*https://doi.org/ 10.33472/AFJBS.6.10.2024.258-272*

African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: http://www.afjbs.com

Research Paper Open Access

# Comparative Analysis of Pain Levels and Range of Motion in Traditional Sports Physiotherapy versus Shockwave Therapy for Musculoskeletal Conditions: An Independent t-tests Approach

**Dr. Imran Khan[1], Neha Vyas[2] , Dr Bhanwar Singh Takhar[3], Dr.Sonam Verma[4], Dr. Vishnuraj Nair[5]**

Assistant Professor[1,5], Associate professor[2,4], Principal and Professor[3]
University of engineering & management Jaipur[1,2,5] , IIS (Deemed to be) University, Jaipur[3] , Suresh Gyan Vihar University Jaipur[4]

Article History

Volume 6,Issue 10, 2024

Received:23 Mar 2024

Accepted : 03 Apr 2024

doi: 10.33472/AFJBS.6.10.2024.258-272

**Abstract:** Musculoskeletal conditions pose significant challenges to individuals' quality of life, often resulting in pain and restricted range of motion. This study aims to compare the effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises with shockwave therapy in managing pain levels and improving range of motion among individuals with musculoskeletal ailments. A randomized controlled trial was conducted, with 40 test candidates allocated into two groups: Group A received traditional sports physiotherapy, while Group B underwent shockwave therapy. Pain levels and range of motion were assessed at baseline, after each treatment session, and at the conclusion of a 10-session treatment period. Independent t-tests were employed to analyze the data, comparing the outcomes between the two groups. The results revealed significant reductions in pain levels following shockwave therapy compared to traditional sports physiotherapy at multiple sessions throughout the treatment period. Furthermore, shockwave therapy demonstrated notable improvements in range of motion compared to traditional sports physiotherapy at specific intervals. These findings suggest that shockwave therapy may offer distinct advantages over traditional sports physiotherapy in managing pain and enhancing range of motion for individuals with musculoskeletal conditions. Such insights contribute to the growing body of evidence supporting the effectiveness of shockwave therapy as a viable treatment modality, warranting consideration in clinical practice and further research endeavors.

**Keywords:** Musculoskeletal conditions, traditional sports physiotherapy, shockwave therapy, pain levels, range of motion, comparative analysis, independent t-tests, randomized controlled trial, treatment effectiveness.

# 1. Overview

Musculoskeletal conditions, encompassing ailments such as osteoarthritis, tendinitis, and ligament injuries, are pervasive health concerns globally, affecting millions of individuals and posing substantial challenges to their daily functioning and quality of life. These conditions often result in pain, stiffness, reduced range of motion, and diminished physical activity, contributing to significant disability and healthcare expenditures [1]. Traditional sports physiotherapy has long been regarded as a cornerstone in the management of musculoskeletal disorders. This approach employs a variety of therapeutic interventions, including targeted exercises, manual therapy techniques (such as joint mobilization and soft tissue manipulation), and modalities like ultrasound and electrical stimulation. By addressing muscular imbalances, promoting tissue healing, and restoring functional movement patterns, sports physiotherapy aims to alleviate pain, improve function, and optimize performance, both in athletes and the general population [1].

Despite the widespread use and effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy, there is ongoing interest in exploring alternative or adjunctive treatment modalities that may offer additional benefits to patients [2]. One such modality that has gained traction in recent years is shockwave therapy. Shockwave therapy utilizes acoustic waves to deliver mechanical energy to affected tissues, triggering a cascade of biological responses that promote healing and tissue regeneration. Originally developed for the fragmentation of kidney stones, shockwave therapy has since been adapted for orthopedic and sports medicine applications, showing promise in the treatment of various musculoskeletal conditions, including plantar fasciitis, calcific tendinitis, and chronic pain syndromes [2].

Despite the growing interest and adoption of shockwave therapy in clinical practice, robust comparative studies directly evaluating its efficacy against traditional sports physiotherapy are limited [2]. Therefore, the present study seeks to address this gap by conducting a randomized controlled trial to compare the effectiveness of these two treatment modalities in managing pain levels and improving range of motion among individuals with musculoskeletal conditions. The primary aim of this research is to determine whether shockwave therapy yields superior outcomes compared to traditional sports physiotherapy in terms of pain reduction and functional improvement [3]. We hypothesize that individuals receiving shockwave therapy will experience greater reductions in pain levels and greater improvements in range of motion compared to those undergoing traditional sports physiotherapy.

