FUNCTION IN PATIENTS WITH CERVICAL RADICULOPATHY OR CHRONICWHIPLASH-ASSOCIATED DISORDERS COMPAREDWITH HEALTHY VOLUNTEERS

Anneli Peolsson, Maria Landén Ludvigsson, Johanna Wibault, Asa Dederling and Gunnel
Peterson

Linköping University Post Print

N.B.: When citing this work, cite the original article.

Original Publication:

Anneli Peolsson, Maria Landén Ludvigsson, Johanna Wibault, Asa Dederling and Gunnel Peterson, FUNCTION IN PATIENTS WITH CERVICAL RADICULOPATHY OR CHRONICWHIPLASH-ASSOCIATED DISORDERS COMPAREDWITH HEALTHY VOLUNTEERS, 2014, Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics, (37), 4, 211-218.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmpt.2014.01.003>

Copyright: Elsevier

<http://www.elsevier.com/>

Postprint available at: Linköping University Electronic Press

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-108175>

TITLE PAGE

ARTICLE INFORMATION	Fill in information in each box below
Article Title	Functioning in Patients with Cervical Radiculopathy or Chronic Whiplash-Associated Disorders, Compared with Healthy Volunteers
Key Words – <i>only use</i> MeSH terms that are found at http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html	Cervical spine; Neck pain; Radiculopathy; Whiplash injury; Outcome measures
Running head - no more than 40 letters/ spaces	Disability following neck disorders
Word count for structured abstract (approx 250 words or less)	234
Word count for text (excludes abstract, figure legends, references)	3040
Practical Applications Three to 5 short sentences that highlight <i>findings</i> of the study. These statements should relate directly to the study findings.	Both WAD and CR patients generally exhibited worse results than healthy volunteers. Patients with CR appeared to be worse than the WAD group, with the exception of self-rated neck disability, in which the WAD group was worse. Further studies are needed to investigate whether training of neck function aiming to improve AROM and NME may improve outcome in these patients.
Human Subjects and Animals If human subject or animals were used, state the name of IRB, Research Ethics Committee or equivalent in the Methods <i>and</i> here.	All participants provided written informed consent. All procedures were conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki, and the study was approved by the Ethics Committee at the Faculty of Health Sciences at Linköping University in Sweden.
Clinical Trial Registry If the study was a clinical trial, please include clinical trial registration number in the Methods and here.	NCT01528579, NCT01547611
Permission to Acknowledge List the names of people who you are acknowledging and specifically how they contributed to the study. A signed letter of permission from <i>each</i> person and/or entity stating they give permission to the JMPT to print their name must be uploaded to the website at the initial time of submission. List permissions here.	N/A
Permission to reprint If you are using any previously published figures or tables, a signed letter of permission from the copyright holder stating they give permission to the JMPT to reprint must be uploaded to the website at the initial time of submission. List permissions here.	N/A
Funding sources State funding sources (grants, funding sources, equipment, and supplies). Include name and number of grant if available. Clearly state if study received direct NIH or national funding. All sources of	This study was financially supported by the Swedish Medical Research Council, REHSAM II, the Wenner-Gren foundations, the Medical Research Council of Southeast Sweden, the Swedish Society of Medicine, and

funding should be acknowledged in the manuscript.	the county councils of Sörmland and Östergötland.
Conflicts of interest List all potential conflicts of interest for all authors. Include those listed in the ICMJE form. These include financial, institutional and/or other relationships that might lead to bias or a conflict of interest. If there is no conflict of interest state none declared.	The authors declare no conflicts of interests.
Contributorship For each author, list initials for how the author contributed to this manuscript. List author initials for each relevant category	
<i>Concept development</i> (provided idea for the research)	AP, GP, MLL
<i>Design</i> (planned the methods to generate the results)	AP, GP, MLL, ÅD, JW
<i>Supervision</i> (provided oversight, responsible for organization and implementation, writing of the manuscript)	AP
<i>Data collection/processing</i> (responsible for experiments, patient management, organization, or reporting data)	AP, JW, MLL, GP
<i>Analysis/interpretation</i> (responsible for statistical analysis, evaluation, and presentation of the results)	AP
<i>Literature search</i> (performed the literature search)	AP
<i>Writing</i> (responsible for writing a substantive part of the manuscript)	AP
<i>Critical review</i> (revised manuscript for intellectual content, this does not relate to spelling and grammar checking)	AP, GP, MLL, JW, ÅD
<i>Other</i> (list other specific novel contributions)	

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

For the <u>corresponding</u> author (responsible for correspondence, proofreading, and reprints)	Fill in information in each box below
First name, middle initial, last name and degrees	Anneli Peolsson, Assoc. Prof., PhD, PT
Email address – this is where your proofs will be sent	Anneli.Peolsson@liu.se
Postal mailing address – this is where your complimentary copy will be shipped	Department of Medical and Health Sciences, Physiotherapy, Hälsans hus plan 12, Campus US, Linköping University, SE-58183 Linköping
Phone number	+46-10-1031798
Fax number	+46-10-1031706

