

Diagnostic Accuracy of Clinical Tests To Diagnose Subacromial Impingement Syndrome: A Systematic Review

Thiruvarangan S¹, Shaminy T²

¹Postgraduate student, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom Email: t.ranga13@gmail.com

²Physiotherapist, Teaching Hospital Jaffna, Sri Lanka

ABSTRACT

Objectives

The aim of this review was to systematically review the cost-effective diagnostic utility of clinical tests to diagnose subacromial impingement syndrome.

Data Sources

The following electronic databases: Medline, EMBASE, Science Direct and the Cochrane Library were searched in June 2020 to identify the studies that investigated the diagnostic accuracy of clinical tests to diagnose SAIS. The search was restricted to articles written in English.

Study Selection

This study included diagnostic accuracy of cohort studies that directly compared the diagnostic utility of clinical tests for diagnosing SAIS against either surgical or indirect imaging reference standards. The PRISMA guidelines were followed to accomplish this review. Two reviewers independently performed the study's methodological quality assessment by using the QUADAS tool.

Data Extraction

The sensitivity and specificity for each clinical test was extracted from the included studies and both positive and negative likelihood ratios were tabulated either direct from available studies or calculated from the provided sensitivity and specificity data.

Data Synthesis

This review included 14 studies in total of 1756 shoulders and considered standard, modified and novel clinical tests for making a differential diagnosis on SAIS. In this review, included studies' overall methodological quality is high and there appears to be the diagnostic utility of the subacromial grinding test, lift-off, bear-hug and belly-off tests provide significant evidence to rule in SAIS when the tests are positive.

Conclusion

This is an updated study of a previous systematic review on the diagnostic accuracy of clinical tests for SAIS. Making a precise differential diagnosis will ultimately ensure the appropriate therapeutic interventions, subsequently successful prognosis on SAIS patients thus, this review findings of diagnostic utility clinical tests need to be considered in the context of clinical practice of the overall patient assessment.

Keywords: Subacromial impingement syndrome, Clinical test, Diagnostic utility, Sensitivity and specificity

INTRODUCTION

Musculoskeletal (MSK) disorders significantly contribute to the disability proportion¹ and it impacts people across their life-course in all regions of the world². The incidence of MSK disease increases with aging³. A recent research study claimed that between 20%–33% of people across the world live with a painful MSK disorder⁴. Among these wide-spread MSK disorders, shoulder pain is a significant cause of morbidity in any age population, and it has been estimated as the third most common complaint of MSK disorder in primary care clinical setting⁵, where the majority of shoulder pain is conservatively managed⁶. The shoulder pain is estimated that the annual prevalence is up to 46.7% with a lifetime prevalence of up to 66.7%⁷. The highest incidence reported among women aged between 45–64 years old⁸. Besides, the shoulder pain population, Subacromial Impingement Syndrome (SAIS) is considered as the most common pathology of the shoulder pain and accounted for 44%–65% of complaints in primary care consultation⁹. The author Consigliere et al., estimated that shoulder pain incidence is between 20% and 50% in the general practice settings and among these patients one in four were diagnosed as SAIS for the therapeutic interventions and further medical management¹⁰. The work-related musculoskeletal disorders population surveys showed that shoulder pain disorders have a negative impact on both personal and national levels as the symptoms can be disabling in terms of individual's functional capability¹¹ and reduced work performance¹². As a result, both eventually lead to a negative influence on a person's financial capacity, mental wellbeing and withdrawal from social interaction¹³. The SAIS is also associated with other psychosocial factors such as self-efficacy¹⁴. This has resulted in an expansion of the demands on health care costs and work-related absenteeism that possibly leads to early retirement or losing jobs¹³. These are social concerns¹⁵ because of its wider range of destructive consequences on the global socio-economic developing activities¹⁶.

Description of Condition

The human shoulder joint involves various physically demanded and a wide range of motion day to day functional activities¹¹. To accomplish this requirement, the joint girdle is not a simple 'ball and socket' but a complex and collected of four articulations, which are reinforced by the morphology of bones, ligaments and muscles surrounding the joints¹⁷. However, the shoulder joint is highly susceptible to a range of articular and peri-articular pathologies because of its complexity and the nature of the functional activity demands on it¹⁸. Therefore, shoulder pain has a wide range of root causes⁹; in addition to that, shoulder pain may be overlapped from other regional pain (eg: neck conditions) and visceral pathologies (eg: gallbladder) causing symptoms¹⁹. These complexities challenge clinicians to have a precise differential diagnosis on shoulder pain¹².

Subacromial Impingement Syndrome has been discussed for decades. In 1972, Neer proposed the term SAIS describing an “inflammation and degeneration of the anatomical structures in the region of the subacromial space”, which is built by the humeral head inferiorly, the anterior lateral third of the acromion and coracoacromial ligament superiorly²⁰.




