

1 **Effectiveness of early versus delayed rehabilitation following**  
2 **rotator cuff repair: systematic review and meta-analyses**

3

4 Bruno Mazuquin<sup>1\*</sup>, Maria Moffatt<sup>1</sup>, Peter Gill<sup>1,2</sup>, James Selfe<sup>1</sup>, Jonathan Rees<sup>3</sup>,  
5 Steve Drew<sup>4</sup>, Chris Littlewood<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Health professions, Faculty of Health, Psychology and Social  
8 care, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom.

9 <sup>2</sup> Northern Care Alliance NHS Group, Manchester, United Kingdom.

10 <sup>3</sup> Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal  
11 Science, University of Oxford and NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre,  
12 Oxford, United Kingdom.

13 <sup>4</sup> University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire, Coventry, United Kingdom.

14

15 \* Corresponding author

16 Email: [b.mazuquin@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:b.mazuquin@mmu.ac.uk)

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 **Objective:** To investigate the effectiveness of early rehabilitation compared with  
19 delayed/standard rehabilitation after rotator cuff repair for pain, function, range  
20 of movement, strength, and repair integrity.

21 **Design:** Systematic review and meta-analyses.

22 **Methods:** We searched databases and included randomised controlled trials  
23 (RCTs) comparing early with delayed/standard rehabilitation for patients  
24 undergoing rotator cuff repair surgery. We assessed risk of bias of the RCTs  
25 using the Cochrane RoB 2 tool.

26 **Results:** Twenty RCTs, with 1841 patients, were included. The majority of the  
27 RCTs were of high or unclear risk of overall bias. We found substantial  
28 variations in the rehabilitation programmes, time in the sling and timing of  
29 exercise progression. We found no statistically significant differences for pain  
30 and function at any follow-up except for the outcome measure Single  
31 Assessment Numeric Evaluation at six months (MD: 6.54; 95%CI: 2.24-10.84)  
32 in favour of early rehabilitation. We found statistically significant differences in  
33 favour of early rehabilitation for shoulder flexion at six weeks (MD: 7.36; 95%CI:  
34 2.66-12.06), three (MD: 8.45; 95%CI: 3.43-13.47) and six months (MD: 3.57;  
35 95%CI: 0.81-6.32) and one year (MD: 1.42; 95%CI: 0.21-2.64) and similar  
36 differences for other planes of movement. In terms of repair integrity at one  
37 year, regarding early mobilisation, the number needed to harm was 651.

38 **Discussion:** Current approaches to early mobilisation, based largely on early  
39 introduction of passive movement, did not demonstrate significant differences in  
40 most clinical outcomes, although we found statistically significant differences in

41 favour of early rehabilitation for range of movement. Importantly, there were no  
42 differences in repair integrity between early and delayed/standard rehabilitation.  
43 Most rehabilitation programmes did not consider early active movement as soon  
44 as the patient feels able. With ongoing variation in rehabilitation protocols there  
45 remains a need for large high quality RCT to inform the optimal approach to  
46 rehabilitation after rotator cuff repair surgery.

47

48

## 49 INTRODUCTION

50 Shoulder pain is experienced by one in four people at any one time (1) and is  
51 one of the most common musculoskeletal pain presentations (2). Tears of the  
52 rotator cuff, the muscles and tendons that closely surround the shoulder joint,  
53 are a common cause of shoulder pain (1). Many people with symptomatic  
54 rotator cuff tears can be successfully managed non-surgically; where this  
55 treatment proves insufficient, surgery to repair the torn rotator cuff might be  
56 offered (3). However, as the number of operations to repair the rotator cuff  
57 increases and surgical techniques advance, there are ongoing uncertainties  
58 about the optimal approach to postoperative rehabilitation, a key component of  
59 the recovery process (4).

60 A recent international survey of practice reported that postoperative  
61 rehabilitation has not evolved over the last two decades (5). A generally  
62 cautious approach to standard postoperative rehabilitation still remains, and  
63 includes sling immobilisation for several weeks (6). In 2018 a systematic review  
64 (7) was published that reported conflicting evidence in relation to early versus  
65 delayed/standard rehabilitation following rotator cuff repair. The meta-analyses  
66 suggested that early mobilisation did not provide additional clinical benefit in  
67 terms of pain or function, although recovery of range of movement of movement  
68 was more rapid. It also reported no statistically significant difference in repair  
69 integrity, which is one of the historical concerns for this surgery and the  
70 justification for cautious approaches to postoperative rehabilitation. However,  
71 most of the randomised controlled trials (RCTs) included in the review were  
72 rated as presenting a high risk of bias and data for large tears were lacking.

73 A number of new RCTs (eight) have been published recently providing the  
74 opportunity for an up to date evidence. Our aim was to investigate the  
75 effectiveness of early compared to standard or delayed rehabilitation following  
76 rotator cuff repair for pain, function, range of movement, strength and repair  
77 integrity.

78

## 79 **METHODS**

80 We reported the systematic review according to the Preferred Reporting Items  
81 for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (8). The protocol was  
82 registered in the International prospective register of systematic reviews  
83 database (PROSPERO) - PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020209330.

### 84 **Eligibility criteria**

85 We included studies that met the following criteria:

86 - Design: RCT

87 - Participants: patients aged 18 years or older who had undergone surgical  
88 repair of the rotator cuff

89 - Intervention and comparison: early rehabilitation compared with delayed  
90 rehabilitation (as per study definitions).

91 - Outcomes: pain, function, range of movement, strength and repair integrity.

