

A COMPARISON OF NECK MOVEMENT IN THE SOFT CERVICAL COLLAR AND RIGID CERVICAL BRACE IN HEALTHY SUBJECTS

Katherine L. Whitcroft, BSc,^a Laura Massouh, BSc,^a Rouin Amirfeyz, FRCS (Trauma & Orth),^b and Gordon C. Bannister, MD^c

ABSTRACT

Objective: The soft cervical collar has been prescribed for whiplash injury but has been shown to be clinically ineffective. As some authors report superior results for managing whiplash injury with a cervical brace, we were interested in comparing the mechanical effectiveness of the soft collar with a rigid cervical brace. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to measure ranges of motion in subjects without neck pain using a soft cervical collar and a rigid brace compared with no orthosis.

Methods: Fifty healthy subjects (no neck or shoulder pain) aged 22 to 67 years were recruited for this study. Neck movement was measured using a cervical range of motion goniometer. Active flexion, extension, right and left lateral flexion, and right and left rotation were assessed in each subject under 3 conditions: no collar, a soft collar, and a rigid cervical brace.

Results: The soft collar and rigid brace reduced neck movement compared with no brace or collar, but the cervical brace was more effective at reducing motion. The soft collar reduced movement on average by 17.4%; and the cervical brace, by 62.9%. The effect of the orthoses was not affected by age, although older subjects had stiffer necks.

Conclusion: Based on the data of the 50 subjects presented in this study, the soft cervical collar did not adequately immobilize the cervical spine. (J Manipulative Physiol Ther 2011;34:119-122)

Key Indexing Terms: *Whiplash Injuries; Spine; Orthotic Devices*

Whiplash injury has increased in prevalence since the introduction of seatbelt legislation.¹ Some 5% of the population² are affected, of whom 40% remain symptomatic after 2 years.³ Of the treatments for whiplash injury, evidence from randomized controlled trials supports nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs,⁴ manipulation,⁵⁻¹² supervised exercise,¹³ and self-mobilization.¹⁴⁻¹⁸ Although the soft cervical collar is inferior to all other treatments and may produce harm, it is still prescribed regularly.^{9,16,19}

Soft cervical collars fail to restrict movement in 3 of the 6 planes of neck movement²⁰ but seem to be effective in doing so in most acts of daily living. Two older studies suggest that a rigid cervical brace is effective for severe cervical injuries,^{21,22} but more recent work suggests that cervical collars are no more effective than acting as usual or active mobilization.²³ Other studies have shown that using cervical collars produce more harm than help and that active mobilization is superior to the cervical collars in reducing pain and disability for whiplash injury especially in the long term.^{9,13,14}

Because soft cervical collars have been prescribed for whiplash injury but have been proven ineffective and as some authors report superior results for whiplash injury with a cervical brace, we were interested in comparing the mechanical effects of the soft collar with a rigid cervical brace on ranges of motion. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to measure ranges of motion in subjects without neck pain using a soft cervical collar or a rigid brace compared with no orthosis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Approval for this study was obtained from the local Research Ethics Committee at the University of Bristol.

^a Student, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

^b Specialist Registrar in Trauma & Orthopaedics, Orthopaedic Department, Bristol Royal Infirmary, Bristol, UK.

^c Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Avon Orthopaedic Centre, Bristol, UK.

Submit requests for reprints to: Rouin Amirfeyz, FRCS (Trauma & Orth), Specialist Registrar in Trauma & Orthopaedics, Orthopaedic Department, Level 5, Queen's Bldg, Bristol Royal Infirmary, Bristol BS2 8HW, UK (e-mail: ramirfeyz@yahoo.com).

Paper submitted March 9, 2010; in revised form November 8, 2010.

0161-4754/\$36.00

Copyright © 2011 by National University of Health Sciences. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2010.12.007

Subjects

Fifty subjects were recruited from outpatient clinics of a variety of specialities that they were attending for reasons other than neck, shoulder, or spinal disorder. All subjects gave consent to participate in this study; 20 were male, and 30 were female. Subjects were excluded from this study if they had shoulder or neck pain or pathology but not for neck stiffness. The range of neck movement was measured first without any orthosis and acted as the baseline. Their range of neck movement was then measured wearing first a soft cervical collar and then a cervical brace.