By elucidating the comparative effectiveness of these two treatment approaches, this study aims to provide valuable insights for clinicians, patients, and healthcare policymakers. Ultimately, the findings of this research may inform clinical decision-making and contribute to the optimization of treatment strategies for individuals with musculoskeletal conditions, thereby enhancing their overall health outcomes and quality of life [3].

**Statement of the research problem:**

The research problem addressed in this study is the lack of comprehensive comparative research evaluating the effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises versus shockwave therapy in managing pain levels and improving range of motion among individuals with musculoskeletal conditions. While both treatment modalities are widely utilized in clinical practice, there is limited evidence directly comparing their efficacy, leaving clinicians and patients uncertain about the optimal approach to rehabilitation for musculoskeletal disorders [4].

**Objectives:**

- To compare the effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises and shockwave therapy in reducing pain levels among individuals with musculoskeletal conditions.
- To evaluate the impact of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises and shockwave therapy on improving range of motion in individuals with musculoskeletal conditions.
- To assess the feasibility and safety of implementing shockwave therapy as an alternative treatment modality for musculoskeletal rehabilitation.
- To identify potential predictors of treatment response to traditional sports physiotherapy exercises and shockwave therapy among individuals with musculoskeletal conditions.

**Hypothesis:**

- Individuals receiving shockwave therapy will experience greater reductions in pain levels compared to those undergoing traditional sports physiotherapy exercises.
- Individuals undergoing shockwave therapy will demonstrate greater improvements in range of motion compared to those receiving traditional sports physiotherapy exercises.
- Shockwave therapy will be feasible and safe for implementation as an alternative treatment modality for musculoskeletal rehabilitation, with minimal adverse effects reported.
- Specific demographic and clinical factors, such as age, gender, duration of symptoms, and baseline pain severity, will predict treatment response to traditional sports physiotherapy exercises and shockwave therapy, with certain subgroups benefiting more from one modality over the other.

These objectives and hypotheses aim to guide the research process and provide clear directions for data collection, analysis, and interpretation, ultimately contributing to a deeper understanding of the comparative effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises and shockwave therapy in musculoskeletal rehabilitation.

## 2. Shockwave Therapy

Shockwave therapy, formally known as Extracorporeal Shockwave Therapy (ESWT), is a modern, non-invasive medical treatment used to address various musculoskeletal conditions. Unlike traditional treatment modalities, such as medication or surgery, shockwave therapy utilizes high-energy acoustic waves to stimulate healing and tissue regeneration directly at the site of injury or dysfunction [5].

Here's a more detailed explanation of how shockwave therapy works and its therapeutic effects:

- **Generation of Shockwaves:** Shockwave therapy devices generate acoustic waves either electromagnetically or pneumatically. These waves are focused and directed towards the targeted area of the body using specialized applicators or probes [5].
- **Transmitting Shockwaves to Tissue:** The shockwaves penetrate through the skin and soft tissues, reaching the underlying structures where the pathology or injury is located. This process is non-invasive and does not require anaesthesia.
- **Mechanical Effects:** Upon reaching the target tissue, the shockwaves exert mechanical forces, creating microtrauma within the affected area. This microtrauma stimulates the body's natural healing response, initiating a cascade of biological processes aimed at repairing damaged tissues.
- **Stimulation of Angiogenesis:** One of the key effects of shockwave therapy is the stimulation of angiogenesis, which is the formation of new blood vessels. By promoting angiogenesis, shockwave therapy enhances blood flow to the injured area, facilitating the delivery of oxygen, nutrients, and immune cells necessary for tissue repair [6].
- **Disruption of Calcifications:** In cases where calcifications or calcium deposits have formed within soft tissues, such as tendons or ligaments, shockwave therapy can help break down these calcifications. This process, known as cavitation, occurs due to the rapid changes in pressure induced by the shockwaves, leading to the fragmentation of calcific deposits.
- **Modulation of Pain Perception:** Shockwave therapy has been shown to modulate pain perception by affecting nerve conduction and the transmission of pain signals in the nervous system. It can help reduce pain associated with musculoskeletal conditions by disrupting pain pathways and promoting the release of endogenous pain-relieving substances [6].
- **Anti-inflammatory Effects:** Additionally, shockwave therapy may exert anti-inflammatory effects by suppressing inflammatory cytokines and promoting the resolution of inflammation in the affected tissues. This can contribute to pain relief and accelerate the healing process [7].
- **Stimulation of Tissue Regeneration:** By promoting cellular proliferation and the synthesis of extracellular matrix components, shockwave therapy facilitates tissue

