Appendix 7.3 Physical therapy

 Study: Diercks 200473

 Outcome: Pain

 Not reported

Study: Diercks 200473

Autoomore Expertion and dissibility measured using the Constant score						
	isability ilicasuleu usili	y ine constant score				
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
PT	Baseline	32	29.97	8.46		
Supervised neglect		45	28.6	8.64		
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b	
PT	3 months	32	39.5	8.45	0.000	
Supervised neglect		45	55.87	14.26		
PT	6 months	32	47.91	7.51	0.000	
Supervised neglect		45	63.31	15		
PT	9 months	32	54.59	7.89	0.000	
Supervised neglect		45	69.96	15.44		
PT	12 months	32	58.97	8.79	0.000	
Supervised neglect		45	76.71	13.6		
PT	15 months	32	65.06	11.12	0.000	
Supervised neglect		45	81.2	13.45		
PT	18 months	32	70.69	12.47	0.000	
Supervised neglect		45	86.82	14.41		
PT	21 months	32	76.75	14.41	0.001	
Supervised neglect		45	87.8	12.8		
PT	24 months	32	79.56	16.09	0.004	
Supervised neglect		45	88.78	11.26		

PT, physiotherapy.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

b *p*-value is for between-group difference.

Study: Diercks 2004 ⁷³						
Outcome: Range of movement – Constant score for external rotation						
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Median	Range	p-value	
PT	Baseline	32	2	NR	NR	
Supervised neglect		45	2	NR		
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Median	Range	p-value	
PT	24 months	32	10	NR	NR	
Supervised neglect		45	8	NR		

NR, not reported; PT, physiotherapy.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

Note: Other range of movements reported, which were not of relevance to this review and are therefore not presented in the data extraction tables, included the range of movement part of the Constant score for forward elevation and lateral elevation.

Study: Diercks 2004 ⁷³	
Outcome: Quality of life	
Not reported	
Study: Diercks 2004 ⁷³	

Not reported

Outcome: Other

Study: Diercks 200473

Outcome: Adverse events

Not reported

Study: Dogru 2008⁵¹							
Outcome: Pain (pain overal	Outcome: Pain (pain overall) measured using SPADI 5-item pain subscale						
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD			
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	66.9	13.8			
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	57.7	18			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c		
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	40.1	18.6	0.37		
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	35.6	13.7			
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	31	20	0.39		
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	25.5	18.3			
Outcome: Pain (pain on act	tivity) measured using	0–100 mm VAS					
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD			
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	80.8	18.2			
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	78	18.4			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b		
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	39.6	25.3	0.56		
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	40.7	20.3			
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	24.8	29.9	0.83		
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	23.6	25.5			

PT, physiotherapy.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.b One participant dropped out in the first week; all analysis and baseline data were based on 24 participants.

c *p*-value is for between-group difference.

Study: Dogru 2008 ⁵¹								
Outcome: Function and disability measured using SPADI total score								
Intervention ^a Time point		No. randomised	No. randomised Mean					
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	66.6	14.6				
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	62.1	17.3				
Interventionª	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c			
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	37	18.6	0.72			
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	38.2	17.8				
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	29.5	21.6	0.5			
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	26.4	19.6				
Outcome: Function and d	lisability measured by	y SPADI 8-item disability	subscale					
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD				
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	66.5	13.7				
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	63.1	13.8				
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c			
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	38.6	17.4	1			
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	38.1	15.9				
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	30	20.9	0.45			
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	25.5	17.8				

PT, physiotherapy.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

b One participant dropped out in the first week; all analysis and baseline data were based on 24 participants.

c *p*-value is for between-group difference.