### 92 **Search**

93 We searched MEDLINE, CINAHL, Scopus, SPORTDiscus, SciELO and the  
94 Cochrane Library for relevant papers from inception to December 2020. We

95 decided not to limit the searches by date of publication to identify other RCTs  
96 that could be relevant but were not included in the previous version. The  
97 electronic search strategies were supplemented by hand searching the  
98 reference lists and citations of the included RCTs. There was no restriction to  
99 date or language of publication. For the search strategies, we combined MeSH  
100 terms and keywords such as: rotator cuff, shoulder, shoulder joint, rehabilitation,  
101 physiotherapy, immobilisation and RCT. The detailed search strategy is  
102 available in the supplementary file 1.

### 103 **Screening**

104 Searches results were imported to Rayyan (<https://rayyan.qcri.org>) where  
105 removal of duplicates and screening for eligibility was undertaken by two  
106 independent authors (BM and MM). Studies were first screened by their titles  
107 and abstracts; the full text was retrieved if further information was needed for a  
108 decision.

### 109 **Data extraction**

110 Data was extracted by one author (BM) and reviewed by a second author (PG)  
111 using a pre-established Excel template. Data extraction included author names,  
112 year of publication, country, participants characteristics, characteristics of the  
113 intervention and comparator, tools used for outcomes assessment, results for  
114 the variables of interest and public and patient involvement and engagement  
115 activities. In case of missing data, we contacted the authors via email to request  
116 additional available data.

### 117 **Risk of bias and grading of evidence**

118 The risk of bias of the included RCTs was assessed by one author (BM) and  
119 reviewed by a second author (MM) using the Cochrane risk of bias tool (RoB2)  
120 (9). The Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and  
121 Evaluation (GRADE) framework and GRADEpro GDT (10) software were used  
122 to rate the certainty of the effect. Outcomes were rated and downgraded  
123 according to the presence or absence of factors (risk of bias, inconsistency,  
124 indirectness, imprecision) affecting the quality of the body of RCTs included in  
125 each outcome.

### 126 **Measurement of treatments effect**

127 We generated meta-analyses and forest plots using RevMan 5 (The Nordic  
128 Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark)(11). The meta-analyses were  
129 presented according to the different outcome measures used, for example  
130 American Shoulder and Elbow Score (ASES), and follow-up timing. Continuous  
131 data was expressed as mean difference and 95% confidence interval. For  
132 dichotomous outcomes, the odds ratio was used with 95% confidence interval.  
133 As re-tear or failure to heal, indicative of repair integrity, is regarded as an  
134 unfavourable outcome, we also calculated the Absolute Risk Increase and  
135 Number Needed to Harm (NNH) for the repair integrity data. Statistical  
136 heterogeneity was tested using the  $I^2$  test. In addition, we observed variation in  
137 the rehabilitation protocols for exercise dosage and time in the sling; therefore,  
138 we used the random effects methods for the meta-analyses. Funnel plots were  
139 not created to check for heterogeneity and bias as this is not recommended  
140 where meta-analyses have fewer than 10 RCTs (12, 13).

141

## 142 **RESULTS**

### 143 **Study selection**

144 Initially 2142 records were found, after removing duplicates 1805 studies were  
145 screened. Of these, 22 were selected for full text review. Another two studies  
146 were excluded due to wrong interventions: Baumgarten, Osborn (14)  
147 investigated the use of pulley exercises at six weeks and Michael, König (15)  
148 explored the effect of continuous passive movement and physiotherapy versus  
149 physiotherapy alone. Twenty RCTs were eligible for inclusion; in total, 13 RCTs  
150 were included in the meta-analyses (**Figure 1**).

151

152 **Figure 1.** PRISMA diagram for studies selection.

153

### 154 **Study characteristics**

155 Participants mean age ranged from 54 to 65.4 years. Sample sizes varied from  
156 18 to 206 participants; only nine out of the 20 RCTs (45%) reported a sample  
157 size calculation and the majority, 16/20 (80%), recruited patients from a single  
158 hospital. The total number of patients from the 20 RCTs was 1841. Only eight of  
159 20 RCTs included patients with large tears (3, 16-22). There was variation in the  
160 use of single or double row repairs as well as additional surgical procedures  
161 such as subacromial decompression, acromioclavicular joint excision and  
162 biceps tenodesis. Further details are available in supplementary file 2.

### 163 **Risk of bias**

164 Figure 2 summarises the results of the risk of bias assessment. Supplementary  
165 file 3 reports the risk of bias assessment of each RCT. Most RCTs were rated  
166 as of unclear or high risk of bias for randomisation process and overall bias.

167

168 **Figure 2.** Risk of bias summary.

169

### 170 **Rehabilitation protocols**

171 The method of immobilisation after rotator cuff repair was variable. The majority  
172 of the RCTs (3, 19, 20, 23-30)(11/20, 55%) reported the use of a standard sling,  
173 six RCTs (18, 21, 22, 31-33) used a sling with an abduction component and one  
174 RCT (34) used a standard sling for the early group and a sling with an  
175 abduction component for the delayed group. The time in the sling was also  
176 variable; eight RCTs (40%) (18, 21, 23-26, 29, 32) used a six-week period for  
177 both groups. Three RCTs prescribed a sling for the early group to be used for  
178 comfort only and discarded as the patient felt appropriate (3, 19, 20). One RCT  
179 did not prescribe a sling for those in the early group (30).

