Comparative Study Of Range Of Motion After Conventional Physiotherapy In Adhesive Capsulitis Of Shoulder Joint Among Diabetic And Non-Diabetic Patients At Teaching Hospital Batticaloa.

#R Rakunaraj

Teaching Hospital, Batticaloa

#rajslkpt@gmail.com

Abstract: Adhesive capsulitis (AC) of shoulder is one of the commonest condition among musculoskeletal disorders. It affects both male and female gender and some medical conditions associated with AC especially diabetes. Physiotherapy is the most advocated treatment option to manage this condition conservatively. The objectives were to compare the range of motion (ROM) of shoulder joint in percentage among the patients with AC associated with diabetic and nondiabetic patients received follow-up at the Teaching Hospital Batticaloa after conventional physiotherapy and to determine the associated risk factors that delaying the recovery. The methodology was Observational, prospective institutional based study was conducted at the Department of Physiotherapy, Teaching Hospital Batticaloa, Sri Lanka for the period of 12 weeks. 32 patients with primary AC were recruited to this study, 15 with diabetic and 17 without diabetic. An interviewer administered questionnaire was given to the participants prior to the commencement of physiotherapy sessions and goniometry measurement was obtained in mean percentage in AC shoulder and contralateral side before and after the conventional physiotherapy with a standard 12-inch plastic goniometer. Data was analyzed in SPSS. The results shown that the conventional physiotherapy would have an impact in improving ROM of AC shoulder both in DM and non-DM population and this trend was statistically significant at a confidence level of 95% (p<0.05). However,

there was no statistically significant (p>0.005) observation identified when compare the recovery of the ROM among DM and non-DM patients with conventional physiotherapy. There was no impact on the recovery of ROM in AC patients associated with DM when compared to non-DM population. Even though the present study is a preliminary in nature, the results indicated that there is no significant improvement among patients with non-DM with compared to DM patients. Therefore, it may not advisable to do over treatment to DM patients with the intention of gaining a higher productivity in the range of motion.

Keywords: Adhesive capsulitis, Frozen shoulder, Range of Motion, Diabetes, Physiotherapy.

Introduction

Peripheral joint disorders are common among the orthopaedic conditions. Of which Adhesive Capsulitis (AC) of shoulder also known as Frozen Shoulder (FS) is one of the commonest peripheral joint disorder primarily referred to physiotherapy for managing conservatively. The AC involve at the glenohumeral joint resulted by synovial thickening of the joint capsule and contracture of the surrounding soft tissues. Movements of the glenohumeral joint are restricted in all directions and the symptoms of pain and Range of Motion (ROM) of shoulder are getting worse gradually (Yanlei, Keong, & Tijauw Tjoen, 2019). Some studies revealed that about 40 % of patients felt stiffness and pain persistently for more than

Allied Health Sciences Sessions

3 years and 7 % to 15 % patients experienced permanent loss of function in shoulder joint. Definite cause for idiopathic or primary AC is unknown, though there are some risk factors influencing in to this condition such as diabetic, hyperthyroidism and female gender however, diabetic shows strong closest association with AC (Yanlei et al., 2019). FS is common among diabetic patients with a reported incidence ranges from 10.0% to 36.0% and prevalence ranges between 10.3% to 22.4% (Vastamäki et al., 2016). Another there study revealed that incidence range in diabetic is 28% to 40 % where as 2 % to 5 % in general population (Yanlei et al., 2019). Adhesive capsulitis is one of the common condition among the musculoskeletal system. According the past records from May 2018 to May 2019 period, there are about 8-9% of the incidence among the reported cases to the Physiotherapy **Department of Teaching Hospital Batticaloa** as outpatients were recorded as adhesive capsulitis. However, some of them require in ward admission in order to undergo other intervention such as Manipulation Under the Anesthesia (MUA) or intra articular injection. AC patients with diabetic complained of poor improvements in Range of Motion (ROM) followed by physiotherapy sessions. Therefore, a focus should be drawn to compare the improvement of ROM in AC patients associated with diabetic and nondiabetic condition in order to assess the improvement and recovery rate. In addition, the present study aims at determining the responsible factors affecting a delay in recovery. The objective of this study was to compare the range of motion (ROM) of shoulder joint in percentage among the patients with adhesive capsulitis associated with diabetes and nondiabetic patients received follow-up at the Teaching Hospital Batticaloa after conventional physiotherapy.

