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Peer Reviewed Journals


   One hundred consecutive patients with low back and/or lower extremity pain had the clinical data, including history, diagnosis, treatment and results of conservative manipulative therapy, collected and tabulated on an IBM 370/138 computer at Indiana-Purdue University in Fort Wayne, Indiana, utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) based on a standardized examination form. Various congenital, developmental and ergonomic factors in low back pain patients were collected and correlated for combinations of factors leading to back pain. Treatment methods and response to treatment as to time and patient visit numbers were determined. The frequency of congenital anomalies was found and those affecting or not effecting low back pain onset determined. Overall, 50% relief of low back and leg pain was obtained in 15.95 days and 10.8 visits average; maximum relief was found in 41.2 days, or 16.1 treatments.

   A chiropractic multi-center observational pilot study to compile statistics on the examination procedures, diagnosis, types of treatment rendered, results of treatment, number of day of care, and number of treatment required to arrive at a 50% and a maximum clinical improvement was collected on 576 patients with low back and/or leg pain. The purpose was to determine the congenital and developmental changes in
patients with low back and/or leg pain, the combinations of such anomalies, the accuracy of orthodox diagnostic tests in assessing low back pain, ergonomic factors affecting onset, and, ultimately, the specific difficulty factors encountered in treating the various conditions seen in the average chiropractor's office. For all conditions treated, the average number of day to attain maximum improvement was 43 and the number of visits was 19. It was concluded that this study provided useful data for assessment of routine chiropractic office based diagnosis and treatment of related conditions; however, further controlled studies are necessary for validation of specific parameters.

A negative myelogram but a positive CT for an L5 disc protrusion is presented. Five months of medical care preceded chiropractic care; the insurance company involvement in a case where treatment mode is changed from usual orthodox medical procedures of epidural steroid injection and physical therapy to chiropractic distraction manipulation is detailed. Finally, the clinical outcome of the case is provided.
At the end of 6 weeks of care the patient returned to his full work duties as a truck driver. His range of motion of the thoracolumbar spine were full and normal and his straight leg raises were positive right at 70 degrees and left at 60 degrees. He had taut hamstring muscle that required constant stretching so as to not mimic a positive straight leg raise sign. This case shows that time off work and cost were both reduced by chiropractic care.


A literature review of the incidence and effects of manipulation on intervertebral disc protrusion is given. A case presented has a 14% reduction of the disc bulge following manipulative care with complete relief of sciatic and low back pain. A system to evaluate the size of disc herniation in computed tomography scans performed before and after manipulative treatment of disc protrusions is offered. Stenosis, with the critical compounded factors of vertebral canal size, dural sac cross-sectional area and soft tissue stenosis in protrusion of the ligamentum flavum and disc, as well as degenerative facet joint changes, is discussed to illustrate the complexity surrounding nerve root compression etiology. Understanding this integration of causative factors can help to explain low back symptoms and outline effective treatment plans.

The exercise and smoking habits of low back or leg pain sufferers vs persons not having low back or leg pain are compared. The type, frequency and length of exercise is
determined from a study of 576 low back or leg pain sufferers compared to 50 persons who state they are symptomatic. The same was done for smoking habits. Thirty-three percent of low back or leg pain sufferers smoked as compared to 14% of those without pain. Forth-seven percent of low back or leg pain sufferers as compared to 86% of non-sufferers exercised regularly. The level of physical activity and general exercise has been found to improve strength, mobility and endurance; this might prevent future back injury. This study is to determine difference in the exercise habits of persons with low back and/or leg pain vs. those who do not have pain, with the intention being to see if pain sufferers exercise less.

The incidence of a C7 spondylolisthesis has never been reported, and this paper shows the presence of C7 and L4 degenerative spondylolisthesis in a a 66-yr-old female; no report of this combined problem has been reported. The clinical findings of the patient are given as well as treatment protocol.
In clinical practice, the finding of degenerative spondylolisthesis should be understood as being best handled conservatively, as it rarely causes neurological deficit nor requires surgery.


Ten true spondylolisthesis patients, nine with the lesion at L5 and one at L3, were tested by vertical suspension radiography compared to neutral lateral weight-bearing x-ray to determine translational segmental instability. Cases were classed as unstable (high instability) if over 3 mm of translation of the spondylolisthetic segment occurred and as stable (low instability) if less than 3 mm of motion was seen. Chiropractic distraction adjustment was applied in each case, and the response to care was evaluated by subjective rating of pain relief. Results found that all five patients with stable spondylolisthesis cases obtained 75% or greater relief from chiropractic adjustment of the type used by the author, whereas one with the unstable variety experienced over 75% relief while the other four had less than 50% relief of pain. As defined in this paper, stable true spondylolisthesis seems to respond better than the unstable variety.

This study compares the findings of plain film x-ray and computed CT examination in the diagnosis of facet orientation and the presence of tropism. Twenty consecutive patients having lumbar disc disease with sciatica were studied using plain x-ray as well as CT
scanning. A chiropractic radiologist read the films to determine if facet facings were sagittally, semi-sagittally, or coronally oriented on both CT and plain x-ray study. CT was accepted as the most accurate method to determine the true facet orientation, and plain x-ray interpretation of facet orientation was compared to the CT reading. There was a statistically significant relationship in diagnosing tropism between plain film x-ray and CT readings, with a predictive accuracy that ranged form 58-84% across the three segmental levels. However, the exact concordance of plain film x-ray and CT readings for right and left facet facings was very low. This raises the question of how the profession defines diagnostic accuracy.

Demographic, clinical and radiographic findings were collected for 424 consecutive low back and/or leg pain patients receiving chiropractic treatment at seven participating centers. A standardized, 293-variable history and examination form was collected for each patient and they were classified into one or more of 15 clinical categories. Outcome measures included the response by days and treatments to attain maximum relief. For the entire patient populations, the average number of days to maximal improvement was 27, with a mean of 11 treatments having been administered over this time. Eight percent of this group of patients reported good to excellent relief of pain.
Among individual categories, patients with an L5 transitional segment had the best response (95% good to excellent outcome, while L4-L5 nuclear prolapse/free fragment patients had the worst response rates (57% good to excellent). Patients with nuclear protrusion required a longer treatment period and more visits than those with spondylolisthesis, facet syndrome, or spondyloarthrosis.
These results are discussed in terms of other reports of nonsurgical care as well as the natural history of low back pain. These data may be expected to aid in the design of future randomized controlled studies into the efficacy of chiropractic manipulation.

A computed tomography (CT)-confirmed L5-S1 disk protrusion is reported to be reduced following chiropractic adjustment, as seen on repeat CT scanning. Distraction type chiropractic manipulation, electrical stimulation, exercises, nutrition advice and low back wellness school class were administered with complete relief of sciatic pain and nearly complete relief of low back pain. Chiropractic distraction manipulation is an effective treatment of lumbar disk herniation, if the chiropractor is observant during its administration for patient tolerance to manipulation under distraction and any signs of neurological deficit demanding other types of care.

Lumbar intraspinal extradural synovial cyst is among the more rare, yet well-documented compressive neuropathies that present with low back and/or leg pain. The current base of knowledge in the medical literature concerning this interesting condition is presented, and the chiropractic protocol and treatment use in this one case of a lumbar synovial cyst. Lumbar intraspinal extradural synovial cysts are of a facetial degenerative etiology and may be referred to by a variety of names - hypertrophic synovitis, cysts of the ligamentum flavum, synovial cysts, ganglion cysts. Tissue studies demonstrate that these cysts contain a variety of components, including reactive fibrous connective tissue, dense fibrous connective tissue, hyperplastic synovial membrane, and fine calcifications. Such a cyst must be thought of in the differential diagnosis of an individual presenting clinically with LBP and leg pain, particularly in the over 50 category. Clinical examination, corollary diagnostic imaging - CT and MRI - make the diagnosis. The definitive treatment of intraspinal cysts in the current literature is surgical laminectomy. However, the authors recommend the possibility of a conservative, noninvasive approach to the care of the cysts via chiropractic distraction manipulation in conjunction with the appropriate physical therapy modalities.

Chiropractic physicians see patient with spinal pain of pathologic origin. Worsening of back pain after manipulation in a 16-year-old girl alerted the treating chiropractic physician to further diagnostic workup to include magnetic resonance imaging of the spine. Eosinophilic granuloma was diagnosed and the proper referral for care was made. The case stresses the importance of recognizing contraindicatory signs to spinal manipulation and the need for proper interdisciplinary care of such patients. Proper diagnostic and treatment protocols for eosinophilic granuloma are presented.

An overview of Cox® distraction manipulation protocols is presented including diagnosis and treatment decision making in low back pain and sciatica cases and proper utilization of flexion distraction in treating lumbar spine and lower extremity pain. In addition, the outcome of 1,000 cases involving low back and/or leg pain treated with chiropractic adjusting (92% utilizing flexion distraction) is presented. A qualitative clinical and literature review provides the basis of the overview of diagnostic and treatment protocols. A descriptive case series design was used to collect outcome information on 1,000 patients with low back and/or leg pain; patients were pooled from two separate studies. Patients were treated by 30 different chiropractors, and a minimum of 20 cases was supplied by each physician. A descriptive review of cases showed that less than 4% of patients with low back or leg pain were candidates for surgery. Less than 9% of patients reached the chronic stage of
care. The mean number of days to maximum improvement under care was 29, and the average number of treatments to maximum improvement was 12. The results of this study provide some evidence for the use of chiropractic management, particularly flexion distraction manipulation, in the treatment of back pain problems due to a variety of mechanical causes.

When undiagnosed abdominal pain is present, spinal tumor should be considered one possible diagnosis.

Chiropractic distraction manipulation and physiological therapeutic care relieved 2 patients with low back and radicular pain attributed to MRI-confirmed synovial cysts of the lumbar spine. This treatment may be an initial conservative treatment option for synovial cysts with careful patient monitoring for progressive neurologic deficit which would necessitate surgery. Distraction manipulation may be a safe and effective conservative treatment of synovial cyst causing radicular pain; further data collection of clinical outcomes is warranted.

In patients with persistent gluteal and sciatica-like pain, especially when centered in the retrotrochanteric region, the gemelli-obturator internus muscle complex and associated bursae should be considered as a possible source of the pain.

http://www.journals.elsevierhealth.com/periodicals/ymmt/article/PIIS016147540500326X/fulltext
The movement of the nucleus pulposus is unpredictable in the degenerated disk. As chiropractors, we treat degenerated disks and need to be aware of their behavior. The intervertebral disk is probably the most common source of chronic low back pain.8 Tolerance testing before applying manipulation to the patient's spine is prudent because of the unpredictable nature of the disk.

Patients with radiculopathy did significantly better with FD. There were no significant differences between groups on the Roland Morris and SF-36 outcome measures. Overall, flexion–distraction provided more pain relief than active exercise; however, these results
varied based on stratification of patients with and without radiculopathy and with and without recurrent symptoms. The subgroup analysis provides a possible explanation for contrasting results among randomized clinical trials of chronic low back pain treatments and these results also provide guidance for future work in the treatment of chronic low back pain.