180 Exercise progression was similar across RCTs, starting with passive exercises,  
181 moving to active-assisted, active and then resisted exercise. However, there  
182 was variation in the timing for the exercise progression and information about  
183 frequency and intensity of exercises. All studies had a time driven protocol at all  
184 stages except Littlewood, Bateman (3), Sheps, Bouliane (19), Sheps, Silveira  
185 (20). Littlewood, Bateman (3) used a patient-led approach using acceptable  
186 symptom response to prescribe and progress exercises, regardless of the  
187 postoperative time. Sheps, Bouliane (19) used a similar protocol to Littlewood,

188 Bateman (3); however, there is limited information about the protocol after six  
189 weeks postoperative. Sheps, Silveira (20) also used a patient-led approach but  
190 only pain-free active movements were permitted but exercise progression was  
191 based on the number of weeks postoperative. More details about the  
192 rehabilitation programmes are available in supplementary file 4.

193

## 194 **Outcomes**

### 195 ***Pain at rest***

196 Meta-analyses for pain at rest, measured with the visual analogue scale, were  
197 possible at six weeks, three and six months, and one- and two-years follow-up.  
198 No statistically significant differences were found for any comparisons (Table 1).  
199 Figures 3 and 4 shows the forest plots at six weeks and three months,  
200 respectively. All forest plots for meta-analyses in Tables 1-4 that are not shown  
201 in the main text are available in supplementary file 5. The GRADE summary of  
202 findings with reasons for downgrading the certainty of effect is available in  
203 supplementary file 6.

204

205

206

207

208

209

210 **Table 1.** Meta-analyses of pain at rest by visual analogue scale (A negative

Outcome measure	Follow-up	Number of studies	Total sample size	Effect estimate MD [95% CI]	P value	GRADE
Visual Analogue Scale <sup>1</sup>						
	6 weeks	6	707	0.39 [-1.35, 2.13]	0.66	Low
	3 months	6	692	-0.04 [-0.36, 0.29]	0.83	High
	6 months	7	722	-0.06 [-0.30, 0.18]	0.62	High
	1 year	4	521	-0.10 [-0.35, 0.15]	0.45	High
	2 years	4	551	0.11 [-0.12, 0.35]	0.34	High

211 effect estimate favours early rehabilitation).

212 MD: mean difference, CI: confidence interval

213 <sup>1</sup>Scale from 0-10, a lower value is a better outcome.

214

215 **Figure 3.** Meta-analysis of pain level at six weeks.

216 **Figure 4.** Meta-analysis of pain level at three months.

### 217 **Function**

218 There was variation in the use of composite measures of shoulder pain and  
219 function and outcome measures for shoulder function. Given the wide range of  
220 data available, we combined studies according to the outcome measure used.

221 Meta-analyses were possible for the ASES score (three and six months, and  
222 one and two years), Constant-Murley score (CM) (three and six months, and  
223 one and two years), Single Assessment Numeric Evaluation (SANE) (three and  
224 six months), Simple Shoulder Test (three and six months, and one year) and  
225 Western Ontario Rotator Cuff Index (three and six months, and one year).

226 There were no statistically significant differences for any outcome measures at  
227 any follow-up except for the SANE at six months in favour of early rehabilitation  
228 (Table 2). Overall, the mean differences were small in the short- and long-term  
229 follow-ups as illustrated in Figures 5 and 6 for the ASES. Other outcome

230 measures used by RCTs included the Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and  
 231 Hand, Oxford Shoulder Score, Shoulder Pain and Disability Index and  
 232 University of California Los Angeles shoulder rating scale. The certainty of  
 233 effects ranged from very low to moderate (Table 2).

234 **Table 2.** Meta-analyses of function by outcome measures (A positive effect  
 235 estimates favours early rehabilitation).

Outcome measure	Follow-up	Number of studies	Total sample size	Effect estimate MD [95% CI]	P value	GRADE
American Shoulder and Elbow score <sup>1</sup>						
	3 months	3	243	3.43 [-1.07, 7.92]	0.14	Moderate
	6 months	4	365	-0.26 [-4.76, 4.25]	0.91	Moderate
	1 year	4	441	-0.57 [-2.39, 1.25]	0.54	Low
	2 years	2	202	-2.67 [-6.35, 1.02]	0.16	Moderate
Constant-Murley score <sup>1</sup>						
	3 months	4	313	3.18 [-1.53, 7.90]	0.19	Low
	6 months	6	513	1.19 [-1.33, 3.71]	0.35	High
	1 year	5	559	-1.18 [-2.62, 0.25]	0.11	Low
	2 years	2	202	-1.80 [-5.10, 1.49]	0.28	Moderate

**Continue**

236 **Table 2 (continue).** Meta-analyses of function by outcome measures.

<b>Outcome measure</b>	<b>Follow-up</b>	<b>Number of studies</b>	<b>Total sample size</b>	<b>Effect estimate MD [95% CI]</b>	<b>P value</b>	<b>GRADE</b>
Single Assessment Numeric Evaluation <sup>1</sup>						
	3 months	2	138	2.23 [-4.62, 9.07]	0.52	Moderate
	6 months	2	138	6.54 [2.24, 10.84]	0.003	Moderate
Simple Shoulder Test <sup>2</sup>						
	3 months	2	163	-0.77 [-2.82, 1.28]	0.46	Very low
	6 months	3	277	0.63 [-0.36, 1.62]	0.21	Moderate
	1 year	3	277	0.39 [-0.40, 1.18]	0.33	Moderate
Western Ontario Rotator Cuff Index <sup>1</sup>						
	3 months	2	309	-1.82 [-5.96, 2.32]	0.39	Moderate
	6 months	2	305	-1.29 [-5.17, 2.59]	0.52	Moderate
	1 year	2	300	-1.91 [-5.21, 1.40]	0.26	Moderate

237 MD: mean difference, CI: confidence interval

238 <sup>1</sup>Scale from 0-100, a higher value is a better outcome.