Study: Dogru 2008 ⁵¹					
Outcome: Range of mover	ment – passive abduc	ction (°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	101.4	20.9	
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	113.5	14.1	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	142.8	25.9	0.72
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	146	26.2	
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	147.8	30.1	0.98
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	148	26.5	
Outcome: Range of mover	ment – external rotati	ion (°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	34.8	14.7	
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	55.8	17.2	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	25	58	0.004
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	24	71.3	
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	25	65.7	0.05
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	24	75.4	
Outcome: Range of mover	ment – internal rotatio	on (°)			
Interventionª	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	29.2	15.7	
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	47.3	18.8	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c
Ultrasound + PT	2 weeks	25	52.2	15.7	0.12
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	58.3	15.5	
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	57.4	13.8	0.21
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	60.9	15.3	

PT, physiotherapy.
a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.
b One participant dropped out in the first week; all analysis and baseline data were based on 24 participants.
c *p*-value is for between-group difference.

Study: Dogru 2008 ⁵¹	Study: Dogru 2008⁵¹							
Outcome: Quality of lif	Outcome: Quality of life – SF-36 PCS							
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD				
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	38.9	7.9				
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	36.6	9.8				
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c			
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	44.2	8.4	0.83			
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	44.6	8.8				
Outcome: Quality of lif	e – SF-36 MCS							
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD				
Ultrasound + PT	Baseline	25	43.5	10.2				
Sham ultrasound + PT		25 (24 ^b)	42	7.7				
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^c			
Ultrasound + PT	3 months	25	44.8	11.5	0.81			
Sham ultrasound + PT		24	43.8	10.6				

PT, physiotherapy.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.
b One participant dropped out in the first week; all analysis and baseline data were based on 24 participants.

c *p*-value is for between-group difference.

Study: Dogru 2008⁵1	
Outcome: Other outcome	
Not reported	
Study: Dogru 2008 ⁵¹	

Outcome: Adverse events

Not reported

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2012. This work was produced by Maund et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health.

Study: Dundar 2009 ⁷⁴				
Outcome: Pain (pain at rest) m	easured using VAS 0–1	10 <i>cm</i>		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	5.44	1.51
Conventional PT		28	5.54	1.64
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	2.86	1.96
Conventional PT		28	4.11	2.03
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	2.41	1.72
Conventional PT		28	3.76	1.91
Outcome: Pain (pain on moven	nent) measured using l	/AS 0–10 cm		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	6.34	1.99
Conventional PT		28	6.31	1.86
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	4.06	2.13
Conventional PT		28	4.93	1.87
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	3.75	1.92
Conventional PT		28	4.65	1.65
Outcome: Pain (pain at night) n	neasured using VAS 0-	-10 <i>cm</i>		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	6.1	1.75
Conventional PT		28	6	1.69
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	2 weeks	29	3.91	2.61
Conventional PT		28	4.84	1.66
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	3.74	2.14
Conventional PT		28	4.64	1.77
Outcome: Pain (pain overall) m	easured using VAS 0–	10 cm		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	5.96	2
Conventional PT		28	5.92	1.8
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Continuous passive motion	2 weeks	29	4.01	2.1
Conventional PT		28	4.58	1.28
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	3.79	2.01
Conventional PT		28	4.39	1.82

PT, physiotherapy.

Study: Dundar 200974

Outcome: Function and disability measured by SPADI 8-item disability subscale					
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	5.78	1.7	
PT		28	5.69	1.84	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	4.03	1.58	
PT		28	4.29	1.91	
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	3.82	1.61	
PT		28	3.99	1.84	
Outcome: Function and disability	measured by Constant sco	ore			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	58.86	9.54	
PT		28	57.59	9.32	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	74.86	9.64	
PT		28	70.54	9.38	
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	79.63	9.45	
PT		28	76.26	9.45	

PT, physiotherapy. a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

Study: Dundar 2009 ⁷⁴					
Outcome: Range of movemen	t – passive abduction ((°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	106.86	24.5	
PT		28	103.45	23.6	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	137.96	16.26	
PT		28	127.67	26.66	
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	141.75	13.11	
PT		28	137.33	15.31	
Outcome: Range of movemen	t – passive external ro	tation (°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	48.8	21.3	
PT		28	49.7	21.2	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	65.82	17.54	
PT		28	64.9	21.52	
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	68.22	17.11	
PT		28	68.98	14.22	
Outcome: Range of movemen	t – passive internal rot	tation (°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	Baseline	29	44.19	19.06	
PT		28	45.02	19.1	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	
Continuous passive motion	4 weeks	29	62.89	19.96	
PT		28	64.45	17.8	
Continuous passive motion	12 weeks	29	66.27	17.14	
PT		28	67.19	18.47	

PT, physiotherapy. a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

Note: Other range of movement reported, which was not of relevance to this review and is therefore not presented in the data extraction table, was passive flexion.

