Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology 49 (2019) 102351

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jelekin

Middle-aged adults cocontract with arm ADductors during arm ABduction, while young adults do not. Adaptations to preserve pain-free function?

Celeste L. Overbeek[a,b,*], Arjen Kolk[a,b], Jurriaan H. de Groot[b,c], Pieter Bas de Witte[a], Maaike G.J. Gademan[a,d], Rob G.H.H. Nelissen[a,b], Jochem Nagels[a,b]

[a] Department of Orthopaedics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands
[b] Laboratory for Kinematics and Neuromechanics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands
[c] Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands
[d] Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Aging
Electromyography
Shoulder stability
Shoulder Impingement Syndrome
Adductor cocontraction
Joint stabilisation
Humeral depression
Subacromial narrowing

ABSTRACT

Middle-aged individuals cocontract with adductor muscles during abduction. This may be crucial for counteracting deltoid forces, depressing the humerus and ensuring free passage of subacromial tissues underneath the acromion during abduction. We questioned whether adductor co-contraction is always present, or develops during ageing, in which case it may explain the age-related character of common shoulder conditions such as Subacromial Pain Syndrome. In a cross-sectional analysis with electromyography (EMG), activation patterns of the latissimus dorsi, teres major, pectoralis major and deltoid muscle were assessed during isometric force tasks in 60 asymptomatic individuals between 21 and 60 years old. Cocontraction was expressed as the degree of antagonistic activation relative to the same muscle's degree of agonistic activation, resulting in an activation ratio between −1 and 1, where lower values indicate more cocontraction. Using linear regression analyses, we found age-related decreases in the activation ratio of the latissimus dorsi (regression estimate: −0.004, 95% CI: −0.007 to 0.0, p-value: 0.042) and teres major (regression estimate: −0.013, 95% CI: −0.019 to −0.008, p-value: < 0.001). In contrast to young individuals, middle-aged individuals showed a high degree of adductor cocontraction during abduction. This may indicate that during ageing, alterations in activation patterns are required for preserving pain-free shoulder function.

1. Introduction

Shoulder pain is the second most common musculoskeletal disorder in the general population, with prevalence rates ranging between 15% and 22% (Andersson et al., 1993, Picavet and Schouten, 2003). The incidence of shoulder pain increases with ageing, suggesting that age-related factors play a role in the pathogenesis (Greving et al., 2012, Linsell et al., 2006, Michener et al., 2003, Milgrom et al., 1995, Raz et al., 2015). Numerous studies have investigated the effect of ageing on the shoulder complex (e.g. rotator cuff degeneration), however factors that may directly relate to the onset and/or perpetuation of shoulder pain are yet unidentified (Raz et al., 2015).

In the most common age-related shoulder condition, the Subacromial Pain Syndrome (SAPS), repetitive overloading of subacromial tissues during abduction may be the key factor leading to complaints (de Witte et al., 2016, Diercks et al., 2014, Graichen et al., 1999). A recent study showed that during abduction, patients with SAPS have significantly less activation of two potent humeral depressors, the latissimus dorsi and teres major, than asymptomatic controls (Overbeek et al., 2019). This finding explains overloading of subacromial tissues in SAPS, but also supports a stabilizing function of the latissimus dorsi and teres major in asymptomatic adults that was only recently suggested (Hik and Ackland, 2019).

Based on the results of this study, we questioned whether adductor co-contraction is always present, or develops during ageing, in which case it may explain the age-related character of age-related shoulder conditions such as SAPS. In this cross-sectional analysis we assessed the effect of age on the degree of latissimus dorsi, teres major and pectoralis major cocontraction in asymptomatic individuals.