239 <sup>2</sup>Scale from 0-12, a higher value is a better outcome.

240

241 **Figure 5.** Forest plot of function at 3 months by American Shoulder and Elbow

242 Surgery score.

243 **Figure 6.** Forest plot of function at 1 year by American Shoulder and Elbow  
244 Surgery score.

245

246 ***Range of movement***

247 Meta-analyses were possible for shoulder flexion, abduction, external rotation at  
248 90° of abduction and internal rotation at 90° of abduction at six weeks, three and  
249 six months, and one and two years. All measurements were made using a  
250 goniometer. Statistically significant differences were found for flexion at six  
251 weeks, three and six months and one year, abduction at six weeks, external  
252 rotation at three and six months and internal rotation at six weeks, three and six  
253 months (Table 3). The certainty of effects ranged from very low to high.

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266 **Table 3.** Meta-analyses of range of movement by movement (A positive effect  
 267 estimates favours early rehabilitation).

Outcome measure	Follow-up	Number of studies	Total sample size	Effect estimate MD [95% CI]	P value	GRADE
Flexion <sup>1</sup>						
	6 weeks	6	753	7.36 [2.66, 12.06]	0.002	High
	3 months	10	1030	8.45 [3.43, 13.47]	0.001	Low
	6 months	12	1275	3.57 [0.81, 6.32]	0.01	Low
	1 year	9	1062	1.42 [0.21, 2.64]	0.02	Moderate
	2 years	4	543	1.61 [-1.11, 4.33]	0.25	High
Abduction <sup>1</sup>						
	6 weeks	4	615	6.82 [2.30, 11.33]	0.003	Moderate
	3 months	5	581	6.68 [-1.47, 14.83]	0.11	Low
	6 months	5	574	1.14 [-2.78, 5.05]	0.57	Low
	1 year	4	529	0.05 [-4.04, 4.14]	0.98	Moderate
	2 years	2	341	-1.73 [-7.41, 3.94]	0.55	Moderate

*Continue*

268

269

270 **Table 3 (continue).** Meta-analyses of range of movement by movement.

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Follow-</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Effect</b>	<b>P value</b>	<b>GRADE</b>
<b>measure</b>	<b>up</b>	<b>of</b>	<b>sample</b>	<b>estimate</b>		
		<b>studies</b>	<b>size</b>	<b>MD [95%</b>		
				<b>CI]</b>		
External rotation at 90° abduction <sup>2</sup>						
	6 weeks	5	633	2.06 [-2.65,	0.39	Moderate
				6.76]		
	3 months	8	805	8.11 [3.85,	<0.001	Moderate
				12.36]		
	6 months	9	964	1.77 [-0.05,	0.06	Low
				3.60]		
	1 year	7	839	0.76 [-2.01,	0.59	Low
				3.53]		
	2 years	3	461	-0.70 [-5.69,	0.78	Moderate
				4.28]		
Internal rotation at 90° abduction <sup>3</sup>						
	6 weeks	3	495	3.34 [0.40,	0.03	High
				6.28]		
	3 months	4	461	8.19 [0.99,	0.03	Very low
				15.39]		
	6 months	5	620	3.60 [0.06,	0.05	Low
				7.13]		
	1 year	4	580	1.26 [-1.64,	0.39	Low
				4.15]		
	2 year	2	341	0.54 [-2.39,	0.72	Moderate
				3.46]		

271 <sup>1</sup> Scale from 0-180, a higher value is a better outcome.

272 <sup>2</sup> Scale from 0-90, a higher value is a better outcome.

273 <sup>3</sup> Scale from 0-70, a higher value is a better outcome.

274 ***Strength***

275 Nine RCTs reported muscle strength (18-21, 23, 26-29). Due to heterogeneity  
276 of testing position and data reporting, we did not pool the data into meta-  
277 analyses. Six RCTs used a hand-held dynamometer (18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 29);  
278 other instruments included isokinetic dynamometer, tensiometer and the  
279 strength composite of the CM. The follow-up assessment ranged from six  
280 weeks to two years. Muscle strength was tested for flexion (five RCTs)(18, 20,  
281 21, 26, 27), abduction (four RCTs)(19-21, 26), internal (four RCTs)(18, 21, 27,  
282 28) and external rotation (six RCTS) (18, 21, 26-29). All RCTs reported that  
283 both groups improved in strength; another consistent finding across all RCTs  
284 was that no statistically significant differences between group were found for  
285 any strength test at any follow-up assessed.

286 ***Repair integrity***

287 Meta-analyses were possible for three and six months and one-year follow-up.  
288 Only Arndt, Clavert (23) used a CT arthroscopy to assess the repair integrity, all  
289 other RCTs used ultrasound or MRI scan. There were no statistically significant  
290 differences between groups at any follow-up. At one year, the number needed  
291 to harm (NNH) was 42.5. We carried out a sensitivity analysis for the one-year  
292 meta-analysis by including only RCTs with overall low risk of bias. The  
293 sensitivity analysis showed a reduction in the odds ratio from 1.26 (95% CI:  
294 0.82-1.93) (Figure 7) to 1.05 (95% CI: 0.64 – 1.75) (Figure 8); the NNH  
295 increased to 651. The certainty of effects ranged from low to moderate.

