RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.4274/cjms.2023.2022-78

Examining the Effectiveness of Low-Level Laser Treatment Applied to the Upper Back Region in Individuals with Myofascial Pain Syndrome

Akgül Kocabal and Gündüz. Examination of the Effectiveness of Laser in Myofascial Pain Syndrome

Ayşegül Akgül Kocabal[1], Osman Hakan Gündüz[2]

[1]Department of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation, Yavuz Selim Bone Disease and Rehabilitation Hospital, Trabzon, Türkiye
[2]Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Marmara University Faculty of Medicine, İstanbul, Türkiye

Abstract
BACKGROUND/AIMS: The aim of this research was to examine the effects of Low Level Laser Therapy (LLLT) application on pain, emotional state, disability, and range of motion (ROM) in myofascial pain syndrome (MPS).
MATERIALS AND METHODS: Sixty patients diagnosed with MPS and randomly divided into treatment and control groups were included in the study. The study group was exposed to LLLT application to four points on the upper trapezius, while the control group received placebo LLLT. Pain was evaluated using a Visual Analogue Scale, neck ROM using an inclinometer, pain pressure threshold using an algometer, emotional state using the Beck Depression Inventory, and disability using the Neck Pain and Disability Scale. The effectiveness of the treatment was evaluated by comparing the pre- and post-treatment and first-month results in each group.
RESULTS: Mean ages were 40.4±8.58 years in the treatment group and 37.6±8.88 in the control group. A significant decrease was observed in the treatment group in terms of pain at the end of treatment and at the first month ($p=0.040$). Similarly, improvement was observed in both groups in terms of emotional state and disability at the conclusion of treatment and at the first month ($p=0.492$, $p=0.497$). In terms of neck ROM, marked improvement compared to the control group was only observed in left lateral flexion measurements at the conclusion of treatment and in the first month ($p=0.010$). Improvement in pain pressure thresholds was significant in both groups ($p<0.05$).
CONCLUSİON: In conclusion, LLLT application exhibited more positive effects than placebo in MPS.
Keywords: Laser, myofascial pain syndrome, trigger point, trapezius

To cite this article: Akgül Kocabal A, Gündüz OH. Examining the Effectiveness of Low-Level Laser Treatment Applied to the Upper Back Region in Individuals with Myofascial Pain Syndrome. Cyprus J Med Sci

ORCID IDs of the authors: A.A.K. 0000-0001-5256-632X; O.H.G. 0000-0002-3214-803X.

Uncorrected Proof

Address for Correspondence: Ayşegül Akgül Kocabal
E-mail: fzt.aysegul@hotmail.com
ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-5256-632X

19.03.2023
13.12.2023

Uncorrected Proof

INTRODUCTION

Myofascial pain syndrome (MPS) is a musculo-skeletal disease with trigger points in at least one muscle or connective tissue and progressing with symptoms such as pain, spasms, sensitivity, movement restriction, weakness, and rarely autonomic dysfunction [1,2]. Although factors such as macro and micro trauma, muscle hypercontraction, physical fatigue, psychological stress, and genetic factors have been proposed, the etiology of MPS is still unclear and has not been attributed to a single factor [3]. Pain, the most pronounced symptom, may be mild or unbearable, sharp, or blunt, and continuous or periodic. Trigger points are decisive in this context and are directly proportional to the level of sensitivity and spread [4]. Upper back region is mostly affected in terms of increased trigger points. It is very common in M. Trapezius. So the patient with MPS suffer from pain pressure sensitivity in this region [5].

The basic aims in the treatment of MPS are to ameliorate the pain, increase muscle strength, and achieve full range of motion (ROM) and appropriate posture of the joint associated with the affected muscle [6]. In addition, since MPS also adversely affects individuals' emotional states and disability status, it is also important for treatment to yield psychosocial benefits. Studies have reported higher risk of depression levels in individuals diagnosed with MPS than in healthy individuals. The relationship between depression level and pain severity is also noteworthy [7]. Since pain leads to restrictions in functional activities, neck disability increases in line with the duration of MPS [8].