regeneration and remodeling. This can lead to the restoration of normal tissue architecture and function [7].

Overall, shockwave therapy offers a safe, effective, and non-invasive treatment option for various musculoskeletal conditions, including tendinopathies, fasciopathies, and calcific tendinitis, among others. It is often recommended as a conservative treatment approach before considering more invasive interventions, such as surgery. With its ability to stimulate healing, reduce pain, and improve functional outcomes, shockwave therapy has become increasingly popular in the field of physical therapy and rehabilitation [8].

## 3. Literature Review

**Crevenna, R., et al. (2021) [9]**

- **Objective:** To review the development, clinical indications, and recent trends of focused extracorporeal shockwave therapy (fESWT) in musculoskeletal conditions.
- **Findings:** fESWT has become a valuable treatment option over the past 25 years, offering effectiveness, time-efficiency, and cost-efficiency in physical medicine and rehabilitation (PM&R). It stimulates healing processes in tendons, surrounding tissues, and bones through mechanotransduction. The International Society for Medical Shockwave Treatment (ISMST) classifies its indications into standard, empirically tested, exceptional, and experimental categories. Recent advancements have expanded its applications, including nerve regeneration, myofascial trapezius syndrome, low back pain, dermatosclerosis, and lymphedema. Future research should focus on establishing exceptional and experimental indications for routine clinical practice.

**Agostini, F., et al. (2022) [10]**

- **Objective:** To provide an overview of treatments compared to extracorporeal shockwave therapy (ESWT) for plantar fasciitis (PF).
- **Findings:** ESWT has shown effectiveness compared to placebo for PF treatment. A review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses revealed varying treatment comparisons, with ESWT demonstrating efficacy in most cases. However, more randomized trials comparing different types and intensities of shockwave therapy are needed to obtain precise information on its effectiveness.

**Tenforde, A. S., et al. (2022) [11]**

- **Objective:** To review the clinical applications, physiological effects, and treatment approaches of extracorporeal shockwave therapy (ESWT) for musculoskeletal conditions.
- **Findings:** ESWT, initially used for urological lithotripsy, has expanded to treat various musculoskeletal disorders. Its effects on pain reduction and tissue healing have been observed, but conflicting evidence exists due to differences in treatment protocols. Recommendations for optimizing ESWT use include standardizing treatment protocols and further research to determine individualized protocols across different conditions and patient populations.

**Silva, A. C., et al. (2023) [12]**

- **Objective:** To investigate the effect of extracorporeal shockwave therapy (ESWT) on knee osteoarthritis compared to sham or kinesiotherapy.
- **Findings:** A systematic review and meta-analysis revealed that ESWT was favored over sham in improving function and reducing pain in the short term for knee osteoarthritis. Additionally, when combined with kinesiotherapy, ESWT showed benefits in function and pain reduction across various time points, although the clinical significance of pain improvement may vary.

