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Abstract

Objectives: A rotator cuff tear is a common cause of pain and disability among adults. People who do repetitive lifting or overhead activities like painters, carpenters, etc., and athletes like tennis players and baseball pitchers are particularly at risk for rotator cuff tears. Though subacromial impingement is more common in patients with Type III (Hooked) acromion than Type I (Flat) acromion but our study was to evaluate any significant difference in patients treated with subacromial decompression to those who are treated without decompression in Type 1 acromion patients.

Materials and methods: A prospective study of 30 patients with rotator cuff tears were divided into 2 groups i.e., Group 1 consisting of 15 patients and are treated with subacromial decompression and Group 2 consisting of another 15 patients who are treated by without subacromial decompression at SGITO, Bengaluru from November 2017 to June 2019. Clinical / Functional assessment was done using ASES, QUICK DASH and ROWE scoring systems and patients was followed at regular intervals of 1, 3 & 6 months & 1-year post-op.

Results: Our study showed predominant male population (60%), traumatic etiology (66.7%) and partial thickness tears (56.7%). At the end of 1 year follow up, ASES, Rowe & Quick Dash Scores were (90.33%), (90.41%) & (11.83%) respectively who are treated by acromioplasty and (92.33%) & (10.78%) respectively who are treated by non-acromioplasty. The mean time for improvement in symptoms in both groups are about 6 months.

Conclusion: Our study concludes that Age, Sex, Etiology of tear and Type of tear was not found to be a significant factor which affects the clinical/functional outcome.
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1. Introduction

Rotator cuff tears are a common cause of shoulder pain and dysfunction encountered in the OPD. The Rotator cuff undergoes progressive degenerative changes with increasing age and may lead to partial tear to finally complete rupture of the rotator cuff. The spectrum of these disorder ranges from inflammation to massive tearing of the rotator cuff musculo-tendinous unit. A rotator cuff tear is a commonly encountered problem in orthopaedic department. After age of 40 years, approximately 30% of patients will have rotator cuff tears, and after age 60 yrs, there will be cuff tears in upto 80% of patients. A rotator cuff tear is a common cause of pain and disability among adults. People who do repetitive lifting or overhead activities like painters, carpenters, etc., and athletes like tennis players and baseball pitchers are particularly at risk for rotator cuff tears. Though subacromial impingement is more common in patients with Type III (hooked) acromion than Type I (Flat) acromion but our study was to evaluate any significant difference in patients treated with subacromial decompression to those who are treated without decompression in Type 1 acromion patients. Arthroscopic results have shown less postoperative pain, morbidity, infections and a more rapid improvement in shoulder motion.
It is essential that the merits and demerits associated with this technique should be balanced depending on the individual condition of the patient and the degree of experience gained.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Objectives
1. To evaluate any significant difference in improvement of pain, muscle power, ability to do activities of daily living and range of motion after arthroscopic rotator cuff repair with and without subacromial decompression.
2. To analyze the effect of age, sex, etiology and type of tear on the clinical/functional outcome.

2.2 Methodology: This prospective study, was conducted at Sanjay Gandhi Institute of Trauma and Orthopedics, Bangalore in Department of Orthopedics on patients who were admitted with rotator cuff tears confirmed by MRI from November 2017 to June 2019. Informed consent was obtained and ethical committee clearance was obtained for the same.

2.3 Inclusion criteria
1. All patients who are clinically and radiologically diagnosed with rotator cuff tears.
2. Patient between 18 and 70 years of age
3. Rotator cuff tears involving either gender.
4. All patients with type I Acromion.
5. Consent to participate and follow up in post-operative period.

2.4 Exclusion criteria
1. Irreparable cuff tears.
2. Labral pathology.
3. Degenerative arthritis of glenohumeral joint.
4. Previous surgery to the same shoulder.
5. Symptomatic arthritis of acromio clavicular joint.