Therapeutic methods in MPS include lifestyle modification, medications, stretching exercises, acupuncture, injections, manual therapy, ultrasound, LLLT (Low Level Laser Therapy) application, electrical stimulation, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS), mesotherapy, massage therapy, and biofeedback [9,10]. Significant progress has been made in the diagnosis and treatment of MPS in recent years. However, no agreed disease management protocol has yet emerged [11]. Light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation (LASER) therapy is a reliable physical therapeutic agent that has been employed for many years. Since the therapeutic LLLT dosage increases tissue temperature by less than 0.5°C, its effects are not thought to be due to warming alone. Various attempts have been made to explain the analgesic effect of LLLT [12]. Another therapeutic LASER application is high-intensity laser therapy (HILT) application which is commonly used in the therapeutic protocols of physiotherapy. The main difference between HILT and LLLT, is that the more powerful beams (power >500 mW) are irradiated to penetrate deeper, bringing a desired high amount of multi-directional energy to deep tissues in a short time [13]. Determining the effectiveness of LLLT in MPS and its biopsychosocial effects will make a significant contribution to the existing literature.

The primary aim of the study was to investigate the impacts of LLLT on reducing pain intensity and disability, increasing neck ROM and emotional state in patients diagnosed with MPS.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was performed with 60 patients (51 women, and nine men) presenting to the XXX University Medial Faculty Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Department, Turkey. Patients aged 18-50 years and diagnosed with MPS who had pain upper back region were enrolled in the study. A total of 4 points were applied. The points that are bilateral and the most painful are selected. When the selected trigger points were palpated, explosive and spontaneous pain occurred. Patients diagnosed with fibromyalgia syndrome based on ACR criteria, with cervical disc lesion, cervical radiculopathy, or myelopathy, those who had undergone neck or shoulder surgery in the year prior to the study, or using drug because of psychological problems, and pregnant women were excluded from the study.

Patient consenting to take part in the study were informed about the research aim and methodology. Written consent was received from all the individuals taking part. The participants' sociodemographic characteristics (sex, body weight, and height) were recorded (Table 1). Data were collected using a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), the Beck Depression Inventory, and the Neck Pain and Disability Scale. Joint neck ROM and pain pressure thresholds were also measured.

Study Design/Procedure

Evaluations were performed at the beginning and conclusion of treatment, and again four weeks following the completion of treatment. Patients received 10 treatment sessions, five times a week for two weeks. The Ga-Al-As laser, which emits a continuous beam of 830 nm with a power density of 0.9 Joule/cm² for 30 seconds, in full contact, at right angles to four points on the upper trapezius in the neck region, was applied to the treatment group for 20 minutes, together with hot pack for 20 minutes, timed TENS, and stretching exercises. The control group received placebo laser for 20 minutes, hot pack for 20 minutes, TENS, and stretching exercises. Only placebo laser were applied during machine was closed. So patient knew as it opened. The home program was set to three sets of 20 repetitions each and included isometric neck exercises and joint neck ROM exercises. Each patient was shown the exercise program and asked to apply it every day for a period of one month. They weren't use any analgesics.

Outcome Measurements

Visual analog scale: It measures the intensity of pain consists of a 10 cantimeters horizontal line, Zero means 'no pain' and ten means 'unbearable pain' [14].

Neck range of motion measurement: Measurements were performed using a Chattanooga Baseline Bubble inclinometer. Neck flexion, extension, bidirectional lateral flexion, and rotation were measured using an inclinometer. Flexion was measured with the patient in a seated position and with the inclinometer on the apex of the head in the sagittal plane. The inclinometer was zeroed with the patient's head facing forward. The patient was asked to incline his neck forward without using the trunk, and the value shown on the inclinometer was recorded. Neck extension was performed in the same position, the patient being asked to lower the head backward. Lateral flexion was also measured with the patient in a sitting position. The inclinometer was installed in the coronal plane. The patient was asked to bring his ear to his shoulder, and the value shown on the inclinometer was recorded. The patient was placed in the supine position for rotation measurements. A thin towel was place beneath the head to keep it central. The inclinometer was placed on the patient's forehead in the transverse plane. The patient was asked to turn his head in both directions, and the value on the inclinometer was recorded [15].