First author

First name, middle initial, last name of author. Include highest academic degree(s).	Anneli Peolsson; Assoc. Prof.
Title, academic or professional position (eg, Professor, University of Illinois)	Assoc. Prof., PhD, PT
Name of department(s) and institution(s) to which work should be attributed for this author (eg, Kinesiology Department)	NHMRC CCRE (Spinal Pain, Injury and Health), The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; Department of Medical and Health Sciences, Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

Second author

First name, middle initial, last name of author. Include highest academic degree(s).	Maria Landén Ludvigsson; MSc
Title, academic or professional position (eg, Professor, University of Illinois)	MSc, PT
Name of department(s) and institution(s) to which work should be attributed for this author (eg, Kinesiology Department)	Dep. Medical and Health Sciences, Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden; Rehab Väst, County Council of Östergötland

Third author

First name, middle initial, last name of author. Include highest academic degree(s).	Johanna Wibault; MSc
Title, academic or professional position (eg, Professor, University of Illinois)	MSc, PT
Name of department(s) and institution(s) to which work should be attributed for this author (eg, Kinesiology Department)	Dep. Medical and Health Sciences, Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

Fourth author

First name, middle initial, last name of author. Include highest academic degree(s).	Åsa Dederig; Dr
Title, academic or professional position (eg, Professor, University of Illinois)	PhD, PT
Name of department(s) and institution(s) to which work should be attributed for this author (eg, Kinesiology Department)	Division of Physiotherapy, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; Department of Physical Therapy, Karolinska University Hospital, Sweden.

Fifth author

First name, middle initial, last name of author. Include highest academic degree(s).	Gunnel Peterson; MSc
Title, academic or professional position (eg, Professor, University of Illinois)	MSc, PT
Name of department(s) and institution(s) to which work should be attributed for this author (eg, Kinesiology Department)	Dep. Medical and Health Sciences, Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden; Centre for Clinical Research Sörmland, Uppsala University, Sweden.

Sixth author

First name, middle initial, last name of author. Include highest academic degree(s).	
Title, academic or professional position (eg, Professor, University of Illinois)	
Name of department(s) and institution(s) to which work should be attributed for this author (eg, Kinesiology Department)	

(if there are additional authors, please copy, paste, then fill in)

Disability following neck disorders

**Functioning in Patients with Cervical Radiculopathy or Chronic Whiplash-Associated
Disorders, Compared with Healthy Volunteers**

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To examine whether any differences in functioning and health exist between patients with cervical radiculopathy (CR) due to disc disease scheduled for surgery and patients with chronic whiplash-associated disorders (WAD), and to compare measures of patients' physical function with those obtained from healthy volunteers.

Methods: A cross-sectional study of patients with CR (n=198) and patients with chronic WAD (n=215). Patient data was compared with raw data previously obtained from healthy people. Physical measures included cervical active range of motion (AROM), neck muscle endurance (NME), and hand grip strength. Self-rated measures included pain intensity (Visual Analogue Scale), neck disability (NDI), self-efficacy (SES), and health-related quality of life (EuroQol five-dimensional self-classifier, EQ-5D).

Results: Patient groups exhibited significantly lower performance than the healthy group in all physical measures ($P<.0005$) except for NME in flexion for women ($P>.09$). There was a general trend towards worse results in the CR group than the WAD group, with significant differences in neck AROM, left hand strength for women, pain intensity, NDI, EQ-5D, and SES ($P<.0001$).

Conclusions: Patients had worse values than healthy individuals in almost all physical measures. There was a trend toward worse results for CR than WAD patients. Further studies are needed to investigate whether training of neck function may improve outcome in these patients.

Key Words: Cervical spine; Neck pain; Radiculopathy; Whiplash injury; Outcome measures.

INTRODUCTION

Longstanding problems of cervical radiculopathy (CR) and indirect neck trauma (whiplash-associated disorder, WAD) are common, with CR incidence of 83/100000¹ and WAD incidence of 235-300/100000.² In recent studies, up to 50% of WAD patients^{3,4} and 30% to 100% of postsurgical CR patients⁴⁻⁹ report personal suffering from prolonged symptoms, with persistent pain, disability, and reduced health-related quality of life (HRQoL). Physical function and treatment have been severely understudied both for CR patients scheduled for surgery^{9,10} and for chronic WAD patients,¹¹ particularly for patients with verified neurological and musculoskeletal findings (WAD Grade III).¹¹ Evidence of effective physiotherapy is inconclusive because there have been few randomized controlled trials involving these specific groups of patients.¹²⁻¹⁵ There is an urgent need for increased knowledge of both groups' functioning and health in order to better understand how to tailor successful exercise regimens.

Patients with CR scheduled for surgery have specific magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)-verified pathology of cervical disc disease consistent with clinical findings. It is therefore of interest to compare CR patients with WAD patients, whose diagnosis often persists with clinical signs but without radiological findings,¹⁶ with respect to self-reporting questionnaires and physiotherapist-obtained measures of function. Active cervical range of motion (AROM), neck muscle endurance (NME), and hand strength are all factors of importance for activities of daily living; they are reduced in other neck pain populations,^{8,17} and should be addressed in rehabilitation programs.¹⁸ For patients with chronic WAD^{19,20} or CR,⁵⁻⁹ these factors have been insufficiently evaluated in relatively small samples that exhibit reduced function.^{5-9,19-22}

Disability following neck disorders

It is important to investigate whether and to what extent these patient groups differ from a healthy population, and whether there are differences in CR patients regarding the onset of symptoms (suddenly after a special occasion, or slowly progressing) and in WAD patients regarding Quebec classification.²³ Information is contradictory regarding whether or not WAD Grade is related to outcome,^{24, 25} and to our knowledge the literature lacks studies investigating whether the type of symptom onset in CR patients is related to functional outcome.