With extrinsic compression by Coracoacromial arch causing cuff tear, Neer advocated Acromioplasty which involved taking down anterolateral edge of acromion along with release of Coracoacromial ligament from its attachment from the anterolateral edge of acromion to prevent further damage to cuff and protect cuff after repair of tear. Emerging current consensus is that if acromion is of type 3 or it has downward projecting acromial spur, acromioplasty is indicated. It clears the SA space of downward protruding spurs or tip of type 3 acromion which can endanger the integrity of repaired cuff. However, type 1 should be left alone and type 2 remains debatable. Three standard portals are used during arthroscopic rotator cuff repair (anterior, lateral subacromial, posterior). Cuff tears was sutured by using Fiber Tape (ARTHREX) 2mm wide and suture anchor Swive Lock SELF PUNCHING (ARTHREX) 4.75MM X 24.5MM. Clinical / Functional assessment was done using ASES, QUICK DASH and ROWE scoring systems and patients was followed at regular intervals of 1, 3 & 6 months & 1 year post-op.

Rehabilitation protocol
Phase I - Passive range of motion (Prom phase) (0-6 weeks)
1. Pendulum hangs;
2. Elbow, wrist and hand AROM;
3. Scapula strengthening exercises;
4. Passive forward flexion and external rotation up to 90 and 30 degrees respectively;
5. Arm sling up to 6 weeks

Phase II - Active range of motion (Arom) (6-12 weeks)
1. Discontinue sling;
2. Begin passive range of motion in other planes;
3. Abduction in scapular plane;
4. External rotation at multiple angles of abduction;
5. Progress from assisted active rom to active rom

Phase III - 12 weeks onwards strengthening phase
1. Dynamic stabilization exercises;
2. Thera band strengthening

MRI of affected shoulder is taken.
MRI showing rotator cuff tear (A) Full thickness tear (B) partial tear (C) Subscapularis tear

(A) Full thickness tear (B) partial tear (C) Subscapularis tear

Fig 1: Portal entry in beech chair position suture anchor
Fig 2. Preoperative marking
Fig 3. Arthrex swivelock
Results
A comparative study with 30 patients is undertaken at Sanjay Gandhi Institute of Trauma & Orthopedics, Bengaluru, to study the functional outcome of Arthroscopic rotator cuff repair with and without subacromial decompression.
The ASES score has improved from 33.31 pre-op (group I) to 90.33 (group I) and from 32.57 pre-op (group II) to 90.41 (group II) at the end of follow-up.

The QUICK DASH score has improved from 45.94 pre-op (group I) to 10.78 (group I) and from 47.53 pre-op (group II) to 11.83 (group II) at the end of follow up.

The ROWE score has improved from 28 pre-op (group 1) to 92.33 (group 1) and from 23.33 pre-op (group 2) to 91.67 (group 2) at the end of follow up.
### Table 1: Showing Master Chart Parameters

| Parameters                      | Procedure Done | Total | Chi Square Test |  |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------|-----------------|---|
|                                 | 1 With acromioplasty | 2 Without acromioplasty | Total | Chi Square Value | P-Value |
| **Age**                         |                |       |                 |   |
| 31 – 40 yrs.                    | 4              | 4     | 8               |  |
|                                 | 26.7%          | 26.7% | 26.7%           |   |
| 41 – 50 yrs.                    | 6              | 5     | 11              |  |
|                                 | 40.0%          | 33.3% | 36.7%           |   |
| 51 – 60 yrs.                    | 2              | 5     | 7               |  |
|                                 | 13.3%          | 33.3% | 23.3%           |   |
| 61 – 70 yrs.                    | 3              | 1     | 4               |  |
|                                 | 20.0%          | 6.7%  | 13.3%           |   |
| **Sex**                         |                |       |                 |   |
| Males                           | 9              | 9     | 18              |  |
|                                 | 60.0%          | 60.0% | 60.0%           |   |
| Females                         | 6              | 6     | 12              |  |
|                                 | 40.0%          | 40.0% | 40.0%           |   |
| **Diagnosis**                   |                |       |                 |   |
| Left Infraspinatus Tear         | 0              | 2     | 2               |  |
|                                 | 0.0%           | 13.3% | 6.7%            |   |
| Left Supraspinatus Tear         | 4              | 4     | 8               |  |
|                                 | 26.7%          | 26.7% | 26.7%           |   |
| Right Infraspinatus Tear        | 1              | 3     | 4               |  |
|                                 | 6.7%           | 20.0% | 13.3%           |   |
| Right Supraspinatus + Infraspinatus Tear | 1             | 1     | 2               |  |
|                                 | 6.7%           | 6.7%  | 6.7%            |   |
| **Etiology**                    |                |       |                 |   |
| Degenerative                    | 6              | 4     | 10              |  |
|                                 | 40.0%          | 26.7% | 33.3%           |   |
| Trauma                          | 9              | 11    | 20              |  |
|                                 | 60.0%          | 33.3% | 33.3%           |   |
| **Type Of Tear**                |                |       |                 |   |
| Full Thickness                  | 6              | 7     | 13              |  |
|                                 | 40.0%          | 46.7% | 43.3%           |   |
| Partial                         | 9              | 8     | 17              |  |
|                                 | 60.0%          | 53.3% | 56.7%           |   |
| **Symptom**                     |                |       |                 |   |
| Inability to Lift Shoulder      | 9              | 10    | 19              |  |
|                                 | 60.0%          | 66.7% | 63.3%           |   |
| Pain in Shoulder                | 6              | 5     | 11              |  |
|                                 | 40.0%          | 33.3% | 36.7%           |   |