Methodology:

This was a 12 weeks cross sectional prospective institutional based study was conducted at the Department of Physiotherapy, Teaching Hospital Batticaloa, Sri Lanka. 32 patients were recruited for this study. Patients over 18 years with diabetic lasting more than 3 years and patients without having diabetic have been diagnosed to have unilateral primary AC in the period between 3 to 9 months after the onset of the condition were included. And the patients who reject to participate for the study, patients undergoing other alternative medicine parallel with physiotherapy, nonconsenting patients and past history of shoulder surgery or with comorbidities of life-threatening disease were excluded. Data was collected through an interviewer administered questionnaire prior to the commencement of physiotherapy session and goniometry measurement was obtained in mean percentage of shoulder ROM (flexion, abduction, external rotation. internal rotation and extension) of AC shoulder and contralateral shoulder before and after the conventional physiotherapy with a standard 12-inch plastic goniometer based as gold standard measurement. Data was analysed in SPSS version 19. Also, the ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethics Review Committee (ERC) of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya Sri Lanka.

Results:

Among the 32 studied patient population, the gender ratio remained 1:1 (n=16 for males and females), while majority of respondents (81.3 %) were belonging to the age group of > 55 years old (Table 4.1). Around 96.9 % patients were married. The O/L qualification was the most common education level (34.4 %) among the patients, while majority were unemployed (53.1 %), with a monthly income of < 10000 LKR (56.2 %). Interestingly, majority of the patients (65.6 %) were not familiar with the issues in ROM.



The percentage of diabetic, hyperlipidemia and hypertension positive patients were 46.9%, 50 % and 34.4 % among the entire patient population as indicated in Table 4.1.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the studied patient population