This study primarily aimed to examine whether any differences in pain intensity, physical function, or HRQoL exist between patients with CR and patients with chronic WAD, and to compare these measures of physical function in these patient groups with measures obtained from healthy volunteers. Secondary goals were to investigate whether there were any differences between patients classified as WAD Grade II and Grade III; to determine whether symptoms of CR appeared after a specific occasion; and to investigate correlations between physical measures and self-reported disability and health.

METHODS

Participants

This study included 198 patients with MRI-verified CR due to cervical disc disease who were scheduled for surgery the following day (mean age 50 years $\pm$ SD 8.5 years, 104 men and 94 women; table 1) and 215 patients with chronic WAD (6 months to 3 years since accident) classified as Grade II (n=122) or Grade III (n=93)²³ (mean age 40 $\pm$ 11.4 years, 78 men and 137 women; table 2). Patients' data was compared with data obtained previously from

Disability following neck disorders

healthy volunteers (for hand strength and neck AROM: $n=101$, mean age 43 ± 10.5 years, 50 men and 51 women (24, 25); for NME: $n=116$, mean age 45 ± 11.7 years, 60 men and 56 women).²⁸

Patients with CR (recruited from Neurosurgical clinics) and WAD (identified through electronic medical records from county councils and recruited after enquiries by mail including a short questionnaire) were participants in ongoing randomized clinical trials. Their baseline values were used in the present study. For inclusion criteria, please see Tables 1 and 2. For both patient groups, eligibility criteria were verified through telephone interviews, medical files when indicated, and physical examination by an experienced physiotherapist.

Volunteers with healthy necks were randomly selected from computerized employee records from a University hospital and a University by an independent researcher, and were stratified with respect to sex and age.²⁶⁻²⁸ Individuals claiming to be healthy without recurrent neck pain, earlier neck trauma, or neck surgery, and without any recent neck treatment were included. Individuals with upper extremity problems were excluded from the hand strength measurements. Pregnant women were also excluded. Raw data from these earlier published normative data of healthy controls²⁶⁻²⁸ were used for comparisons between healthy volunteers and patients.

Different parts of the study received approval from the Regional Medical Research Ethics Committee at Linköping University in Sweden, and the study was conducted in accordance

Disability following neck disorders

with the declaration of Helsinki. All participants received verbal and written information about the study, as well as practical demonstration of the measurements.

Measurements

All measurements were obtained from WAD and CR patients. Only physical measures were obtained from the healthy volunteers.

Background data

Background data included age, sex, and WAD Grade (II or III)²³ for WAD patients and whether or not the onset of symptoms was associated with a specific occasion in CR patients.

Pain

Current pain intensity in the neck and arms was measured using a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), ranging from 0-100mm (0, no pain; 100, worst imaginable pain).²⁹

Neck-specific function

Perceived neck disability was quantified using the Neck Disability Index (NDI). The 10 sections of the NDI (pain intensity, personal care, lifting, reading, headaches, concentration, work, driving, sleeping, and recreation) were scored from 0 to 5 in order of increasing severity, added together, and transformed into percentages (0%, no pain or difficulties; 100%, highest score for pain and difficulty).³⁰

Self-efficacy Scale

Confidence in the ability to perform 20 individual physical and psychosocial activities despite pain was evaluated using the 10-point Self-Efficacy Scale (SES)³¹ (0, not confident; 10, completely confident). The total score was summarized (0, not confident; 200, completely confident).²⁹ Good measurement properties have been reported for the SES.³¹

Health-related quality of life

We used the EuroQol five-dimensional self-classifier (EQ-5D), which addresses mobility, self-care, everyday activities, pain, and anxiety/depression, to assess HRQoL. For each dimension, one of three hierarchical levels was chosen (1, no problem; 2, mild problem; 3, severe problem) and converted to a score (<0, worse than death; 0, death; 1, perfect health).³² Current health state was also measured using the EuroQol vertical VAS (0, worst imaginable; 100, best imaginable).³²

Neck Active Range of Motion

The neck AROM (in sagittal, frontal, and transverse planes) was measured using the plastic helmet cervical range of motion device (Performance Attainment Associates, Roseville, MN) in the sitting position in a reliable (ICC >.80) and standardized way.²⁶

Neck muscle endurance

The endurance tests were measured in a prone position for dorsal neck muscles and a supine position for ventral neck muscles. Maximum duration of a smaller head lift was measured in seconds with a stopwatch. The upper cervical spine was in a flexed position when ventral

