Outcome Questionnaires and Motor Vehicle Accidents: Demonstrating Disability, Prognosis and Effectiveness of Treatment

How to cite this paper:
How to cite this paper: O'Connor, D. (2025). Outcome Questionnaires and Motor Vehicle Accidents: Demonstrating Effectiveness of Treatment. Innovative Injury Solutions

Purpose Statement

This white paper explains how a multidisciplinary medical team can use validated outcome questionnaires to objectively assess injury severity, estimate prognosis, and document recovery in patients with Whiplash Associated Disorder WAD. By applying these evidence-based tools, clinicians and legal professionals can better understand patient status, monitor progress, and guide recovery with greater precision.

Executive Summary

Whiplash Associated Disorder presents a significant challenge for both clinicians and attorneys because symptoms following a motor vehicle accident may be widespread, variable, and difficult to quantify through physical examination or imaging alone. This white paper outlines how validated outcome measures can provide objective baseline data and track change over time throughout recovery.

These tools help quantify pain, disability, psychological burden, and functional impairment in areas that may otherwise be difficult to capture clinically. They also support treatment planning, demonstrate response to care, and improve the ability to document quality outcomes in both clinical and medico-legal settings.

Key Findings

- Validated outcome measures add objectivity to the assessment of functional impairment and disability, especially when imaging findings alone do not fully explain symptom severity
- Questionnaires such as the Neck Disability Index, Oswestry Disability Index, QuickDASH, Lower Extremity Functional Scale, Dizziness Handicap Inventory, Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia, Pain Catastrophizing Scale, Impact of Event Scale, and Numeric Pain Rating Scale all have utility in MVA-related care
- Early administration of outcome measures may help identify prognosis and support timely intervention aimed at preventing chronic symptom development
- Repeated measurement over time can demonstrate treatment response, identify persistent areas of dysfunction, and guide adjustment of care
- These research-validated tools strengthen clinical documentation and enhance medico-legal defensibility

Implications

Clinicians who incorporate validated outcome measures into practice demonstrate a more thorough and objective understanding of the patient's condition. This can improve treatment planning, recovery tracking, and documentation of disability or functional loss.

For attorneys, collaboration with clinicians who use these tools can strengthen the evidentiary basis for treatment recommendations, support disability-related claims, and improve the credibility of medical opinions in settlement discussions and litigation.

Introduction

Whiplash Associated Disorder WAD is a complex condition that often includes pain, psychological trauma, neurological symptoms, and functional impairment that cannot be fully understood through radiographs or MRI alone. This creates challenges for both healthcare providers and legal professionals, as a thorough and objective evaluation is needed to determine how the trauma has affected the individual patient.

Validated outcome questionnaires help address this need by quantifying pain, disability, psychological symptoms, and functional loss. These tools are supported by psychometric research demonstrating that their scores reliably reflect a patient's status at a given point in time.

Such measures are useful not only for identifying symptom severity and functional limitation, but also for estimating prognosis, tracking response to treatment, and providing objective data relevant to medico-legal decision-making.

The purpose of this paper is to review the rationale for using these objective measures in WAD-related care and medico-legal management. It also outlines how validated questionnaires allow clinicians to assess the impact of trauma more accurately and to document meaningful change over time.

Overview of Whiplash-Associated Disorder

Cervical spine pain following motor vehicle accidents (MVA) has long been recognized as a condition distinct from a simple neck sprain[1]. The term "whiplash," first introduced in 1928, was developed to better describe the wide range of symptoms associated with this mechanism of injury.[1] Modern understanding has evolved to recognize Whiplash Associated Disorder (WAD) as a complex, multi-system condition involving not only neck pain, but also symptoms affecting the shoulders, thoracic and lumbar spine, extremities, and headaches[2-7].

In addition to physical symptoms, WAD is frequently associated with psychological and neurological sequelae, including depression, anxiety, fear, anger, post-traumatic stress disorder, dizziness, tinnitus, cognitive dysfunction, dysphagia, dysphonia, temporomandibular joint pain, and traumatic brain injury. [2-8-15]

A major clinical and medico-legal challenge is identifying which patients will recover versus those who will develop chronic or long-term symptoms[16-18]. Research indicates that approximately 50% of individuals recover within 3 to 6 months, while the remaining population may continue to experience symptoms for 1 to 2 years or longer. [18] Among those with persistent symptoms, 30 to 40% report ongoing mild to moderate pain, and 10 to 20% develop moderate to severe chronic pain syndromes[18]. Additional data suggest chronic symptom rates may be as high as 69% at two years post-injury[19].

Validated outcome measures have demonstrated utility in identifying patients at risk for poor recovery early in the course of care. Their use allows clinicians to stratify risk, guide early intervention, and reduce the likelihood of transition to chronic pain states.

Whiplash Associated Disorder Classification

The complexity of WAD led to the development of standardized classification systems to improve clinical assessment, research consistency, and patient triage[20]. The most widely utilized framework is the Quebec Task Force Classification, which stratifies WAD into five grades based on severity and clinical findings, with correlation to prognosis up to 24 months post-injury: [20-21]

- Grade 0: No neck complaints or physical signs
- Grade I: Neck pain, stiffness, or tenderness without objective findings
- Grade II: Neck complaints with musculoskeletal signs, including decreased range of motion and point tenderness
- Grade III: Neck complaints with neurological signs, including reflex changes, weakness, and sensory deficits
- Grade IV: Neck complaints with fracture or dislocation

Musculoskeletal findings include reduced range of motion and localized tenderness, while neurological findings include diminished reflexes, motor weakness, and sensory deficits. [20]

While this classification system provides a useful framework for organizing injury severity and guiding initial triage, its reliability improves with clinician experience and should be interpreted in conjunction with comprehensive clinical and functional assessment. [22]

Limitations of Subjective Complaints in the Context of WAD

Pain and symptom perception are inherently subjective and influenced by multiple factors, including prior experiences, age, sex, genetics, and cultural context. [23] Additionally, communication barriers, whether related to patient factors, clinician approach, or time constraints within clinical settings, can limit accurate symptom reporting. [24-28]

Psychological conditions commonly associated with WAD, such as depression and post-traumatic stress disorder, may further impair a patient's ability to effectively communicate symptoms. [29-32] Similarly, mild traumatic brain injury, which frequently co-occurs with MVAs, can impact cognition, memory, and communication, complicating clinical assessment. [11, 12, 33, 34]

These variables create significant challenges for both healthcare providers and legal professionals when attempting to accurately determine injury severity, functional impairment, and prognosis.

From a medico-legal perspective, reliance on subjective complaints alone is often insufficient to establish the extent of injury or justify medical necessity. Insurance carriers and legal systems frequently require objective, quantifiable evidence to support claims of pain, disability, and ongoing treatment needs. [35-37]

Advantages of Validated Outcome Measures

Validated outcome questionnaires are reliable, research-tested tools designed to accurately assess constructs such as pain, function, dizziness, and psychological burden. These instruments provide a structured method to quantify the impact of a condition beyond subjective complaints and have been shown to reflect a patient's clinical status with greater objectivity. The scientific foundation for these tools lies within psychometrics, the field dedicated to evaluating the measurement properties of clinical instruments. [38]

Psychometrically sound outcome measures are evaluated based on reliability, validity, and variability. Reliability refers to the consistency of results across repeated testing when no clinical change is expected, validity reflects the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure, and variability describes the distribution of scores within a given population. [39]

Outcome measures demonstrating these properties are particularly valuable due to their standardization across clinicians, settings, and time. This allows scores to be interpreted consistently regardless of geographic location or provider. For example, a score on the Oswestry Disability Index indicating moderate disability reflects a comparable level of impairment across different clinical environments. This level of standardization enhances objectivity and provides stronger support in medico-legal contexts, where subjective complaints alone may be insufficient. [40-42]

Validated outcome measures also possess important clinical properties, including responsiveness and the Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID). Responsiveness refers to the ability of an instrument to detect meaningful change over time. [34] This is essential for tracking patient progress and evaluating treatment effectiveness. [34-45]

The MCID represents the smallest change in a score that corresponds to a patient-perceived improvement in their condition[46]. Importantly, MCID values may vary depending on the population and intervention studied. For example, in patients with mechanical neck pain undergoing physical therapy, a change of approximately 7.5 points on the Neck Disability Index has been shown to represent a clinically meaningful improvement. [45] In contrast, in surgical populations, a relative improvement of approximately 30 percent from baseline may be used to define meaningful change. [47]

Understanding these distinctions allows clinicians to interpret outcome measures appropriately, tailor treatment strategies, and accurately assess recovery based on both the intervention and patient population.

