

SHEREE NIX, BHSc(Pod) (Hons)^{1,2} • TREVOR RUSSELL, PhD³ • BILL VICENZINO, PhD⁴ • MICHELLE SMITH, PhD⁵

Validity and Reliability of Hallux Valgus Angle Measured on Digital Photographs

Hallux valgus (HV) is a common foot deformity that presents with lateral deviation of the first toe (hallux) and progressive subluxation of the first metatarsophalangeal joint.⁵ It affects approximately 23% of adults²⁰ and is significantly associated with foot pain, impaired gait, and increased risk of falls in elderly populations.^{4,12,16,22,34} Surgical intervention is often recommended,

making HV the most common indication for orthopaedic forefoot surgery.¹⁹ Increasing hallux deviation and joint subluxation have been shown to impact

health-related quality of life¹⁸ and necessitate classification and monitoring of severity and progression. The commonly advocated measure for this purpose is the

HV angle or the hallux and first metatarsal alignment.⁸

Radiographic measures of HV angle, the current criterion standard, are commonly used in clinical practice³¹ and have an acceptable level of interrater reliability.^{26,28} However, they are not always cost-effective or desirable, due to exposure to ionizing radiation, especially for repeated measurements. One alternative is to take clinical measurements using a finger goniometer.⁸ Although this method has been previously cited as reliable,^{1,11} its criterion validity has not been established. Another alternative is the use of categorical grading scales, which have 4 or 5 categories of deformity. The Manchester scale, which is based on visual comparison with 4 standardized photographs of increasing HV severity, has been validated against radiographs and shown to be reliable.^{9,17} Roddy et al²³ validated a similar 5-grade scale based on line drawings for self-reporting of HV. Although these scales are useful for classifying the severity of deformity, they have limited clinical utility when an incremental measure of the progression of HV deformity is required.

A precise, reliable, and valid measurement of HV angle for classifying severity, which eliminates the costs and risks associated with radiographs, would be

● **STUDY DESIGN:** Controlled laboratory study.

● **OBJECTIVES:** To investigate the reliability and concurrent validity of photographic measurements of hallux valgus angle compared to radiographs as the criterion standard.

● **BACKGROUND:** Clinical assessment of hallux valgus involves measuring alignment between the first toe and metatarsal on weight-bearing radiographs or visually grading the severity of deformity with categorical scales. Digital photographs offer a noninvasive method of measuring deformity on an exact scale; however, the validity of this technique has not previously been established.

● **METHODS:** Thirty-eight subjects (30 female, 8 male) were examined (76 feet, 54 with hallux valgus). Computer software was used to measure hallux valgus angle from digital records of bilateral weight-bearing dorsoplantar foot radiographs and photographs. One examiner measured 76 feet on 2 occasions 2 weeks apart, and a second examiner measured 40 feet on a single occasion. Reliability

was investigated by intraclass correlation coefficients and validity by 95% limits of agreement. The Pearson correlation coefficient was also calculated.

● **RESULTS:** Intrarater and interrater reliability were very high (intraclass correlation coefficients greater than 0.96) and 95% limits of agreement between photographic and radiographic measurements were acceptable. Measurements from photographs and radiographs were also highly correlated (Pearson $r = 0.96$).

● **CONCLUSION:** Digital photographic measurements of hallux valgus angle are reliable and have acceptable validity compared to weight-bearing radiographs. This method provides a convenient and precise tool in assessment of hallux valgus, while avoiding the cost and radiation exposure associated with radiographs. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2012;42(7):642-648, Epub 25 January 2012. doi:10.2519/jospt.2012.3841

● **KEY WORDS:** foot deformity, measurement, radiograph

¹Doctoral candidate, Division of Physiotherapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. ²Lecturer, School of Clinical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. ³Senior Lecturer, Division of Physiotherapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. ⁴Professor and Head, Division of Physiotherapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. ⁵Lecturer, Division of Physiotherapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. This study was funded in part by an Australian Podiatry Education and Research Foundation grant. Sheree Nix was supported by a Sir Robert Menzies Memorial Scholarship in the Allied Health Sciences. The study protocol was approved by the Medical Research Ethics Committee at The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. Address correspondence to Dr Michelle Smith, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia. E-mail: m.smith5@uq.edu.au • Copyright ©2012 Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy


of great benefit to researchers and clinicians in classifying the severity of HV and informing evidence-based practice. Validated assessment tools are vital for researchers when evaluating management strategies and conducting epidemiological research.²³ Furthermore, the ability of clinicians to precisely identify individuals with moderate to severe HV (defined by an HV angle greater than or equal to 20°)⁵ and to monitor its progression over time would help inform management decisions.⁸ With recent advances in digital imaging technology, photographic measurement methods are increasingly used in both clinical practice and research^{13,25}; however, the validity of digital photographs to measure HV angle has not been established. A strong correlation between photographic and radiographic measurements of HV angle has been reported,³² but reliability data and methodological details sufficient to allow reproduction of the technique have not been provided. Investigation of whether digital photographic measurements can accurately reflect radiographically determined bony alignment is warranted.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the validity of HV angle measurements from photographs taken under standardized conditions, compared to radiographs as the criterion standard. Intrarater and interrater reliability of both methods were also established.