Pain pressure threshold measurement: Measurements were taken using a pressure algometer. This semi-quantitative method is employed for assessing pressure pain sensitivity in tissues and for locating abnormal sensitivity in sensitive areas, trigger points, muscles, and

Uncorrected Proof

bones. Pain pressure thresholds using algometry. The Wagner Instruments (Greenwich, CT, USA) brand pressure algometer used in this study consisted of a metal piston with a 1 cm^2 round disc attached to a dial used to measure pressure in both kilograms and pounds. The operator can hold the dial and apply it to the desired part of the body. The dial was calibrated up to 2.5 kg at 25 g intervals. The pressure resulting from the dial being continually pressed against the skin causes the dial hand to move in a clockwise direction. When the device is removed, the needle continues to point to the last measured value (8). Once the procedure had been explained, the patient assumed a sitting position in a chair and was allowed to relax completely. The trigger points on the upper trapezius were first identified and marked, after which the metal rod of the pressure algometer was placed on the marked site in a vertical direction. The compression pressure was gradually increased, and the patient was asked to indicate when he felt pain or discomfort, at which time the pressure was stopped.

Beck depression inventory: The BDI was developed by Beck in 1967. The reliability and validity of the Turkish-language version were investigated by Hisli [16]. It consists of the patient's selection of somatic, affective (perceptual), and cognitive (sensory) functions over 21 items. These items are ranked from neutral (score of 0) to the most severe (score of 3). The patient reads the items and selects the most appropriate response. The highest possible score is 63. Scores of 1-13 indicate no depression, scores of 14-24 moderate depression, and scores of 25 or more severe depression**.**

Neck Pain and Disability Scale: This scale was employed for a functional evaluation of disability levels in the individuals in the study. The Neck Pain and Disability Scale consists of 20 items. Each item is scored using a 10-cm visual analogue scale, values ranging between 0 and 5. Total scores are calculated by adding the different item scores and range between 0 and 100. Higher scores indicate more severe pain and impact. The Turkish validity study of this scale was performed by Biçer et al. in 2004 [17].

Randomization and allocation: The participants were divided into two groups as study and control groups. Drawing lots were used. They pulled the balls of different colors. They were blinded during selection. The ball which was pulled by them opened by the researcher, and the groups were determined. According to homogeneity test two groups were homogeneous (Table 1) ($p>0.05$).

Statistical Analysis

Student t test was applied to compare the groups' qualitative characteristics (such as age, weight, and height), because the data is normally distributed, and the chi-square test in the comparison of categorical characteristics (such as sex, marital status, occupation, smoking status, pack-year values among smokers, and systemic disease).

The groups' pre-treatment, post-treatment and first-month evaluations were compared with Repeated Measures ANOVA test, because the data is normally distributed. For intra group analysis (in pairwise comparisons), Paired t test was used to compare pre-treatment and post treatment/ post treatment and first month measures, because the data is normally distributed. During the statistical analysis, two-sided p values were adopted, and values <0.05 were regarded as statistically significant.

Sample size calculation: In this study, a priori sample size calculation was carried out in the G*Power software 3.1.9.4 program (XXX Universität Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany). In order to examine the change between repeated measurements over time (before, after, 1st month) in two groups, it was determined that the number of samples should be at least 24 in total in each group, considering an error of 0.05, a power of 0.80 and an effect size of 0.05. To avoid missing participation 30 participants were included.

RESULTS

Intra-group analysis revealed significantly lower pain severity in both groups immediately after treatment compared to pre-treatment ($p<0.001$ for both). Pain severity also decreased

Uncorrected Proof

significantly one month after treatment compared to pre-treatment ($p<0.001$). In the control group, a significant decrease was observed in post-treatment and one-month values compared to pre-treatment ($p<0.01$ for both). Intergroup comparisons revealed significantly lower pain severity on the completion of treatment and after one month in the study group compared to baseline values ($p=0.01$ and $p=0.04$, respectively) (Table 2).

Intragroup group analysis revealed a significant decrease in the risk of depression immediately after completion of treatment compared to baseline in both groups ($p<0.001$ for both). The risk of depression also decreased significantly in both groups immediately and one month after treatment compared to pre-treatment ($p<0.001$). Intergroup comparisons revealed no significant difference in pre-treatment values or in those immediately or one month after treatment ($p>0.05$ for all) (Table 2).