   During a one-year followup, participants previously randomized to physical therapy attended significantly more healthcare visits than those participants who received chiropractic care.

   In this first trial on flexion distraction care, flexion distraction was found to be more effective in reducing pain for 1 year when compared to a form of physical therapy.

   A Grand Rounds discussion of a patient suffering from severe low back pain with pain radiating into the left thigh. The patient occasionally gets "stuck" in a position where he is leaning forward and to the right, and he must slowly work out his back in order to straighten up again. Dr. Cox discusses the examination of the patient, the possible pain generators for the patient's pain, and the Cox Distraction Adjusting procedures recommended for the case.
   Algorithms of decision making and treatment protocol are presented for Cox® Distraction diagnosis and care of an acute low back pain patient. As well, discussion of potential sources of the pain is presented. Many references cited.

   A 34-year-old female presented to a chiropractic office with severe, unremitting, cervical, shoulder, and arm pain of several months' duration. Past medical history, clinical evaluation, and plain-film radiographs revealed findings consistent with Klippel-Feil syndrome. The radiographs revealed a C2/3 block vertebrae, atlas assimilation, and premature degenerative changes consistent with the syndrome. Treatment consisted of cervical flexion-distraction manipulation and adjunctive therapies. This patient felt relief after the first treatment and experienced a complete resolution of her symptoms after eight treatments performed over a period of 2 months. Klippel-Feil syndrome is an anatomical entity that results in premature cervical degenerative changes, which may cause radiculopathy. Flexion-distraction manipulation performed to the cervical spine is a
relatively new clinical procedure, which shows great promise for the treatment of cervical radiculopathy.

A 60 year old male presented with complaints of pain and limited motion in his neck, with pain and weakness in his left shoulder and arm. These symptoms began after a fall approximately 4 months prior. His previous allopathic care included medication and physical/occupational therapy, which provided no significant relief. Cervical plain film radiographs demonstrated degenerative changes and the magnetic resonance imaging revealed multilevel central stenosis. The patient was treated with flexion-distraction manipulation, which provided significant relief of his subjective and objective findings. Cervical stenosis with resultant radicular and neurological complaints may be difficult to manage with both conventional allopathic and chiropractic treatment. Flexion distraction manipulative therapy may be an effective treatment option for these often-difficult cases.

Background: Although flexion distraction performed to the lumbar spine is commonly utilized and documented as effective, flexion distraction manipulation performed to the cervical spine has not been adequately studied.
Subjective: To objectively quantify data from the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) to support the clinical judgment exercised for the use of flexion distraction manipulation to treat cervical radiculopathy.
Design and setting: A retrospective analysis of the files of 39 patients from a private chiropractic clinic that met diagnostic criteria for inclusion. All patients were diagnosed with cervical radiculopathy and treated by a single practitioner with flexion distraction manipulation and some form of adjunctive physical medicine modality.
Main outcome measures: The VAS was used to objectively quantify pain. Of the 39 files reviewed, 22 contained an initial and posttreatment VAS score and were therefore utilized in this study.
Conclusion: The results of this study show promise for chiropractic and manual therapy techniques such as flexion distraction, as well as demonstrating that other, larger research studies must be performed for cervical radiculopathy.

Objective: To discuss the nonsurgical treatment of a cervical disk herniation with flexion distraction manipulation. Clinical Features: A case study of cervical disk syndrome with radicular symptoms is presented. Magnetic resonance imaging revealed a large C5-C6 disk herniation. Degenerative changes at the affected level were demonstrated on cervical spine plain film radiographs.
Intervention and Outcome: The patient received treatment in the form of flexion distraction manipulation and adjunctive therapies. A complete resolution of the patient's subjective complaints was achieved.

**Conclusion:** Flexion distraction has been a technique associated with musculoskeletal conditions of the lumbar spine. Flexion distraction applied to the cervical spine might be an effective therapy in the treatment of cervical disk herniations. Although further controlled studies are needed, treatment of cervical disk syndromes with flexion distraction might be a viable form of conservative care.


A case report is discussed in which a clinically diagnosed case of an L4-L5 nuclear disk prolapse with a sequestrated fragment was certified by computerized axial tomography and magnetic resonance imaging at the initiation of the treatment period. It was treated with flexion-distraction manipulation, hot and cold fomentation, positive galvanism, a lumbosacral support, nutritional supplementation, and abstinence from sitting and exercises. Four weeks after initiation of treatment, the patient was asymptomatic. Eight weeks after initiation of treatment, and 6 weeks after the original scan, magnetic resonance imaging certified a reduction in the size of the prolapse within the vertebral canal. An 11-month follow-up examination indicated the patient had no exacerbations of her condition and all objective findings were negative.


Eighteen chronic pelvic patients helped with flexion distraction adjusting


Pelvic Pain and Organic Dysfunction Syndrome Helped with Flexion Distraction


Stable Spondylolisthesis 75% Relieved of Pain with Cox® Distraction


13 of 18 Low Back Patients Felt Greater Positive Effect of Flexion Distraction over Placebo


To discuss the case of a patient with severe, multilevel central canal stenosis who was
managed conservatively with flexion-distraction manipulation; to introduce a cautious approach to the application of treatment, which can reduce the risk of adverse effects and might make an apprehensive doctor more comfortable treating this condition; and to propose a theoretic mechanism for relief of symptoms through use of chiropractic manipulation. Clinical Features: A 78-year-old man had low back pain and severe bilateral leg pains. Objective findings were minimal, yet magnetic resonance imaging demonstrated severe degenerative lumbar stenosis at L3-L4 and L4-L5 and to a lesser degree at L2-L3. Intervention and Outcome: Flexion-distraction manipulation of the lumbar spine was performed. Incremental increases in traction forces were applied as the patient responded positively to care. He experienced a decrease in the frequency and intensity of his leg symptoms and a resolution of his low back pain. These improvements were maintained at a 5-month follow-up visit. Conclusion: Successful management of symptoms either caused by or complicated by lumbar spinal stenosis is presented. Manipulation of the spine shows promise for relief of symptoms through improving spinal biomechanics. Further study in the form of a randomized clinical trial is warranted.

Chiropractors need a nonsurgical, conservative approach to treat low back pain with sciatica as an alternative to and before beginning the more aggressive, and potentially hazardous, surgical treatment. There is some support for the idea that lumbar disc herniation with neurological deficit and radicular pain does not contraindicate the judicious used of manipulation. Although significant questions remain for the evaluation and treatment of lumbar radiculopathy (sciatica) with disc herniations) there is ample evidence to suggest that a course of conservative care, including spinal manipulation, should be completed before surgical consult is considered.
Ice was applied to a patient's lower back for 5 minutes, followed by flexion-distraction mobilization done by placing a hand contact over the L4 spinous process and using the pelvic section of the table to distract the lumbar spine between the L4-L5 segment. This procedure was repeated three times with each distractive process held for 20 seconds. The patient was told to lie on her back at home with her knees bent in a "90/90" position whenever possible. She was instructed to get up only for bathroom use.
One week after this appointment, she reported that her lower back pain was almost gone and that the leg pain no longer bothered her. Treatment again consisted of lumbar flexion distraction and long axis distraction of the lower extremity. At this point, side posture rotary manipulation was added to her treatment plan.

The chiropractic management of a patient with a large herniation of the L5-S1 intervertebral disc is described. Manipulative therapy administered twice a day, over a 16-day period, consisted of flexion distraction mobilization, rotational manipulations, and extension mobilizations. Stretching, strengthening, and coordination exercises were
performed in conjunctions with the manipulative therapy. Dramatic subjective and objective improvement followed chiropractic management. The criteria used to determine the type and direction of manipulative therapy, and the rationale for applying three different forms of manipulative therapy are discussed.

Thirty-two patients with subacute or chronic low back pain were randomly assigned to group A (flexion-distraction technique and trigger point therapy), group B (sham adjustment and effleurage massage), group C (flexion-distraction and effleurage), or group D (sham adjustment and trigger point therapy) for 6 weeks of treatment. The Roland Morris Questionnaire (RMQ) and the Pain Disability Index (PDI) were the outcome instruments of primary interest. RMQ median score changes were similar across groups. PDI median score changes at week 3 were greatest in group A, less in groups C and D, and least in group B. At week 6, group B still showed less change than the others.

A 36-year-old mother of 2, previously healthy and athletic, presented with low back pain, sharp shooting pain down the side of her left leg, and a numb feeling in her toes. She stated that she was unable to toe raise or straighten her left leg at the knee. The CT scan indicated a central left disk herniation at the L5 to S1 level, which was abutting the ventral portion of the thecal sac and the left S1 nerve sheath. Treatment involved 9 therapy sessions over a 3 week period. Each session consisted of 4 modalities. Interferential electrotherapy with moist heat lasting 15 minutes was used to control pain. The interferential was set at a low frequency, 1 to 15 Hz, with approximately 20 mA intensity (for patient tolerance) to produce endorphin release and relieve hypertonicity.
Manipulation of the lumbar spine and sacroiliac joints was done with the patient in side posture. This manipulative technic was well tolerated and not painful during or after the procedure. Finally, flexion traction of the specific vertebral segments was accomplished using a Lloyd flexion distraction table, in which a manual traction force was applied to the L5 spinous process in a cephalad direction while the table was flexed, producing additional traction force at the specific vertebral segment. The patient improved with each session. After the 9th session, the patient felt she had improved enough to discontinue treatment.


An unblinded clinical trial was constructed to measure the objective and subjective patient response to chiropractic management of low back pain with associated lower
limb radiculopathy. Thirty patients fulfilling the inclusion and exclusion criteria were included in the trial. No control groups were used. Two management groups containing 15 subjects each were created. One group received rotatory side posture adjustment to the lumbar spine. The other subject group received flexion distraction techniques on a McManis traction table. Objective and subjective criteria for the measurement of patient discomfort showed statistically significant improvements for both treatment procedures. Neither procedure displayed statistically more favorable results for the management of the patient's symptomatology. Pathology involving the intervertebral discs was noted at the third, fourth, and fifth lumbar intervertebral disc levels. Lesions were most commonly noted at the fifth intervertebral disc levels. Thirty-eight intervertebral disc lesions displayed pathological changes prior to initiation of either management program. An increase in the percentage occupancy of the spinal canal by the intervertebral disc was recorded in 10 cases. Twenty levels showed decreased percentage occupancy. Critical values for percentage occupancy of the spinal canal at the fourth intervertebral disc were statistically evaluated to 0.008. At the fifth intervertebral disc, the percentage occupancy was calculated to 0.763 (t = 13; 0.05 to 1.1771). The mean percentage for the adjustment group pretreatment showed the intervertebral disc to occupy 30.98% of the spinal canal. Post-treatment examination revealed an occupancy of 26.29%. The mean percentage for the flexion-distraction group pretreatment showed the intervertebral disc to occupy 33.51% of the spinal canal. Post-treatment examination revealed occupancy of 29.28%. No statistically significant changes were noted in the percentage occupancy in the spinal canal by the intervertebral disc at any of the spinal levels examined. Reduction of the objective and subjective clinical presentation, without significant changes in the intervertebral disc to spinal canal ratio, leads to the conclusion that neither the presence nor the size of the intervertebral disc following lumbar spine radiological examination should be used as pathological indicators. Chiropractic examination of lumbar spine pain with radiculopathy has displayed positive qualities regarding its effectiveness and safety.


