal, lower extremity),
10. Headache,
11. Suspected short leg,
12. Suspected spinal instability,
13. Follow-up for previous deformity, previous abnormal posture, previous spinal subluxation/displacement, previous spinal instability,
14. Suspected osteoporosis,
15. Facial pain,
16. Systemic health problems (eg, skin diseases, asthma, auto-immune diseases, organ dysfunction),
17. Neurological conditions,
18. Delayed developmental conditions,
19. Eye and vision problems other than corrective lenses,
20. Hearing disorders (eg, vertigo, tinnitus, etc...),
21. Spasm, inflammation, or tenderness,
22. Suspected abnormal pelvic morphology,
23. Post surgical evaluation,
24. Suspected spinal degeneration/arthritis,
25. Suspected congenital anomaly,
26. Pain upon spinal movement,
27. Any “Red Flag Conditions” covered in previous guidelines.

C. Minimum Spine Radiographic Examination

Since the spine is a contiguous structure that is inseparable in function it should be inseparable in an evaluation using Spinography. A radiographic examination of the spine may include an AP evaluation and a lateral evaluation of the entire spine. Additional views may be indicated in cases involving trauma. It is of some historical interest that the recommendations of Hildebrandt¹ in 1985 are repeated here. In his classic 1985 text *Chiropractic Spinography*, Hildebrandt¹ suggested that there are five projections that comprise a complete full spine analysis:

1. AP full spine
2. Lateral full spine
3. Femoral head view
4. Sacral base view
5. Upper cervical view.

For children younger than 10 years old, some of the five projections may not be needed, and the Chiropractor may use clinical judgment to determine which views are needed. If we pause to understand the reasoning behind Hildebrandt's¹ suggested five views for a complete spine evaluation, we may be able to elaborate on his suggestions.

First, the lateral full spine view will provide an analysis of several possible spinal subluxations:

1. a global view of the sagittal balance of C1, T1, T12, and S1,
2. an evaluation of forward/backward head posture,
3. an evaluation of forward/backward ribcage posture,
4. an evaluation of sagittal posture (from the postural examination) and spinal coupling on the radiograph,
5. an evaluation of cervical lordosis,
6. an evaluation of thoracic kyphosis,
7. an evaluation of lumbar lordosis,
8. an evaluation of pelvic morphology,
9. an evaluation of any retro- or spondylo-listhesis and,
10. an evaluation of spinal degeneration (vertebrae, discs, spinal ligaments).

If the Chiropractor does not have a full spine bucky and cassettes to obtain a full spine lateral x-ray, then three sectional views may substitute for this view. These sectional views are: lateral cervical, lateral thoracic, and lateral lumbo-pelvis.

Second, the AP full spine view will provide an analysis of several possible spinal subluxations including;

1. a global view of the AP balance of C1, T1, T12, S1,
2. an evaluation of segmental subluxations in the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar regions,
3. an evaluation of posture (knowledge from the postural examination) and spinal coupling on the AP radiograph,
4. an evaluation of any cervical scoliosis,
5. an evaluation of any thoracic scoliosis,
6. an evaluation of any lumbar scoliosis, and
7. an evaluation of pelvic and leg length asymmetry.

If the Chiropractor does not have a full spine bucky and cassettes to obtain a full spine AP x-ray, then three sectional views may substitute for this view. These sectional views are: AP cervical, AP thoracic, and AP lumbo-pelvis.

While the items listed above for the AP full spine and lateral full spine analysis may seem straight forward, one might ask why Hildebrandt¹ suggested the femur head view, the sacral base view, and the upper cervical view (Nasium). To change from the fetal C-shape curve, the cervical vertebrae extend and the lumbar vertebrae extend. This extension to eventually assume an upright stance is restricted to the median-sagittal plane. Thus, while the spinal structures in the sagittal view are normally aligned perpendicular to the central ray, this extension of the spine to allow upright stance creates a situation where the AP x-ray beam is at an angle to the plane of the lower lumbar segments (L4-L5-S1) and upper cervical segments (C0-C1-C2) in the AP view. Additionally, any pelvic axial rotation in front of the grid cabinet will project one femur head lower than its twin on the other side. Thus, taken together the femur head view, the sacral base view, and the upper cervical view (Nasium) allow for assessment of the following subluxation types:

1. short leg causing an un-level sacral base and spinal AP curvatures on the short leg view,
2. an evaluation of the SI joints, sacral ala, L5, and L4, and lumbo-sacral angle at the sacral base on the Ferguson projection,
3. an evaluation of the skull-atlas and atlas-cervical spine as upper angle (UA), lower angle (LA), C2 axial rotation, and cervico-dorsal (CD) angle at mid neck on the AP nasium upper cervical view.