Intragroup analyses revealed a statistically significant decrease in terms of disability status immediately after treatment compared to pre-treatment ($p<0.001$ for both). Significant decreases were observed in both groups immediately after and one month after treatment compared to baseline ($p<0.001$ for both). No significant difference was observed between the groups in terms of pre-treatment, immediately post-treatment, or one-month post-treatment values ($p>0.05$) (Table 2).

Intragroup analyses revealed a significant increase between repeated all neck ROM measures (pre-treatment, immediately post-treatment and one-month post-treatment) ($p<0.001$) in both groups. (Table 3).

Significant differences were observed between the groups in terms of left lateral flexion values in immediately after treatment, and after one month ($p<0.001$ for all). However, no significant differences emerged between the groups in terms of flexion, extension, right lateral flexion, or right and left rotation values ($p>0.05$ for all) (Table 3).

No significant changes were registered in the control group after treatment compared to baseline in pain pressure threshold values in the right and left trapezius first and second trigger points ($p>0.05$). In the study group, however, significant increases were observed in values immediately after treatment and in the first month in the right and left trapezius first and second trigger points compared to pre-treatment values ($p<0.01$ and $p<0.001$, respectively). The differences between the two groups were statistically significant ($p<0.001$) (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The findings emerging from this research suggest that LLLT is effective in reducing pain severity in MPS, improving emotional state, reducing disability, and increasing neck ROM. Patients' most important complaint in MPS is pain. A previous study suggested that the application of LLLT in MPS reduced pain complaints at rest and during activity [18]. In their study of patients with MPS, Kavadar et al. examined VAS and algometric measurement parameters and found that pain complaints and trigger point sensitivity decreased significantly in both groups immediately and one month after ultrasound therapy compared to baseline pre-treatment values, while pain thresholds increased significantly, although the improvement in the treatment group was significantly better [19]. In the present study, severity of pain decreased significantly compared to the control group, and the pain threshold in the study group increased compared to the pre-treatment value. There is another study that reports a significant decrease in pain at rest and pain on activity in laser group compared to placebo [20].

ROM assessment is an important follow-up parameter in MPS. A previous study involving ultrasound in patients with MPS concluded that the stretch level of the upper trapezius muscle was powerfully correlated with the decrease in neck ROM, pain, and disability caused by MPS and with the pain threshold. Increased tension in the trapezius muscle also increases pain, disability, and the pressure pain threshold. This finding shows that the therapeutic

Uncorrected Proof

methods applied in the present and other studies increases neck ROM by reducing tension in the trapezius muscle [21]. Another study
results showed significant statistical evidence for short-term
effectiveness of LLLT in treatment of patients with myofacial neck pain
in terms of improvements in pain, pain pressure threshold, and neck ROM [22].
Yağcı et al. reported an increased in neck ROM values in individuals with MPS following connective tissue massage and exercise education. Another study involving MPS suggested that dry-needling, kinesiology taping, and dry cupping improved neck ROM [23]. Similarly; in the present study, improvement was observed in almost all neck ROM measurements in both groups. Further studies are now needed to reveal the effect of LLLT on neck ROM in MPS.
The literature shows that LLLT exhibits long-term effectiveness in overcoming pain and symptoms in patients with MPS [24]. LLLT has been shown to reduce trigger point sensitivity in patients with MPS and to increase the pressure pain threshold in trigger points [24]. In agreement with the previous literature, LLLT also lowered pain while raising the pressure pain threshold in the current research. However, further studies are now needed on the study.
The trigger point pressure pain threshold in patients with MPS in lower than average. İlbuldu et al. compared LLLT, dry needling, and placebo laser in patients with trigger points in the upper trapezius. Those authors reported a significant alteration in rest and activity pain and pain thresholds in the group receiving LLLT treatment compared to the other groups [25]. Another study investigated pain threshold measurements in the application of ultrasound, Kinesio taping, and placebo ultrasound to trigger points and reported significant decreases in algometry measurements in all three groups after treatment [26]. Similarly in the present study, pain pressure threshold measurements decreased significantly in the study group compared to the control group. We think that LLLT can be applied to trigger points due to it is non-invasive and painless nature, as well as being simple to apply. However, we also think that it is important to adopt a comprehensive approach including stretching and relaxation exercises, maintenance of proper posture, and lifestyle changes in order to provide long-term therapeutic efficacy. Various parameters associated with dosage, wavelength, duration of treatment, and application sites should be investigated in future studies on the subject.