80% of cervical and lumbar spine disc herniations helped by flexion distraction adjustment. 63% showed MRI reduction in size


Objective: To describe the nonsurgical treatment of acute S1 radiculopathy from a large (12 × 12 × 13 mm) L5-S1 disk herniation. Clinical Features: A 31-year-old man presented with severe lower back pain and pain, paresthesia, and plantar flexion weakness of the left leg. His symptoms began 5 days before the initial visit and progressed despite nonsteroidal
anti-inflammatory drugs and analgesic medication. An absent left Achilles reflex, left S1 dermatome hypesthesia, and left gastrocnemius/soleus weakness was noted. Magnetic resonance imaging demonstrated a large L5-S1 disk herniation. Intervention and Outcome: Initial treatment of this patient included McKenzie protocol press-ups to reduce and centralize symptoms, nonloading exercise for cardiovascular fitness, and lower leg isotonic exercises to prevent atrophy. Counseling was provided to reduce abnormal illness behavior risk. Later, flexion distraction and side-posture manipulation were provided to improve joint function. Sensory motor training, trunk stabilization exercises, and trigger point therapy were also used. He returned to modified work 27 days after symptom onset. A follow-up, comparative magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) study was unchanged. He was discharged as asymptomatic (zero rating on both the Oswestry and numerical pain scales) after 50 days and 20 visits, although the left S1 reflex remained absent. Reassessment 169 days later revealed neither significant symptoms nor lifestyle restrictions. Conclusion: This case demonstrates the potential benefit of a chiropractic rehabilitation strategy by use of multimodal therapy for lumbar radiculopathy associated with disk herniation.


Introduction: Flexion distraction has gained increased credibility as a therapeutic modality for treatment of low back pain. Although important work in the area has elucidated the intradiscal pressure profiles during flexion distraction, the accompanying neural responses have yet to be described. The purpose of this pilot study was to access neural reflex responses to motion with three degrees of freedom applied to the lumbar spine and to evaluate H-reflex responses of the soleus. Methods. Subjects (n=4) were measured for Hmax reflexes determined from stimulus responses recruitment curves measured in neutral prone position, flexion, left and right lateral flexion, and axial rotation on a Cox adjusting table. The mean of 10 evoked Hmax waves expressed as a percentage of maximal M-wave was the criterion measure. Spinal range of motion was quantified by Metrecom digitization. Results. The data showed considerable variation in some movement ranges notwithstanding identical table positioning for all subjects (i.e. Flexion 3-12°). Mean Hmax/Mmax ratios were 65.5+-15, 65.5+-17, 62.8+-12, 59.6+-17 and 65.9+-19 for neutral, flexion, R. Lateral, L. Lateral flexion and R and L axial rotation respectively. The salient findings in the data were the non-existent H-reflex changes in lateral flexion and the significant suppression of neuromuscular activation in flexion (65+-16 vs 60+-15%; p<0.05) and ipsilateral rotation (65+-16 vs 59+-17%; p<0.05). Slight perturbations in numerous afferent receptors are known to significantly alter the H-reflex. The absence of measurable changes in lateral flexion may indicate that both slow and fast adapting receptors could be involved in lumbar motion. These preliminary findings suggest the need for further dynamic motion studies of the flexion distraction neuropathophysiology.
Background: Flexion distraction has gained increased credibility as a therapeutic modality for treatment of low back pain. Although important work in the area has elucidated the intradiskal pressure profiles during flexion distraction, the accompanying neural responses have yet to be described. Objective: The purpose of this pilot study was to assess neural reflex responses to motion with 3 degrees of freedom applied to the lumbar spine and to evaluate H-reflex responses of the soleus. Methods: Subjects (n = 12) were measured for H-maximum reflexes determined from stimulus response recruitment curves measured in neutral prone position. The mean of 10 evoked H-waves (at H-maximum stimulus intensity) were measured in neutral position, flexion, left and right lateral flexion, and axial rotation of the trunk on an adjusting table. H-reflexes were expressed as a percentage of maximal M-wave for the criterion measure. Spinal range of motion was quantified by digitization. Results: The data showed variation in some movement ranges, notwithstanding identical table positioning for all subjects. Mean H-reflex amplitude was decreased (15.2 ± 5.8 mV to 13.8 ± 5.8 mV), and the H/M ratio was also decreased in flexion compared with neutral (55.0% ± 19.1% to 50.3% ± 19.4%; P < .05). Conclusions: Trunk flexion is accompanied by inhibition of the motor neuron pool. Slight perturbations in numerous afferent receptors are known to significantly alter the H-reflex. The absence of measurable changes in lateral flexion and trunk rotation may indicate that both slow- and fast-adapting receptors could be involved in lumbar motion. These preliminary findings suggest the need for further dynamic motion studies of the flexion distraction neurophysiologic condition.


Cox® Technic only one with referreed articles


Lumbar radicular symptoms can be caused by lumbar intervertebral disc herniations. If a disc injury is positively established through diagnostic imaging, surgery is a commonly recommended approach. Flexion/distraction manipulation is a therapeutic alternative that
may offer relief for subjective complaints and elimination of objective signs. Success with this technique might spare the patient an operative procedure. This is a case report of one such incidence.

Flexion/distraction manipulation is a treatment developed by James M. Cox. It is often used for lumbar disc injuries (herniation, bulges, etc.), and for other low back and lower extremity radicular conditions. The technique involves the use of a specialized table which allows for passive distraction, flexion, lateral bending, and rotation. These different planes of motion, along with the use of appropriate adjunctive therapy and exercises, allow for reduction of symptoms attributable to lumbar disc syndromes. Contraindications and indications for flexion/distraction manipulation have been identified and enumerated. Flexion/distraction manipulation is a treatment that should be investigated as a part of the algorithm for presurgical therapies of lumbar intervertebral disc injuries. This alternative in conservative care may be of benefit to a large number of patients. The surgical option for treating intervertebral disc herniations might be reduced with propagation of flexion/distraction manipulation.


It is necessary to determine which specific types of manipulation and non-manipulative types of chiropractic adjustive care are most effective for particular types of low back pain across both tissue-specific and functional classifications. To characterize the quantity and quality of literature gathered for an Expert Panel that was convened to rate various specific chiropractic adjustive procedures for the treatment of common types of low back pain, drawing on the clinical expertise of the panel members and the relevant literature. A systematic review was conducted of treatment-specific, condition-specific trials, studies, and case reports of chiropractic care for low back pain. The 3 most studied adjustive procedures are side-posture high-velocity, low-amplitude; distraction (mostly flexion distraction); and mobilization, respectively. The clinical condition most commonly addressed by the included studies is low back pain.


Objective: To assess the intraexaminer and interexaminer reliability of clinicians trained in flexion-distraction technique to determine the need for chiropractic adjustment of each segment of the lumbar spine. Design: This was an intraexaminer and interexaminer reliability study of commonly used chiropractic assessment procedures, including static and motion palpation and visual observation. Setting: Chiropractic college; by four licensed chiropractors trained in flexion-distraction technique, two with more than 20
years’ experience and two with 3 or fewer years’ experience. Subjects: Subjects were 18 volunteers; 16 were symptom free, and 2 had low back pain at the time the study was conducted. Main Outcome Measure: The kappa statistic was computed for all comparisons and interpreted in categories ranging from “poor” (<0.00) to “almost perfect” (>0.80). Results: Intraexaminer reliability was greater than interexaminer reliability. For intraexaminer reliability there was considerable variation by segment and among the four examiners, but intraexaminer reliability appeared generally higher than interexaminer reliability. Overall, more subluxations were identified on the second examination than on the first. For interexaminer reliability, kappa scores were generally in the “poor” to “slight” categories. Discussion: The results of this study, similar to those of other studies, indicate that even chiropractors trained in the same technique seem to show little consensus on the indications for the necessity to adjust specific segments of the spine. A more standardized assessment approach might be helpful in improving the reliability of diagnostic assessments.


Objective: To describe the safety and potential therapeutic benefit of spinal manipulation postepidural injection in the nonsurgical treatment of patients with cervical and lumbar radiculopathy.

Methods: The study design was a retrospective review of outcomes of 20 cervical and 60 lumbar radiculopathy patients who underwent spinal manipulation postepidural injection in a hospital setting. Patients received either fluoroscopically guided or computed tomography (CT)–guided epidural injection of a combination of lidocaine and Depo-Medrol. The manual therapy consisted of an immediate postepidural application of flexion distraction mobilization and then high-velocity, low-amplitude spinal manipulation to the affected spinal regions. Outcome criteria were empirically defined as significant improvement, temporary improvement, or no change. The minimum follow-up time for all patients was 1 year.

Results: There were no complications associated with spinal manipulation, whereas 3 complications associated with the epidural injection procedure were noted. Of lumbar spine patients, 36.67% (n = 22) noted significant improvement, 41.67% (n = 25) experienced temporary improvement, and 21.67% (n = 13) reported no change. Of the patients undergoing spinal manipulation after cervical epidural injection, 50% (n = 10) noted significant improvement, 30% (n = 6) experienced temporary improvement, whereas 20% (n = 4) exhibited no change.

Conclusions: These data suggest that spinal manipulation postepidural injection is a safe nonsurgical procedure to use in the treatment of the patient with radiculopathy of spinal origin. This is also the first report of the use of spinal manipulation postepidural injection in the cervical spine.

Objective: To identify aspects of the delivery of placebo chiropractic treatments by using sham adjustments that may cause a treatment effect and that may affect the success of blinding. Design and Setting: Two-period crossover design in a chiropractic college research clinic. Subjects: Eighteen volunteer staff, students, and faculty of the chiropractic college who reported low-back pain within the last 6 months. Interventions: Flexion-distraction technique was used to perform chiropractic adjustments, and a hand-held instrument (Activator adjusting instrument) with the pressure gauge set on the 0 was used to perform sham adjustments. The treatment period was 2 weeks, with a total of 4 visits. Main Outcome Measures: The Visual Analog Scale (VAS) for pain and Global Well-Being Scale (GWBS). Results: Although VAS and GWBS scores improved with both treatments, a somewhat greater improvement occurred in most cases with the active treatment. Eight of 14 patients interviewed believed that the placebo had a treatment effect. Conclusion: This study provided preliminary information that was useful in planning the protocol for a placebo chiropractic treatment in the randomized clinical trial for which it was designed.


Objective The purpose of this report is to describe chiropractic treatment of lower back and unilateral leg pain in a pregnant patient. Clinical Features A 26-year-old woman in her second trimester of pregnancy had severe pain in her lower back that radiated to her hips bilaterally and to her right leg. She reported tingling down her right lower leg to the dorsum of her foot. Although no diagnostic imaging was performed, her differential diagnoses included lumbalgia with associated radiculopathy. Intervention and Outcome Treatment consisted of manual traction in the side-lying position using a specialized chiropractic table and treatment technique (Cox flexion-distraction decompression) modified for pregnancy. Relief was noted after the first treatment, and complete resolution of her subjective and objective findings occurred after 8 visits. Conclusion: When modified, this chiropractic technique appears to be an effective method for treating lower back pain with radiation to the leg in a pregnant patient who cannot lie prone.


