

1 **Clinical Practice Guideline: Inversion Therapy**

2
3 **Date of Implementation: June 21, 2007**

4
5 **Product: Specialty**

6
7
8 **GUIDELINES**

9 American Specialty Health – Specialty (ASH) considers inversion therapy as unproven
10 (i.e., a form of traction facilitated by gravity as the patient is either hung or laid upside
11 down typically at an angle of greater than 45° below the horizontal axis) because there is
12 insufficient evidence in the literature to establish long-term safety and clinical
13 effectiveness.

14
15 For more information, see the *Techniques and Procedures Not Widely Supported as*
16 *Evidence Based (CPG 133 – S)* clinical practice guideline.

17
18 Patients must be informed verbally and in writing of the nature of any procedure or
19 treatment technique that is considered experimental/investigational or unproven, poses a
20 significant health and safety risk, and/or is scientifically implausible. If the patient decides
21 to receive such services, they must sign a *Member Billing Acknowledgment Form* (for
22 Medicare use *Advance Beneficiary Notice of Non-Coverage form*) indicating they
23 understand they are assuming financial responsibility for any service-related fees. Further,
24 the patient must sign an attestation indicating that they understand what is known and
25 unknown about, and the possible risks associated with such techniques prior to receiving
26 these services. All procedures, including those considered here, must be documented in the
27 medical record. Finally, prior to using experimental/investigational or unproven
28 procedures, those that pose a significant health and safety risk, and/or those considered
29 scientifically implausible, it is incumbent on the practitioner to confirm that their
30 professional liability insurance covers the use of these techniques or procedures in the event
31 of an adverse outcome.

32
33 **DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND**

34 Inversion therapy is a form of traction facilitated by gravity as the patient is either hung or
35 laid upside down typically at an angle of greater than 45° below the horizontal axis.

36
37 This therapy is used in the treatment of back pain and is believed to help in the
38 decompression of the disks and joints. This therapy takes many forms, from gravity boots
39 to inversion tables the patient lies on before inverting the table.

40
41 The use of inversion therapy for back pain can be traced back to Hippocrates when he
42 found that hanging patients upside down could be therapeutic. The modern use of inversion

1 therapy for back pain was popularized by a physician in the 1960s. The popularity of this
 2 therapy increased greatly by the 1990s and is still used today. Inversion devices can be
 3 bought for the home and are now often used outside the direct supervision of a physician.

4
 5 Contraindications to inversion therapy include hernia, glaucoma, retinal detachment,
 6 conjunctivitis, high blood pressure, recent stroke, heart or circulatory disorders, spinal
 7 injury, cerebral sclerosis, swollen joints, osteoporosis, unhealed fractures, surgically
 8 implanted supports, use of anticoagulants, ear infection, and obesity.

10 **EVIDENCE REVIEW**

11 A review of the literature revealed only a small body of work specific to inversion therapy.
 12 DeVries and Cailliet (1985), Gianakopoulos et al. (1985), Haskvitz and Hanten (1986) and
 13 Nosse et al. (1988) all describe small case control studies evaluating varying aspects of
 14 inversion therapy. DeVries and Cailliet (1985) concluded that inversion had a measurable
 15 effect on neuromuscular tension as measured by EMG. Gianakopoulos et al. (1985) found
 16 that there was some improvement in low back pain in patients who underwent inversion
 17 therapy. Haskvitz and Hanten (1986) found that inversion therapy raised the blood pressure
 18 of patients receiving inversion therapy. Nosse et al. (1988) found that inversion therapy
 19 reduced the depth of low back contour more than sitting. All of these studies are small and
 20 methodologically weak; as such it is difficult to apply their findings to the general
 21 population. However, all four of the papers support the use of inversion therapy.

22
 23 Two RCTs ($n = 69$; $n = 108$) evaluating the effectiveness of inversion therapy combined
 24 with mechanical percussion for treatment of lower pole renal stones after shockwave
 25 lithotripsy (SWL) found positive effects for this therapy compared with observation or
 26 SWL alone (Chiong et al., 2005; Pace et al., 2001). Prasad et al. (2012) sought to study the
 27 feasibility of a randomized controlled trial on the effect of inversion therapy in patients
 28 with single level lumbar discogenic disease, who had been listed for surgery. It was a
 29 prospective randomized controlled trial where patients awaiting surgery for pure lumbar
 30 discogenic disease within the ambit of the pre-stated inclusion/exclusion criteria were
 31 allocated to either physiotherapy or physiotherapy and intermittent traction with an
 32 inversion device. Post-treatment assessment was made at 6 weeks for various outcome
 33 measures. Avoidance of surgery was considered a treatment success. Twenty-six patients
 34 were enrolled and 24 were randomized (13 to inversion + physiotherapy and 11 to
 35 physiotherapy alone [control]). Surgery was avoided in 10 patients (76.9%) in the inversion
 36 group, whereas it was averted in only 2 patients (22.2%) in the control group. Intermittent
 37 traction with an inversion device resulted in a significant reduction in the need for surgery.
 38 Authors suggest that a larger multicenter prospective randomized controlled trial is
 39 justified in patients with sciatica due to single level lumbar disc protrusions. Inversion may
 40 form part of the conservative rehabilitation of patients with single level unilateral lumbar
 41 disc protrusion alongside other forms of physiotherapy.