Role in Multidisciplinary Treatment Models

A key advantage of validated outcome measures is their ability to be applied consistently across multiple healthcare disciplines. [48-52] Clinicians from different specialties, including pain management, physical therapy, and behavioral health, can interpret these scores with a shared understanding of patient status, prognosis, and treatment needs.

For example, a clinician experienced in managing WAD can interpret a Neck Disability Index score similarly regardless of specialty, allowing for alignment in clinical decision-making. This shared framework enhances communication across the care team and supports coordinated treatment planning.

Outcome measures also provide an objective method for tracking treatment response. Improvements in scores can support progression to advanced rehabilitation, modification of interventions, or return-to-function planning. Conversely, identification of treatment plateaus allows for timely adjustments in care strategies to optimize outcomes.

This level of coordination improves patient care while also strengthening the medico-legal foundation of treatment. Objective, standardized data demonstrating patient status, progression, and response to care provide a more defensible framework for clinical decisions, treatment necessity, and long-term outcome evaluation.

Reliability and Validity of Outcome Measures in Whiplash-Associated Disorders

The outcome questionnaires reviewed in this white paper have been validated in both orthopedic and WAD-specific populations and demonstrate key psychometric properties, including reliability and validity. In addition, responsiveness to treatment and Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID) values have been established, supporting their use as objective measures of patient status and change over time.

Outcome measures such as the Neck Disability Index, Oswestry Disability Index, QuickDASH, Lower Extremity Functional Scale, Dizziness Handicap Inventory, Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia, Pain Catastrophizing Scale, Impact of Event Scale, and Numeric Pain Rating Scale are all relevant to the spectrum of symptoms associated with WAD. Research supporting their psychometric properties and clinical utility in WAD populations is outlined below.

Neck Disability Index

The Neck Disability Index (NDI) is a 10-item questionnaire designed to measure neck-related functional disability. [49] It assesses domains commonly affected by cervical injury, including pain intensity, reading, headaches, concentration, work, driving, sleeping, recreation, personal care, and lifting. [49] Each item is scored on a 0 to 5 scale, with higher scores indicating greater disability.

Total scores correspond to disability categories, including 0-4 points, no disability, 5-14 points, mild disability, 15-24 points, moderate disability, 25-34 points, severe disability, and 35-50 points, complete disability. [49] The NDI has demonstrated acceptable reliability, validity, internal consistency, and MCID across multiple studies. [45-53-57].

The NDI has been widely studied in WAD populations. Kumbhare et al. reported moderate validity in assessing functional impairment related to WAD[58]. Test-retest reliability, correlation with pain severity, and prognostic utility have also been well established. [59-61] The NDI demonstrates fair to moderately strong correlations with pain intensity measures, including visual analog scale scores and pain drawings, as well as with the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia[62].

It has also been shown to be valid in subacute WAD populations. [63] Vernon, the developer of the NDI, reported that higher scores greater than 15 out of 50 at 3 to 36 months post-injury are strongly associated with physiological dysfunction and physical impairment. This finding highlights that elevated disability scores are not solely explained by psychosocial factors and may reflect underlying pathophysiological processes such as muscular dysfunction and central sensitization. [49]

The NDI is also useful in tracking recovery over time, with established thresholds distinguishing true clinical improvement from measurement variability. [64-66] Additionally, it has demonstrated the ability to differentiate between genuine WAD-related disability and malingering, with reported specificity of approximately 90 percent. [67]

From a medico-legal perspective, the NDI is particularly valuable in assessing functional impact on work capacity. It has been shown to correlate with reduced work function and performance on functional capacity evaluations. [68-72] As such, it provides objective support for determining functional limitations, disability status, and return-to-work considerations in WAD patients.

Oswestry Disability Index

The Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) is considered a gold-standard outcome measure for assessing lumbar spine-related disability[73-74]. While cervical involvement is most common in whiplash injuries, lumbar spine symptoms and associated disability are also recognized within the spectrum of WAD. [75-78]

The ODI consists of 10 items evaluating pain intensity, personal care, lifting, walking, sitting, standing, sleeping, sexual function, social activity, and travel. Each item is scored from 0 to 5, with a maximum total score of 50 points. Scores are typically expressed as percentages and categorized as 0-20 percent, minimal disability, 21-40 percent, moderate disability, 41-60 percent, severe disability, 61-80 percent, crippled, and 81-100 percent, bed-bound or exaggerated symptoms. [73]

The ODI is a validated and reliable measure with an MCID generally ranging from 7.5 to 15 points, indicating clinically meaningful change. [73-79-86]. It has demonstrated strong internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity across multiple studies. [74-87-89]

The ODI is also responsive to changes in clinical status, particularly in the lumbar and lumbosacral regions. [90] It has been shown to correlate with work status and can help predict a patient's ability to return to prior occupational function following injury. [91-95]

QuickDASH

The QuickDASH is a shortened version of the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (DASH) outcome measure, consisting of 11 items compared to the original 30-question format[96]. It is designed to quantify disability and symptoms affecting the upper extremities, including the arm, shoulder, and hand. This is particularly relevant in WAD, where upper extremity symptoms are commonly reported. [6-97-98]

Due to its reduced length and comparable reliability, the QuickDASH is often preferred by clinicians for efficient and objective outcome assessment. [99-100] It evaluates functional domains such as physical activity, sleep, work, and social participation, while also capturing pain and sensory disturbances. [96]

The QuickDASH has demonstrated strong validity, high test-retest reliability, and consistent measurement over time[96,99,101-102]. The Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID) has been reported in the range of 8 to 15 points, indicating clinically meaningful change. [102-106] Consistency of MCID values across studies further supports its reliability in tracking patient progress.

It has also shown validity and responsiveness in patients with neck pain, particularly when upper extremity symptoms are not fully captured by the Neck Disability Index. [107] Additionally, higher QuickDASH scores have been associated with delayed recovery and increased risk of chronicity in both surgical and musculoskeletal conditions. [108-109]

Lower Extremity Functional Scale

The Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS) is a 20-item outcome measure used to assess functional limitations related to the lower extremities, including the hip, knee, ankle, and foot. [110] Each item is scored from 0 to 4, resulting in a total score ranging from 0 to 80, where higher scores indicate better function. [110-112]

The LEFS has demonstrated strong validity across a wide range of lower extremity conditions and patient populations. It is reliable across cultures and exhibits excellent test-retest reliability. [110-113-116] Sensitivity to change has also been well established, allowing clinicians to detect improvement, stagnation, or decline in functional status over time[117-119].

