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MDT continues to be one of the most researched conservative approaches to musculoskeletal problems. It has been examined in depth in relation to its utility in the spine, and the research is accumulating in the extremities. The following is a selection of some of the most relevant and supportive studies on the approach to date. However, studies on MDT are not universally supportive, to get a comprehensive sense of the literature exploring MDT and for the most up-to-date MDT references, please visit: www.mckenzieinstitute.org

Classification Reliability
Reliability means that different examiners will agree on the assessment findings and reach the same patient classification. Since treatment decisions rely exclusively on the assessment and classification, this is critical. The following two systematic reviews summarise reliability for MDT. When applied by Credentialed or Diplomaed clinicians, MDT has acceptable reliability for the lumbar spine and conflicting levels of reliability for the neck. For the extremities there is strong evidence for acceptable reliability with some study designs and using experienced clinicians:


Treatment Efficacy
The following RCTs endorse the treatise value of MDT, showing efficacy in the spine and in the extremities.


This high-quality RCT endorsed the value of sub-classifying patients using MDT, establishing directional preference (DP) and matching specific exercises based upon these findings. All patient outcomes including pain, function and medication use were significantly superior in the group where the exercises with matched to the DP.


With a one-year follow-up, this study compared two alternative interventions. MDT was found to be more effective than manipulation, and the study gives support to the Method’s classification-based approach.


The patients in this study had symptoms that would normally qualify them for surgery. The patients given DP exercises determined by MDT improved significantly more with respect to global improvement, sick leave, vocational status, root compression signs, and patient satisfaction.


Patients who were given exercises based on an MDT assessment had superior outcomes compared to those of wait-list controls for both pain and function. 40% of the knees examined were classified as having a DP; they demonstrated large effect sizes at two weeks for all primary outcomes and up to large effect sizes at three months.


This RCT with 220 patients, used an exercise-based approach utilising MDT principles, including force progressions, compared to ‘usual care’. At one year follow-up the MDT group showed greater improvements with function, pain and with self-reported success.

Association with Psychosocial Factors
Numerous studies and one systematic have explored the association between MDT and psychosocial outcomes. There has been a positive association shown in relation to fear avoidance beliefs, somatisation, depressive symptoms and pain self-efficacy.


This large cohort study followed 705 patients who completed functional scores and the STarT Back Questionnaire at baseline and received MDT care. Over 90% classified at a high-risk level decreased to either low (67%) or medium risk (25%) by discharge indicating that MDT care may reduce some of the STarT physical and psychosocial impairments.


This cohort study took 138 patients with LBP and high STarT risk. Those with a DP and given matched intervention showed significant and clinically important differences in function compared to those with no DP.

This systematic review found there was an association between MDT and improvement in fear-avoidance, pain self-efficacy, depression and psychological distress.

Predicting Outcomes
MDT also has a proven ability to predict patient outcome. With Centralisation / DP the prognosis for a rapid and lasting improvement is very good.


Assisting in Spinal / Extremity Differentiation
MDT is used as a means for clinicians to differentiate whether extremity symptoms are from a spinal or extremity source. Case studies have outlined this process for individual patients and one cohort study details this MDT process.


Using an MDT based 'baseline-test-retest baseline' process, clinicians determined which of the 369 patients with extremity pain had symptoms that were of 'spinal source' and which had 'extremity source' symptoms. Overall, 43.5% of the patients were designated as having a 'spinal source' and were treated with solely spinal intervention.

Avoiding potential Surgery and Cost-Saving Implications
Several studies have shown the potential of MDT for pre-surgical screening and intervention to reduce surgery rates in the spine. This could have significant cost-saving implications. In the first study, 4 years after implementation of MDT based spine clinics in a Danish county, lumbar disc surgery rates were reduced by 50% compared with previous years. In the second study, transfomaminal epidural injections followed by MDT, demonstrated the potential to be an effective strategy in preventing surgical interventions for patients with lumbar disc herniation.


Systematic Reviews and Guidelines featuring MDT
MDT and the phenomenon of Centralisation and DP have been the subject of, or included in, many systematic reviews and guidelines. Here are a few examples.


It was recommended that clinicians should use specific repeated movements to promote centralisation in patients with acute, subacute or chronic LBP, with the recommendation based on Grade A, 'strong evidence'.


This review evaluated 22 systems that classify populations with low back-related leg pain. MDT scored the highest of any system, with criteria based upon purpose, validity, feasibility, reliability and generalisability.


This clinical practice guideline developed by a panel of international experts made recommendations on the management of knee OA in regard to exercise. MDT was 'strongly recommended' as an intervention.


This review concluded that there was moderate to high quality evidence that MDT is superior to other rehabilitation interventions for pain and disability in patients with chronic LBP.


This review grouped MDT RCTs into those that followed the core principles of MDT and those that did not and compared treatment effect sizes. Those adherent studies showed significantly greater reduction in pain and disability, demonstrating that when the approach used is consistent with the core MDT principles, better outcomes are achieved.