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Background: Clinical relevance of commonly used patient-reported outcomes (PROs) is unclear in people with non-specific chronic low back pain (cLBP). Objectives: To estimate and compare patient acceptable symptom state (PASS) at 1 month post-intervention for 4 PROs between 2 populations of patients with non-specific cLBP and to determine which baseline variables contribute to having an acceptable symptom state at 1 month.

Methods: Overall, we included 256 patients: 135 patients with cLBP and 121 patients with cLBP and without active discopathy participated in a randomized controlled trial assessing the efficacy on pain at 1 month of a single glucocorticoid intradiscal injection compared to contrast alone (2), and 121 patients with cLBP and without active discopathy participated in a randomized controlled trial assessing the efficacy on pain at 4 months of 12 sessions of immersive virtual reality (VR) compared to usual care (3). Using an anchor-based method, PASS estimates for PROs were obtained using the 75th percentile method (4). Logistic regression was used to determine baseline variables contributing to achieving PASS at 1 month. Results: At 1 month, 137/256 (53.52%) participants self-rated their health as acceptable. In the whole population, PASS (95% CI) were 47.50 (40.00 to 50.00) for the lumbar-pain VAS, 30.50 (30.00 to 40.00) for the radicular-pain VAS, 39.27 (33.60 to 45.26) for the QUEBEC score, 9.95 (9.16 to 10.00) for the HAD anxiety subscale and 6.70 (6.00 to 8.00) for the HAD depression subscale. The PASS estimates at 1 month did not differ between the 2 populations of cLBP patients for any of the PRO. The only baseline variable contributing to having an acceptable symptom state at 1 month was symptom intensity. Conclusion: PASS estimates at 1 month did not vary across 2 independent samples of people with cLBP and 2 distinct nociceptive sources of cLBP. The main contributor of the PASS was symptom intensity at baseline. Our findings can be useful in interpreting the clinical relevance of PROs values.
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Background: Calcific tendinitis (CT) results from the deposition of calcium hydroxyapatite crystals in periaricular muscular attachments, and most commonly affects the tendons of the shoulder (1). Extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT) is based on the use of shock waves, and used for pain reduction and tissue healing (2).

Objectives: The aim of this analysis is to demonstrate the effects of ESWT in patients with shoulder CT with inefficient response to local steroid injection.

Methods: 2-year data of shoulder outpatient clinic were scanned. 10 patients with shoulder calcific tendinitis without satisfying response to local steroid injection (less than 50% decrease in pain visual analogue scale (VAS) score) who were treated with ESWT were reviewed.

Results: 10 patients (9 women, 1 man) fulfilled the inclusion criteria. The mean patient age was 51.3 years (range, 32-70 years) and body mass index was 26.2 kg/m². The affected shoulder was left in 6 (60%) patients and right in 4 (40%). The calcific tendinitis involved the dominant side in 5 (50%) patients and non-dominant side in other 5 (50%). All patients had one percutaneous local steroid injection-2 ml 2% prilocain and 1 ml steroid (5 mg of betamethasone dipropionate + 2 mg betamethasone sodium phosphate). Mean time from symptom onset to the ESWT treatment was 3.5 weeks (range, 2.6 weeks). Mean VAS score was 9 and Shoulder Disability Index (SDI) score was 84.4 before ESWT treatment. ESWT system Elmed-Vibrolith ver.3.0 was used in the treatment. Each treatment consisted 2000 shocks with a frequency of 150 shocks a minute with maximum tolerable energy density (range, 3.2-3.4 bar). Mean ESWT session was 3.3 (3 patients had 3, 1 patient had 4 and 1 patient had 5 sessions of treatment). Mean post-treatment VAS score was 4.2 (53.3% decrease) and SDI score was 43.8 (48.1% decrease), which were evaluated after the last ESWT session.

Conclusion: With its good tolerance and safety, ESWT might be an alternative treatment method for calcific tendinitis of the shoulder. Although limited number of patients, we hope that this study might give rise to future randomized-controlled studies about the efficacy of ESWT in acute-subacute shoulder calcific tendinitis.