Image and the series of the	Variable	Category	Numbe	Percentag
GenderMale1650.0Female1650.0Female1650.0Female1650.026-3500.036-45618.846-55618.8552681.3Married3196.9Unmarried13.1Grade 1.4556.3Grade 1.4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education13.1Employment1753.2Income13.11000013.12000113.12000213.12000313.120004412.53000513.13100426.33100426.33500013.1			r	e (%)
remail1650.0Female1650.026-3500.026-35618.846-55618.826.3526.081.3Martiabatata3196.9Married3196.9Unmarried13.1Grade 1.4556.0Grade 1.4515.6Grade 1.4515.6Grade 1.4515.6Grade 1.4515.6Grade 1.4515.6Grade 1.41134.4A/L618.80/L1134.4A/L618.8Married13.1Higher26.3education13.1Employment1753.2Married1237.5Income13.1amount per13.11500013.12000013.12000013.12000013.12000013.13000013.13000013.13000013.13000013.13000013.13000013.1	Gender	Male	16	50.0
Age (Years)<2500.026-3500.036-45618.846-55618.826.52681.3Marital statusMarried3196.9Unmarried13.1Agride 1-455.6Grade 1-4515.6Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.80/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education134.4A/L618.8Married1134.4A/L618.8Finder26.3Employment1753.2d131.0Income126.3amount per month (LKR)1200013.12000412.5300026.331000-26.331000-26.331000-26.331000-26.331000-412.53000013.1		Female	16	50.0
<25				
Age (Years)26-3500.036-45618.846-55618.8>552681.3Maried3196.9Marial status13.1Maried13.1Maried13.1Maried13.1Grade 1-4515.6Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.80/L1134.4A/L6.318.8Higher26.3education13.1Higher26.3education15.3.2Maried1237.5Famployment12100001856.310000-26.31500013.120000112.530000112.531000-26.331000-26.33500013.1	Age (Years)	<25	0	0.0
Age (Years)36-45618.846-55618.8>552681.3Married3196.9Iumarried13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married26.3Grade 1-4515.6Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8O/L1134.4Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married13.1Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3Married26.3 <t< td=""><td>26-35</td><td>0</td><td>0.0</td></t<>		26-35	0	0.0
46-55618.8>552681.3Mariel3196.9Unmarried13.1Marial status13.1Maried13.1Maried13.1Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education13.1Employment1753.2d1237.5Employment1237.5Income13.1amount per100001856.31000013.1200013.12000112.5300026.331000-26.331000-412.53000013.1		36-45	6	18.8
>552681.3Mariel3196.9Mariel313.1Mariel13.1Mariel13.1Mariel26.3Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education153.2Married1753.2Married1237.5Employment26.3Income1amount per month (LKR)Income13.1300013.1		46-55	6	18.8
Marial statusMarried3196.9Unmarried313.1Unmarried13.1another the status55.3Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education26.3Higher26.3education11Employment1753.2dEmployed39.4Retired1237.5100001856.31500013.12000013.121000-412.530000112.53000026.331000-26.331000-26.33500013.1		>55	26	81.3
Married3196.9Unmarried13.1Unmarried13.1Ko school26.3Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education134.4Higher26.3education134.4Married134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education13.1Employment1753.2Married1237.5Income13.1amount per month (LKR)13.126000-412.53000026.331000-26.33500013.1				
Marital statusUnmarried13.1Unmarried13.1IncomeGrade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3educationIIHigher26.3educationIIEmployment1753.2dIIEmployed39.4Retired1237.5IncomeI3.1100001856.315000I3.120000I12.525000I12.53000026.331000-26.335000I3.1	Marital status	Married	31	96.9
Instant Instant Instant Beducational No school 2 6.3 Grade 1-4 5 15.6 Grade 5 6 18.8 O/L 11 34.4 A/L 6 18.8 Higher 2 6.3 education I 10 Higher 2 6.3 education I 10 Employment 17 53.2 d I 12 37.5 Employment 12 37.5 Income 10000 18 56.3 10000- 18 56.3 15000 I 3.1 20000 I 3.1 20000 I 12.5 30000 I 3.1 31000- 2 6.3 35000 I 3.1		Unmarried	1	3.1
No school26.3Grade 1-4515.6Grade 5618.8O/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3education153.2d153.2d153.2Employment1753.2Metried1237.5Factored126.3100001856.31500013.12000013.121000-412.525000412.53000026.331000-26.331000-26.33500013.1		1	1	1
Grade 1-4 5 15.6 Grade 5 6 18.8 O/L 11 34.4 A/L 6 18.8 Higher 2 6.3 education 17 53.2 Bemployment Unemploye 17 53.2 Employed 3 9.4 Employed 3 9.4 Icome 31 31.5 Monol 18 56.3 Icome 15000 18 56.3 Icome 15000 1 3.1 Icome 410000- 1 3.1 Icome 41000- 1 3.1 Icome 41000- 4 12.5 Icono 4 12.5 30000 Icono 4 12.5 30000 3100- Icono 2 6.3 3100- 3.1 Icono 3 3.1 31		No school	2	6.3
Educational LevelGrade 5618.80/L1134.4A/L618.8Higher26.3educationIIHigher1253.2d1753.2d1237.5Employment1237.5Ketired1237.5Income113.1amount per month (LKR)210001200013.1200026.3300026.331000-26.330000112.53000026.331000-26.33500013.1	Educational Level	Grade 1-4	5	15.6
Educational Level 0/L 11 34.4 A/L 6 18.8 Higher 2 6.3 education - - Higher 2 6.3 education 17 53.2 d - - Employment 17 53.2 d - - Employed 3 9.4 Retired 12 37.5 10000 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 - - 20000 1 3.1 20000 - - 21000- 4 12.5 25000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - -		Grade 5	6	18.8
A/L 6 18.8 Higher 2 6.3 education - - education 17 53.2 d - - Employment 17 53.2 d - - Employed 3 9.4 Retired 12 37.5 I0000- 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 - - 21000- 4 12.5 25000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - 35000 1 3.1		0/L	11	34.4
Higher education 2 6.3 education 6.3 education 10 Minemploye 17 53.2 d 12 37.5 Employed 3 9.4 Retired 12 37.5 Income 10000 18 56.3 10000 18 56.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 1 3.1 20000 1 3.1 21000- 4 12.5 25000 1 3.1 26000- 4 12.5 30000 1 3.1 31000- 2 6.3 30000 1 3.1		A/L	6	18.8
education Image Unemploye 17 53.2 d 17 53.2 d 17 53.2 Bemployment d 12 37.5 Retired 12 37.5 Income 10000- 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 Income 110000- 1 3.1 20000 1 3.1 12.5 20000 4 12.5 12.5 30000 4 12.5 30000 1 31000- 2 6.3 1 30000 2 6.3 1 31000- 2 6.3 1 30000 1 3.1 1		Higher	2	6.3
Employment Unemploye 17 53.2 d 17 53.2 d Employed 3 9.4 Retired 12 37.5 10000 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 2 1000- 21000- 4 12.5 25000 - - 26000- 4 12.5 30000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - -		education		
Image: Barbon				
d Employment Employed 3 9.4 Retired 12 37.5 Retired 12 37.5 I0000 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 16000- 1 3.1 20000 21000- 4 12.5 25000 26000- 4 12.5 30000 31000- 2 6.3 35000 >35000 1 3.1	Employment	Unemploye	17	53.2
Employed 3 9.4 Retired 12 37.5 Retired 12 37.5 Income 10000- 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 6.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 21000- 4 12.5 25000 26000- 4 12.5 30000 31000- 2 6.3 3100- 35000 - - 3100- 2 35000 1 3.1 -		d		
Retired 12 37.5 Retired 12 37.5 Income 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 1 3.1 20000 4 12.5 25000 - - 26000- 4 12.5 30000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - >35000 1 3.1		Employed	3	9.4
<10000 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 1 3.1 20000 4 12.5 25000 - - 26000- 4 12.5 30000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - >35000 1 3.1		Retired	12	37.5
<10000 18 56.3 10000- 2 6.3 15000 1 3.1 16000- 1 3.1 20000 2 6.3 16000- 1 3.1 20000 2 6.3 20000 4 12.5 25000 2 6.3 30000 2 6.3 31000- 2 6.3 35000 1 3.1				
Income 10000- 2 6.3 15000 1 3.1 20000 1 3.1 20000 4 12.5 25000 2 6.3 26000- 4 12.5 30000 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - - >35000 1 3.1 -		<10000	18	56.3
Income 15000 1 3.1 amount per month (LKR) 21000- 4 12.5 25000 2 - - 26000- 4 12.5 - 30000 - - - 31000- 2 6.3 - 35000 - - -	Income amount per month (LKR)	10000-	2	6.3
Income 16000- 1 3.1 20000 20000 1 3.1 amount per month (LKR) 21000- 4 12.5 26000- 4 12.5 30000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - >35000 1 3.1		15000		
Income 20000 4 12.5 amount per month (LKR) 25000 4 12.5 26000- 4 12.5 30000 4 12.5 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - >35000 1 3.1		16000-	1	3.1
amount per month (LKR) 21000- 4 12.5 25000 25000 12.5 26000- 4 12.5 30000 - - 31000- 2 6.3 35000 - - >35000 1 3.1		20000		
25000 25000 26000- 4 12.5 30000 31000- 2 6.3 35000		21000-	4	12.5
26000- 4 12.5 30000 12.5 31000- 2 6.3 35000 1 3.1		25000		10.5
30000 2 6.3 31000- 2 6.3 35000 35000 3.1		26000-	4	12.5
31000- 2 6.3 35000		30000	2	()
>35000 1 3.1		31000-	2	6.3
>55000 1 5.1		35000	1	2.1
· · _ · _ · _ · _ · _ · _ ·		>35000		3.1