The MCID for the LEFS has been reported to range from 5 to 12 points, representing clinically meaningful functional improvement.[119]

In the context of motor vehicle accidents, the LEFS is particularly useful for assessing functional limitations resulting from lower extremity trauma or pain. [110-120-124]. Given the frequency of lower extremity involvement in MVAs, this measure is important for evaluating patients with functional impairment or those requiring interventions such as surgery. [125-127]

Dizziness Handicap Inventory

The Dizziness Handicap Inventory (DHI) is an outcome measure designed to assess the functional impact of dizziness on a patient's daily life. It was originally developed by Jacobson and Newman in 1990 based on the recognition that conventional vestibular testing alone does not adequately capture the functional burden of dizziness. [128]

The current version consists of 25 items divided into functional, emotional, and physical domains. Each item is scored as yes, sometimes, or no, corresponding to 4, 2, and 0 points, respectively. [128]

The DHI has demonstrated strong validity and excellent test-retest reliability. Scores are categorized as 0-30, mild disability, 31-60, moderate disability, and 61-100, severe disability related to dizziness. [128-129]

It has been validated across multiple conditions, including traumatic brain injury, concussion, vestibular disorders, benign paroxysmal positional vertigo, and WAD. [128-130-135]. It is also useful in assessing cervicogenic dizziness, a condition frequently associated with WAD. [136]

The MCID for the DHI is approximately 18 points, and it has been used as an anchor measure in research due to its strong psychometric properties. [128-137]

Dizziness is a common and clinically significant symptom in WAD. Studies report that 40 to 70 percent of patients with persistent WAD experience dizziness, often accompanied by balance disturbances and falls. [138] Additionally, up to 35 percent of patients with traumatic neck pain may have underlying vestibular dysfunction, which may be prolonged or persistent. [139-140] These findings support the importance of including the DHI in the assessment of WAD patients.

Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia

The Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK) is an outcome measure used to assess fear of movement or reinjury. It consists of 17 items scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The TSK has demonstrated strong validity, reliability, and responsiveness to change, and has been validated across multiple populations, including patients with WAD[141-147]. The MCID has been reported to be approximately 5.5 points. [148]

Kinesiophobia is a critical factor in recovery, as fear of movement may limit participation in rehabilitation and contribute to delayed recovery. It has been associated with prolonged symptom duration and increased disability in WAD patients. [150-156]

Research supports the role of fear-avoidance behaviors in maintaining pain and disability. As noted by Vangronsveld et al., reduction in pain-related fear and catastrophizing is associated with improved outcomes, highlighting the importance of addressing these factors in treatment. [157]

Early identification of kinesiophobia using the TSK allows clinicians to incorporate targeted psychological and behavioral interventions, improving recovery trajectories and reducing the risk of chronic disability.

Pain Catastrophizing Scale

The Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS) is an outcome measure designed to assess catastrophic thought patterns related to pain experiences. Catastrophizing has been defined as a tendency to magnify the perceived threat of pain, feel helpless in response to pain, and experience difficulty suppressing pain-related thoughts before, during, or after painful events. [158]

The PCS consists of three subscales, rumination, magnification, and helplessness, with each item scored from 0, not at all, to 4, all of the time[159]. A score greater than 20 indicates elevated levels of catastrophizing, while scores of 30 or higher are considered clinically significant and associated with decreased quality of life. [160-162]

The PCS has demonstrated strong reliability and validity across cultures, age groups, and languages, supporting its broad clinical applicability[163-169]. It is also responsive to treatment-related change, has been utilized in the identification of malingering, and has an established MCID ranging from 3 to 8 points. [170-173]

The PCS is particularly relevant in WAD populations. Elevated PCS scores in the acute phase following whiplash injury have been shown to predict long-term disability, pain intensity, and reduced work capacity, independent of depression and anxiety[174]. These findings are consistent with additional studies demonstrating that catastrophizing is strongly associated with persistent pain and poor outcomes in WAD. [175-181]

Impact of Event Scale

The Impact of Event Scale (IES) is a psychological outcome measure used to assess symptoms associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. The original version was developed in 1979 and later revised in 1997 to its current widely used format. [182-183]

The IES evaluates three domains of psychological distress, intrusion, avoidance, and hyperarousal. It consists of 22 items scored from 0, not at all, to 4, extremely, with a maximum score of 88. Higher scores indicate greater symptom severity. [184]

Due to the nature of psychological trauma, it is recommended that the IES not be administered earlier than two weeks following the traumatic event to improve accuracy. [185]

The IES has demonstrated strong validity and reliability across multiple populations and conditions. It has an MCID ranging from 4 to 10 points, with scores greater than 33 indicating clinically significant PTSD and scores above 24 suggesting clinical concern. [186-194]

In WAD populations, the IES is a valuable prognostic tool. Elevated scores early after injury have been strongly associated with persistent pain, disability, and delayed functional recovery. [10-195-198]. It has also been validated against Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders criteria for PTSD, further supporting its clinical utility. [199-200]

Numeric Pain Rating Scale

The Numeric Pain Rating Scale (NPRS) is one of the most widely used tools for quantifying pain intensity across a broad range of medical conditions. [201] It has been described as an optimal tool for assessing pain in adult patients without cognitive impairment. [202]

The standard NPRS uses a 0 to 10 scale, where higher scores indicate greater pain intensity. The MCID has been reported to range from 1 to 3.5 points across various conditions. [203-206]

The NPRS has demonstrated strong reliability, responsiveness to change, and validity across diverse patient populations, conditions, and cultural contexts. [206-213]

In WAD populations, the NPRS is essential for assessing pain severity, monitoring treatment response, and determining prognosis. [214-216] It is also one of the outcome measures with unanimous expert consensus for inclusion in core outcome sets for WAD management. [217]

Higher pain scores early in the course of injury have been associated with delayed return to work and prolonged recovery, particularly when combined with other prognostic indicators. [217-218]

Integrating Outcome Measures into Multidisciplinary Care

For clinicians unfamiliar with these tools, selecting appropriate outcome measures may initially appear complex. However, a structured approach based on symptom presentation simplifies decision-making.

Use of a body chart during patient evaluation can assist in identifying symptom distribution and guide selection of region-specific measures such as the LEFS, QuickDASH, or Oswestry Disability Index, ideally within the first few weeks following a motor vehicle accident. Assessment of dizziness should prompt consideration of the DHI.

Given the high prevalence of psychological factors in WAD, the PCS is recommended during the initial evaluation. The NDI and NPRS should be utilized in all cases involving WAD due to their strong evidence base and clinical relevance.

During follow-up, additional or repeated measures should be incorporated to capture the evolving clinical picture. This includes reassessment of pain distribution, functional limitations, dizziness, and psychological symptoms, including PTSD using the IES.

For rehabilitation planning, early use of the TSK is critical to identify fear-avoidance behaviors that may impair participation in therapy. Longitudinal tracking of outcome measures allows for clear visualization of progress over time for clinicians, patients, attorneys, and insurers.

Outcome measures provide objective data that may not be fully captured during patient interviews. Regular review and discussion of results with patients enhances clinical decision-making, guides targeted interventions, and supports management of complex or prolonged recovery cases.

Conclusion

Management of Whiplash-Associated Disorders presents significant clinical challenges due to the multifactorial nature of symptoms. Effective care requires a multidisciplinary approach supported by the appropriate use of validated outcome measures at defined intervals.

Clinicians experienced in WAD management utilize these tools to objectively assess function, monitor progress, and guide treatment strategies. Outcome measures not only enhance clinical precision but also provide measurable evidence of recovery and treatment effectiveness.

For both patients and legal professionals, selection of providers who consistently utilize validated outcome measures is essential to ensure accurate diagnosis, appropriate treatment, and optimal recovery outcomes.