Objective The purpose of this report was to describe the use of Cox flexion distraction decompression manipulation on a patient with radiculopathy from a C6/C7 disc herniation. Clinical Features A 33-year-old man complained of severe neck pain and spasms, pain radiating down his left arm and upper back, and associated numbness in his fingers. Cervical spine plain film radiographs showed mild C6/C7 osseous degenerative
changes. Cervical magnetic resonance imaging revealed a moderate-sized left posterolateral disc herniation at C6/C7 causing severe foraminal stenosis. Intervention and Outcome Treatment consisted of Cox flexion distraction decompression manipulation and adjunctive physiotherapy modalities. The patient was treated a total of 15 times over a period of 10 weeks. Subjective findings using a pain scale and objective examination findings supported a good clinical outcome. At 2-year follow-up, subjective and objective findings remained stable. Conclusion This study reports Cox flexion distraction decompression manipulation and physiotherapy modalities showed good subjective and objective clinical outcomes for this patient.


OBJECTIVE: The purpose of this study is to review the literature concerning distraction manipulation of the lumbar spine, particularly regarding physiological effects, clinical efficacy, and safety. DATA SOURCES: A search of the English language literature was conducted using the MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL, Chiropractic Research Archives Collection, and Manual, Alternative, and Natural Therapies Information System databases. A secondary hand search of bibliographies was completed to identify older or non-indexed literature. DATA SELECTION AND EXTRACTION: Articles were identified, which described the characteristics of distraction manipulation beyond a simple description or the results of treatment with distraction manipulation. Data were extracted on the basis of relevance to the stated objective. DATA SYNTHESIS AND RESULTS: Thirty articles were identified. Three were uncontrolled or pilot studies, 3 were basic science studies, and 6 were case series. Most were case reports. Lumbar distraction manipulation is a nonthrust mechanically assisted manual medicine technique with characteristics of manipulation, mobilization, and traction. It is used for a variety of lumbar conditions and chronic pelvic pain. The primary rationale for its use is on the basis of the biomechanical effects of axial spinal distraction. Little data are available describing the in vivo effect of distraction when used in combination with flexion or other motions. CONCLUSIONS: Despite widespread use, the efficacy of distraction manipulation is not well established. Further research is needed to establish the efficacy and safety of distraction manipulation and to explore biomechanical, neurological, and biochemical events that may be altered by this treatment.

Gay et al\textsuperscript{1} discussed nucleus pulposus movement during flexion and extension of the lumbar spine, citing Fennell et al\textsuperscript{2} as stating that the nucleus moves anterior on extension and posterior on flexion. Full study of the Fennell paper, however, shows a different finding. Fennell studied nuclear motion on magnetic resonance imaging of 3 patients—1 normal 18-year-old patient with no history of low back pain and two 25- and 46-year-old patients with low back pain history.

The 18-year-old patient with no back pain did show anterior nuclear movement on extension and posterior motion on flexion; however, the 2 patients with a history of low back pain showed the L4-L5 disk to move anteriorly during flexion. The nucleus spread within the L4-L5 disk during flexion instead of migrating posteriorly. Fennel explained the 2 unexpected results in the painful spines as possible disk degeneration etiology.

Gay et al\textsuperscript{1} also discussed the study of Beattie et al\textsuperscript{3} about 20 healthy young women with lumbar spine magnetic resonance imaging in extension, and Gay et al stated that they found that the posterior margin of the nucleus in the normal lower lumbar disk tends to move anteriorly with extension and posteriorly with flexion, and there was no anterior nucleus movement. Again, that is not a complete explanation of Beattie’s finding. He found that in normal disks without degeneration, the posterior disk margin increased between the posterior margin of the nucleus pulposus and the posterior portion of the vertebral bodies of the normal disks of healthy young females during extension motion. However, 8 of the 20 subjects had at least one degenerative disk in the lower lumbar spine. The nucleus of the degenerative disks did not move the same as normal disks. Degenerative disks deform differently from nondegenerative disks. Other similar studies have shown that the nucleus pulposus moves posterior or does not move with extension movement.\textsuperscript{4, 5, 6, 7} Reading the article of Gay et al., one is led to believe that the nucleus pulposus always moves anterior on extension and posterior on flexion, when in fact that is not the case. Gay et al accurately cite literature showing that stenosis is induced into the vertebral and the osseoligamentous canals by extension, which causes posterior annulus protrusion, ligamentum flavum buckling, facet imbrication, and narrowing of the posterior disk space.

Hopefully, I have augmented the findings as given in the important paper of Gay et al. The movement of the nucleus pulposus is unpredictable in the degenerated disk. As chiropractors, we treat degenerated disks and need to be aware of their behavior. The intervertebral disk is probably the most common source of chronic low back pain.\textsuperscript{8} Tolerance testing before applying manipulation to the patient’s spine is prudent because of the unpredictable nature of the disk. For safety, I teach that the maximum angle of flexion used is 6° when long y-axis decompression is applied to the motion segment. At that degree, our research has shown that the ligament stresses are well within normal limits so that damage will not occur to the stability of the segments. This small 6° flexion angle used may diminish the value of this discussion, but nevertheless, we must maintain correct biomechanical concepts for future study.
References


INTRODUCTION: A major issue in clinical trials in manual medicine is treatment variability. The challenge is to insure that the bounded treatment options are both representative of field practitioner behavior and consistent among research clinicians. This investigation assesses the treatment comparability of field practitioners and research clinicians, for a flexion-distraction treatment procedure, as quality control for a randomized clinical trial. METHODS: Using a series of vignettes, we studied the level of agreement of treatment protocols between field clinicians, research clinicians and a reference clinician regarding treatment location, range of motion during treatment, and number of repetitions used within the flexion-distraction protocol. RESULTS: Results indicated that reliability around decision making for anticipated location of spinal treatment was highest regardless of clinician group. For the research clinicians
this level of agreement was ICC=0.88. Decision-making for treatment direction was second highest, at kappa=0.64 for the research clinicians. Reliability around the number of repetitions is poor ranging from ICC=0.18 to 0.34 depending on clinician type.

**DISCUSSION:** Understanding the disparity in treatment protocols is of value in the construction and maintenance of quality control in an actual randomized clinical trial setting. More work was recommended in the preparation of clinical trials and the understanding of clinical decision-making because these disparate factors may dramatically impact the generalizability of clinical trial results.

60. **Hondras MA, Long CR, Cao Y, Rowell RM, Meeker WC.** A randomized controlled trial comparing 2 types of spinal manipulation and minimal conservative medical care for adults 55 years and older with subacute or chronic low back pain. J Manipulative and Physiol Ther 2009; 32;330-43

Objective: Chiropractic care is used by many older patients for low back pain (LBP), but there are no published results of randomized trials examining spinal manipulation (SM) for older adults. The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of 2 biomechanically distinct forms of SM and minimal conservative medical care (MCMC) for participants at least 55 years old with subacute or chronic nonradicular LBP.

Methods: Randomized controlled trial. The primary outcome variable was low back-related disability assessed with the 24-item Roland Morris Disability questionnaire at 3, 6, 12, and 24 weeks. Participants were randomly allocated to 6 weeks of care including 12 visits of either high-velocity, low-amplitude (HVLA)-SM, low-velocity, variable-amplitude (LVVA)-SM, or 3 visits of MCMC.

Results: Two hundred forty participants (105 women and 135 men) ages 63.1 ± 6.7 years without significant comorbidities. Adjusted mean Roland Morris Disability change scores (95% confidence intervals) from baseline to the end of active care were 2.9 (2.2, 3.6) and 2.7 (2.0, 3.3) in the LVVA-SM and HVLA-SM groups, respectively, and 1.6 (0.5, 2.8) in the MCMC group. There were no significant differences between LVVA-SM and HVLA-SM at any of the end points. The LVVA-SM group had significant improvements in mean functional status ranging from 1.3 to 2.2 points over the MCMC group. There were no serious adverse events associated with any of the interventions.

Conclusions: Biomechanically distinct forms of SM did not lead to different outcomes in older LBP patients and both SM procedures were associated with small yet clinically important changes in functional status by the end of treatment for this relatively healthy older population. Participants who received either form of SM had improvements on average in functional status ranging from 1 to 2.2 over those who received MCMC. From an evidence-based care perspective, patient preference and clinical experience should drive how clinicians and patients make the SM procedure decision for this patient population.

61. **Editorial Response by Cox JM:** A randomized controlled trial comparing 2 types of spinal manipulation and minimal conservative medical care for adults 55 years and older with subacute or chronic low back pain. J of Manipulative and Physiol Therap 2009; 32(7):601
Hondras et al1 reported on comparison of low-velocity, low-amplitude spinal manipulation (Cox flexion distraction) to high-velocity, low-amplitude adjusting (side-lying lumbar roll adjustment) to minimal conservative medical care for adults older than 55 years with subacute or chronic nonradicular low back pain. The reported result was both forms of manipulation yielded equal clinical relief with low-velocity, low-amplitude adjusting (eg, Cox technique) having significant improvement in mean functional status over medical care.

However, patients were excluded from the study “if they had low back pain associated with frank radiculopathy or neurological signs such as altered lower extremity reflex, dermatosensory deficit, progressive unilateral muscle weakness or motor loss, symptoms of cauda equina compression, or computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging evidence of anatomical pathology (eg, abnormal disk, lateral or central stenosis).” It seems nearly impossible to find patients without disk degeneration. Disk diseases of degeneration, herniation, and spinal stenosis causing low back and lower extremity pain are the most painful and challenging cases seen in chiropractic practice. Failed back surgical syndrome patients are also included with these patients, and this is an ever-increasing patient load.2 These cases are growing in numbers in chiropractic offices because of the “baby boomer” influx of older Americans who develop spinal stenosis as a part of the degenerative aging process. They are the 5% of the cases of back pain that absorb 75% of the cost in back care in the United States today.3 It is not a question of using only one adjustment form or the other but rather how they complement one another to gain the best clinical outcome for the patient. Nearly 60% of chiropractors use flexion distraction in their practices, using it on 23.5% of their patients—those patients for whom the doctor feels it to be most indicated to give the best clinical outcome.4 Patients with severe low back and radiculopathy were excluded from this study.

In the real world of clinical chiropractic, it is the excluded patients from this study that represent the greatest challenge, and flexion distraction becomes the most important spinal adjustment. Gudavalli authored the article showing superiority of flexion distraction decompression adjusting over medical care (physical therapy) in treating low back and radicular pain patients.5 Had the article of Hondras included the severe low back and radicular patient with spinal stenosis and disk herniation disease, the outcomes could have better revealed the place and need for flexion distraction spinal manipulation and side posture adjusting as determined by clinical relief and improved patient tolerance.