Disability following neck disorders

muscles were tested and in an extended position during dorsal testing. In the dorsal position, a load of 2 kg for women and 4 kg for men was applied around the head. Patients were instructed to “maintain the head lift for as long as possible, stopping at exhaustion or radiating pain into the arms”. The standardized test position was carefully monitored by the test leader and immediately corrected if not maintained. The physiotherapist interrupted the test if the patient was unable to maintain the position despite two reminders.²⁸ Reliability of these procedures has been reported previously as good (ICC >.80).²⁸

Hand strength

The test was performed in a standardized way using an isometric hydraulic hand dynamometer “Jamar” (Sammons Preston, Inc., Bolingbrook, IL) in the standing position with a straight back; shoulder adducted and in a relaxed position; elbow flexed to 90 degrees; and the lower arm and wrist in neutral position. Men used grip breadth 3 and women used grip breadth 2. This test was always performed with the right hand first. After a maximal squeeze duration of 8s, the peak value was registered in kilograms.²⁷ Reliability of this procedure has been reported previously as good (ICC >.80).²⁷

Statistical Analysis

For descriptive statistics, means±standard deviations are presented. For unpaired group comparisons, Student’s two-tailed *t*-test was used for two-group comparisons, and factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by the Bonferroni post hoc test was used for unpaired three group comparisons with $P<.0167$ considered statistically significant. For two-group comparison and correlation, statistical significance was set at $P>.05$. Bivariate

correlations were studied using Pearson's correlation coefficient. Because biological sex has been demonstrated as a factor of importance when interpreting the results of hand strength and NME data^{27, 28} and because different loading and grip size were used for men and women during these measurements, the analysis of hand strength and NME data was split by sex owing to the unequal distribution of men and women between patient groups. Effect size (ES) was calculated³³ as the mean value number one minus mean value number two, divided with the pooled standard deviation of the two groups. Effect size ≥ 0.40 was set as clinical relevance.³³

RESULTS

Comparisons between CR Patients, WAD Patients, and Healthy Volunteers

Patients with CR or WAD exhibited significantly lower performance than the healthy group in all physical measures ($P < .0005$; ES 0.41-1.84), except for NME flexion for women ($P > .09$; ES 0.23; table 3). The physical function results for both patient groups were approximately 60-80% of the function results of the healthy group, except for NME flexion and extension. Regarding NME flexion, male patients had approximately 40% of function compared with healthy volunteers. Regarding NME extension, male patients had approximately 25% of function and female patients had approximately 20% of function compared with healthy volunteers.

Disability following neck disorders

There was a general trend toward lower/worse values in CR patients than WAD patients regarding both physical and self-reported measures. Significant differences were observed in neck AROM, women's left hand strength, pain intensity, NDI, EQ-5D, and SES ($P<.0001$; ES 0.40-1.38; table 3).

Within the CR Group

In the CR group, there were no significant differences among patients who reported that their problems had started after a specific occasion and those who did not ($P=.10-.90$). Neck muscle endurance correlated significantly with all self-reported measures ($r=-.15$ to $.32$, $P<.05$). Sagittal plane neck AROM correlated significantly with NDI, SES, and neck pain intensity ($r=-.15$ to $-.25$, $P<.05$). Transverse plane neck AROM correlated significantly with NDI ($r=-.20$, $P=.008$) and EQ-5D ($r=.16$, $P=.03$).

Within the WAD Group

Patients with Grade II WAD trended toward better results on both physical and self-reported measures than patients with Grade III WAD. Statistical significant differences was observed for neck AROM in the sagittal and transverse planes, hand strength, NME extension, pain ratings, NDI, and self-efficacy ($P<.05$; table 4) with clinical relevant differences for arm pain (ES 0.69) and self-efficacy (ES 0.47) only (table 4). When patients were stratified by sex, the significances between Grades II and III disappeared regarding men's hand strength and men's NME extension.

Disability following neck disorders

All physical measures correlated significantly with NDI ($r=-.14$ to $-.42$, $P=.04$ to $<.0001$) and self-efficacy ($r=.17$ to $.40$, $P<.02$). NME extension and flexion correlated significantly with arm pain ($r=-.15$ to $-.19$, $P<.04$), and NME extension to EQ 5D ($r=.39$, $P<.0001$).

DISCUSSION

Comparisons between Patients and Healthy Participants and CR and WAD Patients

Both patient groups exhibited results that were approximately 20-80% of healthy volunteers' results in nearly all physical measures, suggesting the importance of physical rehabilitation aimed at gaining function. This finding was particularly pronounced for NME extension. The non-significant difference between female patients and healthy women regarding NME flexion may indicate that even healthy women have relatively low muscle endurance compared with men ($P<.0001$)²⁸; this may be an important factor regarding the higher prevalence of neck pain among women than among men.³⁴ To compare the three groups properly, it was necessary to standardize the assessments performed in all three groups, as well as the ability to use raw data.