METHODS

Participants

A SAMPLE OF 38 HEALTHY ADULTS (8 men and 30 women) was recruited to participate in the study through community advertisements seeking volunteers with and without HV. The mean \pm SD age of the participants was 51.8 \pm 16.3 years, ranging from 20 to 75 years, and their mean body mass index was 25.8 \pm 4.4 kg/m², ranging from 18.0 to 36.8 kg/m². Potential participants ($n = 61$) were screened and excluded if they had any previous foot or ankle fractures, or surgery ($n = 13$) or inflammatory arthritis



($n = 5$). Due to risks associated with exposure to ionizing radiation, potential participants were also excluded if they were pregnant or breastfeeding ($n = 5$). This study was approved by the Medical Research Ethics Committee at The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. All participants gave written informed consent and the rights of all participants were protected.

Digital Images

To control for potential error introduced by subject positioning and camera placement, the following procedure was used for obtaining digital images. Participants stood in their natural angle and base of gait, as determined by the principal examiner's observation of each participant walking along a 10-m walkway. The importance of weight-bearing views has been described elsewhere.³³

A single bilateral weight-bearing dorsoplantar radiograph was obtained for each participant by the same radiogra-

pher. Standardized X-ray tube distance (100 cm) and angle (15° from vertical) were used, with the X-ray beam centered between left and right feet at the level of the midfoot (**FIGURE 1**). Two digital photographs taken by the principal examiner were measured for intrarater reliability, and a third photograph immediately captured by the radiographer was measured for interrater reliability. Thus, photographic measurements were taken from 3 independent sets of images. The digital camera was held in a standardized position, which was flat against the X-ray tube, to reproduce the angle and position of the radiographic image relative to both feet (**FIGURE 1**). The digital camera used was a Nikon D90 (Nikon Inc, Melville, NY), with an 18- to 200-mm zoom lens. Images were taken using a focal length of 30 mm and an aperture setting of F4. The highest resolution (12.3 megapixels) was used, with a relatively low ISO (200) to avoid pixelation and to ensure clarity for the purpose of locating measurement landmarks.

Measurement Procedure

Measurements were obtained from digital photographs and radiographs using software adapted from a measurement suite included in the eHAB telerehabilitation system Version 2.3 (NeoRehab, St Lucia, Australia). This software has demonstrated high reliability and validity.^{24,25} All digital images were de-identified prior to measurement and saved in JPEG format (1445 \times 960 pixels, 8-bit RGB JPEG). Radiographs were originally obtained in digital format so that conversion would not be required and there would be no need to measure radiographs by hand.

To determine HV angle from the digital photographs, 4 points were selected by the examiner: 2 visual bisection points for the head and base of the first proximal phalanx and 2 visual bisection points for the head and base of the first metatarsal bone (**FIGURE 2A**). The software used these 4 points to calculate the HV angle, which is the angle formed by the intersection of



the axes of the first metatarsal and proximal phalanx.

Several methods have been described for bisecting the first metatarsal shaft on radiographs.²⁸ The method used in this study was in accordance with recommendations from the American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society.⁶ Points marking the width of the metaphyseal/diaphyseal region of the proximal phalanx (0.5-1.0 cm proximal and distal to the articular surface) and first metatarsal (1.0-2.0 cm proximal and distal to the articular surface) were selected, and the software

calculated the bisection points and HV angle (**FIGURE 2B**).

The principal examiner determined reference points and took measurements from the full set of photographs and radiographs (76 feet) on 2 separate occasions 2 weeks apart. That is, on each measurement occasion, each image was independently marked up and an independent measurement produced. To minimize test-retest bias and to ensure that the examiner was unable to recall previous observations, no reference was made to the data or images in the interim. All the photographic measurements were taken first in a single measurement session, followed by the radiographic measurements, such that no direct comparison could be made between the radiographs and photographs of individual subjects. A second examiner measured a subset of radiographs and photographs (40 feet), following the measurement protocol described above, on a single occasion. Both the principal examiner and second examiner were podiatrists with 3 to 4 years of clinical experience.

At each session, 1 measurement for each foot was recorded from the bilateral radiographs and photographs and used in our analysis. Repeated measurements by the principal examiner (76 feet) were used to calculate intratester reliability for both photographic and radiographic measurements. The first measurement by the principal examiner and the measurements by the second examiner (40 feet) were used to calculate interrater reliability.

