

1 **Title:Effectiveness of prolotherapy vs local anesthetic**
2 **infiltration guided by ultrasound in the treatment of shoulder**
3 **pain syndrome.**

4 Prolotherapy vs local anesthetic infiltration in shoulder pain syndrome

5
6 Juan A. LIRA-LUCIO¹, Guillermo OCHOA-GAÍTAN^{1,2}, Lizeth HERNÁNDEZ-
7 ESCOBAR^{1,2}, Christian I. Padilla-Rivera^{1,3}, Berenice C. Hernández Porras⁴, Ángel M.
8 JUAREZ-LEMUS⁴, Jose Guillermo OCHOA-MILLAN^{1,5}, Roberto J. Jimenez-Contreras⁶,
9 Enrique ROLDÁN-RODRÍGUEZ^{1,2,4*}.

10

11 ¹Anestesia Integral de la Mujer, Gynecology and obstetrics, Centro Medico ABC, Mexico
12 City, Mexico; ²Gynecology and obstetrics, Institution, Centro Medico ABC, Mexico City,
13 Mexico; ³ Anesthesiology , Orthopedia and trauma , IMSS Hospital de Ortopedia "Dr.
14 Victorio de la Fuente Narvaez", Mexico City, Mexico; ⁴ Algology Department, Instituto
15 Nacional de Cancerología, Mexico City, Mexico; ⁵ Anesthesiology, Hospital Real San
16 Jose, Guadalajara, Mexico. ⁶ Anesthesiology, Centro Medico ABC, Mexico City, Mexico.

17

18 *Corresponding author Enrique ROLDÁN-RODRÍGUEZ, Anestesia Integral de la Mujer,
19 Gynecology and obstetrics, Centro Medico ABC, Av. Carlos Fernández Graef 154, Santa
20 Fe, 05330 Ciudad de México, CDMX. GO-G, eroldan@anestesiaintegralmujer.com.

21

22 **BACKGROUND** □ Chronic Shoulder Pain (CSP) is a health problem that affects
23 almost 67% of the general population. Almost a third of patients with acute shoulder pain
24 syndrome don't respond to initial therapy with analgesics and need interventional therapy.
25 Corticosteroid injection is the standard therapy. Prolotherapy has been demonstrated to be
26 effective in other chronic pain syndromes, but not in CSP. The aim of this study was to
27 determine the effectiveness of prolotherapy compared to local anesthetic injection in the
28 treatment of chronic shoulder pain

29

30

31 **METHODS** □ Retrospective and comparative study of 77 patients from the National
32 Institute of Oncology in Mexico City who received treatment for Chronic Shoulder Pain
33 guided by ultrasound between 2017-2019. 57 patients were kept in the study for further
34 analysis. 39 received infiltration with corticosteroids and 17 prolotherapy. Effectiveness of

35 therapies was determined based on the decrease in VAS score in next follow-up session.
36 Statistical analysis were performed with SPSS and RStudio Software.

37

38

39 RESULTS □ 51% of patients with Chronic Shoulder Pain were unemployed—84% of
40 the patients needed 3 different types of analgesics before they received ultrasound guided
41 local treatment. Prolotherapy was as efficient as local anesthetic injection, no matter basal
42 pain severity or underlying shoulder diagnosis, despite prolotherapy being more used as
43 treatment for Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy.

44

45 CONCLUSIONS □ Prolotherapy and corticosteroid injection guided by ultrasound
46 have the same efficacy in pain relief for chronic shoulder pain in oncologic patients.

47

48 Key words: *Local anesthetic infiltration, Prolotherapy, Shoulder Pain Treatment,*
49 *Capsulitis.*

50

51

52

53

54

55

56 **1.Introduction**


57 *Chronic Shoulder Pain (CSP) is a health problem that affects almost 67% of the*
58 *general population with high economic and lifestyle burden*¹. *Patients with an oncologic*
59 *disease have an increased risk of developing shoulder pain after surgical interventions,*
60 *radiotherapy, and the pathologic features of their underlying disease*²³. *Even with*
61 *pharmacologic treatment, almost a third part of patients with acute shoulder pain*
62 *syndrome don't respond to initial therapy with acetaminophen, non-steroidal anti-*
63 *inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) or muscle relaxants and will develop chronic shoulder*
64 *pain.*⁴ *If initial therapy, such as NSAIDs, rest, and physical rehabilitation, fail to relieve*
65 *pain and improve function, the second line of treatment may non-invasive treatment as*
66 *local anesthetic injection or prolotherapy*⁵.

