

1 **Clinical Practice Guideline**                      **Functional Leg Length Assessment**

2  
3 **Date of Implementation:**                      **July 13, 2006**

4  
5 **Product:**    **Specialty**

---

6  
7  
8 **GUIDELINES**

9 American Specialty Health, Inc. (ASH) considers functional leg length assessment  
10 unproven for the purpose of validating subluxation (segmental joint dysfunction). It is not  
11 established as having diagnostic utility. Due to the extent of variability in specificity and  
12 reliability of observation (subjectivity), this procedure cannot be relied upon to definitively  
13 diagnose mechanical dysfunction.

14  
15 **DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND**

16 When a subject lies prone or supine, the feet are examined for the presence of a “short  
17 leg” or alignment asymmetry. This *functional* leg length inequality (LLI) is in contrast to  
18 *anatomical* leg-length inequality in which there are actual differences in the length and  
19 geometry of the osseous structures of the lower extremity. The theory behind leg length  
20 analysis is that various spinal misalignments (subluxations) or other biomechanical  
21 disorders will manifest as changes in functional leg length.

22  
23 The most commonly used procedure involves the patient lying prone on the adjusting table.  
24 After a series of movements and maneuvers designed to eliminate any false findings, and  
25 after applying a slight cephalad pressure on the feet, the relative position of the patient’s  
26 heels is compared. Additional maneuvers are typically performed, including flexing the  
27 legs to 90°, rotating the head, and applying pressure at various points on the spine  
28 (challenges) while observing changes in LLI.

29  
30 The evaluation of LLI is predicated upon the occurrence of changes in functional leg length  
31 that result from pelvic distortions. The posterior rotation of the innominate bone at the  
32 sacroiliac joint is believed to result in swinging the acetabulum superiorly relative to the  
33 opposite acetabulum. The leg on the side of the superior acetabulum is thereby caused to  
34 be functionally short. Other theories posit that muscular imbalances, rather than articular  
35 dysfunction, result in a functionally short leg (Cooperstein & Gleberzon, 2004).

36  
37 The evaluation of LLI is also used by some practitioners as an outcome measure. Upon the  
38 administration of a particular corrective procedure, the leg lengths are re-checked and, if  
39 the inequality has vanished, it is presumed that the underlying disorder has been resolved.

## 1 EVIDENCE REVIEW

2 There are several challenges to interpreting the scientific evidence on functional leg-length  
3 assessment. The first is that there is no consensus on the method of analysis or on the  
4 interpretation of results. Several different systems employ some variation of LLI testing;  
5 each with their own interpretation of the results.

6  
7 Additionally, there are three levels of scientific evidence necessary to evaluate this  
8 procedure:

- 9 1. *Reliability*. Can the same or different examiners obtain the same findings on repeated  
10 measures of the same subject?
- 11 2. *Validity*. Do the leg length differences found actually reflect real functional  
12 differences in leg length?
- 13 3. *Clinical utility*. Do the findings of functional leg length differences and the  
14 subsequent therapeutic decisions that follow result in improved patient outcomes?

### 15 Reliability

16 The evidence on reliability is mixed. Cooperstein et al. has shown that when LLI is  
17 artificially created for the purposes of evaluating testing procedures, a very high degree of  
18 reliability can be achieved (Cooperstein, Morschhauser, Lisi, & Nick, 2003). However, the  
19 evidence does not support the finding that it is possible to differentiate functional from  
20 anatomic LLI. Other studies on intra- and inter-examiner reliability have found varying  
21 degrees of concordance, but many of the positive results have been called in to question  
22 over methodological and analytical deficiencies of the studies. Overall, the literature  
23 suggests that it should be possible to achieve a reasonable level of reliability, although  
24 inconsistencies in methods, training, and experience have not resulted in a reliable  
25 procedure (Cooperstein & Lisi, 2000; Friberg, 1983; Gross, Burns, Chapman, Hudson,  
26 Curtis, Lehmann, & Renner, 1998; Hoikka, Ylikoski, & Tallroth, 1989; Jansen &  
27 Cooperstein, 1998; Knutson, 2005; Knutson, 2005; Rhodes, Mansfield, Bishop, & Smith,  
28 1995; Soukka, Alaranta, Tallroth, & Heliovaara, 1991).

