



Title of Evidence Based Article: Hip and Knee Strengthening Is More Effective Than Knee Strengthening Alone for Reducing Pain and Improving Activity in Individuals with Patellofemoral Pain: A systematic Review with Meta-analysis.

Objectives

- Background information
- Causes
- Asking questions and finding answers

 Describe prior research and need for further inquiry
- Data analysis (listing research characteristics)
- Results
 - Characteristics of included trials
 - Interpretation
- Implications for Physical Therapy
- Alternative treatments
- Conclusion



<section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><text><text><text>



Local Factors: (patellofemoral joint and surrounding tissues)

- Altered mechanics of the joint
- Impaired quadriceps strength -

Non-Local Factors: (mechanics of the joints distal and proximal

- Increased pronation of the foot -
- Increased hip abduction Increased femoral medial rotation _



- Increased duration of exercise. _
- _ Sudden increase of mileage.
- -Change of training surface.
- Inappropriate/no footwear. _
- Overweight. -







Focus of the research:

The aim of this systematic review was to examine the efficacy of knee strengthening, associated or not with hip strengthening (from now on referred to as hip and knee strengthening), to increase strength, reduce pain, and improve activity in individuals with patellofemoral pain.

Questions to be answered:

- Does hip and knee strengthening increase strength, reduce pain, and improve activity in individuals with patellofemoral pain compared to no intervention at all? Are any benefits maintained beyond the intervention period?
- Is hip and knee strengthening more effective than knee strengthening alone for increasing strength, reducing pain, and improving activity in individuals with patellofemoral pain? Are any benefits maintained beyond the intervention period ?



Why was the review needed?

Prior research:

- Hip strengthening has positive effect on pain reduction.
- Addition of hip strengthening decreased pain during activity (CI 95%), but not functional ability.
- Some showed improvement of pain but research included bias.
- Others did not compare with other types of treatment.

Listing inclusion criteria

Participants

Individuals with PFP.

•

- Age, physical activity and pain assessed for similarities to compare subject similarity.
- Excluded studies with individuals with other knee conditions. (numerous)

Interventions

- Must consist of hip and/ or knee strengthening

 Using body weight, free weights, machines or tubing
- Dose of exercise expected to improve strength
- Research must be assessing for strengthening
- FITT determined to assess similarity

Control Group

- 1. Question 1: Efficacy of hip and knee strengthening, control group could be no intervention.
- Effect of hip and knee strengthening , control group could be only exercises focusing on knee musculature only.

Outcome Measures

- 3 areas of interest: Strength, Pain and Activity
 - Strength: measured by peak force/ torque generation, max contraction (MMT or HHD)
 - Pain: self reported (VAS or numeric scale)
 Activity: direct measure of capacity or performance.





Characteristics continued...

Participants:

- Mean Age: 21-35 years
- Majority of trials: patients with pain > 3 months with pain intensities ranging from 3-8/10
- Not all participants were highly active individuals, but did have PFP.

Intervention:

- All trials, experimental intervention was strengthening of hip muscles.
- 79% included hip and knee strengthening.
- Hip muscles targeted:
 - Lateral Rotators
 Abductors
 - Extensors
- Training:
 - Average of 2-3 times per week with as many as 7 times.
 - Average duration of 6 weeks SD +/- 2.5 weeks.
 - Time for each training: 30-120 min each time.
 - Parameters: listed in table 2: Body weight, percentages of 1-RM, percentage of body weight
 - Progressions for each week or each training listed and type of load indicated.
 - Performed at home or in the clinic...

Outcome measures:

- Measures of strength:
 - Max voluntary force production (isometric, concentric and eccentric contractions)
 - Measures of pain intensity: - Validated self-reporting (numeric, VAS)
- Measures of Activity:
 - Questionnaires based on performance of ADLs
 - LEFS
 - WOMAC
 - AKPS
 - Knee Function Scale