Figure 01: Anatomical illustration of SAIS²⁰

SAIS is classified into external/subacromial and internal impingement syndrome; the external impingement occurs in the subacromial space, whereas the internal impingement syndrome happens between the posterior portion of the humerus head and the glenoid labrum²¹. SAIS encompasses a spectrum of pathologies including subacromial bursitis, rotator cuff tendinosis either partial or full thickness²⁰. The trigger of SAIS is commonly multifactorial; resulting from both intrinsic and extrinsic factors²². Also, the pain is commonly located around the acromion and lateral side of the upper shoulder and it is often exaggerated by overhead functional activities¹⁸. In the majority of cases, the pain negatively impacts sleep hygiene and daily activities; as a result, shoulder pain disorders become a chronic pain and socio-economic burden widely across the world²³. The main concern of SAIS relates to functional loss and disability¹⁹.

Scope of challenges

Over the years different hypotheses have been put forward to describe the pathogenesis of SAIS but, a clear explanation has not been established as of now¹⁸. Therefore, it remains a poorly understood entity whether the damage to the rotator cuff tendons causes the impingement (intrinsic mechanism) or the impingement causes the destruction of the rotator cuff tendons (extrinsic mechanism)²⁴. The theories supporting the intrinsic mechanism are becoming more and more popular in the last few years²⁵. These theories argue that the poor vascularity of the supraspinatus tendon insertion could be a significant factor in the pathogenesis of degenerative rotator cuff tears²⁵. Conversely, over several decades the extrinsic theory supporters are demanding to correlate the SAIS

to different orientations of the scapula due to muscular imbalances (weakness-tightness) and increasing of thoracic spine curvature (kyphosis) as well as considering the morphology of acromion²⁶. Moreover, SAIS terminology has been questioned among the healthcare professionals and believed as it is outdated²⁵. However a simple search of the term brings up thousands of contemporary research articles and recent publications in many scientific databases. In addition to that, the SAIS is still categorised as a Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) in the National Library of Medicine. Therefore, a specific diagnosis of shoulder pain symptomatology is both difficult and controversial²⁷.

According to the research studies^{20 28} SAIS is a frequent root cause of shoulder pain. It has been suggested that successful prognosis related to shoulder pain and dysfunction is dependent on a precise diagnosis²⁹. It is traditionally believed that effective medical history taking and comprehensive physical examination is a cornerstone to generate a potential hypothesis, subsequently successful clinical decision-making in medical practice³⁰. Furthermore, this approach can help clinicians to get out of unnecessary advanced diagnostic tests exposure of the patients, thus potentially saving money, reducing time delay and avoid needless health risks³¹. Therefore, developing an accurate clinical decision based on the potential diagnostic utility of clinical examination would aid clinicians to design the early effective therapeutic interventions and consequently, it possibly leads successful clinical outcomes³². Unfortunately, at present this traditional clinical decision-making approach can be often challenged to make a precise differential diagnosis related to shoulder pain because over 186 clinical tests have been labelled and proposed for their application in the shoulder complex³³. This leads to a challenging for clinicians to have a choice on appropriate clinical tests for differential diagnosis of shoulder pain¹⁰. Moreover, confusion arises by the description of the same clinical test with different names for example, the Empty Can test is also known as Jobe's test both suspected supraspinatus pathological involvement³⁴. Besides, different criteria are applied to interpret the same clinical test for instance, either pain or weakness as a criterion to have a positive supraspinatus test³⁵. However, there are other diagnostic utilities available such as magnetic resonance image, magnetic arthrography, diagnostic ultrasound, and intra-operative investigations to make a differential diagnosis of SAIS³⁶. Nevertheless, these types of investigations are not affordable for clinicians³⁷, who work in the primary care clinical setting; moreover it is not a cost-effective pathway³⁸.

This review primary aim is to make a clear establishment through evidence-based practice to have the cost-effective and appraise diagnostic accuracy of commonly applied clinical tests for diagnosing SAIS. As a result,

it would aid clinicians to generate a potential hypothesis, subsequently design an appropriate therapeutic regimen to have successful prognostic outcomes related to the shoulder pain.

METHODS

Study Design

This systematic review followed the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines for conducting and reporting the study's findings. The study was exempt from the Human Ethics Committee review.

Search Strategy

A literature search was conducted in June 2020 and included the following databases: Medline, EMBASE, Science Direct and the Cochrane Library. The search engines were searched using a combination of keywords and Medical Subject Headings of the National Library of Medicine designed to identify clinical tests, the diagnostic accuracy set, and the target condition. The following key words were included: "physical examination" OR "clinical examination" OR "routine diagnostic tests" OR "diagnostic tests, routine" AND "shoulder" OR "shoulder pain" OR "shoulder impingement syndrome" OR "bursitis" OR "tendinopathy" OR "rotator cuff" AND "sensitivity and specificity" OR "diagnosis." Checking references of the relevant articles and searching Google Scholar supplemented the search. Searches were limited to only English language.