Study: Dundar 200974

Outcome: Quality of life

Not reported

Study: Dundar 200974

Outcome: Other outcome

Not reported

Study: Dundar 200974

Outcome: Adverse events

No side effects were observed during the study

Study: Leung 200775

Outcome: Pain

Not reported

Study: Leung 200775

Outcome: Function and disability measured by SPADI 8-item disability subscale

Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
SWD + stretching	Baseline	10	41.5	12.1	
HP + stretching		10	38.9	11.8	
No intervention		10	33.3	12.5	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b
SWD + stretching	2 weeks	10	56.3	15	0.046
HP + stretching		10	54.2	15.4	
No intervention		10	45.3	11.2	
SWD + stretching	4 weeks	10	67.8	15.1	NR
HP + stretching		10	56.5	14.1	
No intervention		10	46.1	12.7	
SWD + stretching	8 weeks	10	71.3	19.3	NR
HP + stretching		10	57.8	16.3	
No intervention		10	53.8	16.5	

NR, not reported.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

b *p*-value for between-group difference.

Study: Leung 200775

Outcome: Range of movement – external rotation (arm by side) (°)						
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
SWD + stretching	Baseline	10	50.4	14.1		
HP + stretching		10	28.2	23.4		
No intervention		10	39.5	21.7		
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b	
SWD + stretching	2 weeks	10	59.3	19.8	0.09	
HP + stretching		10	27.6	18.7		
No intervention		10	39.5	20.6		
SWD + stretching	4 weeks	10	60.9	14.5	NR	
HP + stretching		10	32.6	21.1		
No intervention		10	43.3	22.6		

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2012. This work was produced by Maund *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health.

SWD + stretching	8 weeks	10	62.1	11.5	NR
HP + stretching		10	32.6	21.7	
No intervention		10	41.1	23.2	
Outcome: Range of mo	ovement – external rota	ntion (arm at 90° abducti	on)		
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
SWD + stretching	Baseline	10	51.6	18.2	
HP + stretching		10	26.7	26	
No intervention		10	42.5	18.7	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	<i>p-value</i> ^b
SWD + stretching	2 weeks	10	57.8	22.7	0.021
HP + stretching		10	27	26.5	
No intervention		10	43.4	20.8	
SWD + stretching	4 weeks	10	59.6	19.3	NR
HP+ stretching		10	30.1	26.8	
No intervention		10	45.7	23.3	
SWD + stretching	8 weeks	10	60.6	11	NR
HP + stretching		10	30.5	24.4	
No intervention		10	49	27.2	
Outcome: Range of mo	ovement – hand behind	back (cm)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
SWD + stretching	Baseline	10	12.3	4.8	NR
HP + stretching		10	24.9	11.5	
No intervention		10	16	9.6	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	<i>p-value</i> ^b
SWD + stretching	2 weeks	10	7.2	6.1	0.004
HP + stretching		10	22.2	11.5	
No intervention		10	14.7	8.1	
SWD + stretching	4 weeks	10	7.6	5.7	NR
HP + stretching		10	18.5	8.9	
No intervention		10	14.7	8	
SWD + stretching	8 weeks	10	6	7.3	NR
HP + stretching		10	18.3	7.5	
No intervention		10	13	6.7	

HP, heat pack; NR, not reported.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

b *p*-value for between-group difference.

Note: Other range of movements reported, which were not of relevance to this review and are therefore not presented in the data extraction tables, included flexion and cross-body adduction.