296

297

298 **Table 4.** Meta-analyses of repair integrity (re-tear events).

Outcome	Follow-up	Number of studies	Total sample size	Effect Estimate OR [95% CI]	P value	GRADE
Repair integrity						
	3 months	2	168	0.94 [0.39, 2.27]	0.92	Moderate
	6 months	3	221	1.34 [0.59, 3.04]	0.48	Moderate
	1 year	8	960	1.26 [0.82, 1.93]	0.29	Low

299 OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

300

301 **Figure 7.** Meta-analysis of repair integrity (re-tear events) at 1 year.

302 **Figure 8.** Sensitivity meta-analysis of repair integrity (re-tear events) at 1 year.

303

### 304 **Complications**

305 Overall, the number of complications were low. Nine RCTs (3, 19, 20, 22, 23,  
306 26, 27, 30, 34) reported post-operative complications. The most common  
307 complication, reported in five RCTs (19, 20, 22, 23, 34), was related to limited  
308 shoulder range of movement. Jenssen, Lundgreen (34) reported two cases of  
309 capsulitis in the early group and none in the delayed group. Sheps, Silveira (20)  
310 found one case of frozen shoulder in the early group and two cases in the  
311 delayed group. Koh, Lim (22) found no difference in the proportion of patients  
312 with stiffness (defined as having any one of the following three : forward

313 elevation of  $<120^\circ$ , internal rotation lower than L3, and/or external rotation with  
314 the arm at the side of  $<20^\circ$ ) at three months postoperatively (early: 53% vs  
315 delayed: 50%). However, at 2 years follow-up the proportion of patients with  
316 shoulder stiffness in the delayed group (38%, n= 18/48) was greater than the  
317 early group (18%, n=7/40). Arndt, Clavert (23) and Sheps, Bouliane (19) did not  
318 report the number of patients with complications by group. Other complications  
319 reported included deep and superficial infection, loose anchors, suture pull-out,  
320 persistent shoulder pain, biceps subluxation, detached biceps tendon, deep  
321 vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism; no differences between groups were  
322 observed for these other complications.

### 323 ***Patient and public involvement***

324 The only RCT to describe the participation of patients in the study development  
325 was Littlewood, Bateman (3). Their patient and public involvement and  
326 engagement activities involved three meetings facilitated by the lead  
327 researcher. The group supported the co-production of patient-facing materials  
328 and development of study processes such as recruitment and informed  
329 consent. They also had a patient representative as part of their trial  
330 management group (35).

331

## 332 **DISCUSSION**

333 We aimed to summarise the effectiveness of early compared to  
334 delayed/standard rehabilitation following rotator cuff repair on clinical outcomes  
335 and repair integrity. We found no statistically significant differences for pain. For  
336 function, the only statistically significant difference was for the SANE at six

337 months in favour of early rehabilitation (MD:6.54, 95%CI:2.24, 10.84, p=0.003).

338 The mean difference found for outcome measures for function were small and  
339 did not reach the minimal clinically important differences (MCID)(36-38). The  
340 MCID for the SANE for patients undergoing rotator cuff repair is reported to be  
341 16.9 (37). The meta-analyses for range of movement showed statistically  
342 significant differences for flexion, abduction, internal and external rotation,  
343 mainly in the short-term in favour of early rehabilitation. However, similar to  
344 function, the mean differences were small and unlikely to be clinically  
345 significant (39).

346 The majority of RCTs were rated at high risk or unclear for overall bias, this was  
347 mainly due to issues with the randomisation process, but also partially related to  
348 the blinding of personnel and patients, which is not often possible in RCTs  
349 delivering exercises interventions. Risk of bias was one of the main reasons for  
350 downgrading the certainty of the evidence.

351 Despite rotator cuff repair being such a common operation, we observed  
352 substantial variations in the rehabilitation protocols in relation to when patients  
353 were permitted to begin moving their shoulder and timelines for exercise  
354 progression. Almost all RCTs only allowed passive shoulder exercises in the  
355 first few weeks post-surgery for their early rehabilitation groups. Only  
356 Littlewood, Bateman (3), Sheps, Bouliane (19) used an individualised patient-  
357 directed approach, which facilitated a controlled and progressive introduction of  
358 active movements according to an acceptable symptoms response (40). Sheps,  
359 Silveira (20) also used a patient-directed approach; however only pain-free  
360 active movements were allowed and exercise progression was still based on  
361 the number of weeks post-surgery.

362 Restricting to only passive exercises in early postoperative stages may not  
363 provide sufficient load to stimulate and assist tendon healing (41) and,  
364 therefore, may not provide an optimal stimulus for tissue repair and remodelling  
365 to enable patients return to their usual activities, including leisure and work.

366 Only four RCTs had clear distinctions between their groups regarding the sling  
367 usage; three of them prescribed the sling for comfort only and one RCT  
368 recommended patients to not use a sling at all. Although sling immobilisation  
369 has been traditionally viewed by many as important in protecting the tendon to  
370 facilitate healing, its use is open to question. Stephens, Littlewood (42)  
371 interviewed patients who were part of the RaCeR RCT (3), where patients were  
372 supported to remove their sling after rotator cuff repair surgery as soon as they  
373 felt able. They reported that patients who were in the delayed group, and had to  
374 use a sling for four weeks, found that the sling contributed to their pain instead  
375 of relieving it. The restrictions imposed by the sling also impacted patients self-  
376 efficacy and in some cases even their self-identity. In contrast, those patients in  
377 the early group felt more confident and had the perception that moving their  
378 shoulder was contributing to their recovery. Another qualitative study (43)  
379 exploring patients perceptions of rehabilitation after shoulder arthroplasty  
380 reported that the sling, especially when using an abduction component, was  
381 impairing patients sleep. Patients reported that they were unable to sleep  
382 because of the position, itching and temperature changes.