Study Limitations

There are two limitations of the study. First is the number of studies examining its biopsychosocial effects has been insufficient to interpret the results. Based on that, there is a need for well-conducted clinical trials with better standardization of the parameters to be used in the treatment of this syndrome. Second limitation is placebo affect didn't investigated deeply. Another group which was applied no treatment was needed to indicate it.

CONCLUSION

Taken as a whole, our results showed that LLLT is affective reducing trigger point sensitivity. Exercise programs that include suppression of triggering factors, posture training, and stretching tense and short muscles while strengthening weak muscles will be highly beneficial in achieving long-term therapeutic efficacy. In conclusion, LLLT might be employed as a therapeutic option in patients with MPS. Further studies are now needed on this subject.

MAIN POINTS

- LLLT is more effective than placebo laser on reducing the pain intensity and improving emotional state of individual with MPS.
- LLLT is more effective than placebo laser on reducing disability and increasing neck ROM of individual with MPS.

Uncorrected Proof

- LLLT reduces trigger point sensitivity and increases pressure pain threshold in individuals with MPS.

REFERENCES

1. Jaeger B (2013) Myofascial trigger point pain. The Alpha omegan, 106: 14–22. PMID: 24864393
2. Stecco A, Gesi M, Stecco C, Stern R (2013) Fascial components of the myofascial pain syndrome. Current pain and headache reports, 17(8), 352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11916-013-0352-9.
3. Şendur ÖF, Kahvecioğlu F (2015) Ağrılı Kas Sendromları, 3rd edn. Nobel Tip Kitabevi, Istanbul, pp 1011-1124
4. Yalçın P, Yıldızlar D (2012) Miyofasiyal Ağrı Sendromları, 1st edn. Romatoloji, Ankara, pp 777-787
5. Gerber LH, Sikdar S, Armstrong K, Diao G, Heimur J, Kopecky J, et al (2013) A systematic comparison between subjects with no pain and pain associated with active myofascial trigger points. PM&R5(11):931-8.
6. Özgül A (2014) Kuru iğne; Patofizyolojik Temel ve Miyofasiyal Ağrıda Kullanımı. Turkiye Klinikleri Journal of Physical Medicine Rehabilitation, 7:37-47
7. Altindag Ö, Gur A, Altindag A (2008) The relationship between clinical parameters and depression level in patients with myofascial pain syndrome. Pain medicine (Malden, MPSs.), 9(2), 161–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-4637.2007.00342.x
8. Duyur Çakıt B, Genç H, Altuntaş V et al (2009) Disability and related factors in patients with chronic cervical myofascial pain. Clinical rheumatology, 28(6), 647–654. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10067-009-1116-0
9. Bron C, de Gast A, Dommerholt J et al (2011) Treatment of myofascial trigger points in patients with chronic shoulder pain: a randomized, controlled trial. BMC medicine, 9, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-9-8
10. Moraska Albert F, Schmiege Sarah J, Mann John D, Butryn Nathan, Krutsch Jason P (2017) Responsiveness of Myofascial Trigger Points to Single and Multiple Trigger Point Release MPSsages: A Randomized, Placebo Controlled Trial. American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation, 96(9), 639–645. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHM.0000000000000728
11. Anudeep Saxena, Mayank Chansoria, Gaurav Toma, Abhyuday Kumar (2015) Myofascial pain syndrome: an overview. Journal of pain & palliative care pharmacotherapy, 29(1), 16–21. https://doi.org/10.3109/15360288.2014.997853
12. Tuna N (2001) Elektroterapi. Nobel Tıp Kitapevi, İstanbul
13. Boyraz I, Yildiz A, Koc B, Sarman H. Comparison of high-intensity laser therapy and ultrasound treatment in the patients with lumbar discopathy. Biomed Res Int. 2015;2015:304328. doi: 10.1155/2015/304328.
14. Polly E Bijur, Wendy Silver, E John Gallagher (2001) Reliability of the visual analog scale for measurement of acute pain. Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine, 8(12), 1153–1157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1553-2712.2001.tb01132.x
15. de Koning CHP, van den Heuvel SP, Staal, JB et al (2008) Clinimetric evaluation of active range of motion measures in patients with non-specific neck pain: a systematic review. European spine journal : official publication of the European Spine Society,