Study: Leung 200775

Outcome: Quality of life

Not reported

Study: Leung 200775

Outcome: Other

Not reported

Study: Leung 2007 ⁷⁵			
Outcome: Adverse events			
Not reported			
Study: Maricar 1999 ⁷⁶			
Outcome: Pain			
Not reported			
Study: Maricar 1999 ⁷⁶			
Outcome: Function and disability			
Not reported			

Study: Maricar 1999 ⁷⁶						
Outcome: Range of movement – external rotation, internal rotation and hand behind back						
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
PT	Baseline	54	NR	NR		
Exercises			NR	NR		
Interventionª	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from ba	seline, p-values		
PT	3, 5, 7 and 8 weeks	16	Both groups showed s	ignificant improvement in all shoulder range of		
Exercises		16	movements (p<0.001 at weeks 3, 5, 7 or 8). There was no significant difference between groups		

NR, not reported; PT, physiotherapy.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

Note: Other range of movements reported, which were not of relevance to this review and are therefore not presented in the data extraction tables, included total elevation through flexion and hand behind neck.

Study: Maricar 1999 ⁷⁶
Outcome: Quality of life
Not reported
Study: Maricar 1999 ⁷⁶
Outcome: Adverse events
Not reported
Study: Maricar 1999 ⁷⁶
Uutcome: Utner Outcome
Not reported

325

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2012. This work was produced by Maund *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health.

Study: Pajareya 2004 ⁷⁷						
Outcome: Pain (no. of anal	gesics tablets taken)					
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
PT	Baseline	61	Baseline data not			
No intervention (information	only)	61	reported			
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD		
PT	3 weeks	60	61.38			
No intervention (information	only)	59	58.59			

PT, physiotherapy.

Study: Pajareya 200477				
Outcome: Function and disability n	neasured by SPADI 8-i	tem disability subscale		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	54.93	21.3
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	50.6	16.6
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD
PT	3 weeks	60	20.5	15.4
No intervention (information only)		59	11.9	14.2
Outcome: Function and disability n	neasured by global rat	ting of pain and disability		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	No shoulder complaint	, n (%)
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	0	
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	0	
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Some pain or limitation but does not interfere v everyday life, n (%)	
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	0	
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	0	
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Minimal inconvenience	e, n (%)
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	9 (15%)	
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	12 (20.3%)	
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Moderate inconveniend	ce, n (%)
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	35 (58.3%)	
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	34 (57.6%)	
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Marked inconvenience	, n (%)
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	16 (26.7%)	
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	13 (22.3%)	

PT, physiotherapy. a All analyses and baseline data based on the number followed up at 3 weeks.

Study: Pajareya 2004 ⁷⁷						
Outcome: Range of movement – abdu	uction (°)					
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	121.9	27.8		
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	121.3	27.8		
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD		
PT	3 weeks	60	21.9	21		
No intervention (information only)		59	14.7	18.1		
Outcome: Range of movement – exte	rnal rotation (°)					
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	74.8	22.1		
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	75.3	16		
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD		
PT	3 weeks	60	21.3	15.3		
No intervention (information only)		59	18.3	15.4		
Outcome: Range of movement – inter	rnal rotation (°)					
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD		
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	41.2	10.6		
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	41.1	10.3		
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD		
PT	3 weeks	60	6.3	7.7		
No intervention (information only)		59	3	7		

PT, physiotherapy.

a All analyses and baseline data based on the number followed up at 3 weeks.

Study: Pajareya 200477

Outcome: Quality of life

Not reported

Study: Pajareya 200477

Outcome: Adverse events

Patients were asked, 'Have the trial drugs and/or treatment programme upset you in any way?', and were examined for signs of echymosis or burn during range of movement evaluation

РТ

10 episodes of pain (in 4 patients) that persisted for >2 hours after treatment

No intervention 15 patients had gastrointestinal side effects (6 had severe dyspepsia and discontinued NSAIDs; 2 had severe oedema; 1 had severe headache that subsided with discontinuation of NSAIDs) (information only)