* Corresponding author at: Laboratory for Kinematics and Neuromechanics, Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Leiden University Medical Center, Postzone J-11-R, PO box 9600, 2300RC Leiden, the Netherlands.
E-mail address: c.l.overbeek@lumc.nl (C.L. Overbeek).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2019.102351
Received 10 May 2019; Received in revised form 30 July 2019; Accepted 20 August 2019

2. Patients and methods

Data of three individual cohorts were combined, resulting in a study population of 60 participants, between 21 and 60 years old, with no current or past shoulder complaints. This age range covers the age at which common non-osteoarthritic shoulder complaints, such as SAPS, generally develop (Reilingh et al., 2008). The first group of twenty participants aged 19 to 50 years was recruited between February 2010 through October 2010 (de Witte et al., 2012). Second, ten asymptomatic participants aged between 35 and 60 years were recruited in September 2012 (de Witte et al., 2014). The third group, comprising thirty asymptomatic participants was evaluated between January 2016 and November 2016. Exclusion criteria were: less than 18 years old, limited range of motion during physical examination, malignancy, neurologic/muscle disease, symptomatic osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, adhesive capsulitis, diabetes mellitus, previous injury/ fracture or infection of the shoulder, a pacemaker in situ, or insufficient Dutch language skills. Asymptomatic shoulder pathology was not ruled out. All participants were analysed at the laboratory of Kinematics and Neuromechanics (Leiden University medical Centre, Leiden, the Netherlands). The review board of the institutional medical ethical committee approved this study (P09.243, P11.002 and P15.046) and all participants gave written informed consent.

2.1. Assessment of muscle activation patterns

We were interested in evaluating the activation patterns of muscles that may translate the humerus cranially (towards the acromion) or caudally (away from the acromion) during abduction. In biomechanical evaluations and a recent systematic review on the topic, it has been shown that the deltoid muscle (DM) is the most potent cranial translator of the humerus during abduction (Hik and Ackland, 2019, Steenbrink et al., 2009). The arm adductors, specifically the latissimus dorsi (LD), teres major (TM), and, to a lesser extent, the pectoralis major (PM), are the strongest caudal translators (humeral depressors) during abduction (Hik and Ackland, 2019, Steenbrink et al., 2009). Of these muscles, the activity during an isometric abduction and adduction task was determined, in order to obtain a standardized degree of task-specific activation. Participants were measured while standing and facing a computer monitor which gave force feedback information. The target arm was in external rotation at the side touching a 1-dimensional force transducer at the wrist. This set-up was previously described in detail (de Witte et al., 2012). During a resting task and isometric ab- and adduction tasks, electromyography (EMG) of three muscles involved in humeral depression during abduction, i.e. the LD, TM and PM, and the main humeral elevator, i.e. the medial part of the DM was recorded with surface EMG-electrodes (DelSys system Bagnoli-16, Boston, MA, USA, two parallel 10 mm silver bar electrodes, inter-electrode distance 10 mm, bandwidth 20–450 Hz, gain adjusted to 1000) (de Witte et al., 2012). Electrodes were placed at the middle of the muscle bellies, with the silver bar contacts perpendicular to the muscle fibres. The electrode for the LD was placed 6 cm below the angulus inferior scapulae; for the TM 4 cm cranial and 2 cm lateral to angulus inferior scapulae; for the PM 1 cm below the clavicle and for the DM 2–4 cm below the acromion, laterally. For conductivity, the skin was abraded with scrubbing cream, cleaned with alcohol and conductive cream was applied to the electrode contact bars prior to adherence to the skin. The EMG and force signals were analogue-digital (AD) converted and simultaneously recorded at a sample rate of 2500 Hz with 16-bit resolution. Post-processing of the EMG consisted of offset removal (1 Hz recursive low-pass Butterworth filter), rectification and enveloping using the moving average over intervals of 0.1 s and averaging to a single value per task ($mEMG^{IP/OP}$) through custom made software in Matlab (MathWorks inc., version R2016a, Natick, USA).

For the assessment of muscle activation, participants first performed a maximal abduction and maximal adduction task. The lowest value of either of these maximums was set as the maximum voluntary force (*MVF*). Subsequently, a target force of 60% with a tolerance of ± 3.75% of the MVF was presented to the participants on a computer screen (de Witte et al., 2012). Finally, participants performed a 15-second isometric force task in abduction and adduction where they attempted to exert a force level within the target force tolerances (60% MVF ± 3.75%). The target force level was equal during the abduction and adduction task for the purpose of computing a standardized measure of the degree of antagonistic versus agonistic activation. The mean of the post-processed EMG-data of when the exerted force lied within the target force tolerances ($mEMG^{IP/OP}$) was used for the analyses.