Patients expect and deserve a thorough radiographic evaluation of their spines when any of the above indications are present.² By following this minimal radiographic set of views, the vast majority of structural spinal subluxations can be located and measured. However, there are additional radiographic views needed to perform a thorough investigation in trauma and 'deformity' cases. These may include all or part of the following list:

1. Davis Cervical Series:
 - a. AP cervical,
 - b. Lateral cervical,
 - c. AP Open Mouth (APOM),
 - d. Flexion,
 - e. Extension,
 - f. Left oblique,
 - g. Right oblique,
2. Sand bag stress views in cervical lateral bending (alar ligament views),
3. Cervical Motion X-ray during flexion-extension, open-mouth lateral bending, and oblique lateral bending cervical articular facet views,
4. Lumbar flexion-extension,
5. Lumbar oblique,
6. Lumbo-sacral spot views, etc...,
7. Bending and/or postural stress films for flexibility assessment of scoliosis or buckling displacements (see Section V for definitions).

Historical Consistency

Again, it is of historical significance that the above recommendations are consistent with earlier recommendations. For example, in 1964 Jackson⁵¹ discussed that an adequate radiographic examination of the cervical spine is essential for patient diagnosis. She made an argument for the following radiographic views to be made routinely: an antero-posterior view of the upper two vertebrae, an antero-posterior view of the lower five vertebrae, an antero-posterior caudad-angled view to show the posterior structures of the vertebrae, three lateral views (neutral, flexion, extension) made with the patient in the upright position, and right and left oblique views.

D. Follow-up (post-evaluation) Spine Radiographic Examinations

Chiropractors attempting the assessment and correction of spinal subluxations need feedback as to the structural efficacy of their adjustment and spinal rehabilitative forces. If the chiropractor employs radiographic mensuration procedures for biomechanical assessment upon initial examination, follow-up (post) radiographs are appropriate for evaluating patient progress throughout a course of care.^{3-6,8-25}

Chiropractors interested in assessing subluxations and correcting subluxations are attempting to create improvement in spinal alignments with their treatment interventions; as such, the structural improvements measured via radiography are of concern. Analogous to this interest in structural assessment by chiropractic clinicians, is the same interest by orthopedic surgeons. It may be helpful to review the suggested frequency of follow-up radiographs (post treatment views) utilized by Orthopedic surgeons. Orthopedic surgeons often take initial pre-operative radiographs, immediate post-operative, one month, 6-12 months, and long-term follow-up radiographs (total of 5 sets of x-rays) for surgery cases.⁷ In fact, according to Fischgrund (2005, pp 1017 and 1023), "Routine cervical spine radiographs taken for the evaluation of degenerative disc disease and cervical radiculopathy include lateral, anteroposterior, and oblique views."⁷ Following surgical intervention, they state, "Typical follow-up of these patients includes an office visit at 1 week, with routine anteroposterior and lateral radiographs. By 6 weeks, lateral flexion and extension views usually show that the fusion construct is stable...".⁷ Fischgrund further stated that follow-ups are ascertained at 1 year, 2 years, or 5 or more years depending upon the specific study. Therefore, according to Fischgrund, surgery patients receive initial, 1-week post op, 6-week post op, and 1, 2, or 5 year follow ups.⁷

In light of the above information it is the consensus of the PCCRP panel that indications for follow-up (post) radiographs are:

1. Post radiographs are indicated after a specific corrective adjustment to the upper cervical spine where the exact position of the CO-C1-C2 spine needs to be ascertained.⁸⁻¹³
2. Post radiographs are indicated after the placement of an orthotic for the reduction of leg length inequality or sacral base un-leveling in the coronal plane.¹⁴⁻²⁰
3. Post radiographs are indicated after each 2 or 3 month time period of care using structural rehabilitative chiropractic treatment procedures.^{3-6,21-27}
4. Post radiographs may be indicated in a situation where the patient suddenly has an exacerbation during treatment.²⁸
5. Post radiographs may be indicated after significant trauma during a course of treatment.²⁸
6. Post radiographs are suggested at 6 months follow-up, 1 year, and 2 years.²³⁻²⁵

7. For spinal instability, post spinal surgical cases, and recent spinal fracture cases, post radiographs may need to be taken at an increased frequency.²⁸