Selection of patient conditions for such studies needs input from field practitioners as to the type of patients presenting the greatest clinical challenge. In this author's opinion, the exclusions in this study would not have been selected had such been done. It is the field practitioner who depends on this type of study for clinical guidance in patient care. The excluded conditions from this study make its conclusions limited in value via exclusion of the most difficult problems seen in clinical practice.
   Post-surgical continued pain patients, aka FBSS or Failed Back Surgical Syndrome, seek relief, any relief. Chiropractic offers it. In this retrospective study of 32 patients treated with chiropractic Cox Technic flexion distraction, the patients reported improvement:
   4.1 out of 10 points overall
   5.7 out of 10 points in patients who underwent combined surgeries (lumbar discectomy, fusion and/or laminectomy)
   Best of all, no adverse side effects from the chiropractic Cox Technic treatment were reported!

63. Murphy, DR; Hurwitz, EJ; Gregory, AA; Clary, R. A non-surgical approach to the management of lumbar spinal stenosis: A prospective observational cohort study. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders 2006; 7:NIL_1-NIL_8
   New study of Cox® Distraction Manipulation in the treatment of lumbar spine stenosis lumbar spinal stenosis patients improved by 76% and disability improved in 73%

   13 visits to attain 0 out of 10 pain score and 2% Oswestry. At 2 year follow-up, still resolved.

   Relief of neck pain and arm pain in 10 visits in 4 weeks which continues at 8 months. C6/7 left posteromedial disk

   Testicular Pain (and Low Back Pain and Leg Pain) Relieved with Cox Technic
   36 year old man with 5 years of lower back pain, right leg pain, testicular pain
   19 treatments with Cox Technic (flexion distraction) in 8 weeks
   Testicular pain – improved at 1 visit; gone in 3 weeks; still gone at 6 month follow up
   Low back pain – decreased at 4 weeks
   Leg pain – gone at 4 weeks

75 year old man with low back pain and right anterior thigh and left posterior leg pain of 3 years’ duration is relieved with Cox Technic (flexion distraction).
4 visits – no right or left leg pain
3 months of 16 visits – low back and buttock pain are minimal with no leg pain
80% relief

Physical therapists take flexion distraction to new defined protocols for subclassifications of non-specific chronic low back pain.

Patients received treatment in 85 minute sessions, 6 days per week for the first two weeks, and 4 days per week for two additional weeks. Treatment protocol consisted of spinal decompression via SpineMED and flexion-distraction mobilization of the cervical spine as well as cervical stabilization exercises. Physical therapy modalities including superficial heat, ultrasound, and interferential current were also delivered prior to administration of SpineMED. Differences between patients’ pre-intervention and discharge outcome measures, pain on a visual analogue scale (VAS) and neck disability index (NDI), were examined using a paired t-test. [Results] Mean measures of patients’ VAS and NDI demonstrated significant improvement after being treated with 20 sessions of combined treatment. [Conclusion] Findings of the present study provide significant evidence to support the efficacy of a multimodal treatment approach using spinal decompression via SpineMED and spinal mobilization as well as cervical stabilization exercises. A multimodal approach might be an asset in the management of cervical spine disorders.

70. Hope, M: The effect of flexion distraction therapy on the lumbar spine on the electromyographic effect of the erector spinae muscles in lumbar facet dysfunction patients. University of Johannesburg Chiropractic Clinic. Published 6-30-11 (https://ujdigit space.uj.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10210/3765/Hope.pdf?sequence=1)
In light of these findings it can be concluded that flexion distraction therapy demonstrated favourable treatment results in terms of the pain experienced by the subjects, the resting rate and contraction ability of the Erector Spinae muscles.
   A course of conservative management consisting of 10 treatments including lumbar flexion/distraction and activity modification was provided over an 8-week period. Despite the long-standing nature of the complaint and underlying multiple-level lumbar spondylolysis with spondylolisthesis, there was a 25% reduction in low back pain severity on the numeric rating scale and a 22% reduction in perceived disability related to low back pain on the Revised Oswestry Disability Questionnaire.

   Cox flexion distraction showed almost no adverse side effects in its clinical application of manipulation to doctor and 1 in 54 of patients being manipulated. Distributions of injuries associated with adjusting techniques and specifically training-related activities at Parker College of Chiropractic, 2006 (student perception of injury sources)
   Adjusting Technique
   Diversified  280 cases  61 to doctor (22%)  74 injuries to patient (26%)
   Thompson    142 cases  3 (2%)          25 (18%)
   Gonstead    135 cases  31 (23%)        39 (29%)
   Cox F/D     54 cases  0 (0%)          1 (2%)

73. Greenwood D: Improvement in chronic low back pain in an aviation crash survivor with adjacent segment disease following flexion distraction therapy: a case study, J of Chiropractic Medicine 2012; 11(4):300-305
   - A chronic low back pain patient with a 3-year history of chronic non-specific low back pain due to a lumbar disc herniation after an accident that left him with fractures and cauda equina syndrome that required fusion surgery, vertebrectomy and cage reconstruction. His adjacent segment disease is relieved with Cox Flexion Distraction protocols over 4 weeks, attaining 0/10 on the numerical pain scale. At 3 months, he works 8 to 9 hours a day. At 9 months, he reports continued complete reduction of symptoms.

   http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/954134
   - In this cadaveric study we observed decreases in IDP in the lower cervical spine during a chiropractic MCD procedure in prone position. Based on the maximum number of specimens DC1 has done, moving flexion and traction seem to reduce
more IDP, followed by neutral traction, fixed flexion and tractions, and generalized traction. Although the doctors of chiropractic in this study demonstrated good intraclinician reliability, the magnitude of traction forces varied. Larger powered studies should be undertaken to determine if these decreases in IDP are significant depending on the doctor, contact location, and the different traction procedures. Also, the clinical significance of these differences is unknown.

   • This paper reports on the development of real-time feedback on the applied forces during the application of the flexion-distraction procedure. In this pilot study we measured the forces applied by experienced DCs as well as novice DCs in using this procedure. After a brief training with real-time feedback novice DCs have improved on the magnitude of the applied forces. This real-time feedback technology is promising to do systematic studies in training DCs during the application of this procedure.

   • Clinician proficiency in delivering cervical traction forces within three specified ranges (low force, less than 20 N; medium force, 21–50 N; and high force 51–100 N). Clinicians delivered manual cervical distraction treatments within the prescribed traction force ranges 75% of the time without visual feedback and 97% of the time with visual feedback. This study demonstrates that doctors of chiropractic can successfully deliver prescribed traction forces while treating neck pain patients, enabling the capability to conduct force-based dose response clinical studies.

   • This pilot study demonstrated the feasibility of a clinical trial protocol and the utility of a traction-based, minimal intervention as an attention-touch control for future efficacy trials of MCD for patients with neck pain.

   • compares short-term effects of a side-lying, thrust spinal manipulation (SM) procedure and a non-thrust, flexion-distraction SM procedure in adults with subacute or chronic low back pain (LBP) over 2 weeks.
• Thrust and non-thrust SM procedures with distinctly different joint loading characteristics demonstrated similar effects in short-term LBP improvement and both were superior to a wait list control.


• Doctors of chiropractic (DCs) use manual cervical distraction to treat patients with neck pain. Previous research demonstrates variability in traction forces generated by different DCs. This article reports on a training protocol and monthly certification process using bioengineering technology to standardize cervical traction force delivery among clinicians. Methods: This longitudinal observational study evaluated a training and certification process for DCs who provided force-based manual cervical distraction during a randomized clinical trial. The DCs completed a 7-week initial training that included instructional lectures, observation, and guided practice by a clinical expert, followed by 3 hours of weekly practice sessions delivering the technique to asymptomatic volunteers who served as simulated patients. An instrument-modified table and computer software provided the DCs with real-time audible and visual feedback on the traction forces they generated and graphical displays of the magnitude of traction forces as a function of time immediately after the delivery of the treatment. The DCs completed monthly certifications on traction force delivery throughout the trial. Descriptive accounts of certification attempts are provided. Results: Two DCs achieved certification in traction force delivery over 10 consecutive months. No certification required more than 3 attempts at C5 and occiput contacts for 3 force ranges (0-20 N, 21-50 N, and 51-100 N). Conclusions: This study demonstrates the feasibility of a training protocol and certification process using bioengineering technology for training DCs to deliver manual cervical distraction within specified traction force ranges over a 10-month period.


• At the end of active care, 54 (81%) of patients report greater than 50% pain relief and 13 (19%) less than 50% pain relief. (mean active care: 49 days, average 11 treatments)

• At 24 months following active treatment, 56 patients returned the survey. 46 (82%) patients report pain relief of greater than 50%, and 10 (18%) patients report 50% or less relief.

• The mean percent of relief at the end of active care was 71.6 (Standard Deviation (SD): 23.2), and at 24 months was 70 (SD:25).

• Further at 24 months,
  • 24 patients (43%) had not sought further care
  • 32 patients required further treatment consisting of
• chiropractic manipulation for 17 (53%),
• physical therapy, exercise, injections, and medication for 9 (28%), and
• additional surgery for 5 (16%).

Greater than 50% pain relief following chiropractic distraction spinal manipulation was seen in 81% of PSCP patients receiving a mean of 11 treatment visits over a 49 day period of active care. Further systematic and randomized clinical studies are required to determine the benefits of spinal manipulation for post-surgical continued pain patients.


The purpose of this study is to introduce the application of Cox flexion distraction decompression as an innovative approach to treating knee pain and osteoarthritis. For all 25 patients, a change was observed in the mean VAS scores from 7.7 to 1.8. The mean number of treatments was 5.3 over an average of 3.0 weeks. Acute patient mean VAS scores dropped from 8.1 to 1.1 within 4.8 treatments over 2.4 weeks. Chronic patient mean VAS scores dropped from 7.5 to 2.2 within 5.4 treatments over 3.3 weeks. No adverse events were reported. This study showed clinical improvement in patients with knee pain who were managed with Cox flexion distraction decompression applied to the knee.


A 59 year-old female presented with chronic constant neck pain and stiffness which limited her ability to perform activities of daily living (ADLs). Cervical spine radiographs revealed findings consistent with DISH. This patient was treated with Cox manual cervical distraction resulting in a decrease in the severity and frequency of her pain and improved ability to perform ADLs. Protocol II was utilized to help promote normal facet mobility. This case study describes the treatment of a 59 year old woman with chronic neck pain in the setting of DISH.


PMCID: PMC4322019

A 38-year-old man presented to a chiropractic clinic with neck pain and a history of an anterior cervical spine plate fusion at C6-7 after a work related accident 4 years earlier. He had signs and symptoms of spondolytic myelopathy and right lower back, right posterior thigh pain and numbness. The patient was treated with Cox technique and rehabilitation. The patient experienced a reduction of pain on a numeric pain scale from
8/10 to 3/10. The patient was seen a total of 12 visits over 3 months. No adverse effects were reported. A patient with a prior C6-7 fusion with spondylotic myelopathy and concurrent L5-S1 radiculopathy improved after a course of rehabilitation and Cox distraction manipulation. Further research is needed to establish its efficiency.