Study: Pajareya 200477

Outcome: Other – treatment success			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	n (%) patients who had successful treatment
PT	Baseline	61 (60ª)	NA
No intervention (information only)		61 (59ª)	NA
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	n (%) patients who had successful treatment
PT	3 weeks	60	21 (35)
No intervention (information only)		59	11 (18.6)
PT	6 weeks	60	35 (61.4)
No intervention (information only)		59	21 (60.8)
PT	12 weeks	60	43 (76.8)
No intervention (information only)		59	31 (60.8)
PT	24 weeks	60	45 (80.4)
No intervention (information only)		59	42 (82.4)
Outcome: Other – satisfaction ^b			
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. patients 'very satisfied'
РТ	3 weeks	60	5
No intervention (information only)		59	1
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. patients 'moderately satisfied'
PT	3 weeks	60	7
No intervention (information only)		59	1
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. patients 'unsatisfied'
PT	3 weeks	60	24
No intervention (information only)		59	13
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. patients 'very unsatisfied'
PT	3 weeks	60	23
No intervention (information only)		59	45

NA, not applicable; PT, physiotherapy.

a All analyses and baseline data based on the number followed up at 3 weeks.b There may be an error in these data as responses for the PT group add up to 59 and those for the control group add up to 60.

Study: Stergioulas 20	08 ¹⁶			
Outcome: Pain (pain d	overall) measured using VAS	0–100 mm		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Laser therapy	Baseline	37	70.90	8.51
Placebo laser		37	67.03	8.12
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Laser therapy	4 weeks	31	32.34	7.44
Placebo laser		32	51.15	8.22
Laser therapy	8 weeks	31	27.41	6.72
Placebo laser		32	40.18	7.99
Laser therapy	16 weeks	31	23.92	6.11
Placebo laser		32	36.6	7.09
Outcome: Pain (pain a	at night) measured using VA	S 0–100 mm		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Laser therapy	Baseline	37	77.91	9.23
Placebo laser		37	72.39	8.86
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Laser therapy	4 weeks	31	41.42	7.69
Placebo laser		32	55.67	8.49
Laser therapy	8 weeks	31	24.18	6.56
Placebo laser		32	49.33	8.05
Laser therapy	16 weeks	31	19.38	5.77
Placebo laser		32	42.35	7.57
Outcome: Pain (pain c	on activity) measured using	VAS 0–100 mm		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Laser therapy	Baseline	37	80.55	8.82
Placebo laser		37	73.66	8.74
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Laser therapy	4 weeks	31	45.57	8.27
Placebo laser		32	67.75	8.03
Laser therapy	8 weeks	31	30.82	6.88
Placebo laser		32	51.39	8.58
Laser therapy	16 weeks	31	22.54	6.02
Placebo laser		32	39.78	7.65

Study: Stergioulas 200816

Outcome: Function and disability measured by SPADI total score							
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD			
Laser	Baseline	37	65.78	13.23			
Placebo laser		37	61.67	14.22			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b		
Laser	4 weeks	31	36.57	11.31	< 0.05		
Placebo laser		32	48.35	13.61			

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2012. This work was produced by Maund *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health.

Laser	8 weeks	31	25.73	10.72	< 0.01
Placebo laser		32	39.84	11.11	
Laser	16 weeks	31	19.92	10.04	< 0.01
Placebo laser		32	33.75	10.43	
Outcome: Function and d	isability measured by	Croft score			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Laser	Baseline	37	13.85	4.44	
Placebo laser		37	15.63	4.79	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analvsed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b
laser	A weeks	31	7 69	4.03	< 0.05
Placeho laser	4 100103	32	14 52	4.00	< 0.00
laser	8 weeks	31	6.93	3.87	< 0.05
Placebo laser	0 110010	32	11.27	4.23	(0.00
Laser	16 weeks	31	5.52	4.00	< 0.005
Placebo laser		32	12.65	4.31	
o		5 4 6 4			
Outcome: Function and d	isability measured by l	DASH score			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Laser	Baseline	37	48.56	14.19	
Placebo laser		37	43.09	13.78	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b
Laser	4 weeks	31	26.67	10.44	NR
Placebo laser		32	27.35	11.39	
Laser	8 weeks	31	20.64	9.89	< 0.05
Placebo laser		32	29.88	10.78	
Laser	16 weeks	31	15.23	7.98	< 0.005
Placebo laser		32	25.74	11.45	
Outcome: Function and d	lisability measured by	HAQ score			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
Laser	Baseline	37	2.03	0.81	
Placebo laser		37	2.24	0.92	
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD	p-value ^b
Laser	4 weeks	31	1.43	0.72	< 0.001
Placebo laser		32	2.14	0.78	
Laser	8 weeks	31	1.27	0.56	< 0.005
Placebo laser		32	2.02	0.8	
Laser	16 weeks	31	1.23	0.54	NR
Placebo laser		32	1.54	0.77	

NR, not reported.