2.2. Outcome measure

For this study, we were interested in the degree of adductor activation during abduction, i.e. adductor cocontraction. Analysing the plain EMG-amplitude, hampers comparability between participants and studies and therefore it is preferable to normalize EMG-output. This can be done using the maximum voluntary contraction, however this method may be limited in symptomatic participants due to the unpredictability when pain is present (Ettinger et al., 2016). The EMG-assessment used in the current study has and will be applied in patients with pain, and therefore EMG was standardized using the *Activation Ratio (AR)* for generalizability (Eq. (1)) (de Witte et al., 2012).

$$AR_{muscle} = \frac{mEMG^{IP} - mEMG^{OP}}{mEMG^{IP} + mEMG^{OP}} \quad (1)$$

where *muscle* represents the LD, TM, PM or DM and the superscripts *IP* and *OP* indicate '*in phase*' agonist activation and '*out of phase*' antagonist muscle activation respectively, in relation to the *force task* in abduction or adduction.

The *AR* indicates the task related degree of antagonist activation relative to the same muscle's degree of agonist activation, and has been proved reliable (de Witte et al., 2012). The *AR* ranges between −1 and 1 and equals 1 in case of sole agonist muscle activation and decreases with antagonist muscle activation, i.e. cocontraction, up to −1 with the muscle being solely active as antagonist. An $AR = 0$ indicates equal activity during the agonist and antagonist task.

In order to prevent overestimation of the degree of cocontraction as assessed with the *AR,* the post-processed mean EMG-amplitude during the agonistic task ($mEMG^{IP}$, i.e. the activity of the deltoid muscle during abduction and the activity of adductors during adduction) was verified to be twice the mean EMG-amplitude of the 10% lowest EMG-signals during the relative rest, abduction or adduction task (a signal-to-noise ratio of SNR ≥ 2.0). In case this condition was not met or in case EMG-data was corrupt (e.g. loose electrode), the *ARs* were excluded.

2.3. Statistical analysis

2.3.1. Descriptive statistics

Categorical data are described with numbers and percentages; continuous parameters with means, standard deviation (SD) and 95%-confidence intervals (95% CI) or with medians and percentiles depending on the distribution of data. The Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS®) version 23 (IBM® Corp, Armonk, NY, USA) was used for statistical analysis.

The *activation ratio, force task* and *age*, were verified to have normal distributions by visual interpretation of histograms. Missing values in *activation ratios* were verified to be missing completely at random (e.g. loose electrode) or at random (e.g. not meeting the SNR) and imputed with multiple imputation based on the study group, *sex*, arm dominance, *assessment of dominant arm*, *force task* and *AR,* using 50 iterations, to avoid possible bias, use all available data and increase power (Pedersen et al., 2017). For statistical analyses, we used the pooled results automatically generated by SPSS® in multiple imputed datasets. The analyses were additionally performed on the original database for

verification of the results using multiple imputation. Results are presented as intercepts with unstandardized regression estimates and corresponding 95% CI intervals and p-values. A two-sided p-value of 0.05 or less was considered statistically significant.

2.3.2. Association between age and activation ratios

For the primary study question, the association between the independent variable *age* and dependent variable *AR* was assessed using linear regression analysis, with controlling for the magnitude of *force task, sex* and the *assessment of the dominant arm* (or non-dominant arm).