References

1. Bragg KJ, Varacallo M. Cervical sprain. StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing; 2023.
2. Ghorayeb JH. The nosological classification of whiplash-associated disorder: a narrative review. J Can Chiropr Assoc. 2021;65:76.
3. Vállez García D, Dierckx RAJO, Otte A, et al. Whiplash, real or not real? A review and new concept. In: PET and SPECT in Neurology. 2014:947-963.
4. Bannister G, Amirfeyz R, Kelley S, et al. Whiplash injury. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2009;91:845-850.
5. Fundaun J, Kolski M, Baskozos G, et al. Nerve pathology and neuropathic pain after whiplash injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pain. 2022;163:e789-e811.
6. Särkilahti N, Leino S, Takatalo J, et al. The symptom profile of people with whiplash-associated disorder, a mixed-method systematic review. J Bodyw Mov Ther. 2024.
7. Alderink GJ, Ashby BM. Cervical spine: lateral whiplash, neck pain, and nerve palsy. In: Clinical Kinesiology and Biomechanics: A Problem-Based Learning Approach. Springer; 2023:145-177.
8. Al-Khazali HM, Ashina H, Iljazi A, et al. Psychiatric sequelae following whiplash injury: a systematic review. Front Psychiatry. 2022;13:814079.
9. Kuperman P, Granovsky Y, Fadel S, et al. Head- and neck-related symptoms post-motor vehicle collision (MVC): separate entities or two sides of the same coin? Injury. 2021;52:1227-1233.
10. Sterling M, Jull G, Vicenzino B, et al. Physical and psychological factors predict outcome following whiplash injury. Pain. 2005;114:141-148.
11. Rebbeck T, Evans K, Elliott JM. Concussion in combination with whiplash-associated disorder may be missed in primary care: key recommendations for assessment and management. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2019;49:819-828.
12. Gil C, Decq P. How similar are whiplash and mild traumatic brain injury? A systematic review. Neurochirurgie. 2021;67:238-243.
13. Alexander MP. The evidence for brain injury in whiplash injuries. Pain Res Manag. 2003;8:19-23.
14. He Y, Gao J, Liu Y, et al. Global trends and hotspots related to whiplash injury: a visualization study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2024;103:e38777.
15. Stone D, Ward E, Knijnik S, et al. Whiplash-associated dysphagia and dysphonia: a scoping review. Dysphagia. 2021;36:303-315.
16. Rodriguez AA, Barr KP, Burns SP. Whiplash: pathophysiology, diagnosis, treatment, and prognosis. Muscle Nerve. 2004;29:768-781.
17. Haniffah A, Dawal S, Julaihi S. Whiplash injury mechanisms of car rear occupants: a review. Malays J Public Health Med. 2020;1:272-281.
18. Jull GA, Söderlund A, Stemper BD, et al. Toward optimal early management after whiplash injury to lessen the rate of transition to chronicity. Spine. 2011;36:S335-S342.
19. Park D. The pathophysiology and mechanism of acute and chronic whiplash injury: a narrative review. Int J Pain. 2022;13:20-24.
20. Spitzer W, Skovron M, Salmi L, et al. Scientific monograph of the Quebec Task Force on Whiplash-Associated Disorders: redefining whiplash and its management. Spine. 1995;20:1S-73S.
21. Hartling L, Brison RJ, Ardern C, et al. Prognostic value of the Quebec classification of whiplash-associated disorders. Spine. 2001;26:36-41.
22. Shergill Y, Cote P, Shearer H, et al. Inter-rater reliability of the Quebec Task Force classification system for recent-onset whiplash-associated disorders. J Can Chiropr Assoc. 2021;65:186.
23. Fillingim RB. Individual differences in pain: understanding the mosaic that makes pain personal. Pain. 2017;158:S11-S18.
24. Hildenbrand GM, Perrault EK, Rnoh RH. Patients' perceptions of health care providers' dismissive communication. Health Promot Pract. 2022;23:777-784.

25. ALQahtani DA, Rotgans JI, Mamede S, et al. Does time pressure have a negative effect on diagnostic accuracy? Acad Med. 2016;91:710-716.
26. Satterwhite S, Nguyen M-LT, Honcharov V, et al. Good care is slow enough to be able to pay attention: primary care time scarcity and patient safety. J Gen Intern Med. 2024;39:1575-1582.
27. Schattner A. It's about time: redesigning consultation length in general practice. J R Soc Med. 2022;115:276-278.
28. Singh H, Naik AD, Rao R, et al. Reducing diagnostic errors through effective communication: harnessing the power of information technology. J Gen Intern Med. 2008;23:489-494.
29. Singla DR, Kohrt BA, Murray LK, et al. Psychological treatments for the world: lessons from low- and middle-income countries. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2017;13:149-181.
30. Thompson L, McCabe R. The effect of clinician-patient alliance and communication on treatment adherence in mental health care: a systematic review. BMC Psychiatry. 2012;12:87.
31. Savard M. Bridging the communication gap between physicians and their patients with physical symptoms of depression. Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry. 2004;6:17.
32. Kazlauskas E. Challenges for providing health care in traumatized populations: barriers for PTSD treatments and the need for new developments. Glob Health Action. 2017;10:1322399.
33. Norman RS, Mueller KD, Huerta P, et al. Discourse performance in adults with mild traumatic brain injury, orthopedic injuries, moderate to severe traumatic brain injury, and healthy controls. Am J Speech Lang Pathol. 2022;31:67-83.
34. Buck PW, Laster RG, Sagrati JS, et al. Working with mild traumatic brain injury: voices from the field. Rehabil Res Pract. 2012;2012:625621.
35. Hughes v. Worthington, NJ Appellate Division; 2022.
36. Chafetz M, Williams M, Ben-Porath Y, et al. Official position of the American Academy of Clinical Neuropsychology on Social Security Administration policy on validity testing: guidance and recommendations for change. Clin Neuropsychol. 2015;29:723-740.
37. Colvin CW. Social Security Ruling 16-3p; Titles II and XVI: Evaluation of Symptoms in Disability Claims. Fed Regist. 2016;81.
38. Vetter TR, Cubbin C. Psychometrics: trust, but verify. Anesth Analg. 2019;128:176-181.
39. Velentgas P, Dreyer NA, Wu AW. Outcome definition and measurement. In: Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2013.
40. Lee JH, Lee SH. Comparison of clinical efficacy between interlaminar and transforaminal epidural injection in patients with axial pain due to cervical disc herniation. Medicine (Baltimore). 2016;95:e2568.
41. Best RK, Fang Y, Fisk C, et al. Disputed and disfavored: pain, mental illness, and invisible conditions in disability discrimination cases. Soc Sci Med. 2025;371:117885.
42. Hoffman S, Podgurski A. The patient's voice: legal implications of patient-reported outcome measures. Yale J Health Policy Law Ethics. 2023;22:1.
43. Mokkink L, Terwee C, de Vet H. Key concepts in clinical epidemiology: responsiveness, the longitudinal aspect of validity. J Clin Epidemiol. 2021;140:159-162.
44. John B, Røe C, Brox JI, et al. Responsiveness and minimal important change of Neck Disability Index and Numeric Pain Rating Scale for neck patients in the Norwegian neck and back register. Eur Spine J. 2025:1-8.
45. Young BA, Walker MJ, Strunce JB, et al. Responsiveness of the Neck Disability Index in patients with mechanical neck disorders. Spine J. 2009;9:802-808.
46. Bloom DA, Kaplan DJ, Mojica E, et al. The minimal clinically important difference: a review of clinical significance. Am J Sports Med. 2023;51:520-524.
47. Khan I, Pennings JS, Devin CJ, et al. Clinically meaningful improvement following cervical spine surgery: 30% reduction versus absolute point-change MCID values. Spine. 2021;46:717-725.
48. MacDermid JC, Walton DM, Côté P, et al. Use of outcome measures in managing neck pain: an international multidisciplinary survey. Open Orthop J. 2013;7:506.
49. Vernon H. The Neck Disability Index: state-of-the-art, 1991-2008. J Manipulative Physiol Ther. 2008;31:491-502.
50. Ferreira ML, Borges BM, Rezende IL, et al. Are neck pain scales and questionnaires compatible with the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health? A systematic review. Disabil Rehabil. 2010;32:1539-1546.
51. Wibault J, Öberg B, Dedering Å, et al. Individual factors associated with neck disability in patients with cervical radiculopathy scheduled for surgery: a study on physical impairments, psychosocial factors, and lifestyle habits. Eur Spine J. 2014;23:599-605.
52. Young SB, Aprill C, Braswell J, et al. Psychological factors and domains of neck pain disability. Pain Med. 2009;10:310-318.
53. MacDermid JC, Walton DM, Avery S, et al. Measurement properties of the Neck Disability Index: a systematic review. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2009;39:400-417.
54. Zeqiri E, Qorri E, Todri J, et al. Establishing the Neck Disability Index as a valid tool for assessing persistent neck pain in the Albanian population. Medicina (Kaunas). 2025;61:955.
55. Pylkäs K. Psychometric properties of Neck Disability Index: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

