Distraction-Based Cross-Validation Protocol: Scientific Summary

Restoration Physiotherapy, Inc.

Functional capacity evaluation methodology varies significantly across providers. The classification of effort as maximal, submaximal, or equivocal is only as reliable as the protocol used to produce it. The following summarizes the scientific basis of the distraction-based cross-validation protocol used by Restoration Physiotherapy.

The Legal Standard

In 1993, the United States Supreme Court established in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579, that expert witness testimony must be grounded in methods with established reliability and validity published in peer-reviewed literature. That standard applies directly to the methodology underlying effort classification in functional capacity evaluation. Lechner, Bradbury, and Bradley reviewed the available literature on effort assessment methods in a 1998 paper published in *Physical Therapy* and concluded that the methods then in widespread clinical use did not meet the criteria established by *Daubert*, nor did they comply with the American Physical Therapy Association's own measurement standards.[1] That conclusion has not been overturned by subsequent research. The sections below address standard methodology for hand testing and lift testing separately, followed by the peer-reviewed alternative used by Restoration Physiotherapy.

Standard Hand Testing Methodology

The three most commonly used methods for effort classification in hand strength testing — the coefficient of variation, the bell-shaped curve, and the rapid exchange grip test — have been extensively examined in the peer-reviewed literature. A compilation of twenty-five peer-reviewed studies documents that none of these standard approaches can reliably determine effort classification in clinical or medicolegal settings.[2]

Coefficient of Variation

The coefficient of variation, or CV, measures consistency of repeated force measurements. The underlying assumption is that submaximal effort produces greater variability than maximal effort. A CV above a certain threshold — typically 15% — is interpreted as indicating less than maximal effort.

The research does not support this. A series of independent peer-reviewed studies concluded that the CV is not an appropriate method for determining whether effort is maximal, that it cannot be applied with adequate sensitivity or specificity at any tested

cutoff value, and that its use should be avoided in clinical and medicolegal settings.[3] [4] [5] [6] At the commonly used 15% cutoff, sensitivity for detecting submaximal effort was found to be only 0.55 — meaning the CV correctly identified submaximal effort in just over half of cases while missing it in nearly half.[7] Research has demonstrated that subjects can reliably reproduce submaximal efforts with low CVs, producing results indistinguishable from maximal effort by this measure alone.[8] The 15% threshold has no validated scientific basis — no controlled study establishing that specific cutoff with documented sensitivity and specificity data has been published in the peer-reviewed literature.[1]

The Bell-Shaped Curve

The bell-shaped curve method is based on grip strength testing across five handle positions on a standard hand dynamometer. The premise is that maximal effort produces a predictable curve — highest force at the middle positions, lower at the extremes — while a flat or irregular curve indicates submaximal effort.

The method traces to a 1983 paper that reported no sensitivity or specificity data and did not specify the number of subjects on which its conclusions were based.[9] Multiple subsequent peer-reviewed studies have demonstrated that the bell-shaped curve cannot reliably classify effort.[10] [11] [12] [13] [14] Subjects with proper instruction have been shown to produce bell-shaped curves indistinguishable from the maximal efforts of injured people while performing at a submaximal level.[14] Research has further demonstrated that curve shape is a function of grip strength rather than effort level — subjects with weaker grip produce flatter curves regardless of whether they are performing maximally.[12] [13] In current clinical practice, the determination of whether a curve qualifies as a bell shape is made by visual observation — meaning the conclusion rests entirely on the individual clinician's judgment with no standardized numeric criteria.[1]

Rapid Exchange Grip

The rapid exchange grip test, or REG, asks a claimant to alternate grip force rapidly between hands on the premise that this makes it harder to maintain consistent submaximal effort. A substantially higher force during rapid exchange than during sustained grip is interpreted as evidence of submaximal effort during the sustained test.

The research on REG is marked by fundamental disagreement on what threshold constitutes a positive result, with no standardized administration protocol established across the field.[15] Studies addressing the REG have found that it cannot reliably detect submaximal effort.[16] [17] The five-position grip strength test — closely related to REG methodology — detected submaximal effort in only 15% of cases in controlled research, with 33% of subjects performing at a submaximal level producing an entirely normal grip pattern.[18]

Standard Lift Testing Methodology

Standard lift testing methodology relies on visual estimation of effort, or VEE — the evaluator's direct observation of the claimant's movement patterns, body mechanics,

and muscular recruitment during lifting tasks. The evaluator's visual judgment determines whether the claimant is performing at a maximal level or self-limiting performance. There is no cross-validation mechanism in standard lift testing.