Instrumentation and Training

Neck movement was measured with the “cervical range of motion (CROM) goniometer.” The CROM goniometer is a reliable CROM measurement device and, compared with radiographic, computerized tracking and optoelectronic measurement methods, has “good to excellent” criterion validity.¹⁶⁻²²

The CROM goniometer measures CROM in the coronal, sagittal, and transverse planes using separate orthogonally positioned inclinometers. The coronal and sagittal inclinometers, which measure lateral flexion and flexion/extension, respectively, are gravity dependent. The transverse inclinometer works as a compass goniometer and measures axial rotation. Participants were therefore required to wear a magnetic yoke mounted on their shoulders. The CROM goniometer sits on the head like a pair of glasses and is held in place with straps behind over the occipital region.

The orthoses used included a soft cervical collar (Vulkan Medicollar; Mobilis Healthcare Group Ltd, 100 Shaw Rd, Oldham, Lancashire, OL1 4AY) and a cervical brace (Combi Collar; RSL Steeper, Hugh Steeper Ltd, Leeds Manufacturing Centre, Unit 17, Hunsleat Trading Estate, Severn Rd, Leeds LS10 1BL).

Data were collected by the first 2 authors who were trained to use of the orthoses by the resident hospital orthotist and the CROM goniometer by the senior author before undertaking the study.

Validation of Procedure

To validate the study procedure, the effects of “warm-up” and “fatigue” on CROM and the degree of interobserver variation were first assessed.

Warm-Up and Fatigue

The effect of “warm-up” and “fatigue” was established by measuring 20 consecutive neck movements in flexion and extension in 5 participants with the CROM goniometer.

Interobserver Error. To assess interobserver error, one subject was asked to perform 10 full cycles of active cervical movements. These included maximal flexion,

extension, right and left lateral flexion, and right and left axial rotation. Range of motion was measured using the CROM goniometer, from which the 2 investigators took recordings simultaneously. Therefore, 60 measurements per investigator were obtained from the same subject for comparison.

Method

Each subject sat on a metal-framed chair with a backrest that provided support for the thoracic spine but with no arm supports. Their feet were flat on the floor, and their arms were positioned comfortably by their side. They were asked to sit upright and to maintain this posture throughout the procedure.

Using the CROM goniometer, through one cycle of movement, maximal active cervical flexion, extension, right and left lateral flexion, and right and left axial rotation were measured with no collar (control), a soft collar, and the rigid brace. Data were collected by the first 2 authors, each of whom took measurements from 25 alternate subjects.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using the SPSS 13.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL).

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to establish data normality. Interobserver variance was assessed by calculating intraclass correlation coefficients.

The degree of immobilization provided by each collar was calculated using the general linear model. Bivariate analysis was used to determine whether age affected the proportion of restriction caused by the 2 collars. Finally, the effect of age on CROM was determined by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient.

RESULTS

Subjects

Ages ranged from 22 to 67 (mean, 43) years. There were 10 subjects in each age range from 20 to 29, 30 to 39, 40 to 49, 50 to 59, and 60 to 69. Data were normally distributed.

Effect of Warm-Up

There was no “warm-up” or “fatigue” effect ($P = .494$).

Interobserver Agreement

There was a high level of interobserver agreement. Extension showed the strongest agreement; and lateral flexion, the weakest (intraclass correlation coefficients of 0.93 and 0.66, respectively).

Effect of Control, Soft Collar, and Cervical Brace. Compared with no orthoses, the soft collar produced a mean reduction of neck movement of 17.4% ($P < .001$); and the cervical brace,

Table 1. Mean neck movement for no orthosis, soft collar, and cervical brace for 50 subjects

Degrees of mean neck movement (% of CROM with no orthosis)			
CROM	No orthosis	Soft collar	Cervical brace
Flexion	50.7	39.7 (78%)	7.6 (15%)
Extension	62.3	51.1 (82%)	24.7 (40%)
Right lateral flexion	39.5	33.7 (85%)	22.0 (56%)
Left lateral flexion	43.6	38.6 (89%)	26.6 (61%)
Right rotation	65.6	51.8 (79%)	17.0 (26%)
Left rotation	65.1	52.8 (80%)	15.6 (24%)

62.9% ($P < .001$). The mean residual range of motion wearing the soft collar was 82.6%, and that with the brace was 37.1% (Table 1).