67 *Local corticosteroid (CS) infiltration is the second most common non-surgical*
68 *therapy used to treat CSP, after the use of multiple analgesics. Almost 11% of patients*
69 *with shoulder pain receive CS local infiltration in primary care*⁶. *There is uncertainty*
70 *about CS injection efficacy as therapy of shoulder pain after recent evidence that*
71 *demonstrate a small and transient pain relief without additional benefit to other therapies.*
72 *Anesthetic infiltration and physical therapy show equal long-term results for function,*
73 *range of motion and patient-perceived improvement*⁷⁸. *Additionally, CS injections display*
74 *multiple adverse effects, such as rotator cuff tendon degeneration, exacerbation of*
75 *neuropathic pain and delay in tissue repair and tendon necrosis, possibly secondary to an*
76 *increase of oxidative stress by an increase of glutamate receptor NMDAR1 that promote*
77 *apoptosis after injection of CS*⁹.

78 *Prolotherapy (PT) is a non-surgical technique for the treatment of chronic painful*
79 *musculoskeletal conditions. It's based in the infiltration of local tissues with irritating*
80 *agents to promote fibrous repair in tissues like tendons, joints, or damaged ligaments*¹⁰.

81 *The most common irritating agents used are hyaluronic acid, hypertonic dextrose, zinc,*
82 *growth hormone, and autologous cells such as platelet-rich plasma¹¹. PT has won field in*
83 *recent years as treatment elected by patients, physicians and researchers. In figure 1*
84 *most common words used in PubMed publication about PT are represented. PT has*
85 *demonstrated beneficial effects in function, pain relief, and quality of life in patients with*
86 *osteoarthritis, plantar fasciitis and adhesive capsulitis; with high treatment adherence and*
87 *patient satisfaction^{12 13}. Bertrand et al. demonstrated prolotherapy efficacy vs placebo in*
88 *Painful Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy treatment with pain improvement and a higher patient*
89 *satisfaction.¹⁴*

90 Figure 1.— Word Map of Prolotherapy research in PubMed



91
92 Figure 1 Word Map of Prolotherapy research in PubMed. The size of the words represent the frequency that this words
93 have been used in PL research.

94
95 *An ultrasonography (US) approach has recently been added to the management of*
96 *interventional shoulder pain. Therapy guided by ultrasonography (US) is an economic*
97 *and fast tool to improve previously needle blinded procedures. It has the advantage of*
98 *being less traumatic to tissues, because it allows puncture to the exact site of infiltration,*

99 *making this therapy more accurate*¹⁵¹². *PT has not been studied previously in should pain*
100 *syndrome.*

101 *Both techniques have been widely used in pain control with local anesthetic*
102 *infiltration, but the superiority for pain relief in these patients has not been compared. The*
103 *aim of this study is to compare the efficacy of prolotherapy versus local anesthetic*
104 *infiltration for pain relief guided by ultrasonography in patients with chronic shoulder*
105 *pain.*

106

107 **2. Materials and methods**

108 **2.1 Study Design**

109 *Retrospective and comparative study of 77 patients recorded from the National*
110 *Institute of Oncology in México City with diagnosis of CSP who received US guided*
111 *interventional pain management between January 2017 and December 2019.*
112 *Demographic data were collected from medical records and captured in a database.*

113 **2.2 Studied Population**

114 *Inclusion criteria were >18 years and CSP secondary to capsulitis, rotator cuff*
115 *syndrome, or impingement syndrome. Exclusion criteria were incomplete medical records,*
116 *patients with a primary tumor in the shoulder, combined technique, or history of*
117 *previously infiltration. Other pathologies were excluded because low frequency (n=<2)*
118 *with low statistical representation. The studied population was divided into patients who*
119 *received nervous infiltration with local anesthetic, and those who were treated with*
120 *prolotherapy. Mild efficacy of treatment was considered as relief of less than 30% of basal*
121 *AVS score previous the intervention, moderate efficacy a reduction of 30-50% and, strong*
122 *efficacy a decrease of >50% from basal AVS score. The present study has been carried*

123 *out under the Helsinki principles with number of approbation INCAN 2019/0140 by the*
124 *local bioethics committee.*