No	Search history	Results
1	Physical Examination/	215765
2	Diagnostic Tests, Routine/	78480
3	Shoulder/	32305
4	Shoulder Pain/	16458
5	Shoulder Impingement Syndrome/	2839
6	Bursitis/	4691
7	Tendinopathy/	5329
8	Rotator Cuff/	6356
9	"Sensitivity and Specificity"/	363941
10	Diagnosis/	1333404

11	1 or 2	291115
12	3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8	59940
13	9 or 10	1677690
14	11 and 12 and 13	501
15	limit 14 to English language	491

Table 01: EMBASE Search strategy**Study Selection**

Studies were included if they met the following inclusion criteria;

- 1 *Study Types:* Prospective or retrospective cohort studies
- 2 *Patient population:* Adult patients (age >18years) with painful shoulder
- 3 *Setting of care:* Inpatient and outpatient clinical settings
- 4 *Descriptive variables:* Any clinical test examined to diagnose the SAIS target condition in all three stages. Three stages and the relevant common clinical tests are described in table1.
- 5 *Reference test:* The following reference standards were considered acceptable for diagnosis of SAIS; using surgical diagnostic standard (arthroscopy/ intra-operative) and indirect imaging diagnostic methods (MRI/USS/CT arthrogram /anaesthetic) as the reference test.
- 6 *Diagnostic accuracy measures:* Each study was required to account or permit calculation of diagnostic values (sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative likelihood ratios) for all clinical tests.

Two reviewers (T.S, S.T) read the titles and/or abstracts of the identified references and eliminated irrelevant studies. Studies that were considered eligible for inclusion were read fully in duplicate, and both reviewers independently determined their suitability for inclusion to the study. Disagreements were managed by consensus.




Figure 02: PRISMA flow diagram of the studies

Data Extraction

The number of sensitivity and specificity for each clinical test were extracted from each of the studies. In addition, both positive and negative likelihood ratios were tabulated either direct from available studies or calculated from the data provided the sensitivity and specificity findings. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion between the 2 reviewers (T.S and T.S). This review's primary investigator contacted the appropriate

corresponding study's author to gain further information when there was insufficient detail in an article to finalise the data extraction.

Quality Assessment

After all relevant articles were attained; the quality of each included article was evaluated. The quality of the study was determined by examining that study's internal and external validity. This was assessed using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS) tool³⁹. It is a validated tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies⁴⁰. The QUADAS tool has 14 questions, each involves individualised scoring as "yes", "no", or "unclear". In this review, two independent reviewers (T.S. and C.J.) applied the QUADAS tool to the included studies and dissimilarities in the assessment were fixed by discussion.

Data synthesis and Analysis

This study has struggled to perform a meta-analysis because the majority of the included articles hadn't provided raw data (true positives, false positives, true negatives, and false negative) for constructing 2 by 2 table. Thus, this study has applied the methodology in previous study⁴¹ of this nature to determine the accuracy of defined clinical tests for the each pathology. From included studies, each clinical test's sensitivity and specificity were extracted in addition to that both positive and negative likelihood ratios were tabulated either direct from available studies or calculated. Because, specificity is the probability of a positive test result in someone with the pathology, whereas sensitivity is the probability of a negative test result in someone without the pathology. The classification catalogue was followed in order to descriptively characterising degrees of this study's sensitivity and specificity⁴². It categorises as; low if 50% or less, low to moderate if between 51% and 64%, moderate if between 65% and 74%, moderate to high if between 75% and 84%, and high if 85% or greater. Positive likelihood ratios (+LR) > 1 surge the post-test probability that the target condition is present. Negative likelihood ratios (-LR) closer to 0 decreases the probability of the target disorder with a negative finding, and the smaller the negative likelihood ratio, the greater the decrease in probability⁴³. A positive finding with a test that has a $LR+ > 10$ generates a large change in post-test probability, whereas a $LR+$ of 5-10 moderately influences post-test probability. A negative finding with a test that has a $LR- < 0.1$ generates a large shift in post-test probability, whereas a $LR-$ of 0.1-0.2 moderately shifts the pre to post-test probability⁴⁴.

RESULTS

Study Identification

A flow diagram of the search and selection of the study is presented in Figure 2. Records identified through databases searching on Medline, Embase, Science Direct and Cochrane Library in addition to that some records identified through review of references in articles and hand search on Google Scholar. After removal of duplicates, 1069 articles yielded. Among these 1069 considered articles, 1042 were excluded after reading title and abstract. All potential 27 full text articles were screened against the study inclusion criteria subsequently, 14 articles met the inclusion criteria and were selected for inclusion in the review. A description of the common clinical tests relevant to diagnose of all SAIS pathologies is described in Table 2.