### 29 Validity

30 Are functional LLI findings real? Cooperstein et al. argues that in order for the pelvic  
31 torsion to occur to a sufficient degree to produce a measurable LLI it would be necessary  
32 to totally disrupt the symphysis pubis; if the sacro-iliac joint movement is occurring so as  
33 to produce LLI, motion must also be occurring at the symphysis which could not occur  
34 without significant structural damage (Cooperstein et al., 2003). Many would also argue  
35 that there is not even sufficient potential sacro-iliac motion necessary to produce pelvic  
36 torsion and thereby an LLI.  
37  
38

39  
40 There are also theoretical problems with a muscular-imbalance mechanism of LLI. *If*  
41 muscular hypertonicity caused LLI in an unloaded position (prone or supine) and if the  
42 pelvis itself remains in normal alignment, then upon assuming weight bearing position the

1 LLI must vanish; to do otherwise would require, “picking up one’s leg by the bootstraps.”  
2 Knutson has concluded that at least in the unloaded position, it is likely that functional  
3 LLIs do exist.

#### 4 5 **Clinical Utility**

6 A review of the literature concluded that the prevalence of anatomic LLI (as identified on  
7 x-ray) was 90% with a mean difference in length of 5.21 mm. The review concludes that  
8 there is no likely clinical significance for these very small differences in leg-length  
9 (Knutson, 2005; Knutson, 2005). It further concluded that anatomic LLI must reach 20 mm  
10 (about 3/4”) to become clinically meaningful. However, there is essentially no information  
11 indicating that functional LLI (if it exists) is associated with clinical back pain or other  
12 complaints. There is also no evidence that therapy directed by findings of the Derifield leg  
13 check, or any other similar procedure will improve clinical outcomes. (Please note that this  
14 represents an absence of evidence, rather than evidence of ineffectiveness.) Despite the  
15 above findings, Havran et al. (2016) presented an article on leg length discrepancy (LLD)  
16 with an algorithm outlining approaches to diagnosis and management of LLD in older  
17 adults, along with a representative clinical case. Using a modified Delphi approach, the  
18 LLD evaluation and treatment algorithm was developed by a multidisciplinary expert panel  
19 representing expertise in physical therapy, geriatric medicine, and physical medicine and  
20 rehabilitation. The materials were subsequently refined through an iterative process of  
21 input from a primary care provider panel comprised of VA and non-VA providers. Authors  
22 believe that in older adults, LLD can be an important contributor to CLBP. They believe  
23 that to promote a patient-centered approach, providers should consider evaluating for leg  
24 length discrepancy when treating older adults with CLBP to help diminish pain and  
25 disability, regardless of previous insufficient findings to support LLD as a cause of low  
26 back pain.

27  
28 Applebaum et al. (2021) completed an overview and spinal implications of leg length  
29 discrepancy (LLD) in a narrative review. LLD occurs when the paired lower extremities  
30 are unequal in length and can be etiologically classified as functional or structural. Length  
31 differences are typically less than 10 mm and asymptomatic or easily compensated for by  
32 the patient through self-lengthening or shortening of the lower extremities. LLD can be  
33 assessed directly through tape measurements or indirectly through palpation of bony  
34 landmarks, but poor validity and reliability of these measures exist. Imaging modalities,  
35 specifically radiography, are more precise and help identify coexistent deformity. Once  
36 LLD has been diagnosed, evaluation for potential adverse complications is necessary.  
37 Discrepancies greater than 20 mm can alter biomechanics and loading patterns with  
38 resultant functional limitations and musculoskeletal disorders, such as functional scoliosis.  
39 Long-standing LLD and functional scoliosis often result in permanent degenerative  
40 changes in the facet joints and intervertebral discs of the spine. Further understanding of  
41 the contribution of LLD in the development of scoliosis and degenerative spine disease

1 will allow for more effective preventative treatment strategies and hasten return to  
2 function. Use of LLD for diagnosis of subluxation is not appropriate.