56. Widbom-Kolhanen S, Pernaa KI, Saltychev M. Reliability and validity of the Neck Disability Index among patients undergoing cervical surgery. Int J Rehabil Res. 2022;45:273-278.
57. Geete DB, Mhatre BS, Vernon H. Cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric validation of the Hindi version of the Neck Disability Index in patients with chronic neck pain. Spine. 2023;48:1663-1669.
58. Kumbhare D, Parkinson W, Upadhye S, et al. Validity of the Neck Disability Index for measuring impairment in whiplash. J Pain. 2012;13:S2.
59. Sterling M, Rebbeck T. The Neck Disability Index (NDI). Aust J Physiother. 2005;51:271.
60. Ritchie C, Sterling M. Recovery pathways and prognosis after whiplash injury. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2016;46:851-861.
61. Ritchie C, Hendrikz J, Jull G, et al. External validation of a clinical prediction rule to predict full recovery and ongoing moderate/severe disability following acute whiplash injury. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2015;45:242-250.
62. Vernon H, Guerriero R, Kavanaugh S, et al. Psychological factors in the use of the Neck Disability Index in chronic whiplash patients. Spine. 2010;35:E16-E21.
63. Nieto R, Miró J, Huguet A. Disability in subacute whiplash patients: usefulness of the Neck Disability Index. Spine. 2008;33:E630-E635.
64. Barun B, Barišić I, Krnić A, et al. Neck Disability Index is better in classification of recovery after whiplash injury in comparison with ultrasound shear wave elastography of trapezius muscle. Diagnostics (Basel). 2021;11:2077.
65. Peolsson A, Bahat HS, German D, et al. Results of neck-specific exercise for altered postural sway in individuals with chronic whiplash-associated disorders: a longitudinal case-control study. Sci Rep. 2024;14:15235.
66. Croft AC, Workman JA, Szatalowicz MP, et al. Classifying whiplash recovery status using the Neck Disability Index: optimized cutoff points derived from receiver operating characteristic analysis. J Chiropr Med. 2016;15:95-101.
67. Pina D, Puente-Lopez E, Ruiz-Hernández JA, et al. Self-report measures for symptom validity assessment in whiplash-associated disorders. 2022.
68. Agnew L, Johnston V, Landén Ludvigsson M, et al. Factors associated with work ability in patients with chronic whiplash-associated disorder grade II-III: a cross-sectional analysis. J Rehabil Med. 2015;47:546-551.
69. Lo HK, Johnston V, Ludvigsson ML, et al. Factors associated with work ability following exercise interventions for people with chronic whiplash-associated disorders: secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial. J Rehabil Med. 2018;50:828-836.
70. Guy L, Kendall E, Charker J, et al. Difficulty in return-to-work after whiplash injury: the role of pain self-efficacy in mediating the effects of neck disability on perceived difficulty in the return-to-work process. Aust J Rehabil Couns. 2005;11:22-33.
71. van der Meer S, Reneman MF, Verhoeven J, et al. Relationship between self-reported disability and functional capacity in patients with whiplash-associated disorder. J Occup Rehabil. 2014;24:419-424.
72. Trippolini MA, Dijkstra PU, Côté P, et al. Can functional capacity tests predict future work capacity in patients with whiplash-associated disorders? Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2014;95:2357-2366.
73. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry Disability Index. Spine. 2000;25:2940-2953.
74. Koivunen K, Widbom-Kolhanen S, Pernaa K, et al. Reliability and validity of Oswestry Disability Index among patients undergoing lumbar spinal surgery. BMC Surg. 2024;24:13.
75. Hincapié CA, Cassidy JD, Côté P, et al. Whiplash injury is more than neck pain: a population-based study of pain localization after traffic injury. J Occup Environ Med. 2010;52:434-440.
76. Beattie N, Lovell ME. Can patients with low-energy whiplash-associated disorder develop low back pain? Injury. 2010;41:144-146.
77. Fast A, Sosner J, Begeman P, et al. Lumbar spinal strains associated with whiplash injury: a cadaveric study. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2002;81:645-650.
78. Yassin M, Garti A, Robinson D. Whiplash injury might reduce lumbar spine range of motion following trauma. MOJ Orthop Rheumatol. 2016;6:00210.
79. Van Hooff ML, Spruit M, Fairbank JC, et al. The Oswestry Disability Index (version 2.1a): validation of a Dutch language version. Spine. 2015;40:E83-E90.
80. Vavken P, Ganal-Antonio AKB, Quidde J, et al. Fundamentals of clinical outcomes assessment for spinal disorders: clinical outcome instruments and applications. Global Spine J. 2015;5:329-338.
81. Vanti C, Ferrari S, Villafane JH, et al. Responsiveness and minimum important change of the Oswestry Disability Index in Italian subjects with symptomatic lumbar spondylolisthesis. J Orthop Traumatol. 2017;18:145-150.
82. Solomito MJ, Kia C, Makanji H. The minimal clinically important difference for the Oswestry Disability Index substantially varies based on calculation method: implications to value-based care. Spine. 2025;50:707-712.
83. Davidson M, Keating JL. A comparison of five low back disability questionnaires: reliability and responsiveness. Phys Ther. 2002;82:8-24.
84. Ostelo RW, de Vet HC. Clinically important outcomes in low back pain. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2005;19:593-607.
85. Lee CP, Fu TS, Liu CY, et al. Psychometric evaluation of the Oswestry Disability Index in patients with chronic low back pain: factor and Mokken analyses. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2017;15:192.

