The Journal of Physical Therapy Science

Review Article

Does low back pain or leg pain in gluteus medius syndrome contribute to lumbar degenerative disease and hip osteoarthritis and vice versa? A literature review

MASAHIRO KAMEDA, MD^{1)*}, HIDEYUKI TANIMAE, BSc²⁾, AKINORI KIHARA, MS³⁾, FUJIO MATSUMOTO, MD, PhD⁴⁾

¹⁾ Senshunkai Hospital: 2-14-26 Kaiden, Nagaokakyo, Kyoto 617-0826, Japan

²⁾ Kichijoji Taishido Manual Medicine Office, Japan

³⁾ Kuretake Gakuen Clinical Research Institute of Oriental Medicine, Japan

⁴⁾ Takanodai Matsumoto Clinic, Japan

Abstract. [Purpose] Gluteus medius syndrome is one of the major causes of back pain or leg pain and is similar to greater trochanteric pain syndrome, which also presents with back pain or leg pain. Greater trochanteric pain syndrome is associated with lumbar degenerative disease and hip osteoarthritis. The objective of this review was to demonstrate gluteus medius syndrome as a disease entity by reviewing relevant articles to elucidate the condition. [Methods] Gluteus medius syndrome was defined as myofascial pain syndrome arising from the gluteus medius. We performed a search of the literature using the following keywords: "back pain", "leg pain", "greater trochanteric pain syndrome", "degenerative lumbar disease", "hip osteoarthritis", and "gluteus medius". We reviewed articles related to gluteus medius syndrome and described the findings in terms of diagnosis and treatment based on the underlying pathology. [Results] A total of 135 articles were included in this review. Gluteus medius syndrome is similar as a disease entity to greater trochanteric pain syndrome, which presents with symptoms of low back pain and leg pain. Gluteus medius syndrome is also related to lumbar degenerative disease, hip osteoarthritis, knee osteoarthritis, and failed back surgery syndrome. [Conclusion] Accurate diagnosis of gluteus medius syndrome and appropriate treatment could possibly improve lumbar degenerative disease and osteoarthritis of the hip and knee, as well as hip-spine syndrome and failed back surgery syndrome.

Key words: Gluteus medius syndrome, Low back pain, Greater trochanteric pain syndrome

(This article was submitted Sep. 19, 2019, and was accepted Nov. 7, 2019)

INTRODUCTION

Medical expenditures for the management of degenerative disease are increasing because of population aging around the world^{1, 2)}. Degenerative disease and chronic pain have been well investigated to decrease the costs and social resources required for proper management of degenerative disease and its associated pain. However, the mechanism of pain in degenerative disease is often of unknown origin^{3, 4)}.

As causes of back pain, leg pain, or hip pain, lumbar disk herniation, lumbar spinal canal stenosis (LSCS), or hip osteoarthritis can be considered differential diagnoses. In daily clinical practice, the prevalence of these conditions is not so high⁵⁻⁷), and sometimes the source of the pain cannot be readily identified. Other causes of low back pain such as degenerative disk disease and degenerative facet joint disease are difficult to identify as sources of pain because the diagnosis is usually

*Corresponding author. Masahiro Kameda (E-mail: mkameda@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

©2020 The Society of Physical Therapy Science. Published by IPEC Inc.



c 🛈 S 🕞 This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd) License. (CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

resource-intensive, with high cost and risk in terms of proper diagnosis and management. As a result of these factors, undiagnosed back pain or leg pain is widespread in daily clinical practice; consequently, there remains a great need for improvement in pain management systems.

The term "gluteus medius syndrome (GMedS)" appeared in several reports^{8–11}) as the gluteus medius (GMed) was identified as the muscle most commonly associated with low back pain or leg pain and the diagnosis of myofascial pain syndrome (MPS)^{11, 12}). MPS is simply defined as pain accompanied by confirmation of pain trigger points in specific muscles^{13, 14}). However, the causes of back pain are various, and diagnosis is difficult based on confirmation of trigger points only⁵). Low back pain is usually accompanied by lumbar disk or facet joint degeneration or several other conditions⁵). A diagnosis of MPS does not necessarily rule out other pathology and usually the presence of a various pathologies tends to complicate pain management⁵). Although the MPS complication rate is very high in pain management, the relationship between MPS and degenerative disease is still unknown. Various hypotheses regarding MPS have been proposed based on the muscle sliding theory, nerve compression theory, and the muscle energy theory^{14–17}). Recently trigger point block injection under ultrasound guidance has allowed visualization of muscle sliding and has facilitated symptomatic relief¹⁸) and this may confirm the role of muscle sliding in the improvement of symptoms, but this is yet to meet consensus.

The prevalence of MPS within the context of chronic back pain or non-specific back pain is about 70–90%^{11, 19, 20}, while the prevalence of myofascial trigger points (MTrPs) in GMed namely GMedS within the context of chronic low back pain or nonspecific low back pain is about 38–68%^{11, 20, 21}. GMedS is treated by physiotherapy, manual trigger point therapy, or trigger point block injection^{10, 11, 22}, and in difficult cases by surgical decompression of the GMed or the cluneal nerve^{10, 23}.

Related conditions include the greater trochanteric pain syndrome (GTPS) or trochanteric bursitis, which are similar to GMedS. GTPS presents with pain around the hip and is often accompanied by low back pain or leg pain and could be associated with hip osteoarthritis or lumbar degenerative disease $(LDD)^{24-33}$. The pathology may be caused by trochanteric bursitis or gluteal tendinopathy. LDD has been reported to be related to GTPS^{34, 35}, and GMedS is also accompanied by low back pain and some symptoms of LDD are possibly attributed to GMedS. Numerous reports have pointed out that hip osteoarthritis is related to GTPS or decreased GMed strength³⁶⁻⁴⁰. Thus, some symptoms of hip osteoarthritis can be possibly attributed to GMedS.

The objective of this review was to demonstrate GMedS as a disease entity, which is a major cause of low back pain or leg pain, and associated with LDD and hip osteoarthritis. Relevant articles were searched for and reviewed to clarify the diagnosis and treatment of GMedS.

METHODS

GMedS was defined as a form of MPS arising from the GMed often accompanied by low back pain, leg pain, or hip pain. A literature review was carried out in PubMed electronic databases for related English-language articles using the following keywords during the period of 1 to 31 May 2019.

- 1. "back pain" and "gluteus medius"
- 2. "leg pain" and "gluteus medius"
- 3. "greater trochanteric pain syndrome" and "gluteus medius"
- 4. "hip osteoarthritis" and "gluteus medius"
- 5. "lumbar degenerative disease" and "gluteus medius"
- 6. "lumbar degenerative disease" and "greater trochanteric pain syndrome"

Titles and abstracts were reviewed to identify articles related to GMedS. Articles related to GMedS were subjected to a full-text review and their reference lists were checked for other articles related to GMedS. Relevant articles from the reference lists were also screened and included as appropriate. Our search yield 135 articles, and the resulting literature were divided into 6 categories.

- 1. Relation between GTPS and GMedS.
- 2. Relation between back pain and GMed.
- 3. Relation between LDD and GMed.
- 4. Relation between hip osteoarthritis and GMed.
- 5. Relation between leg pain and GMed.
- 6. Surgery-related symptoms related to GMed.
- Inclusion criteria
- •The keywords "gluteus medius" or "hip abductor" are included in the title or abstract. Exclusion criteria
- •Case reports with fewer than 5 cases.
- •Surgical treatment with total hip arthroplasty (THA).

•No values/figures that are clearly related to GMed and back pain or leg pain.

RESULTS

A total of 135 articles were included in this review (Tables $1-12^{41-167}$).

As described in the Introduction, GTPS presents with chief complaints of pain around the hip and is related to hip osteoarthritis or LDD caused by gluteal tendinopathy or trochanteric bursitis^{24–32} (Table 1).

The prevalence of GTPS was reported to be about 1.8% among patients in a primary care clinic⁵¹, and about 20% of patients with hip pain or low back pain²⁶. However, the definition or pathology of GTPS differs depending on the era of the report or and also differs between reports^{30, 31}. Thus, it may be difficult to consider all such presentations as the same disease entity. The prevalence of cases of GTPS with trochanteric bursitis is reported to be rather low; the prevalence of gluteal tendinopathy is 14% on all MRI in cases of hip pain⁴⁴ and about 8% for cases of trochanteric bursitis⁴⁶. There are strong imaging diagnostic correlations to GTPS^{46, 49, 52}; however, gluteal tendinopathy has also been reported poorly in relation to hip pain^{53, 54}. Still many reports adopt simple diagnostic criteria for GTPS like pain with tenderness around the hip^{26, 30, 31, 64, 168, 169}, and may be related to the gluteal muscles (GMed and gluteus minimus). It is then possible that GTPS is part of the symptomatology of GMedS because GTPS is similar to GMedS.

Hip abductor strength, and walking speed were decreased in GTPS cases comparison with healthy controls^{59, 60}. Hip range of motion on the affected side compared with the contralateral side was significantly decreased in GTPS⁵⁸, and muscle strength is useful for diagnosing GTPS.

GTPS is treated using various methods including rest, reduced weight-bearing, medication, exercise, corticosteroid injection, extracorporeal shockwave therapy (ESWT), and surgical intervention^{29–32)} (Tables 2 and 3). Treatments related to the GMed include corticosteroid injection, ESWT, exercise, and surgical intervention. Better results were obtained with ESWT or exercise than with corticosteroid injection⁶⁶⁾. For cases unresponsive to conservative treatment, surgical treatment is also reported to be successful (Table 3).

Low back pain is defined as pain extending from the lowest rib to the gluteal groove. Nevertheless, GMedS is often complicated with MPS of the multifidus or quadratus lumborum or other muscles^{11, 20}. Usually pain is not limited to the affected region in the GMed or simple low back pain in GMedS or GTPS.

The prevalence of GMedS within the context of chronic back pain or nonspecific back pain is high, as noted in the Introduction section, and many reports suggest that the GMed is involved in back pain (Table 4). In chronic back pain, muscle strength of hip abductor or GMed is significantly decreased^{20, 88–90, 93}. On electromyography (EMG), the amplitude of GMed was significantly increased by back pain provoked group^{87, 92, 96}, and EMG co-activation of the GMed was more significantly observed in a provoked pain group^{91, 96}. GMed contraction evaluated using ultrasound was significantly decreased in a low back pain group⁹⁹. GMed is significantly associated with back pain⁹³, and is the most commonly involved muscle in back pain and low back pain^{11, 12}.

Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Swezey RL ⁴¹⁾	Patients with LBP (n=70)	31/70 (44.3%) were diagnosed with TB
	Patients with TB (n=31)	LDD was a complication in 31/31 (100%)
		Hip OA was a complication in 6/31 (19.3%) of TB
Collée G et al.42)	Patients with LBP (n=100)	35% were diagnosed as TB/GTPS
Collée G et al.43)	Patients with LBP (n=40, 124, 40)	18-45% were diagnosed with GTPS
Kingzett-Taylor A. et al. ⁴⁴⁾	Patients with buttock, lateral hip, and groin pain (n=250)	GMed tear was confirmed in 14% on MRI
Howell GE et al. ⁴⁵⁾	OA hips that underwent arthroplasty (n=176)	20% of cases had confirmed degenerative pathology of the hip abd.
Bird PA et al.46)	Patients with chronic GTPS (n=24)	GMed tear was confirmed in 45.8% on MRI
		GMed tendinitis was confirmed in 62.5% on MRI
		TB was confirmed in 8% on MRI
Tortolani PJ et al.47)	Patients with LBP (n=247)	20% was diagnosed with GTPS
Connell DA et al. ⁴⁸⁾	Patients with greater trochanteric pain (n=75)	53 (74.7%) patients showed evidence of GMed tendinopathy on ultrasonography
		8 (10.7%) patients had fluid pooling in the trochanteric bursa
Cvitanic O et al.49)	Hips with gluteal tendon tear (n=15)	Diagnostic accuracy of gluteal tendon tear on MRI was 91%
Sayegh F et al. ⁵⁰⁾	Patients with GTPS (n=300)	Leg pain was a complication in 77.7%
		LDD was a complication in 79.4%

Table 1. Characteristics of GTPS related to GMed

Table 1. Continued.

Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Lievense A et al. ⁵¹⁾	Patients with greater trochanteric pain (n=164)	Prevalence of GTPS was 1.8% among all primary care
		patients
		14.6% had hip OA
		8.5% had LBP
		9.8% had knee OA
Walker P et al. ³⁴⁾	Patients with GTPS (n=97)	TB was found in 43.3% on SPECT
		Gluteal tendinopathy was found 36.1% on SPECT
		LDD was found in 76.3% on SPECT
		Active articular hip disease was found in 2% on SPECT
		Occurrence of gluteus tendinitis was correlated with spinal disease
Segal NA et al. ²⁶⁾	Patients with lateral hip pain (n=1,786)	Prevalence of GTPS was 23.5%
		Prevalence of bilateral GTPS was 15.0%
		Bilateral GTPS was significantly associated with physical activity (20-m walk time and chair stand time)
		Ipsilateral and contralateral knee OA was significantly cor- related with GTPS
		LBP was significantly correlated with GTPS
Lequesne M et al. ⁵²⁾	Patients with persistent GTPS (n=17)	94.1% of patients had GMed tear and trochanteric bursitis on MRI
Woodley SJ et al.53)	Patients with unilateral hip pain (n=40)	Difficulty with diagnosing GTPS on MRI
		Bursitis was confirmed in 33% who were symptomatic and 46% who were asymptomatic
		Gluteal tendon pathology was confirmed in 53% who were symptomatic and 28% who were asymptomatic
Blankenbaker DG et al. ⁵⁴⁾	Hip MRI (n=131)	Asymptomatic gluteal tear was confirmed in 33.1% of cases on MRI
		Gluteal tear was not associated with hip pain
Iagnocco A et al.55)	Patients with hip OA $(n=75)$	22.7% of cases had gluteal tendinopathy
Long SS et al. ⁵⁶⁾	Patients with greater trochanteric pain (n=877)	20.2% had trochanteric bursitis; 49.9% had gluteal tendi-
0		nosis
Lindner D et al. ⁵⁷⁾	Patients with lateral hip pain who underwent GMed repair surgery (n=47)	100% had partial or complete gluteal tears and 91% had trochanteric bursitis
Ebert JR et al.58)	Patients with symptomatic hip abd. tear (n=149)	Patients with hip abd. tears demonstrated significantly lower abd. strength and active ROM on the affected limb
Allison K et al. ⁵⁹⁾	Patients with chronic unilateral gluteal tendi- nopathy (n=50)	Significantly decreased hip abd. strength in the GTPS group
Fearon A et al. ⁶⁰⁾	Patients with GTPS (n=38)	GTPS and OA group had significantly lower walking speeds compared with asymptomatic controls
	Patients with hip OA (n=20)	GTPS and OA groups had significantly higher pain levels compared with asymptomatic controls
		GTPS and OA groups had significantly worse SLS results compared with asymptomatic controls
		GTPS and OA groups had significantly lower hip abd.
Pozzi G et al. ⁶¹⁾	Patients with FAI (n=189)	Gluteal tendinopathy was confirmed in 72 cases (38.1%) on MRI: GTPS was confirmed in 74 cases (39.2%)
Ganderton C et al. ⁶²⁾	Post-menopausal patients with chronic GTPS $(n=8)$	GMed and GMin were significantly activated on EMG in GTPS group
	(ii 0)	Significantly decreased peak torque strength of hip abduc- tion in GTPS group
Tan L et al. ³⁵⁾	Patients with LDD (n=273)	50.5% had GTPS

GTPS: greater trochanteric pain syndrome; GMed: gluteus medius; Gmin: gluteus minimus; LBP: low back pain; TB: trochanteric bursitis; LDD: lumbar degenerative disease; OA: osteoarthritis; abd.: abductor; FAI: Femoroacetabular impingement; SLS: single-leg squat test; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; SPECT: single-photon emission computed tomography.