The physical disability results confirm results from earlier small studies involving CR patients,^{5, 8-10} as well as earlier small studies of AROM in patients with chronic WAD.^{18, 19}

Mean values of neck AROM data for the CR group are comparable to earlier studies of CR

Disability following neck disorders

patients with relatively few participants^{5,9} and were lower for both patient groups than those obtained in young adults being treated for radiating neck pain.³⁵ Regarding hand strength, CR patients in the present study fared worse than in earlier studies, and WAD patients exhibited results similar to those of CR patients in previous studies.^{5,9} The lower hand strength among CR patients in the present study may be explained by more generous inclusion criteria for surgery in studies that were initiated more than a decade ago, but may also be a reflection of the small study samples in the older studies.^{5,9} NME flexion values in the present WAD patients were comparable to those of previous non-specific neck pain patients⁸; however, the NME extension values among the present female WAD patients were worse.⁸ The NME values for CR patients in the present study were both slightly better and worse than reported in earlier studies of CR patients.^{5,8,9}

All measurements were worse for the CR group., to our knowledge, no such comparison between the groups has been presented before.

WAD Grade

WAD grade was important regarding both physical measures and-self reported data; although this finding was not unexpected, it was debatable.^{24,25} To our knowledge, only one previous randomized controlled trial¹¹ of patients with chronic WAD included Grade III patients. The results of the present study show that there is an urgent need for increased knowledge of the best way to treat this subgroup of WAD patients, suggesting that future randomized controlled trials should also include patients with Grade III WAD.

Correlation between Measures

Although significant, the correlations between the physical measures and the self-reported pain, function, and health data were relatively low, indicating that physical rehabilitation must be combined with treatments that aim to improve other important factors, such as psychosocial factors. Psychosocial factors have shown to be important predictors of treatment outcome in both CR and WAD patients.^{16, 36, 37} Apart from neck-specific exercises,^{38, 39} cognitive behavioral intervention has been suggested to be effective in neck pain patients.^{18, 40} HRQoL measurements with EQ-5D were worse in both groups of patients in the present study than among previous patients with, for example, low back pain and asthma,⁴¹ demonstrating the frailty that can follow neck pain problems and the interference of such problems with patients' daily lives. The low EQ-5D value for CR patients of only .39 is noteworthy. The SES results in the present study are in agreement with the previous results of patients with sub-acute WAD⁴²; however, to our knowledge such results in patients with MRI-verified CR scheduled for surgery have never been presented before. Although the CR patients were scheduled for surgery, surgery cannot be expected to solve more than the segmental dysfunction and factors related to nerve encroachment in the particular segmental area. Additional studies about the role of physiotherapy in pre- and postoperative neck surgery are therefore needed in light of the results of the present study and owing to the lack of NDI improvement reported in a long-term follow-up study of the effects of surgery.⁴³

Study Limitations

One limitation of the present study is the difference in sex distribution between the two patient groups: the CR patient group was 47% women and the WAD patient group was 64% women. This variation was expected from other studies^{1, 44} and can be considered representative for each group. Especially when measuring hand strength and NME, biological sex has been shown to be important to consider when interpreting the results.^{27, 28} Women with chronic pain also tend to give up physical activity to a greater extent than men,⁴⁵ which can further influence the physical measures. To be able to compare these patient groups with healthy volunteers and to limit the effect of different levels of representation, hand strength and NME were stratified by biological sex in the analysis. Alternative analysis was also performed for the other variables, leading to a non-significant difference between CR and WAD for men in the transverse plane, but no other changes in the results (table 3).

Nevertheless, sex distribution may influence the results of the present study. Despite this possibility, the present study, demonstrated worse results for CR patients than WAD patients. If the sex distribution had been equal, there may have been an even greater difference between the groups, as female sex has been shown correlate with worse outcome.^{36, 37, 46} We therefore argue that a more equal sex distribution would not alter the conclusions of the study.

For security reasons and owing to the risk of confounding factors, CR patients with myelopathy and WAD patients with head injuries were excluded. Therefore, the results may underestimate the severity of problems in these patient groups overall. Nevertheless, our findings undoubtedly demonstrate the existence of disability in these patient groups compared with a healthy population, as well as the potential for treatment to be improved.

In the present study ventral and dorsal NME was investigated as a result of united neck muscle performance. However, for a deeper understanding of muscle function the coordination between different muscle layers needs to be examined in future studies.⁴⁷

Clinical application

The present study reported patients to have low physical function and high disability in the investigated measures that also were related to self-evaluated function and health, showing the potential of training these functions in rehabilitation and especially for those patients with neurological deficits.

CONCLUSIONS

Both WAD and CR patients generally exhibited worse results than healthy volunteers. Patients with CR appeared to be worse than the WAD group. Patients with Grade III WAD exhibited worse results than those with Grade II WAD. Further studies are needed to investigate whether training of neck function aiming to improve AROM and NME may improve outcome in these patients.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Disability following neck disorders

This study was financially supported by the Swedish Medical Research Council, REHSAM II, the Wenner-Gren foundations, the Medical Research Council of Southeast Sweden, the Swedish Society of Medicine, and the county councils of Sörmland and Östergötland.