Uncorrected Proof

the European Spinal Deformity Society, and the European Section of the Cervical Spine Research Society, 17:905–921. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-008-0656-3
16. Hisli, N (1989) Beck Depresyon Envanterinin üniversite öğrencileri için geçerliği, güvenirliği. Psikoloji dergisi, 7:3-13.
17. Bicer A, Yazici A, Camdeviren H, Erdogan C (2004) Assessment of pain and disability in patients with chronic neck pain: reliability and construct validity of the Turkish version of the neck pain and disability scale. Disability and rehabilitation, 959–962. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280410001696755
18. Öz N, Çağlar NS, Akar N, Akar A, Aytekin E (2021) Miyofasiyal Ağrı Sendromunda Lazer Tedavisinin Etkinliğinin AraştırılMPSı. https://doi.org/10.4274/jarem.galenos.2021.3981
19. Kavadar G, Çağlar N, Özen Ş, Tütün Ş, Demircioğlu D (2015) Efficacy of conventional ultrasound therapy on myofascial pain syndrome: a placebo controlled study. The journal of the Turkish Society of Algology, 27(4), 190–196. https://doi.org/10.5505/agri.2015.48569
20. Gur A, Sarac AJ, Cevik R, Altindag O, Sarac S. Efficacy of 904 nm Gallium Arsenide low level laser therapy in the management of chronic myofascial pain in the neck: a double-blind and randomize-controlled trial. Lasers Surg Med. 2004;35(3):229–35.
21. Akhbari B, Salavati M, Ebarahimi I, Ezzati K, Haghighat Khah H (2015) Association of Ultrasonography Findings with Pain, Range of Motion, Disability, and Pressure Pain Threshold in Subjects with Upper Trapezius Myofascial Pain Syndrome. PTJ 4:221-227 http://ptj.uswr.ac.ir/article-1-202-en.html
22. Tehrani, M. R., Nazary-Moghadam, S., Zeinalzadeh, A., Moradi, A., Mehrad-Majd, H., & Sahebalam, M. (2022). Efficacy of low-level laser therapy on pain, disability, pressure pain threshold, and range of motion in patients with myofascial neck pain syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Lasers in medical science, 37(9), 3333–3341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10103-022-03626-9
23. Brattberg G (1999) Connective tissue MPSsage in the treatment of fibromyalgia. European journal of pain, 3(3), 235–244. PMID: 10700351
24. Sumen A, Sarsan A, Alkan H, Yildiz N, & Ardic F (2015). Efficacy of low level laser therapy and intramuscular electrical stimulation on myofascial pain syndrome. Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation, 28(1), 153–158. https://doi.org/10.3233/BMR-140503
25. Ilbuldu E, Cakmak A, Disci R, Aydin R (2004) Comparison of laser, dry needling, and placebo laser treatments in myofascial pain syndrome. Photomedicine and laser surgery, 22(4), 306–311. https://doi.org/10.1089/pho.2004.22.306
26. Bağcı B (2018) Miyofasiyal ağrı sendorumlu hastalarda farklı fizyoterapi uygulamalarının ağrı, fonksiyon ve yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi. MPSter thesis, Hasan Kalyoncu University

Uncorrected Proof

Table 1. Sociodemographic data

Features		**Study group n=30**	**Control group n=30**	**p**
Gender	Female	26	25	1
	Male	4	5	
Marital status	Married	26	20	0.125
	Single	4	10	

Employment	Working	13	15	0.343
	Housewife	15	15	
	Student	2	0	
Education	Illiterate	1	1	0.296
	Elementary	12	7	
	Middle school	5	7	
	High school	4	10	
	University	8	5	
Systemic disease	Yes	0	0	1
	No	30	30	
Smoking status	Smoker	7	9	0.447
	Non-smoker	23	21	