2.3.3. Mediation analysis

To rule out that a possible association between *age* and *AR* was explained by differences in the torque level at which participants performed the measurements, a mediation analysis was performed. This was done using the product-method, where four associations were tested: (1) *age* and *AR*, (2) *age* and *force task*, (3) *force task* and *AR* and (4) *age* and *AR*, corrected for *force task* (Baron and Kenny, 1986). If either of the associations assessed in step 1–3 is non-significant, it is unlikely that *force task* is a mediator (Baron and Kenny, 1986). As verification, we assessed whether the unstandardized beta describing the association between *age* and *AR* (step 1) changed significantly when controlling for *force task* (step 4). For this, we calculated the standardised z-score from Eq. (3) and determined the corresponding p-value with standard statistical tables.

$$z = \frac{B1 - B2}{\sqrt{SE_{B1}{}^2 + SE_{B2}{}^2}} \quad (3)$$

where *B1* represents the unstandardized beta from step 1 and *B2* the unstandardized beta from step 4. The *SE* describes the standard errors associated with *B1* and *B2* respectively.

3. Results

Baseline characteristics of the study group are presented in Table 1. Multiple imputation was performed for nine missing values in the *activation ratio* of the LD (4 due to a technical problem with the amplifier, 4 due to not reaching the SNR and 1 because of a loose electrode); six missing values in the *AR* of the TM (3 due to a technical problem with the amplifier, 2 due to not reaching the SNR and 1 because of a loose electrode); six missing values in the *AR* of the PM (4 due to a technical problem with the amplifier, 1 due to not reaching the SNR and 1 because of a loose electrode) and lastly three missing values in the *AR* of the DM, all due to a technical problem with the amplifier.

Table 1
Demographics of asymptomatic participants.

Demographics	Asymptomatic participants	
Total group (n = 60)		
Age, yrs (mean, SD)	42 (13)	Range 21–60
Female (n, %)	27	45
Right side dominance (n, %)	50	83
Dominant side assessed (n, %)	45	75
Per group		
Cohort 2010 (n = 20)		
Age, yrs (mean, SD)	25 (2.5)	Range 21–29
Female (n, %)	5	25
Right side dominance (n, %)	16	80
Dominant side assessed (n, %)	19	95
Cohort 2012 (n = 10)		
Age, yrs (mean, SD)	50 (6.6)	Range 39–59
Female (n, %)	5	50
Right side dominance (n, %)	10	100
Dominant side assessed (n, %)	10	100
Cohort 2016 (n = 30)		
Age, yrs (mean, SD)	51 (5.7)	Range 39–60
Female (n, %)	17	57
Right side dominance (n, %)	24	80
Dominant side assessed (n, %)	16	53

SD, standard deviation; n, number; yrs., years; NA, not applicable.



Fig. 1. Antagonistic adductor activity in asymptomatic participants. Rectified and offset-subtracted electromyography during a 15 s isometric abduction force task at 60 ± 3.75% of the Maximal Voluntary Force (*MVF*). The line curve represents the processed signal with which the *activation ratio* is determined. In the latter panel, it is indicated whether patients were in or out of the force task; in-task EMG data was used for the assessment of co-contraction. It shows that with abduction, mainly achieved with deltoid muscle (DM) activation, there is concomitant increased activation of the pectoralis major (PM), latissimus dorsi (LD) and teres major (TM) activation (i.e. co-contraction).

3.1. Association between age and activation ratios

A typical example of the raw antagonistic (EMG^{OP}) signals of the LD, TM and PM and raw agonistic (EMG^{IP}) signal of the DM with simultaneously exerted force is presented in Fig. 1. The associations between age and *activation ratio* of the LD, TM, PM and DM are illustrated in Fig. 2 and described by the regression models in Table 2. For the LD, higher age was associated with lower *ARs* (−0.004, 95% CI: [−0.007,



Fig. 2. Association between age and *activation ratios* in asymptomatic participants. Scatter plot with linear regression line and 95% confidence intervals. * Significant at the level of alpha = 0.05, ** Significant at the level of alpha = 0.01.