REFERENCES

1. Radhakrishnan K, Litchy WJ, Ofallon WM, Kurland LT. Epidemiology of cervical radiculopathy - A population-based study from Rochester, Minnesota, 1976 through 1990. *Brain* 1994;117:325-35.
2. Styrke J, Stålnacke B-M, Bylund P-O, Sojka P, Björnstig U. A 10-Year Incidence of Acute Whiplash Injuries After Road Traffic Crashes in a Defined Population in Northern Sweden. *Am Academy of Phys Med Rehabil* 2012;7:39-47.
3. Berglund A, Alfredsson L, Cassidy JD, Jensen I, Nygren Å. The association between exposure to a rear-end collision and future neck or shoulder pain: a cohort study. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2000;53:1089-94.
4. Leth-Petersen S, Rotger GP. Long-term labour-market performance of whiplash claimants. *J Health Econom* 2009;28:996-1019.
5. Peolsson A, Vavruch L, Öberg B. Disability after anterior decompression and fusion for cervical disc disease. *Adv Physiother* 2002;4:111-24.
6. Ylinen JJ, Savolainen S, Airaksinen O, Kautiainen H, Salo P, Häkkinen A. Decreased strength and mobility in patients after anterior cervical discectomy compared with healthy subjects. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2003;84:1043-7.
7. Peolsson A, Vavruch L, Hedlund R. Long-term randomised comparison between a Carbon fibre cage and the Cloward procedure in the cervical spine. *Eur Spine J* 2007;16:173-8.

8. Peolsson A, Kjellman G. Neck muscle endurance in non-specific neck-pain patients and in patients after anterior cervical decompression and fusion. *J Manip Physiol Ther* 2007;30:343-50.
9. Peolsson A, Söderlund A, Engquist M, Lind B, Löfgren H, Vavruch L, Holtz A, Winström-Christersson A, Isaksson I, Öberg B. Physical Function Outcome in Cervical Radiculopathy Patients After Physiotherapy Alone Compared With Anterior Surgery Followed by Physiotherapy: A Prospective Randomized Study With a 2-Year Follow-up. *Spine* 2013;38:300-7.
10. Persson LCG, Moritz U. Pain, muscular tenderness, cervical and shoulder mobility in patients with cervical radiculopathy randomly treated with surgery, physiotherapy or a cervical collar. *The Pain Clinic* 1998;11:51-67.
11. Stewart MJ, Maher CG, Refshauge KM, Herbert R, Bogduk N, Nicholas M. Randomized controlled trial of exercise for chronic whiplash-associated disorders. *Pain* 2007;128:59-68.
12. Teasell RW, McClure JA, Walton D, Pretty J, Salter K, Meyer M, Sequeira K, Death B. A research synthesis of therapeutic interventions for whiplash-associated disorder: part 1 – overview and summary. *Pain Res Manag* 2010;15:287-94.
13. Verhagen AP, Scholten-Peeters GG, van Wijngaarden S, de Bie RA, Bierma-Zeinstra SM. Conservative treatments for whiplash. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2007 Apr 18; (2):CD003338.
14. Fouyas IP, Statham PFX, Sandercock PAG. Cocrane review of the role of surgery in cervical spondylotic radiculomyelopathy. *Spine* 2002;27:736-47.

15. Nikolaidis I, Fouyas IP, Sandercock PAG, Statham PF. Surgery for cervical radiculopathy or myelopathy: review. The Cochrane Library 2010, issue 1.
<http://www.thecochranelibrary.com>.
16. Sterner Y, Gerdle B. Acute and chronic whiplash disorders – a review. *J Rehab Med*. 2004;36:193-210.
17. Häkkinen A, Kautiainen H, Hannonen P, Ylinen J. Strength training and stretching versus stretching only in the treatment of patients with chronic neck pain: a randomized one-year follow-up study. *Clin Rehabil*. 2008;22:592-600.
18. Teasell RW, McClure JA, Walton D, Pretty J, Salter K, Meyer M, Sequeira K, Death B. A research synthesis of therapeutic interventions for whiplash-associated disorder (WAD): part 4 – noninvasive interventions for chronic WAD. *Pain Res Manag* 2010;15:313-22.
19. Bono G, Antonaci F, Ghirmai S, D'Angelo F, Berger M, Nappi G. Whiplash injuries: clinical picture and diagnostic work-up. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2000;18:S23-8.
20. Öhberg F, Grip H, Wiklund U, Sterner Y, Karlsson JS, Gerdle B. Chronic whiplash associated disorders and neck movement measurements: an instantaneous helical axis approach. *IEEE Trans Inf Technol Biomed* 2003;7:274-82.
21. Kumbhare DA, Balsor B, Parkinson WL, Harding Bskin P, Bedard M, Papaioannou A, Adachi JD. Measurement of cervical flexor endurance following whiplash. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005;27:801-7.
22. Ask T, Strand LI, Skouen JS. The effect of two exercise regimes; motor control versus endurance/ strength training for patients with whiplash-associated disorders: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Clin Rehabil* 2009;23:812-23.

23. Spitzer WO, Skovron ML, Salmi LR, Cassidy JD, Duranceau J, Suissa S, Ziess E.

Scientific monograph of the Quebec task Force on Whiplash-Associated Disorders:

redefining whiplash and its management. *Spine* 1995;20(8 Suppl):1S-73S.

24. Walton DM, Pretty J, MacDermid JC, Teasell RW. Risk factors for persistent problems

following whiplash injury: results of a systematic review and meta analysis. *J Orthop Sports*

Phys Ther 2009;39:334-50.