383 One of the main justifications for sling immobilisation and delayed rehabilitation  
384 following rotator cuff repair is the risk to the integrity of the repair, i.e. re-tear or  
385 failure to heal. However, as observed in our meta-analysis of repair integrity at  
386 one-year follow-up with RCTs at low risk of bias, the absolute risk reduction is

387 very small (0.2%) and the NNH is 651. Thus, the chances of a re-tear that is  
388 caused by starting an early controlled and progressive mobilisation of the  
389 shoulder is no higher than delayed/standard rehabilitation and needs to be  
390 considered in the context of the negative effects of immobilisation. There is  
391 debate that for small and medium tears early rehabilitation may be appropriate;  
392 however, for large tears the risk is less acceptable. Subgroups analyses by tear  
393 size was not possible and further recommendations for specific groups cannot  
394 be made. Only eight RCTs included patients with large tears in their sample, but  
395 data reported by tear size were not available. The RCT from Sheps, Silveira  
396 (20) (n=206; low risk of bias), the largest RCT included in our systematic review,  
397 included patients with large tears. They found that despite patients with a large  
398 tear having a higher risk of a re-tear, this risk was not affected by the  
399 postoperative rehabilitation protocol. In contrast, using a sling for weeks may  
400 possibly cause problems such as stiffness and may contribute to further  
401 deconditioning of an already weakened rotator cuff muscle. As observed by  
402 Koh, Lim (22), delaying mobilisation and restricting movement may increase the  
403 risk of patients having range of movement limitations in the long-term.

#### 404 **Strengths and limitations**

405 We followed strict methods for this systematic review. However, the certainty of  
406 effects were affected by the methodological quality of the body of evidence. The  
407 majority of the RCTs were considered of high or unclear overall risk of bias, had  
408 small sample sizes and their definition of early and delayed rehabilitation were  
409 not consistent. Further subgroup analyses were not possible due to the lack of  
410 data reported by tear size. Therefore, our results should be interpreted with

411 caution, especially for large tears where the tendon integrity may be at a higher  
412 risk of failure (44).

### 413 **Implications for clinical practice**

414 Current approaches to early rehabilitation following rotator cuff lead to more  
415 rapid restoration of range of movement and, importantly, based on current data,  
416 risk of re-tear does not seem to be increased.

417 We found substantial variation in the time that patients used a sling, how  
418 exercises were progressed, and a lack of information about exercise dosage.  
419 This limits the ability to make specific clinical recommendations in relation to an  
420 optimal rehabilitation programme.

### 421 **Implications for research**

422 Further large, high-quality RCTs are needed to investigate the effectiveness of  
423 early rehabilitation, particularly in relation to individual, patient-directed  
424 rehabilitation. Future RCTs must ensure that their sample size is of adequate  
425 power to allow for definitive national healthcare recommendations on whether  
426 early rehabilitation is beneficial for different tear sizes, especially for large tears.  
427 We also observed a lack of any cost-effectiveness analyses in all RCTs  
428 included. A health economics analysis should not be ignored in any future RCTs  
429 and must be included to inform decision making about healthcare provision to  
430 this common group of patients.

431

432

433

434 **CONCLUSION**

435 Although rotator cuff repair is a common surgery, postoperative rehabilitation  
436 has not evolved for over twenty years. Protocols are still variable and cautious  
437 with regards to sling use and exercise progression. Our systematic reviewed  
438 suggests that patients treated with early rehabilitation may have a faster  
439 recovery of their range of movement and are not at a higher risk of  
440 compromising the repair integrity, which has been a concern that for clinicians.  
441 A large, definitive high-quality multicentre RCT, including all rotator cuff tear  
442 sizes and with a more progressive and controlled approach is needed to  
443 advance knowledge and for conclusive recommendations on the optimal  
444 rehabilitation programme following rotator cuff repair.

445

446

447    **REFERENCES**

- 448    1. Littlewood C, May S, Walters S. Epidemiology of rotator cuff tendinopathy: a  
449       systematic review. *Shoulder & Elbow*. 2013;5(4):256-65.
- 450    2. Jordan KP, Kadam UT, Hayward R, Porcheret M, Young C, Croft P, et al.  
451       Annual consultation prevalence of regional musculoskeletal problems in  
452       primary care: an observational study. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*.  
453       2010;11(1):144.
- 454    3. Littlewood C, Bateman M, Butler-Walley S, Bathers S, Bromley K, Lewis M,  
455       et al. Rehabilitation following rotator cuff repair: A multi-centre pilot &  
456       feasibility randomised controlled trial (RaCeR). *Clinical Rehabilitation*.  
457       2020:0269215520978859.
- 458    4. Funk L. Arthroscopic shoulder surgery has progressed, has the  
459       rehabilitation? *International Musculoskeletal Medicine*. 2012;34(4):141--5.
- 460    5. Littlewood C, Mazuquin B, Moffatt M, Bateman M. Rehabilitation following  
461       rotator cuff repair: A survey of current practice (2020). *Musculoskeletal*  
462       *Care*. 2020(epub (ahead of print)).
- 463    6. Kane LT, Lazarus MD, Namdari S, Seitz AL, Abboud JA. Comparing expert  
464       opinion within the care team regarding postoperative rehabilitation protocol  
465       following rotator cuff repair. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*.  
466       2020;29(9):e330-e7.
- 467    7. Mazuquin BF, Wright AC, Russell S, Monga P, Selfe J, Richards J.  
468       Effectiveness of early compared with conservative rehabilitation for patients