	Diabetes	15	46.9	
Diabetic status	Non-	17	53.1	
	Diabetes			
Hyperlipidemi	Positive	16	50.0	
а	Negative	16	50.0	
Hypertension	Positive	11	34.4	
	Negative	21	65.6	
Have you	Yes	11	34.4	
heard about	No	21	65.6	
the condition				

Effect of physiotherapy on the recovery in both DM and non-DM were described the mean extension percentage for Abduction, External Rotation (ER) and Internal Rotation (IR) of ROM in the studied population remained as 60.1 ± 2.8 %, 53.2 ± 2.8 % and 62.2 ± 2.9 %, respectively, before the physiotherapy sessions. The percentage of all parameters corresponding to both active and passive ROM increased after the treatment with respect to both active and passive ranges (Figure 4.1). The results of the paired t test suggested that this trend was statistically significant at a confidence level of 95% (p<0.05).



Figure 1: The ROM features before and after physiotherapy

Effect of diabetic status on the percentage recovery (comparison) revealed both

Allied Health Sciences Sessions

diabetic and non-diabetic populations denoted positive recovery rates. The recoverv percentages of non-diabetic patients were relatively higher, except for abduction, ER (active ROM), flexion (passive ROM) and IR (passive ROM) as indicated in Figure 4.7. According to the statistics of the independent sample t test, the effect of diabetic status on the recovery levels of ROM

remained statistically insignificant (p>0.005).



Figure 2: The variation of percentage recovery of studied ROM features with the diabetic status

The results of the present study shown, that the conventional physiotherapy would have an impact in improving ROM of AC shoulder both in DM and non-DM population and this trend was statistically significant at a confidence level of 95% (p<0.05). But there was statistically insignificant (p>0.005) when compare the recovery of ROM among DM and non-DM patients with conventional physiotherapy. Though recovery percentage of non-diabetic patients were relatively higher, except for abduction, ER (active ROM), flexion (passive ROM) and IR (passive ROM).

