<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Main results</th>
<th>Risk of bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andersen et al. (18) 2012, Dalager et al. (22) 2015, Gram et al. (24) 2014</td>
<td>Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers n = 573 male: 223 female: 350 mean age (SD), 45.8 years (10.2)</td>
<td>Group 1 (n=116): Supervised progressive resisted exercises (front raise, lateral raise, reverse fly, shrug and wrist extension; progression from 20 RM to 8 RM and adjusted for pain levels; 20 weeks), 1 h/week</td>
<td>20 weeks</td>
<td>Right shoulder pain numerical scale in the past 3 months (10 points scale)</td>
<td>Difference between group 5 and:</td>
<td>11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2 (n=126): Supervised progressive resisted exercises, 3 × 20 min/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: 0.56 (95% CI: 0.42 to 1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3 (n=106): Supervised progressive resisted exercises, 9 × 7 min/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: 0.36 (95% CI: –0.12 to 0.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4 (n=124): Minimally supervised progressive resisted exercises, 3 × 20 min/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3: 0.43 (95% CI: –0.07 to 0.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 5 (n=101): Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention groups (group 1, 2, 3 combined): 0.45 (95% CI: 0.04 to 0.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blangsted et al. (19) 2008</td>
<td>Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers n = 549 male: 195 female: 354 mean age (SD): 44.9 years (9.3)</td>
<td>Group 1 (n=180): Supervised resisted exercises (shoulder extension, shoulder abduction, shoulder flexion, isometric contraction for flexion, extension and side-bending of the neck, rowing or kayaking machine) 3 × 20 min/week</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Left shoulder pain numerical scale in the past 3 months (10 points scale)</td>
<td>Difference between group 5 and:</td>
<td>12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2 (n=187): General physical exercises (general aerobic and strengthening exercises, visit by an instructor 1–4 times a month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: 0.41 (95% CI: –0.03 to 0.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3 (n=182): Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: 0.19 (95% CI: –0.24 to 0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4: 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3: 0.32 (95% CI: –0.12 to 0.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 5: 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention groups (group 1, 2, 3 combined): 0.30 (95% CI: –0.06 to 0.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence (% of participant who exercised at least 20 min/week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3: 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4: 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 5: 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 5: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 4 (p&lt;0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornej et al. (25) 2001</td>
<td>Symptomatic and asymptomatic healthcare workers n = 282 male: 0 female: 282 mean age: 44.0 years</td>
<td>Group 1 (n=90): Exercises (individualized programme including: Posture, balance, muscular endurance, functional exercises, stretching exercises, cardiovascular fitness), 20 min, self-exercise and 4 supervised sessions</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>DASH (%)</td>
<td>No statistically significant differences between groups (p&gt;0.05)</td>
<td>7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2 (n=93): Stress management training (psychosocial intervention) 1 ×/week for 7 weeks and follow-up at 3 and 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No statistically significant differences between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 (p=0.3073)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3 (n=99): Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No statistically significant differences between group 1 and 2 (p=0.4220)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 (p<0.05)

No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 4 (p<0.14)

No statistically significant differences between groups (p>0.05)

No statistically significant differences between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 (p<0.05)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.18 (95% CI: –0.14 to 0.49)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.36 (95% CI: 0.04 to 0.68)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.08 (95% CI: –0.19 to 0.35)

No statistically significant differences between groups (p>0.05)

No statistically significant differences between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.20 (95% CI: –0.06 to 0.47)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.06 (95% CI: –0.01 to 0.13)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.30 (95% CI: –0.06 to 0.67)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.45 (95% CI: 0.04 to 0.85)

Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 combined: 0.08 (95% CI: –0.01 to 0.13)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Group Description</th>
<th>Intervention Details</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Jay et al. (26)</td>
<td>Symptomatic and asymptomatic laboratory technicians, n = 112</td>
<td>Group 1 (n = 56): Exercises (elastic resistance band exercises targeting the shoulder girdle and arm/hand, control motor exercises with education on pain de-catastrophizing and fear-avoidance beliefs) 4 × week and mindfulness session 1 × /week</td>
<td>Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 2.2 (95% CI: 1.6 to 2.9); Group 2: 0.6 (95% CI: 0.1 to 1.2); Difference between groups: 1.6 (95% CI: 0.9 to 2.3)</td>
<td>12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jorgensen et al. (27)</td>
<td>Symptomatic and asymptomatic cleaning workers, n = 294</td>
<td>Group 1 (n = 95): Exercises (stabilization exercises of the trunk muscles and shoulder girdle: abdominal bracing, bridge, four point kneeling, horizontal side support, vertical plank, body blade), 1 h/week for 3 months to 1 h/month in the last 6 months</td>
<td>Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 6 (p &lt; 0.05); Group 2: 4 (p &lt; 0.05); Group 3: -1 (p &lt; 0.05); No statistically significant differences between groups (p ≥ 0.05)</td>
<td>11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Lundblad et al. (30)</td>
<td>Symptomatic female industrial workers, n = 58</td>
<td>Group 1 (n = 15): Exercises (stabilization, strength, coordination, endurance, flexibility and rhythm exercises) and education on coping skills</td>
<td>Pre and post treatment: Group 1: 2.3 (0.6); 2.2 (0.1) (p ≥ 0.05); No statistically significant differences between groups (p ≥ 0.05)</td>
<td>6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Moreira et al. (32)</td>
<td>Symptomatic and asymptomatic workers from a manufacturing company, n = 70</td>
<td>Group 1 (n = 39): Supervised exercises (stretching exercises of the upper limb, general strength exercises of the lower limb), 10–15 min/session, 3 × /week and stretching and strengthening programme at home</td>
<td>Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: -2.6 (p &lt; 0.05); Group 2: -9.7 (p = 0.508); Difference between group 1 and 2: 7.1 (p-value not reported); Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: -2.6 (p &lt; 0.05); Group 2: 3.3 (p = 1); Difference between group 1 and 2: 5.9 (p-value not reported)</td>
<td>9/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pereira et al. (33) 2013
Symptomatic and asymptomatic garment workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.4 years (8.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 (n=44): Supervised exercises (stretching, muscular endurance, massage) 10 min, 2/day, 5 ×/week

Group 2 (n=17): Control group

12 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoulder pain intensity (11 points scale) (SD)</th>
<th>7/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 7.1 (2.2); 4.9 (1.8) (p=0.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: 5.0 (0.0); 5.8 (1.1) (p=0.923)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p-value not reported)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rasotto et al. (36) 2014
Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers from a manufacturing company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.10 years (8.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 (n=34): Supervised exercises (stretching and strengthening: low-weight and elastic band shoulder adduction/adduction, shoulder flexion/extension, forward and lateral pushes), 3 × 5 repetitions, 2 ×/week for 9 months

Group 2 (n=34): Control group

10 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoulder pain (cm VAS) (SD)</th>
<th>8/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 5 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.0005 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.0007 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.0007 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.0007 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.00125 |  |

### Rasotto et al. (35) 2015
Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers from an airline company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.5 years (5.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 (n=56): Self-exercise (stretching exercises for the neck region and cervical range of motion exercise, 10 × 5 s) during office breaks and 2 h lecture (education on neck and shoulder anatomy and about the exercise programme)

Group 2: Group exercise 1 (n=69): (1 ×/day, all sessions supervised by a PT for 2 weeks and continued by themselves after for 2–3 months) and 2 h lecture

Group 3: Group exercise 2 (n=14): (2 ×/day, half of the sessions supervised by a PT for 2 weeks and continued by themselves after for 2–3 months) and 2 h lecture

Group 4 (n=36): Control group (2 h lecture)

6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoulder pain (10 cm VAS) (SD)</th>
<th>9/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 5 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.039 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.035 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.035 |  |
| Difference between group 1 and 2: p=0.003 |  |

### Tsauo et al. (37) 2004
Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers from an airline company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.5 years (5.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 (n=56): Self-exercise (stretching exercises for the neck region and cervical range of motion exercise, 10 × 5 s) during office breaks and 2 h lecture (education on neck and shoulder anatomy and about the exercise programme)

Group 2: Group exercise 1 (n=69): (1 ×/day, all sessions supervised by a PT for 2 weeks and continued by themselves after for 2–3 months) and 2 h lecture

Group 3: Group exercise 2 (n=14): (2 ×/day, half of the sessions supervised by a PT for 2 weeks and continued by themselves after for 2–3 months) and 2 h lecture

Group 4 (n=36): Control group (2 h lecture)