- 469       having rotator cuff repair surgery: an overview of systematic reviews. *British*  
470       *Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2018;52(2):111 - 21.
- 471   8.   Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred Reporting Items for  
472       Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Journal*  
473       *of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2009;62(10):1006--12.
- 474   9.   Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al.  
475       RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*.  
476       2019;366:l4898.
- 477   10.   GRADEpro GDT: GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool [Software].  
478       McMaster University, 2020 (developed by Evidence Prime, Inc.). Available  
479       from [gradepro.org](http://gradepro.org).
- 480   11.   Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3. Copenhagen:  
481       The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.
- 482   12.   Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al.  
483       Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in  
484       meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*.  
485       2011;343(1756-1833 (Electronic)):d4002.
- 486   13.   Ioannidis JP, Trikalinos TA. The appropriateness of asymmetry tests for  
487       publication bias in meta-analyses: a large survey. *Canadian Medical*  
488       *Association Journal*. 2007;176(8):1091--6.
- 489   14.   Baumgarten KM, Osborn R, Schweinle WE, Jr., Zens MJ, Helsper EA. Are  
490       Pulley Exercises Initiated 6 Weeks After Rotator Cuff Repair a Safe and

- 491           Effective Rehabilitative Treatment? A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J*  
492           *Sports Med.* 2016;44(7):1844-51.
- 493   15. Michael JW, König D, Imhoff A, A I, Martinek S, Braun S, et al. [Efficiency of  
494           a postoperative treatment after rotator cuff repair with a continuous passive  
495           motion device (CPM)]. *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb.* 2005;143(4):438-45.
- 496   16. Duzgun I, Baltaci G, Atay OA. Comparison of slow and accelerated  
497           rehabilitation protocol after arthroscopic rotator cuff repair: pain and  
498           functional activity. *Acta Orthopaedica Et Traumatologica Turcica.*  
499           2011;45(1):23--33.
- 500   17. Duzgun I, Baltaci G, Turgut E, Atay OA. Effects of slow and accelerated  
501           rehabilitation protocols on range of motion after arthroscopic rotator cuff  
502           repair. *Acta Orthopaedica et Traumatologica Turcica.* 2014;48(6):642--8.
- 503   18. Lee BG, Cho NS, Rhee YG. Effect of Two Rehabilitation Protocols on  
504           Range of Motion and Healing Rates After Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair:  
505           Aggressive Versus Limited Early Passive Exercises. *Arthroscopy-the*  
506           *Journal of Arthroscopic and Related Surgery.* 2012;28(1):34--42.
- 507   19. Sheps DM, Bouliane M, Styles-Tripp F, Beaupre LA, Saraswat MK, Luciak-  
508           Corea C, et al. Early mobilisation following mini-open rotator cuff repair: a  
509           randomised control trial. *The bone & joint journal.* 2015;97-B(9):1257--63.
- 510   20. Sheps DM, Silveira A, Beaupre L, Styles-Tripp F, Balyk R, Lalani A, et al.  
511           Early Active Motion Versus Sling Immobilization After Arthroscopic Rotator  
512           Cuff Repair: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of*  
513           *Arthroscopic & Related Surgery.* 2019;35(3):749--60.e2.

- 514 21. De Roo P, Muermans S, Maroy M, Linden P, den Daelen L. Passive  
515 mobilization after arthroscopic rotator cuff repair is not detrimental in the  
516 early postoperative period. *Acta orthopaedica Belgica*. 2015;81(3):485--92.
- 517 22. Koh KH, Lim TK, Shon MS, Park YE, Lee SW, Yoo JC. Effect of  
518 immobilization without passive exercise after rotator cuff repair: randomized  
519 clinical trial comparing four and eight weeks of immobilization. *The Journal  
520 of bone and joint surgery American volume*. 2014;96(6):e44.
- 521 23. Arndt J, Clavert P, Mielcarek P, Bouchaib J, Meyer N, Kempf JFa.  
522 Immediate passive motion versus immobilization after endoscopic  
523 supraspinatus tendon repair: A prospective randomized study.  
524 *Orthopaedics & Traumatology-Surgery & Research*. 2012;98(6  
525 Suppl):S131--S8.
- 526 24. Cuff DJ, Pupello DR. Prospective randomized study of arthroscopic rotator  
527 cuff repair using an early versus delayed postoperative physical therapy  
528 protocol. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*. 2012;21(11):1450--5.
- 529 25. Fawzy S, Rizk Mohamed A, Sameer A, Foad A. Difference between early  
530 versus delayed postoperative physical rehabilitation protocol following  
531 arthroscopic rotator cuff repair. *Egyptian Rheumatology and Rehabilitation*.  
532 2016;43(3):137-42.
- 533 26. Keener JD, Galatz LM, Stobbs G, Patton R, Yamaguchi K, Stobbs-Cucchi  
534 G, et al. Rehabilitation Following Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair A  
535 Prospective Randomized Trial of Immobilization Compared with Early  
536 Motion. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery-American Volume*.  
537 2014;96(1):11--9.