25. Kivioja J, Jensen I, Lindgren U. Neither WAD-classification nor the Quebec Task Force

follow-up regimen seems to be important for the outcome after a whiplash injury. A

prospective study on 186 consecutive patients. *Eur Spine J* 2008;17:930-5.

26. Peolsson A, Hedlund R, Ertzgaard S, Öberg B. Intra-and inter-tester reliability and age-

and sex-specific range of motion of the neck, *Physiother Can* 2000;52:233-42.

27. Peolsson A, Hedlund R, Öberg B. Intra- and inter-tester reliability and reference values

for hand strength, *J Rehab Med* 2001;33:36-41.

28. Peolsson A, Almkvist C, Dahlberg C, Lindqvist S, Pettersson S. Age- and sex-specific

reference values of a test of neck muscle endurance. *J Manip Physiol Ther* 2007;30:171-7.

29. Scott J, Huskisson EC. Graphic representation of pain. *Pain* 1976;2:175-84.

30. Vernon H, Mior S. The neck disability index: a study of reliability and validity. *J Manip*

Physiol Ther 1991;14:409-15.

31. Altmaier E, Russell D, Feng KC, Lehmann T, Weinstein J. Role of self-efficacy in

rehabilitation outcome among chronic low back pain patients. *J Counsel Psychol*

1993;40:335-9.

32. Brooks R with the EuroQol group. EuroQol: the current state of play. *Health Policy* 1996;37:53-72.
33. Armijo-Olivo S, Warren S, Fuentes J, Magee DJ. Clinical relevance vs. statistical significance: using neck outcomes in patients with temporomandibular disorders as an example. *Man Ther* 2011;16:563-72.
34. Linton SJ, Hellsing AL, Halldén K. A population-based study of spinal pain among 35-45-year-old individuals. Prevalence, sick leave, and health care use. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1998;23:1457-63.
35. Kautner MD, Piotrowski M, Hussmann B, Lendemann S, Wedemeyer C. Cervical range of motion and strength in 4,293 young male adults with chronic neck pain. *Eur Spine J* 2012;21:1522-7.
36. Carroll LJ, Holm LW, Hogg-Johnson S, Côté P, Cassidy JD, Haldeman S, Nordin M, Hurwitz EL, Carragee EJ, van der Velde G, Peloso PM, Guzman J. Course and prognostic factors for neck pain in whiplash-associated disorders (WAD): results of the Bone and Joint Decade 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *Spine* 2008;33(4 Suppl):83-92.
37. Peolsson A, Peolsson M. Predictive factors for long-term outcome of anterior cervical decompression and fusion: a multivariate data analysis. *Eur Spine J* 2008;17:406-14.
38. Kay TM, Gross A, Goldsmith C, Santaguida PL, Hoving J, Bronfort G; Cervical Overview Group. Exercises for mechanical neck disorders. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2005 Jul 20;(3):CD004250.

39. Kay TM, Gross A, Goldsmith CH, Rutherford S, Voth S, Hoving JL, Bronfort G, Santaguida PL. Exercises for mechanical neck disorders. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012 Aug 15;8:CD004250. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004250.pub4.
40. Söderlund A, Lindberg P. Cognitive behavioural components in physiotherapy management of chronic whiplash associated disorders (WAD) - a randomized group study. *G Ital Med Lav Ergon* 2007;29:A5-11.
41. Burström K, Johannesson M, Diderichsen F. Swedish population health-related quality of life results using EQ-5D. *Qual Life Res* 2001;10:621-35.
42. Bunketorp Käll L. Psychological determinants of quality of life in patients with whiplash associated disorders – a prospective study. *Disabil Rehabil* 2009;31:227-36.
43. Peolsson A. Investigation of clinically Important Benefit of Anterior Cervical Decompression and Fusion. *Eur Spine J* 2007;16:507-14.
44. Crutebo S, Nilsson C, Skillgate E, Holm LW. The course of symptoms for whiplash-associated disorders in Sweden: 6-month follow-up study. *J Rheumatol*. 2010;37:1527-33.
45. Björnsdóttir S, Jónsson SH, Valdimarsdóttir U. Functional limitations and physical symptoms of individuals with chronic pain. *Scand J Rheumatol*. 2013;42:59-70.
46. Berglund A, Bodin L, Jensen I, Wiklund A, Alfredsson L. The influence of prognostic factors on neck pain intensity, disability, anxiety and depression over a 2-year period in subjects with acute whiplash injury. *Pain* 2006;125:244-56.
47. Peolsson AL, Peolsson MN, Jull GA, O'Leary SP. Cervical muscle activity during loaded arm lifts in patients 10 years postsurgery for cervical disc disease. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2013;36:292-9.