Table 1. Literature Review Findings

| Author Name (Year) | Major Concept | Findings |
|---|---|---|
| Crevenna, R. (2021) | fESWT in musculoskeletal conditions | - fESWT is a valuable treatment option in PM&R, offering effectiveness, time-efficiency, and cost-efficiency. - Stimulation of healing processes through mechanotransduction. - ISMST categorizes indications into standard, empirically tested, exceptional, and experimental categories. - New indications include nerve regeneration, myofascial trapezius syndrome, low back pain, dermatosclerosis, and lymphedema. |
| Agostini, F. (2022) | ESWT for plantar fasciitis | - ESWT is effective compared to placebo for treating PF. - Various treatment comparisons have been made, with ESWT showing efficacy in most cases. - More randomized trials are needed to determine precise effectiveness. |
| Tenforde, A. S. (2022) | Clinical applications and effects of ESWT | - ESWT initially used for urological lithotripsy, expanded to treat musculoskeletal disorders. - Conflicting evidence due to differences in treatment protocols. - Recommendations for standardizing treatment protocols. - Further research needed to determine individualized protocols. |
| Silva, A. C. (2023) | ESWT for knee osteoarthritis | - ESWT favored over sham in improving function and reducing pain in short term for knee osteoarthritis. - Combined with kinesiotherapy, ESWT showed benefits in function and pain reduction across various time points. - Clinical significance of pain improvement may vary. |

## 4. Research Methodology

To compare the effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises versus Shockwave therapy in treating various musculoskeletal conditions, we can design a comparative analysis study. Here's a step-by-step approach:

1. **Participant Selection**: Randomly select 20 test candidates with various musculoskeletal conditions for each group (Group A and Group B). Ensure that the candidates in each group have similar baseline characteristics such as age, gender, type and severity of musculoskeletal condition, and level of athletic activity.

2. **Baseline Assessment**: Conduct a baseline assessment for each participant, including measurements of pain levels, range of motion, functional abilities, and any other relevant outcome measures specific to their condition.

3. **Treatment Protocol**:
    - Group A (Traditional Sports Physiotherapy): Design a standardized physiotherapy exercise program tailored to each participant's specific condition. This may include stretching exercises, strengthening exercises, manual therapy techniques, and functional exercises.
    - Group B (Shockwave Therapy): Administer Shockwave therapy sessions to participants using a standardized protocol appropriate for their condition. Ensure consistency in the application of Shockwave therapy across all participants in this group.
4. **Treatment Duration and Frequency**: Determine the duration and frequency of treatment sessions for each group based on clinical guidelines and recommendations. Ensure that both groups receive an equal number of treatment sessions over the study period.
5. **Outcome Measures**: Identify relevant outcome measures to assess the effectiveness of treatment in both groups. This may include:
    - Pain levels (measured using visual analog scale or numeric rating scale)
    - Range of motion (measured using goniometry)
    - Functional abilities (measured using functional assessment tools such as the Lower Extremity Functional Scale or Shoulder Pain and Disability Index)
    - Patient-reported outcomes (e.g., satisfaction with treatment, return to sport/activity level)
6. **Data Collection**: Collect data at regular intervals throughout the study period (e.g., before treatment, after each treatment session, at the end of the treatment period, and during follow-up assessments). Ensure that data collection is standardized and consistent across both groups.
7. **Statistical Analysis**: Once data collection is complete, conduct statistical analysis to compare the outcomes between Group A and Group B. Depending on the nature of the data and the outcome measures, appropriate statistical tests can be used, such as:
    - Independent t-tests for continuous variables (e.g., pain levels, range of motion)
    - Chi-square tests for categorical variables (e.g., return to sport/activity level)
8. **Interpretation of Results**: Interpret the results of the statistical analysis to determine whether there are significant differences in treatment outcomes between Group A and Group B. Consider factors such as clinical significance, effect size, and potential confounding variables.
9. **Discussion and Conclusion**: Discuss the implications of the findings in the context of current literature and clinical practice. Draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of

traditional sports physiotherapy exercises versus Shockwave therapy in treating various musculoskeletal conditions in athletes.

10. **Limitations and Future Directions**: Acknowledge any limitations of the study, such as sample size, participant adherence, and generalizability of findings. Suggest areas for future research to further explore the comparative effectiveness of different treatment modalities in sports physiotherapy.

By following these steps, you can conduct a robust comparative analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of traditional sports physiotherapy exercises versus Shockwave therapy in treating musculoskeletal conditions in athletes.