Statistical Methods

Statistical analyses were performed using data from both left and right feet, with each foot considered a separate unit in analysis ($n = 76$). Although this approach is sometimes problematic in clinical research,¹⁴ it can be considered appropriate for studies of this nature, where the aim is to simply compare 2 sets of measurements and not to draw conclusions regarding individual patients.¹⁷ Intratester and interrater reliability were examined

using intraclass correlation coefficients ($ICC_{3,1}$ and $ICC_{2,1}$).³⁰ These reliability coefficients were then used to generate the standard error of measurement (SEM) as a measure of absolute reliability, using the formula $SEM = SD \times \sqrt{1 - ICC}$.⁷ Minimal detectable change (MDC) at the 90% confidence interval (CI) was calculated using the following formula: $MDC = 1.65 \times SEM \times \sqrt{2}$.¹⁰ Furthermore, to facilitate comparison with our validity analysis, the repeatability coefficient (RC) described by Bland and Altman² was calculated as follows: the standard deviation of the differences between test and retest was multiplied by the z score for 95% confidence limits (1.96).

The validity of photographic measurements, compared to radiographs as the criterion standard, was assessed by calculating the 95% limits of agreement (LA), which determine the range within which 95% of differences between the 2 measurement methods should lie.³ Independent t tests were used to examine differences between the means of photographic and radiographic measurements obtained by the principal examiner, and mean differences were calculated with their 95% CIs. Mean absolute differences and Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to further examine the association between photographic and radiographic measurements.

To investigate potential factors contributing to the discrepancy between photographic and radiographic measurements, the 95% LA were calculated separately for subgroups according to age (less than or equal to 50 years and greater than 50 years) and HV angle, using all data obtained by the principal examiner. HV severity was defined using the following classification⁵: no deformity (HV angle less than 15°), mild (greater than or equal to 15° and less than 20°), moderate (20°-40°), or severe (greater than 40°). For the purpose of our subgroup analysis, these categories were collapsed into 2 groups, defined as follows: none or mild deformity (HV angle less than 20°) or moderate to severe deformity (HV angle

greater than or equal to 20°). In addition to the 95% LA, independent *t* tests and calculated mean differences (95% CI) were used to investigate subgroups by age and HV angle.

Interpretation of correlation coefficients was based on the following guidelines: high correlation was represented by coefficients between 0.70 and 0.89, whereas coefficients of 0.90 or greater indicated very high correlation.⁷ An acceptable range for 95% LA between photographic and radiographic measurements was determined a priori to be $\pm 6.5^\circ$, which is the reported interrater RC for radiographic measurement of HV angle.²⁷ Statistical analyses were conducted using Stata Version 10 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

IN THE OVERALL SAMPLE OF 76 FEET, mean \pm SD HV angle was $22.2^\circ \pm 10.6^\circ$, as measured on radiographs. Of the 76 feet studied, 22 were classified as having no HV deformity (HV angle less than 15°), 14 as having a mild deformity (greater than or equal to 15° and less than 20°), 37 as moderate (20° – 40°), and 3 as severe (greater than 40°).

Intrarater Reliability

The ICC_{3,1} for measurements taken by the first examiner on 2 separate occasions (76 feet) was 0.99 for radiographic measurements (95% CI: 0.99, 1.00) and 0.97 for photographic measurements (95% CI: 0.95, 0.98), which indicates very high intrarater reliability (TABLE 1). Values for SEM and MDC also indicate high test-retest reliability for radiographic (SEM, 1.1° ; MDC, 2.5°) and photographic measurements (SEM, 1.8° ; MDC, 4.1°).

Interrater Reliability

Comparison of measurements taken by 2 different examiners on 40 feet showed very high interrater reliability for radiographs (ICC_{2,1} = 0.99; 95% CI: 0.98, 1.00) and photographs (ICC_{2,1} = 0.96; 95% CI: 0.93, 0.98) (TABLE 2). Interrater agree-

TABLE 1		INTRARATER RELIABILITY OF HALLUX VALGUS ANGLE MEASUREMENTS (76 FEET)				
	Test*	Retest*	ICC _{3,1} (95% CI)	SEM, deg	MDC ₉₀ , deg	RC, deg
Radiograph	22.2 \pm 10.6	21.7 \pm 10.2	0.99 (0.99, 1.00)	1.1	2.5	± 2.9
Photograph	23.2 \pm 10.1	22.6 \pm 9.9	0.97 (0.95, 0.98)	1.8	4.1	± 5.3
Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; ICC, intraclass correlation coefficient; MDC ₉₀ , minimal detectable change at 90% confidence level; RC, repeatability coefficient; SEM, standard error of the measurement.						
*Values are mean \pm SD degrees.						

TABLE 2		INTERRATER RELIABILITY OF HALLUX VALGUS ANGLE MEASUREMENTS (40 FEET)				
	Examiner 1*	Examiner 2*	ICC _{2,1} (95% CI)	SEM, deg	MDC ₉₀ , deg	RC, deg
Radiograph	19.7 \pm 10.4	20.4 \pm 10.8	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	1	2.4	± 3.0
Photograph	21.0 \pm 10.1	21.1 \pm 11.0	0.96 (0.93, 0.98)	2	4.7	± 5.8
Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; ICC, intraclass correlation coefficient; MDC ₉₀ , minimal detectable change at 90% confidence level; RC, repeatability coefficient; SEM, standard error of the measurement.						
*Values are mean \pm SD degrees.						

ment for photographic measurements was confirmed by relatively small SEM (2.0°) and MDC (4.7°) values, also shown in TABLE 2.