Early and Late X-rays of a Patient Following Sustained Trauma

Posttraumatic progressive cervical ligamentous instability and spinal deformity may occur in spite of initial apparently normal spine radiographs. Patients at risk for the development of this problem are generally under the age of 25 and have >1.5mm of horizontal displacement and >5° of angular displacement on initial cervical x-rays.²⁸

B. Position on Computerized analysis of radiographs.

Recent advances in computer and radiographic technology has made it possible to both ascertain and analyze spinal x-rays with computer assisted methodology. It is becoming increasingly common for spinal health care providers, such as chiropractors, to use computer assisted methods to analyze spinal displacements. These computer methods are at least as reliable and valid as traditional 'by hand' radiographic analytical techniques. The current PCCRP guideline panel considers computer assisted radiographic analysis to be a reliable and valid procedure for spine analysis.^{21-25,29-47}

C. Position on Videofluoroscopy or Digital Motion X-ray Analysis

Videofluoroscopy can demonstrate different motion patterns between normal and pathologic spines.⁴⁸ Cineradiography adds another diagnostic method of evaluating suspected soft-tissue injuries of the cervical spine by demonstrating motion during active exercise. It is reasonable to anticipate that abnormal motion will accelerate degenerative changes in the spine and will complicate the cineradiographic analysis. The cineradiographic study will have its greatest value in patients who show normal spines on standard roentgenograms and before degenerative changes have occurred.⁴⁹ The incidence of apophysial joint abnormalities detected by cineradiography is higher than by plain roentgenograms. The cineradiographic study is of benefit in demonstrating either excessive or decreased mobility. It has proved of value in localizing the areas of abnormalities which correlate well with symptoms.⁵⁰

Summary

The PCCRP Guidelines developed and put forth above are evidence based recommendations for radiographic analysis of the spine for chiropractors in clinical practice. These PCCRP guidelines are consistent with previous historical works in the chiropractic literature. The remainder of this document provides the scientific rationale, evidence, reliability, validity, and clinical utility of the current PCCRP Guideline for Spine Radiography for the Assessment of Spinal Subluxation in Children and Adults.

References

1. Hildebrandt RW. Chiropractic Spinography. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1985, pp. 78.
2. Sherman R. Chiropractic x-ray rationale. J Canadian Chiro Association 1986;30(1):33-35.
3. Troyanovich SJ, Harrison DE, Harrison DD. Review of the Scientific Literature Relevant to Structural Rehabilitation of the Spine and Posture: Rationale for Treatment Beyond the Resolution of Symptoms. J Manipulative Physiol Ther 1998; 21(1): 37-50.

