References

1. Glasoe WM, Allen MK, Saltzman CL, et al: Comparison of two methods used to assess first-ray mobility. Foot Ankle Int **23:** 248, 2002.
2. Coughlin MJ, Shurnas PS: Hallux rigidus: demographics, etiology, and radiographic assessment. Foot Ankle Int **24:** 731, 2003.
3. Coughlin MJ, Shurnas PS: Hallux valgus in men: part II. First ray mobility after bunionectomy and factors associated with hallux valgus deformity. Foot Ankle Int **24:** 73, 2003.
4. Roukis TS, Landsman AS: Hypermobility of the first ray: a critical review of the literature. J Foot Ankle Surg **42:** 377, 2003.
5. Voellmicke KV, Deland JT: Manual examination technique to assess dorsal instability of the first ray. Foot Ankle Int **23:** 1040, 2002.

Reliability and Validity of Clinically Assessing First-Ray Mobility of the Foot

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to the article published in the September/October 2004 issue of the *Journal* titled "Reliability and Validity of Clinically Assessing First-Ray Mobility of the Foot" by Mark W. Cornwall, PhD, PT, CPed, William D. Fishco, DPM, MS, Thomas G. McPoil, PhD, PT, ATC, Camilla Rae Lane, PT, DPT, CSCS, Deborah O'Donnell, PT, DPT, and Lea Hunt, PT, DPT. I am puzzled why the authors claimed that "no studies have been previously conducted to investigate the reliability or validity of such measurements" (p 475). In 2002, Glasoe et al[1] questioned the reliability and validity of manual estimates of first-ray mobility. During the subsequent year, several articles[2-5] pertinent to this topic referenced and discussed the findings reported by Glasoe et al.[1] Evidence-based practice is a critical component of clinical care. Authors have a responsibility to cite current references and to present all relevant previous research. The authors' omission of Mr. Glasoe's work is irresponsible and troubling.

Mary K. Allen, MPT, MS
Iowa Orthopaedics and Sports
Physiotherapy Associates
600 7th St SE, Ste A
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401

Author's Response

To the Editor:

I would like to thank Ms. Allen for her letter regarding our recent article. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly apologize for not including a reference to the article by Glasoe et al[1] in our article. Mr. Glasoe and his colleagues have done tremendous work over the years in the area of assessing first-ray mobility, and the omission of their paper was extremely regrettable and by no means intentional. It is fortunate that Ms. Allen chose to write her letter, because the results presented in our article clearly support those of Glasoe et al and, therefore, strengthen both works. As Ms. Allen pointed out, "evidence-based practice is a critical component of clinical care," and the fact that two articles, rather than one, support the finding of poor reliability of manual assessment of first-ray mobility serves to strengthen the importance of this information for proper clinical practice. Again, I apologize for the omission and hope that readers of the *Journal* will understand that it was not intentional.

Mark W. Cornwall, PT, PhD, CPed
Department of Physical Therapy
Northern Arizona University
PO Box 15105
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Reference

1. Glasoe WM, Allen MK, Saltzman CL, et al: Comparison of two methods used to assess first-ray mobility. Foot Ankle Int **23:** 248, 2002.