Validity

Analysis of validity showed acceptable 95% LA (-6.5° , 4.4°) between radiographic and photographic measurements by the first examiner (76 feet measured) and slightly narrower LA (-4.9° , 3.5°) for the second examiner (40 feet measured). Very high correlations between 0.96 and 0.98 were found using the Pearson correlation coefficient (TABLE 3). Further analysis of the first examiner's data by age and HV angle subgroups showed narrower 95% LA for measurements of participants aged 50 years or younger (LA: -5.8° , 3.6°) and those with an HV angle of less than 20° (LA: -6.2° , 3.2°) (TABLE 4).

DISCUSSION

THIS STUDY COMPARED DIGITAL PHOTOGRAPHIC measurements of HV angle with hallux alignment on weight-bearing dorsoplantar radiographs, showing an acceptable level of

agreement. Statistical analysis using 95% LA is used to detect possible discrepancy between 2 measurement methods, by indicating the range between which 95% of differences should lie. We determined from the literature that up to $\pm 6.5^\circ$ of variation can be seen when more than 1 examiner measures radiographic HV angle.²⁷ Therefore, this amount of error was considered an appropriate clinical standard for our analysis. Our results showed LA within this range, indicating that photographic measurements of HV angle can be confidently used as an alternative to radiographs.

To interpret results for validity, the repeatability of both photographic and radiographic measurements needed to be established separately. Intrarater reliability and interrater reliability were demonstrated by very high ICCs (greater than 0.96). These findings are consistent with reports from previous studies investigating repeatability of radiographic HV angle measurements (ICCs greater than 0.95).^{26,29} The calculated SEM for photographic measurements indicates a likely variation of approximately 2° in either direction due to measurement

TABLE 3

VALIDITY OF PHOTOGRAPHIC HALLUX VALGUS ANGLE MEASUREMENTS COMPARED TO RADIOGRAPHS

	Radiograph*	Photograph*	Mean Difference (95% CI), deg	P Value	95% LA, deg	Mean Absolute Difference, deg	Pearson r
Examiner 1 (76 feet)	21.6 ± 10.1	22.7 ± 9.9	-1.0 (-3.3, 1.2)	.37 [†]	-6.5, 4.4	2.5	0.96
Examiner 2 (40 feet)	20.4 ± 10.8	21.1 ± 11.0	-0.7 (-5.5, 4.1)	.77 [†]	-4.9, 3.5	1.9	0.98

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; LA, limits of agreement.

*Values are mean ± SD degrees.

[†]t tests indicated no significant difference ($P > .05$).

error. However, the MDC at the 90% confidence level was less than 5° (intra-rater, 4.1°; interrater, 4.7°), demonstrating good repeatability. Furthermore, we calculated the RC,² which can be directly compared to the 95% LA. As can be seen by comparing TABLES 1 through 3, the RC for photographic measurements was of a similar magnitude to the 95% LA between photographic and radiographic measurements. This indicates that the extent of potential discrepancy between the 2 measurement methods is primarily determined by the level of repeatability of photographic measurements of HV angle.

Because weight-bearing dorsoplantar radiographs are the current standard in clinical practice, they were considered to be an appropriate criterion standard for assessing concurrent validity.³¹ Clinical measurement of HV angle has been recommended when it is not possible or necessary to obtain radiographs, as this measure is useful for classifying severity of deformity and monitoring progression over time.^{8,17} Clinical assessment should also include attention to the patient's presenting complaint, which may involve foot pain or cosmetic concerns, particularly severity of HV angle.⁸ In individuals who do not have pain, Ferrari⁸ recommended a waiting period to determine whether the condition may be deteriorating, prior to introducing any treatment aimed at prevention, because there is no evidence to suggest that conservative interventions are more effective in mild HV. Therefore, baseline and follow-up measures of both HV angle and foot pain

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF LIMITS OF AGREEMENT BY SUBGROUPS OF AGE AND HALLUX VALGUS SEVERITY (76 FEET)

Subgroup	Radiograph*	Photograph*	Mean Difference (95% CI), deg	P Value	95% LA, deg
Age ≤50 y (30 feet)	18.5 ± 9.1	19.6 ± 9.3	-1.1 (-4.5, 2.2)	.51 [†]	-5.8, 3.6
Age >50 y (46 feet)	23.7 ± 10.2	24.7 ± 9.8	-1.0 (-3.9, 2.0)	.51 [†]	-6.8, 4.9
None/mild HV (36 feet)	15.1 ± 8.5	16.6 ± 8.2	-1.5 (-4.2, 1.3)	.29 [†]	-6.2, 3.2
Moderate/severe HV (40 feet)	27.6 ± 7.3	28.2 ± 7.8	-0.6 (-3.0, 1.8)	.61 [†]	-6.6, 5.4

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HV, hallux valgus; LA, limits of agreement.