### Table 2: Showing different types of tests done on individual patients

| Procedure Done | Total | Chi Square Test |  |
|----------------|-------|-----------------|---|
| 1 With acromioplasty | 2 Without acromioplasty | Total | Chi Square value | p-value |
| **Impingement Test** |                |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 5              | 10    | 15              | 3.33 | 0.07(NS) |
|                   | 33.3%          | 66.7% | 50.0%           |   |
| Positive          | 10             | 5     | 15              |  |
|                   | 66.7%          | 33.3% | 50.0%           |   |
| **Hawkins Test**  |                |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 5              | 15    | 20              | 15.00 | <0.001* |
|                   | 33.3%          | 100.0% | 66.7%         |   |
| Positive          | 10             | 0     | 10              |  |
|                   | 66.7%          | 0.0%  | 33.3%           |   |
| **Empty Can Test**|                |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 5              | 6     | 11              |  |
|                   | 33.3%          | 40.0% | 36.7%           |   |
| Positive          | 10             | 9     | 19              |  |
|                   | 66.7%          | 60.0% | 63.3%           |   |
| **Belly Press Test**|             |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 14             | 14    | 28              |  |
|                   | 93.3%          | 93.3% | 93.3%           |   |
| Positive          | 1              | 1     | 2               |  |
|                   | 6.7%           | 6.7%  | 6.7%            |   |
| **External Rotation Stress Test** |       |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 11             | 8     | 19              |  |
|                   | 73.3%          | 53.3% | 63.3%           |   |
| Positive          | 4              | 7     | 11              | 1.29 | 0.26(NS) |
|                   | 26.7%          | 46.7% | 36.7%           |   |
| **Speed Test**    |                |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 12             | 14    | 26              |  |
|                   | 80.0%          | 93.3% | 86.7%           |   |
| Positive          | 3              | 1     | 4               |  |
|                   | 20.0%          | 6.7%  | 13.3%           |   |
| **Yergason's**    |                |       |                 |   |
| Negative          | 13             | 14    | 27              |  |
|                   | 86.7%          | 93.3% | 90.0%           |   |
| Positive          | 2              | 1     | 3               |  |
|                   | 13.3%          | 6.7%  | 10.0%           |   |
4. Discussion
In our study of 30 patients, we assessed the functional outcome in terms of pain, range of movements and other baseline shoulder functions in those patients who are subjected to acromioplasty to those patients who are operated without acromioplasty.

In our study, the mean age of the patients was 53.5yrs which was found to be almost similar as compared to other studies. 8 Patients in the age group of 20-40yrs (26.7%) out of which 4 underwent acromioplasty & another 4 operated by non-acromioplasty and 11 patients in the age group of 41-50yrs (36.7%) out of which 6 underwent acromioplasty & another 5 operated by non-acromioplasty and 7 patients in the age group of 51-60 yrs (23.3%) out of which 2 underwent acromioplasty & another 5 operated by non-acromioplasty and finally there are 4 patients in the age group of 61-70yrs (13.3%) out of which 3 underwent acromioplasty & another 1 operated by non-acromioplasty.