Table 2. Conservative treatments of GTPS related to GMe	d
---	---

Swezey RL ⁴¹⁾ Patients with TB (n=31) Cs injection (Cs+lidocaine) Symptoms relapsed in 3/31 (9.7%) Ege RKJ et al. ⁶³⁾ Patients with TB (n=33) Cs injection Relapsed in 9/33 (27.2%) after 23 months Shbeeb MI ⁶⁴⁾ Patients with TB (n=75) Cs injection (Cs+lidocaine) 77% showed improvement after 1 week 68% showed improvement after 6 weeks 61% showed improvement after 26 weeks	d physical function
Ege RKJ et al.63)Patients with TB (n=33)Cs injectionRelapsed in 9/33 (27.2%) after 23 monthsShbeeb MI64)Patients with TB (n=75)Cs injection (Cs+lidocaine)77% showed improvement after 1 week 68% showed improvement after 6 weeks 61% showed improvement after 26 weeks	d physical function
Shbeeb MI ⁶⁴⁾ Patients with TB (n=75) Cs injection (Cs+lidocaine) 77% showed improvement after 1 week 68% showed improvement after 6 weeks 61% showed improvement after 26 weeks 61% showed improvement after 26 weeks	d physical function
(Cs+lidocaine) 68% showed improvement after 6 weeks 61% showed improvement after 26 weeks	d physical function
61% showed improvement after 26 weeks	d physical function gradually wors-
	d physical function gradually wors-
Sayegn F et al. ³⁰ Female patients with GTPS Peritrochanteric Cs Cs injection significantly improved pain and	s gradually wors-
examination (n=150) (Oswestry Disability Index), but symptoms ened over 4 years	
Lievense A et al. ⁵¹ Patients with greater tro-Medication (55%) 52% showed transient improvement	
chanteric pain (n=164) Cs injection (37%) 66% showed improvement	
Physiotherapy 00% showed improvement Welling Data 134) = Data and CTDS (c. 07). Contribution $20/40$ (c2 50/) improvement	
walker P et al. ³⁴ Patients with G1PS ($n=97$) Cs injection $30/48$ (62.3%) improved for 6 weeks	
Cases with LDD were significantly more red	current
Furia JP et al.Patients with chronic GTPS ESW1/9% had excellent or good outcomes after 1(n=33)Roles and Maudsley score was greater in ES	SWT group
Rompe JD et al. ⁶⁶ Patients with unilateral Home training Treatment was successful in 7% after 1 more	nth; 41% after 4
GTPS (n=299) including hip abd. months; 80% after 15 months training	
Cs injectionTreatment was successful in 75% after 15 m(Cs+lidocaine)months; 48% after 15 months	nonths; 51% after 4
ESWT Treatment was successful in 13% after 1 mo months; 74% after 15 months	onth; 68% after 4
Cohen SP et al.67)Patients with GTPS (n=32)Fluoroscopy guidedNo significant differences between blind inj copy-guided injection	jection and fluoros-
Uliassi NW ⁶⁸⁾ Patients with GTPS (n=60) Cs injection No significant differences between Cs inject groups	ction and usual care
Mautner K et al. ⁶⁹⁾ Patients with tendinopathy Ultrasound-guided 81% showed improvement	
diagnosed by MRI (n=16) PRP injection	
McEvoy JR et al. ⁷⁰ Patients with GTPS (n=41) Cs injection to greater trochanteric bursa signater trochanter	ignificantly im-
Patients with GTPS (n=24) Cs injection to sub- Cs injection to subgluteus medius bursa did gluteus medius bursa	1 not improve pain
Estrela GQ et al. ⁷¹⁾ Patients with GTPS (n=60) Ultrasound guided Cs No significant benefit in ultrasound-guided injection	l group
Lee JJ et al. ⁷²⁾ Patients with recalcitrant GTPS (n=21) Ultrasound-guided intratendinous PRP inje intratendinous PRP injection score)	ection significantly ADL, HOS-Sports
Ribeiro A et al.73)Patients with chronic GTPSUltrasound-guided PRP injectionThere was no significant benefit in PRP gro Cs injection group	oup compared with
Jacobson JA et Patients with GTPS unre-PRP injection al. ⁷⁴) proved pain treatments (n=15) Both ultrasound-guided fenestration and PR proved pain	RP injection im-
Tan L et al.35)Patients with LDD (n=73)Cs injectionTreatment was effective in 49.3%	
Fitzpatrick J et al. 75)Patients with GTPS (n=80)PRP injection vs. Cs injectionPRP injection improved HHS significantly in injection	more than CS

TB: trochanteric bursitis; GTPS: greater trochanteric pain syndrome; Cs: corticosteroid; ESWT: extracorporeal shockwave therapy; PRP: platelet-rich plasma; GMed: gluteus medius; LDD: lumbar degenerative disease; HHS: Harris Hip Score.

Table 4 shows the treatment results of LBP in terms of GMed. Treatment of back pain originating from the GMed is typically by trigger point injection (TPI), which was found to significantly improve pain assessed using the numerical rating scale (NRS)¹¹ (Table 5). For cases unresponsive to conservative treatment, GMed decompression surgery was found to significantly improve pain NRS score and function (Japanese Orthopaedic Association/ Roland-Morris Disability Question-

Report	Cases	Treatment	Outcomes
Brooker AF ⁷⁶⁾	Patients with refractory TB (n=5)	Decompression by fenestration of bursa	All cases achieved pain relief and average HHS score was improved
Kagan A ⁷⁷⁾	Patients with unresponsive TB (n=7)	GMed repair/fasci- otomy	All cases achieved pain relief and one case had weakness of the GMed
Govaert LH et al. ⁷⁸⁾	Patients with chronic TB (n=12)	Trochanteric oste- otomy	Outcomes were very good in 6/12 (50%) and good in 5/12 (41.7%)
	*5 cases refractory to bur- sectomy		Pain and physical function (Merle d'Aubigné and Postel Method) were significantly improved
Baker CL et al. ⁷⁹⁾	Patients with refractory TB (n=42)	Endoscopic bursec- tomy	44/45 (97.8%) had improved symptoms/postoperative average JOA score
Davies H et al. ⁸⁰⁾	Patients with GTPS unre- sponsive to conservative treatment (n=16)	GMed/GMin repair and bursectomy	11/16 had significant reduction of hip symptoms; 5/16 had relapse
Voos JE et al. ⁸¹⁾	Patients with GMed tear (n=10)	Endoscopic gluteus medius repair	All cases had complete resolution of pain; MMT of hip abd. was improved
Walsh MJ et al. ⁸²⁾	Patients with GTPS unre- sponsive to conservative treatments (n=72)	Gluteal tendon repairs	More than 90% of cases were pain-free or had minimal pain; repair surgery significantly improved hip score
Davies H et al. ⁸³⁾	Patients with unresponsive TB with tear of hip abd. by MRI (n=23)	Open gluteal ten- don repair	23/23 had significant improvement in VAS, OHS, and SF-36 PCS
Chandrasekaran S et al. ⁸⁴⁾	Patients who underwent en- doscopic GMed repair (n=24)	Endoscopic GMed repair	Age-matched non-surgery group had significantly greater strength than the surgery group; GMed strength is a possible risk factor for surgical intervention

Tabl	e 3.	Operative	treatments	of GTPS	related	to GMed
------	------	-----------	------------	---------	---------	---------

TB: trochanteric bursitis; GTPS: greater trochanteric pain syndrome; Cs: corticosteroid; abd.: abductor; ESWT: extracorporeal shockwave therapy; PRP: platelet-rich plasma; GMed: gluteus medius; GMin: gluteus minimus; LDD: lumber degenerative disease; JOA: Japanese Orthopaedic Association; VAS: visual analogue scale; HHS: Harris Hip Score; OHS: Oxford Hip Score; SF-36: MOS Short-Form 36-Item Health Survey.

naire scores)^{10, 23} (Table 6). Many articles discussed the diagnosis and treatment with respect to the relationship between low back pain and the GMed.

Because low back pain is related to the GMed and LDD is related to back pain, LDD should also be related to the GMed. However, there are only few reports on the association between LDD and GMedS (Table 1). Walker et al. performed singlephoton emission computed tomography (SPECT) in patients with GTPS, and found about 48.4% of cases of GTPS had LDD, the majority of which were facet joint disease³⁴. Swezey et al. and Sayegh et al. also reported on the relationship between TB/ GTPS and LDD. Tan et al. reported that 50.5% of LDD cases had GTPS and 49.3% of cases were responsive to corticosteroid injection to the trochanteric bursa³⁵. LDD is related to GTPS and LDD is possibly related to the GMed and GMedS.

Hip osteoarthritis has characteristic radiological features. However, images of hip osteoarthritis on X-ray films do not always reveal the source of the osteoarthritic pain⁴). Pain from hip osteoarthritis is regarded as very wide ranging, often radiating around the knee and it is sometimes hard to distinguish between osteoarthritis of the knee and of the hip.

Numerous reports have pointed out the relationship between the GMed and hip osteoarthritis (Table 7). GTPS is complicated by hip osteoarthritis 2–20%^{34,41,51}). GMed tear was confirmed in 20% of cases following THA⁴⁵). Hip abductor muscle strength and GMed volume were significantly decreased and GMed intensity on ultrasound was significantly higher in hip osteoarthritis^{110,111,113–118,125,128,129}). Moreover, EMG activity of the GMed was significantly increased^{109,120,124}). In terms of treatment of hip OA, physiotherapy and manual therapy involving the hip abductors significantly improved hip function and relieved pain (Table 8)^{134–136}).

GMed-responsive radiating pain lesions have been reported around the hip¹³⁾, but GMedS causes pain radiating from the knee to the lower leg or even the foot^{8, 170)}. The pain in GMedS is not limited to pain around the hip as it is in GTPS.

About 30% of cases of leg pain are reported to be GMedS and 50% of GMedS cases present with leg pain¹¹). While 77.7% of GTPS is complicated by leg pain⁵⁰, 44.2% of trochanteric bursitis involved leg pain radiating around the knee²⁵). Tortolani et al. reported that 62.7% of GTPS patients diagnosed by spine surgeons were misdiagnosed⁴⁷). It is sometime difficult to diagnose GTPS or GMedS.