*Values are mean ± SD degrees, except where indicated otherwise.

[†]t tests indicated no significant difference ($P > .05$).

should inform management decisions. Our study investigated HV angle as a primary indicator of HV severity; however, it should be noted that a thorough preoperative assessment of HV includes measurement of other radiographic angles, such as intermetatarsal angle and distal metatarsal articular angle,³¹ in addition to noting the presence of sesamoid displacement and degenerative change.²¹ Therefore, radiographs would still be required in individuals with HV for whom surgical correction is being considered.

Several limitations should be considered when applying these results clinically. Possible sources of error when using this method include subject positioning, camera placement, and locating landmarks on the images. We used each subject's angle and base of gait as a standardized position, which can be easily reproduced in a clinical setting. The camera position was determined by the standard tube-to-film distance and angle of the radiography equipment. By controlling for potential bias introduced by subject

positioning and camera placement, we were primarily investigating the reliability and validity of locating measurement landmarks for HV angle on digital photographs and radiographs independently. Therefore, this method has been validated for use under ideal conditions in a laboratory setting, and further work is required to validate a standardized camera position that would be appropriate for use in a clinical setting.

Another limitation of this method is that visually determining the position of the first metatarsal shaft using a photograph requires a good knowledge of surface anatomy of the foot. Both examiners who took measurements in this study were podiatrists. While they may be considered representative of any healthcare professional with a good knowledge of anatomy of the foot, examiners with less experience in treating the foot may exhibit less repeatable results. It has been suggested that systematic differences between radiographic and photographic measurements may occur due to the ef-

fect of soft tissue in photographs.¹³ However, in our validity analysis (TABLE 3), we found the mean radiographic HV angle ($21.6^\circ \pm 10.1^\circ$) and mean photographic HV angle ($22.7^\circ \pm 9.9^\circ$) to differ by approximately 1° ; therefore, any difference does not appear to be systematic. Independent t test results also showed that this difference was not significant ($P = .37$).

The sample of volunteers recruited was representative of a clinical population, with a wide range of ages and severity of HV. The range of HV angles observed in our sample of 76 feet was 3° to 46° , with a range of mild, moderate, and severe HV, as well as 22 feet with no deformity (8 participants with no HV deformity and 6 individuals with unilateral HV). It is interesting to note that further analysis of our validity data by subgroups of HV severity indicated slightly narrower 95% LA when examining feet with mild or no HV deformity (less than 20°) (TABLE 4). It is possible that greater measurement error may occur when examining feet with moderate to severe HV (HV angle greater than or equal to 20°), as joint subluxation or development of a medial bursa may lead to inaccuracy in determining the first metatarsal head reference point on a digital photograph.

In comparison to previously validated categorical rating scales, digital photographs provide clinicians with a measurement scale with finer intervals. The 4-level Manchester scale has been shown to have good retest reliability (weighted $\kappa = 0.78$ - 0.90)¹⁵ and a strong association with radiographic HV angle measurements (Spearman $\rho = 0.73$, $P < .01$).¹⁷ Similarly, a 5-grade scale described by Roddy et al²³ has been shown to have very good observer repeatability (weighted $\kappa = 0.82$). Although this measurement tool has 1 more level of grading than the Manchester scale, it was designed for the collection of self-report data and uses simplified line drawings that may be less accurate in reflecting the underlying bone alignment. One of the clear benefits of photographic measurements over these

categorical scales is that they produce a finer incremental measurement, which is important due to the progressive nature of HV. Furthermore, although goniometric measurements have been reported to have good test-retest reliability ($r = 0.71$),¹ their validity compared to radiographic measurements has not been established, and this should be investigated in future clinical studies.

The clear benefits of photographic measurements are the noninvasive nature of this technique and its cost-effectiveness for researchers and clinicians. Juvenile HV deformity is a common presentation, and digital photography offers a means of avoiding unnecessary repeated exposure to ionizing radiation in individuals whose HV angle may need to be monitored over a long period. A secondary benefit of having a digital image on record is that it can be used retrospectively to show progress to the patient. This can be a powerful motivational tool to assist with treatment compliance. Finally, while digital imaging and processing software is becoming widely utilized in healthcare settings, future development of smartphone applications could combine the image-capture and measurement procedures into a single step, thus streamlining the method for convenience of both clinicians and researchers.