	Experimenta	Group	Control G	roup			
Study	Mean ± SD	Total, n	Mean ± SD	Total, n	Weight	SMD IV, Random (95% Confidence Interval)	
de Marche Baldon et al ¹⁰	74.3 ± 4.6	15	70.6 ± 8.0	16	12.1%	0.55 (-0.17, 1.27)	
Dolak et al ¹²	67 ± 11	17	59 ± 14	16	12.2%	0.62 (-0.08, 1.32)	· · · · ·
Ferber et al ³⁴	88.0 ± 11.2	111	87.7 ± 10.5	88	14.4%	0.03 (-0.25, 0.31)	+
Fukuda et al ²⁷	65.7 ± 13.5	21	65.6 ± 14.5	20	12.7%	0.01 (-0.61, 0.62)	11
Fukuda et al ³⁶	74.1±5.6	25	49.4 ± 11.2	24	11.5%	2.76 (1.96, 3.56)	
Ismail et al ¹⁹	85.1±6.2	16	85.0 ± 6.7	16	12.2%	0.02 (-0.68, 0.71)	-
Khayambashi et al ²⁰	21.9 ± 16.5	18	6.2 ± 3.9	18	12.0%	1.28 (0.56, 2.01)	
Şahin et al ³⁸	85.4 ± 5.8	25	79.1 ± 7.6	25	12.9%	0.92 (0.33, 1.50)	-
Total		248		223	100.0%	0.74 (0.17, 1.31)	•
1 <i>bbreviations: IV, inde</i> j I GURE 8. Standardized m	<i>vendent varia</i> ean differences	<i>ble; SMD,</i> of the effe	<i>standardized</i> ct of hip and kr	<i>mean difj</i> nee strengt	Ference. hening versus	knee strengthening alone on activit	avors control 2 1 2 4 Favors control 2 2 4 y, immediately after intervention (n = 47
Abbreviations: IV, indep IGURE 8. Standardized m Hip/Knee Strengthening Vi	oendent varial ean differences ersus Knee Stree	ble; SMD, of the effe	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I	mean difj nee strengt	Ference. hening versus	: knee strengthening alone on activity	-4 -2 0 2 $4Pavors control Pavors experimenta$
1bbreviations: IV, indep IGURE 8. Standardized m Ilp/Knee Strengthening Vi	oendent varial lean differences ersus Knee Stree Experimenta	ble; SMD, of the effe ngthening /	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I Control G	mean diff	Ference. hening versus n Period: Activ	knee strengthening alone on activit	wors control Pavors experimenta y, immediately after intervention (n = 47
1 <i>bbreviations: IV, inde</i> IGURE 8. Standardized m Ilip/Knee Strengthening Vi Study	eendent variai ean differences ersus Knee Stree Experimenta Mean ± SD	ble; SMD, of the effe ngthening J al Group Total, n	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I Control G Mean ± SD	mean difj nee strengt Intervention iroup Total, n	Ference. hening versus Period: Activ Weight	knee strengthening alone on activit ity SMD IV, Random	y immediately after intervention (n = 47
1 <i>bbreviations: IV, inde</i> j IGURE 8. Standardized m Ilp/Knee Strengthening W Study de Marche Baldon et al ¹⁹	eendent varia ean differences ersus Knee Stree Experimenta Mean ± SD 74.9 ± 3.9	ble; SMD, of the effe ngthening / al Group Total, n 15	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I Control G Mean ± SD 70.4 ± 8.4	mean diff nee strengt intervention iroup Total, n 16	Ference. hening versus Period: Activ Weight 20.1%	knee strengthening alone on activit ity SMD IV, Random 0.66 (~006, 1.39)	wers control -2 0 2 4 Provos experimenta were control -2 0 2 4 Provos experimenta (95% Confidence Interval)
Abbreviations: IV, indeg IQURE 8. Standardized m Ilp/Knee Strengthening W Study de Marche Baldon et al ¹⁰ Dolak et al ¹²	eendent variai ean differences arsus Knee Stree Experimenta Mean ± SD 749 ± 3.9 70 ± 10	ble; SMD, of the effe ngthening / al Group Total, n 15 12	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I Control G Mean ± S0 70.4 ± 8.4 67 ± 11	mean diff nee strengt Intervention roup Total, n 16 10	Ference. hening versus Period: Activ Weight 20.1% 19.1%	knee strengthening alone on activit ity SMD IV, Random 0.66 (~0.05, 1.39) 0.28 (~0.55, 112)	werds control -2 0 2 4 Favors experimental y, immediately after intervention (n = 47 (95% Confidence Interval)
Ibbreviations: IV; indeg GURE 8. Standardized m IIp/Knee Strengthening W Study de Marche Baldon et al ¹⁰ Dolak et al ¹² Rokuda et al ¹²	eendent variai ean differences Experimenta Mean ± SD 74.9 ± 3.9 70 ± 10 72.4 ± 6.1	of the effe ngthening / Group Total, n 15 12 25	standardized ct of hip and kr Control G Mean ± SD 70.4 ± 8.4 67 ± 11 477 ± 10.5	mean diff nee strengt intervention roup Total, n 16 10 24	Ference. hening versus Period: Activ Weight 20.1% 19.1% 19.4%	knee strengthening alone on activit ty SMD IV, Random 0.66 (-0.06, 1.39) 0.28 (-0.03, 3.66)	wers control -2 0 2 4 Favors experimenta y, immediately after intervention (n = 47 (95% Confidence Interval)
Ibbreviations: IV, indeg GURE 8. Standardized m lip/Knee Strengthening V Study de Marche Baldon et al ¹⁰ Dolak et al ¹⁰ Fukuda et al ²⁰	een dent varial een differences arsus Knee Stree Keen ± SD 749 ± 39 70 ± 10 72 4 ± 6.1 23.16 ± 14.15	ble; SMD, of the effe a Group Total, n 15 12 25 18	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I Control G Mean ± SD 70.4 ± 8.4 67 ± 11 477 ± 10.5 6.94 ± 5.70	mean diff nee strengt Intervention Total, n 10 24 18	Ference. hening versus Period: Activ Weight 20.0%	* knee strengthening alone on activit ity SMD IV, Random 0.66 (~0.06, 1.39) 0.28 (~0.57, 112) 2.85 (2.03, 3.66) 1.47 (0.72, 2.22)	y version control -2 0 2 4 Favors experimental g, immediately after intervention (n = 47 (95% Confidence Interval)
Ibbreviations: IV, indeg GURE 8. Standardized m Ilp/Knee Strengthening W Study de Marche Baldon et al ¹⁰ Dolak et al ¹² Fikuda et al ¹⁰ Knayambashi et al ²⁰	een dent varial een differences arsus Knee Stree Experimenta Mean ± SD 74.9 ± 3.9 70 ± 10 72.4 ± 6.1 23.16 ± 14.15 8.3.0 ± 6.8	ble; SMD, of the effe ngthening / d Group Total, n 15 12 25 18 25	standardized ct of hip and kr None—Beyond I Mean ± SD 70.4 ± 8.4 67 ± 11 477 ± 10.5 6.94 ± 5.70 77.9 ± 6.6	mean diff nee strengt intervention roup Total, n 16 10 24 18 25	Ference. hening versus Period: Activ Weight 20.1% 19.1% 19.4% 20.0% 21.4%	knee strengthening alone on activity ity SMD IV, Random 0.28 (-0.57, 1.29) 2.85 (2.03, 3.66) 1.47 (0.72, 2.22) 0.75 (0.17, 1.32)	wers control -2 0 2 4 Favors experimenta x, immediately after intervention (n = 47 (95% Confidence Interval)