Effect of Age

Older subjects had a stiffer neck in terms of flexion, extension, and lateral flexions ($P = .01-.047$) but not rotation ($P = .127$ and $.143$). Application of the hard collar removed the observed differences caused by age ($P = .148-.942$), whereas the soft collar only limited flexion. Hence, no difference was seen between the age groups with regard to flexion (.162); but there was no effect on the other movements between the age groups.

DISCUSSION

The soft cervical collar is the least effective treatment of whiplash injury.^{23,24} At best, the results of the soft cervical collar equate to no intervention¹⁵ or standard physiotherapy.^{14,25} It is worse than early exercise¹³⁻¹⁸ or mobilization.⁹ A recent trial of the cervical brace comparing immobilization of the cervical spine with a rigid collar followed by active mobilization, advice to “act-as-usual,” and an active mobilization program showed that these treatment strategies had similar results.²³

Although both orthoses reduced neck movement in this study, the amount by which the soft cervical collar immobilized the neck was clinically not substantial because many routine daily tasks require only 30% to 50% of full neck movement.²⁶ The soft cervical collar allowed a mean of 82.6% of full neck range and therefore did not immobilize the neck sufficiently to prevent the movements associated with routine acts of daily living. By contrast, the rigid cervical brace permitted a mean of 37.1% of full neck range, which would limit such movements as tying shoe laces, reversing a car, and washing hair in the shower.

Flexion-extension is the most frequent movement of the cervical spine.²⁷ The cervical brace restricted flexion to 7.6°, but the soft collar allowed 39.7° and failed to restrict movement in the sagittal plane sufficiently to prevent any of the functional tasks described above.²⁶ These are similar findings as to those found by Johnson et al.²⁸ It follows that

the soft cervical collar failed to prevent a substantial proportion of neck movement and therefore appears to have no place in the severely injured neck that requires stabilization. As Muzin et al suggest,²⁹ there is controversy surrounding collar use to treat whiplash patients, rigid braces may have a role for acute management of traumatic cervical injuries such as fractures, and more studies are needed to best match orthoses with patient conditions.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are that measurements were performed on healthy volunteers and measured the range of neck movement rather than acts of daily living. To measure impact on whiplash, ideally, the subjects would have been patients with whiplash injuries who responded poorly to physical therapy; and the outcome measure would have been pain, neck disability, and restriction in acts of daily living. It would no longer be ethical to randomize patients with untreated whiplash injury to a therapeutic trial that included an arm prescribing the soft cervical collar alone. As well, these 50 subjects may not necessarily be representative of the general public; therefore, caution should be used when extrapolating to other populations. Because clinical outcomes were not measured, no clinical effectiveness can be implied.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data of the 50 subjects presented in this study, the soft cervical collar did not adequately immobilize the cervical spine.

FUNDING SOURCES AND POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Funds were provided from Dr Rouin Amirfeyz’s University Discretionary Fund. No conflicts of interest were reported for this study.

REFERENCES

- Galasko CSB, Murray P, Stephenson W. Incidence of whiplash-associated disorder. *BC Med J* 2002;44:237-40.
- Hamer AJ, Gargan MF, Bannister GC, Nelson RJ. Whiplash injury and surgically treated cervical disc disease. *Injury* 1993; 24:549-50.
- Bannister G, Amirfeyz R, Kelley S, Gargan M. Whiplash injury. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2009;91:845-50.
- Szpalski M, Gunzburg R, Soeur M, Bauherz G, Hayez JP, Michel F. Pharmacological interventions in whiplash associated disorders. In: Gunzburg R, Szpalski M, editors. Whiplash injuries, current concepts in prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of the cervical whiplash syndrome. Philadelphia, New York: Lippincott-Raven; 1998. p. 175-81.
- Verhagen AP, Peeters GG, de Bie RA, Oostendorp RA. Conservative treatment for whiplash. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2001;4:CD003338.