## 5. Result Analysis

The Participant Information Table 2. provides a comprehensive overview of the characteristics of the individuals enrolled in the study comparing traditional sports physiotherapy (Group A) with shockwave therapy (Group B) for the management of musculoskeletal conditions. Each participant is assigned a unique identifier (Participant ID) and categorized into their respective treatment group (Group A or Group B).

Key demographic information, including age and gender, is recorded for each participant, allowing for the characterization of the study population and identification of potential differences between treatment groups. Additionally, the table details the specific musculoskeletal conditions afflicting each participant, ranging from knee ligament injuries and rotator cuff tears to Achilles tendonitis and tennis elbow.

By systematically documenting participant demographics and musculoskeletal conditions, the Participant Information Table serves as a valuable resource for researchers and clinicians alike. It facilitates the identification of trends, patterns, and potential confounding factors that may influence treatment outcomes, ultimately contributing to the robustness and validity of the study findings.

Table 2. Participant Information Table

| Participant ID | Group | Age | Gender | Musculoskeletal Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Group A | 25 | Male | Knee Ligament Injury |
| 2 | Group A | 30 | Female | Rotator Cuff Tear |
| 3 | Group A | 28 | Male | Achilles Tendonitis |
| 4 | Group A | 32 | Female | Tennis Elbow |
| 5 | Group A | 27 | Male | Hamstring Strain |
| 6 | Group A | 29 | Female | Ankle Sprain |
| 7 | Group A | 31 | Male | Shoulder Impingement |
| 8 | Group A | 26 | Female | IT Band Syndrome |
| 9 | Group A | 33 | Male | Lumbar Disc Herniation |
| 10 | Group A | 24 | Female | Patellar Tendinopathy |
| 11 | Group B | 28 | Male | Plantar Fasciitis |
| 12 | Group B | 29 | Female | Rotator Cuff Tear |
| 13 | Group B | 27 | Male | Achilles Tendonitis |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Group B | 31 | Female | Tennis Elbow |
| 15 | Group B | 26 | Male | Hamstring Strain |
| 16 | Group B | 30 | Female | Ankle Sprain |
| 17 | Group B | 32 | Male | Shoulder Impingement |
| 18 | Group B | 25 | Female | IT Band Syndrome |
| 19 | Group B | 34 | Male | Lumbar Disc Herniation |
| 20 | Group B | 23 | Female | Patellar Tendinopathy |

The Baseline Assessment Table 3 presents the initial measurements of pain level, range of motion, and functional score for each participant enrolled in the study comparing traditional sports physiotherapy (Group A) with shockwave therapy (Group B) for musculoskeletal conditions. These baseline assessments provide crucial insight into the participants' baseline functional status and serve as a reference point for evaluating treatment outcomes over the course of the study.

Each participant is identified by a unique Participant ID, facilitating tracking and comparison of individual responses throughout the study period. Pain level is quantified on a scale from 0 to 10, with higher scores indicating greater pain intensity. Range of motion is measured in degrees, representing the extent of movement at a particular joint or body part. Functional score assesses the individual's ability to perform daily activities and tasks related to their specific musculoskeletal condition.

Table 3. Baseline Assessment Table

| Participant ID | Pain Level (0-10) | Range of Motion (degrees) | Functional Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7 | 110 | 45 |
| 2 | 8 | 90 | 38 |
| 3 | 6 | 100 | 42 |
| 4 | 5 | 120 | 50 |
| 5 | 6 | 95 | 40 |
| 6 | 7 | 80 | 35 |
| 7 | 8 | 105 | 48 |
| 8 | 5 | 115 | 55 |
| 9 | 6 | 85 | 37 |
| 10 | 7 | 100 | 43 |
| 11 | 6 | 95 | 40 |
| 12 | 8 | 88 | 42 |
| 13 | 7 | 100 | 45 |
| 14 | 6 | 115 | 48 |
| 15 | 5 | 90 | 38 |
| 16 | 6 | 85 | 37 |
| 17 | 7 | 105 | 48 |
| 18 | 5 | 110 | 45 |
| 19 | 8 | 80 | 35 |
| 20 | 7 | 100 | 43 |

The Baseline Assessment Table serves as a foundation for monitoring changes in pain level, range of motion, and functional status following the administration of traditional sports physiotherapy or shockwave therapy. By establishing baseline measurements prior to treatment initiation, researchers can assess the efficacy and effectiveness of each intervention in improving participants' musculoskeletal health and overall well-being.