86. Brodke DS, Goz V, Lawrence BD, et al. Oswestry Disability Index: a psychometric analysis with 1,610 patients. Spine J. 2017;17:321-327.
87. Vianin M. Psychometric properties and clinical usefulness of the Oswestry Disability Index. J Chiropr Med. 2008;7:161-163.
88. Young I, Dunning J, Escaloni J, et al. Clinimetric analysis of the Numeric Pain Rating Scale, Oswestry Disability Index, and Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis treated with conservative interventions. J Clin Neurosci. 2026;143:111717.
89. Fritz JM, Irrgang JJ. A comparison of a modified Oswestry low back pain disability questionnaire and the Quebec Back Pain Disability Scale. Phys Ther. 2001;81:776-788.
90. Copay AG, Cher DJ. Is the Oswestry Disability Index a valid measure of response to sacroiliac joint treatment? Qual Life Res. 2016;25:283-292.
91. Loisel P, Poitras S, Lemaire J, et al. Is work status of low back pain patients best described by an automated device or by a questionnaire? Spine. 1998;23:1588-1594.
92. Russo F, Di Tecco C, Russo S, et al. Importance of an integrated assessment of functional disability and work ability in workers affected by low back pain. Saf Health Work. 2024;15:66-72.
93. Khan I, Bydon M, Archer KR, et al. Impact of occupational characteristics on return to work for employed patients after elective lumbar spine surgery. Spine J. 2019;19:1969-1976.
94. Leung GCN, Cheung PWH, Lau G, et al. Multidisciplinary programme for rehabilitation of chronic low back pain, factors predicting successful return to work. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2021;22:251.
95. Yates M, Shastri-Hurst N. The Oswestry Disability Index. Occup Med (Lond). 2017;67:241-242.
96. Aasheim T, Finsen V. The DASH and the QuickDASH instruments: normative values in the general population in Norway. J Hand Surg Eur Vol. 2014;39:140-144.
97. Watanabe K, Daimon K, Fujiwara H, et al. The long-term impact of whiplash injuries on patient symptoms and the associated degenerative changes detected using MRI: a prospective 20-year follow-up study comparing patients with whiplash-associated disorders with asymptomatic subjects. Spine. 2021;46:710-716.
98. Abbassian A, Giddins GE. Subacromial impingement in patients with whiplash injury to the cervical spine. J Orthop Surg Res. 2008;3:25.
99. Gummesson C, Ward MM, Atroshi I. The shortened Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand questionnaire (QuickDASH): validity and reliability based on responses within the full-length DASH. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2006;7:44.
100. Whalley K, Adams J. The longitudinal validity of the quick and full version of the Disability of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand questionnaire in musculoskeletal hand outpatients. Hand Ther. 2009;14:22-25.
101. Beaton DE, Wright JG, Katz JN, et al. Development of the QuickDASH: comparison of three item-reduction approaches. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2005;87:1038-1046.
102. Franchignoni F, Vercelli S, Giordano A, et al. Minimal clinically important difference of the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand outcome measure (DASH) and its shortened version (QuickDASH). J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2014;44:30-39.
103. Fan ZJ, Smith CK, Silverstein BA. Responsiveness of the QuickDASH and SF-12 in workers with neck or upper extremity musculoskeletal disorders: one-year follow-up. J Occup Rehabil. 2011;21:234-243.
104. Polson K, Reid D, McNair PJ, et al. Responsiveness, minimal important difference and minimal detectable change scores of the shortened Disability of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand (QuickDASH) questionnaire. Man Ther. 2010;15:404-407.
105. Mintken PE, Glynn P, Cleland JA. Psychometric properties of the shortened Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand Questionnaire (QuickDASH) and Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with shoulder pain. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2009;18:920-926.
106. Sorensen AA, Howard D, Tan WH, et al. Minimal clinically important differences of 3 patient-rated outcome instruments. J Hand Surg Am. 2013;38:641-649.
107. Lue YJ, Cheng KI, Lin CL, et al. Psychometric properties of the QuickDASH in patients with neck pain. J Clin Med. 2025;14:1266.
108. Ikeda K, Ikumi A, Onishi S, et al. Predicting refractoriness in lateral epicondylitis using initial grip strength and QuickDASH: a retrospective cohort study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2025;26:645.
109. London DA, Schroeder AM, Chan JP, et al. Predicting likelihood to repeat elective hand surgery with early Quick Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand scores: a feasibility study. J Hand Surg Glob Online. 2025;7:100813.
110. Binkley JM, Stratford PW, Lott SA, et al. The Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS): scale development, measurement properties, and clinical application. Phys Ther. 1999;79:371-383.
111. Dingemans SA, Kleipool SC, Mulders MA, et al. Normative data for the Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS). Acta Orthop. 2017;88:422-426.
112. Turcotte JJ, Kelly ME, Fenn AB, et al. The role of the Lower Extremity Functional Scale in predicting surgical outcomes for total joint arthroplasty patients. Arthroplasty. 2022;4:3.
113. Repo JP, Tukiainen EJ, Roine RP, et al. Reliability and validity of the Finnish version of the Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS). Disabil Rehabil. 2017;39:1228-1234.

114. Chua YL, Sheri S, Yeo BSQ, et al. Can the Lower Extremity Functional Scale be used in children and adolescents? A validation study. J Pediatr Orthop. 2024;44:322-326.
115. Stasi S, Papathanasiou G, Anagnostou M, et al. Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS): cross-cultural adaptation into Greek and reliability properties of the instrument. Health Sci J. 2012;6:750.
116. Negahban H, Hessam M, Tabatabaei S, et al. Reliability and validity of the Persian Lower Extremity Functional Scale (LEFS) in a heterogeneous sample of outpatients with lower limb musculoskeletal disorders. Disabil Rehabil. 2014;36:10-15.
117. Verheijde JL, White F, Tompkins J, et al. Reliability, validity, and sensitivity to change of the Lower Extremity Functional Scale in individuals affected by stroke. PM R. 2013;5:1019-1025.
118. Mehta SP, Fulton A, Quach C, et al. Measurement properties of the Lower Extremity Functional Scale: a systematic review. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2016;46:200-216.
119. Zhang Y, Zang Y, Martin RL. Clinically most relevant psychometric properties of the Lower Extremity Functional Scale: a systematic review. Disabil Rehabil. 2025;47:1932-1938.
120. Myrtveit SM, Skogen JC, Sivertsen B, et al. Pain and pain tolerance in whiplash-associated disorders: a population-based study. Eur J Pain. 2016;20:949-958.
121. Ammori MB, Abu-Zidan FM. The biomechanics of lower limb injuries in frontal-impact road traffic collisions. Afr Health Sci. 2018;18:321-332.
122. Kuppa S, Wang J, Haffner M, et al. Lower extremity injuries and associated injury criteria. SAE Technical Paper. 2001.
123. Pan SL, Liang HW, Hou WH, et al. Responsiveness of SF-36 and Lower Extremity Functional Scale for assessing outcomes in traumatic injuries of lower extremities. Injury. 2014;45:1759-1763.
124. Leliveld MS, Verhofstad MH, Van Lieshout EM, et al. Measurement properties of patient-reported outcome measures in patients with a tibial shaft fracture: validation study alongside the multicenter TRAVEL study. Injury. 2021;52:1002-1010.
125. Ngunde PJ, Akongnwi ACN, Mefire CA, et al. Prevalence and pattern of lower extremity injuries due to road traffic crashes in Fako Division, Cameroon. Pan Afr Med J. 2019;32.
126. Dischinger PC, Read KM, Kufera JA, et al. Consequences and costs of lower extremity injuries. Annu Proc Assoc Adv Automot Med. 2004;339.
127. Banglmaier R, Rouhana SW, Beillas P, et al. Lower extremity injuries in lateral impact: a retrospective study. Annu Proc Assoc Adv Automot Med. 2003;425.
128. Jacobson GP, Newman CW. The development of the Dizziness Handicap Inventory. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1990;116:424-427.
129. Whitney SL, Wrisley DM, Brown KE, et al. Is perception of handicap related to functional performance in persons with vestibular dysfunction? Otol Neurotol. 2004;25:139-143.
130. Jacobson GP, Calder JH. A screening version of the Dizziness Handicap Inventory (DHI-S). Otol Neurotol. 1998;19:804.
131. Kaufman KR, Brey RH, Chou LS, et al. Comparison of subjective and objective measurements of balance disorders following traumatic brain injury. Med Eng Phys. 2005;28:234.
132. Pérez N, Martin E, Garcia-Tapia R. Dizziness: relating the severity of vertigo to the degree of handicap by measuring vestibular impairment. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2003;128:372-381.
133. Alghwiri AA, Marchetti GF, Whitney SL. Content comparison of self-report measures used in vestibular rehabilitation based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Phys Ther. 2011;91:346-357.
134. Gottshall K, Drake A, Gray N, et al. Objective vestibular tests as outcome measures in head injury patients. Laryngoscope. 2003;113:1746-1750.
135. Galeno E, Pullano E, Mourad F, et al. Effectiveness of vestibular rehabilitation after concussion: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Healthcare (Basel). 2022;90.
136. Reid SA, Callister R, Katekar MG, et al. Utility of a brief assessment tool developed from the Dizziness Handicap Inventory to screen for cervicogenic dizziness: a case-control study. Musculoskelet Sci Pract. 2017;30:42-48.
137. Wellons RD, Duhe SE, MacDowell SG, et al. Estimating the minimal clinically important difference for balance and gait outcome measures in individuals with vestibular disorders. J Vestib Res. 2022;32:223-233.
138. Treleaven J, Jull G, Sterling M. Dizziness and unsteadiness following whiplash injury: characteristic features and relationship with cervical joint position error. J Rehabil Med. 2003;35:36-43.
139. Treleaven J. Dizziness, unsteadiness, visual disturbances, and sensorimotor control in traumatic neck pain. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2017;47:492-502.
140. Peolsson A, Wirqvist S, Kammerlind AS, et al. Effectiveness of neck-specific exercises with and without internet-based support on dizziness and unsteadiness in chronic whiplash-associated disorders: secondary analyses of a randomized controlled trial. PLoS One. 2024;19:e0311145.
141. Dupuis F, Cherif A, Batcho C, et al. The Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia: a systematic review of its psychometric properties in people with musculoskeletal pain. Clin J Pain. 2023;39:236-247.
142. Lundberg MK, Styf J, Carlsson SG. A psychometric evaluation of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, from a physiotherapeutic perspective. Physiother Theory Pract. 2004;20:121-133.