The accuracy of visual estimation of effort was examined in a peer-reviewed study involving 117 subjects including trained FCE evaluators with an average of 259 administered evaluations and 8.3 years of FCE experience. Accuracy in classifying relative levels of exertion was marginally above chance across all subject groups. There was no statistically significant difference in accuracy between trained evaluators and untrained lay subjects.[19] The authors identified multiple conceptual and perceptual limitations of the VEE — including the physical constraints of foveal vision, the inability to objectively quantify muscular recruitment, and the absence of standardized numeric criteria — and concluded that visual estimation does not meet the legal standard for scientific knowledge as defined in *Daubert*.

Hand Strength — Distraction-Based Cross-Validation

The hand strength component of the distraction-based cross-validation protocol was developed in response to the documented failures of standard hand testing methodology. It is built on a principle established by Waddell et al. (1980): that clinically valid distraction-based testing must be non-emotional, non-surprising, and non-hurtful.[20] The distraction-based cross-validation protocol satisfies all three criteria by design.

By testing both upper extremities simultaneously across randomized trial sequences, the distraction-based cross-validation protocol creates a cognitive and motor demand that disrupts the biofeedback loop through which subjects can otherwise modulate and reproduce submaximal force output consistently. The result is a dataset of internal consistency measures across multiple independent bilateral comparisons rather than a single examiner's visual impression of effort.

The hand strength component was validated in a peer-reviewed study published in the *Journal of Hand Therapy*. One hundred asymptomatic subjects were tested under both maximal and instructed submaximal conditions. Seven statistical criteria were applied to unilateral and bilateral hand strength data to classify effort. Sensitivity was 99 percent. Specificity was 100 percent. Overall accuracy was 99.5 percent. The phi coefficient was 0.99.[21]

A subsequent peer-reviewed study applied the same distraction-based cross-validation protocol to 200 consecutive functional capacity evaluation clients drawn from a real-world clinical population — compensation and disability claimants, not asymptomatic volunteers. Results were consistent with the validation study. Clients classified as performing submaximal effort had significantly lower rates of documented surgical history than those classified as performing at a maximal level, with $p = 0.001$ — directly contradicting the common assumption that submaximal effort findings reflect pain-limited performance rather than volitional effort regulation.[22]

Lifting — Distraction-Based Cross-Validation

The lifting component of the distraction-based cross-validation protocol addresses the absence of objective cross-validation in standard lift testing. It uses a patented lever arm device that obscures actual workload values from the subject. Effort classification is based on the percentage difference between a standard baseline crate lift and performance with the lever arm device — two independent measures of lifting capacity compared for internal consistency. The evaluator's visual judgment plays no role in the classification.

A peer-reviewed study demonstrated that subjects estimated lever arm workloads with a mean absolute error of 84.1 percent, confirming that the distraction mechanism prevents subjects from regulating their lifting performance to a predetermined submaximal target.[23] Concordance between hand strength classification and lifting classification in the same subjects was 84.4 percent — two independent protocols applied to different movement modalities producing consistent classifications.[23]

A 2016 peer-reviewed study examining the lifting component of the distraction-based cross-validation protocol found 100 percent specificity in identifying maximal effort performance — meaning no subject performing at a maximal level was incorrectly classified as submaximal. The authors concluded that the high specificity of the protocol eliminates concern regarding false positive classifications of submaximal effort during functional testing.[24]

The Classification Standard

Effort classifications produced by the distraction-based cross-validation protocol are maximal, submaximal, or equivocal. The hand strength classifications are derived from the application of seven statistical criteria to unilateral and bilateral measurement data. The lifting classifications are derived from percentage difference calculations between two independent lifting measures. Neither classification is based on visual observation, clinical impression, or evaluator judgment. Both are mathematical outputs of the data.

Summary

The distraction-based cross-validation protocol used by Restoration Physiotherapy produces effort classifications derived from peer-reviewed statistical criteria applied to measurement data independently of evaluator judgment. The protocol addresses the documented failures of both standard hand testing methodology and standard lift testing methodology. It has been validated in published research and meets the *Daubert* standard for scientific admissibility. Independent validation has confirmed that the protocol does not produce false positive classifications — no subject performing at a maximal level has been incorrectly classified in controlled research conditions. The methods most commonly used as alternatives do not meet that standard — a conclusion supported by more than four decades of peer-reviewed literature across multiple independent research groups.

References

1. Lechner, D.E., Bradbury, S.F., Bradley, L.A. (1998). Detecting Sincerity of Effort: A Summary of Methods and Approaches. Physical Therapy, 78(8), 867–888.