CONCLUSION

THIS STUDY DEMONSTRATES THAT digital photographs taken under standardized conditions can be used with confidence to measure HV angle, because these measurements accurately represent joint angle compared to the current criterion standard of weight-bearing dorsoplantar foot radiographs. Validity data were also supported by good intrarater and interrater reliability. One of the main advantages to this method of HV angle measurement is that it provides an inexpensive and noninvasive alternative to radiographs, while providing a more incremental measure of HV progression than do the commonly used cat-

egorical rating scales. Further research is warranted to validate this procedure for use in a clinical setting. ●

KEY POINTS

FINDINGS: Measurements of HV angle can be performed with acceptable reliability and validity using standardized digital photographs.

IMPLICATIONS: Compared to clinical rating scales currently used to classify HV severity, digital photographs provide a more incremental measure of hallux deviation, and may reduce the need for radiographs in the early stages of monitoring HV deformity.

CAUTION: Determining reference points on digital photographs may be dependent on examiner experience and knowledge of surface anatomy. Subject positioning and camera placement must be standardized to reduce potential error.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Abdulwahab SS, Al-Dosry RD. Hallux valgus and preferred shoe types among young healthy Saudi Arabian females. *Ann Saudi Med*. 2000;20:319-321.
2. Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 1999;8:135-160.
3. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet*. 1986;327:307-310.
4. Cho NH, Kim S, Kwon DJ, Kim HA. The prevalence of hallux valgus and its association with foot pain and function in a rural Korean community. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2009;91:494-498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.91B4.21925>
5. Coughlin MJ, Jones CP. Hallux valgus: demographics, etiology, and radiographic assessment. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2007;28:759-777. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3113/FAI.2007.0759>
6. Coughlin MJ, Saltzman CL, Nunley JA, 2nd. Angular measurements in the evaluation of hallux valgus deformities: a report of the ad hoc committee of the American Orthopaedic Foot & Ankle Society on angular measurements. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2002;23:68-74.
7. Domholdt E. *Physical Therapy Research: Principles and Applications*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders/Elsevier; 2000.
8. Ferreri J. Critical review: the assessment and conservative treatment of hallux valgus deformity in healthy adults. *Br J Podiatry*.

[RESEARCH REPORT]

- 2006;9:104-108.
9. Garrow AP, Papageorgiou A, Silman AJ, Thomas E, Jayson MI, Macfarlane GJ. The grading of hallux valgus. The Manchester Scale. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc.* 2001;91:74-78.
 10. Haley SM, Fragala-Pinkham MA. Interpreting change scores of tests and measures used in physical therapy. *Phys Ther.* 2006;86:735-743.
 11. Kilmartin TE, Bishop A. Hallux abductus angle measurement: repeatability trials of a clinical measuring instrument. *Chiropodist.* 1988;43:185-187.
 12. Koski K, Luukinen H, Laippala P, Kivela SL. Physiological factors and medications as predictors of injurious falls by elderly people: a prospective population-based study. *Age Ageing.* 1996;25:29-38.
 13. McPoil TG, Cornwall MW, Medoff L, Vicenzino B, Forsberg K, Hiltz D. Arch height change during sit-to-stand: an alternative for the navicular drop test. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 2008;1:3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1757-1146-1-3>
 14. Menz HB. Analysis of paired data in physical therapy research: time to stop double-dipping? *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2005;35:477-478. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2005.0108>
 15. Menz HB, Fotoohabadi MR, Wee E, Spink MJ. Validity of self-assessment of hallux valgus using the Manchester scale. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2010;11:215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-11-215>
 16. Menz HB, Lord SR. Gait instability in older people with hallux valgus. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2005;26:483-489.
 17. Menz HB, Munteanu SE. Radiographic validation of the Manchester scale for the classification of hallux valgus deformity. *Rheumatology (Oxford).* 2005;44:1061-1066. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/keh687>
 18. Menz HB, Roddy E, Thomas E, Croft PR. Impact of hallux valgus severity on general and foot-specific health-related quality of life. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* 2011;63:396-404. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acr.20396>
 19. Meyr AJ, Adams ML, Sheridan MJ, Ahalt RG. Epidemiological aspects of the surgical correction of structural forefoot pathology. *J Foot Ankle Surg.* 2009;48:543-551. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.jfas.2009.05.003>
 20. Nix S, Smith M, Vicenzino B. Prevalence of hallux valgus in the general population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Foot Ankle Res.* 2010;3:21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1757-1146-3-21>
 21. Robinson AH, Limbers JP. Modern concepts in the treatment of hallux valgus. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2005;87:1038-1045. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.87B8.16467>
 22. Roddy E, Zhang W, Doherty M. Prevalence and associations of hallux valgus in a primary care population. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2008;59:857-862. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/art.23709>
 23. Roddy E, Zhang W, Doherty M. Validation of a self-report instrument for assessment of hallux valgus. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2007;15:1008-1012. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2007.02.016>
 24. Russell T. Goniometry via the internet. *Aust J Physiother.* 2007;53:136.
 25. Russell TG, Jull GA, Wootton R. Can the Internet be used as a medium to evaluate knee angle? *Man Ther.* 2003;8:242-246.
 26. Saro C, Johnson DN, Martinez De Aragon J, Lindgren U, Fellander-Tsai L. Reliability of radiological and cosmetic measurements in hallux valgus. *Acta Radiol.* 2005;46:843-851.
 27. Schneider W, Csepan R, Kasperek M, Pinggera O, Knahr K. Intra- and interobserver repeatability of radiographic measurements in hallux surgery: improvement and validation of a method. *Acta Orthop Scand.* 2002;73:670-673. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/000164702321039651>
 28. Schneider W, Csepan R, Knahr K. Reproducibility of the radiographic metatarsophalangeal angle in hallux surgery. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2003;85-A:494-499.
 29. Shima H, Okuda R, Yasuda T, Jotoku T, Kitano N, Kinoshita M. Radiographic measurements in patients with hallux valgus before and after proximal crescentic osteotomy. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2009;91:1369-1376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.H.00483>
 30. Shrout PE, Fleiss JL. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull.* 1979;86:420-428.
 31. Srivastava S, Chockalingam N, El Fakhri T. Radiographic measurements of hallux angles: a review of current techniques. *Foot (Edinb).* 2010;20:27-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foot.2009.12.002>
 32. Stevenson M. A study of the correlation between neutral calcaneal stance position and relaxed calcaneal stance position in the development of hallux abducto valgus. *Aust Podiatrist.* 1990;24:18-20.
 33. Tanaka Y, Takakura Y, Takaoka T, Akiyama K, Fujii T, Tamai S. Radiographic analysis of hallux valgus in women on weightbearing and nonweight-bearing. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1997;186-194.
 34. Tinetti ME, Speechley M, Ginter SF. Risk factors for falls among elderly persons living in the community. *N Engl J Med.* 1988;319:1701-1707. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198812293192604>