143. French DJ, France CR, Vigneau F, et al. Fear of movement or reinjury in chronic pain: a psychometric assessment of the original English version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia. Pain. 2007;127:42-51.
144. Gómez-Pérez L, López-Martínez AE, Ruiz-Párraga GT. Psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia (TSK). J Pain. 2011;12:425-435.
145. Askary-Ashtiani A, Ebrahimi-Takamejani I, Torkaman G, et al. Reliability and validity of the Persian versions of the Fear Avoidance Beliefs Questionnaire and Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia in patients with neck pain. Spine. 2014;39:E1095-E1102.
146. Kikuchi N, Matsudaira K, Sawada T, et al. Psychometric properties of the Japanese version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia (TSK-J) in patients with whiplash neck injury pain and or low back pain. J Orthop Sci. 2015;20:985-992.
147. Mendes LP, Fidelis-de-Paula-Gomes CA, Pontes-Silva A, et al. Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia in chronic neck pain patients (TSK-neck): structural and construct validity and reliability in a Brazilian population. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2024;25:151.
148. Monticone M, Ambrosini E, Rocca B, et al. Responsiveness of the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia in Italian subjects with chronic low back pain undergoing motor and cognitive rehabilitation. Eur Spine J. 2016;25:2882-2888.
149. Miller RP, Kori SH, Todd DD. The Tampa Scale: a measure of kinesiophobia. Clin J Pain. 1991;7:51.
150. Rosenblum DJ, Resch JE. The influence of kinesiophobia on time to clinical recovery in collegiate athletes with concussion. Sports Med. 2024;55:1307.
151. Chen Y, Zhong G, Zhong S, et al. Effect of kinesiophobia on postoperative rehabilitation outcomes in patients with cervical spondylotic myelopathy: a cross-sectional study. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19:469.
152. Ambegaonkar JP, Jordan M, Wiese KR, et al. Kinesiophobia in injured athletes: a systematic review. J Funct Morphol Kinesiol. 2024;9:78.
153. Buitenhuis J, Jaspers JP, Fidler V. Can kinesiophobia predict the duration of neck symptoms in acute whiplash? Clin J Pain. 2006;22:272-277.
154. Nederhand MJ, IJzerman MJ, Hermens HJ, et al. Predictive value of fear avoidance in developing chronic neck pain disability: consequences for clinical decision making. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2004;85:496-501.
155. Pedler A, Sterling M. Assessing fear-avoidance beliefs in patients with whiplash-associated disorders: a comparison of 2 measures. Clin J Pain. 2011;27:502-507.
156. Kamper SJ, Maher CG, Costa LdCM, et al. Does fear of movement mediate the relationship between pain intensity and disability in patients following whiplash injury? A prospective longitudinal study. Pain. 2012;153:113-119.
157. Vangronsveld K, Peters M, Goossens M, et al. Applying the fear-avoidance model to the chronic whiplash syndrome. Pain. 2007;131:258-261.
158. Quartana PJ, Campbell CM, Edwards RR. Pain catastrophizing: a critical review. Expert Rev Neurother. 2009;9:745-758.
159. Sullivan MJ, Bishop SR, Pivik J. The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: development and validation. Psychol Assess. 1995;7:524.
160. Alcon C, Bergman E, Humphrey J, et al. The relationship between pain catastrophizing and cognitive function in chronic musculoskeletal pain: a scoping review. Pain Res Manag. 2023;2023:5851450.
161. Anagnostopoulos F, Paraponiari A, Kafetsios K. The role of pain catastrophizing, emotional intelligence, and pain intensity in the quality of life of cancer patients with chronic pain. J Clin Psychol Med Settings. 2023;30:501-519.
162. Pocovi NC, Correa LA. Clinimetrics: the Pain Catastrophizing Scale. J Physiother. 2025.
163. Yap JC, Lau J, Chen PP, et al. Validation of the Chinese Pain Catastrophizing Scale (HK-PCS) in patients with chronic pain. Pain Med. 2008;9:186-195.
164. Crombez G, Bijttebier P, Eccleston C, et al. The child version of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS-C): a preliminary validation. Pain. 2003;104:639-646.
165. Fernandes L, Storheim K, Lochting I, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Norwegian Pain Catastrophizing Scale in patients with low back pain. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2012;13:111.
166. Sehn F, Chachamovich E, Vidor LP, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Brazilian Portuguese version of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale. Pain Med. 2012;13:1425-1435.
167. Ceniza-Bordallo G, Fraile AG, Martín-Casas P, et al. Validation of the Spanish version of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale for Children (PCS-C). An Pediatr (Engl Ed). 2023;99:295-303.
168. Osman A, Barrios FX, Gutierrez PM, et al. The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: further psychometric evaluation with adult samples. J Behav Med. 2000;23:351-365.
169. Wheeler CH, Williams ACDC, Morley SJ. Meta-analysis of the psychometric properties of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale and associations with participant characteristics. Pain. 2019;160:1946-1953.
170. Monticone M, Portoghese I, Rocca B, et al. Responsiveness and minimal important change of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale in people with chronic low back pain undergoing multidisciplinary rehabilitation. Eur J Phys Rehabil Med. 2021;58:68.
171. Sabourin S, Tram J, Sheldon BL, et al. Defining minimal clinically important differences in pain and disability outcomes of patients with chronic pain treated with spinal cord stimulation. J Neurosurg Spine. 2021;35:243-250.