Study	No Patients	Mean Age	Clinical test	Reference Criterion	Pathology	Publication details
Takeda ⁵¹ 2016	130	64.5 (39-77)	Lift-off, belly press, bear-hug	Arthroscopy	SAIS 1-3	Orthopaedic Japan.
Sgroi ⁵⁶ 2019	112	57.3+ - 12.0	Hornblower's sign, drop arm, ERLS, IRLS, Patte sign,	Arthroscopy	SAIS 2-3	Orthopaedic Germany
Yoon ⁵² 2013	312	57.1 + - 10.7	Lift-off, IRLS, belly Press, bear-hug	Arthroscopy/ Surgery	SAIS 1-3	Orthopaedic South Korea
Kappe ⁵³ 2018	106	57.3 +- 12.2 (32-80)	Lift-off, IRLS belly press, belly off, bear hug	Arthroscopy	SAIS 1-3	Orthopaedic Germany
Sgroi ⁵⁸ 2018	115	57.3+ - 12.0	Empty can, full can, drop arm Scapular retraction	Arthroscopy	SAIS 2-3	Orthopaedic Germany
Collin ⁵⁷ 2015	100	68	ERLS, Patte sign, drop arm	CT Arthrogram	SAIS 1-3	Shoulder clinic, France.
Guosheng ⁴⁶ 2017	85	15-65	Belly press	MRI	SAIS 1-3	Primary care China
Lin ⁵⁴ 2015	235	51+ - 18.3 (26-76)	Lift-off, belly press, IRLS, bear-hug, IRRRT	Arthroscopy	SAIS 1-3	Sports Medicine, China
Liu ⁴⁷ 2016	200	46.8+ - 15.8 (14-77)	Hug-up, empty can full can, MNT Hawkins-Kennedy	Arthroscopy	SAIS 1-3	Sports Medicine, China
Sawalha ⁴⁵ 2015	47	58 (27-76)	Subacromial grinding	Arthroscopy	SAIS 2-3	Orthopaedics UK
Bartsch ⁵⁵ 2010	50	58 + - 11.6	Lift-off, IRLS, belly press, belly-off sign	Arthroscopy	SAIS 1-3	MSK Clinic Germany
Bak ⁴⁸ 2010	104	56 (39-75)	Hawkins-Kennedy empty can, painful arc ERLS IRLS Infraspinatus drop	MRI & Injection	SAIS 2-3	Emergency Department Denmark
Fowler ⁵⁰ 2010	101	40.8+- 14.6	Hawkins-Kennedy empty can, lift-off	Arthroscopy	SAIS 2-3	Sports Medicine UK
	80	20-70	Neer's sign, full can,, empty can Hawkins-Kennedy painful arc	USS	SAIS 1-3	Orthopaedics UK

Table 02: Characteristics of included studies

Shoulder Pathology	Clinical Tests
SAIS	Neer's sign, Hawkins-Kennedy test, Horizontal adduction test
Supraspinatus tendinopathy	Empty can test, full can test, Drop arm test, Painful arc test,
Infraspinatus and Teres minor tendinopathy	Resisted external rotation (infraspinatus test), External lag sign, Patte's test, Hornblower's sign
Subscapularis tendinopathy	Bear-hug test, Belly press test/Napolean test, Belly-off sign, Lift-off test, Internal rotation lag sign

Table 03: Description of the common clinical tests relevant to diagnose SAIS pathology

Study Description

Table 3 refers to the characteristics of the included studies. In this review research finally 14 studies included a total of 1756 patients. All included studies were in English. The included studies sample range from 47 to 312 patients. The majority of included studies' study design was prospective and included studies' were carried out in various clinical setting such as sports, orthopaedic, musculoskeletal clinics, primary care and emergency department. However, higher proportion of the studies were set in speciality or tertiary care clinical setting and only 2 studies carried out reference tests that would apply to primary care clinical setting. Four studies were carried out in Germany, 3 in United Kingdom, 3 in China, 1 in Japan, 1 in Denmark, 1 in France, and 1 in South Korea. In this review, both surgical diagnosis (arthroscopy and intra-operative) and indirect imaging methods (MRI, CT arthrogram and diagnostic USS) were considered as the reference standard criterion. In the included 14 studies, twenty different clinical tests were examined to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy to define the pathology related to all three stages of SAIS. Among these, seventeen clinical tests were assessed against surgical diagnostic procedures, whereas twelve clinical tests were examined alongside the indirect imaging diagnostic methods.

Methodological Quality Assessment

The included each study's methodological quality score based on the 14 items of the QUADAS tool is presented in Figure 2. The overall summary of the included studies' methodological quality assessment by two independent reviewers (T.S & S.T) is illustrated in Figure 3. The overall quality ranges from moderate to good because, in the included 14 studies, 11 studies' overall methodological quality score is greater than 10 out of 14. In addition, in these individual 14 methodological quality measuring questions, the three questions' overall

answer is unclear. Among three questions, two questions evaluate whether the assessors were blinded to the outcome between the index tests and reference standard criterion, whereas one question assesses about the time delay between the clinical test and the reference test.




Figure 03: Individual study’s score against the QUADAS




Figure 04: Methodological quality of included studies

Diagnostic value of clinical tests

Table 2 describes the 20 common clinical tests included in 14 diagnostic accuracy studies in comparing either surgical or indirect diagnostic imaging reference standard for the diagnosis of SAIS and associated with rotator cuff pathologies. These findings were clustered by two main target conditions such as subacromial impingement and rotator cuff tendinopathy including supraspinatus, subscapularis and infraspinatus-teres minor because of the involvedness of a quite large number (20) of clinical tests.