Most known cases of MPS with radiating lower leg pain are piriformis syndrome^{171, 172)}. Other muscles responsible for leg pain include the GMed and gluteus minimus^{11, 13)}. The prevalence of GmedS is higher than that of MPS of the piriformis

Table 4. Characteristics of LBP related to GMed	Table 4.	Characteristics	of LBP	related	to GMed
---	----------	-----------------	--------	---------	---------

Njoo KH et al. ⁵⁹ Patients with chornic LBP (n=61) MTPs of CMed constituted 34% of cases Farasyn A et al. ⁸⁰ Patients with LBP (n=42) PPT of GMed was significantly decreased in the LBP group Nelson-Wong E et al. ⁸¹ Healthy participants with UBP GMed strength was isgnificantly higher in the LBP group Meson-Wong E et al. ⁸¹ Pregnam female patients with LBP (n=200) Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls Kendall KD et al. ⁸⁹ Patients with LBP (n=200) Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls Kendall KD et al. ⁸⁰ Patients with LBP (n=200) Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls Kendall KD et al. ¹⁹⁰ Healthy participants without LBP GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (n=24) LBP-provoked group Kate complication on surface IEMG was significantly higher in the 30.% Latent XPPs of GMed was 12.1% Latent MTPs of GMed was 12.1% Iglesias-González JJ Patients with cLBP after MTPs of GMed was 12.1% Iglesias-González JJ Patients with CLBP after EMG amplitude of GMed was 12.1% Santos FG et al. ⁹²⁾ Patients with CLBP after EMG amplitude after ecomplication of GMed was significantly lower exercise loading test (n=39) Patients with LBP (n=1	Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Farsyn At el. ⁸⁹⁰ Patients with LBP (n=42)PT of G/Med was significantly decreased in the LBP groupNelson-Wong E et al. ⁸⁷¹ Healthy participants withou LBP (n=16)EMG amplitude was significantly higher in the LBP, provoked group (n=16)Arab AM et al. ⁸⁹¹ Pregnant female patients with LBP (n=16)GMed strength was significantly weaker than in controls (n=10)Marshall PW et al. ⁸⁹¹ Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=10)Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (n=10)Marshall PW et al. ⁸⁹¹ Healthy participants without LBP (n=10)GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (n=24) (n=42)Chen CK et al. ¹⁹³ Healthy participants without LBP (n=42)GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (n=24) (n=42)Iglesias-González, JJ et al. ²⁰¹ Patients with CBP fafter (n=42)MiTPs of GMed was 12.1% (MTPs of GMed significantly decreased and peak time significantly inficantly slower during protocol (n=42)Santos FG et al. ⁴²⁰ Patients with CLBP fafter exercise loading test (n=39)GMed amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time significantly lower (mfeator) significantly lower (mfeator) of GMed was significantly lowerKuniya H et al. ⁵⁴⁰ Patients with CLBP (n=21)GMed auscientified in 17.0% (Med auscientified in 68.1% of casesKuniya H et al. ³⁴⁰ Patients with CLBP (n=150)MT of GMed was significantly decreased (mfTPs of GMed was significantly lowerCooper NA et al. ³⁴⁰ Patients with CLBP (n=150)MT of GMed was significantly decreased (mfTPs of	Njoo KH et al. ⁸⁵⁾	Patients with chronic LBP (n=61)	MTrPs of GMed constituted 34% of cases
Nelson-Wong E et al. ⁸⁷⁰ Healthy participants without LBP EMG amplitude was significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group after exercise loading test (m-23) Bewyer KJ et al. ⁸⁹⁰ Pregnant female patients with LBP (m=16) GMed strength was lower in the LBP group (m=16) Arah AM et al. ⁸⁹⁰ Patients with LBP (m-200) Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (m=10) Marshall PW et al. ⁹⁰¹ Healthy participants without LBP after exercise loading test (m-24) GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (m-24) Chen CK et al. ¹⁹⁰ Patients with 1.BP (m-126) GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (m-24) LBP-provoked group CMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (m-24) LBP-provoked group Marshall PW et al. ⁹⁰¹ Patients with nonspecific LBP et al. ²⁰¹ MiTPs of GMed vas 12.1% Iglesias-González JJ et al. ²⁰¹ Patients with CLBP fater exercise loading test (m-39) Patients with CLBP (m=21) GMed muscle strength was significantly decreased and peak time sig- mitivity Santos FG et al. ³⁰¹ Patients with LBP and leg pain (m=42) Latent MTPs of GMed identified in 17.0% Kaniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁰ Patients with CLBP (m=150) MTPs of GMed was significantly lower EMG antipication of GMed was significantly lower EMG antipicating protocol (m=20) Kaniya H	Farasyn A et al.86)	Patients with LBP (n=42)	PPT of GMed was significantly decreased in the LBP group
Bewyer KJ et al. ⁸⁹ Pregnant female patients with LBP GMed strength was lower in the LBP group (m=16) Arab AM et al. ⁹⁹ Patients with nonspecific LBP (m=10) Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (m=10) Marshall PW et al. ⁹¹ Healthy participants without LBP (m=26) Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (m=10) Marshall PW et al. ⁹¹ Healthy participants without LBP (m=126) GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (m=24) LBP-provoked group Facet complications were present in 43.1%, LSCS in 33.8%, disc in 30.8% JO 26 Marshall PW et al. ⁹¹ Patients with nonspecific LBP (m=42) Intern MTPs of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side) Latent MTPs of GMed identified in 17.0% Santos FG et al. ⁹² Pennyey T et al. ³³ Patients with CLBP (m=21) CMed muscle trangth was significantly lower EMG arbitration of GMed was significantly ligher during unipedal activity No difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted LBP was orrelated to GMed was significantly decreased Marps and M	Nelson-Wong E et al. ⁸⁷⁾	Healthy participants without LBP after exercise loading test (n=23)	EMG amplitude was significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group
Arab AM et al. ¹⁹⁹ Patients with nonspecific LBP Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (10) Marshall PW et al. ⁹⁹⁰ Healthy participants without LBP GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (n=24) Chen CK et al. ¹⁹⁰ Patients with LBP (n=126) 80/126 (63,5%) had MPS Facet complications were present in 43.1%, LSCS in 33.8%, disc in 30.8%, MTPs of GMed was 12.1% MTPs of GMed was 12.1% Iglesian-González JJ Patients with nonspecific LBP MTPs of GMed identified in 17.0% Santos FG et al. ²⁹⁰ Female patients with CLBP after et al. ²⁰¹ EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time significantly weaker than in controls inficantly shower during protocol Pennyey T et al. ²⁹⁰ Patients with LBP (n=210) GMed muscle strength was significantly lower Kuniya H et al. ⁵⁹⁰ Patients with LBP and leg pain (m12) % were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapment (m=834) Cooper Ac et al. ²⁹⁰ Patients with LBP and leg pain (m13) % were GMed was significantly decreased Takka MK et al. ⁵⁹⁰ Patients with LBP and leg pain (m12) % were GMed group from the shold Bassey MD et al. ⁵⁹⁰ Female hockey players with LBP Ale answith CLBP (n=124) PMT of GMed was significantly decreased Takla MK et al. ⁵⁹⁰ Female hockey players with LBP<	Bewyer KJ et al. ⁸⁸⁾	Pregnant female patients with LBP (n=16)	GMed strength was lower in the LBP group
Kendall KD et al. ⁵⁰ Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=10) Hip add. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (n=10) Marshall PW et al. ⁵⁰ Hip add. strength was significantly weaker than in controls (n=10) Chen CK et al. ¹⁹) Patients with LBP (n=126) GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group Chen CK et al. ¹⁹) Patients with LBP (n=126) Sol 126 (63.5%) had MPS Facet complications were present in 43.1%, LSCS in 33.8%, disc in 30.8% MTrPs of GMed was 12.1% Iglesias-González JJ et al. ²⁰ Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=42) MTrPs of GMed identified in 17.0% Santos FG et al. ⁹²) Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39) EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time sig- nificantly slower during protocol Pennyey T et al. ⁵⁹) Patients with CLBP (n=21) GMed muscle strength was significantly higher during unipedal activity No difference in EMG peak of GMed orses time was noted (n=834) LBP was correlated to GMed strength Kuniya H et al. ²⁶) Patients with CLBP (n=150) MTrPs of GMed was significantly lower GMed prosure/pain threshold Bussey MD et al. ⁴⁹) Patients with CLBP (n=124) PT of GMed was significantly lower GMed prosure/pain threshold Bussey MD et al. ⁴⁹) Patients with CLBP (n=124) PT of GMed was significantly decreas	Arab AM et al. ⁸⁹⁾	Patients with LBP (n=200)	Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls
Marshall PW et al. ⁹⁹ Healthy participants without LBP GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the after exercise loading test (n=24) Chen CK et al. ¹⁹ Patients with LBP (n=126) 80/126 (63.5%) had MPS Facet complications were present in 43.1%, LSCS in 33.8%, disc in 30.8% MTrPs of GMed vas 12.1% Iglesias-González JJ Patients with nonspecific LBP MTrPs of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side) Santos FG et al. ²⁰ Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39) EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time significantly slower during protocol Pennyey T et al. ⁵⁰ Patients with LBP (n=21) GMed extivation of GMed was significantly lower Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) 113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapment (n=834) Cooper NA et al. ³⁰ Patients with CLBP (n=150) MTrP of GMed was significantly decreased MTPs of GMed vas identified in 68.1% of cases Takla MK et al. ³⁰ Patients with CLBP (n=124) Bussey MD et al. ³⁰ Patients with CLBP (n=124) PT of GMed was ignificantly decreased on the affect ed side contralateral side Korupska E et al. ³⁷¹ Patients with CLBP (n=124) PT of GMed was ignificantly decreased on the affect ed side contralateral side Skorupska E et al. ³⁷³	Kendall KD et al. ⁹⁰⁾	Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=10)	Hip abd. strength was significantly weaker than in controls
Chen CK et al. ¹⁹ Patients with LBP (n=126) 80/126 (63.5%) had MPS Facet complications were present in 43.1%, LSCS in 33.8%, disc in 30.8% MTrPs of GMed was 12.1% Iglesias-González JJ Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=42) MTrPs of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side) Santos FG et al. ⁹²) Patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=59) EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time significantly lower Pennyey T et al. ⁹³) Patients with CLBP (n=21) GMed muscle strength was significantly lower Pennyey T et al. ⁹⁴) Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) MMTrPs of GMed vas significantly lower Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴) Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed onset time was noted LBP was correlated to GMed strength Sussey MD et al. ⁵⁰) Patients with MPS (n=50) MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed hast the fibre of 81.% of cases Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷) Patients with CLBP (n=120) MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain threshold Bussey MD et al. ⁵⁰ Peratents with CLBP (n=120) MPS had significantly lower ser significantly decreased on the affected side compared with duce muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral side Farahpour N et al. ⁹⁹ Patients with CLBP (n=120) PT of GMed h	Marshall PW et al. ⁹¹⁾	Healthy participants without LBP after exercise loading test (n=24)	GMed coactivation on surface EMG was significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group
Is a construction of the sector of the sec	Chen CK et al. ¹⁹⁾	Patients with LBP (n=126)	80/126 (63.5%) had MPS
ItemsMTRb of GMed was 12.1%Igleias-González JJ et al. ²⁰⁾ Pients with nonspecific LBP (n=42)MTRb of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side)Santos FG et al. ⁹²⁾ Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39)EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time sig- nificantly slower during protocolPennyey T et al. ²³⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=21) attest with CLBP (n=21)GMed muscle strength was significantly lower EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during unipedal activity No difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted LBP was correlated to GMed strengthKuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834)113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluncal nerve entrapmentCooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150)MTf of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of casesTakla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=50)MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain thresholdBussey MD et al. ⁸⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=120)MTG of Med was significantly decreased mtrPs of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased in the LBP group on USVagigaini D et al. ¹⁰⁰ Haeinst with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰ Patients with LBP (n=40)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in aquatic excre- cise compared with the contralateral sideViggia			Facet complications were present in 43.1%, LSCS in 33.8%, disc in 30.8%
Iglesias-González JJ et al. ²¹⁾ Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=42) MTrPs of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side) Santos FG et al. ⁹²⁾ Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39) EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time sig- nificantly slower during protocol Pennyey T et al. ⁹³⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=21) GMed muscle strength was significantly lower EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during unipedal activity No difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted LBP was correlated to GMed strength Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁰⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) 113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve (n=834) Cooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with MPS (n=50) MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed bad significantly lower GMed pressure/pain threshold Bussey MD et al. ²⁶ Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group Imamura M. et al. ¹²⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=124) PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other muscles Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=71) GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral side Yiggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰ Healthy participants with ULBP (n=30) <			MTrPs of GMed was 12.1%
Santos FG et al. ²²⁾ Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39)EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time sig- nificantly slower during protocolPennyey T et al. ²³⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=21)GMed muscle strength was significantly lowerPennyey T et al. ²⁴⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=21)GMed muscle strength was significantly ligher during unipedal activityKuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834)113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapmentCooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150)MT of GMed was significantly decreased MT of GMed was identified in 68.1% of casesTakla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=50)MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain thresholdBussey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾ Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) higher in the LBP-provoked groupGMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al. ¹²⁾ Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideSkorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰ Healthy participants without LBP protocol (n=20)GMad contraction was significantly decreased in aquatic exer- cise compared with had exercise EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly decreased in aquatic exer- cise compared with land exercise EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controls <t< td=""><td>Iglesias-González JJ et al.²¹⁾</td><td>Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=42)</td><td>MTrPs of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side)</td></t<>	Iglesias-González JJ et al. ²¹⁾	Patients with nonspecific LBP (n=42)	MTrPs of GMed recognized in 35%/38% (affected side/contralateral side)
Santos FG et al. ⁹²⁾ Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39) EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time significantly slower during protocol Pennyey T et al. ⁹³⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=21) GMed muscle strength was significantly higher during unipedal activity No difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted LBP was correlated to GMed strength EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during unipedal activity Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) 113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve (m=834) Cooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150) MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MartPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of cases Takla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=124) Bussey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾ Female hockey players with LBP GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly after exercise loading test (n=14) higher in the LBP-provoked group PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other muscles Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with LBP and pronated-foot EMG activation of GMed was significantly bigher during walking Farahpour N et al. ⁹⁰⁾ Female patients with LBP (n=30) GMed contraction was significantly higher during walking Farahpour N et al. ⁹⁰⁾ Patients with LBP and pronated-foot EMG activation of GMed was sig			Latent MTrPs of GMed identified in 17.0%
Pennyey T et al. ³⁹ Patients with CLBP (n=21) GMed muscle strength was significantly lower EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during unipedal activity No difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted LBP was correlated to GMed strength LBP was correlated to GMed strength Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) 113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapment Cooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150) MMT of GMed was identified in 68.1% of cases Takla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with MPS (n=50) MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain threshold Busey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾ Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group Imamura M. et al. ¹²⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=124) PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other muscles Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=71) GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on US Viggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰⁾ Healthy participants without LBP (n=30) GMed contraction was significantly decreased in aquatic exercise compared with land exercise Protocol (n=20) EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with contols Kameda M e al. ¹¹⁾	Santos FG et al. ⁹²⁾	Female patients with CLBP after exercise loading test (n=39)	EMG amplitude of GMed significantly decreased and peak time sig- nificantly slower during protocol
EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during unipedal activityNo difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted LBP was correlated to GMed strengthKuniya H et al.94)Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834)Cooper NA et al.20)Patients with CLBP (n=150)MTT of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of casesTakla MK et al.95)Patients with MPS (n=50)Bussey MD et al.96)Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al.12)Patients with CLBP (n=124)Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al.97)Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=71)Farahpour N et al.98)Patients with LBP and pronated-foot (n=71)Kuriga in D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)Viggiani D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al.101)Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic with CLBP exercise aquatic with controlsKameda M e al.11)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 55/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Pennyey T et al. ⁹³⁾	Patients with CLBP (n=21)	GMed muscle strength was significantly lower
Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834)113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapmentCooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150)MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of casesTakla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with MPS (n=50)MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain thresholdBussey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾ Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) higher in the LBP-provoked groupGMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al. ¹²⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with LBP and pronated-footEMG activation of GMed was significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideFarahpour N et al. ⁹⁸⁾ Patients with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰⁾ Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al. ¹⁰¹⁾ Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 52/83 (38.6%)			EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during unipedal activity
LBP was correlated to GMed strengthKuniya H et al. 94)Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834)113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapmentCooper NA et al. 20)Patients with CLBP (n=150)MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of casesTakla MK et al. 95)Patients with MPS (n=50)MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain thresholdBussey MD et al. 96)Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14)GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al. 12)Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al. 97)Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideFarahpour N et al. 98)Patients with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al. 100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al. 101)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)			No difference in EMG peak of GMed onset time was noted
Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾ Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834) 113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapment Cooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150) MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of cases Takla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with MPS (n=50) MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain threshold Bussey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾ Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group Imamura M. et al. ¹²⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=124) PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other muscles Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71) GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral side Farahpour N et al. ⁹⁸⁾ Patients with LBP (n=30) GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on US Viggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰⁾ Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40) The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40) Psycharakis SG et al. ¹⁰¹⁾ Patients with LBP (n=83) MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)			LBP was correlated to GMed strength
Cooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=150) MMT of GMed was significantly decreased MTrPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of cases MTrPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of cases Takla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾ Patients with MPS (n=50) MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain threshold Bussey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾ Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14) GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group Imamura M. et al. ¹²⁾ Patients with CLBP (n=124) PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other muscles Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾ Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71) GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral side Farahpour N et al. ⁹⁸⁾ Patients with LBP and pronated-foot EMG activation of GMed was significantly decreased in the LBP group on US Viggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰⁾ Healthy participants without LBP (n=30) GMed contraction was significantly decreased in aquatic exerprotocol (n=20) Psycharakis SG et al. ¹⁰¹⁾ Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic (see ompared with land exercise) EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controls Kameda M e al. ¹¹⁾ Patients with LBP (n=83) MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Kuniya H et al. ⁹⁴⁾	Patients with LBP and leg pain (n=834)	113/834 (13.5%) were diagnosed as having superior cluneal nerve entrapment
Takla MK et al. 95)Patients with MPS (n=50)MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain thresholdBussey MD et al. 96)Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14)GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al. 12)Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al. 97)Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideFarahpour N et al. 98)Patients with LBP and pronated-footEMG activation of GMed was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al. 100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al. 101)Patients with LBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)EMG amplitude of GMed was significantly different compared with controlsKameda M e al. 11)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Cooper NA et al. ²⁰⁾	Patients with CLBP (n=150)	MMT of GMed was significantly decreased
Takla MK et al. 95)Patients with MPS (n=50)MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain thresholdBussey MD et al. 96)Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14)GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al. 12)Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al. 97)Patients with CLBP and leg pain 			MTrPs of GMed was identified in 68.1% of cases
Bussey MD et al.96)Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14)GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked groupImamura M. et al.12)Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al.97)Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideFarahpour N et al.98)Patients with LBP and pronated-footEMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during walking GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al.101)Patients with LBP (n=83)EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controlsKameda M e al.11)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Takla MK et al. ⁹⁵⁾	Patients with MPS (n=50)	MPS had significantly lower GMed pressure/pain threshold
Imamura M. et al. ¹²)Patients with CLBP (n=124)PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other musclesSkorupska E et al. ⁹⁷)Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideFarahpour N et al. ⁹⁸)Patients with LBP and pronated-footEMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during walkingAboufazeli M et al. ⁹⁹)Female patients with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al. ¹⁰¹)Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controlsKameda M e al. ¹¹)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Bussey MD et al. ⁹⁶⁾	Female hockey players with LBP after exercise loading test (n=14)	GMed coactivation was confirmed by surface EMG and significantly higher in the LBP-provoked group
Skorupska E et al.97)Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71)GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral sideFarahpour N et al.98)Patients with LBP and pronated-footEMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during walking GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group after standing loading test (n=40)Psycharakis SG et al.101)Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controlsKameda M e al.11)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Imamura M. et al. ¹²⁾	Patients with CLBP (n=124)	PPT of GMed had the highest correlation to VAS and RMQ compared with other muscles
Farahpour N et al.98)Patients with LBP and pronated-footEMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during walkingAboufazeli M et al.99)Female patients with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain groupPsycharakis SG et al.101)Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)EMG amplitude of GMed was significantly decreased in aquatic exer- cise compared with land exercise EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controlsKameda M e al.11)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Skorupska E et al. ⁹⁷⁾	Patients with CLBP and leg pain (n=71)	GMax, GMin, and Piri muscle size were significantly decreased on the affected side compared with the contralateral side
Aboufazeli M et al.99)Female patients with LBP (n=30)GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on USViggiani D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain groupPsycharakis SG et al.101)Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)EMG amplitude of GMed was significantly decreased in aquatic exer- 	Farahpour N et al.98)	Patients with LBP and pronated-foot	EMG activation of GMed was significantly higher during walking
Viggiani D et al.100)Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain groupPsycharakis SG et al.101)Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)EMG amplitude of GMed was significantly decreased in aquatic exer- cise compared with land exerciseKameda M e al.11)Patients with LBP (n=83)MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Aboufazeli M et al. ⁹⁹⁾	Female patients with LBP (n=30)	GMed contraction was significantly decreased in the LBP group on US
Psycharakis SG et al. ¹⁰¹ Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic EMG amplitude of GMed was significantly decreased in aquatic exercise protocol (n=20) EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controls Kameda M e al. ¹¹ Patients with LBP (n=83) MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Viggiani D et al. ¹⁰⁰⁾	Healthy participants without LBP after standing loading test (n=40)	The pain group developed hip abd. fatigue before the no-pain group
Kameda M e al. ¹¹⁾ Patients with LBP (n=83) EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controls MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Psycharakis SG et al. ¹⁰¹⁾	Patients with CLBP exercise aquatic protocol (n=20)	EMG amplitude of GMed was significantly decreased in aquatic exercise compared with land exercise
Kameda M e al. ¹¹⁾ Patients with LBP (n=83) MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%) GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)			EMG amplitude of GMed was not significantly different compared with controls
GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)	Kameda M e al. ¹¹⁾	Patients with LBP (n=83)	MPS was identified in 65/83 (78.3%)
			GMedS was identified in 32/83 (38.6%)