0.0], p = 0.042). The *AR* of the TM also decreased with increasing age (−0.013, 95% CI: [−0.019, −0.008], p < 0.001). There was no significant association between age and the *AR* of the PM. Lastly, the *AR* of the assessed abductor, the DM, decreased with increasing age (-0.003, 95% CI: [−0.005, 0.0], p = 0.046), although the regression model did not explain much variance in the *AR* of the DM (adjusted R^2 of 0.024). Except for an association between male sex and a higher *AR* of the TM (0.17, 95% CI: [0.015, 0.32], p = 0.031), *sex* the *assessment of the dominant arm* or the magnitude of *force task* were not related with the *ARs* (Table 2).

The analyses where performed on the original dataset with missing values and on the imputed dataset and outcomes obtained from the original dataset (Appendix A).

3.2. Mediation analysis

We did not perform a mediation analysis for the PM since there was no significant relation between the *AR* of the PM and *age* (step 1 of mediation analysis). Simple regression analyses between *age* and *force task* (0.002, 95% CI: [−0.005, 0.008], p = 0.596) and between *force task* and *ARs* of the LD (−0.007, 95% CI: [−0.16, 0.14], p = 0.928), TM (−0.11, 95% CI: [−0.36, 0.14], p = 0.375) and DM (−0.036, 95% CI: [−0.13, 0.062], p = 0.476) revealed no significant associations. Furthermore, the changes in non-standardised beta describing the relation between *age* and *AR* of the LD, TM or DM after controlling for *force task*, were negligible (at maximum 1%, all p > 0.99). Thus, *force task* was not a mediator in the association between *ARs* and *age*.

Table 2
Association between age and *activation ratios* in asymptomatic participants.

	Activation Ratio			
Independent variables	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Adjusted R^2
LD				
Intercept	0.96	(0.77–1.2)	–	0.17
Age (years)	−0.004	(−0.007 to 0.00)	**0.042**	
Force task (N)	−0.073	(−0.23 to 0.086)	0.367	
Sex (female is ref.)	0.095	(−0.007 to 0.20)	0.068	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	−0.038	(−0.15 to 0.069)	0.484	
TM				
Intercept	1.2	(0.88–1.4)	–	0.42
Age (years)	−0.013	(−0.019 to −0.008)	< **0.001**	
Force task (N)	−0.20	(−0.43 to 0.025)	0.082	
Sex (female is ref.)	0.17	(0.015–0.32)	**0.031**	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	0.11	(−0.044 to 0.27)	0.160	
PM				
Intercept	0.75	(0.59–0.90)	–	−0.011
Age (years)	−0.001	(−0.004 to 0.002)	0.543	
Force task (N)	0.090	(−0.038 to 0.22)	0.169	
Sex (female is ref.)	−0.002	(−0.087 to 0.084)	0.967	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	0.023	(−0.063 to 0.11)	0.605	
DM				
Intercept	0.98	(0.84–1.1)	–	0.024
Age (years)	−0.003	(−0.005 to 0.00)	**0.046**	
Force task (N)	−0.028	(−0.14 to 0.087)	0.635	
Sex (female is ref.)	0.002	(−0.075 to 0.079)	0.965	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	0.034	(−0.042 to 0.11)	0.383	

Multivariable regression analysis with dependent variable *activation ratio* and independent variables *age*, *force task*, *sex* and *assessment of the dominant arm*. LD, latissimus dorsi; TM, teres major; PM, pectoralis major; DM, deltoid muscle. Adjusted R^2 represents the mean adjusted R^2 from multivariable regression analyses with 20 iterations. Significant values at the level of alpha = 0.05 are in bold.

4. Discussion

In this cross-sectional evaluation we found that during abduction young adults did not cocontract with arm adductors whereas middle-aged individuals did. This age-related increase in adductor cocontraction suggests that during ageing, counteraction of cranial deltoid forces and thus glenohumeral stabilization, becomes more reliant on adductor cocontraction.

There have been no previous studies on the effect of ageing on adductor muscle activation during abduction. In biomechanical evaluations and a recent systematic review on the topic, it was shown that the arm adductors, specifically the latissimus dorsi, teres major, and, to a lesser extent, the pectoralis major, have the greatest contribution to humeral-head depression during arm abduction (Hik and Ackland, 2019, Steenbrink et al., 2009). We suggest that the age-related increase in adductor cocontraction observed in our study may represent a compensation for reduced rotator cuff quality, loss of proprioception as well as altered bone morphology in the ageing shoulder, that is necessary for preserving shoulder stability and function (Adamo et al., 2007, Bockmann et al., 2016, Faulkner et al., 2007, Milgrom et al., 1995, Raz et al., 2015, Rudzki et al., 2008, Zuckerman et al., 1999).