Conclusion

This present study stands as the first documented research work as there was no published study available in Sri Lanka on comparison of ROM of shoulder in AC

patients associated with DM and non-DM. This present study revealed that there was no impact on the recovery of range of motion in AC patients associated with diabetes when compared to non-DM population. However, it emphasizes that conventional physiotherapy is an effective treatment option for AC patients. The limitations of this study were duration of this study was not sufficient to follow-up more treatment sessions, low number of sample size did not represent a sufficient number of patients with diabetes and this study was limited to one institute. Therefore, it is recommended to expand the study with more sample size including different institutes.

References

Ahmad, S., Sohail Rafi, M., Ahmed Siddiqui, I., Hamidi, K., Mujahid Faruq, N., Ahmad, S., ... Mujahid Faruq, N. (2012a). The Frequency of Adhesive Capsulitis in Diabetes Mellitus Patients. *Pakistan Journal of Rehabilitation*.

Ahmad, S., Sohail Rafi, M., Ahmed Siddiqui, I., Hamidi, K., Mujahid Faruq, N., Ahmad, S., ... Mujahid Faruq, N. (2012b). The Frequency of Adhesive Capsulitis in Diabetes Mellitus Patients. *Pakistan Journal of Rehabilitation*, *11*(2), 49–55. Retrieved from http://www.zu.edu.pk/images/pdf/rehabilitatio n/4955 Ahmed S et al_juldec12.pdf

Barbosa, F., Swamy, G., Salem, H., Creswell, T., Espag, M., Tambe, A., & Clark, D. (2018). Chronic adhesive capsulitis (Frozen shoulder): Comparative outcomes of treatment in patients with diabetes and obesity. *Journal of Clinical Orthopaedics and Trauma*, 15–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2018.02.015

Boutefnouchet, T., Jordan, R., Bhabra, G., Modi, C., & Saithna, A. (2019). Comparison of outcomes following arthroscopic capsular release for idiopathic, diabetic and secondary shoulder adhesive capsulitis: A Systematic Review. *Revue de Chirurgie Orthopedique et Traumatologique*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcot.2019.03.009

Brue, S., Valentin, A., Forssblad, M., Werner, S., Mikkelsen, C., & Cerulli, G. (2007). Idiopathic adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder: A review.



Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-007-0291-2

Fieseler, G., Laudner, K. G., Irlenbusch, L., Meyer, H., Schulze, S., Delank, K.-S., ... Schwesig, R. (2017). Inter- and intrarater reliability of goniometry and hand held dynamometry for patients with subacromial impingement syndrome. *Journal of Exercise Rehabilitation*. https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.23156

Jain, T. K., & Sharma, N. K. (2014). The effectiveness of physiotherapeutic interventions in treatment of frozen shoulder/adhesive capsulitis: A systematic review. *Journal of Back and Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation*. https://doi.org/10.3233/BMR-130443

Junaid, M. (2016). A Comparative Study to Determine the Efficacy of Routine Physical Therapy Treatment with and without Kaltenborn Mobilization on Pain and Shoulder Mobility in Frozen Shoulder Patients. *International Journal of Physiotherapy*.

https://doi.org/10.15621/ijphy/2016/v3i3/100 836

Katulanda, P., Sheriff, M., & Matthews, D. (2009). The diabetes epidemic in Sri Lanka – a growing problem. *Ceylon Medical Journal*. https://doi.org/10.4038/cmj.v51i1.1373

Kingston, K., Curry, E. J., Galvin, J. W., & Li, X. (2018a). Shoulder adhesive capsulitis: epidemiology and predictors of surgery. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2018.04.004

Kingston, K., Curry, E. J., Galvin, J. W., & Li, X. (2018b). Shoulder adhesive capsulitis: epidemiology and predictors of surgery. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2018.04.004

Kolber, M. J., Fuller, C., Marshall, J., Wright, A., & Hanney, W. J. (2012). The reliability and concurrent validity of scapular plane shoulder elevation measurements using a digital inclinometer and goniometer. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.3109/09593985.2011.57420 3

Le, H. V., Lee, S. J., Nazarian, A., & Rodriguez, E. K. (2017). Adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder: review of pathophysiology and current clinical treatments. *Shoulder & Elbow*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1758573216676786