125 **2.3 Statistical analysis**

126 *Statistical analysis was performed under IBM[®], SPSS[®] software Version 25 ,*
127 *WordMap was created in RStudio V 2.3.1 for MacOS Catalina Version 10.15.5 with*
128 *Bibliometrix package^{16 17 18}. Data distribution was calculated with Shapiro-Wilk test.*
129 *Data is represented with median and standard deviations (SD). Median differences were*
130 *determined by T student test; for categorical data X2 test and Fisher Exact Test were used*
131 *as required. Statistical significance was considered with a p-value <0.05.*

132

133 **3. Results**


134 **3.1 Demographic patient characteristics.**

135 *77 patients received pain treatment guided by US between January 2017 and*
136 *December 2019. 57 patients were selected according to inclusion and exclusion criteria.*
137 *39 were assigned to the local anesthetic with corticosteroids group (CS) and 17 patients*
138 *to the prolotherapy group (PT). Demographic features are represented in table 1. There*
139 *were no differences in age, PT group was 60 (± 12.4) vs 60 (± 14.06) in LA ($p > 0.05$), 78%*
140 *of PT patients were women vs 82% in LA but there was not statistical significance. 51% of*
141 *the patients in both groups were unemployed when the first session of treatment was*
142 *received. Prolotherapy treatment was more used when the left shoulder was affected. CS*
143 *therapy was also used more when rotator cuff was affected (90% vs 83%, $p < 0.001$).*
144 *Tumors in the stomach and kidneys were more frequent when prolotherapy was used. 84%*
145 *of patients in both groups needed treatment with three different families of analgesics*
146 *before US-guided pain treatment without differences between groups. There was no*
147 *difference in basal severity of pain between the groups.*

148 **3.2 Effectiveness in pain control**

149 *Pain control was categorized as mild, moderate, or strong. First, we wanted to*
150 *know if patient choice of the therapy was associated to basal pain severity, but we did not*
151 *find any difference (fig 2). We then evaluated if pain control was dependent on the initial*
152 *pain, table 2. PT demonstrated to be equal effective as CS to control pain, no matter the*
153 *basal pain severity. Both groups had good results decreasing chronic pain in patients; 0%*
154 *in both groups reported mild or no control of pain, 30% in CS had mild control vs 47% in*
155 *PT group, and respectively 27% vs 56% reported strong control, without statistical*
156 *difference between the groups (p=0.16). (Fig 3).*

157 Figure 2.— Pain decrease by US guided procedure
158




159

160 *CS infiltration was more used in the treatment of rotator cuff syndrome (RCS) than*
161 *prolotherapy. We evaluated if there is a difference in pain decrease based on the primary*
162 *diagnosis of CSP. 35 patients in the CS group have RCS vs 15 in the PT group. PT group*
163 *was equally effective as CS in pain control, with respectively 34% of patients with*

164 moderate control vs 45%, and 66% vs 55% with strong relief of pain ($p < 0.21$). This
165 control was not dependent of the number of different analgesics required after infiltration
166 procedures, none of the groups needed 3 families of analgesics. 83% of CS group needed
167 2 classes of analgesics, vs 57% PL. In the population with strong control, 56% and 50%
168 required 2 classes of analgesics, respectively. None of the participants in this study
169 presented adverse events.

170 Figure 3.— Pain decrease based on initial severity.
171



172

173 3. Discussion

174 To our knowledge, this is the first study to evaluate the efficacy of CS vs PT for shoulder
175 pain management. PT has demonstrated to be safe and effective in chronic pain therapy in
176 many musculoskeletal pathologies, but just a few studies have investigated PT in CSP,
177 even though it is the third most common musculoskeletal disorder in general practice⁶. As

178 *in other studies reported previously, in this age group the main cause of CSP was Rotator*
179 *Cuff Syndrome, with a frequency of 88% in the population of this study. This indicates that*
180 *even though oncologic patients have an increased risk of CSP, the main cause is still*
181 *Rotator Cuff Syndrome.¹⁵ ⁶There is no clear indication of prolotherapy for pain treatment*
182 *in shoulder pathologies, but in this study, we have demonstrated that it is equally effective*
183 *as CS injections for treatment of Capsulitis, Rotator Cuff Syndrome and adhesive*
184 *capsulitis. Further studies are needed to evaluate each of the procedures separately in*
185 *CSP.*