LBP: low back pain; CLBP: chronic LBP; MTrPs: muscle trigger points; GMax: gluteus maximus; GMed: gluteus medius; GMin: gluteus minimus; Piri: piriformis; MPS: myofascial pain syndrome; LSCS: lumbar spinal canal stenosis; abd.: abductor; MMT: manual muscle test; EMG: electromyography; VAS: visual analogue scale; PPT: pressure pain threshold; RMQ: Roland Morris questionnaire; US: ultrasonography.

Table 5. Conservative treatment of LBP related to GMed

Report	Cases	Treatment	Outcomes
Koo TK et al. ¹⁰²⁾	Patients with CLBP (n=14)	NIMMO-receptor tonus technique for GMed	NIMMO-receptor tonus technique significantly improved pain (VAS)
Kameda M et al. ¹¹⁾	MPS patients with LBP (n=26)	ASTR or TPI	Combination treatment of ASTR or TPI significantly improved pain (NRS)
	GMedS patients with LBP (n=18)	ASTR or TPI	Combination treatment of ASTR or TPI significantly improved pain (NRS)

LBP: low back pain; CLBP: chronic LBP; GMed: gluteus medius; GMedS: gluteus medius syndrome; MPS: myofascial pain syndrome; ASTR: active soft tissue release; TPI: trigger point injection; VAS: visual analog scale; NRS: numerical rating scale.

Table 6. Operative treatment of LBP related to Gmed

Report	Cases	Treatment	Outcomes
Kim K et al. ¹⁰⁾	GMedS patients with LBP (n=10)	TPI and GMed decompression surgery	GMed decompression surgery significantly improved pain (NRS) and JOA
Kokubo R et al. ¹⁰³⁾	Patients with GMedS (n=17)	TPI, GMed surgical decompression and nerve decompression	Significantly improved pain (NRS)/RMDQ
Matsumoto J et al. ²³⁾	Patients with MCN entrapment (n=11)	GMed surgical decompression and nerve decompression	Significantly improved pain (NRS)/RMDQ/JOA

LBP: low back pain; CLBP: chronic LBP; GMedS: gluteus medius syndrome; MPS: myofascial pain syndrome; MCN: middle cluneal nerve; GMed: gluteus medius; TPI: trigger point injection; VAS: visual analog scale; NRS: numerical rating scale; RMDQ: Roland Morris Disability questionnaire; JOA: Japanese Orthopaedic Association.

(46.7% vs. 13.3%, respectively)¹¹⁾. Constriction of peripheral nerves such as the middle cluneal nerve is known to contribute to gluteal pain^{23,94)}.

Leg pain including patellofemoral pain syndrome (PFPS) is also related to the GMed (Table 9). Pain in knee osteoarthritis was reported to be related to GTPS²⁶⁾. GMed strength was significantly decreased in patients with patellofemoral (PF) osteoarthritis¹⁵⁴⁾. Hip abductor muscle strength was also significantly decreased^{137, 139, 142, 143, 148)}. GMedS is also possibly related to knee OA and PFPS.

Treatment of GMedS with leg pain, physiotherapy and manual therapy including hip abductors significantly improved hip function and relieved pain^{11, 143, 161, 162} (Table 10), and patients with recalcitrant gluteal pain were successfully treated with cluneal nerve decompression surgery⁹⁴).

Symptoms of GTPS have been noted postoperatively following THA in about 4%^{164, 165} (Table 11). The prevalence is lower in the posterior approach¹⁶⁴, and most cases recovered after steroid injection^{164, 165}). Failed back surgery syndrome (FBSS) is defined as recurrence of symptoms after spine surgery¹⁷³). MPS is implicated in 85% of cases of FBSS; the proportion of GMed was about 19%¹⁶⁶. It is reported that cases of FBSS were treated successfully by GMed decompression and peripheral nerve decompression¹⁶⁷ (Table 12).

DISCUSSION

This review found the three following results: (1) GMedS is a disease entity similar to GTPS, one of the major causes of LBP and leg pain; (2) GTPS shows relations with LDD and hip OA; (3) LBP, GTPS, and hip OA show relations with GMed. Thus, GMedS is one of the major causes of low back pain and leg pain, is related to LDD and hip OA based on this review. MPS of GMed origin has a simple pathology, but this simple pathology appears to have a big impact. Thus, understanding the MPS basis of diagnosis and treatment, the evaluation of target muscles and adjacent peripheral nerve constriction is vital^{11, 23, 94, 103}.

In most cases, both most of GTPS and GMedS cases respond to conservative treatment; however, there are still unresponsive cases. These treatment methods of GTPS and GMeds possibly affect each other. Further study is needed on treatments for GMedS such as ASTR, TPI, gluteal muscle decompression surgery, and nerve decompression for GTPS. Corticosteroid injection for GTPS has been shown to have less satisfactory long-term results compared with physiotherapy. Intra-tendinous corticosteroid injection possibly may result in some complications and so should not be the first choice of treatment. ESWT and platelet-rich plasma injection are other treatments available for GMedS and should be considered as treatment options. Decompression surgery for GTPS has been already reported with beneficial results⁷⁶, however there were also refractory cases to surgical decompression⁷⁸. Thus, an appropriate surgical strategy should be established including peripheral nerve decompression or other effective treatment procedures. Nevertheless, physiotherapy targeting the GMed or hip abductors

Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Širka A et al. ¹⁰⁴⁾	Patients with hip OA (n=56)	GMed atrophy grade was significantly higher in the OA group
Shih CH et al. ¹⁰⁵⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=20)	Hip abd. strength was lower but not significantly.
Hurwitz DE et al. ¹⁰⁶⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=19)	Hip abd. kinematics were not significantly lower in the OA group (p=0.087)
Watanabe H et al. ¹⁰⁷⁾	Female patients with unilateral hip OA (n=84)	GMed EMG amplitude was not significantly changed
Watelain E et al. ¹⁰⁸⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=22)	Hip abd. joint moment was not significantly changed
Sims KJ et al. ¹⁰⁹⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=19)	GMed EMG amplitude was significantly increased (p=0.037) compared with controls
Arokoski MH et al. ¹¹⁰⁾	Patients with hip OA (n=27)	Hip isometric abd. strength was significantly lower than in controls
Rasch A et al. ¹¹¹⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=11)	Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased in OA group
Eimre M et al. ¹¹²⁾	Patients with hip OA who underwent GMed biopsy (n=60)	OA was associated with increased sensitivity of mitochondrial respiration to ADP
Kubota M	Patients with bilateral hip OA (n=12)	Peak abd. angle was significantly lower in OA
et al. ¹¹³⁾		Peak abd. joint moment was significantly lower in OA
Amaro A et al. ¹¹⁴⁾	Patients with hip OA (n=41)	GMed atrophy was correlated with pain score and pain score was correlated with radiographic signs of OA
Rasch A et al. ¹¹⁵⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=22)	Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased in the OA group GMed/GMin size was significantly decreased in the OA group on MRI
Grimaldi A et al. ¹¹⁶⁾	Patients with advanced hip OA (n=6)	GMed volume was significantly smaller on the affected side in the severe OA group on MRI
	Patients with mild hip OA (n=6)	
Rasch A et al. ¹¹⁷⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=22)	Hip abd. strength was significantly lower on the affected side compared with the contralateral side in the OA group
Youdas JW et al. ¹¹⁸⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=20)	Hip abd. strength was significantly lower in the OA group
Fukumoto Y	Patients with hip OA (n=24)	GMed echo intensity was significantly higher (p<0.05)
et al. ¹¹⁹⁾		GMed size was not significantly changed
Dwyer MK et al. ¹²⁰⁾	Patients with unilateral Hip OA (n=13)	GMed EMG amplitude was significantly increased (p=0.037)
Judd DL et al. ¹²¹⁾	Patients with unilateral end-stage hip OA (n=26)	Hip abd. strength was not significantly lower in the OA group (p=0.23)
Hatton A et al. ¹²²⁾	Patients with symptomatic hip chondropa- thy diagnosed by endoscopy (n=63)	Dynamic single-leg standing balance was significantly reduced in the OA group
Rutherford DJ et al. ¹²³⁾	Patients with hip OA (n=20)	Ambulatory individuals with severe OA had less dynamic gluteus medius activation compared with the other two groups.
French HP et al. ¹²⁴⁾	Patients with hip OA (n=13)	GMed EMG amplitude was significantly greater in the OA group during step-up and -down exercises
		Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased in the OA group
Zacharias A et al. ¹²⁵⁾	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=20)	Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased compared with the contralateral side and with controls.
	(severe cases n=13)	GMed size was smaller on the affected side in severe OA than on the contralateral side or in controls
Nankaku M et al. ¹²⁶⁾	Female patients with unilateral THA (n=74)	Preoperative gluteus medius atrophy was correlated to limping after THA
Momose T	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=50)	Hip abd. strength was correlated to HHS/CT density
et al. ¹²⁷⁾		Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased compared with the contralateral side
Zacharias A	Patients with unilateral hip OA (n=20)	Hip abd. strength significantly decreased compared with controls
et al. ¹²⁸⁾		Gluteal muscle atrophy was associated with clinical severity of OA

Table 7. Continued.

Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Loureiro A	Patients with symptomatic hip OA (n=19)	Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased compared with controls
et al.129)		GMed volume was not significantly decreased compared with controls
Zacharias A et al. ¹³⁰⁾	Patients with unilateral Hip OA (n=20)	GMin EMG amplitude in gait was significantly increased

OA: osteoarthritis; GMed: gluteus medius; GMin, gluteus minimus; abd.: abductor; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; THA: total hip arthroplasty; EMG: electromyography; HHS: Harris Hip Score; CT: computed tomography.

Table 8. Treatments of hip OA related	to	GMed
---------------------------------------	----	------

Report	Cases	Treatment	Outcomes
Hoeksma HL et al. ¹³¹⁾	Patients with symp- tomatic hip OA (n=109)	Manual therapy vs. exercise therapy	Manual therapy was significantly superior in improve- ment of pain (VAS), ROM, HHS, and walking speed
Stener-Victorin E et al. ¹³²⁾	Patients with symp- tomatic hip OA	Electroacupuncture (n=15)	VAS and DRI were significantly decreased by treatment at 6 months after the last treatment
	(n=45)	Hydrotherapy (n=15)	VAS and DRI were significantly decreased by treatment at 3 months after the last treatment
		Patient education (n=15)	VAS and DRI were not significantly improved
Veenhof C et al. ¹³³⁾	Patients with hip or knee OA (n=51)	Behavioral graded activity program vs. exercise therapy and advice	No significant differences were noted between the programs
Wang TJ et al. ¹³⁴⁾	Patients with knee or hip OA (n=20)	Aquatic exercise including hip abd.	Hip ROM and GMed strength were improved No change was observed in pain and function
Hinman RS et al. ¹³⁵⁾	Patients with hip or knee OA (n=36)	Aquatic exercise including hip abd.	Significant improvements in pain (VAS/WOMAC) and function (WOMAC)
Steinhilber B et al. ¹³⁶⁾	Patients with hip OA (n=70)	Tübingen exercise therapy including hip abd.	Tübingen exercise therapy has a significant positive effect on HMS

OA: osteoarthritis; VAS: visual analog scale; abd.: abductor; ROM: range of motion; HHS: Harris Hip Score; WOMAC: Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index.

is effective for both GTPS and GMedS and this treatment is widely available^{22, 51, 66, 174)}. Physiotherapy is thus the most recommended first-line treatment option for both GTPS and GMedS with low back pain and LDD.

Several articles discussed back pain in relation to the GMed. Several degenerative lumbar diseases like facet joint syndrome, disc herniation, and lumbar spinal canal stenosis can cause low back pain but a simple TPI can alleviate the symptoms^{10, 11, 94}); most cases of low back pain are possibly complications secondary to MPS. LDD is a complication in half of cases of GTPS; however, 70% of low back pain cases were found to be complicated with LDD by SPECT¹⁷⁵). GMedS is a major cause of low back pain, therefore GMedS is possibly related to LDD. Involvement of muscles adjacent to the GMed is significantly correlated to low back pain^{97, 176}), and functional disorders such as GMed atrophy or disfunction of GMedS are possibly related to poor body posture and could worsen low back pain.

Radicular pain exacerbates the symptoms of MPS¹⁷⁷⁾. However, MPS cases with radicular pain are also responsive to acupuncture and dry needling⁹⁷⁾. There is a possibility that MPS treatment also improves radicular pain. Therefore, accurate diagnosis and treatment of GMedS possibly also treat radicular pains. It is natural that cases of LSCS with impaired hip abductor strength were improved by L5 laminectomy¹⁷⁸⁾. Radicular pathology or facet joint pain exacerbates GMed dysfunction, which in turn worsens LDD and LDD, then this worsens radicular or facet joint pain. Breaking these vicious cycles may be the key to treatment of chronic back pain or leg pain.

GMedS is often complicated by piriformis syndrome or MPS of the piriformis¹¹, moreover both GMed and gluteus minimus are adjacent to piriformis^{44, 179}. Piriformis syndrome is accompanied by adhesions to adjacent muscles such as GMed¹⁸⁰. MTrPs may be responsible for nerve constriction directly or indirectly by muscle adhesions.

In cases of MTrPs caused by contracture of the GMed and gluteus minimus, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the GMed and gluteus minimus as the source of MTrPs clinically; they are the same pathology. This may be reflected in the fact that both the GMed and the gluteus minimus are involved in the pathology of GTPS. It is difficult to diagnose the GMed and gluteus minimus as the source by physical examination alone. For accurate diagnosis, ultrasound guidance may be necessary^{18, 181}.

Constriction of the cluneal nerves is a differential diagnosis of hip pain²³⁾. The symptoms and site of cluneal nerve constriction are similar in presentation to those of MTrPS of the gluteus maximus^{23, 93)}. Sometimes even water-diluted local

Table 9.	Characteristics	of leg pain	related to GMed
----------	-----------------	-------------	-----------------

Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Robinson RL et al. ¹³⁷⁾	Female patients with PFPS (n=10)	Hip abd. and external rotation strength were significantly decreased compared with the contralateral side and with controls
Bolgla LA et al. ¹³⁸⁾	Female patients with PFPS (n=18)	PFPS group generated significantly less hip abd. torque
Willson JD et al. ¹³⁹⁾	Female patients with PFPS (n=20)	Hip abd. strength was significantly lower compared with controls
Franettovich M et al. ¹⁴⁰⁾	Female patients with exercise- related leg pain (n=14)	Individuals with a history of exercise-related leg pain demonstrated significantly lower EMG peak activation and lower average EMG activation of GMed
Costa RA et al. ¹⁴¹⁾	Patients with symptomatic unilateral knee OA (n=25)	Hip abd. strength (peak torque) was significantly decreased compared with the contralateral side
Hinman RS et al. ¹⁴²⁾	Patients with symptomatic knee OA (n=89)	Hip abd. strength was significantly decreased compared with controls
Sled EA et al. ¹⁴³⁾	Patients with symptomatic medial knee OA (n=40)	Isokinetic hip abd. strength was significantly decreased in the knee OA group
Nakawaga TH et al. ¹⁴⁴⁾	Female patients with anterior knee pain (n=9)	No significant EMG activation of GMed was observed
Bolgla LA et al. ¹⁴⁵⁾	Female patients with PFPS (n=18)	PFPS group generated significantly less hip abd. torque PFPS group also generated greater GMed EMG activity during loading test
Nakawaga TH et al. ¹⁴⁶⁾	Patients with chronic PFPS (n=20)	Patients with PFPS generated less peak eccentric hip abd. torque; EMG amplitude of the GMed was significantly greater in female controls than in female patients with PFPS
Crossley KM et al. ¹⁴⁷⁾	Patients with symptomatic PFJ OA (n=60)	Individuals with PFJ OA ambulated with significantly lower peak hip abd. muscle forces than controls
Baert IA et al. ¹⁴⁸⁾	Female patients with knee OA (n=40)	Hip abd. strength was decreased compared with controls, but not significantly
Bley AS et al. ¹⁴⁹⁾	Female patients with PFPS	PFPS group generated significantly greater EMG activity of GMed and greater hip abd. moment than controls
Izumi M et al. ¹⁵⁰⁾	Hypertonic saline injection	GMed PPT was increased
Rutherford DJ et al. ¹⁵¹⁾	Patients with moderate knee OA (n=54)	No clear relationship of hip abd. muscle strength with specific amplitude and temporal KAM characteristics was found
Motealleh A et al. ¹⁵²⁾	Athletes with PFPS (n=28)	Onset and amplitude of GMed EMG activity were earlier and higher in the manipulation group than in the control group
Tevald MA et al. ¹⁵³⁾	Patients with knee OA (n=35)	Hip abd. significantly contributed to physical performance
Sritharan P et al. ¹⁵⁴⁾	Patients with symptomatic OA (n=39)	Calculated GMed force was significantly decreased compared with controls
Orozco-Chaves I et al. ¹⁵⁵⁾	Female patients with PFP (n=24)	PFP group had significantly later onset of GMed EMG, and showed no adaptation to velocity variation
Kalytczak MM et al. ¹⁵⁶⁾	Female patients with PFP (n=14)	EMG values for the GMax and GMed were significantly higher in the eccentric phase than in the concentric phase
Mirzaie GH et al. ¹⁵⁸⁾	Male patients with PFP (n=18)	Significant differences were found in GMed activity in loading tasks
Fuentes-Márquez P et al. ¹⁵⁷⁾	Female patients with chronic pelvic pain (n=40)	MTrPs of GMed was present in 55-87.5% of patients with chronic pelvic pain
Kameda M et al. ¹¹⁾	Patients with leg pain or hip pain (n=66)	45/66 (69.0%) cases had MPS
		20/29 (68.9%) cases had GMedS
Ackland DC et al. ¹⁵⁹⁾	Patients with patellofemoral joint OA (n=51)	Muscle volume was significantly decreased in the OA group

GMax: gluteus maximus; GMedS: gluteus medius syndrome; GMed: gluteus medius; PFP: patellofemoral pain; PFPS: patellofemoral pain syndrome; OA: osteoarthritis; abd.: abductor; PPT: pressure pain threshold; MPS: myofascial pain syndrome; EMG: electromyography; MTrPs: muscle trigger points.

Table 10.	Treatments o	f leg pain	related t	to GMed
-----------	--------------	------------	-----------	---------

Report	Cases	Treatment	Outcomes
Bennell KL et al. ¹⁶⁰⁾	Patients with symptomatic knee OA (n=119)	Isometric contraction of glu- teal muscles	No significant difference was found compared with placebo
Veenhof C et al. ¹³³⁾	Patients with hip or knee OA (n=101)	Behavioral graded activity program vs exercise therapy and advice	No significant difference was found between pro- grams
Sled EA et al. ¹⁴³⁾	Patients with symptomatic medial knee OA (n=40)	8-week home strengthen- ing program for the hip abd. muscles	Strengthening program decreased pain (WOMAC)
Bennell KL et al. ¹⁶¹⁾	Patients with symptomatic medial knee OA and pain (n=45)	Hip strengthening training for 13 weeks	Training significantly improved pain (WOMAC) and function (WOMAC)
Foroughi N et al. ¹⁶²⁾	Patients with knee OA (n=54)	Strengthening exercise with and without hip abd./hip ad- duction/knee extension	Strengthening exercise significantly improved pain (WOMAC) and difficulty (WOMAC); there were no significant differences between groups
Glaviano NR et al. ¹⁶³⁾	Female patients with chronic PFPS (n=15)	Patterned electrical neuro- muscular stimulation (PENS) vs. sham	PENS group had significantly improved pain (VAS) in load testing, with improvement of hip abduction and significant improvement in GMed activation
Kameda M e al. ¹¹⁾	MPS patients with leg pain or hip pain (n=14)	ASTR or TPI	Combination treatment of ASTR or TPI significantly improved pain (NRS)
	GMedS patients with leg pain or hip pain (n=9)	ASTR or TPI	Combination treatment of ASTR or TPI significantly improved pain (NRS)

OA: osteoarthritis; PFPS: patellofemoral pain syndrome; abd.: abductor; WOMAC: Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index; VAS: visual analogue scale; NRS: numerical rating scale; ASTR: active soft tissue release; TPI: trigger point injection.

anesthesia or normal saline is effective as TPI for treating MPS^{11, 18, 182}), which may have little or no results of nerve block **Table 11**. Characteristics of surgery-related symptoms related to GMed

Report	Cases	References to GMedS
Iorio R et al. ¹⁶⁴⁾	Patients with postoperative (THA) lateral hip pain	24/543 LTP (4.4%)
	(n=24)	Postoperative GTPS in 5% of cases, direct lateral approach
		Postoperative GTPS in 1.2% of cases, posterior approach
Farmer KW et al. ¹⁶⁵⁾	Patients with postoperative TB (n=32)	32 cases of postoperative GTPS among 689 cases of primary THA (4.6%)
Teixeira MJ et al. ¹⁶⁶⁾	Patients with FBSS (n=56)	85% of FBSS cases were complicated with MPS
		MTrPs of GMed was identified in 16% of cases
Matsumoto J et al. ¹⁶⁷⁾	Patients who underwent lumbar surgery (n=74)	20/74 (27%) FBSS patients

GMedS: gluteus medius syndrome; TB: trochanteric bursitis; LTP: Lateral trochanteric pain; GTPS: greater trochanteric pain syndrome; THA: total hip arthroplasty; GMed: gluteus medius; MPS: myofascial pain syndrome; FBSS: failed back surgery syndrome; MTrPs: muscle trigger points.

effects. The appropriate diagnosis to identify the pathology of the pain in terms of muscle sliding or nerve constriction is required in daily clinical practice. Since, both of these pathologies are hypothetically designated as MPS.

Many reports support the association of hip osteoarthritis with GMed dysfunction (Tables 7 and 8). GMed dysfunction possibly exacerbates hip osteoarthritis. THA is an effective treatment strategy for hip osteoarthritis, but THA also involves manipulation of the GMed. It is thus undeniable that this manipulation of GMed is a partial cause of pain or symptom recurrence in THA. Further research is needed on this topic.