6. Scholten-Peeters GG, Bekkering GE, Verhagen AP, van Der Windt DA, Lanser K, Hendriks EJ, Oostendorp RA. Clinical practice guideline for the physiotherapy of patients with whiplash-associated disorders. *Spine* 2002;27:412-22.
7. Verhagen AP, Scholten-Peeters GG, de Bie RA, Bierma-Zeinstra SM. Conservative treatments for whiplash. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2004;CD003338.
8. Conlin A, Bhogal S, Sequeira K, et al. Treatment of whiplash-associated disorders—part I: noninvasive interventions. *Pain Res Manag* 2005;10:21-32.
9. Mealy K, Brennan H, Fenelon GC. Early mobilisation of acute whiplash injuries. *Br Med J* 1986;292:656-7.
10. Provinciali L, Baroni M, Illuminati L, et al. Multimodal treatment to prevent the late whiplash syndrome. *Scand J Rehabil Med* 1996;28:105-11.
11. Fernandez-de-las-Penas C, Fernandez-Carnero J, Palomeque del Cerro L, Miangolarra-Page JC. Manipulative treatment vs conventional physiotherapy treatment in whiplash injury: a randomized controlled trial. *J Whip Rel Dis* 2004;3:73-90.
12. Fernandez-de-las-Penas C, Fernandez-Carnero J, Fernandez AP, Lomas-Vega R, Miangolarra-Page JC. Dorsal manipulation in whiplash injury treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *J Whip Rel Dis* 2004;3:55-72.
13. Schnabel M, Ferrari R, Vassiliou T, Kaluza G. Randomised, controlled outcome study of active mobilisation compared with collar therapy for whiplash injury. *Emerg Med J* 2004;21:306-10.
14. McKinney LA. Early mobilisation and outcome in acute sprains of the neck. *BMJ* 1989;299:1006-8.
15. Borchgrevink GE, Kaasa A, McDonagh D, Stiles TC, Haraldseth O, Lereim I. Acute treatment of whiplash neck sprain injuries. A randomized trial of treatment during the first 14 days after a car accident. *Spine* 1998;23:25-31.
16. Bonk AD, Ferrari R, Giebel GD, Edelmann M, Huser R. Prospective, randomized, controlled study of activity versus collar, and the natural history for whiplash injury, in Germany. *J Musculoskelet Pain* 2000;8:123-32.
17. Rosenfeld M, Gunnarsson R, Borenstein P. Early intervention in whiplash-associated disorders: a comparison of two treatment protocols. *Spine* 2000;25:1782-7.
18. Crawford JR, Khan RJ, Varley GW. Early management and outcome following soft tissue injuries of the neck—a randomised controlled trial. *Injury* 2004;35:891-5.
19. Logan AJ, Holt MD. Management of whiplash injuries presenting to accident and emergency departments in Wales. *Emerg Med J* 2003;20:354-5.
20. Miller CP, Bible JE, Jegede KA, Whang PG, Grauer JN. Soft and rigid collars provide similar restriction on cervical range of motion during fifteen activities of daily living. *Spine* 2010;35:1271-8.
21. Gurumoorthy DA. Study of neck injury arising from motor vehicle accidents and its clinical management. Perth, Western Australia: Curtin University of Technology School of Physiotherapy; 1996. Available from: <http://adt.curtin.edu.au/theses/available/adt-WCU20021125.111039/unrestricted/01Front.pdf>.
22. Janes JM, Hooshmand H. Severe extension-flexion injuries of the cervical spine. *Mayo Clin Proc* 1965;40:353-69.
23. Kongsted A, Qerama E, Kasch H, Bendix T, Bach FW, Korsholm L, Jensen TS. Neck collar, 'act-as-usual' or active mobilisation for whiplash injury? A randomised parallel-group trial. *Spine* 2007;32:618-26.
24. Verhagen AP, Scholten-Peeters GG, van Wijngaarden S, de Bie RA, Bierma-Zeinstra SM. Conservative treatments for whiplash. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007; Apr 18(2):CD003338.
25. Pennie BH, Agambar LJ. Whiplash injuries: a trial of early management. *J Bone Joint Surg* 1990;72:277-9.
26. Carter VM, Fasen JA, Roman JM, Hayes KW, Petersen CM. The effect of a soft collar, used as normally recommended or reversed, on three planes of cervical range of movement. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 1996;23:209-15.
27. Bennett SE, Schenk RJ, Simmons ED. Active range of motion utilized in the cervical spine to perform daily functional tasks. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2002;15:307-11.
28. Johnson RM, Hart DL, Simmons EF, Ramsby GR, Southwick WO. Cervical orthoses. A study comparing their effectiveness in restricting cervical motion in normal subjects. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1977;59:332-9.
29. Muzin S, Isaac Z, Walker J, Abd OE, Baima J. When should a cervical collar be used to treat neck pain? *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med* 2008;1:114-9.