2. Schapmire, D.W. & St. James, J.D. Published Studies Which Discredit Standard Hand Strength Testing Methods. Internal compilation.

3. Shechtman, O. (1999). Is the coefficient of variation a valid measure for detecting sincerity of effort of grip strength? Work, 13(2), 163–169.

4. Shechtman, O. (2000). Using the coefficient of variation to detect sincerity of effort of grip strength: A literature review. Journal of Hand Therapy, 13(1), 25–32.

5. Shechtman, O. (2001). The coefficient of variation as a measure of sincerity of effort of grip strength, Part I: The statistical principle. Journal of Hand Therapy, 14(3), 180–187.

6. Shechtman, O., Anton, S., Kanasky, W.F., Robinson, M.E. (2006). The use of the coefficient of variation in detecting sincerity of effort: a meta-analysis. Work, 26(4), 335–341.

7. Shechtman, O. (2001). The coefficient of variation as a measure of sincerity of effort of grip strength, Part II: Sensitivity and specificity. Journal of Hand Therapy, 14(3), 188–194.

8. Ashford, R.F., Nagelburg, S., Adkins, R. (1996). Sensitivity of the Jamar Dynamometer in detecting submaximal grip effort. Journal of Hand Surgery, 21(3), 402–405.

9. Stokes, H.M. (1983). The Seriously Uninjured Hand: Weakness of Grip. Journal of Occupational Medicine, 25(9), 683–684.

10. Goldman, S., Cahalan, T.D., An, K.N. (1991). The injured upper extremity and the JAMAR five-handle position grip test. American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 70(6), 306–308.

11. Gutierrez, Z., Shechtman, O. (2003). The effectiveness of the five-handle position grip strength test in detecting sincerity of effort in men and women. American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 82, 847–855.

12. Hamilton, A., Balnave, R., Adams, R. (1994). Grip strength testing reliability. Journal of Hand Therapy, 7(3), 163–170.

13. Shechtman, O., Gutierrez, Z., Kokendofer, E. (2005). Analysis of methods used to detect submaximal effort with the five-rung grip strength test. Journal of Hand Therapy, 18(1), 10–18.

14. Niebuhr, B.R., Marion, R. (1990). Voluntary control of submaximal grip strength. American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 69(2), 96–101.

15. Taylor, C., Shechtman, O. (2000). The use of the rapid exchange grip test in detecting sincerity of effort, Part I: The administration of the Rapid Exchange Grip Test. Journal of Hand Therapy, 13, 195–202.

16. Shechtman, O., Taylor, C. (2000). The use of the rapid exchange grip test in detecting sincerity of effort, Part II: The validity of the rapid exchange grip test. Journal of Hand Therapy, 13, 203–210.

17. Westbrook, A.P., Tredgett, M.W., Davis, T.R., Oni, J.A. (2002). The rapid exchange grip strength test and the detection of submaximal grip effort. Journal of Hand Surgery, 27(2), 329–333.

18. Tredgett, M.W., Pimble, L.J., Davis, T.R. (1999). The detection of feigned hand weakness using the five position grip strength test. Journal of Hand Surgery, 24(4), 426–428.

19. Schapmire, D.W., St. James, J.D., Townsend, R., Feeler, L. (2011). Visual Estimation of Effort During Lifting: Accuracy of Sincerity of Effort Determinations. Work, 40, 445–457.

20. Waddell, G., McCulloch, J.A., Kummel, E., Venner, R.M. (1980). Nonorganic Physical Signs in Low-Back Pain. Spine, 5(2), 117–125.

21. Schapmire, D.W., St. James, J.D., Townsend, R., Stewart, B., Delheimer, S., Focht, D.R. (2002). Validity of a New Distraction-Based Method of Simulated Work Testing. Journal of Hand Therapy, 15, 242–250.

22. Schapmire, D.W., St. James, J.D., Feeler, L., Kleinkort, J.A. (2010). Validity of Effort Testing in Functional Capacity Evaluations: Hand Strength Part I. Work, 37, 309–320.

23. St. James, J.D., Schapmire, D.W., Feeler, L., Kleinkort, J.A. (2010). Validity of Effort Testing in Functional Capacity Evaluations: Hand Strength Part II. Work, 37, 395–403.

24. Townsend, R., Bell, S., Harry, J. (2016). Accuracy of Distraction Based Lifting Criteria for the Identification of Insincere Effort Utilizing the Under Loading Method. Work, 55(4), 873–882.