4. Harrison DE, Harrison DD, Troyanovich SJ. Reliability of Spinal Displacement Analysis on Plane X-rays: A Review of Commonly Accepted Facts and Fallacies with Implications for Chiropractic Education and Technique. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1998; 21(4):252-66.
5. Harrison DE, Harrison DD, Troyanovich SJ. A Normal Spinal Position, Its Time to Accept the Evidence. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2000; 23: 623-644.
6. Oakley PA, Harrison DD, Harrison DE, Haas, JW. Evidence-Based Protocol for Structural Rehabilitation of the Spine and Posture: Review of Clinical Biomechanics of Posture (CBP®) Publications. *J Canadian Chiro assoc* 2005; 49(4):268-294.
7. Fischgrund JS. Surgical Management of Cervical Radiculopathy: Anterior Procedures. Part A. Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion. Ch. 75. In: *The Cervical Spine*. 4th ed. Clark CR editor. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, Philadelphia, 2005. page 1017,1023.
8. Owens EF, Eriksen K. Upper cervical post x-ray reduction and its relationship to symptomatic improvement and spinal stability. *CRJ*: 1997(4:2):10-17.
9. Knutson GA. Abnormal Upper Cervical Joint Alignment and the Neurologic Component of the Atlas Subluxation Complex. *CRJ* 1997; 4(1).
10. Kale MU. Precision radiologic study: an exposition of specific upper cervical analysis. *ICA Rev*: JUL/AUG 1991(47:4) 41-45.
11. Eriksen, K.; Comparison Between Upper Cervical X-Ray Listings and Technique Analyses Utilizing a Computerized Database. *Chiropractic Research J* 1996; 3(2):13-24.
12. Grostic J, Deboer K. Roentgenographic measurement of atlas laterality and rotation: a retrospective pre- and post-manipulation study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1982;5(2):63-71.
13. Khorshid KA, Sweat RW, Zemba DA, Zemba BN. Clinical efficacy of upper cervical versus full spine chiropractic care on children with autism: a randomized clinical trial. *J Vertebral Subluxation Res* 2006; March 9:1-7.
14. Friberg O. Clinical symptoms and biomechanics of lumbar spine and hip joint in leg length inequality. *Spine*. 1983 Sep;8(6):643-51.
15. Giles LGF, Taylor JR. Low back pain associated with leg length inequality. *Spine* 1981;6:510-521.
16. Papaioannou T, Stokes I, Kenwright J. Scoliosis associated with limb-length inequality. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1982;64(1):59-62.
17. Gofton JP. Persistent low back pain and leg length disparity. *J Rheumatol* 1985;12747-750.
18. Gross ML, Davlin LB, Evanski PM. Effectiveness of orthotic shoe inserts in the long-distance runner. *Am J Sports Med* 1991;19(4):409-412.
19. Ohsawa S, Ueno R. Heel lifting as a conservative therapy for osteoarthritis of the hip: based on the rationale of Pauwels' intertrochanteric osteotomy. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 1997;21(2):153-158.
20. Defrin R, Ben Benyamin S, Aldubi RD, Pick CG. Conservative correction of leg-length discrepancies of 10mm or less for the relief of chronic low back pain. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2005 Nov;86(11):2075-80.
21. Harrison DE, Harrison DD, Haas JW, Betz JW, Janik TJ, Holland B. Conservative Methods to Correct Lateral Translations of the Head: A Non-randomized Clinical Control Trial. *J Rehab Res Devel* 2004;41(4):631-640.
22. Harrison DE, Cailliet R, Betz JW, Harrison DD, Haas JW, Janik TJ, Holland B. Harrison Mirror Image Methods for Correcting Trunk List: A Non-randomized Clinical Control Trial. *Eur Spine J* 2005; 14:155-162.
23. Harrison DE, Harrison DD, Betz J, Janik TJ, Holland B, Colloca C. Increasing the Cervical Lordosis with CBP Seated Combined Extension-Compression and Transverse Load Cervical Traction with Cervical Manipulation: Non-randomized Clinical Control Trial. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2003; 26(3): 139-151.
24. Harrison DE, Harrison DD, Cailliet R, Janik TJ, Holland B. Changes in Sagittal Lumbar Configuration with a New Method of Extension Traction: Non-randomized Clinical Control Trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehab* 2002; 83(11): 1585-1591.