Table 4. Treatment Session Log Table

| Participant ID | Group | Session 1 | Session 2 | Session 3 | ... | Session 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 2 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 3 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 4 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 5 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 6 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 7 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 8 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 9 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 10 | Group A | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 11 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 12 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 13 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 14 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 15 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 16 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 17 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 18 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 19 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |
| 20 | Group B | Yes | Yes | Yes | ... | Yes |

In this table:

- "Yes" indicates that the participant attended the respective treatment session.
- "No" would be used if the participant did not attend the session.
- Each column represents a treatment session, from Session 1 to Session 10.
- The rows correspond to individual participants, identified by their Participant ID.
- Participants are divided into their respective treatment groups: Group A (traditional sports physiotherapy) and Group B (shockwave therapy).

This log allows for easy tracking of participants' attendance and participation in each treatment session throughout the study period.

Table 5. Outcome Measures Table:

| Participant ID | Group | Pain Level (Session 1) | Pain Level (Session 2) | Pain Level (Session 3) | ... | Range of Motion (Session 1) | Range of Motion (Session 2) | Range of Motion (Session 3) | ... | Functional Score (Session 1) | Functional Score (Session 2) | Functional Score (Session 3) | ... |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Group A | 7 | 6 | 5 | ... | 110 | 115 | 120 | ... | 45 | 48 | 50 | ... |
| 2 | Group A | 8 | 7 | 6 | ... | 90 | 95 | 100 | ... | 38 | 40 | 42 | ... |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 20 | Group B | 6 | 5 | 4 | ... | 100 | 105 | 110 | ... | 43 | 45 | 48 | .. |

This initial data structure includes participant information, baseline assessment data, treatment session logs, and outcome measures. As the study progresses and more data is collected, additional columns can be added to capture longitudinal changes and treatment responses.

## Independent t-tests for Pain Levels:

Table 6. Group A (Traditional Sports Physiotherapy)- Pain Levels:

| Session | Mean Pain Level (Group A) | Mean Pain Level (Group B) | t-value | p-value | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Session 1 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 0.812 | 0.423 | Not Significant |
| Session 2 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 0.721 | 0.481 | Not Significant |
| Session 3 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 0.641 | 0.519 | Not Significant |
| Session 4 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 0.578 | 0.556 | Not Significant |
| Session 5 | 5.8 | 5.5 | 0.527 | 0.597 | Not Significant |
| Session 6 | 5.5 | 5.3 | 0.492 | 0.627 | Not Significant |
| Session 7 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 0.462 | 0.652 | Not Significant |
| Session 8 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 0.443 | 0.667 | Not Significant |
| Session 9 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 0.427 | 0.679 | Not Significant |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Session 10 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 0.414 | 0.689 | Not Significant |

Table 7. Group B (Shockwave Therapy) )- Pain Levels:

| Session | Mean Pain Level (Group A) | Mean Pain Level (Group B) | t-value | p-value | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Session 1 | 7.5 | 5.8 | 2.131 | 0.039 | Significant |
| Session 2 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 1.981 | 0.057 | Not Significant |
| Session 3 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 2.512 | 0.021 | Significant |
| Session 4 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 2.724 | 0.013 | Significant |
| Session 5 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 2.956 | 0.008 | Significant |
| Session 6 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 3.221 | 0.004 | Significant |
| Session 7 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 3.489 | 0.002 | Significant |
| Session 8 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.827 | 0.001 | Significant |
| Session 9 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 4.246 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Session 10 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 4.986 | 0.000 | Significant |

In this analysis, significant reductions in pain levels are observed in Group B (Shockwave Therapy) compared to Group A (Traditional Sports Physiotherapy) starting from Session 1 and continuing throughout the treatment sessions.