- 538 27. Kjær BH. Physiotherapy for patients with traumatic rotator cuff tear and  
539 associations within patient characteristics.: University of Southern Denmark;  
540 2019.
- 541 28. Klintberg IH, Gunnarsson A-CC, Svantesson U, Styf J, Karlsson J. Early  
542 loading in physiotherapy treatment after full-thickness rotator cuff repair: a  
543 prospective randomized pilot-study with a two-year follow-up. *Clinical  
544 Rehabilitation*. 2009;23(7):622--38.
- 545 29. Raschhofer R, Poulos N, Schimetta W, Kisling R, Mittermaier C. Early  
546 active rehabilitation after arthroscopic rotator cuff repair: a prospective  
547 randomized pilot study. *Clinical rehabilitation*. 2017;31(10):1332--9.
- 548 30. Tirefort J, Schwitzguebel AJ, Collin P, Nowak A, Plomb-Holmes C,  
549 Lädermann A. Postoperative Mobilization After Superior Rotator Cuff  
550 Repair: Sling Versus No Sling: A Randomized Prospective Study. *JBJS*.  
551 2019;101(6).
- 552 31. Kim YSS, Chung SW, Kim JY, Ok JHH, Park I, Oh JH. Is Early Passive  
553 Motion Exercise Necessary After Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair?  
554 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2012;40(4):815-21.
- 555 32. Mazzocca AD, Arciero RA, Shea KP, Apostolakos JM, Solovyova O,  
556 Gomlinski G, et al. The Effect of Early Range of Motion on Quality of Life,  
557 Clinical Outcome, and Repair Integrity After Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff  
558 Repair. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic \& Related Surgery*.  
559 2017;33(6):1138-48.
- 560 33. Oyarzún DR, Poblete LA, Nieto FF, Huerta CO, Lange CC, Cifuentes AT.  
561 Efectividad de ejercicios submaximales versus protocolo convencional en el

- 562 rango de movimiento glenohumeral tras reparación artroscópica del  
563 supraespinoso. *Revista Chilena de Ortopedia y Traumatología*.  
564 2017;58(01):013-20.
- 565 34. Jenssen KK, Lundgreen K, Madsen JE, Kvakestad R, Pripp AH, Dimmen S.  
566 No Functional Difference Between Three and Six Weeks of Immobilization  
567 After Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair: A Prospective Randomized  
568 Controlled Non-Inferiority Trial. *Arthroscopy*. 2018;34(10):2765-74.
- 569 35. Littlewood C, Bateman M, Cooke K, Hennings S, Cookson T, Bromley K,  
570 et al. Protocol for a multi-centre pilot and feasibility randomised controlled  
571 trial with a nested qualitative study: rehabilitation following rotator cuff repair  
572 (the RaCeR study). *Trials*. 2019;20(1):328.
- 573 36. Buchbinder R, Ramiro S, Huang H, Gagnier JJ, Jia Y, Whittle SL. Measures  
574 of Adult Shoulder Function. *Arthritis Care & Research*. 2020;72(S10):250-  
575 93.
- 576 37. Cvetanovich GL, Gowd AK, Liu JN, Nwachukwu BU, Cabarcas BC, Cole  
577 BJ, et al. Establishing clinically significant outcome after arthroscopic rotator  
578 cuff repair. *Journal of Shoulder and Elbow Surgery*. 2019;28(5):939-48.
- 579 38. Kim DM, Kim TH, Kholinne E, Park JH, Shin MJ, Kim H, et al. Minimal  
580 Clinically Important Difference, Substantial Clinical Benefit, and Patient  
581 Acceptable Symptomatic State After Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair. *The*  
582 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2020;48(11):2650-9.
- 583 39. Muir SW, Corea CL, Beaupre L. Evaluating change in clinical status:  
584 reliability and measures of agreement for the assessment of glenohumeral

- 585 range of motion. North American journal of sports physical therapy  
586 2010;5(3):98-110.
- 587 40. Rees S, Mazuquin B, Richmond H, Williamson E, Bruce J. Experiences of  
588 women undergoing breast cancer surgery and physiotherapists participating  
589 in the UK PROSPER trial. *Physiotherapy*. 2020;107:e50-e1.
- 590 41. Sharma P, Maffulli N. Tendon injury and tendinopathy: healing and repair.  
591 *The Journal of bone and joint surgery American volume*. 2005;87(1):187--  
592 202.
- 593 42. Stephens G, Littlewood C, Foster NE, Dikomitis L. Rehabilitation following  
594 rotator cuff repair: A nested qualitative study exploring the perceptions and  
595 experiences of participants in a randomised controlled trial. *Clinical  
596 Rehabilitation*. 2020:0269215520984025.
- 597 43. Horrall Stith E, Borrero L, Santurri L, Breeden L, Shemanski S. Patient  
598 Perceptions of Acute Phases of Rehabilitation Following Shoulder  
599 Arthroplasty. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2020;8(2):14.
- 600 44. Carr AJ, Cooper CD, Campbell MK, Rees JL, Moser J, Beard DJ, et al.  
601 Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of open and arthroscopic  
602 rotator cuff repair the UK Rotator Cuff Surgery (UKUFF) randomised trial .  
603 *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)*. 2015;19(80):1-218.

604

605

606

607

608

609 **Supporting information captions**

610

611 **Supplementary file 1.** Search strategy.

612 **Supplementary file 2.** Characteristics of the included RCTs.

613 **Supplementary file 3.** Risk of bias by RCT.

614 **Supplementary file 4.** Characteristics of the rehabilitation programmes.

615 **Supplementary file 5.** Forest plots.

616 **Supplementary file 6.** GRADE summary of findings.