Fearon et al. argued that pain itself rather than GMed tendinopathy is the cause of decreased GMed strength⁶⁰. Alleviating pain possibly improves gluteal tendinopathy or hip osteoarthritis, and additional physiotherapy, manual therapy, TPI, and other pain release methods may be important in treatment of hip osteoarthritis. The question remains as to whether hip pain exacerbates GMed dysfunction or whether GMed dysfunction worsens hip articular pressure, hip pain, or prognosis of hip osteoarthritis, or whether these vicious cycles constitute the pathology of hip osteoarthritis. Proper diagnosis and treatment of GMedS could possibly protect the hip from osteoarthritis, and possibly reduce the number of cases of THA. Further study

Table 12. Treatment of surgery-related symptoms related to GMed

Report	Cases	Treatment	Outcomes
Iorio R et al. ¹⁶⁴⁾	Patients with postoperative (THA) lateral hip pain (n=24)	Cs injection	All cases were treated non-surgically
Farmer KW et al. ¹⁶⁵⁾	Patients with postoperative (THA) TB (n=32)	Cs injection	Symptoms resolved in 20/25 patients (80%)
Matsumoto J et al. ¹⁶⁷⁾	Patients with FBSS (n= 20)	Only TPI (n=4) GMed decompression (n=8) Peripheral nerve decompression (n=11) Repeat surgery for lumbar disease (n=6)	FBSS group achieved good results similar to those of the non-FBSS group (RMDQ/JOA) (n=20)

GMed: gluteus medius; THA: total hip arthroplasty; TB: trochanteric bursitis; Cs: corticosteroid injection; FBSS: failed back surgery syndrome; TPI: trigger point injection; RMQ: Roland Morris Disability questionnaire; JOA: Japanese Orthopaedic Association.

is needed.

Knee osteoarthritis is related to GMed and interventions for GMed improved function and pain of knee osteoarthritis and PFPS (Tables 9 and 10). Vasilevska et al. and Grimaldi et al. described GTPS and the iliotibial band^{32, 183}). Furthermore, the strength involving the hip abductors improved the prognosis of knee osteoarthritis¹⁸⁴), and thus some part of knee osteoarthritis possibly attributed to GMedS.

In some cases, hip OA is complicated by LDD and treatment is unsuccessful even after surgical intervention. Even the combination of THA and spine surgery could not achieve pain relief but rather reduces activities of daily living of patients. Degenerative hip disease is often accompanied by LDD, and this combination was named hip-spine syndrome^{185, 186}.

It was demonstrated that GMedS and GTPS elicit both back pain and hip or leg pain and are related to LDD and hip osteoarthritis. This implies that GMedS or GTPS is possibly the main cause of hip-spine syndrome. Proper diagnosis and treatment of GMedS before surgery may decrease postoperative complications.

The prevalence of FBSS is reported to be 10–40%^{167, 173, 187}. Most cases of FBSS are complicated by MPS¹⁶⁶. The fact that most FBSS cases are adequately treated by GMed decompression and nerve decompression¹⁶⁷ might indicate that FBSS is a component of MPS. Proper diagnosis and treatment of MPS and GMedS might decrease the likelihood of FBSS and further research is needed in terms of safety and cost-effectiveness.

The clinical features of GMedS was reviewed in terms of diagnosis and treatment on this article. GMedS is associated with low back pain, leg pain, LDD, and hip osteoarthritis. Moreover, we identified a new treatment strategy for GMedS and GTPS. Proper diagnosis of GMedS may improve LDD and osteoarthritis of the hip and knee, as well as hip-spine syndrome and FBSS. Further research is warranted to clarify these issues.

This research review was conducted by searching for articles using only simple keywords, which may not have captured the full scope of the topic. This may have led to overlooking or not identifying some important factors. Also, the quality of evidence was not assessed in the included articles, and so the reliability of the review may have been lessened by combining certain and uncertain research. There were few reviews on this topic, and this might limit the conclusiveness of our review.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Mr. Masakazu Kutsunugi and Dr. Tadashi KOBAYASHI for the advice during the drafting of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Dagenais S, Caro J, Haldeman S: A systematic review of low back pain cost of illness studies in the United States and internationally. Spine J, 2008, 8: 8–20. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- The Arthritis Foundation of Australia: The prevalence, cost, and disease burden of arthritis in Australia. Access Economics Pty Limited Canberra ACT March 2001 https://arthritisaustralia.com.au/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Access Economics 2001.pdf (Accessed Oct. 1, 2019)
- 3) Koes BW, van Tulder MW, Thomas S: Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. BMJ, 2006, 332: 1430-1434. [Medline] [CrossRef]

- 4) Litwic A, Edwards MH, Dennison EM, et al.: Epidemiology and burden of osteoarthritis. Br Med Bull, 2013, 105: 185–199. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 5) Suzuki H, Kanchiku T, Imajo Y, et al.: Diagnosis and characters of non-specific low back pain in Japan: the Yamaguchi Low Back Pain Study. PLoS One, 2016, 11: e0160454. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 6) Ishimoto Y, Yoshimura N, Muraki S, et al.: Prevalence of symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis and its association with physical performance in a populationbased cohort in Japan: the Wakayama Spine Study. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2012, 20: 1103–1108. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 7) Goldie I: Att förebygga sjukdomar i rörelseorganen. Socialstyrelsen, 1987, 14: 129-139.
- 8) Bewyer DC, Bewyer KJ: Rationale for treatment of hip abductor pain syndrome. Iowa Orthop J, 2003, 23: 57–60. [Medline]
- 9) Martínez Rodríguez P, Calvo Rodríguez D, González Cal A, et al.: [Update on gluteus medius syndrome]. Semergen, 2013, 39: 208–213 (in Spanish). [Medline]
- Kim K, Isu T, Chiba Y, et al.: Decompression of the gluteus medius muscle as a new treatment for buttock pain: technical note. Eur Spine J, 2016, 25: 1282– 1288. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Kameda M, Tanimae H: Effectiveness of active soft tissue release and trigger point block for the diagnosis and treatment of low back and leg pain of predominantly gluteus medius origin: a report of 115 cases. J Phys Ther Sci, 2019, 31: 141–148. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Imamura M, Alfieri FM, Filippo TR, et al.: Pressure pain thresholds in patients with chronic nonspecific low back pain. J Back Musculoskeletal Rehabil, 2016, 29: 327–336. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 13) Simons DG, Travell JG, Simons LS: Travell & Simons' myofascial pain and dysfunction: the trigger point manual, 2nd ed. Baltimore: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1999.
- 14) Stecco A, Gesi M, Stecco C, et al.: Fascial components of the myofascial pain syndrome. Curr Pain Headache Rep, 2013, 17: 352. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 15) Shah JP, Gilliams EA: Uncovering the biochemical milieu of myofascial trigger points using in vivo microdialysis: an application of muscle pain concepts to myofascial pain syndrome. J Bodyw Mov Ther, 2008, 12: 371–384. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 16) Quintner JL, Cohen ML: Referred pain of peripheral nerve origin: an alternative to the "myofascial pain" construct. Clin J Pain, 1994, 10: 243–251. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 17) Simons DG, Travell JG: Myofascial origins of low back pain. 1. Principles of diagnosis and treatment. Postgrad Med, 1983, 73: 66, 68–70, 73 passim. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 18) Kobayashi T, Kimura H: Atarashii gainen "Kinmakuseisittuushoukougun (MPS)". In: The seikeinaika. Tokyo: Nanzando, 2016, pp 37-49.
- 19) Chen CK, Nizar AJ: Myofascial pain syndrome in chronic back pain patients. Korean J Pain, 2011, 24: 100-104. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 20) Cooper NA, Scavo KM, Strickland KJ, et al.: Prevalence of gluteus medius weakness in people with chronic low back pain compared to healthy controls. Eur Spine J, 2016, 25: 1258–1265. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Iglesias-González JJ, Muñoz-García MT, Rodrigues-de-Souza DP, et al.: Myofascial trigger points, pain, disability, and sleep quality in patients with chronic nonspecific low back pain. Pain Med, 2013, 14: 1964–1970. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Cooper NA: Gluteus medius dysfunction in chronic low back pain. PhD thesis, University of Iowa, 2017. https://doi.org/ 10.17077/etd.a67jlh6i (Accessed Oct. 1, 2019)
- 23) Matsumoto J, Isu T, Kim K, et al.: Surgical treatment of middle cluneal nerve entrapment neuropathy: technical note. J Neurosurg Spine, 2018, 29: 208–213. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 24) Anderson TP: Trochanteric bursitis: diagnostic criteria and clinical significance. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 1958, 39: 617-622. [Medline]
- 25) Gordon EJ: Trochanteric bursitis and tendinitis. Clin Orthop, 1961, 20: 193-202. [Medline]
- 26) Segal NA, Felson DT, Torner JC, et al. Multicenter Osteoarthritis Study Group: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome: epidemiology and associated factors. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2007, 88: 988–992. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 27) Williams BS, Cohen SP: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome: a review of anatomy, diagnosis and treatment. Anesth Analg, 2009, 108: 1662–1670. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 28) Strauss EJ, Nho SJ, Kelly BT: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome. Sports Med Arthrosc Rev, 2010, 18: 113–119. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Lustenberger DP, Ng VY, Best TM, et al.: Efficacy of treatment of trochanteric bursitis: a systematic review. Clin J Sport Med, 2011, 21: 447–453. [Medline]
 [CrossRef]
- Mulligan EP, Middleton EF, Brunette M: Evaluation and management of greater trochanter pain syndrome. Phys Ther Sport, 2015, 16: 205–214. [Medline]
 [CrossRef]
- 31) Reid D: The management of greater trochanteric pain syndrome: a systematic literature review. J Orthop, 2016, 13: 15–28. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 32) Grimaldi A, Fearon A: Gluteal tendinopathy: integrating pathomechanics and clinical features in its management. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther, 2015, 45: 910–922. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 33) Torres A, Fernández-Fairen M, Sueiro-Fernández J: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome and gluteus medius and minimus tendinosis: nonsurgical treatment. Pain Manag, 2018, 8: 45–55. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 34) Walker P, Kannangara S, Bruce WJ, et al.: Lateral hip pain: does imaging predict response to localized injection? Clin Orthop Relat Res, 2007, 457: 144–149. [Medline]
- 35) Tan LA, Benkli B, Tuchman A, et al.: High prevalence of greater trochanteric pain syndrome among patients presenting to spine clinic for evaluation of degenerative lumbar pathologies. J Clin Neurosci, 2018, 53: 89–91. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 36) French HP, Gilsenan C, Cusack T: Gluteal muscle dysfunction and the role of specific strengthening in hip osteoarthritis: a review. Phys Ther Rev, 2008, 13: 333–344. [CrossRef]
- 37) Loureiro A, Mills PM, Barrett RS: Muscle weakness in hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken), 2013, 65: 340–352. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 38) Zacharias A, Green RA, Semciw AI, et al.: Efficacy of rehabilitation programs for improving muscle strength in people with hip or knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2014, 22: 1752–1773. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 39) Marshall AR, Noronha M, Zacharias A, et al.: Structure and function of the abductors in patients with hip osteoarthritis: systematic review and meta-analysis. J Back Musculoskeletal Rehabil, 2016, 29: 191–204. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 40) Lawrenson PR, Crossley KM, Vicenzino BT, et al.: Muscle size and composition in people with articular hip pathology: a systematic review with meta-

analysis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2019, 27: 181–195. [Medline] [CrossRef]