Abbreviations: IV, independent variable; SMD, standardized mean difference.

Discussion There is enough evidence that hip and knee strengthening Change in strength was not significant enough to be is effective in reducing pain and improving activity with clinically significant. individuals with patellofemoral pain. It is also clinically - Could be because intervention was not long significant when comparing it to knee strengthening alone. enough or intense enough. - Muscle adaptations occur after 8-12 weeks. Benefits continue even after intervention periods. - (those that were 8-12 weeks showed higher Trainings were long enough to increase hip and knee strength measures) musculature endurance. (Due to inactivity from pain, - Most interventions did not minister correct endurance loss is usually a result). intensity set by American College of Sports medicine: - 60-70% of 1RM Some loads or duration of sessions were not reported

-

lately after interve

2

tion (n = 517).

Implications to Therapy

- Why is this important to us?
- As direct care providers we can be the first line of treatment to help the patient understand
 their symptoms and give them non-invasive options for care.
- We can assist the patient in developing a plan of care to alleviate pain.
- We can focus our treatments on specific areas.
- By decreasing pain the patient can get back to prior function and enjoying their social participation.
- By focusing on Hip and Knee strengthening we can work towards saving the patient time and money by avoiding time and money lost by dealing with more expensive treatments and tests.

Alternatives to Exercises

- Taping: Improve patellar tracking
- Knee braces and sleeves
- Orthotics
 - Controlling excessive foot pronation and reducing Q angle.
- Biofeedback
- Lumbo-pelvic Manipulation: Decrease in quads inhibition.
- Activity Modification: Avoiding aggravating activities, decrease in BMI
- Injections and surgery

Conclusion

Hip and knee strengthening is not only effective, but also superior to knee strengthening alone, for decreasing pain intensity and improving activity in people with patellofemoral pain. The results of the meta-analyses, based on 14 trials, indicated that strength training of the hip muscles, accompanied by strengthening of the knee muscles, 3 times a week for 6 weeks can be expected to decrease pain and improve activity in people with moderate-to-high levels of patellofemoral pain. The training benefits are maintained beyond the intervention period.

Strengths of the article

Weaknesses of the article

References

- Bloomer, B. A., & Durall, C. J. (2015). Does the Addition of Hip Strengthening to a Knee-Focused Exercise Program Improve Outcomes in Patients with Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome? *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation*, 24(4), 428-433. doi:10.1123/jrs.2014-0184
- Nascimento, L. R., Teixeira-Salmela, L. F., Souza, R. B., & Resende, R. A. (2018). Hip and Knee Strengthening Is More Effective Than Knee Strengthening Alone for Reducing Pain and Improving Activity in Individuals With Patellofemoral Pain: A Systematic Review With Meta-analysis. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*, 48(1), 19-31. doi:10.2519/jospt.2018.7365
- Patellofemoral Pain. (2016, November 20). Retrieved from https://www.moveforwardpt.com/SymptomsConditionsDetail.aspx?cid=f6dfe597-2f7d-4f1e-9aff-67694dca085f
- Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome. (n.d.). Retrieved September 28, 2018, from https://www.physio-pedia.com/Patellofemoral_Pain_Syndrome#cite_note-Nakagawa_et_al-16

Selfe, J. (2017). Patellofemoral pain - an evidence-based clinical guide. Nova Science.