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

b *p*-value is for between-group difference.

Study: Stergioulas 2008	916			
Outcome: Range of mov	vement – active abduction (°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Laser	Baseline	37	65.56	12.05
Placebo laser		37	59.37	10.89
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Laser	4 weeks	31	78.67	13.76
Placebo laser		32	69.68	12.87
Laser	8 weeks	31	81.94	13.71
Placebo laser		32	76.47	9.65
Laser	16 weeks	31	85.63	13.95
Placebo laser		32	80.43	13.58
Outcome: Range of mov	vement – external rotation (°)			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
Laser	Baseline	37	31.52	9.53
Placebo laser		37	28.63	8.79
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. analysed	Mean	SD
Laser	4 weeks	31	35.33	9.91
Placebo laser		32	33.56	9.12
Laser	8 weeks	31	37.13	9.97
Placebo laser		32	35.08	9.44
Laser	16 weeks	31	42.72	10.05
Placebo laser		32	38.53	9.9

a All interventions received concomitant home exercise.

Note: Other range of movement reported, which was not of relevance to this review and is therefore not presented in the data extraction tables, was active flexion.

Study: Stergioulas 2008 ¹⁶			
Outcome: Quality of life			
Not reported			

Study: Stergioulas 200816

Outcome: Other

Not reported

Study: Stergioulas 2008¹⁶

Outcome: Adverse events

Authors stated no complications were reported

Study: Vermeulen 2006⁴⁰

LGMT

HGMT

Outcome: Pain (pa	Outcome: Pain (pain at rest) measured using VAS 0–100 mm				
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	28	15.0 to 65.0	
LGMT		51	36	20.0 to 64.5	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	95% Cl	
HGMT	3 months	49	-15	-5.9 to -24.0	
LGMT		51	-22.1	-15.6 to -28.7	
HGMT	6 months	49	-22.3	-32.1 to -12.4	
LGMT		51	-24.3	-31.3 to -17.4	
HGMT	12 months	49	-23.9	-31.7 to -16.0	
LGMT		51	-23	-30.8 to -15.2	
Pain (pain during I	movement) measured us	sing VAS 0–100 mm			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	59	46.0 to 78.0	
LGMT		51	62	37.5 to 77.0	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	95% Cl	
HGMT	3 months	49	-26.9	-19.0 to -34.7	

-24.3

-31.4

-16.1 to -32.5

-39.5 to -23.2

-39.2 to -24.5

-47.2 to -31.2

-41.4 to -23.8

LGMT 51 -31.9 HGMT 12 months 49 -39.2 LGMT 51 -32.6

51

49

Pain (pain at night) measured using VAS 0-100 mm

6 months

	•			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR
HGMT	Baseline	49	72	47.0 to 84.0
LGMT		51	63	31.0 to 78.5
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	95% CI
HGMT	3 months	49	-31.3	-20.3 to -42.4
LGMT		51	-27.5	-19.0 to -35.9
HGMT	6 months	49	-38.8	-50.8 to -26.9
LGMT		51	-31.7	-40.1 to -23.4
HGMT	12 months	49	-43.7	-53.6 to -33.8
LGMT		51	-35.9	-44.4 to -27.4

Study: Vermeulen 200	Study: Vermeulen 2006 ⁴⁰				
Outcome: Function an	d disability measured	using the shoulder rat	ing questionnaire		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	37.5	28.7 to 47.0	
LGMT		51	39.5	31.0 to 49.6	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD ^a	
HGMT	3 months	49	25.8	17.4	
LGMT		51	23.4	15.1	
HGMT	6 months	49	32.3	19.3	
LGMT		51	27.8	15.6	
HGMT	12 months	49	38.3	19.2	
LGMT		51	31.7	17.6	
Outcome: Function an	d disability measured	using the shoulder dis	ability questionnaire (Dutch versio	on)	
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	81.2	75.0 to 87.5	
LGMT		51	81.2	71.9 to 93.7	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SDª	
HGMT	3 months	49	-29.9	25.2	
LGMT		51	-24.7	24.5	
HGMT	6 months	49	-38.9	32.0	
LGMT		51	-33.2	27.5	
HGMT	12 months	49	-50.0	30.5	
LGMT		51	-38.8	27.5	

a Computed from 95% Cls.