Cyriax, Quilette, and Kramer hypothesized that as the vertebrae in the spine are distracted, a negative pressure develops in the disc, and sucks back a protrusion. The present study shows that the decrease in the intradiscal pressures may provide the opportunity for the reduction in the disc bulge during the flexion-distraction procedure. Ramos et al. reported decreases in the intradiscal pressures during Vertebral Axial Decompression (VAD) procedure on three patients measured intraoperatively. The result of the present study are in general agreement with the study reported by Ramos and Martin. Andersson et al. reported increases in the intradiscal pressures at L3-L4 disc on four volunteers during active and passive traction. A possible reason for the increase in the intradiscal pressures could be that the muscles of the in vivo subjects could have been contracting while under active and passive traction. Work is in progress to monitor the muscle activity during in vivo situations of treating the patients using the flexion-distraction procedure.


We observed a significant decrease in intradiscal pressure during the flexion-distraction procedure for low back pain. The pressure has increased during extension motion of the table. The pressures have increased during right lateral motion whereas the pressures have decreased during the left lateral motion. During circumduction the pressures have decreased during the left lateral and flexion motions, where as they have increased during right lateral and flexion combined motions. In all of the motions the pressures returned to their original values when the spine was brought back to the initial prone position. One of the reasons for the increase and decrease during lateral motions is due to the fact that the transducer was inserted some what right laterally from the center of the disc. The results clearly show that the pressures are affected during different motions of the spine associated with the motions of the table. Even though the present study is limited to one cadaver, the results are very interesting and studies with more number of cadavers and studies on animals can give further insight into the changes in the pressures at different regions of the spine.


We observed a significant decrease in intradiscal pressure during the flexion-distraction procedure for low back pain. When the discs were not pressurized, the pressures went
below 0 mm Hg. When the discs were pressurized, the decrease in the intradiscal pressures was much larger, suggesting that in patients with higher intradiscal pressures, the decrease may be much higher during the treatment. The pressures returned to their original values when the spine was brought back to the initial prone position. Quillette (2), and Kramer (3) hypothesized that as the vertebrae in the spine are distracted, a negative pressure develops in the disc, and sucks back a protrusion. Ramos et al. (4) reported on the intradiscal pressure during Vertebral Axial Decompression (VAD) procedure on three patients measured intraoperatively. The results showed that the disc pressures reduced during the VAD therapy. They demonstrated that the disc pressures can go as low as -160 mmHg. The results of the present study are in general agreement with the study reported by Ramos and Martin (4). Anderson et al. (5) reported the intradiscal pressures at L3-L4 disc on four volunteers during standing, lying, active traction, and passive traction. The findings showed an increase in the disc pressure during both active and passive traction. The results from the present study do not agree with the results reported by Anderson et al. (5). A possible reason could be that the muscles of the in vivo subjects could have been contracting while under active and passive traction. Work is in progress to monitor the muscle activity during in vivo situations of treating the patients using flexion-distraction procedure.

   The doctors who have experience have applied significantly higher preloads and peak loads compared to doctors having less than one year of experience. This observation was valid for the forces in the posterior-to-anterior direction as well as inferior to superior direction. Doctors who have more experience have a lesser duration cycle compared to the inexperienced doctors. This system can be used to quantify the skills of experienced chiropractors and this information can be used to train the future doctors of chiropractic. This device can be used to quantify the forces in treating different patient populations presenting different conditions and a research data base can be developed using that information. Future work will be aimed in this direction. This study is a first to report the force characteristics of experienced and inexperienced doctors using a flexion-distraction procedure.


7. Cox JM, Gudavalli MR. Applied chiropractic spinal manipulation research to improve clinical outcomes. 8th Interdisciplinary World Congress on Low Back and Pelvic Pain, October 27-31, 2013, Dubai, UAE.
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2. Cox JM: Mechanism, Diagnosis and Treatment of lumbar disc protrusion and prolapse. ACA J of Chiropractic XI(11) (November 1974)


6. Cox JM: Low back pain: recent statistics and data on its mechanism, diagnosis and treatment from chiropractic manipulation. ACA J of Chiropractic 1979


15. Cox JM: Conservative flexion-distraction management of lumbar disc and facet subluxation syndrome conditions. Los Angeles College of Chiropractic Visiting Scholars' Program (November 11-12, 1989) on lumbar disc syndromes


19. Cox JM: Lumbar disc disease: distraction adjutvieve procedures. prepared for Clinical Chiropractic Report published by C.V.Mosby Co. This paper is to be in the first edition of the journal to be out in 1990 under POINT/COUNTERPOINT


Automated axial distraction is described and depicted.

   Algorithms of the standard of care for Cox® Distraction are presented and explained.
   Automated axial distraction, the newest ability of Cox® Technique protocol, is introduced in a very technical, step-by-step fashion with illustrations as to hand positioning as well as instrument use. AAD eases the distraction procedures for the physician and provides a smooth adjustment for the patient.

   Cox® Distraction procedures for the cervical spine and thoracic spine are a natural outgrowth of its application to the low back. This technical overview of Cox® Distraction procedures for the cervical and thoracic spine is intended to introduce this form of care for patients intolerant of classic rotatory thrust techniques due to such anatomical and pathological findings as degenerative disc disease, vertebral artery syndrome, disc herniation, blocked vertebra, occipitalization, scoliosis, other congenital defects, as well as for patients who just cannot be high velocity adjusted.

25. Cox and other researchers: Chiropractic researchers take aim at sciatica. J of the American Chiropractic Association 2001; (March) 38(3):6-13


27. Hayden RA: Multilevel degenerative disc disease: a case study. Georgia Chiropractic Journal 1996; April: 6-7:34
   A case of a 61-year-old female with low back, hip and sciatic pain since for five years has been bedridden or restricted to the sofa prior to care is presented. Onset of the pain was gradual and worsened recently, interfering with work, sleep and rest. Lying flat on her back helped. Pain radiated to both calves at time, left more than right. The physician diagnosed her as having multi-level disc degeneration and degenerative joint disease with significant subluxation of the thoracolumbar spine. She was most symptomatic of a large, medial, contained L5/S1 disc protrusion with S1 nerve root compression.
   After four weeks of Cox® Distraction therapy, she reported no leg or back pain. She is able to walk and function again much to the delight of her family and the confusion of her friends.

   The authors present a case of a 24-year-old Hispanic hyperkyphotic male with a complaint of acute low back pain as the result of a bending and pulling injury. The patient presented
with a marked right laterally flexed antalgic lean and appeared to be in severe pain. Radiographs revealed an L6 vertebra with hypoplastic lumbosacral articular facets and spina bifida occulta. The patient also had radicular compression symptomatology on physical exam. He was treated with flexion distraction for three treatments with a significant decrease in symptomatology. The significance of this case is that flexion distraction may also be useful in the treatment of conditions with inherent instability such as in the case presented.

29. National Board of Chiropractic Examiners: Job Analysis of Chiropractic 1993: 78 53% of DC’s report using COX

30. National Board of Chiropractic Examiners: Job Analysis of Chiropractic 1999: 58% of DC’s report using COX

31. National Board of Chiropractic Examiners: Job Analysis of Chiropractic 2010: 63.7% of DC’s report using flexion-distraction

32. Mercy Center Consensus Conference: Guidelines For Chiropractic Quality Assurance And Practice Parameters. 1993: 108, 208 Flexion-distraction – “established” technic – one of only two such in chiropractic


34. Gallucci G [1438 S.O.M. Center Road, Mayfield Heights, OH 44124 -- (216)461-4848]: The effectiveness of chiropractic treatment for disc syndrome. A Study by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Ohio and Physicians First, Inc. (1996)

A study was conducted as a joint venture between Physicians First, an established chiropractic clinic, and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Ohio. The purpose was to compile statistics on the effectiveness of chiropractic treatment of back injuries that might otherwise require surgical intervention. The study was composed of a total of 10 patients with diagnosed intervertebral disc syndrome. All 10 subjects had received treatment from a medical doctor for the diagnosed conditions. The subjects were treated under a twelve week plan which included the utilization of Cox Distraction Technique. Post-treatment surveys revealed that all 10 patients reported improvement in the frequency and severity of symptoms.


OBJECTIVE: This case study reported the conservative management of a patient presenting with left sided low back and leg pain diagnosed as a left sided L5-S1 disc prolapse/herniation.
CLINICAL FEATURES: A 31-year-old male recreational worker presented with left sided low back and leg pain for the previous 3-4 months that was exacerbated by prolonged sitting. INTERVENTION AND OUTCOME: The plan of management included interferential current, soft tissue trigger point and myofascial therapy, lateral recumbent manual low velocity, low amplitude traction mobilizations and pelvic blocking as necessary. Home care included heat, icing, neural mobilizations, repeated extension exercises, stretching, core muscle strengthening, as well as the avoidance of prolonged sitting and using a low back support in his work chair. The patient responded well after the first visit and his leg and back pain were almost completely resolved by the third visit. SUMMARY: Conservative chiropractic care appears to reduce pain and improve mobility in this case of a L5-S1 disc herniation. Active rehabilitative treatment strategies are recommended before surgical referral.

   • Cox Technic Flexion Distraction is discussed as a relieving approach to reducing pain from DISH.


38. Lombardy K: "Disc herniation with spondylolisthesis." The Georgia Chiropractor, Spring 2014 issue
Textbooks & Chapters of Textbooks

1. Cox JM: Low Back Pain: Mechanism, Diagnosis and Treatment -

   a. 4th edition – Fall 2014 – privately published


Video for Healthcare Colleagues


2. Cox JM: Cox® Low Back Treatment using Distraction Technique [doctor's educational videotape]. Fort Wayne, IN: privately produced and published by Dr. Cox, 1990

3. Cox JM: Cox® Cervical Spine Distraction Technique: Diagnosis and Treatment [doctor's educational videotape]. Fort Wayne, IN: privately produced and published by Dr. Cox, 1991


6. Cox JM: Cox Technic Flexion Distraction and Decompression Demonstration Video (101 minutes), 2013

Video for Public/Patient


3. Cox JM: Chiropractic and Your Health: Low Back Wellness School [patient educational videotape]. Fort Wayne, IN: privately produced by Cox and The Production Studio, 1993
Books/Brochures for Public/Patient


Online Published Case Reports (www.coxtechnic.com/downloads.aspx)