186 *Interestingly, almost 50% of patients in both groups were unemployed when they received*
187 *local therapy. This agrees with other studies about the potential functional restriction that*
188 *CSP leads to in patients, and the importance of a therapy that improves these functional*
189 *restrictions. ¹⁹Ultrasound guided pain management has been studied widely. This is a*
190 *useful equipment for shoulder pain management ¹⁵. Raeissadat et al. demonstrated in a*
191 *prospective study that CS and PT in patients with plantar fasciitis has the same efficacy in*
192 *pain relief after a 24-weeks follow up. ¹² In this study, we have also demonstrated that the*
193 *use of PT has the same efficacy as LA infiltration for chronic shoulder pain. We also*
194 *found that pain relief does not depend on basal pain severity. The mechanism of PT*
195 *effectiveness is based on the induction of anti-inflammatory reactions by irritant agents*
196 *that enhance tissue healing. ¹¹*

197 *We are aware of the limitations of this study, as a retrospective study where we lack*
198 *control of some variables of interest. However, to our knowledge this is the first study to*
199 *evaluate the efficacy of PT vs CS for CSP. CS therapy requires multiples sessions, in this*
200 *study PT and LA infiltration demonstrated to be safe when guided by US.*

201 *CS and PT therapies have limitations in shoulder pain treatment. In randomized*
202 *controlled trial, Kesikburun et al demonstrate that PT is not a therapy that should be used*

203 *alone, its effectiveness is dependent of physical rehabilitation* ²⁰ . *In this study, we have*
204 *evaluated the use of PT and LA nervous infiltration separately. This study allows us to*
205 *place PT as a safe technique when it is guided by US and enables future blinded studies in*
206 *shoulder pain. PT is a promising technique, and it has demonstrated that its benefits are*
207 *not limited to pain control, but also improvement of functionality and mobility.*

208

209

210

Conclusions

211 *Most patients with CSP needs to receive pharmacologic treatment before receiving an*
212 *interventional management. LA and PT have demonstrated to relieve pain in short term in*
213 *these patients, regardless of the severity of basal pain. Prolotherapy is a safe and*
214 *minimally invasive technique with high adherence to treatment for pain control in CSP*
215 *patients. It has the same effectiveness in pain relive as CS nervous injection in oncologic*
216 *patients, no matter the basal severity of pain. Further prospective, blinded and*
217 *randomized studies with covariates as functional improvement are needed to prove PT*
218 *long term benefits, but this study demonstrate that it is a promising treatment.*

219

220

WHAT IS KNOWN

- 221 • *Patients with painful man syndrome need multiple therapies to have pain relief*
- 222 • *Use of corticosteroid infiltration is therapy with few acute adverse events when*
- 223 *performed by ultrasound.*

WHAT IS NEW

- 225 • *Prolotherapy is as effective as corticosteroid infiltration in pain relief of patients with*
- 226 *painful shoulder syndrome.*
- 227 • *When ultrasound guided prolotherapy is a safe therapy for handling painful shoulde*
- 228 *syndrome.*

229

REFERENCES

230

- 231 1. Luime JJ, Koes BW, Hendriksen IJM, et al. Prevalence and incidence of shoulder
232 pain in the general population; a systematic review. *Scand J Rheumatol.*
233 2004;33(2):73-81. doi:10.1080/03009740310004667
- 234 2. Gane EM, Michaleff ZA, Cottrell MA, et al. Prevalence, incidence, and risk factors
235 for shoulder and neck dysfunction after neck dissection: A systematic review. *Eur J*
236 *Surg Oncol.* 2017;43(7):1199-1218. doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2016.10.026
- 237 3. Yang S, Park DH, Ahn SH, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of adhesive capsulitis
238 of the shoulder after breast cancer treatment. *Support Care Cancer.*
239 2017;25(4):1317-1322. doi:10.1007/s00520-016-3532-4
- 240 4. Boudreault J, Desmeules F, Roy JS, Dionne C, Frémont P, MacDermid JC. The
241 efficacy of oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for rotator cuff tendinopathy:
242 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Rehabil Med.* 2014;46(4):294-306.
243 doi:10.2340/16501977-1800
- 244 5. Mehta S, Gimbel JA, Soslowsky LJ. Etiologic and pathogenetic factors for rotator
245 cuff tendinopathy. *Clin Sports Med.* 2003;22(4):791-812. doi:10.1016/S0278-
246 5919(03)00012-7
- 247 6. Linsell L, Dawson J, Zondervan K, et al. Prevalence and incidence of adults
248 consulting for shoulder conditions in UK primary care; patterns of diagnosis and
249 referral. *Rheumatology.* 2006;45(2):215-221. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/kei139
- 250 7. Cook T, Lowe CM, Maybury M, Lewis JS. Are corticosteroid injections more
251 beneficial than anaesthetic injections alone in the management of rotator cuff-
252 related shoulder pain? A systematic review. *Br J Sports Med.* 2018;52(8):497-504.
253 doi:10.1136/bjsports-2016-097444
- 254 8. Mohamadi A, Chan JJ, Claessen FMAP, Ring D, Chen NC. Corticosteroid
255 Injections Give Small and Transient Pain Relief in Rotator Cuff Tendinosis: A
256 Meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2017;475(1):232-243. doi:10.1007/s11999-
257 016-5002-1
- 258 9. Dean BJF, Franklin SL, Murphy RJ, Javaid MK, Carr AJ. Glucocorticoids induce
259 specific ion-channel-mediated toxicity in human rotator cuff tendon: A mechanism