3  
4 There are no safety concerns associated with the use of the procedure. There is the potential  
5 risk of substitution harm if LLI tests are used in place of physical/neurological examination  
6 techniques with demonstrated diagnostic utility.

## 7 8 **References**

9 Applebaum, A., Nessim, A., & Cho, W. (2021). Overview and Spinal Implications of Leg  
10 Length Discrepancy: Narrative Review. *Clinics in orthopedic surgery*, 13(2), 127–  
11 134. <https://doi.org/10.4055/cios20224>

12  
13 Cooperstein, R., & Gleberzon, B. (2004). Core chiropractic diagnostic/assessment  
14 procedures: leg checking, manual. In *Technique systems in chiropractic*. (pp. 23-30).  
15 London: Churchill Livingstone.

16  
17 Cooperstein, R. & Lisi, A. (2000, September). Pelvic torsion: anatomic considerations,  
18 construct validity, and chiropractic examination procedures. *Topics in Clinical*  
19 *Chiropractic*,(7):3, 38-49.

20  
21 Cooperstein, R., Morschhauser, E., Lisi, A., & Nick, T.G. (2003, November-December).  
22 Validity of compressive leg checking in measuring artificial leg-length inequality.  
23 *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutic*, (26):9, 557-66.

24  
25 Friberg, O. (1983, September). Clinical symptoms and biomechanics of lumbar spine and  
26 hip joint in leg length inequality. *Spine*, (8):6, 643-651.

27  
28 Gross, M.T., Burns, C.B., Chapman, S.W., Hudson, C.J., Curtis, H.S., Lehmann, J.R., &  
29 Renner, J.B. (1998, April). Reliability and validity of rigid lift and pelvic leveling  
30 device method in assessing functional leg length inequality. *Journal of Orthopedic and*  
31 *Sports Physical Therapy*, (27):4, 285-294.

32  
33 Havran, M., Scholten, J. D., Breuer, P., Lundberg, J., Kochersberger, G., Newman, D., &  
34 Weiner, D. K. (2016). Deconstructing Chronic Low Back Pain in the Older Adult-Step-  
35 by-Step Evidence and Expert-Based Recommendations for Evaluation and Treatment:  
36 Part XII: Leg Length Discrepancy. *Pain medicine (Malden, Mass.)*, 17(12), 2230–  
37 2237. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnw270>

38  
39 Hoikka, V., Ylikoski, M., & Tallroth, K. (1989). Leg-length inequality has poor correlation  
40 with lumbar scoliosis. *Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery*; (108):3, 173-75.

- 1 Jansen R.D. & Cooperstein, R. (1998, January). Measurement of soft tissue strain in  
2 response to consecutively increased compressive and distractive loads on a friction-  
3 based test bed. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutic*, (21):1, 19-26.  
4
- 5 Knutson, G. (2005, July). Anatomic and functional leg-length inequality: A review and  
6 recommendation for clinical decision-making. Part I, anatomic leg-length inequality:  
7 prevalence, magnitude, effects and clinical significance. *Chiropractic & Osteopathy*,  
8 (13):11.  
9
- 10 Knutson, G. (2005, July). Anatomic and functional leg-length inequality: A review and  
11 recommendation for clinical decision-making. Part II, the functional or unloaded leg-  
12 length asymmetry. *Chiropractic & Osteopathy*, (13):12.  
13
- 14 Rhodes, D.W., Mansfield, E.R., Bishop, P.A., & Smith, J.F. (1995, July-August). The  
15 validity of the prone leg check as an estimate of standing leg length inequality  
16 measured by x-ray. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutic*, (18):6,  
17 343-346.  
18
- 19 Soukka, A., Alaranta, H., Tallroth, K., & Heliovaara, M. (1991, April). Leg-length  
20 inequality in people of working age. The association between mild inequality and low-  
21 back pain is questionable. *Spine*, (16):4, 429-431.