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Patients with CR

Surgical inclusion criteria

- Cervical disc disease verified by MRI and compatible with clinical findings (examined by a neurosurgeon) showing cervical nerve root compression
- Radiculopathy
- Persistent neurological deficit from a cervical nerve root (duration ≥ 2 months)

Study inclusion criteria

- Scheduled for surgery for cervical disc disease (with either an anterior approach with fusion or a posterior approach) in 1 to 3 segmental levels
- Age 18-70 years

Study exclusion criteria

- Myelopathy
 - Earlier fracture or luxation of the cervical column
 - Malignancy, spinal tumor, spinal infection, or previous surgery in the cervical column
 - Systemic disease or a trauma that contraindicates the treatment program or the study measurements/assessments
 - Diagnosed severe psychiatric disorder, such as schizophrenia or psychosis
 - Known drug abuse
 - Lack of familiarity with the Swedish language
-

Table 2: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Patients with WAD

Study inclusion criteria

- Age 18-63 years
- Grade II or III WAD
- Continuing problems (>20mm on 100mm VAS and >20% on NDI) at least 6 months after a whiplash injury, but not for more than 3 years.

Study exclusion criteria

- Known or suspected serious physical pathology (e.g., myelopathy, spinal tumor, spinal infection or ongoing malignancy, earlier fracture or luxation of the cervical column, earlier neck trauma with persistent injury, or surgery to the cervical column)
 - Neck pain causing absence from work for >1 month during the year before the trauma
 - Signs of traumatic brain injury at the time of WAD (e.g., unconsciousness, retrograde and post-traumatic amnesia, and disorientation/confusion)
 - Generalized or more dominant pain elsewhere in the body
 - Diseases or other injuries that might prevent full participation in the study
 - Diagnosed severe psychiatric disorder
 - Known drug abuse
 - Lack of familiarity with the Swedish language
-

1 **Table 3: Comparison between WAD Patients, CR Patients and Healthy (Hy) volunteers**

2

3

4

	WAD	CR	Hy	WAD vs CR	WAD vs Hy	CR vs Healthy
	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	<i>P;ES</i>	<i>P;ES</i>	<i>P;ES</i>
Physical measures						
Sagittal AROM*	96±26.1	83±26.7	142±22.1	<.0001;0.68	<.0001;1.84	<.0001;2.33
Frontal AROM	66±17.9	54±17.8	83±19.9	<.0001;0.91	<.0001;0.91	<.0001;1.57
Transverse AROM	111±26.8	100±25.5	154±22.6	<.0001;0.42	<.0001;1.68	<.0001;2.19
Hand right men	41±13.3	38±11.7	51±6.0	.08;0.24	<.0001;0.91	<.0001;1.16
Hand right women	24±7.5	22±8.3	34±4.4	.05;0.25	<.0001;1.62	<.0001;1.93
Hand left men	38±13.4	37±13.0	50±7.2	.43;0.08	<.0001;1.05	<.0001;1.17
Hand left women	23±7.0	20±8.0	32±4.6	<.0001;0.40	.0004;1.55	<.0001;1.98
NME flex men	50±48.5	63±62.8	153±103.2	.25;0.23	<.0001;1.32	<.0001;1.12
NME flex women	29±41.4	28±26.1	37±11.0	.78;0.03	.13;0.23	.10;0.41

Disability following neck disorders

NME ext men	108±118.5	106±129.8	417±309.9	.93;0.02	<.0001;1.38	<.0001;1.45
NME ext women	89±123.4	61±84.6	507±386.4	.41;0.35	<.0001;1.79	<.0001;1.81
Self-reported measures*						
Neck pain VAS	42±24.3	56±24.0		>.0001;0.58		
Arm pain VAS	16±22.7	51±28.0		<.0001;1.38		
NDI%	33±13.3	43±14.7		<.0001;0.72		
Self-efficacy	150±36.8	127±39.7		<.0001;0.84		
EQ-5D	0.62±0.26	0.39±0.32		<.0001;0.79		

1 Data are presented as mean±SD with p-values (*P*) for significance set as *P*<.0167. Effect size (ES) ≥ 0.40 is regarded as clinical relevant.

2 *When self-reported data and AROM were stratified by sex, significantly worse values for both patient groups remained versus healthy volunteers (*P*=.0008 to *P*<.0001).

3 Between CR and WAD, significantly worse values were still reported for CR patients (*P*=.002 to *P*<.0001), with the exception that there was no significant difference

4 between the two groups regarding AROM in the transverse plane for men (*P*=.03).

5

Table 4: Comparison between Patients with Grade II and Grade III WAD

	Grade II	Grade III	<i>P;ES</i>
	mean±SD	mean±SD	
Sagittal AROM	100±22.2	91±30.0	.02;0.35
Frontal AROM	67±15.0	63±21.0	.11;0.22
Transverse AROM	116±21.3	106±32	.01;0.38
Hand right	32±12.5	27±12.8	.005*; 0.39
Hand left	30±11.9	26±12.6	.009*;0.33
NME flex	41±47.2	31±41.6	.11;0.22
NME ext	112±126.5	75±112.2	.03*;0.34
Neck pain VAS	39±23.9	47±24.2	.02;0.33
Arm pain VAS	10±16.9	25±26.5	<.0001;0.69
NDI%	31±12.2	36±14.1	.004;0.38
Self-efficacy	157±34.3	140±38.0	.0007;0.47
EQ-5D	.63±.26	.59±.26	.24;0.15

Statistical significance is set as P-value (P) <0.05; Effect size (ES) ≥0.40 is regarded as clinical relevant

*Only significant for women when the groups were stratified by sex.