Table 2. Intragroup and intergroup comparisons of pain severity, emotional state, and disability

Measure	**Study group N=30 Mean±SD**	**Control group N=30 Mean±SD**	**p**
Pain severity			
Pre-treatment	7.16±1.82	6.08±1.71	
Post-treatment	4.04±1.91	4.84±1.95	**0.010***
One month after treatment	2.92±2.21	4.95±2.07	**0.040***
p	**0.0001***	**0.0015***	
Emotional state			
Pre-treatment	14.3±8.35	12.8±7.47	
Post-treatment	10.8±6.35	10.9±6.4	0.385
One month after treatment	9.73±6.62	12.7±8.64	0.492
p	**0.0001***	**0.0001***	
Disability			
Pre-treatment	58.0±14.5	54.5±16.6	
Post-treatment	45.3±16.2	46.5±17.8	0.216
One month after treatment	41.7±19.6	45.1±14.4	0.497
p	**0.0001***	**0.0017***	
Repeated Measures ANOVA test; Paired t test			

Table 3. Intragroup and intergroup comparisons of joint range of movement

ROM	**Study group Mean ± SD**	**Control group Mean ± SD**	**p**
Flexion			
Pre-treatment	50.3±15.0	50.9±13.7	
Post-treatment	58.4±14.4	56.0±13.7	0.258
One month after treatment	58.1±13.7	58.4±15.1	0.411
p	**<0.001***	**<0.001***	
Extension			
Pre-treatment	45.4±14.5	52.7±18.8	

Uncorrected Proof

Post-treatment	53.4±17.1	57.8±16.8	0.265
One month after treatment	54.3±17.4	58.6±18.4	0.989
p	**<0.001***	**<0.001***	
Right lateral flexion			
Pre-treatment	33.0±11.8	32.2±11.0	
Post-treatment	42.5±10.9	38.4±11.8	0.109
One month after treatment	44.1±12.3	37.9±13.5	0.238
p	**<0.001***	**<0.001***	
Left lateral flexion			
Pre-treatment	37.3±9.40	36.6±12.7	
Post-treatment	44.9±9.84	44.8±13.6	0.778
One month after treatment	47.7±11.0	43.5±14.6	**0.010***
P	**<0.001***	**<0.001***	
Right rotation			
Pre-treatment	60.9±18.7	65.4±17.6	
Post-treatment	69.7±17.1	71.4±16.6	0.312
One month after treatment	70.0±20.0	72.6±16.9	0.649
p	**<0.001***	**<0.001***	
Left rotation			
Pre-treatment	69.0±15.5	69.6±16.2	
Post-treatment	74.7±13.9	74.7±12.9	0.808
One month after treatment	76.3±16.1	75.8±13.3	0.818
p	**<0.001***	**<0.001***	

Table 4. Intra- and intergroup pain pressure threshold comparisons			
Right m. trapezius 1st trigger point pain pressure threshold	**Study group Mean ± SD**	**Control group Mean ± SD**	**p**
Pre-treatment	1.94±0.44	1.91±0.49	
Post-treatment	2.14±0.31	1.91±0.47	**<0.001**
One month after treatment	2.25±0.31	1.93±0.44	**<0.001**
p	**<0.001***	0.8664	
Right m. trapezius 2nd trigger point pain threshold			
Pre-treatment	1.92±0.35	1.78±0.50	
Post-treatment	2.08±0.29	1.82±0.08	**<0.001**
One month after treatment	2.25±0.23	2.01±0.26	**<0.001**
p	**<0.001***	0.3727	
Left m. trapezius 1st trigger point pain pressure threshold			
Pre-treatment	2.03±0.15	1.91±0.47	
Post-treatment	2.13±0.29	1.91±0.47	**<0.001**
One month after treatment	2.26±0.33	1.98±0.43	**<0.001**
p	**<0.001***	0.4682	
Left m. trapezius 2nd trigger point pain			
Pre-treatment	1.97±0.45	1.84±0.46	
Post-treatment	2.12±0.36	1.89±0.44	**<0.001**
One month after treatment	2.25±0.27	1.97±0.44	**<0.001**
p	**<0.001***	0.1142	
Repeated Measures ANOVA test; Paired t test			

Uncorrected Proof