- 41) Swezey RL: Pseudo-radiculopathy in subacute trochanteric bursitis of the subgluteus maximus bursa. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 1976, 57: 387–390. [Medline]
- 42) Collèe G, Dijkmans BA, Vandenbroucke JP, et al.: A clinical epidemiological study in low back pain. Description of two clinical syndromes. Br J Rheumatol, 1990, 29: 354–357. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 43) Collée G, Dijkmans BA, Vandenbroucke JP, et al.: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome (trochanteric bursitis) in low back pain. Scand J Rheumatol, 1991, 20: 262–266. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 44) Kingzett-Taylor A, Tirman PF, Feller J, et al.: Tendinosis and tears of gluteus medius and minimus muscles as a cause of hip pain: MR imaging findings. AJR Am J Roentgenol, 1999, 173: 1123–1126. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 45) Howell GE, Biggs RE, Bourne RB: Prevalence of abductor mechanism tears of the hips in patients with osteoarthritis. J Arthroplasty, 2001, 16: 121–123. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 46) Bird PA, Oakley SP, Shnier R, et al.: Prospective evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging and physical examination findings in patients with greater trochanteric pain syndrome. Arthritis Rheum, 2001, 44: 2138–2145. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 47) Tortolani PJ, Carbone JJ, Quartararo LG: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome in patients referred to orthopedic spine specialists. Spine J, 2002, 2: 251–254. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 48) Connell DA, Bass C, Sykes CA, et al.: Sonographic evaluation of gluteus medius and minimus tendinopathy. Eur Radiol, 2003, 13: 1339–1347. [Medline]
- 49) Cvitanic O, Henzie G, Skezas N, et al.: MRI diagnosis of tears of the hip abductor tendons (gluteus medius and gluteus minimus). AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2004, 182: 137–143. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 50) Sayegh F, Potoupnis M, Kapetanos G: Greater trochanter bursitis pain syndrome in females with chronic low back pain and sciatica. Acta Orthop Belg, 2004, 70: 423–428. [Medline]
- 51) Lievense A, Bierma-Zeinstra S, Schouten B, et al.: Prognosis of trochanteric pain in primary care. Br J Gen Pract, 2005, 55: 199-204. [Medline]
- 52) Lequesne M, Djian P, Vuillemin V, et al.: Prospective study of refractory greater trochanter pain syndrome. MRI findings of gluteal tendon tears seen at surgery. Clinical and MRI results of tendon repair. Joint Bone Spine, 2008, 75: 458–464. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 53) Woodley SJ, Nicholson HD, Livingstone V, et al.: Lateral hip pain: findings from magnetic resonance imaging and clinical examination. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther, 2008, 38: 313–328. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 54) Blankenbaker DG, Ullrick SR, Davis KW, et al.: Correlation of MRI findings with clinical findings of trochanteric pain syndrome. Skeletal Radiol, 2008, 37: 903–909. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 55) Iagnocco A, Filippucci E, Riente L, et al.: Ultrasound imaging for the rheumatologist XLI. Sonographic assessment of the hip in OA patients. Clin Exp Rheumatol, 2012, 30: 652–657. [Medline]
- 56) Long SS, Surrey DE, Nazarian LN: Sonography of greater trochanteric pain syndrome and the rarity of primary bursitis. AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2013, 201: 1083–1086. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 57) Lindner D, Shohat N, Botser I, et al.: Clinical presentation and imaging results of patients with symptomatic gluteus medius tears. J Hip Preserv Surg, 2015, 2: 310–315. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 58) Ebert JR, Retheesh T, Mutreja R, et al.: The clinical, functional and biomechanical presentation of patients with symptomatic hip abductor tendon tears. Int J Sports Phys Ther, 2016, 11: 725–737. [Medline]
- 59) Allison K, Vicenzino B, Wrigley TV, et al.: Hip abductor muscle weakness in individuals with gluteal tendinopathy. Med Sci Sports Exerc, 2016, 48: 346–352. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 60) Fearon A, Neeman T, Smith P, et al.: Pain, not structural impairments may explain activity limitations in people with gluteal tendinopathy or hip osteoarthritis: a cross sectional study. Gait Posture, 2017, 52: 237–243. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 61) Pozzi G, Lanza E, Parra CG, et al.: Incidence of greater trochanteric pain syndrome in patients suspected for femoroacetabular impingement evaluated using magnetic resonance arthrography of the hip. Radiol Med (Torino), 2017, 122: 208–214. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 62) Ganderton C, Pizzari T, Harle T, et al.: A comparison of gluteus medius, gluteus minimus and tensor facia latae muscle activation during gait in post-menopausal women with and without greater trochanteric pain syndrome. J Electromyogr Kinesiol, 2017, 33: 39–47. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 63) Ege Rasmussen KJ, Fanø N: Trochanteric bursitis. Treatment by corticosteroid injection. Scand J Rheumatol, 1985, 14: 417–420. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 64) Shbeeb MI, O'Duffy JD, Michet CJ Jr, et al.: Evaluation of glucocorticosteroid injection for the treatment of trochanteric bursitis. J Rheumatol, 1996, 23: 2104–2106. [Medline]
- 65) Furia JP, Rompe JD, Maffulli N: Low-energy extracorporeal shock wave therapy as a treatment for greater trochanteric pain syndrome. Am J Sports Med, 2009, 37: 1806–1813. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 66) Rompe JD, Segal NA, Cacchio A, et al.: Home training, local corticosteroid injection, or radial shock wave therapy for greater trochanter pain syndrome. Am J Sports Med, 2009, 37: 1981–1990. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 67) Cohen SP, Strassels SA, Foster L, et al.: Comparison of fluoroscopically guided and blind corticosteroid injections for greater trochanteric pain syndrome: multicentre randomised controlled trial. BMJ, 2009, 338: b1088. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 68) Uliassi NW: Steroid injections vs. analgesics for greater trochanteric pain syndrome. Am Fam Physician, 2012, 85: 916.
- 69) Mautner K, Colberg RE, Malanga G, et al.: Outcomes after ultrasound-guided platelet-rich plasma injections for chronic tendinopathy: a multicenter, retrospective review. PM R, 2013, 5: 169–175. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- McEvoy JR, Lee KS, Blankenbaker DG, et al.: Ultrasound-guided corticosteroid injections for treatment of greater trochanteric pain syndrome: greater trochanter bursa versus subgluteus medius bursa. AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2013, 201: W313–7. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 71) Estrela GQ, Furtado R, Natour J, et al.: Blinded vs ultrasound-guided corticosteroid injections for the treatment of the greater trochanteric pain syndrome (SDPT): a randomized controlled trial. Ann Rheum Dis, 2014, 73: 304. [CrossRef]
- 72) Lee JJ, Harrison JR, Boachie-Adjei K, et al.: Platelet-rich plasma injections with needle tenotomy for gluteus medius tendinopathy: a registry study with prospective follow-up. Orthop J Sports Med, 2016, 4: 2325967116671692. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 73) Ribeiro AG, Ricioli W, Silva AR, et al.: PRP in the treatment of trochanteric syndrome: a pilot study. Acta Ortop Bras, 2016, 24: 208–212. [Medline] [Cross-Ref]

- 74) Jacobson JA, Yablon CM, Henning PT, et al.: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome: percutaneous tendon fenestration versus platelet-rich plasma injection for treatment of gluteal tendinosis. J Ultrasound Med, 2016, 35: 2413–2420. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 75) Fitzpatrick J, Bulsara MK, O'Donnell J, et al.: The effectiveness of platelet-rich plasma injections in gluteal tendinopathy: a randomized, double-blind controlled trial comparing a single platelet-rich plasma injection with a single corticosteroid injection. Am J Sports Med, 2018, 46: 933–939. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 76) Brooker AF Jr: The surgical approach to refractory trochanteric bursitis. Johns Hopkins Med J, 1979, 145: 98–100. [Medline]
- 77) Kagan A 2nd: Rotator cuff tears of the hip. Clin Orthop Relat Res, 1999, (368): 135-140. [Medline]
- 78) Govaert LH, van der Vis HM, Marti RK, et al.: Trochanteric reduction osteotomy as a treatment for refractory trochanteric bursitis. J Bone Joint Surg Br, 2003, 85: 199–203. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Baker CL Jr, Massie RV, Hurt WG, et al.: Arthroscopic bursectomy for recalcitrant trochanteric bursitis. Arthroscopy, 2007, 23: 827–832. [Medline] [Cross-Ref]
- 80) Davies H, Zhaeentan S, Tavakkolizadeh A, et al.: Surgical repair of chronic tears of the hip abductor mechanism. Hip Int, 2009, 19: 372–376. [Medline] [Cross-Ref]
- 81) Voos JE, Shindle MK, Pruett A, et al.: Endoscopic repair of gluteus medius tendon tears of the hip. Am J Sports Med, 2009, 37: 743–747. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 82) Walsh MJ, Walton JR, Walsh NA: Surgical repair of the gluteal tendons: a report of 72 cases. J Arthroplasty, 2011, 26: 1514–1519. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 83) Davies JF, Stiehl JB, Davies JA, et al.: Surgical treatment of hip abductor tendon tears. J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2013, 95: 1420–1425. [Medline] [CrossRef]
 84) Chandrasekaran S, Vemula SP, Gui C, et al.: Clinical features that predict the need for operative intervention in gluteus medius tears. Orthop J Sports Med,
- 2015, 3: 2325967115571079. [Medline] [CrossRef]
 85) Njoo KH, Van der Does E: The occurrence and inter-rater reliability of myofascial trigger points in the quadratus lumborum and gluteus medius: a prospective study in non-specific low back pain patients and controls in general practice. Pain, 1994, 58: 317–323. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 86) Farasyn A, Meeusen R: The influence of non-specific low back pain on pressure pain thresholds and disability. Eur J Pain, 2005, 9: 375–381. [Medline] [Cross-Ref]
- 87) Nelson-Wong E, Gregory DE, Winter DA, et al.: Gluteus medius muscle activation patterns as a predictor of low back pain during standing. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon), 2008, 23: 545–553. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 88) Bewyer KJ, Bewyer DC, Messenger D, et al.: Pilot data: association between gluteus medius weakness and low back pain during pregnancy. Iowa Orthop J, 2009, 29: 97–99. [Medline]
- 89) Arab AM, Nourbakhsh MR: The relationship between hip abductor muscle strength and iliotibial band tightness in individuals with low back pain. Chiropr Osteopat, 2010, 18: 1. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 90) Kendall KD, Schmidt C, Ferber R: The relationship between hip-abductor strength and the magnitude of pelvic drop in patients with low back pain. J Sport Rehabil, 2010, 19: 422–435. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- Marshall PW, Patel H, Callaghan JP: Gluteus medius strength, endurance, and co-activation in the development of low back pain during prolonged standing. Hum Mov Sci, 2011, 30: 63–73. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 92) Santos FG, Carmo CM, Fracini AC, et al.: Chronic low back pain in women: muscle activation during task performance. J Phys Ther Sci, 2013, 25: 1569–1573. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 93) Penney T, Ploughman M, Austin MW, et al.: Determining the activation of gluteus medius and the validity of the single leg stance test in chronic, nonspecific low back pain. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2014, 95: 1969–1976. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 94) Kuniya H, Aota Y, Kawai T, et al.: Prospective study of superior cluneal nerve disorder as a potential cause of low back pain and leg symptoms. J Orthop Surg, 2014, 9: 139. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 95) Takla MK, Razek NM, Kattabei O, et al.: A comparison between different modes of real-time sonoelastography in visualizing myofascial trigger points in low back muscles. J Manual Manip Ther, 2016, 24: 253–263. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 96) Bussey MD, Kennedy JE, Kennedy G: Gluteus medius coactivation response in field hockey players with and without low back pain. Phys Ther Sport, 2016, 17: 24–29. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 97) Skorupska E, Keczmer P, Łochowski RM, et al.: Reliability of MR-based volumetric 3-D analysis of pelvic muscles among subjects with low back with leg pain and healthy volunteers. PLoS One, 2016, 11: e0159587. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 98) Farahpour N, Jafarnezhadgero A, Allard P, et al.: Muscle activity and kinetics of lower limbs during walking in pronated feet individuals with and without low back pain. J Electromyogr Kinesiol, 2018, 39: 35–41. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 99) Aboufazeli M, Akbari M, Jamshidi AA, et al.: Comparison of selective local and global muscle thicknesses in females with and without chronic low back pain. Ortop Traumatol Rehabil, 2018, 20: 197–204. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 100) Viggiani D, Callaghan JP: Hip abductor fatigability and recovery are related to the development of low back pain during prolonged standing. J Appl Biomech, 2018, 34: 39–46. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 101) Psycharakis SG, Coleman SG, Linton L, et al.: Muscle activity during aquatic and land exercises in people with and without low back pain. Phys Ther, 2019, 99: 297–310. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 102) Koo TK, Cohen JH, Zheng Y: Immediate effect of nimmo receptor tonus technique on muscle elasticity, pain perception, and disability in subjects with chronic low back pain. J Manipulative Physiol Ther, 2012, 35: 45–53. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 103) Kokubo R, Kim K, Isu T, et al.: Superior cluneal nerve entrapment neuropathy and gluteus medius muscle pain: their effect on very old patients with low back pain. World Neurosurg, 2017, 98: 132–139. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 104) Širca A, Susec-Michieli M: Selective type II fibre muscular atrophy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip. J Neurol Sci, 1980, 44: 149–159. [Medline] [Cross-Ref]
- 105) Shih CH, Du YK, Lin YH, et al.: Muscular recovery around the hip joint after total hip arthroplasty. Clin Orthop Relat Res, 1994, (302): 115–120. [Medline]
- 106) Hurwitz DE, Hulet CH, Andriacchi TP, et al.: Gait compensations in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip and their relationship to pain and passive hip motion. J Orthop Res, 1997, 15: 629–635. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 107) Watanabe H, Shimada Y, Sato K, et al.: Gait analysis before or after varus osteotomy of the femur for hip osteoarthritis. Biomed Mater Eng, 1998, 8: 177–186. [Medline]