External impingement

In this included studies, 4 clinical tests' such as Neer's, Hawkins-Kennedy, subacromial grinding and modified Neer test accuracy were evaluated for diagnosing the SAIS. The subacromial grinding test was examined in a single surgical reference criterion study⁴⁵ total of 50 shoulders. The sensitivity, specificity, and +LR (diagnostic utility) values ranged from 73%, 91% and 9.5 respectively. The modified Neer's test was inspected in an indirect imaging reference criterion study⁴⁶ total of 85 patients. The diagnostic utility values ranged from 85%, 96% and 19.1 correspondingly. However, Neer's and Hawkins-Kennedy tests' diagnostic accuracy was examined in both surgical and indirect imaging reference standard studies. The Neer's test diagnostic values in a single surgical reference standard study⁴⁷ total of 200 patients ranged from 62.7%, 89.4% and 5.9. In contrast, it was explored in 3 indirect imaging studies^{46, 48, 49} total 269 painful shoulders and its diagnostic utility values ranged from 45.5-90.2%, 17.4-50% and 0.6-1.8. The Hawkins-Kennedy test diagnostic values in 2 surgical reference standard studies^{47, 50} total 301 patients ranged from 35.9-57.6%, 72.1-87.2% and 2.1-2.8. In contrast, it was investigated in 2 indirect imaging studies^{48, 49} total 184 shoulders and its diagnostic utility values ranged from 55.6-88.9%, 13-40.9% and 0.7-1.5.

Rotator cuff tendinopathy

Clinical tests for subscapularis

Five clinical tests such as lift-off, belly-press, belly-off, bear-hug test and IRLS evaluated the subscapularis's pathological association for SAIS. However, except IRLS, other 4 clinical tests were investigated only against the surgical reference standard. The lift-off is in 6 studies^{49,50,51,52,53,54} total 934 painful shoulders. The diagnostic utility values ranged from 18.8-65.2%, 68.5-98% and 1.9-17.5 respectively. The belly-press test is in 5 studies^{49,51,52,53,54} total 833 patients and diagnostic utility values range are in the following way 34-80%, 79.7-96% and 3.2-8.5. The bear hug test is in 4 studies^{52,53,54} total 783 patients. The diagnostic utility values are ranging from 18.8-73.7%, 79.9-97.4% and 0.98-28.4 in that order. The belly-off test is in 2 studies^{53,55} total 156 patients and its diagnostic utility values are ranging from 31-86%, 91-97% and 9.6-10.3 correspondingly,

whereas the IRLS was investigated in both surgical and indirect imaging reference standards. In surgical reference standard, IRLS was in 4 studies^{52,53,54,55} total 703 patients and its diagnostic utility values sensitivity, specificity and +LR range from 31.6-71%, 60-92.5% and 1.8-4.6 respectively in contrast in indirect imaging criterion standard, IRLS was in one study⁴⁸ total 104 patients its utility ranged from 31%, 87% and 2.4.

Clinical tests for supraspinatus

Six clinical tests full can, empty can, drop arm, 0 abduction, hug-up and painful arc were explored in this review for supraspinatus associated with SAIS. The full can, empty can, drop arm and 0° abduction were investigated in both surgical and indirect imaging reference standards. In surgical reference criterion, empty can test in 3 studies^{47,50,56} total 416 patients its diagnostic values range 66.7-91%, 41-74.5% & 1.1-3.3, full can test in 2 studies^{47,56} 315 patients its diagnostic values are 78.4-79%, 69-80.9% & 2.6-4.1, drop arm test in 1 study⁵⁶, 115 patients its diagnostic values 24%, 77% & 1.1 and 0 abduction test in 1 study⁵⁶ 115 patients its diagnostic values are 64.5%, 54% & 1.4. In contrast, indirect imaging reference standard empty can test in 2 studies^{48,49} total 184 patients its diagnostic values from 64.3-76%, 12.5-39% & 0.8-1.3, full can test in 1 study⁴⁹ 80 patients its diagnostic values 66.7%, 25.5% & 1, drop arm test in 2 studies^{48,57} 204 patients its diagnostic values 41-87%, 83-88% & 2.4-7.3 and 0 abduction test in 1 study⁴⁹ 80 patients its diagnostic values 70.9%, 31.2% & 1.1. The hug-up test was investigated in a single surgical reference criterion study⁵⁴ 200 patients its diagnostic values 94.1%, 76.6% & 4, while painful arch in 2 indirect imaging reference standard studies^{48,49} 184 patients its diagnostic values ranged 55-96%, 4-44.4% & 0.7-1.3.

Clinical tests for infraspinatus and Teres minor

Five clinical tests such as ERLS, Patte's sign, Hornblower's sign, infraspinatus drop sign and scapular retraction test evaluated the infraspinatus and teres minor's pathological association for SAIS. The ERLS and Patte's sign were investigated in both surgical and indirect imaging reference standards. In surgical reference standard, ERLS was in one study⁵⁸ 115 patients its diagnostic utility ranges from 21.5%, 92% and 2.6 respectively in contrast in indirect imaging criterion standard, ERLS was in 3 studies^{48,49,57} total 284 patients and its diagnostic utility values range from 45-100%, 18.2-92% and 0.9-12.5. Whereas, Patte's sign in a single surgical reference criterion study⁵⁸ total 115 shoulders and its diagnostic utility values range 77.5%, 33% and 1.2, in contrast in indirect imaging criterion standard, Patte's sign was in a single study⁵⁷ total 100 patients and its diagnostic utility values range from 93%, 72% and 3.3. The Hornblower's sign and scapular retraction test were investigated in a single surgical reference criterion study⁵⁸ 115 shoulders its diagnostic values ranges from 19-

54%, 63-93% & 1.5-3.6, whereas infraspinatus drop sign in a single indirect imaging reference standard study⁴⁸ 104 sample its diagnostic values range 45%, 70% and 1.5 respectively.