Study: Vermeulen 2006 ⁴⁰				
Outcome: Range of	movement – active abd	uction (°)		
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR
HGMT	Baseline	49	75	60.0 to 90.0
LGMT		51	75	67.5 to 85.0
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SDª
HGMT	3 months	49	46.3	33.0
LGMT		51	36.3	28.8
HGMT	6 months	49	55.8	37.1
LGMT		51	46.9	31.8
HGMT	12 months	49	72.9	31.5
LGMT		51	60.3	32.5

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2012. This work was produced by Maund *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health.

Outcome: Range of n	novement – active exter	nal rotation (°)			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	20	10.0 to 25.0	
LGMT		51	20	7.5 to 30.0	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD ^a	
HGMT	3 months	49	11.6	11.3	
LGMT		51	9.3	14.6	
HGMT	6 months	49	15.9	12.7	
LGMT		51	13.2	13.1	
HGMT	12 months	49	20.8	12.0	
LGMT		51	15.9	16.2	
Outcome: Range of n	novement – passive abo	luction (°)			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	85	70.0 to 95.0	
LGMT		51	85	80.0 to 95.0	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD ^a	p-value ^b
HGMT	3 months	49	47.9	31.7	< 0.05
LGMT		51	34.8	26.5	
HGMT	6 months	49	57.1	34.5	
LGMT		51	46.1	29.4	
HGMT	12 months	49	72.4	29.4	< 0.05
LGMT		51	59.9	29.1	
Outcome: Range of n	novement – passive exte	ernal rotation (°)			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	20	10.0 to 30.0	
LGMT		51	20	12.5 to 35.0	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD ^a	p-value ^b
HGMT	3 months	49	13.1	11.8	
LGMT		51	11.7	13.1	
HGMT	6 months	49	16.8	13.4	
LGMT		51	12.7	12.4	
HGMT	12 months	49	21.9	14.3	< 0.05
LGMT		51	15.4	17.4	

a Computed from 95% Cls.

b Determined by analysis of covariance with correction for baseline values.
 Note: Other range of movements reported, which were not of relevance to this review and are therefore not presented in the data extraction tables, included active forward flexion and passive forward flexion.

Study: Vermeule	n 200640				
Outcome: Quality	y of life – SF-36 PCS				
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	43.8	31.9 to 54.2	
LGMT		51	45.1	36.3 to 57.5	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SDª	
HGMT	3 months	49	14.2	16.0	
LGMT		51	13.6	17.8	
HGMT	6 months	49	19.2	18.8	
LGMT		51	17.1	17.8	
HGMT	12 months	49	23.2	21.9	
LGMT		51	22.8	19.7	
Outcome: Quality	y of life – SF-36 MCS				
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Median	IQR	
HGMT	Baseline	49	73.4	51.9 to 87.0	
LGMT		51	73.2	51.9 to 83.5	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SDª	
HGMT	3 months	49	8.6	17.1	
LGMT		51	4.5	23.4	
HGMT	6 months	49	8.2	20.4	
LGMT		51	7.9	21.7	
HGMT	12 months	49	7.7	20.4	
LGMT		51	10.2	4.8	

a Computed from 95% Cls.

Study: Vermeulen 200640
Outcome: Other outcome
Not reported
Study: Vermeulen 2006 ⁴⁰
Outcome: Adverse events
Not reported
Study: Yang 2007 ⁷⁸
Outcome: Pain

Not reported

335

Study: Yang 2007 ⁷⁸				
Outcome: Function and dis	ability measured using the F	lexilevel Scale of Shoulder F	Function	
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
ERM + MRM	Baseline	14	NR	NR
MWM + MRM		14	NR	NR
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean % of change	SD
ERM + MRM	6 weeks	14	19.9	8.1
MWM + MRM		13	17.25	12.2

NR, not reported.

