Radiography 22 (2016) 199–202

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Radiography

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/radi

Review article

Imaging the cervical spine following rugby related injury

J.J.W. Beck

University of Bradford, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 17 August 2015
Received in revised form
13 October 2015
Accepted 30 October 2015
Available online 23 November 2015

Keywords:
Imaging
Sport
Rugby
Computed tomography
Cervical spine
Radiography

ABSTRACT

Rugby Union and Rugby League are popular sports with high participation across the world. The high impact nature of the sport results in a high proportion of injuries. Rugby has an association with cervical spine injury which has potentially catastrophic consequences for the patient. Anecdotal evidence suggests that radiographers find it challenging to visualise the cervicothoracic junction on the lateral supine cervical spine projection in broad shouldered athletes. This paper intends to analyse the risk factors for cervical spine injuries in rugby and discuss the imaging strategy in respect to radiography and CT scanning in high risk patient groups such as rugby players who are suspected of suffering a cervical spine injury.

Background

Two differing codes of rugby have existed since 1895 and are played on a global scale with particular focus on the former British Empire and France. It is generally accepted that the game is a high energy, contact sport and that participation comes with a significant risk of injury. The risk has increased over time with greater advantage being gained from having larger and stronger participants, particularly at the highest level.[1] The changes in physiology and anthropometrics of rugby have led to greater physicality and an increased incidence of musculoskeletal injury. The nature of the game involves repeated exposure to impacts which have reported in terms of g force as high as 7–10 g during professional games.[1] The majority of these musculoskeletal injuries will not be considered life threatening or life altering but a significant risk of cervical spine injury (CSI) exists for participants which renders the prospect of paraplegia or tetraplegia and have association with significant morbidity and mortality for both players of rugby union and rugby league. The consequences of more serious CSI for the participants, the immediate family and for wider healthcare is highly significant. Fuller (2007) concluded that the level of risk for what were described as "catastrophic injuries" suffered in English rugby union fell into the Health and Safety Executive's guide values for an "acceptable" level of risk which was defined as "a risk in the region of 1 in one million of a serious adverse occurrence".[2] There are estimated to be 2.5 million registered rugby union players in England 2011.[3] The number of rugby league participants is rumoured to be around 250,000 in England which is considerably lower and is testament to the more geographically restricted area that the game is traditionally associated with. In combination, rugby represents one of the biggest sports played in the UK.

Given the consequences of CSI, correct clinical and radiological diagnosis is imperative to ensure correct management. Traditionally, this would have involved conventional radiography. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the required visualisation of the cervicothoracic junction in rugby players with broad shoulders is problematic for radiographers who resort to additional views in order to visualise this important region. The consequences of additional views include delayed diagnosis[4] and additional ionising radiation to the head and neck region. Further complications of radiological diagnosis can exist if the patient is paediatric and clinicians are unfamiliar with the appearances of a paediatric cervical spine.[5]

The traditional imaging of the cervical spine in trauma situations has been three views, the anteroposterior C3–C7, lateral supine and anteroposterior C1–C2 "open mouth" projections. Sloane et al. (2010)'s most recent Clark's radiographic positioning textbook discusses the difficulties encountered with the lateral supine projection. The need to visualise the cervicothoracic junction is appreciated and the use of traction is suggested to visualise up to one additional vertebra. Should the use of traction be unsuccessful, swimmer's lateral, oblique projections or CT should be considered.

E-mail address: j.j.w.beck@bradford.ac.uk.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2015.10.011
1078-8174/

Given the body habitus of rugby players, the additional vertebra seen through traction is unlikely to be sufficient.[6]

With the increased use of CT scanning in trauma and the additional benefit that it can bring in assessment of the cervical spine, the continued use of both conventional radiography or additional views could be questioned. Traditionally, radiographers have reverted to trauma obliques or "swimmers" views in an attempt to visualise the cervicothoracic junction. The long held argument against CT scanning was that it was perceived as a high radiation dose modality but with more recent developments, the radiation dose has been reduced to such a point that the continued use of additional views, particularly in patients with high suspicion of injury, could be rendered obsolete.

Causation of injury

Given the distribution of both codes of rugby, much of the literature in relation to the sport comes predominantly from a limited number of countries but from a wide geographical spread.