- 108) Watelain E, Dujardin F, Babier F, et al.: Pelvic and lower limb compensatory actions of subjects in an early stage of hip osteoarthritis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2001, 82: 1705–1711. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 109) Sims KJ, Richardson CA, Brauer SG: Investigation of hip abductor activation in subjects with clinical unilateral hip osteoarthritis. Ann Rheum Dis, 2002, 61: 687–692. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 110) Arokoski MH, Arokoski JP, Haara M, et al.: Hip muscle strength and muscle cross sectional area in men with and without hip osteoarthritis. J Rheumatol, 2002, 29: 2185–2195. [Medline]
- 111) Rasch A, Dalén N, Berg HE: Test methods to detect hip and knee muscle weakness and gait disturbance in patients with hip osteoarthritis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2005, 86: 2371–2376. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 112) Eimre M, Puhke R, Alev K, et al.: Altered mitochondrial apparent affinity for ADP and impaired function of mitochondrial creatine kinase in gluteus medius of patients with hip osteoarthritis. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol, 2006, 290: R1271–R1275. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 113) Kubota M, Shimada S, Kobayashi S, et al.: Quantitative gait analysis of patients with bilateral hip osteoarthritis excluding the influence of walking speed. J Orthop Sci, 2007, 12: 451–457. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 114) Amaro A, Amado F, Duarte JA, et al.: Gluteus medius muscle atrophy is related to contralateral and ipsilateral hip joint osteoarthritis. Int J Sports Med, 2007, 28: 1035–1039. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 115) Rasch A, Byström AH, Dalen N, et al.: Reduced muscle radiological density, cross-sectional area, and strength of major hip and knee muscles in 22 patients with hip osteoarthritis. Acta Orthop, 2007, 78: 505–510. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 116) Grimaldi A, Richardson C, Stanton W, et al.: The association between degenerative hip joint pathology and size of the gluteus medius, gluteus minimus and piriformis muscles. Man Ther, 2009, 14: 605–610. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 117) Rasch A, Dalén N, Berg HE: Muscle strength, gait, and balance in 20 patients with hip osteoarthritis followed for 2 years after THA. Acta Orthop, 2010, 81: 183–188. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 118) Youdas JW, Madson TJ, Hollman JH: Usefulness of the Trendelenburg test for identification of patients with hip joint osteoarthritis. Physiother Theory Pract, 2010, 26: 184–194. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 119) Fukumoto Y, Ikezoe T, Tateuchi H, et al.: Muscle mass and composition of the hip, thigh and abdominal muscles in women with and without hip osteoarthritis. Ultrasound Med Biol, 2012, 38: 1540–1545. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 120) Dwyer MK, Stafford K, Mattacola CG, et al.: Comparison of gluteus medius muscle activity during functional tasks in individuals with and without osteoarthritis of the hip joint. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon), 2013, 28: 757–761. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 121) Judd DL, Thomas AC, Dayton MR, et al.: Strength and functional deficits in individuals with hip osteoarthritis compared to healthy, older adults. Disabil Rehabil, 2014, 36: 307–312. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 122) Hatton AL, Kemp JL, Brauer SG, et al.: Impairment of dynamic single-leg balance performance in individuals with hip chondropathy. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken), 2014, 66: 709-716. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 123) Rutherford DJ, Moreside J, Wong I: Hip joint motion and gluteal muscle activation differences between healthy controls and those with varying degrees of hip osteoarthritis during walking. J Electromyogr Kinesiol, 2015, 25: 944–950. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 124) French HP, Huang X, Cummiskey A, et al.: Normalisation method can affect gluteus medius electromyography results during weight bearing exercises in people with hip osteoarthritis (OA): a case control study. Gait Posture, 2015, 41: 470–475. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 125) Zacharias A, Pizzari T, English DJ, et al.: Hip abductor muscle volume in hip osteoarthritis and matched controls. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2016, 24: 1727– 1735. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 126) Nankaku M, Tsuboyama T, Aoyama T, et al.: Preoperative gluteus medius muscle atrophy as a predictor of walking ability after total hip arthroplasty. Phys Ther Rev, 2016, 19: 8–12. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 127) Momose T, Inaba Y, Choe H, et al.: CT-based analysis of muscle volume and degeneration of gluteus medius in patients with unilateral hip osteoarthritis. BMC Musculoskelet Disord, 2017, 18: 457. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 128) Zacharias A, Green RA, Semciw A, et al.: Atrophy of hip abductor muscles is related to clinical severity in a hip osteoarthritis population. Clin Anat, 2018, 31: 507–513. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 129) Loureiro A, Constantinou M, Diamond LE, et al.: Individuals with mild-to-moderate hip osteoarthritis have lower limb muscle strength and volume deficits. BMC Musculoskelet Disord, 2018, 19: 303. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 130) Zacharias A, Pizzari T, Semciw AI, et al.: Comparison of gluteus medius and minimus activity during gait in people with hip osteoarthritis and matched controls. Scand J Med Sci Sports, 2019, 29: 696–705. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 131) Hoeksma HL, Dekker J, Ronday HK, et al.: Comparison of manual therapy and exercise therapy in osteoarthritis of the hip: a randomized clinical trial. Arthritis Rheum, 2004, 51: 722–729. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 132) Stener-Victorin E, Kruse-Smidje C, Jung K: Comparison between electro-acupuncture and hydrotherapy, both in combination with patient education and patient education alone, on the symptomatic treatment of osteoarthritis of the hip. Clin J Pain, 2004, 20: 179–185. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 133) Veenhof C, Köke AJ, Dekker J, et al.: Effectiveness of behavioral graded activity in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip and/or knee: a randomized clinical trial. Arthritis Rheum, 2006, 55: 925–934. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 134) Wang TJ, Belza B, Elaine Thompson F, et al.: Effects of aquatic exercise on flexibility, strength and aerobic fitness in adults with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. J Adv Nurs, 2007, 57: 141–152. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 135) Hinman RS, Heywood SE, Day AR: Aquatic physical therapy for hip and knee osteoarthritis: results of a single-blind randomized controlled trial. Phys Ther, 2007, 87: 32–43. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 136) Steinhilber B, Haupt G, Miller R, et al.: Exercise therapy in patients with hip osteoarthritis: Effect on hip muscle strength and safety aspects of exercise-results of a randomized controlled trial. Mod Rheumatol, 2017, 27: 493–502. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 137) Robinson RL, Nee RJ: Analysis of hip strength in females seeking physical therapy treatment for unilateral patellofemoral pain syndrome. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther, 2007, 37: 232–238. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 138) Bolgla LA, Malone TR, Umberger BR, et al.: Hip strength and hip and knee kinematics during stair descent in females with and without patellofemoral pain syndrome. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther, 2008, 38: 12–18. [Medline] [CrossRef]

- 139) Willson JD, Davis IS: Lower extremity strength and mechanics during jumping in women with patellofemoral pain. J Sport Rehabil, 2009, 18: 76–90. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 140) Franettovich M, Chapman AR, Blanch P, et al.: Altered neuromuscular control in individuals with exercise-related leg pain. Med Sci Sports Exerc, 2010, 42: 546–555. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 141) Costa RA, Oliveira LM, Watanabe SH, et al.: Isokinetic assessment of the hip muscles in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee. Clinics (Sao Paulo), 2010, 65: 1253–1259. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 142) Hinman RS, Hunt MA, Creaby MW, et al.: Hip muscle weakness in individuals with medial knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken), 2010, 62: 1190–1193. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 143) Sled EA, Khoja L, Deluzio KJ, et al.: Effect of a home program of hip abductor exercises on knee joint loading, strength, function, and pain in people with knee osteoarthritis: a clinical trial. Phys Ther, 2010, 90: 895–904. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 144) Nakagawa TH, Baldon RM, Muniz TB, et al.: Relationship among eccentric hip and knee torques, symptom severity and functional capacity in females with patellofemoral pain syndrome. Phys Ther Sport, 2011, 12: 133–139. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 145) Bolgla LA, Malone TR, Umberger BR, et al.: Comparison of hip and knee strength and neuromuscular activity in subjects with and without patellofemoral pain syndrome. Int J Sports Phys Ther, 2011, 6: 285–296. [Medline]
- 146) Nakagawa TH, Moriya ET, Maciel CD, et al.: Trunk, pelvis, hip, and knee kinematics, hip strength, and gluteal muscle activation during a single-leg squat in males and females with and without patellofemoral pain syndrome. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther, 2012, 42: 491–501. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 147) Crossley KM, Dorn TW, Ozturk H, et al.: Altered hip muscle forces during gait in people with patellofemoral osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2012, 20: 1243–1249. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 148) Baert IA, Jonkers I, Staes F, et al.: Gait characteristics and lower limb muscle strength in women with early and established knee osteoarthritis. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon), 2013, 28: 40–47. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 149) Bley AS, Correa JC, Dos Reis AC, et al.: Propulsion phase of the single leg triple hop test in women with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a biomechanical study. PLoS One, 2014, 9: e97606. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 150) Izumi M, Petersen KK, Arendt-Nielsen L, et al.: Pain referral and regional deep tissue hyperalgesia in experimental human hip pain models. Pain, 2014, 155: 792–800. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 151) Rutherford DJ, Hubley-Kozey C, Stanish W: Hip abductor function in individuals with medial knee osteoarthritis: Implications for medial compartment loading during gait. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon), 2014, 29: 545–550. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 152) Motealleh A, Gheysari E, Shokri E, et al.: The immediate effect of lumbopelvic manipulation on EMG of vasti and gluteus medius in athletes with patellofemoral pain syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. Man Ther, 2016, 22: 16–21. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 153) Tevald MA, Murray A, Luc BA, et al.: Hip abductor strength in people with knee osteoarthritis: a cross-sectional study of reliability and association with function. Knee, 2016, 23: 57–62. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 154) Sritharan P, Lin YC, Richardson SE, et al.: Musculoskeletal loading in the symptomatic and asymptomatic knees of middle-aged osteoarthritis patients. J Orthop Res, 2017, 35: 321–330. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 155) Orozco-Chavez I, Mendez-Rebolledo G: Effect of squatting velocity on hip muscle latency in women with patellofemoral pain syndrome. J Phys Ther Sci, 2018, 30: 381–386. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 156) Kalytczak MM, Lucareli PR, Dos Reis AC, et al.: Female PFP patients present alterations in eccentric muscle activity but not the temporal order of activation of the vastus lateralis muscle during the single leg triple hop test. Gait Posture, 2018, 62: 445–450. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 157) Fuentes-Márquez P, Valenza MC, Cabrera-Martos I, et al.: Trigger points, pressure pain hyperalgesia, and mechanosensitivity of neural tissue in women with chronic pelvic pain. Pain Med, 2019, 20: 5–13. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 158) Mirzaie GH, Rahimi A, Kajbafvala M, et al.: Electromyographic activity of the hip and knee muscles during functional tasks in males with and without patellofemoral pain. J Bodyw Mov Ther, 2019, 23: 54–58. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 159) Ackland DC, Denton M, Schache AG, et al.: Hip abductor muscle volumes are smaller in individuals affected by patellofemoral joint osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2019, 27: 266–272. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 160) Bennell KL, Hinman RS, Metcalf BR, et al.: Efficacy of physiotherapy management of knee joint osteoarthritis: a randomised, double blind, placebo controlled trial. Ann Rheum Dis, 2005, 64: 906–912. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 161) Bennell KL, Hunt MA, Wrigley TV, et al.: Hip strengthening reduces symptoms but not knee load in people with medial knee osteoarthritis and varus malalignment: a randomised controlled trial. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2010, 18: 621–628. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 162) Foroughi N, Smith RM, Lange AK, et al.: Lower limb muscle strengthening does not change frontal plane moments in women with knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon), 2011, 26: 167–174. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 163) Glaviano NR, Huntsman S, Dembeck A, et al.: Improvements in kinematics, muscle activity and pain during functional tasks in females with patellofemoral pain following a single patterned electrical stimulation treatment. Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon), 2016, 32: 20–27. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 164) Iorio R, Healy WL, Warren PD, et al.: Lateral trochanteric pain following primary total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty, 2006, 21: 233–236. [Medline] [Cross-Ref]
- 165) Farmer KW, Jones LC, Brownson KE, et al.: Trochanteric bursitis after total hip arthroplasty: incidence and evaluation of response to treatment. J Arthroplasty, 2010, 25: 208–212. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 166) Teixeira MJ, Yeng LT, Garcia OG, et al.: Failed back surgery pain syndrome: therapeutic approach descriptive study in 56 patients. Rev Assoc Med Bras 1992, 2011, 57: 282–287. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 167) Matsumoto J, Isu T, Kim K, et al.: Impact of additional treatment of paralumbar spine and peripheral nerve diseases after lumbar spine surgery. World Neurosurg, 2018, 112: e778–e782. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 168) Genth B, Von Düring M, Von Engelhardt LV, et al.: Analysis of the sensory innervations of the greater trochanter for improving the treatment of greater trochanteric pain syndrome. Clin Anat, 2012, 25: 1080–1086. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 169) Karpinski MR, Piggott H: Greater trochanteric pain syndrome. A report of 15 cases. J Bone Joint Surg Br, 1985, 67: 762–763. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 170) Facco E, Ceccherelli F: Myofascial pain mimicking radicular syndromes. Acta Neurochir Suppl (Wien), 2005, 92: 147–150. [Medline] [CrossRef]

- 171) Sayson SC, Ducey JP, Maybrey JB, et al.: Sciatic entrapment neuropathy associated with an anomalous piriformis muscle. Pain, 1994, 59: 149–152. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 172) Vassalou EE, Katonis P, Karantanas AH: Piriformis muscle syndrome: a cross-sectional imaging study in 116 patients and evaluation of therapeutic outcome. Eur Radiol, 2018, 28: 447–458. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 173) Schofferman J, Reynolds J, Herzog R, et al.: Failed back surgery: etiology and diagnostic evaluation. Spine J, 2003, 3: 400-403. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 174) Stephens G, O'Neill S, French HP, et al.: A survey of physiotherapy practice (2018) in the United Kingdom for patients with greater trochanteric pain syndrome. Musculoskelet Sci Pract, 2019, 40: 10–20. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 175) Russo VM, Dhawan RT, Baudracco I, et al.: Hybrid bone SPECT/CT imaging in evaluation of chronic low back pain: correlation with facet joint arthropathy. World Neurosurg, 2017, 107: 732–738. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 176) Sebro R, O'Brien L, Torriani M, et al.: Assessment of trunk muscle density using CT and its association with degenerative disc and facet joint disease of the lumbar spine. Skeletal Radiol, 2016, 45: 1221–1226. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 177) Sari H, Akarirmak U, Uludag M: Active myofascial trigger points might be more frequent in patients with cervical radiculopathy. Eur J Phys Rehabil Med, 2012, 48: 237–244. [Medline]
- 178) Hatakeyama Y, Miyakoshi N, Senma S, et al.: Quantitative measurements of hip abduction strength in lumbar surgery patients. J Orthop Sci, 2019, 24: 400-403. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 179) Chang C, Varacallo M: Anatomy, bony pelvis and lower limb, piriformis muscle. StatPearls Publishing; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK519497/ (Accessed Oct. 1, 2019)
- 180) Windisch G, Braun EM, Anderhuber F: Piriformis muscle: clinical anatomy and consideration of the piriformis syndrome. Surg Radiol Anat, 2007, 29: 37–45. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 181) Fusco P, Di Carlo S, Scimia P, et al.: Ultrasound-guided dry needling treatment of myofascial trigger points for piriformis syndrome management: a case series. J Chiropr Med, 2018, 17: 198–200. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 182) Frost FA, Jessen B, Siggaard-Andersen J: A control, double-blind comparison of mepivacaine injection versus saline injection for myofascial pain. Lancet, 1980, 1: 499-500. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 183) Vasilevska V, Szeimies U, Stäbler A: Magnetic resonance imaging signs of iliotibial band friction in patients with isolated medial compartment osteoarthritis of the knee. Skeletal Radiol, 2009, 38: 871–875. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 184) Chang AH, Chmiel JS, Almagor O, et al.: Hip muscle strength and protection against structural worsening and poor function and disability outcomes in knee osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage, 2019, 27: 885–894. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 185) Offierski CM, MacNab I: Hip-spine syndrome. Spine, 1983, 8: 316-321. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 186) Fogel GR, Esses SI: Hip spine syndrome: management of coexisting radiculopathy and arthritis of the lower extremity. Spine J, 2003, 3: 238–241. [Medline] [CrossRef]
- 187) Sebaaly A, Lahoud MJ, Rizkallah M, et al.: Etiology, evaluation, and treatment of failed back surgery syndrome. Asian Spine J, 2018, 12: 574–585. [Medline] [CrossRef]