3 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported soreness in past week in the shoulder region (%)</th>
<th>7/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 23.1 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: 6.6 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3: 6.0 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4: 13.2 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between group 1 and 4: 36.2 (p-value not reported)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between group 2 and 4: 13.8 (p-value not reported)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between group 3 and 4: 19.2 (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zebis et al. (40) 2011
Symptomatic and asymptomatic laboratory technicians
n = 537; male: 82; female: 455 mean age (SD): 42.0 years (10.5)
Group 1 (n = 282): Supervised resisted exercises (front raise, lateral raise, reverse fly, shrug, wrist extension) progression from 15 RM to 8–12 RM, 20 min/session, 3 × /week
Group 2 (n = 255): Control group (advice to stay physically active, consulted 1 × /week)
20 weeks
Shoulder pain intensity in the last 7 days for symptomatic participants (10 points scale) (SD) Odds ratio for improvement of shoulder pain
Pre- and post-treatment:
Group 1: 4.8 (1.7); 1.4 (1.7) (p-value not reported)
Group 2: 4.7 (1.8); 2.5 (2.6) (p-value not reported)
3.9 (95% CI: 1.7 to 9.4)
0.6 (95% CI: 0.3 to 1.3)

Ergonomic intervention
Aghilinejad et al. (17) 2015
Symptomatic and asymptomatic automobile factory workers
n = 223
gender: not mentioned
mean age: 30.4 years
Group 1 (n = 79): Ergonomic intervention (5 h workshop about neck and shoulder complaints and related ergonomic concepts) Group 2 (n = 70): Ergonomic education (5 h lecture with the same concepts) Group 3 (n = 74): Ergonomic intervention (pamphlet with the same concepts) Group 4 (n = 251): Control group
1 year
Prevalence of shoulder pain in the last week (%)
Pre-post difference within groups:
Group 1: 10 (p = 0.002)
Group 2: 5 (p = 0.063)
Group 3: 4 (p = 0.054)
Group 4: not reported
Difference between groups: p-value not reported
Pre-post difference within groups:
Group 1: 5 (p = 0.020)
Group 2: 7 (p = 0.066)
Group 3: 5 (p = 0.115)
Group 4: not reported
Difference between groups: p-value not reported

Cook & Burgess-Limerick (21) 2004
Symptomatic and asymptomatic newspaper call centre workers
n = 59
male: 5 female: 54 mean age (range): 39 years (21–68)
Group 1 (n = 30): Ergonomic intervention (maintaining arm position with monitoring for the first h and weekly) Group 2 (n = 29): Control group (ergonomic intervention according to Australian standards)
12 weeks
Prevalence of shoulder pain in the last year (%)
1. 6 weeks
2. 12 weeks
Pre-post difference within groups:
Group 1: 1 (p-value not reported)
Group 2: 6 (p-value not reported)
Difference between groups: 5 (p = 0.36)
2. Pre-post difference within groups:
Group 1: 0 (p-value not reported)
Group 2: 10 (p-value not reported)
Difference between groups: –10 (p = 0.15)

Galinsky et al. (23) 2000
Symptomatic and asymptomatic data-entry operators
n = 42
male: 11 female: 31 mean age: 30 years
Group 1 (n = 23): Supplementary work break (5 min every h and a 15 min, 2 ×/shift) Group 2 (n = 19): Control group (Regular work break, 15 min, 2 ×/shift)
16 weeks
Discomfort (5 points scale)
1. 6 months
2. 12 months
Post treatment adjusted for baseline:
1. Group 1: 2.2 (0.2) (p-value not reported)
2. Group 2: 2.4 (0.1) (p-value not reported)
Group 3: 2.8 (0.2) (p-value not reported)
Statistically significant differences favoring group 1 over group 3 (p = 0.12)
No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 3 (p = 0.53) and between 2 and 3 (p = 0.36)

Ketola et al. (28) 2002
Symptomatic office workers using a video display unit
n = 109
male: 46 female: 63 mean age: 47.9 years
Group 1 (n = 39): Ergonomic intervention (checklist on workstation organization and workstation adjustments suggested by a physiotherapist) Group 2 (n = 35): Ergonomic intervention (1-h training session) Group 3 (n = 35): Control group (one page pamphlet on musculoskeletal health)
10 months
Musculoskeletal discomfort (5 points scale) (SD)
Right shoulder
1. 2 months
2. 10 months
Post treatment adjusted for baseline:
1. Group 1: 1.9 (0.1) (p-value not reported)
2. Group 2: 2.1 (0.1) (p-value not reported)
Group 3: 2.4 (0.2) (p-value not reported)
Statistically significant differences favoring group 1 over group 3 (p = 0.025)
No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 3 (p = 0.61) and between 2 and 3 (p = 0.86)

In conclusion, the study by Zebis et al. (40) 2011 demonstrated that supervised resisted exercises were effective in reducing shoulder pain intensity in the last 7 days for symptomatic participants. The intervention group showed a significant improvement in shoulder pain intensity compared to the control group. However, further research is needed to determine the long-term effects of such interventions.
Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers \( n = 23 \) gender: not mentioned mean age: not mentioned