Lin, M. T., Hsiao, M. Y., Tu, Y. K., & Wang, T. G. (2018). Comparative Efficacy of Intra-Articular Steroid Injection and Distension in Patients With Frozen Shoulder: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Archives of Physical Medicine* and *Rehabilitation*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2017.08.471

Lyhne, J. M., Jacobsen, J. R., Hansen, S. J., Jensen, C. M., & Deutch, S. R. (2018). Diabetic and nondiabetic patients report equal symptom relief after arthroscopic capsular release of frozen shoulder. *Journal of Clinical Orthopaedics and Trauma*.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2018.05.004

Malavolta, E. A., Gracitelli, M. E. C., Ribeiro Pinto, G. de M., Freire da Silveira, A. Z., Assunção, J. H., & Ferreira Neto, A. A. (2018). Asian ethnicity: a risk factor for adhesive capsulitis? *Revista Brasileira de Ortopedia*, *53*(5), 602–606. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbo.2017.07.006

Mehta, S. S., Singh, H. P., & Pandey, R. (2014). Comparative outcome of arthroscopic release for frozen shoulder in patients with and without diabetes. *Bone and Joint Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1302/0301-620X.96B10.34476

Pandey, A., Shrestha, B., & Shrestha, K. M. (2018). A Comparative Study of Steroid Injection With or Without Lignocaine in Treating Frozen Shoulder. *Journal of Universal College of Medical Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.3126/jucms.v5i1.19051

Pons-Villanueva, J., & Escalada San Martín, J. (2016). The stiff shoulder in diabetic patients. *International Journal of Rheumatic Diseases*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1756-185X.12890

Reddy, B. C., & Metgud, S. (2014). A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL TO COMPARE THE EFFECT OF MUSCLE ENERGY TECHNIQUE WITH CONVENTIONAL THERAPY IN STAGE II ADHESIVE CAPSULITIS Quick Response code. *Int J Physiother Res*, 2(3), 549–554. Retrieved from http://oaji.net/articles/2014/287-

1402459034.pdf%5Cnwww.ijmhr.org/ijpr.html

Struyf, F., & Meeus, M. (2014). Current evidence on physical therapy in patients with adhesive capsulitis: What are we missing? *Clinical* *Rheumatology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10067-013-2464-3

Sule, K., Rathi, M., Palekar, Tushar, J., & Anwer, S. (2015). Comparison of Conventional Therapy versus Sleeper Stretch with Conventional Therapy in Adhesive Capsulitis. *International Journal of Health Sciences & Research*, *5*(11), 186–192.

Uddin, M. M., Khan, A. A., Haig, A. J., & Uddin, M. K. (2014). Presentation of frozen shoulder among diabetic and non-diabetic patients. *Journal of Clinical Orthopaedics and Trauma*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2014.09.008

Vastamäki, H., Ristolainen, L., & Vastamäki, M. (2016). Range of motion of diabetic frozen shoulder recovers to the contralateral level. *Journal of International Medical Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0300060516675112

Werner, B. C., Holzgrefe, R. E., Griffin, J. W., Lyons, M. L., Cosgrove, C. T., Hart, J. M., & Brockmeier, S. F. (2014). Validation of an innovative method of shoulder range-of-motion measurement using a smartphone clinometer application. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2014.02.030

Whelton, C., & Peach, C. A. (2018a). Review of diabetic frozen shoulder. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00590-017-2068-8

Whelton, C., & Peach, C. A. (2018b). Review of diabetic frozen shoulder. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology*, *28*(3), 363–371. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00590-017-2068-8

Yanlei, G. L., Keong, M. W., & Tijauw Tjoen, D. L. (2019). Do diabetic patients have different outcomes after arthroscopic capsular release for frozen shoulder? *Journal of Orthopaedics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2019.02.003

Yuan, X., Zhang, Z., & Li, J. (2017). Pathophysiology of adhesive capsulitis of shoulder and the physiological effects of hyaluronan. *European Journal of Inflammation*, *15*(3), 239–243.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1721727X17747439

Zappia, M., Di Pietto, F., Aliprandi, A., Pozza, S., De Petro, P., Muda, A., & Sconfienza, L. M. (2016). Multi-modal imaging of adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder. *Insights into Imaging*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13244-016-0491-8

Zreik, N. H., Malik, R. A., & Charalambous, C. P. (2016). Adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder and diabetes: A meta-analysis of prevalence. *Muscles, Ligaments and Tendons Journal, 6*(1), 26–34. https://doi.org/10.11138/mltj/2016.6.1.026