1. Case Report #1 - L5S1 Disc Herniation
2. Case Report #2 - Synovial Cyst
3. Case Report #3 - H-fracture Management
4. Case Report #4 - Cervical Disc Herniation (Dr. Stuart Rosenthal)
5. Case Report #5 - C5-C6 Disc Herniation
6. Case Report #6 - Cervical Spine Pain Patient Avoids Surgery
7. Case Report #7 - Osteoporosis Induced Compression Fracture
8. Case Report #8 - Discogram confirmed disc herniation
9. Case Report #9 - Slipped femoral capital epiphysis leads to degeneration
10. Case Report #10 - Renal cyst causes back pain
11. Case Report #11 - Sequestered L5S1 Disc Fragment
12. Case Report #12 - Synovial Cyst (Dr. Wong)
13. Case Report #13 - Failed back surgery syndrome
14. Case Report #14 - Diastematomyelia
15. Case Report #15 - Large HNP @ C5-6 with MRI Pre/Post
16. Case Report #16 - Patient chooses surgery, has pain after
17. Case Report #17 - C5/6 disc herniation with radiculopathy and instability
18. Case Report #18 - Hip Replacement, Avascular Necrosis, Spondylolisthesis
19. Case Report #19 - Cervical Myelopathy Pain Relief (Dr. Ted Siciliano)
20. Case Report #20 - Spinal cord edema at cervical disc level
21. Case Report #21 - Bilateral Arm and Leg Pain
22. Case Report #22 - Surgery for large extraforaminal disc
23. Case Report #23 - A Common Case of cervical spine degeneration
24. Case Report #24 - Rapid onset stenotic changes
25. Case Report #25 - Cervical Spine Stenosis
26. Case Report #26 - Klippel Feil
27. Case Report #27 - Patient Avoids Third Surgery - Cervical Spine
28. Case Report #28 - Ankylosing Spondylitis (Dr. Mike Poulin)
29. Case Report #29 - Multidisciplinary approach to lumbar disc herniation (Drs. Gangemi, Ditsworth, Lombardi)
30. Case Report #30 - Anomalous 9th Rib Formation with scoliosis
31. Case Report #31 - L5 Spondylolisthesis with Low Back and Leg Pain
32. Case Report #32 - L4-L5 Spinal Stenosis With Synovial Cyst
33. Case Report #33 - Special Protocol for L4-5 disc extrusion (Dr. Stuart Rosenthal)
34. Case Report #34 - MRI correlation with clinical findings in stenosis and disc herniation
35. Case Report #35 - MRI misses fragment, Clinical exam finds it
36. Case Report #36 - Marked motor weakness requires surgery
37. Case Report #37 - Two Disc Herniations - one touches spinal cord
38. Case Report #38 - Degenerative Osteochondrosis with Scoliosis
39. Case Report 38b - Treatment of A Lumbar Spine Synovial Cyst With Cox Technic (Dr. Ted Siciliano)
40. Case Report #39 - Non-Congruent Cervical Spine Pain Patient
41. Case Report #40 - Surgical Low Back Fusion with Spondylolisthesis
42. Case Report #41 - Hip Replacement and Cox Technic Needed for Pain Relief
43. Case Report #42 - Marked Disc Degeneration and Stenosis
44. Case Report #43 - Degenerative Spondylolisthesis & Stenosis
45. Case Report #46 - Far Lateral Disc Herniation: Surgery & Cox Technic
46. Case Report #47 - Butterfly Vertebra Treated Post Surgical Disc Removal
47. Case Report #48 - L5S1 Disc Fragment
48. Case Report #49 - Pre/Post MRI Study of a 10mm Lumbar Disc Extrusion (Drs. Gangemi & LeMarr)
49. Case Report #50 - Spondylolisthesis With L5 Nerve Root
50. Case Report #51 - Sciatica with Muscle Weakness (Dr. Donna Lieberman)
51. Case Report #52 - Realistic Expectations for Spine Fusion and Hip Replacement
52. Case Report #53 - Leg Pain Returns after Surgery, Relieved with FD
53. Case Report #54 - Progressive Disc Degeneration in the Cervical Spine From C6-7 to C4-5
54. Case Report #55 - Large Extraforaminal L2-L3 Disc Herniation
55. Case Reports #56 - Osseoligamentous Free Fragment
56. Case Report #57 - Two Lumbar Disc Herniations
57. Case Report #58 - Patient Avoids Surgery for L3-4 Disc Herniation
58. Case Report #59 – Two Cases of Sciatica
59. Case Report #60 - Upper Level Disc Herniation Thigh Pain
60. Case Report #61 - Motor Weakness and Atrophy (Dr. Dean Greenwood)
61. Case Report #62 - Diabetic, Post Laminectomy Chronic Pain (Dr. Chris Moran)
62. Case Report #64 - Cervical DDD with Scleratogenous Pain Distribution (Dr. Cox)
63. Case Report #65 - Lumbar Spine DDD and Spondylolisthesis (Dr. Ted Siciliano)
64. Case Report #66 - DDD with Bilateral Avascular Necrosis (Dr. Mike Poulin)
65. Case Report #67 - 3 Level Spine Surgery Prevented (Dr. Allen Unruh)
66. Case Report #68 - Lumbar Spine Degenerative Disc Disease with Spondylolisthesis (Dr. Ted Siciliano)
67. Case Report #69 - L5S1 Disc Herniation (Dr. James Orphan)
68. Case Report #71 - Pelvic Pain and Organic Dysfunction (Dr. James Browning)
69. Case Report #72 - Low Back Pain and Sciatica in a Golf Professional (Dr. James Schantz)
70. Case Report #73 - L5 S1 Disc Herniation Avoids Surgery (Dr. Randy Rein)
71. Case Report #76 - Chronic Intractable Pain after Surgery (Dr. Chris A Humble)
72. Case Report #77 - Large L5S1 Disc Herniation (Dr. Dean Greenwood)
73. Case Report #78 - Synovial Cyst
74. Case Report #80 - Three Cervical Spine Disc Herniations (Dr. Mike Poulin)
75. Case Report #82 - Surgery for Spinal Stenosis
76. Case Report #83 - Multi-Level Spondylolisthesis and Stenosis (Dr. Lee J Hazen)
77. Case Report #84 - Large C4/5 Spondylotic Disc Bulge, Stenosis, Myelomalacia
78. Case Report #85 - Failed VAXD Care of L4-5 Disc Successfully Care for by Cox Technic
79. Case Report #86 - Extruded L5S1 Disc Herniation, Sciatica, Paresthesia (Dr. Mark Ashley)
80. Case Report #87 - Left Sided Lumbosacral Pain with L4-L5 Disc Herniation and Stenosis Controlled with Cox Technic (Dr. Chris Moran)
81. Case Report #88 - Degenerative Disc Disease Of The Cervical Spine With Radicular Pain Treated With Cox Decompression Adjusting (Dr. Ted Siciliano)
82. Case Report #89 - L5-S1 Extruded Disc Herniation Successfully Cared for with Cox Technic
83. Case Report #90 - Bertolotti’s Syndrome (Dr. Roy Siegel)
84. Case Report #91 - Spinal Stenosis With Foot Drop Successfully Relieved with Cox Technic (Dr. Ilan Sommer)
85. Case Report #92 - Cox Technic Relieves Pain from Degenerative Scoliosis and Spinal Stenosis (Dr. Robert Patterson)
86. Case Report #93 - Cox® Technic Flexion Distraction and Decompression Treatment of L3-L4 Degenerative Spondylolisthesis and Spinal Stenosis and a Transitional L5 Vertebral Segment (Bertolotti’s Syndrome) (Dr. Lee Hazen)
87. Case Report #94 - Cox Technic Flexion-Distraction and Decompression Relieves Right Lower Extremity Radiculopathy and Low Back Pain Post Laminectomy (Dr. Eric Frank)
88. Case Report #95 - Spinal Stenosis in an 82-Year-Old Male (Dr. Robert Hayden)
89. Case Report #96 - Lumbar Intervertebral Disc Syndrome L4/5 Left with Compression of L5 Nerve – Relieved (Dr. Bryce Milam)
90. Case Report #97 - C5-6 and C6-7 Disc Herniation with Stenosis Causing Nerve Root Impingement (Dr. James Brandt)
91. Case Report #98 - Cox® Technic for Osteoporotic Thoracic Kyphosis and Pain Syndrome after Vertebroplasty (Dr. Lee Hazen)
92. Case Report #99 - Cervical Spine Degenerative Stenosis in a Post Surgical Continued Pain (FBSS) Patient (Dr. Lee Hazen)
93. Case Report #100 - Facet Arthropathy Induced Nerve Root Compression Resulting In Motor Weakness And Pain (Dr. James Cox)
94. Case Report #101 - Cervical Radiculopathy with a Disc/Spur Complex at C5/6 with Left Nerve Root Compression (Dr. Keith Bartley)
95. Case Report #102 - 37 year old Female with Spondylolisthesis & Disc Herniation (Dr. James Brandt)
96. Case Report #103 Lumbar Spine Disc Herniation without Myelopathy: Patient Compliance is Key (Dr. Shay Corbin)
97. Case Report #104 - L3-L4, L4-L5 Severe Spinal Stenosis Responds To Cox Technic (Dr. Randy Rein)
98. Case Report #105 - Cox Technic Relieves Chronic LBP, Leg Pain due to Degenerative Spondylolisthesis and Stenosis (Dr. James Cox)
99. Case Report #106 - L4-5 Disc Herniation with Motor Weakness - Relief with Cox Technic (Dr. James Cox)
100. Case Report #107 - Thoraco-Lumbar Spinal Stenosis - Avoids 5th Back Surgery (Dr. Kurt Olding)
101. Case Report #108 - L5 Radiculopathy from Large L4/5 Extrusion (Dr. Kurt Olding)
102. Case Report #109 - Lumbar Spine Disc Herniation (Dr. Lucio Evangelista)
103. Case Report #110 - C6-7 Disc Herniation with Neck Pain Relieved (Dr. Joseph D’Angiolillo)
104. Case Report #111 – Retrolisthesis (Dr. James Cox I)
105. Case Report #112 - Post Car Accident Neck Pain and Ear Pain Relief (Dr. James Brandt)
106. Case Report #113 – Resolution of Leg Pain after Failed Back Surgery (Dr. Dean Greenwood)
107. Case Report #114 – Resolution of C6/7 Neck Pain in Male (Dr. Joel Dixon)
108. Case Report #115 – Perseverance of a Stenotic Patient Ends in Relief with Cox Technic (Dr. Kurt Olding)
109. Case Report #116 – Lumbar Disc Herniation with Radiculopathy Treated Successfully with Cox Technic (Dr. Steven Garber)
110. Case Report #117 - Disc Extrusion Resorbed Under Cox® Technic Flexion Distraction and Decompression System (Dr. Ilan Sommer)
111. Case Report #118 – Concomitant Tourette's (Maladie des TICS) and Adolescent Idiopathic Mild Scoliosis complicated by Chronic L5/S1 Facet Syndrome and spinal subluxations treated using Cox® Technic Protocols (Dr. Mike Poulin)
112. Case Report #119 - Moderate Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis (AIS) while being braced, now presents with lumbar disc disorder with sciatica, treated using Cox® Technic Protocols. (Dr. Mike Poulin)
113. Case Report #120 - Chronic Severe “S” Scoliosis (Lumbar dextroscoliosis and Thoracic levoscoliosis) treated successfully using Chiropractic for over 30 years and Cox® Technic Protocols for over 11 yrs. (Dr. Mike Poulin)
114. Case Report #121 - Rapid Improvement In A Lumbar Radiculopathy Patient With Cox® Technic (Dr. Tim Hayes)
115. Case Report #122 – Treatment Of Cervical Spine Disc Herniations And Radiculopathy With Cox Decompression Adjusting (Dr. Ted Siciliano)
116. Case Report #123 – Free Fragment Of Disc At L3-4 (Dr. Kurt Olding)
117. Case Report #124 – Disc Herniation With Spondylolisthesis Treated With Cox Technic Flexion Distraction (Dr. Travis Cross)
118. Case Report #125 – Neck Pain And Bilateral Arm Pain Relief With Cox Technic (Dr. Jay Schwartz)
119. Case Report #126 – Cox Technic Helps Relieve Pain From Disc Protrusion When Neurontin Isn’t Tolerated (Dr. Sara Miller)
120. Case Report #127 – Multilevel Low Back Disc Herniations And Radiculopathy Relieved (Dr. Gregory Priest)
121. Case Report #128 – Chiropractic Management Of A Combined L4 Lumbar Disc Protrusion A L2-L3 Synovial Cyst (Dr. Michael McMurray)
122. Case Report #129 – Lumbar Discogenic Pain With Motor Weakness Increased By Lumbar Extension (Dr. Adam Keefe)
123. Case Report #130 – Vulvodynia (And Back Pain And Leg Pain) Resolved With Cox Technic (Dr. Michael Johnson)
124. Case Report #131 – Nonspecific Back Pain, Degenerative Disc Disease, Endplate Modic Changes (Dr. Paul Vanier)
125. Case Report #132 - Flexion/Distraction in the Treatment of OA of the Hip
126. Case Report #133 - Chronic LBP with Extremity Pain, Modic Changes
127. Case Report #134 - 14 Year Old with An L5 Central Tear
128. Case Report # 135 - 8.8mm Extrusion Causes LBP, Leg Pain and Buttock Pain - Relief with Cox Technic
130. Case Report #137: Success And Failure In An L4-L5 Left Sided Synovial Cyst Case
131. Case Report #138: Cox® Distraction Spinal Manipulation Treatment Of A Large L5-S1 Disc Herniation Extrusion
132. Case Report #139 - Pregnant Patient with LBP and Leg Pain Relieved
133. Case Report #140 - L2-3 Disc Extrusion, Fragment, Scoliosis
134. BONUS CASE REPORT - FBSS Post Surgical Continued Pain Patient Helped with FD
135. Case Report #141 - Large L4-L5 Disc Herniation
136. Case Report #142 - L3-4 Disc Extrusion & Its Long-Term Follow Up
137. Case Report #143 - Multiple Disc Extrusions Relieved
138. Case Report #144 - Improved Motor Weakness of the L5 Nerve Root after One Treatment
139. Case Report #145 - Two Level Spondylolisthesis
140. Case Report #146 - Subtle X-Ray Finding
141. Case Report #147 - Severe Post Surgical Stenosis Treated With Cox Technic
142. Case Report #148 - Stenosis, Myelomalacia, C5-6, C6-7 Disc Protrusions
143. Case Report #149 - 12 Year History of L4 Disc Protrusion
144. Case Report #150 - Care of a Large Lumbar Herniated Disc
145. Case Report #151 - Calcified L5-S1 Disc with Radiculopathy
146. Case Report #152: Relief of C6-7 Disc Herniation with Radiculopathy, Muscle Weakness and Hypoesthesia
147. Case Report #153 - Low Back and Extremity Pain: Walker to Walking
148. Case Report #154 - Chiropractic Integrative Medicine Management of Chronic Low-Back and Right Lower Extremity Scleratogenous Pain (Dr. George Simmons)
149. Case #155 - Large C6-7 Extruded Disc with Extremity Pain and Weakness Avoids Surgical Intervention
150. Case #157 - Cox® Flexion Distraction Decompression of the Knee (Dr. Luigi Albano)
151. Case #158 - Case Series: The Innovative Application of Cox® Flexion Distraction Decompression to the Knee (Dr. Luigi Albano)
152. Case Report #159 - C5-6 Disc Herniation with Cord Impingement (Dr. Larry Widmer)
153. Case Report #160 - Post Surgical C6-C7 Fusion With Spondylotic Myelopathy and Concurrent L5-S1 Radiculopathy (Dr. George Joachim)
154. Case Report #161: Foot Drop, Radiculopathy, Spinal Stenosis (Dr. Howard Rosenberg)
155. Case Report #162 - Cervical Spine Stenosis and Radiculopathy (Dr. Charles Portwood)
156. Case Report #163 - Post-Surgical Continued Pain Syndrome Relief for Recurring L5 and S1 Dermatome Pain (Dr. Kurt Olding)
157. Case Report #164 - Chiropractic Management of Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome (Dr. George Joachim)
158. Case Report #165 - A Patient With Neck and Right Upper Extremity Pain (Dr. Greg Priest)
159. Case Report #166 - 16 Years Post Cervical Fusion Surgery Care (Dr. Mike Poulin)
160. Case Report #167 - The Wisdom of Cox Technic System: Carefully Evaluate the Patient - Positive Valsalva and Kemp (Dr. Ralph Kruse)
161. Case Report #168 - Post-Surgical Neck Pain With Radiculopathy Relieved (Dr. Jay Schwartz)
162. Case Report #169 - L4-5 Disc Extrusion, Radiculopathy, Spondylolisthesis (Dr. Ralph Kruse)
163. Case Report #170 - Pre / Post MRIs of Relieved Disc Extrusion (Joel Dixon DC/Chloe Wilkerson DC)
164. Case Report #171 – Far Lateral Disc Herniation Helped with Cox Technic (Dean Greenwood DC)
165. Case Report #172 - Thoracic Disc Protrusion, Cervical Spondylosis, Scoliosis (Dr. Leisa Grgula)