1 Alternate therapies, such as mechanical traction on a horizontal surface, are more
 2 commonly practiced possibly due to reduced contraindications and lower risk of adverse
 3 events compared to inversion therapy. Lerebours et al. (2017) reported bilateral retinal
 4 detachments with use of an inversion table in a case report. In a case series, Jung et al.
 5 (2021) describes 3 patients with cervical spinal cord injuries sustained from falls while
 6 using inversion tables correctly highlighting the potential danger when utilizing these
 7 devices.

8
 9 Kassay et al. (2023) discusses the risks of inversion table therapy (ITT), the current
 10 regulatory process for ITT, and the need for a better understanding of the role of ITT in the
 11 treatment of spinal pain while optimizing consumer safety. Authors highlight that
 12 according to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) statistics, injuries due to non-
 13 powered traction from various medical devices have been rising since 2011. The FDA has
 14 regulated ITT for only manufacturers that indicated medical use; however, most
 15 manufacturers have not made such medical claims and were exempt from FDA regulation.
 16 Given this, authors express the need for a better understanding of the role of ITT in the
 17 treatment of spinal pain while optimizing consumer safety.

18 **References**

- 19
 20 Chiong E, Hwee ST, Kay LM, Liang S, Kamaraj R, Esuvaranathan K. Randomized
 21 controlled study of mechanical percussion, diuresis, and inversion therapy to assist
 22 passage of lower pole renal calculi after shock wave lithotripsy. *Urology*.
 23 2005;65(6):1070-1074. doi:10.1016/j.urology.2004.12.045
 24
 25 Clarke J, van Tulder M, Blomberg S, de Vet H, van der Heijden G, Bronfort G. Traction
 26 for low back pain with or without sciatica: an updated systematic review within the
 27 framework of the Cochrane collaboration. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2006;31(14):1591-
 28 1599. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000222043.09835.72
 29
 30 deVries HA, Cailliet R. Vagotonic effect of inversion therapy upon resting neuromuscular
 31 tension. *Am J Phys Med*. 1985;64(3):119-129
 32
 33 Gianakopoulos G, Waylonis GW, Grant PA, Tottle DO, Blazek JV. Inversion devices: their
 34 role in producing lumbar distraction. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1985;66(2):100-102
 35
 36 Haskvitz EM, Hanten WP. Blood pressure response to inversion traction. *Phys Ther*.
 37 1986;66(9):1361-1364. doi:10.1093/ptj/66.9.1361
 38
 39 Jung SH, Hwang JM, Kim CH. Inversion Table Fall Injury, the Phantom Menace: Three
 40 Case Reports on Cervical Spinal Cord Injury. *Healthcare (Basel)*. 2021;9(5):492.
 41 Published 2021 Apr 22. doi:10.3390/healthcare9050492

- 1 Kassay A, Soliman MAR, Jhawar BS. Recommendations for inversion table therapy.
2 Disabil Rehabil. 2023;45(22):3779-3782. doi:10.1080/09638288.2022.2133174
3
- 4 Lerebours VC, Rohl AJ, Shaikh S. Bilateral Retinal Detachments Associated with
5 Inversion Table Therapy. Cureus. 2017;9(3):e1098. Published 2017 Mar 15.
6 doi:10.7759/cureus.1098
7
- 8 Nosse LJ, Sobush DC, McCrimmon C. Spinal effects of head-down tilting. Part 1--Low
9 back contour changes. Phys Ther. 1988;68(1):60-66. doi:10.1093/ptj/68.1.60
10
- 11 Pace KT, Tariq N, Dyer SJ, Weir MJ, D'A Honey RJ. Mechanical percussion, inversion
12 and diuresis for residual lower pole fragments after shock wave lithotripsy: a
13 prospective, single blind, randomized controlled trial. J Urol. 2001;166(6):2065-2071
14
- 15 Prasad KS, Gregson BA, Hargreaves G, Byrnes T, Winburn P, Mendelow AD. Inversion
16 therapy in patients with pure single level lumbar discogenic disease: a pilot randomized
17 trial. Disabil Rehabil. 2012;34(17):1473-1480. doi:10.3109/09638288.2011.647231
18
- 19 van der Heijden GJ, Beurskens AJ, Koes BW, Assendelft WJ, de Vet HC, Bouter LM. The
20 efficacy of traction for back and neck pain: a systematic, blinded review of randomized
21 clinical trial methods. Phys Ther. 1995;75(2):93-104. doi:10.1093/ptj/75.2.93