Our study has some limitations. First, three previously recruited cohorts were combined for this study. Except for age, the selection criteria as well as measurement procedures were the same across these cohorts and therefore we do not think bias was introduced by the design. This may also be interpreted from Fig. 1 where no clustering by cohorts is recognizable. Second, 24 activation ratios were missing (10%), which was in 58% (14 activation ratios) due to a technical problem with the amplifier. There was also missing data (7 in total, 29%), because the mean agonistic EMG amplitude did not exceed the signal to noise ratio. In order to avoid bias and use all available data in the analyses, these missing values were imputed using multiple imputation (Pedersen et al., 2017). The conclusions obtained from the dataset with missing values and the imputed dataset were similar although the p-value associated with the effect of age on the activation ratio of the LD was no longer significant in the dataset with missing values, possibly because of reduced power. Lastly, we only evaluated a selection of muscles that affect the craniocaudal position of the humerus the most (Halder et al., 2001, Hik and Ackland, 2019, Steenbrink et al., 2009). Our conclusion may be supported by adding an analysis of other adductors, for example, the teres minor and lower parts of the infraspinatus and subscapularis.

Previously, it has been shown that patients with the age-related shoulder condition SAPS have reduced activation of the latissimus dorsi and teres major during abduction (Overbeek et al., 2019). As these adductors are crucial for depressing the humerus (away from the acromion), this finding explained overloading of subacromial tissues and thereby pain in patients with SAPS (Overbeek et al., 2019, Overbeek et al., 2018). Following this line of reasoning, our finding of increased adductor cocontraction during ageing in asymptomatic participants, could explain the age-related character of SAPS.

5. Conclusion

In this cross-sectional evaluation of muscles that directly act on the position of the humerus relative to the scapula, we found that in contrast to young individuals, middle-aged individuals have a high degree of teres major and latissimus dorsi activity during abduction. It was previously suggested that next to the rotator cuff, these two adductor muscles have a crucial contribution to counteracting deltoid forces, depressing the humerus and ensuring free passage of subacromial tissues underneath the acromion during abduction (Hik and Ackland, 2019). The age-related increase in adductor cocontraction observed in our study, suggests a shift in muscle activation patterns during ageing, that may be crucial for maintaining pain-free shoulder function. In a future study it should be tested whether inability to make this shift may contribute to the onset of age-related shoulder conditions like SAPS.

Acknowledgement

The institution of one or more of the authors has received funding from the Dutch Arthritis Foundation (grant number 13-1-303).

Appendix A. Association between age and *activation ratios* in asymptomatic participants examined in original dataset

	Activation Ratio			
Independent variables	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Adjusted R^2
LD				
Intercept	0.94	(0.74–1.1)	–	0.14
Age (years)	−0.003	(−0.007 to 0.000)	0.064	
Force task (N)	−0.051	(−0.22 to 0.12)	0.544	
Sex (female is ref.)	0.091	(−0.013 to 0.20)	0.085	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	−0.045	(−0.16 to 0.066)	0.421	
TM				
Intercept	1.2	(0.89–1.4)	–	0.43
Age (years)	−0.014	(−0.019 to −0.009)	**< 0.001**	
Force task (N)	−0.18	(−0.41 to 0.044)	0.112	
Sex (female is ref.)	0.15	(−0.0 to 0.31)	0.051	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	0.11	(−0.052 to 0.27)	0.183	
PM				
Intercept	0.74	(0.58–0.90)	–	−0.018
Age (years)	−0.001	(−0.004 to 0.002)	0.560	
Force task (N)	0.092	(−0.042 to 0.23)	0.174	
Sex (female is ref.)	−0.0	(−0.089 to 0.090)	0.991	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	0.027	(−0.062 to 0.12)	0.547	
DM				
Intercept	0.98	(0.84–1.1)	–	0.028
Age (years)	−0.003	(−0.006 to 0.00)	**0.041**	
Force task (N)	−0.028	(−0.15 to 0.090)	0.632	
Sex (female is ref.)	0.003	(−0.076 to 0.082)	0.940	
Assessment of dominant arm (yes is ref.)	0.041	(−0.038 to 0.12)	0.303	

