Clinical Research on Foot & Ankle

McPoil et al. Clin Res Foot Ankle 2013, 1:1
DOI: 10.4172/2329-910X.1000104

Research Article Open Access

The Optimal Method to Assess the Vertical Mobility of the Midfoot: Navicular Drop versus Dorsal Arch Height Difference?

Thomas G. McPoil[1*], Mark W. Cornwall[2], Monica G. Abeler[1], Kelsey J. Devereaux[1], Laura J. Flood[1], Shannon E. Merriman[1], Sara Sullivan[2], Michael J. van Der Laan[1], Tiffany A. Villadiego[1] and Karie Wilson[2]

[1]School of Physical Therapy, Rueckert-Hartman College for Health Professions, Regis University, Denver, CO, USA
[2]Department of Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, College of Health and Human Services, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA

Ke words: R ab a a A a a a

Introduction

a a b a
a a a a a a a a a . Ba

– º · ¼ ¥ ³ Á ™ ½ ½ Â ” ¼ ¹ º ³
œ ¦ ¦ ¡ « – ¥ ™ ” ¯ ¼ ½ ¾ ³ ¼ ¯ ± ± ³ Á Á ¸ ½ Ã À ¼ ¯ º

© ½ º Ã » ³ Ú œ Á Á

a b a a a a aa .

Methods

Participant characteristics

a - a a (107 a a a) a .P a a a a 1) R U a a D , a (R -) a 2) A aU a a F a a , A a (N -AZ). A a a a 1) a x 2) x a 3) a a a x) b a , - b a a , a x a , a x , a x a) a a a , x , b a a a 6 a a . a b a a a D a 102 a 0 a a a F a a . b a a a a a a 107 a , . a a 1 2 a a a 26.3 ± .2 a a a 20 a . a a a a a a a 2 .6 ± 3. a 27.2 ± .3 a , . I a R B a R U a A U a aa a a a a a a a .

Instrumentation

T a a a a . b a a a (M #700-126, M A a , A a, I 60 02) x a a a 1.2 .0 10.0 a b a a . A T 0.0( )7 .0 ( )- -(-1 ( )-3(12( )-6- ( )12( )10( )6( )- (

(D -R) a a b a a (F 1). x , a a b a a a a a a a a a - b . a a a a a b a (-R) a a b a a (F 3). a a a b a a a a b a a a a a a a a a a a b a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a b W a b a b ( ) (( ) ( ) a - ( ) ( ) 12((( )10([(a)11( )-3)1(a)1 ( )12( )6([( )10(6)6(

ab a . a a a a a a a a ab a (M #2117 62, A a a , a B , IL 60 23) a a (F 3).

Procedures

a b a a a b a a a a , b a a a , a a a a b a a a a b a a a a b a b a (F) [1]. p b a a , a b a a a a a a a b a a a a a a 1 .2 a a . b a a , b a a a a b a a b a a b b a . T a a a b a ba a a a a a a ba , a a x , a (F). x , a a a 0% a a a b a a b a a a b . T 0% a , a a a a a b a a 0% a a - b . a b a a a 0% a a a a

Citation: McPoil TG, Cornwall MW, Abeler MG, Devereaux KJ, Flood LJ, et al. (2013) The Optimal Method to Assess the Vertical Mobility of the Midfoot: Navicular Drop versus Dorsal Arch Height Difference? Clin Res Foot Ankle 1: 104. doi:10.4172/2329-910X.1000104

Determination of reliabilit

Data anal sis

Results

REGIS-CO	Rater 1 (experience 0 years)			Rater 2 (experience 5 years)			Rater 3 (experience 37 years)		
	ICC	Mean	SEM	ICC	Mean	SEM	ICC	Mean	SEM
NH Resting	0.91	45.75	1.80	0.95	45.85	1.30	0.96	44.14	1.10
NH SJN	0.83	48.06	2.30	0.93	50.29	1.40	0.91	49.07	1.60
DAH Resting	0.95	63.80	1.30	0.95	62.63	1.20	0.96	63.62	1.00
DAH NWB	0.93	71.91	1.60	0.94	72.10	1.50	0.94	73.40	1.50
NAU-AZ	Rater 1 (experience 0 years)			Rater 2 (experience 0 years)			Rater 3 (experience 35 years)		
	ICC	Mean	SEM	ICC	Mean	SEM	ICC	Mean	SEM
NH Resting	0.95	45.85	1.60	0.92	45.53	2.00	0.92	45.62	1.80
NH SJN	0.88	50.50	2.10	0.88	49.33	1.90	0.85	48.94	1.90
DAH Resting	0.96	62.82	1.00	0.95	64.32	1.10	0.98	64.99	0.80
DAH NWB	0.95	74.13	1.30	0.93	73.57	1.50	0.97	74.89	1.10

Note: NH: Navicular Height; SJN: Subtalar Joint Neutral; DAH: Dorsal Arch Height; NWB: Non-Weight Bearing

Table 1: Between-session intu ntu " "