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Background Information

Hypothesis

In this study, the efficacy of CS treatment of 90 seconds was compared to 120 seconds for tenderness of mobile points in the thoracic region.

Clinical Significance
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Participants were asked to rate their perceived level of pain on a scale of 0 to 10. The results showed that CS treatment of 90 seconds was significantly effective compared to 120 seconds.

Counterstrain (CS) was found to be effective at reducing pain when treatment was held for 90 or 120 seconds at either rib or thoracic tender points (p<0.05).

1. Data were collected from a convenience sample of patients treated in a clinical setting, especially in the case of the significant findings on non-mobile tender points.
2. Differences in treatment duration (90 vs. 120 seconds) were found to be statistically significantly different between the thoracic and lumbar regions (Thoracic CS, p=0.001; Lumbar CS, p=0.002; Thoracic lumbar, p=0.001).

1. The mean pain reduction was significantly different between the duration of treatment (Thoracic CS) when comparing the mean pain reduction (p<0.05).

1. No significant differences were found between the mean pain reduction in the thoracic and lumbar regions (Thoracic CS, p=0.054; Lumbar CS, p=0.056, respectively).

1. The mean pain reduction was found to be statistically significantly different between the duration of treatment (Thoracic CS) when comparing the mean pain reduction (p<0.05).

1. No significant differences were found between the mean pain reduction in the thoracic and lumbar regions (Thoracic CS, p=0.054; Lumbar CS, p=0.056).
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