In our study consisting of total 30 patients, 18 were males (60%) out of which 9 underwent acromioplasty remaining 9 underwent non acromioplasty and 12 females (40%) out of which 6 underwent acromioplasty remaining 6 underwent non-acromioplasty. As compared to other studies, our study also has male preponderance.

In our study consisting of total 30 patients, 20 were traumatic (66.7%) out of which 9 underwent acromioplasty, remaining 11 operated by non-acromioplasty procedure and rest 10 were Degenerative (33.3) out of which 6 underwent acromioplasty and remaining 4 operated by non-acromioplasty procedure. In our study, we had 17 partial thickness tears (56.7%) out of which 9 patients underwent subacromial decompression, remaining 8 were treated by without subacromial decompression and 13 full thickness tears (43.3%) out of which 6 patients underwent subacromial decompression, remaining 7 were treated by without subacromial decompression.

There was significant improvement of flexion from 129.0 (group 1) preoperatively to 154.67 (group 2) at 1yr and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures (i.e., with and without subacromial decompression).

There was significant improvement of External rotation from 49.0 (group 1) preoperatively to 76.33 (group 1) & from 50.0 (group 2) preoperatively to 76.67 (group 2) at 1yr and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures (i.e., with and without subacromial decompression).

There was significant improvement of Internal rotation from 41.67(group 1) preoperatively to 71.33 (group 1) & from 40.33 (group 2) preoperatively to 70.00 (group 2) at 1yr follow up and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures (i.e., with and without subacromial decompression).

There was significant improvement of Abduction from 129.0 (group 1) & from 129.67 (group 2) preoperatively to 154.67 (group 2) at 1yr and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures.

There was significant improvement of Abduction from 129.0 (group 1) preoperatively to 155.0 (group 1) & from 129.67 (group 2) preoperatively to 154.67 (group 2) at 1yr and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures (i.e., with and without subacromial decompression).

There was significant improvement of External rotation from 49.0 (group 1) preoperatively to 76.33 (group 1) & from 50.0 (group 2) preoperatively to 76.67 (group 2) at 1yr and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures (i.e., with and without subacromial decompression).

There was significant improvement of Internal rotation from 41.67 (group 1) preoperatively to 71.33 (group 1) & from 40.33 (group 2) preoperatively to 70.00 (group 2) at 1yr follow up and there was no statistical significant difference in functional outcome in both the type of procedures (i.e., with and without subacromial decompression).

5. Conclusion
Our study concludes that there is no significant statistical difference in the functional outcome following the arthroscopic rotator cuff repair with and without subacromial decompression in type I Acromion patients.

6. References
1. Adamson GJ, Tibone JE. Ten-year assessment of primary rotator cuff repairs. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 1993; 2(2):57-63.
2. Ellman H, Harker G, Bayer M. Repair of the rotator cuff: End-result study of factors influencing reconstruction. J Bone Joint Surg Am, 1986; 68(8):1136-44.
3. Rick W Wright, Mark A Heller, Donald C. Arthroscopic decompression for impingement syndrome secondary to an unstable os acromiale. Arthroscopy: The journal of arthroscopic and related surgery, 2000; 16(6)
4. Cheng C, Bin Chen, Hongwei, Zhongwei Zhang, Weibin Xu. Efficacy of concomitant acromioplasty in the treatment of rotator cuff tears: a systematic review and metaanalysis. PLOS ONE 2018; 13(11):e0207306.
5. Lei Song, Ling Miao, Wen-Liang Wang. Does concomitant acromioplasty facilitate arthroscopic repair of full thickness rotator cuff tears? PMID: 27350920. PMCID: PMC4899382 pub in, 2016.
6. Bruce J Goldberg, Robert P. Arthroscopic transglenoid suture capsulolabral repairs. Published on, 1993.
7. Mardini Kivi, Ali Karimi, Sohrab Keyhani, Keyvan, Hashemi-Motlagh. Rotator cuff repair: is there any role for acromioplasty. 2016, 274-277