- 260 underpinning the ultimately deleterious effect of steroid injection in tendinopathy?
261 Br J Sports Med. 2014;48(22):1620-1626. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2013-093178
- 262 10. Rahimzadeh P, Imani F, Faiz SHR, Entezary SR, Zamanabadi MN, Alebouyeh MR.
263 The effects of injecting intra-articular platelet-rich plasma or prolotherapy on pain
264 score and function in knee osteoarthritis. Clin Interv Aging. 2018;13:73-79.
265 doi:10.2147/CIA.S147757
- 266 11. Ryu K, Ko D, Lim G, Kim E, Lee SH. Ultrasound-Guided Prolotherapy with
267 Polydeoxyribonucleotide for Painful Rotator Cuff Tendinopathy. Pain Res Manag.
268 2018;2018. doi:10.1155/2018/8286190
- 269 12. Raeissadat SA, Nouri F, Darvish M, Esmaily H, Ghazihosseini P. Ultrasound-
270 guided injection of high molecular weight hyaluronic acid versus corticosteroid in
271 management of plantar fasciitis: A 24-week randomized clinical trial. J Pain Res.
272 2020;13:109-121. doi:10.2147/JPR.S217419
- 273 13. Sit RWS, Wu RWK, Rabago D, et al. Efficacy of intra-articular hypertonic dextrose
274 (Prolotherapy) for knee osteoarthritis: A randomized controlled trial. Ann Fam
275 Med. 2020;18(3):235-242. doi:10.1370/afm.2520
- 276 14. Bertrand H, Reeves KD, Bennett CJ, Bicknell S, Cheng AL. Dextrose prolotherapy
277 versus control injections in painful rotator cuff tendinopathy. Arch Phys Med
278 Rehabil. 2016;97(1):17-25. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2015.08.412
- 279 15. Karel YHJM, Miranda A, Thoomes-de Graaf M, et al. Does the outcome of
280 diagnostic ultrasound influence the treatment modalities and recovery in patients
281 with shoulder pain in physiotherapy practice? Results from a prospective cohort
282 study. Musculoskelet Sci Pract. 2019;41(March 2018):28-35.
283 doi:10.1016/j.msksp.2019.03.003
- 284 16. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Published
285 online 2015.
- 286 17. Miscellaneous TH, Yes L. Package ‘Hmisc.’ Published online 2020.
- 287 18. Villanueva RAM, Chen ZJ, Wickham H. Ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data
288 Analysis Using the Grammar of Graphics. Springer-Verlag New York; 2016.
289 doi:10.1080/15366367.2019.1565254
- 290 19. Silvestri J. Effects of chronic shoulder pain on quality of life and occupational
291 engagement in the population with chronic spinal cord injury: preparing for the best
292 outcomes with occupational therapy. Disabil Rehabil. 2017;39(1):82-90.
293 doi:10.3109/09638288.2016.1140829
- 294 20. Kesikburun S, Tan AK, Yilmaz B, Yaşar E, Yazicioğlu K. Platelet-rich plasma
295 injections in the treatment of chronic rotator cuff tendinopathy: A randomized
296 controlled trial with 1-year follow-up. Am J Sports Med. 2013;41(11):2609-2615.
297 doi:10.1177/0363546513496542

300 *Conflicts of interest*

301

302 The authors certify that there is no conflict of interest with any financial organization
303 regarding the material discussed in the manuscript.

