

[J Chiropr Med.](#) 2003 Summer; 2(3): 102–106.

Published online 2003. doi: [10.1016/S0899-3467\(07\)60053-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60053-6)

PMCID: PMC2646968

PMID: [19674603](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19674603/)

The relationship between pelvic block placement and radiographic pelvic analysis

[Robert D. Klingensmith](#)^a and [Charles L. Blumb](#),*

[Author information](#) [Article notes](#) [Copyright and License information](#) [Disclaimer](#)

Abstract

Objective

In this current study, radiographs were taken to determine whether pelvic distortions could be demonstrated on x-ray when pelvic blocks were placed under the patient in the prone position.

Methods

One patient was placed prone in a neutral position and radiographs were taken in a neutral position, and then with a pair of pelvic blocks placed under the subject in each of 4 different positions: (Right Short Leg - Category One) left iliac crest, right greater trochanter; (Left short Leg – Category One) right iliac crest, left greater trochanter; (SB+) left and right iliac crests; and (SB–) left and right greater trochanters.

Results

Findings indicated that pelvic block placement could create or affect distortions of the pelvis.

Conclusion

Further studies are indicated correlating radiographic analysis, pain provocation, and muscle strength to determine if a clear pelvic block preference can be determined definitively.

Key Indexing Terms: Chiropractic, Pelvis, Pain

References

1. Lisi AJ, Cooperstein R. A pilot study of provocation testing with pelvic wedges: Can prone blocking demonstrate a directional preference? Proceedings of the ACC Conference IX. *J Chiropr Ed.* 2002;16:30–31. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
2. DeJarnette MB. *Sacro occipital technic*. Privately Published; Nebraska City, NB: 1984. pp. 1–23. [[Google Scholar](#)]
3. Mannelo DM. Leg length inequality. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 1992;15:576–590. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
4. Cooperstein R. Padded wedges for lumbopelvic mechanical analysis. *J Am chiropr Assoc.* 2000:24–26. [[Google Scholar](#)]
5. Unger JF. The effect of a pelvic blocking procedure upon muscle strength: a pilot study. *Chiropr Technique.* 1999;10:150–155. [[Google Scholar](#)]
6. Cooperstein R, Lisi A. Pelvic torsion: anatomic considerations, construct validity, and chiropractic examination procedures. *Top Clin Chiro.* 2000;7:38–49. [[Google Scholar](#)]
7. Cummings G, Scholz JP, Barnes K. The effects of imposed leg length difference on pelvic bone symmetry. *Spine.* 1993;18:368–373. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
8. Walsh M, Connolly P, Jenkinson A, O'Brien T. Leg length discrepancy—an experimental study of compensatory changes in three dimensions using gait analysis. *Gait Posture.* 2000;12:156–161. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
9. McCaw ST, Bates BT. Biomechanical implications of mild leg length inequality. *Br J Sports Med.* 1991;25:10–13. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
10. Young RS, Andrew PD, Cummings GS. Effects of stimulating leg length inequality on pelvic torsion and trunk mobility. *Gait Posture.* 2000;1:217–223. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
11. Giles LGF. Lumbosacral facet 'joint angles' associated with leg length inequality. *Rheumatol Rehabil.* 1981;20:233–238. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

12. Giles LGF, Taylor RJ. Lumbar spine structural changes associated with leg length inequality. *Spine*. 1982;7:159–162. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]

Articles from Journal of Chiropractic Medicine are provided here courtesy of **National University of Health Sciences**