Table 3: showing comparison of mean age with other studies

| Study           | Mean Age (YRS) |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Sugaya et al.   | 57.7           |
| Park et al.     | 57             |
| Cole et al.     | 57             |
| Burks et al.    | 56             |
| Our study       | 53.5           |

Table 4: showing comparison of gender distribution

| Study       | Males (%) | Females (%) |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Kim (53)    | 58.9      | 38.8        |
| Galatz (25) | 59        | 39.4        |
| Our study   | 60        | 40          |

Table 5: showing comparison of Etiology of tears

| Study       | Traumatic (%) | Degenerative (%) |
|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| Braune et al.| 43.4          | 56.5             |
| Goutallier D et al. | 38.9 | 61.1 |
| Our study   | 66.7          | 33.3             |

Table 6: showing comparison of types of tear

| Study                  | Partial Thickness (%) | Full Thickness (%) |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Karin S Peters (55)    | 60.9                  | 39.1               |
| Deutsch A et al (59)   | 61.8                  | 38.2               |
| Our study              | 56.7                  | 43.3               |

There were no infections, neurovascular injuries, instances of postoperative shoulder stiffness, or other complications requiring intervention.
8. Sanjay Meena, Shreesh Kumar Gangary. The arthroscopic rotator cuff repair with and without acromioplasty for rotator cuff tear: a meta analysis. Published on Dec 7 Elsevier India, 2015.

9. Jaskarndip Chahal, Nathan Mall, Peter B Macdonald, Geoffrey Van Thiel, Brian J Cole, Anthony A Rome et al. The role of subacromial decompression in patients undergoing arthroscopic repair of full thickness tears of the rotator cuff. Pub. 28(8):1047-8

10. Tauro JC. Arthroscopic rotator cuff repair: Analysis of technique and results at 2- and 3-year follow-up, Arthroscopy. 1998; 14:45-51.

11. Arjen Kolk, Nienke Wolterbeek, Kiem Gie Auw Yang, Jacco A. Predictors of disease specific quality of life after arthroscopic rotator cuff repair. Pub in, 2015.

12. Nho SJ, Brown BS, Lyman S, Adler RS, Altchek DW, MacGillivray JD. Prospective analysis of arthroscopic rotator cuff repair: prognostic factors affecting clinical and ultrasound outcome. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2009; 18(1):13-20. doi: 10.1016/j.jse.2008.05.045.

13. Bishop J, Klepps S, Lo IK, Bird J, Gladstone JN, Flatow EL. Cuff integrity after arthroscopic versus open rotator cuff repair: a prospective study. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2006; 15(3):290-299.

14. Köse KC, Tezen E, Cebesoy O et al. Mini-open versus all-arthroscopic rotator cuff repair: comparison of the operative costs and the clinical outcomes. Adv Ther. 2008; 25(3):249-2.

15. AK S. Dynamic stability of the glenohumeral joint. Acta Orthop Scand 1972; 42:476-83.

16. Peters, Karin S. McCallum, Sebastian; Briggs, Lisa; Murrell, George A. C. A Comparison of Outcomes After Arthroscopic Repair of Partial Versus Small or Medium-Sized Full-Thickness Rotator Cuff Tears. Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery, American. 2012; 94(12):1078-1085.

17. Deutsch A. Arthroscopic repair of partial-thickness tears of the rotator cuff. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2007; 16:193-201.

18. Patte D. Classification of rotator cuff lesions. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1990, 81-6.

19. Hamada K, Tomonaga A, Gotoh M et al. Intrinsic healing capacity and tearing process of torn supraspinatus tendons: in situ hybridization study of alpha 1 (I) procollagen mRNA. J Orthop Res. 1997; 15:24-32.

20. Kamath, Ganesh, Galatz, Leesa M Keener, Jay D, Teeffey et al. Tendon Integrity and Functional Outcome After Arthroscopic Repair of High-Grade Partial-Thickness Supraspinatus Tears. JBJS. 2009; 91(5):1055-1062