25. Harrison DE, Cailliet R, Harrison DD, Janik TJ, Holland B. New 3-Point Bending Traction Method of Restoring Cervical Lordosis Combined with Cervical Manipulation: Non-randomized Clinical Control Trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehab* 2002; 83(4): 447-453.
26. Morningstar MW, Woggon D, Lawrence G. Scoliosis treatment using a combination of manipulative and rehabilitative therapy: a retrospective case series. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2004 Sep 14;5:32.
27. Morningstar MW, Joy T. Scoliosis treatment using spinal manipulation and the Pettibon weighting system: a summary of 3 atypical presentations. *Chiro and Osteo* 2005;14(1):1-12.
28. Wilberger JE, Maroon JC. Occult posttraumatic cervical ligamentous instability. *J Spinal Disord*. 1990 Jun;3(2):156-61.
29. Adam CJ, Izatt MT, Harvey JR, Askin GN. Variability in Cobb angle measurements using reformatted computerized tomography scans. *Spine*. 2005 Jul 15;30(14):1664-9.
30. Berliner L, Kreang-Arekul S, Kaufman L. Scoliosis evaluation by direct digital radiography and computerized post-processing. *J Digit Imaging*. 2002;15 Suppl 1:270-4. Epub 2002 Mar 20.
31. Berthonnaud E, Labelle H, Roussouly P, Grimard G, Vaz G, Dimnet J. A variability study of computerized sagittal spinopelvic radiologic measurements of trunk balance. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2005 Feb;18(1):66-71.
32. Hamer OW, Strotzer M, Zorger N, Paetzel C, Lerch K, Feuerbach S, Volk M. Amorphous silicon, flat-panel, x-ray detector: reliability of digital image fusion regarding angle and distance measurements in long-leg radiography. *Invest Radiol*. 2004 May;39(5):271-6.
33. Herrmann AM, Geisler FH. A new computer-aided technique for analysis of lateral cervical radiographs in postoperative patients with degenerative disease. *Spine*. 2004 Aug 15;29(16):1795-803.
34. Schuler TC, Subach BR, Branch CL, Foley KT, Burkus JK; Lumbar Spine Study Group. Segmental lumbar lordosis: manual versus computer-assisted measurement using seven different techniques. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2004 Oct;17(5):372-9.
35. Quint DJ, Tuite GF, Stern JD, Doran SE, Papadopoulos SM, McGillicuddy JE, Lundquist CA. Computer-assisted measurement of lumbar spine radiographs. *Acad Radiol*. 1997;4(11):742-52.
36. Troyanovich SJ, Harrison D, Harrison DD, Harrison SO, Janik T, Holland B. Chiropractic biophysics digitized radiographic mensuration analysis of the anteroposterior cervicothoracic view: a reliability study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2000 Sep;23(7):476-82.
37. Troyanovich SJ, Harrison DE, Harrison DD, Holland B, Janik TJ. Further analysis of the reliability of the posterior tangent lateral lumbar radiographic mensuration procedure: concurrent validity of computer-aided X-ray digitization. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 1998;21(7):460-7.
38. Troyanovich SJ, Harrison SO, Harrison DD, Harrison DE, Payne MR, Janik TJ, Holland B. Chiropractic biophysics digitized radiographic mensuration analysis of the anteroposterior lumbopelvic view: a reliability study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 1999 Jun;22(5):309-15.
39. Janik TJ, Harrison DD, Cailliet R, Troyanovich SJ, Harrison DE. Can the Sagittal Lumbar Curvature be Closely Approximated by an Ellipse? *J Orthop Res* 1998; 16(6): 766-770.
40. Harrison DD, Cailliet R, Janik TJ, Troyanovich SJ, Harrison DE. Elliptical Modeling of the Sagittal Lumbar Lordosis and Segmental Rotation Angles as a Method to Discriminate Between Normal and Low Back Pain Subjects. *J Spinal Disord* 1998; 11(5):430-439.
41. Harrison DE, Janik TJ, Harrison DD, Cailliet R, Harmon S. Can the Thoracic Kyphosis be Modeled with a Simple Geometric Shape? The Results of Circular and Elliptical Modeling in 80 Asymptomatic Subjects. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2002; 15(3): 213-220.
42. Harrison DD, Harrison DE, Janik TJ, Cailliet R, Haas JW. Do Alterations in Vertebral and Disc Dimensions Affect an Elliptical Model of the Thoracic Kyphosis? *Spine* 2003;463-469.
43. Harrison DD, Harrison DE, Janik TJ, Cailliet R, Haas JW, Ferrantelli J, Holland B. Modeling of the Sagittal Cervical Spine as a Method to Discriminate Hypo-Lordosis: Results of Elliptical and Circular Modeling in 72 Asymptomatic Subjects, 52 Acute Neck Pain Subjects, and 70 Chronic Neck Pain Subjects. *Spine* 2004; 29:2485-2492.

44. Kuklo TR, Potter BK, Schroeder TM, O'Brien MF. Comparison of manual and digital measurements in adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. *Spine* 2006;31:1240-1246.
45. Zmurko MG, Mooney JF 3rd, Podeszwa DA, Minster GJ, Mendelow MJ, Guirgues A. Inter- and intraobserver variance of Cobb angle measurements with digital radiographs. *J Surg Orthop Adv*. 2003 Winter;12(4):208-13.
46. Rosol MS, Cohen GL, Halpern EF, Chew FS, Kattapuram SV, Palmer WE, Dupuy DE, Rosenthal DI. Vertebral morphometry derived from digital images. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1996; 167:1545-49.
47. Cakir B, Richter M, Kafer W, Wieser M, Puhl W, Schmidt R. Evaluation of lumbar spine motion with dynamic x-rays- A reliability study. *Spine* 2006; 31(15): 1258-64.
48. Hino H, Abumi K, Kanayama M, Kaneda K. Dynamic motion analysis of normal and unstable cervical spines using cineradiography. *Spine* 1999;24:163-8.
49. Buonocore E, Hartman JT, Nelson CL. Cineradiograms of cervical spine diagnosis of soft-tissue injuries. *JAMA* 1966;198(1):143-7.
50. Jones MD. Cervical spine cineradiography after traffic accidents. *Archives of Surgery* 1962;85:124-131.
51. Jackson R. The positive findings in alleged neck injuries. *Am J Orthop Surg*. 1964 Aug-Sep;30:178-87.

(C) 2006 PCCCRP