Group 1 \(( n = 11)\): Use of a biofeedback mouse (Hoverstop, Ontario, Canada)

Group 2 \(( n = 12)\): Control group

25 weeks

Intensity of shoulder pain (11 points scale) (SD)

1. 5 weeks

2. 25 weeks

Pre- and post-treatment:

1.Group 1: 2.09 (2.18); 0.76 (1.14)

Group 2: 1.36 (2.26); 1.11 (1.76)

Difference between groups in post treatment score: \( p \geq 0.05 \)

2. Group 1: 2.09 ± 2.18; 0.79 ± 1.22

Group 2: 1.36 ± 2.26; 1.58 ± 2.87

Difference between groups in post treatment score: \( p \geq 0.05 \)

8/16

Pre-post differences within groups:

Group 1: 10 (\( p \geq 0.05 \))

Group 2: 4 (\( p \geq 0.05 \))

Difference between groups: 6 (\( p \)-value not reported by the authors)

Symptomatic and asymptomatic hairdressers \( n = 38 \)

male: 38 female: 38 mean age (SD): 29.53 years (5.53)

Group 1 \(( n = 20)\): Ergonomic intervention (oral and written recommendations by an occupational therapist and individualized follow-up)

Group 2 \(( n = 18)\): Control group (oral and written recommendations)

1 to 2 months

Prevalence of shoulder complaint (%)

Pre-post differences within groups:

Group 1: 15.2

Group 2: 4.1

Difference between groups: 11.1 (\( p \)-value not reported)

Difference between groups:

O.R. (95% CI): 2.9 (0.3–27.4) \( p = 0.352 \)

Pre-post differences within groups:

Group 1: 2.1

Group 2: 3.0

Difference between groups: 0.9 (\( p \)-value not reported)

8/16

Symptomatic and asymptomatic administrative personnel using a VDT \( n = 200 \)

male: 58 female: 142 mean age (SD): 44.3 years (7.6)

Group 1 \(( n = 100)\): Ergonomic intervention (adjustments and alterations to the existing furniture by a physical therapist) and informative brochure

Group 2 \(( n = 100)\): Control group (informative brochure)

6 months

Prevalence of shoulder pain (%)

Pre-post differences within groups:

Group 1: 15

Group 2: 4

Difference between groups: 11 (\( p \)-value not reported)

Other interventions

Symptomatic workers with rotator cuff disorder (type of work not mentioned) \( n = 94 \)

male: 72 female: 22 mean age (SD): 32.3 years (10.2)

Group 1 \(( n = 46)\): Workplace-based exercises (shoulder stretching 10 × 15 s, scapular control and rotator cuff strengthening 3 × 10 reps) and biomechanics and ergonomic education, task modification 3 ×/week

Group 2 \(( n = 48)\): Clinic-based exercises (upper limb mobilisation activity, strength and endurance exercises) + work simulation, 3 ×/week

4 weeks

SPADI score

Pre- and post-treatment:

Group 1: 54.25 ± 12.07; 40.50 ± 16.30

Group 2: 52.09 ± 10.89; 31.54 ± 13.37

Difference between groups: \( p = 0.034 \)

7/16

Proportion of participants returned to work (%)

Group 1: 73.5 (value not reported)

Group 2: 71.7 (value not reported)

Difference between groups: \( p = 0.001 \)

9/16

Statistically significant differences between groups (\( p < 0.05 \)) for shoulder range of motion in flexion, strength in bilateral carrying, arm lift and high near-lift. No statistically significant differences between groups for other variables (\( p \geq 0.05 \))

Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers \( n = 164 \)

male: 80 female: 84 mean age (SD): 38.68 years (7.74)

Group 1 \(( n = 83)\): Ergonomic intervention (evaluation by occupational medicine specialists, modifications of workstation and equipment according to ergonomic rules)

Group 2 \(( n = 81)\): Exercises (supervised work-place exercise programme including stretching exercises focusing on neck, shoulder, wrist, back and low back) 2 ×/day

1 month

Reduction in complaints in shoulder pain (%)

Group 1: 10 (\( p = 0.05 \))

Group 2: 3 (\( p = 0.05 \))

Differences between groups: \( p = 0.02 \)

DASH: Disability in Arms, Shoulders and Hands, Self-reported disability questionnaire. Higher scores indicate a greater level of disability; RM: repetition maximum; CI: confidence interval; Pre-post: pre-intervention to post-intervention; Work Ability Index: perceived work ability, the higher the score, the better the work ability; NMQ: Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire; VDT: video display terminal; SPADI: Shoulder Pain and Disability Index; SD: standard deviation.