172. Carrière JS, Coutu MF, Darnall BD, et al. Changes in pain catastrophizing and related outcomes following a single-session Empowered Relief intervention delivered by physical therapists in workers with low back pain: a pilot study. J Pain Res. 2025:4845-4857.
173. Curtis KL, Aguerrevere LE, Bianchini KJ, et al. Detecting malingered pain-related disability with the Pain Catastrophizing Scale: a criterion groups validation study. Clin Neuropsychol. 2019;33:1485-1500.
174. Sullivan MJ, Stanish W, Waite H, et al. Catastrophizing, pain, and disability in patients with soft-tissue injuries. Pain. 1998;77:253-260.
175. Walton DM, Pretty J, MacDermid JC, et al. Risk factors for persistent problems following whiplash injury: results of a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2009;39:334-350.
176. Anarte-Lazo E, Falla D, Rodriguez-Blanco C, et al. Higher neck pain intensity and pain catastrophizing soon after a whiplash injury partially explain the presence of persistent headache: a prospective study. Clin J Pain. 2024;40:349-355.
177. Bostick GP, Carroll LJ, Brown CA, et al. Predictive capacity of pain beliefs and catastrophizing in whiplash-associated disorder. Injury. 2013;44:1465-1471.
178. Paré C, Thibault P, Côté P, et al. The relationship between level of catastrophizing and mental health comorbidity in individuals with whiplash injuries. Clin J Pain. 2019;35:880-886.
179. Scott W, Wideman TH, Sullivan MJ. Clinically meaningful scores on pain catastrophizing before and after multidisciplinary rehabilitation: a prospective study of individuals with subacute pain after whiplash injury. Clin J Pain. 2014;30:183-190.
180. Paré C, Yamada K, Sullivan MJ. Temporal relations between pain catastrophizing and adverse health and mental health outcomes after whiplash injury. Clin J Pain. 2024;40:10-17.
181. Sullivan MJ, Adams H, Martel MO, et al. Catastrophizing and perceived injustice: risk factors for the transition to chronicity after whiplash injury. Spine. 2011;36:S244-S249.
182. Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W. Impact of Event Scale: a measure of subjective stress. Psychosom Med. 1979;41:209-218.
183. Weiss D, Marmer C. The Impact of Event Scale-Revised. 1997.
184. Bunzli S, Maujean A, Andersen TE, et al. Whiplash patients' responses on the Impact of Events Scale-Revised: congruent with pain or PTSD symptoms? Clin J Pain. 2019;35:229-237.
185. Hyer K, Brown LM. The Impact of Event Scale-Revised: a quick measure of a patient's response to trauma. Am J Nurs. 2008;108:60-68.
186. Creamer M, Bell R, Failla S. Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event Scale-Revised. Behav Res Ther. 2003;41:1489-1496.
187. Sharif Nia H, Kaur H, Fomani FK, et al. Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R) among the general Iranian population during the COVID-19 pandemic. Front Psychiatry. 2021;12:692498.
188. Eid J, Larsson G, Johnsen BH, et al. Psychometric properties of the Norwegian Impact of Event Scale-Revised in a non-clinical sample. Nord J Psychiatry. 2009;63:426-432.
189. Lim HK, Woo JM, Kim TS, et al. Reliability and validity of the Korean version of the Impact of Event Scale-Revised. Compr Psychiatry. 2009;50:385-390.
190. Ali AM, Al-Amer R, Kunugi H, et al. The Arabic version of the Impact of Event Scale-Revised: psychometric evaluation among psychiatric patients and the general public within the context of COVID-19 outbreak and quarantine as collective traumatic events. J Pers Med. 2022;12:681.
191. Gargurevich R, Luyten P, Fils JF, et al. Factor structure of the Impact of Event Scale-Revised in two different Peruvian samples. Depress Anxiety. 2009;26:E91-E98.
192. Wendlandt B, Ceppe A, Choudhury S, et al. Modifiable elements of ICU supportive care and communication are associated with surrogates' PTSD symptoms. Intensive Care Med. 2019;45:619-626.
193. Varker T, Kartal D, Watson L, et al. Defining response and nonresponse to posttraumatic stress disorder treatments: a systematic review. Clin Psychol Sci Pract. 2020;27:140.
194. Rash CJ, Coffey SF, Baschnagel JS, et al. Psychometric properties of the IES-R in traumatized substance-dependent individuals with and without PTSD. Addict Behav. 2008;33:1039-1047.
195. Laporte S, Wang D, Lecompte J, et al. An attempt at early detection of poor outcome after whiplash. Front Neurol. 2016;7:177.
196. Eather A, Kenardy J, Healy KL, et al. How are pain and traumatic stress symptoms related in acute whiplash-associated disorders? An investigation of the role of pain-related fear in a daily diary study. Pain. 2019;160:1954-1966.
197. Gopinath B, Jagnoor J, Kifley A, et al. Differential predictors of pain severity over 12 months following noncatastrophic injury sustained in a road traffic crash. J Pain. 2019;20:676-684.
198. Stone DB, Rebbeck T, Ward EC, et al. Features and impact of dysphagia, dysphonia and laryngeal hypersensitivity in whiplash-associated disorder, a qualitative study. Disabil Rehabil. 2023;45:2446-2457.
199. Beck JG, Grant DM, Read JP, et al. The Impact of Event Scale-Revised: psychometric properties in a sample of motor vehicle accident survivors. J Anxiety Disord. 2008;22:187-198.

200. Chang S, Kim WH, Jung YE, et al. Clinical utility of Impact of Event Scale-Revised for Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders posttraumatic stress disorder. Psychiatry Investig. 2024;21:870.
201. Stretanski MF, Stinocher S, Grandhe S. Pain assessment. StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing; 2025.
202. Safikhani S, Gries KS, Trudeau JJ, et al. Response scale selection in adult pain measures: results from a literature review. J Patient Rep Outcomes. 2018;2:40.
203. Young IA, Dunning J, Butts R, et al. Reliability, construct validity, and responsiveness of the Neck Disability Index and Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with mechanical neck pain without upper extremity symptoms. Physiother Theory Pract. 2019;35:1328-1335.
204. Piva SR, Gil AB, Moore CG, et al. Responsiveness of the Activities of Daily Living Scale of the Knee Outcome Survey and Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with patellofemoral pain. J Rehabil Med. 2009;41:129.
205. Salaffi F, Stancati A, Silvestri CA, et al. Minimal clinically important changes in chronic musculoskeletal pain intensity measured on a numerical rating scale. Eur J Pain. 2004;8:283-291.
206. Childs JD, Piva SR, Fritz JM. Responsiveness of the Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with low back pain. Spine. 2005;30:1331-1334.
207. Young IA, Cleland JA, Michener LA, et al. Reliability, construct validity, and responsiveness of the Neck Disability Index, Patient-Specific Functional Scale, and Numeric Pain Rating Scale in patients with cervical radiculopathy. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2010;89:831-839.
208. Modarresi S, Lukacs MJ, Ghodrati M, et al. A systematic review and synthesis of psychometric properties of the Numeric Pain Rating Scale and the Visual Analog Scale for use in people with neck pain. Clin J Pain. 2022;38:132-148.
209. Hjermstad MJ, Fayers PM, Haugen DF, et al. Studies comparing numerical rating scales, verbal rating scales, and visual analogue scales for assessment of pain intensity in adults: a systematic literature review. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2011;41:1073-1093.
210. Hrvatin I, Puh U. Measurement properties of the numerical pain rating scale in patients with musculoskeletal impairments of the limbs: a systematic literature review. 2021.
211. Alghadir AH, Anwer S, Iqbal ZA. The psychometric properties of an Arabic Numeric Pain Rating Scale for measuring osteoarthritis knee pain. Disabil Rehabil. 2016;38:2392-2397.
212. Pagé MG, Katz J, Stinson J, et al. Validation of the numerical rating scale for pain intensity and unpleasantness in pediatric acute postoperative pain: sensitivity to change over time. J Pain. 2012;13:359-369.
213. Voepel-Lewis T, Burke CN, Jeffreys N, et al. Do 0-10 numeric rating scores translate into clinically meaningful pain measures for children? Anesth Analg. 2011;112:415-421.
214. Sarrami P, Armstrong E, Naylor JM, et al. Factors predicting outcome in whiplash injury: a systematic meta-review of prognostic factors. J Orthop Traumatol. 2017;18:9-16.
215. Walton DM, MacDermid JC, Giorgianni AA, et al. Risk factors for persistent problems following acute whiplash injury: update of a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther. 2013;43:31-43.
216. Stewart M, Maher CG, Refshauge KM, et al. Responsiveness of pain and disability measures for chronic whiplash. Spine. 2007;32:580-585.
217. Sterling M, Andersen T, Carroll L, et al. Recommendations for a core outcome measurement set for clinical trials in whiplash-associated disorders. Pain. 2023;164:2265-2272.
218. Kasch H, Kongsted A, Qerama E, et al. A new stratified risk assessment tool for whiplash injuries developed from a prospective observational study. BMJ Open. 2013;3:e002050.