ONLINE RECORDED COURSES

1. Scoliosis: Degenerative and Idiopathic
2. Neuroanatomical Innervation of the Spine AUDIO only
3. Pathologies I in Chiropractic Practice
4. Pathologies II in Chiropractic Practice
5. Pathologies III & FBSS II in Chiropractic Practice
6. FBSS I (Failed Back Surgery Syndrome) in Chiropractic Practice
7. Research & History of Cox Technic
9. Spinal Nutrition
10. Spondylolisthesis, Transitional Segment, and Bertolotti's Syndrome
11. Cervical Spine: Part I - Biomechanics, Diagnosis, and Treatment
12. Cervical Spine: Part II - Biomechanics & Treatment Demonstration
13. Low Back Pain: Research, Cases, and Demonstration
14. Spinal Cysts (Synovial, Tarlov, Discal): Diagnosis, Differentiation, Treatment
15. Scoliosis: Degenerative and Sciatic: Research, Bracing, Cases, and Treatment
16. Cervical Spine: Degenerative Joint and Disc Disease (with discussion of Syrinx)
17. Pelvic Pain and Organic Dysfunction: Relief with Flexion Distraction
18. Cervical Spine: Research Updates, Patient Cases, and Treatment Demonstration
19. The Subluxation: PLUS Rotation Effects on Spinal Elements
20. Free Fragments & Chemical Radiculitis
21. Examination of the Low Back Pain Patient - test by test
22. Examination of the Cervical and Thoracic Spine Pain Patient - test by test
23. Patient Cases #1: CS Cord Edema, Spondylolisthesis, LS Free Fragment
24. Patient Cases #2: Scoliosis, Post Vertebroplasty/Kyphoplasty, TS/CS Disc herniation
28. Patient Cases #3: Scoliosis, Disc Herniation, Disc Extrusion, Compression Fracture
29. Clinical Cases and Current Research Fall 2013
30. Disc Degeneration and Regeneration: State of the Current Research Findings
31. When to Refer for Back Surgery: PART I Considerations & Cases
32. When to Refer for Back Surgery: PART 2
33. When to Refer for Back Surgery: PART 3
34. TOP 10 Imaging Findings in the Chiropractic Practice Beyond the Disc Herniation
35. Leg Length Inequality, Compensatory Lovett Scoliosis, Foot Mechanics And Orthotics
36. Treatment Demonstration #1: C1 to S1
37. Treatment Demonstration #2: Far Lateral Disc, Free Fragment, T4 Syndrome
38. Osteoporosis and Nutrition
39. Treatment Demonstration #3: Back Pain Classifications: Quebec, Pfirrmann, Modic (Case: Large L5S1 Extrusion)
40. Treatment Demonstration #4 - Common Drugs Back Pain Patients Take Plus CS Treatment Demo
41. MRI Basic Physics and Interpretation
42. Part I Certification Course - Section 1 - RECOMMENDATION: Take Part I courses in sequence.
43. Part I - Section 2
44. Part I - Section 3
45. Part I - Section 4
46. Part I - Section 5
47. Part I - Section 6
48. Part I - Section 7
49. Part I - Section 8
50. Part III (1) - Section 1 - NOTE: Could take these individually though in sequence is recommended. (Sec. 1 topic: Nerve supply, nerve pressure, pain modulation, introduction to course theme)
51. Part III (1) - Section 2 - Synovial Cyst cases and Pregnancy related back pain (live patient presentations)
52. Part III (1) - Section 3 - Pelvic Pain and Organic Dysfunction
53. Part III (1) - Section 4 - Back Surgery: procedures (neurosurgeon), outcomes, live patient cases
54. Part III (1) - Section 5 - Interdisciplinary practices with Cox Technic physicians
55. Part III (1) - Section 6a - Neurosurgeon's talk on Mind, Body and relation to wellness
56. Part III (1) - Section 6b - Neurosurgeon's talk on "Fraud of Chronic Pain"
57. Part III (1) - Section 7 - Cox Technic - research, use in clinic, protocols, demo, patient cases
58. Part III (1) - Section 8 - co-management of cases, closing comments, research update
59. Afferentation #1
60. Afferentation #2
61. Afferentation #3
62. Cox Technic: Evidence Based Practice for Cervical, Thoracic and Lumbar Spine
63. Afferentation #4
64. Chiropractic and the Immune System
65. Cervico-Thoracic Spine Diagnosis and Treatment
66. Cox Technic for Neck and Back Pain
67. ICD-10 Coding and Disc Classification
68. Applying Spinal Manipulation to the ICD-10 Codes
69. Spondylolisthesis, Doming of the Diaphragm for Hamstring stretch, treatment, cases, nutrition
70. Cox® Technic: It's More Than You Think It Is! Neck and Back Pain Relief
71. Cervical Spine V - 2016 CS Webinar Series - Session 1
72. Cervical Spine VI - 2016 CS Webinar Series - Session 2
73. Cervical Spine VII - 2016 CS Webinar Series - Session 3
74. Cervical Spine VII - 2016 CS Webinar Series - Session 4
75. "I know what's wrong with you, and we can help!"
76. Headache, Cervical Spine and Spinal Manipulation - Part 1
77. Headache, Cervical Spine and Spinal Manipulation - Part 2
78. Open Forum: Q&A with Dr. Cox
79. Osteoporosis: The Neglected Condition - Part 1
80. Osteoporosis: The Neglected Condition - Part 2
81. COX® TECHNIC: The Evidence-Based Neck and Back Pain Relief System
82. NUHS Homecoming Hour 1 – research and cases
83. NUHS Homecoming Hour 2 – research and cases
84. 2017 Case Report Series #1
85. 2017 Case Report Series #2
86. 2017 Case Report Series #3
87. 2017 Case Report Series #4
88. 2017 Case Report Series #5
89. Tell The World: Using Published Papers to Tell The World What Chiropractic Can Do
90. Research Pearls for the Spine Specialist #1
91. Research Pearls for the Spine Specialist #2
92.