304

305

306

307 *Funding.*

308

309 The authors report no involvement in the research by the sponsor that could have
310 influenced the outcome of this work.

311

312

313

314 _____

315

316 *Authors' contributions.—*

317 **Author Contributions:** ER-R, Data collection and curation; JAL-L and GO-G, Formal
318 analysis; JAL- and LH-A, Investigation; ER-R and AJ-L Methodology; JAL-L, COG-G,
319 ER-R , Project administration; JAL-L, Software; GO-G and ER-R, Supervision; JAL-L,
320 GO-G, LH-A, AJ-L ER-R, Validation; JAL-L and LH-A, Visualization; JAL-L and ER-R,
321 Writing—original draft preparation; GO-G, LH-A – review & editing. All authors have
322 read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

323

324

325

326 ...

327

328

329

330

331

332
333

TABLES

Table I.

		Demographic features			
		Total n=57 (%)	CS n=39 (%)	Prolotherapy n=18 (%)	<i>p</i> valor
Age (years)		60 (±12.4)	60(±14.06)	60(±8.4)	0.96
Sex (Fem)		46(80%)	32(82%)	14(78%)	0.98
Occupation					
	Homecare	17(30%)	14(36%)	3(16%)	0.36
	Trade	3(5%)	4(10%)	0	0.54
	technical	3(5%)	2(5%)	1(6%)	0.31
	Office	5(9%)	3(8%)	1(6%)	1
	Worker				
	Unemployed	29(51%)	17(41%)	13(72%)	0.26
Affected shoulder					
	Left	28(49%)	24(62%)	14(78%)	0.001*
	Rigth	28(49%)	14(36%)	4(22%)	0.001*
	Both	1(2%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	1
Diagnosis					
	Capsulitis	3(5%)	3(8%)	0	0.54
	Rotator cuff syndrome	50(88%)	35(90%)	15(83%)	<0.001*
	Impingement syndrome	4(7%)	1(2%)	3(17%)	0.08
Primary Tumor					
	Breast	29(51%)	22(56%)	8(44%)	0.26
	Stomach	3(5%)	0(0%)	3(17%)	0.02*
	Prostate	5(9%)	4(10%)	1(6%)	1
	Kidney	3(5%)	0(0%)	3(17%)	0.02*
	Other	17(30%)	13(33%)	4(22%)	0.53
Basal Pain					
	Mild		5(13%)	2(12%)	0.64
	Moderate		20(51%)	9(53%)	0.90
	Severe		14(36%)	6(35%)	0.96
Prior treatment					
	1 family	1(2%)	1(3%)	0	1
	2 families	8(14%)	6(15%)	2(11%)	1
	3 families	48(84%)	32(82%)	16(89%)	0.7

Data is represented in mean and SD for quantitative variable and absolute and relative frequencies for categoric data. Sd = Syndrome. Mean differences were calculated by U-Mann-Whitney test, for categorical data X2 and Fisher Exact test were used as required. * Statistical significance when $p < 0.05$.

334

335

336
337

TABLE II
DECREASE IN PAIN ACCORDING TO BASAL PAIN

BASAL PAIN	Treatment efficacy	CS (n=39)	Prolotherapy (n=18)	P value
MILD		n= 5	n=2	0.47
	Mild	0	0	
	Moderate	3(60%)	2(100%)	
	Strong	2(40%)	0	
MODERATE		n=20	n=9	
	Mild	0	0	0.53
	Moderate	8(40%)	3(33.3%)	
	Strong	12 (60%)	6 (66.6%)	
SEVERE		n=14	n=6	0.13
	Mild	0	0	
	Moderate	2(14%)	3(50%)	
	Strong	12(86%)	3(50%)	

MILD EFFICACY OF TREATMENT WAS CONSIDERED AS A RELIEVE OF LESS THAT 30% OF BASAL THE VAS SCORE PREVIOUSLY THE INTERVENTION, MODERATE EFFICACY A REDUCTION OF 30-50% AND STRONG EFFICACY TO A DECREASE >50% FROM THE BASAL VAS SCORE. X2 AND FISHER EXACT TEST WERE USED AS REQUIRED. * STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE WHEN P<0.05.

338
339
340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

injections intra articular

treatment outcome

glucose therapy

male

humans

female

middle aged

pain management

Fig. 10. Normalized number of applications



Fig. 1. Effect of the degree of forest cover on the diversity of species.