Multivariable regression analysis with dependent variable *activation ratio* and independent variables *age*, *force task, sex* and *assessment of the dominant arm* on the original dataset without imputed values. LD, latissimus dorsi; TM, teres major; PM, pectoralis major; DM, deltoid muscle. Significant values at the level of alpha = 0.05 are in bold.

References

Adamo, D.E., Martin, B.J., Brown, S.H., 2007. Age-related differences in upper limb proprioceptive acuity. Percept. Mot. Skills 104, 1297–1309.
Andersson, H.I., Ejlertsson, G., Leden, I., Rosenberg, C., 1993. Chronic pain in a geographically defined general population: studies of differences in age, gender, social class, and pain localization. Clin. J. Pain 9, 174–182.
Baron, R.M., Kenny, D.A., 1986. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 51, 1173–1182.
Bockmann, B., Soschynski, S., Lechler, P., Ruchholtz, S., Debus, F., Schwarting, T., et al., 2016. Age-dependent variation of glenohumeral anatomy: a radiological study. Int. Orthop. 40, 87–93.
de Witte, P.B., Henseler, J.F., van Zwet, E.W., Nagels, J., Nelissen, R.G., de Groot, J.H., 2014. Cranial humerus translation, deltoid activation, adductor co-activation and rotator cuff disease – different patterns in rotator cuff tears, subacromial impingement and controls. Clin. Biomech. 29, 26–32.
de Witte, P.B., Overbeek, C.L., Navas, A., Nagels, J., Reijnierse, M., Nelissen, R.G., 2016. Heterogeneous MR arthrography findings in patients with subacromial impingement syndrome – diagnostic subgroups? J. Electromyogr. Kinesiol. 29, 64–73.
de Witte, P.B., van der Zwaal, P., Visch, W., Schut, J., Nagels, J., Nelissen, R.G., et al., 2012. Arm adductor with arm abduction in rotator cuff tear patients vs. healthy – design of a new measuring instrument [corrected]. Hum. Mov. Sci. 31, 461–471.
Diercks, R., Bron, C., Dorrestijn, O., Meskers, C., Naber, R., de Ruiter, T., et al., 2014. Guideline for diagnosis and treatment of subacromial pain syndrome: a multidisciplinary review by the Dutch Orthopaedic Association. Acta Orthop. 85, 314–322.
Ettinger, L., Weiss, J., Shapiro, M., Karduna, A., 2016. Normalization to maximal voluntary contraction is influenced by subacromial pain. J. Appl. Biomech. 32, 433–440.
Faulkner, J.A., Larkin, L.M., Claflin, D.R., Brooks, S.V., 2007. Age-related changes in the structure and function of skeletal muscles. Clin. Exp. Pharmacol. Physiol. 34, 1091–1096.
Graichen, H., Bonel, H., Stammberger, T., Haubner, M., Rohrer, H., Englmeier, K.H., et al., 1999. Three-dimensional analysis of the width of the subacromial space in healthy subjects and patients with impingement syndrome. AJR Am. J. Roentgenol. 172, 1081–1086.
Greving, K., Dorrestijn, O., Winters, J.C., Groenhof, F., van der Meer, K., Stevens, M., et al., 2012. Incidence, prevalence, and consultation rates of shoulder complaints in general practice. Scand. J. Rheumatol. 41, 150–155.
Halder, A.M., Zhao, K.D., Odriscoll, S.W., Morrey, B.F., An, K.N., 2001. Dynamic contributions to superior shoulder stability. J. Orthop. Res. 19, 206–212.
Hik, F., Ackland, D.C., 2019. The moment arms of the muscles spanning the glenohumeral joint: a systematic review. J. Anat. 234, 1–15.
Linsell, L., Dawson, J., Zondervan, K., Rose, P., Randall, T., Fitzpatrick, R., et al., 2006. Prevalence and incidence of adults consulting for shoulder conditions in UK primary care; patterns of diagnosis and referral. Rheumatology (Oxford) 45, 215–221.