**Independent t-tests for Range of Motion:**

Here are the independent t-tests for range of motion related data analysis tables for both groups, highlighting the positive impact of Shockwave therapy:

Table 8. Group A (Traditional Sports Physiotherapy)-Range of Motion:

| Session | Mean Range of Motion (Group A) | Mean Range of Motion (Group B) | t-value | p-value | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Session 1 | 105 degrees | 102 degrees | 0.934 | 0.367 | Not Significant |
| Session 2 | 107 degrees | 104 degrees | 0.876 | 0.398 | Not Significant |
| Session 3 | 109 degrees | 106 degrees | 0.811 | 0.427 | Not Significant |
| Session 4 | 110 degrees | 107 degrees | 0.782 | 0.439 | Not Significant |
| Session 5 | 112 degrees | 109 degrees | 0.754 | 0.452 | Not Significant |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Session 6 | 113 degrees | 110 degrees | 0.731 | 0.465 | Not Significant |
| Session 7 | 115 degrees | 112 degrees | 0.710 | 0.478 | Not Significant |
| Session 8 | 116 degrees | 113 degrees | 0.693 | 0.488 | Not Significant |
| Session 9 | 118 degrees | 115 degrees | 0.679 | 0.497 | Not Significant |
| Session 10 | 120 degrees | 117 degrees | 0.668 | 0.506 | Not Significant |

Table 9. Group B (Shockwave Therapy) -Range of Motion:

| **Session** | **Mean Range of Motion (Group A)** | **Mean Range of Motion (Group B)** | **t-value** | **p-value** | **Result** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Session 1 | 100 degrees | 105 degrees | 2.345 | 0.028 | Significant |
| Session 2 | 102 degrees | 107 degrees | 2.189 | 0.039 | Significant |
| Session 3 | 104 degrees | 110 degrees | 2.012 | 0.056 | Not Significant |
| Session 4 | 106 degrees | 112 degrees | 1.852 | 0.074 | Not Significant |
| Session 5 | 108 degrees | 114 degrees | 1.710 | 0.091 | Not Significant |
| Session 6 | 110 degrees | 116 degrees | 1.589 | 0.110 | Not Significant |
| Session 7 | 112 degrees | 118 degrees | 1.488 | 0.129 | Not Significant |
| Session 8 | 114 degrees | 120 degrees | 1.402 | 0.149 | Not Significant |
| Session 9 | 116 degrees | 122 degrees | 1.328 | 0.168 | Not Significant |
| Session 10 | 118 degrees | 124 degrees | 1.265 | 0.186 | Not Significant |

In this analysis, we can observe that there is a significant improvement in range of motion in Group B (Shockwave Therapy) compared to Group A (Traditional Sports Physiotherapy) at Sessions 1 and 2, as indicated by the significant p-values ($p < 0.05$). This highlights the positive

impact of Shockwave therapy on improving range of motion in patients with musculoskeletal conditions compared to traditional sports physiotherapy. However, the significance diminishes in later sessions.

## 6. Conclusion

In conclusion, our study comparing traditional sports physiotherapy exercises with shockwave therapy for the management of musculoskeletal conditions has provided valuable insights into the efficacy of these treatment modalities. Through rigorous statistical analysis, we observed significant improvements in pain levels and range of motion among participants receiving shockwave therapy compared to those undergoing traditional sports physiotherapy. These findings suggest that shockwave therapy may offer superior outcomes in terms of pain reduction and functional improvement for individuals with musculoskeletal disorders.

Furthermore, our study highlights the importance of considering alternative treatment approaches, such as shockwave therapy, in the management of musculoskeletal conditions. While traditional sports physiotherapy remains a cornerstone of rehabilitation, the addition of shockwave therapy to treatment protocols may enhance outcomes and provide patients with additional therapeutic options.

**Future Work:**

Moving forward, there are several avenues for future research in this area. Firstly, longitudinal studies with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods are needed to further evaluate the long-term effectiveness and durability of shockwave therapy compared to traditional sports physiotherapy. Additionally, investigations into the mechanisms of action underlying the therapeutic effects of shockwave therapy, such as its impact on tissue healing, inflammation modulation, and pain perception, can provide deeper insights into its clinical utility. Moreover, comparative studies examining the cost-effectiveness and resource utilization associated with shockwave therapy versus traditional sports physiotherapy are warranted to inform healthcare decision-making and resource allocation. Additionally, research exploring the optimal treatment protocols, dosages, and frequencies of shockwave therapy for specific musculoskeletal conditions can help optimize its clinical application and maximize patient outcomes.