References:

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

THU0486  PREGABALIN EFFICACY IN THE TREATMENT OF CHRONIC PAIN IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS

Ekaterina Filatova, Shandor Erdes. Federal State Budgetary Scientific Research Institute Rheumatology named after V A Nasonova, Moscow, Russian Federation

Background: Objectives: To study the efficacy of Pregabalin in the treatment of chronic pain in patients with rheumatoid arthritis.

Methods: We enrolled 80 patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Screening with the DAS28, patient global assessment, tender and swollen joints, disease duration and disability. Positive dynamics of VAS pain intensity was observed in both groups, with the VAS scale.

Results: There were no significant differences between groups before the start of the study (Table 1).

Abstract THU0486 -Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>P&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (years)</td>
<td>58.2±9.15</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease duration</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS28</td>
<td>5.3±0.6</td>
<td>4.8±1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN4 (points)</td>
<td>5.2±1.1</td>
<td>5.0±0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Detect (points)</td>
<td>17.0±3.2</td>
<td>18.2±2.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADS-Anxiety</td>
<td>6.8±3.2</td>
<td>12.0±4.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADS-Depression</td>
<td>8.4±2.5</td>
<td>8.0±2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAS, mm</td>
<td>77.0±13.5</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive dynamics of VAS pain intensity was observed in both groups [Fig. 1] (77.0 ± 13.5 vs 75.2 ± 14.7, at week 2 48.8 ± 14.2 vs 72.9 ± 14.7).
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Background: Chronic mechanical low back pain represents the second leading cause of disability worldwide being a major welfare and economic problem.

Subcutaneous prolotherapy treats prolonged pathological peripheral neurogenic inflammation for several painful conditions. As it induces apoptosis of proliferating peptidergic nociceptors and neovessels by reducing vascular endothelial growth factor}

Objectives: To assess the effectiveness of subcutaneous perineural injection therapy in management of pain, physical function, disability and psychological status in mechanical low back pain

Methods: Ninety patients with non-radiating non-specific chronic mechanical low back pain (LBP) that persisted for 12 weeks or more were selected in this study. (Patients with inflammatory LBP, radiating, or LBP due to specific cause, pregnant women or Patients with implanted pacemaker or spinal cord stimulator were excluded from this study). After giving written consent; the patients were randomly divided into 3 groups 30 patients in each. Group I received 8 weekly subcutaneous injections of 1 ml of buffered dextrose 5% in each chronic constriction injury points and hamstring, calf, and back muscles, and strengthening exercises for back region with frequency of 10 Hz and intensity of 2 millitesla every day. Group II received 8 weekly subcutaneous injections of 1 ml of buffered dextrose 5% in each chronic constriction injury points and hamstring, calf, and back muscles, and strengthening exercises for back region with frequency of 10 Hz and intensity of 2 millitesla every day. Group III received sham PEMSs. All patients will be instructed to follow an exercise program in the form of stretching for hamstring, calf, and back muscles, and strengthening exercises for back and abdominal muscles. Assessments were performed at baseline, at the end of the treatment and after four months, using the following measurements: visual analog scale (VAS), Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) scores, Lequesne index, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). Results: The mean age of patients in the 3 groups was 40.2±10.5, 38.3 ±9.9, and 43.1±10.8 respectively. The mean VAS was 7.9±1.4, 8.2±0.6, and 7.6±1.1 respectively. No baseline differences existed between all groups in all parameters. There was significant improvement in VAS, WOMAC and HDAS in group I & II (p<0.05) after treatment, and 4 months later (figure 1). While the improvement in group III was non-significant (p>0.05). The improvement in group I was better than in group II with significant difference between the two groups (p<0.05) after treatment and 4 months follow up.

Conclusion: Perineural Injection Therapy is an effective new modality in management of pain, physical function, psychological status and disability in mechanical low back pain.
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