Purpose: This study examined the effect of KT to balance control in people with NCLBP.

Materials and Methods: 30 subjects with NCLBP participated the study. Standing balance control was examined with unexpected support surface translations generated by the SMART EquiTest system (version 8.4, NeuroCom, USA). The “Motor Control Test” protocol was used to examine the postural response to anteroposterior support translations in two directions (backwards or forwards) at three amplitudes (large, medium and small). Three trials for each translation condition (2 directions x 3 amplitudes) were tested with 3 taping conditions (no tape (NT), Kinesia tape (KT) and sham tape (ST)) in a randomized taping sequence. Postural control was quantified by “Time to postural stabilisation” (TTS) and the Range of centre-of-pressure (RCOP) during TTS. RCOP is the excursion COP in anteroposterior direction within TTS.

Results: TTS. There were significant effects for taping (P = 0.001) and amplitude (P < 0.001) conditions, but not for the direction condition (P = 0.47). Compared with NT (534.04 ± 15.35 ms), both KT (466.75 ± 12.58 ms, p < 0.001) and ST (473.54 ± 13.16 ms, p = 0.001) showed significantly reduced TTS, with no difference between KT and ST (p = 0.648). The absence of interaction effects (tape x direction: P = 0.91, tape x amplitude: P= 0.69, and tape x direction x amplitude: P = 0.64) suggests that application of either KT or ST consistently reduced TTS in response to support surface perturbations in all directions and amplitudes.

RCOP. Similar to TTS, there were significant effects for the taping (P < 0.0001) and amplitude (P < 0.0001) conditions but not for the direction condition (P = 0.51). Comparison of RCOP indicated that both KT (4.6 ± 0.30 mm, P < 0.0001) and ST (4.54 ± 0.30 mm, P < 0.0001) had significantly smaller RCOP during TTS than NT (5.84 ± 0.36 mm). There was a significant interaction effect for tape x amplitude (P < 0.0001) condition. Post hoc analysis revealed that KT and ST showed reduced RCOP following medium and large amplitude perturbations in both directions compared with NT. Only KT showed significant reduced RCOP in response to small perturbations in both directions compared with NT. The result suggested that KT is more effective in improving balance control than ST as reduced RCOP was evident even following small perturbations. No interaction effects for tape x direction (P = 0.91), direction x amplitude (P = 0.57), tape x direction x amplitude (P = 0.91) were found.

Conclusions: 1. The result of the present study suggests that both Kinesio and sham taping improved postural control in people with NCLBP, as evident by reduced TTS and RCOP during TTS in response to support surface translations. 2. However, KT was more effective than ST as reduced RCOP during TTS following small perturbations was only evident with KT application. 3. Based on the results of this study, we conclude that KT is superior to ST in the improvement of standing balance control in people with NCLBP. It should be emphasized that application of KT with proper technique (i.e. tension or stretching of the tape) should be considered as a treatment option for this population.
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Introduction: Myofascial pain syndrome (MPS) is described as the sensory, motor and autonomic...
symptoms caused by myofascial trigger points (TrP). TrP is a hyperirritable spot in skeletal muscle that is associated with a hypersensitive palpable nodule in a taut band. MPS can cause regional lower back pain (LBP), usually affecting one side of the body. There is commonly tenderness and spasm in the painful areas and, in chronic pain conditions, there may be tenderness in areas that are not painful. It is also common for patients with MPS to have poor sleep patterns with decreased recovery sleep (non-rapid eye movements). This is associated with awakening feeling unrested and daytime fatigue. Stiffness after inactivity is common. Several treatments have been used for myofascial LBP, however no one treatment is found superior to other. Both physical (muscle tension) and psychological (stress) factors can predispose to the formation of TrP. Optimal treatment of MPS requires a multifaceted approach. This can include education of the patient, stress reduction, stretching and exercise programs as well as physical therapy, sleep improvement, and medications all best organized by a single physician who tailors the therapies over time by customizing them for the individual patient. This review will update and add on information to the previous comprehensive review which was published in 2014 covering the studies till 2015.

Aim: The aim of this systematic review was to evaluate the published literature studies on the management of myofascial pain syndrome of the low back.

Materials and Methods: Literature searches were made on MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, CINAHL, PEDro and Google Scholar for studies published till November 2015. Appropriate key words and Boolean terms were used to extract relevant and more studies. Studies were included that evaluated on the management of myofascial LBP. Based on the eligibility criteria the articles were finalised and the rest of the articles were excluded from the systematic review (Figure 1). Only studies in English language were considered for the study. Published studies were included in the systematic review that evaluated the following: management of myofascial LBP, treatment outcomes, duration and additional factors relevant to the management of LBP. Study selection, methodological quality and data extraction were performed by 2 independent reviewers based on the PRISMA criteria. The studies were reviewed and summarized also for research design, methodology, results and conclusion.

Results: Only the studies which met our inclusion criteria were shortlisted for the review. Among the 208 studies extracted, only 44 studies were relevant to the search criteria, among which 23 were prospective clinical trials and others were prospective, retrospective, reviews and descriptive studies. The studies included the following common treatment approaches: physiotherapy, electrotherapy, aquatic therapy, biofeedback, dry needling, yoga, tai chi and cognitive behaviour therapy. The other recommendations which can add up to treatment effectiveness are ergonomic modifications, increased activity level, balanced diet and regular exercise. Other relatively few number of studies which showed effectiveness were hyperbaric oxygen therapy, botulinum toxin injection, acupuncture and horticultural therapy. Several studies focus on neuroscience education oriented active approach. However, one thing which was clear from the review was that the invasive methods of management offers less progress or lack of evidence in their effectiveness in the management of individuals with myofascial LBP, so also with the treatment using modalities like Ultrasound therapy and TENS.

Conclusion: The review shows that a multidisciplinary treatment involving a holistic approach with a combination of pharmacological, non pharmacological and alternative approaches can offer the best management for myofascial LBP.
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Figure 1: Flowchart of the study selection process