DISCUSSION

This study goal is to investigate the diagnostic accuracy of clinical tests for involving differential diagnosis of SAIS. This review assessed studies that examined the clinical test's diagnostic utility when compared to the reference criterion either surgical or indirect imaging diagnostic reference standard.

Summary of principal findings

This review included 14 studies in total 1756 shoulders and considered a number of standard, modified and novel clinical tests for making a differential diagnosis of SAIS. In this review, the overall methodological quality is high. The 10 included studies were examined against the surgical reference criterion, which is called "gold standard", whereas 4 studies were carried out against indirect imaging diagnostic reference standard. A number of clinical tests (n=17) diagnostic accuracy was examined to rotator cuff pathology associated with SAIS and only 3 clinical tests found that had been directly assessed for diagnosing SAIS. Furthermore, the majority of included studies investigated for all 3 stages of SAIS pathology from subacromial bursitis, partial to full-thickness of rotator cuffs.

This narrative descriptive review suggests based on their positive likelihood⁴⁴ subacromial grinding and modified Neer clinical tests for "ruling in" SAIS because these 2 clinical tests have + LR > 10 it is relatively high diagnostic utility⁴⁴. However, the subacromial grinding test (+LR-) was evaluated against the surgical reference standard and modified Neer's test (+LR-) was investigated in an indirect imaging reference criterion. The lift-off (17.5), bear-hug (28.4) and belly-off (10.3) tests were assessed against the surgical reference standard and these tests + LR in the maximal category. Therefore, this indicates that patients are more likely to have subscapularis associated SAIS when these 3 clinical tests are positive. To rule in the supraspinatus pathology associated with SAIS can be examined by drop arm test because its +LR (7.25) in the moderate classification; however it was assessed against indirect imaging standard. Whereas, hug-up, full can and empty can tests diagnostic accuracy were investigated against the surgical reference standard, but their +LR between 2 to 5 in the minimal classification. The ERLS test has higher (12.5) +LR and suggests for ruling the infraspinatus associated SAIS when this test is positive. However, it was assessed against the indirect imaging reference standard whereas, Hornblower's sign test diagnostic accuracy was examined against the surgical reference standard, but their +LR (6.6) in the moderate classification.

Study Limitations

This review has limitations. Firstly, the majority of the included articles hadn't provided raw data (true positives, false positives, true negatives, and false negative) for constructing 2 by 2 table therefore; this review was not performed in the meta-analysis. Secondly, this review primary intention was to investigate the diagnostic accuracy of clinical tests in primary care clinical setting as shoulder pain are the third most common complaint of musculoskeletal disorders in primary care clinical settings¹⁰, where the majority of shoulder pain is conservatively managed by general practitioners and physiotherapists⁶. Unfortunately, in this review only 2 studies examined in primary care clinics and the remaining 12 studies explored the diagnostic accuracy of SAIS and rotator cuff associated pathological involvement clinical tests in specialist clinics. In this setting, the clinical examination is performed by various clinicians including medical surgeons and rheumatologists. This review included studies' overall quality range was from moderate to good because in the included 14 studies, 11 studies' overall methodological quality score was greater than 10 out of 14. However, the primary concerns with methodological quality relate to the time delay between the clinical test and the reference test, and it is unclear in many studies whether the assessors were blinded to the outcome of the index and reference tests. The previous systematic review⁵⁹ on similar topic also has limitations in these both aspects.

There is a need for future prospective cohort studies in primary care settings, get rid of time delay and ensure double blinded process between the clinical test and reference tests to examine the diagnostic accuracy of these clinical tests.

Current context and future research recommendations

The international guidelines recommend that clinical tests such as the Neer's sign, Hawkins-Kennedy test, and drop arm test may be helpful as a part of the clinical examination. In addition to that, a previous systematic review's meta-analysis on the similar topic concludes that the lift-off test has the highest diagnostic utility for ruling in SAIS when the test is positive. In this review, there appears to be a diagnostic utility of subacromial grinding test, lift-off, bear-hug and belly-off tests that provides evidence to rule in SAIS when the tests are positive. In order to confirm the reliability, validity and diagnostic accuracy of these clinical tests further studies are essential based on larger sample sizes, a reduced time delay between the index and reference tests studies and minimising risks of bias.

CONCLUSION

The SAIS has high prevalence pathology among shoulder disorders however; it can be often challenging clinicians to have an accurate diagnosis on it. This is an updated study of previous systematic reviews related to evaluating the accuracy of clinical tests for diagnosing SAIS. Making a precise differential diagnosis will ultimately ensure the appropriate therapeutic interventions, subsequently successful prognosis on SAIS patient thus, the diagnostic utility of the subacromial grinding test, lift-off, bear-hug and belly-off tests clinical tests need to be considered in the context of the clinical practice of the overall patient assessment.