MORE INFORMATION
WWW.JOSPT.ORG

BROWSE Collections of Articles on JOSPT's Website

The *Journal's* website (www.jospt.org) sorts published articles into more than **50 distinct clinical collections**, which can be used as convenient entry points to clinical content by region of the body, sport, and other categories such as differential diagnosis and exercise or muscle physiology. In each collection, articles are cited in reverse chronological order, with the most recent first.

In addition, *JOSPT* offers easy online access to special issues and features, including a series on **clinical practice guidelines** that are linked to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Please see **"Special Issues & Features"** in the right-hand column of the *Journal* website's home page.

This article has been cited by:

1. Gavin John Heyes, Amir R. Vosoughi, Lizzy Weigelt, Lyndon Mason, Andrew Molloy. 2020. Pes Planus Deformity and Its Association With Hallux Valgus Recurrence Following Scarf Osteotomy. *Foot & Ankle International* 5, 107110072093764. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Harsh H. Buddhadev, Carolyn E. Barbee. 2020. Redistribution of joint moments and work in older women with and without hallux valgus at two walking speeds. *Gait & Posture* 77, 112-117. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Patricia Palomo-López, Ricardo Becerro-de-Bengoa-Vallejo, Marta Elena Losa-Iglesias, Daniel López-López, David Rodríguez-Sanz, Carlos Romero-Morales, César Calvo-Lobo, Victoria Mazoterías-Pardo. 2020. Kinesiophobia and Pain Intensity Are Increased by a Greater Hallux Valgus Deformity Degree- Kinesiophobia and Pain Intensity in Hallux Valgus. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17:2, 626. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Michelle D. Smith, Daniel Lee, Trevor Russell, Mark Matthews, David MacDonald, Bill Vicenzino. 2019. How Much Does the Talocrural Joint Contribute to Ankle Dorsiflexion Range of Motion During the Weight-Bearing Lunge Test? A Cross-sectional Radiographic Validity Study. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 49:12, 934-941. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
5. Kanako Nakajima, Yoshiyuki Kobayashi, Masaaki Mochimaru. The Influence of Hallux Valgus on Plantar Pressure During Walking 1-5. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Kazuo Kinoshita, Kyoji Okada, Isao Saito, Akira Saito, Yusuke Takahashi, Minoru Kimoto, Masahiko Wakasa. 2019. Alignment of the rearfoot and foot pressure patterns of individuals with medial tibial stress syndrome: A cross-sectional study. *Physical Therapy in Sport* 38, 132-138. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Pieter van der Woude, Stefan B. Keizer, Martine Wever-Korevaar, Bregje J.W. Thomassen. 2019. Intra- and Interobserver Agreement in Hallux Valgus Angle Measurements on Weightbearing and Non-Weightbearing Radiographs. *The Journal of Foot and Ankle Surgery* 58:4, 706-712. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Satoshi Yamaguchi, Aya Sadamasu, Seiji Kimura, Ryuichiro Akagi, Yohei Yamamoto, Yasunori Sato, Takahisa Sasho, Seiji Ohtori. 2019. Nonradiographic Measurement of Hallux Valgus Angle Using Self-photography. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 49:2, 80-86. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)]
9. Nathan Heineman, Avneesh Chhabra, Lihua Zhang, Riham Dessouky, Dane Wukich. 2019. Point vs. traditional method evaluation of hallux valgus: interreader reliability and intermethod performance using X-ray and MRI. *Skeletal Radiology* 48:2, 251-257. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Takenori Awatani, Taisuke Enoki, Ikuhiro Morikita. 2018. Inter-rater reliability and validity of angle measurements using smartphone applications for weight-bearing ankle dorsiflexion range of motion measurements. *Physical Therapy in Sport* 34, 113-120. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Kanako Nakajima, Yoshiyuki Kobayashi, Mitsunori Tada, Masaaki Mochimaru. 2018. Evaluation of plantar pressures in people with hallux valgus using principal component analysis. *Technology and Health Care* 26:4, 667-674. [[Crossref](#)]
12. David Rodríguez-Sanz, Natalia Tovaruela-Carrión, Daniel López-López, Patricia Palomo-López, Carlos Romero-Morales, Emmanuel Navarro-Flores, César Calvo-Lobo. 2018. Foot disorders in the elderly: A mini-review. *Disease-a-Month* 64:3, 64-91. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Kenneth Kin-Hoo Koo, Lung Fung Tse, Hi Shan Cheng, Kevin Ki Wai Ho. 2017. The progression of hallux valgus in the oriental Chinese population in Hong Kong. *The Foot* 32, 15-21. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Takenori Awatani, Taisuke Enoki, Ikuhiro Morikita. 2017. Reliability and validity of angle measurements using radiograph and smartphone applications: experimental research on protractor. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science* 29:10, 1869-1873. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Daniel López López, Juan Manuel Vilar Fernández, Marta Elena Losa Iglesias, Carlos Álvarez Castro, César Calvo Lobo, José Ramos Galván, Ricardo Becerro de Bengoa Vallejo. 2016. Influence of depression in a sample of people with hallux valgus. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 25:6, 574-578. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Antonio I. Cuesta-Vargas, Cristina Roldán-Jiménez. 2016. Validity and reliability of arm abduction angle measured on smartphone: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 17:1. . [[Crossref](#)]