Berry et al. (2006)'s analysis of spinal injuries in rugby union and rugby league between 1986 and 2003 identified the tackle and the scrum as occasions that created the greater risk of spinal injury. Due to technical aspects of the sport, the scrum in rugby league presented less of a risk which was further highlighted by the statement that the risk of tetraplegia was four times higher in rugby union than in rugby league. They concluded that an urgent need to further improve safety in both codes of rugby was needed.[7]

Dennison et al. (2012) analysed spinal injuries in rugby union alone.[8] They agree with Berry et al. (2006) in that the majority of CSI occur during the tackle or the scrum but they examine the biomechanics further and question the belief that hyperflexion is the more prevalent cause of CSI pointing to a more diverse range of causes. However, what is stated is that the opportunity for hyperflexion and axial loading to the cervical spine should be minimised.[7] Fuller et al. (2007) identified a change in the scrummaging laws in rugby union had reduced cervical spine injuries.[2] An interesting comparison can be made with American Football which saw the incidence of cervical quadriplegia drop dramatically from a peak of 34 cases to 5 per season via simple changes to the rules of the sport to reduce the incidence of axial loading type injuries.[9] High impact sport needs to continue to be vigilant in the causation of CSI injuries and instigate prevention mechanisms when appropriate.

From an imaging perspective, the origins and biomechanics of the CSI are important but it is the clinical examination of the patient that is significant, both in terms of subsequent imaging and for the long term prognosis. The significance is that the CSI represents a more established risk in rugby than in other sports although pastimes such as horse riding and diving also have greater risk. The risk for rugby league players alone was cited by Hoskins et al. (2006) as 1.5 per 1,00,000 players which may seem small but needs seeing in context with the catastrophic consequence for the individual.[10] This particular study originates in Australia which, unlike most other countries, rugby league is the dominant code. Kuster et al. (2012) cited a potential highest figure of 13 per 100000 players for rugby union in the UK.[11] Imaging remains an important part of any investigation of suspected CSI.

Clinical examination

Hardy and Snaith (2011) state that patients should be presumed to have a spinal injury until proven otherwise and that a systematic trauma assessment using the <C> ABC approach should be initiated and immobilisation applied. Initial pitch-side assessment would look to establish the risk of CSI.[12]

The NEXUS and Canadian cervical spine rules exist to assist clinicians in assessing the cervical spine. Nexus refers to midline tenderness, intoxication, alertness, focal neurological deficit and distracting injuries whereas the Canadian rules refer to "dangerous mechanism", one of which is axial loading in combination with questions on movement and rotation. The sensitivity of the rules are generally accepted to be good but there are questions with regard their specificity.[13] There is overlap between both rules and the NICE guidelines discussed within the clinical imaging section.

Pattern of injury

Goldberg et al.,'s 2001 study based on the NEXUS project identified that the greater prevalence of cervical spine fractures and dislocations occur at the C5, C6 and C7 level. The study was based on blunt trauma as an entity rather than sports related but gives a clear pattern of injuries in the lower section of the cervical spine.[14] Given the body habitus of rugby players, this is the area of the cervical spine most likely to be obscured by bone and soft tissue which gives concern as to the potential for injuries being missed. However, Munera et al. (2012) commented that pure axial loading of the skull on C1 can result in fractures of the anterior arch of C1 at one or two locations in addition to fractures of the posterior arch meaning that vigilance is needed at all levels of the cervical spine.[15]

Clinical imaging

Within the UK, no specific NICE guidance exists in relation to cervical spine alone. The head injury pathway does however refer to CT cervical spine scan within 1 h in the presence of "risk factors"; these risk factors are included in Table 1. It should be noted that these apply to adults only.

The two significant issues that arise from this guidance in the context of rugby related injuries are the technically inadequate x-rays (due to inadequate visualisation of the cervicothoracic junction) and the dangerous mechanism of injury which refers specifically to axial load to the head, the mechanism that is likely to result from rugby.

The RCR guidelines T08 also refers to cervical spine assessment in conscious patients with head and/or facial injury. The authors refer to "dangerous mechanism of injury". The RCR comment that CT is undoubtedly more accurate than three-view cervical spine x-ray but carries a higher radiation dose. They also state that CT cervical spine can be undertaken at the same time as a CT head, which could render the undertaking of cervical spine radiography both time consuming and unnecessary. From the perspective of clinical radiography, the RCR's guidance refers to "three view cervical spine x-ray" suggesting that trauma obliques and swimmers views have not been factored in to the radiation dose comparison.[17]

There is a general paucity of recent research in relation to use of additional views in cervical spine radiography. Goyal et al. (2010) took a more radiography-centric view of the technical aspects that exist in cervical spine imaging.[18] They concluded that use of filters and anti-scatter grids had an impact in visualising the cervicothoracic junction but they also state that CT scanning is likely to replace further views where availability permits as it is quick and gives visualisation in almost 100% of patients. Rethnam et al. (2012) concluded that swimmers views did not satisfactorily provide adequate visualisation of the cervical spine in trauma patients, recommending CT as alternative if the lateral radiograph and swimmers views were deemed inadequate which poses the question as to why attempt radiography in the first instance if the mechanism and clinical history is highly suspicious.[19] Indeed Kanji et al. (2014)'s systematic review and Raza et al. (2013) meta-analysis and cohort study both concluded that multi-detector CT