REFERENCES

1. Briggs, A. M. et al. Musculoskeletal Health Conditions Represent a Global Threat to Healthy Aging: A Report for the 2015 World Health Organization World Report on Ageing and Health. *Gerontologist* 2016;56(2):243-55.
2. Hay, S. I. et al. Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life-years for 333 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet* 2017; 390:1260-344.
3. Marinho, F. et al. Burden of disease in Brazil, 1990–2016: a systematic subnational analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet* 2018;392:760-75.
4. Brennan-Olsen, S. L. et al. Prevalence of arthritis according to age, sex and socioeconomic status in six low and middle-income countries: Analysis of data from the World Health Organization study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE) Wave 1. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 2017.
5. Pribicevic, M. The Epidemiology of Shoulder Pain: A Narrative Review of the Literature. *Pain in Perspective* 2012.
6. Van Hecke, O., Torrance, N. and Smith, B. H. Chronic pain epidemiology and its clinical relevance. *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 2013 111(1):13-18.
7. Artus M, van der Windt DA, Afolabi EK, et al Management of shoulder pain by UK general practitioners (GPs): A national survey *BMJ Open* 2017;7: 571.
8. Steuri R, Sattelmayer M, Elsig S, et al. Effectiveness of conservative interventions including exercise, manual therapy and medical management in adults with shoulder impingement: a

- systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(18):1340-47.
9. Rahul, B., Kimberely, E. and Angus,W. Does arthroscopic sub-acromial decompression really work for sub-acromial impingement syndrome: A cohort study. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 2014;15:324.
 10. Consigliere, P. et al. Subacromial impingement syndrome: Management challenges. *Orthopedic Research and Reviews* 2018;10:83-91.
 11. Mohamed Faisal, C. K. and Mathias, L. Variations in prevalence and intensity of work related musculoskeletal disorders in different departments among dental professionals. *International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences* 2014;5:688-99.
 12. Marinho, F. et al. ‘Burden of disease in Brazil, 1990–2016: a systematic subnational analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016’, *The Lancet* 2018.
 13. Hoy, D. G. et al. ‘The global burden of musculoskeletal conditions for 2010: An overview of methods’, *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2014.
 14. Bhattacharyya R, Edwards K, Wallace AW. Does arthroscopic sub-acromial decompression really work for sub-acromial impingement syndrome: a cohort study? *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2014;15:324-28.
 15. Palmer, K. T. et al. Effectiveness of community- and workplace-based interventions to manage musculoskeletal-related sickness absence and job loss: A systematic review. *Rheumatology* 2014;51:230-42.
 16. Briggs, A. M. et al. Reducing the global burden of musculoskeletal conditions. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2018;96:366-68.
 17. Sedeek, S.M. Subacromial impingement syndrome: Review article. *Hard Tissue* 2013;2:39.
 18. Diercks, R. et al. Guideline for diagnosis and treatment of subacromial pain syndrome: a multidisciplinary review by the Dutch Orthopaedic Association. *Acta orthopaedica*. 2014;85:314-22.
 19. Kulkarni, R. et al. Subacromial shoulder pain. *Shoulder and Elbow* 2015.
 20. Neer CS.. 1972 2nd Anterior acromioplasty for the chronic impingement syndrome in the shoulder: a preliminary report. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 54(1):41–50.
 21. Manske RC, Grant-Nierman M, Lucas B. Shoulder posterior internal impingement in the overhead athlete. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*. 2013;8:194-204.
 22. Clausen, M., Witten, A., Holm, K. et al. Glenohumeral and scapulothoracic strength impairments

- exists in patients with subacromial impingement, but these are not reflected in the shoulder pain and disability index. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2017;18:302.
23. Holdaway, L.A., Hegmann, K.T., Thiese, M.S. et al. Is sleep position associated with glenohumeral shoulder pain and rotator cuff tendinopathy: a cross-sectional study *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2018;19, 408.
 24. McFarland, E. G. et al. Impingement is not impingement: the case for calling it “Rotator Cuff Disease”. *Muscle Ligaments and Tendons Journal* 2019.
 25. Dhillon, K. S. Subacromial impingement syndrome of the shoulder: A musculoskeletal disorder or a medical myth?. *Malaysian Orthopaedic Journal* 2019;13,1-7.
 26. Seitz, A. L. Mechanisms of Rotator Cuff Disease: Alterations of Scapular Kinematics on Subacromial Space. Virginia Commonwealth University 2010.
 27. James, S. L. et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 Diseases and Injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *The Lancet* 2018;392,1789-858.
 28. Garving C, Jakob S, Bauer I, Nadjari R, Brunner UH. Impingement Syndrome of the Shoulder. *Dtsch Arztebl Int.* 2017;11:765-76.
 29. Faltus, J. Optimal therapeutic management of chronic shoulder dysfunction. *Athletic Therapy Today* 2010 15,4-7.
 30. Oyedokun A, Adeloye D, Balogun O. Clinical history-taking and physical examination in medical practice in Africa: still relevant?. *Croat Med J.* 2016;57:605-07.
 31. Cadogan, A. et al. Diagnostic accuracy of clinical examination features for identifying large rotator cuff tears in primary health care. *Journal of Manual and Manipulative Therapy* 2013;21:148-59.
 32. Biederwolf, N. E. A proposed evidence-based shoulder special testing examination algorithm: clinical utility based on a systematic review of the literature. *International journal of sports physical therapy* 2013;8, 427-40.
 33. Gismervik, S. et al. Physical examination tests of the shoulder: A systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test performance. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 2017; 18:1-9.
 34. Chew K, Pua YH, Chin J, Clarke M, Wong YS. Clinical predictors for the diagnosis of supraspinatus pathology. *Physiotherapy Singapore* 2010;13:7-12.
 35. Jain NB, Luz J, Higgins LD, et al. The Diagnostic Accuracy of Special Tests for Rotator Cuff