17. César Calvo Lobo, Alejandro Garrido Marín, David Rodríguez Sanz, Daniel López López, Patricia Palomo López, Carlos Romero Morales, Irene Sanz Corbalán. 2016. Ultrasound evaluation of intrinsic plantar muscles and fascia in hallux valgus. *Medicine* **95**:45, e5243. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Daniel López López, Lucía Callejo González, Marta Elena Losa Iglesias, Jesús Luis Saleta Canosa, David Rodríguez Sanz, Cesar Calvo Lobo, Ricardo Becerro de Bengoa Vallejo. 2016. Quality of Life Impact Related to Foot Health in a Sample of Older People with Hallux Valgus. *Aging and Disease* **7**:1, 45. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Yi-Hsiang Hsu, Youfang Liu, Marian T Hannan, William Maixner, Shad B Smith, Luda Diatchenko, Yvonne M Golightly, Hylton B Menz, Virginia B Kraus, Michael Doherty, AG Wilson, Joanne M Jordan. 2015. Genome-wide association meta-analyses to identify common genetic variants associated with hallux valgus in Caucasian and African Americans. *Journal of Medical Genetics* **52**:11, 762-769. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Danielle Y. Ponzio, David I. Pedowitz, Kushagra Verma, Mitchell G. Maltenfort, Brian S. Winters, Steven M. Raikin. 2015. Radiographic Outcomes of Postoperative Taping Following Hallux Valgus Correction. *Foot & Ankle International* **36**:7, 820-826. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Moon-Hwan Kim, Jong-Hyuck Weon. 2015. Intra- and Inter-rater Reliabilities of Infrasternal Angle Measurement. *The Journal of Korean Physical Therapy* **27**:3, 154-158. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Christian Klein, Wieland Kinz, Alexander Zembsch, Elisabeth Groll-Knapp, Michael Kundi. 2014. The hallux valgus angle of the margo medialis pedis as an alternative to the measurement of the metatarsophalangeal hallux valgus angle. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* **15**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
23. Daniël MC Janssen, Antal P Sanders, Nick A Guldemon, Joris Hermus, Geert HIM Walenkamp, Lodewijk W van Rhijn. 2014. A comparison of hallux valgus angles assessed with computerised plantar pressure measurements, clinical examination and radiography in patients with diabetes. *Journal of Foot and Ankle Research* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
24. Sheree E Nix, Bill T Vicenzino, Natalie J Collins, Michelle D Smith. 2013. Gait parameters associated with hallux valgus: a systematic review. *Journal of Foot and Ankle Research* **6**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
25. Sung-Dae Choung, Sun-Young Kang, Moon-Hwan Kim, Jong-Hyuck Weon. 2013. Reliability and Validity of the Goniometer for Hallux Valgus Angle Measurement. *Physical Therapy Korea* **20**:2, 46-51. [[Crossref](#)]