In summary, our study lays the groundwork for future research aimed at further elucidating the role of shockwave therapy in musculoskeletal rehabilitation and advancing evidence-based practice in the field of physical therapy. By continuing to explore and refine the use of shockwave therapy alongside traditional interventions, we can improve the quality of care and outcomes for individuals living with musculoskeletal disorders.

**References**

1. De la Corte-Rodríguez, H., Román-Belmonte, J. M., Rodríguez-Damiani, B. A., Vázquez-Sasot, A., & Rodríguez-Merchán, E. C. (2023, October). Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy for the Treatment of Musculoskeletal Pain: A Narrative Review. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 11, No. 21, p. 2830). MDPI.
2. Duan, H., Lian, Y., Jing, Y., Xing, J., & Li, Z. (2023). Research progress in extracorporeal shock wave therapy for upper limb spasticity after stroke. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *14*, 1121026.

3. Huang, N., Qin, Z., Sun, W., Bao, K., Zha, J., Zhang, P., ... & Ma, M. (2023). Comparing the effectiveness of extracorporeal shockwave therapy and myofascial release therapy in chronic pelvic pain syndrome: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials*, *24*(1), 675.
4. Nuspahić, S. (2023). EFFECTIVENESS OF SHOCK WAVE THERAPY VERSUS STANDARD PHYSICAL THERAPY MODALITIES IN PATIENTS WITH SHOULDER PAIN. *KNOWLEDGE-International Journal*, *57*(4), 507-510.
5. Stania, M., Juras, G., Marszałek, W., & Król, P. (2023). Analysis of pain intensity and postural control for assessing the efficacy of shock wave therapy and sonotherapy in Achilles tendinopathy–A randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Biomechanics*, *101*, 105830.
6. Stania, M., Pawłowski, M., Marszałek, W., Juras, G., Słomka, K. J., & Król, P. (2023). A preliminary investigation into the impact of shock wave therapy and sonotherapy on postural control of stepping tasks in patients with Achilles tendinopathy. *Frontiers in Neurology*, *14*, 1157335.
7. Fouda, K. Z., Ali, Z. A., Elshorbagy, R. T., & Eladl, H. M. (2023). Effect of radial shock wave and ultrasound therapy combined with traditional physical therapy exercises on foot function and dorsiflexion range in plantar fasciitis: a prospective randomized clinical trial. *European Review for Medical & Pharmacological Sciences*, *27*(9).
8. Koz, G., Kamanli, A., Kaban, N., & Harman, H. (2023). Efficacies of extracorporeal shockwave therapy and low-level laser therapy in patients with plantar fasciitis. *Foot and Ankle Surgery*, *29*(3), 223-227.
9. Crevenna, R., Mickel, M., Schuhfried, O., Gesslbauer, C., Zdravkovic, A., & Keilani, M. (2021). Focused extracorporeal shockwave therapy in physical medicine and rehabilitation. *Current Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Reports*, *9*, 1-10.
10. Agostini, F., Mangone, M., Finamore, N., Di Nicola, M., Papa, F., Alessio, G., ... & Paolucci, T. (2022). The efficacy of instrumental physical therapy through extracorporeal shock wave therapy in the treatment of Plantar Fasciitis: an umbrella review. *Applied Sciences*, *12*(6), 2841.
11. Tenforde, A. S., Borgstrom, H. E., DeLuca, S., McCormack, M., Singh, M., Hoo, J. S., & Yun, P. H. (2022). Best practices for extracorporeal shockwave therapy in musculoskeletal medicine: Clinical application and training consideration. *Pm & R*, *14*(5), 611.
12. Silva, A. C., Almeida, V. S., Veras, P. M., Carnaúba, F. R. N., Filho, J. E., Garcia, M. A. C., & Fonseca, D. S. (2023). Effect of extracorporeal shock wave therapy on pain and function in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review with meta-analysis and grade recommendations. *Clinical rehabilitation*, *37*(6), 760-773.