- Tear: The ROW Cohort Study. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2017;96:176-83.
36. Lenza, M. et al. (2013) Magnetic resonance imaging, magnetic resonance arthrography and ultrasonography for assessing rotator cuff tears in people with shoulder pain for whom surgery is being considered. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013.
 37. Bullock, R. et al. Accuracy of magnetic resonance arthrography in detecting rotator cuff tears. *West Indian Medical Journal* 2018;67.
 38. Sambandam, S. N. et al. (2015) Rotator cuff tears: An evidence based approach. *World Journal of Orthopaedics* 2015; 6,902-18.
 39. Whiting, P. et al. QUADAS: the development of a new tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies [abstract]. *XI Cochrane Colloquium: Evidence, Health Care and Culture* 2003; 26-31.
 40. Tacconelli, E. Systematic reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2010;10:226.
 41. Alqarni AM, Schneiders AG, Cook CE, Hendrick PA. Clinical tests to diagnose lumbar spondylolysis and spondylolisthesis: A systematic review. *Phys Ther Sport* 2015;16:268-75.
 42. Schneiders AG, Sullivan SJ, Hendrick PA, et al. The ability of clinical tests to diagnose stress fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2012;42:760-71.
 43. Habibzadeh, Farrokh; Habibzadeh, Parham. The likelihood ratio and its graphical representation. *Biochemical Medical* 2012; 29:193-99.
 44. Baeyens JP, Serrien B, Goossens M, Clijsen R. Questioning the "SPIN and SNOUT" rule in clinical testing. *Archives of Physiotherapy*. 2019 ;9:4.
 45. Sawalha, S. and Fischer, J. The accuracy of "subacromial grind test" in diagnosis of supraspinatus rotator cuff tears. *International Journal of Shoulder Surgery* 2015; 9:43-46.
 46. Guosheng, Y. et al. The diagnostic value of a modified Neer test in identifying subacromial impingement syndrome. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Traumatology*. Springer Paris 2017;27,1063-67.
 47. Liu, Y. L. et al. The Hug-up Test: A New, Sensitive Diagnostic Test for Supraspinatus Tears. *Chinese medical journal* 2016;129,147-53.
 48. Bak, K. et al. The Value of Clinical Tests in Acute Full-Thickness Tears of the Supraspinatus Tendon: Does a Subacromial Lidocaine Injection Help in the Clinical Diagnosis? A Prospective

- Study. Arthroscopy Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery. Elsevier Inc 2010; 26:734-42.
49. Kelly, S. M., Brittle, N. and Allen, G. M. The value of physical tests for subacromial impingement syndrome: A study of diagnostic accuracy. Clinical Rehabilitation. 2010;24:149-58.
50. Fowler, E. M., Horsley, I. G. and Rolf, C. G. Clinical and arthroscopic findings in recreationally active patients. Sports Medicine, Arthroscopy, Rehabilitation, Therapy and Technology 2010; 2,1.
51. Takeda, Y. et al. Diagnostic Value of the Supine Napoleon Test for Subscapularis Tendon Lesions', Arthroscopy - Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery. Arthroscopy Association of North America 2016;32, 2459-65.
52. Yoon, J. P. et al. Diagnostic value of four clinical tests for the evaluation of subscapularis integrity. Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery 2013; 22: 1186-92.
53. Kappe, T. et al. Diagnostic performance of clinical tests for subscapularis tendon tears. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy. Springer Berlin Heidelberg 2018;26:176-81.
54. Lin, L. et al. Internal rotation resistance test at abduction and external rotation: a new clinical test for diagnosing subscapularis lesions. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy 2015; 23:1247-52.
55. Bartsch, M. et al. Diagnostic values of clinical tests for subscapularis lesions. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology. Arthroscopy 2010;18:1712-17.
56. Sgroi, M. et al. Diagnostic Value of Clinical Tests for Supraspinatus Tendon Tears. Arthroscopy - Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery. Arthroscopy Association of North America 2019;35:1339-47.
57. Collin, P. et al. What is the Best Clinical Test for Assessment of the Teres Minor in Massive Rotator Cuff Tears?. Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research 2015;473:2959-66.
58. Sgroi, M. et al. Diagnostic Value of Clinical Tests for Infraspinatus Tendon Tears', Arthroscopy - Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery. Arthroscopy Association of North America 2018;34:2326-33.