Study: Yang 2007 ⁷⁸				
Outcome: Range of movem	ent – external rotation (°)			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
ERM + MRM	Baseline	14	NR	NR
MWM + MRM		14	NR	NR
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean % of change	SD
ERM + MRM	6 weeks	14	36.4	24.3
MWM + MRM		13	34.2	14.3
Outcome: Range of movem	ent – internal rotation (°)			
Intervention ^a	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD
ERM + MRM	Baseline	14	NR	NR
MWM + MRM		14	NR	NR
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean % of change	SD
ERM + MRM	6 weeks	14	20.5	24.4
MWM + MRM		13	45.6	38.5

NR, not reported. Note: The FASTRAK motion analysis system, arm elevation, scapular tipping and scapulohumeral rhythm were also reported.

Study: Yang 2007 ⁷⁸
Outcome: Quality of life
Not reported
Study: Yang 2007 ⁷⁸
Outcome: Other
Not reported

Study: Yang 2007 ⁷⁸	
Outcome: Adverse events	
Not reported	
Study: Yan 2005 ⁷²	
Study: Yan 2005 ⁷² Outcome: Pain	

Study: Yan 200572

Outcome: Function and disability

Not reported

Study: Yan 200572

Outcome: Range of movement

Measures of interest not reported

Note: Arm bending towards the front of the shoulder, arm stretching towards the lower back and arm stretching of upper outside of the arm were reported.

Study: Yan 2	200572
--------------	--------

Outcome: Other – rate of improve	ment ^a		
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. of patients with bad outcome
Dumb-bell gymnastics	3 months	26	0
Barehanded exercises		28	7
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. of patients with average outcome
Dumb-bell gymnastics	3 months	26	0
Barehanded exercises		28	16
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. of patients with good outcome
Dumb-bell gymnastics	3 months	26	2
Barehanded exercises		28	5
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	No. of patients with excellent outcome
Dumb-bell gymnastics	3 months	26	24
Barehanded exercises		28	0

a Rate of improvement: excellent (pain disappeared and normal function completely recovered), good (a little pain on movement and normal function partially recovered), average (some reduction in pain and improvement in range of movement), bad (no improvement in pain and no change in range of movement).

Study: Yan 2005 ⁷²
Outcome: Quality of life
Not reported
Study: Yan 2005 ⁷²
Outcome: Other
Not reported
Study: Yan 2005 ⁷²
Outcome: Adverse events
Not reported
Study: Wies 2003 ⁷¹
Outcome: Pain
Not reported

Study: Wies 2003 ⁷¹					
Outcome: Function and	disability measured by	SPADI total score			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
PT	Baseline	10	NR	NR	
Osteopathy technique		10	NR	NR	
Control		10	NR	NR	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD	p-value ^a
PT	9 weeks	10	18.8	23.6	0.059
Osteopathy technique		10	38.7	22.5	
Control		10	22.8	18.2	

NR, not reported; PT, physiotherapy. a *p*-value for between-group differences.

Study: Wies 200371

Outcome – Range of moven	ent – active abduction	(°)			
Intervention	Time point	No. randomised	Mean	SD	
PT	Baseline	10	NR	NR	
Osteopathy technique		10	NR	NR	
Control		10	NR	NR	
Intervention	Time point	No. analysed	Mean change from baseline	SD	p-valueª
PT	9 weeks	10	39.6	35.8	NR
Osteopathy technique		10	46	23	
Control		10	0.8	39.5	

NR, not reported; PT, physiotherapy.

a *p*-value for between-group differences.

Study: Wies 2003 ⁷¹
Outcome: Quality of life
Not reported
Study: Wies 2003 ⁷¹
Outcome: Adverse events
Not reported
Study: Wies 2003 ⁷¹
Outcome: Other outcome
Not reported