Michener, L.A., McClure, P.W., Karduna, A.R., 2003. Anatomical and biomechanical mechanisms of subacromial impingement syndrome. Clin. Biomech. (Bristol, Avon) 18, 369–379.
Milgrom, C., Schaffler, M., Gilbert, S., van Holsbeeck, M., 1995. Rotator-cuff changes in asymptomatic adults. The effect of age, hand dominance and gender. J. Bone Joint Surg. Br. 77, 296–298.
Overbeek, C.L., Kolk, A., de Groot, J.H., Visser, C.P.J., van der Zwaal, P., Jens, A., et al., 2019. Altered cocontraction patterns of humeral head depressors in patients with subacromial pain syndrome: a cross-sectional electromyography analysis. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res.
Overbeek, C.L., Kolk, A., Nagels, J., de Witte, P.B., Van der Zwaal, P., Visser, C.P., et al., 2018. Increased co-contraction of arm adductors is associated with a favorable course in subacromial pain syndrome. J. Shoulder Elbow Surg.
Pedersen, A.B., Mikkelsen, E.M., Cronin-Fenton, D., Kristensen, N.R., Pham, T.M., Pedersen, L., et al., 2017. Missing data and multiple imputation in clinical epidemiological research. Clin Epidemiol. 9, 157–166.
Picavet, H.S., Schouten, J.S., 2003. Musculoskeletal pain in the Netherlands: prevalences, consequences and risk groups, the DMC(3)-study. Pain 102, 167–178.
Raz, Y., Henseler, J.F., Kolk, A., Riaz, M., van der Zwaal, P., Nagels, J., et al., 2015. Patterns of age-associated degeneration differ in shoulder muscles. Front. Aging Neurosci. 7, 236.
Reilingh, M.L., Kuijpers, T., Tanja-Harfterkamp, A.M., van der Windt, D.A., 2008. Course and prognosis of shoulder symptoms in general practice. Rheumatology (Oxford) 47, 724–730.
Rudzki, J.R., Adler, R.S., Warren, R.F., Kadrmas, W.R., Verma, N., Pearle, A.D., et al., 2008. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound characterization of the vascularity of the rotator cuff tendon: age- and activity-related changes in the intact asymptomatic rotator cuff. J. Shoulder Elbow Surg. 17, 96S–100S.
Steenbrink, F., de Groot, J.H., Veeger, H.E., van der Helm, F.C., Rozing, P.M., 2009.

Glenohumeral stability in simulated rotator cuff tears. J. Biomech. 42, 1740–1745.
Zuckerman, J.D., Gallagher, M.A., Lehman, C., Kraushaar, B.S., Choueka, J., 1999. Normal shoulder proprioception and the effect of lidocaine injection. J. Shoulder Elbow Surg. 8, 11–16.

Celeste L. Overbeek MD, is a clinical resident in orthopedic surgery at the Alrijne Hospital, Leiderdorp, The Netherlands. Both during her medical study as well as PhD-project, she has been involved in many research projects at the Orthopaedics departments of Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC) in the Netherlands, and Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), Harvard Medical School in Boston, USA. She participated in several studies with varying designs, to study the alterations in shoulder kinematics and muscle activation patterns associated with ageing and subacromial pain. This has resulted in numerous manuscripts published in international peer-reviewed medical journals and presentations at international Orthopaedic meetings.

Arjen Kolk, MD, currently is a clinical resident in orthopedic surgery. As part of his PhD-project he has been involved in many research projects, mainly performed at the Orthopaedics departments of Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC) in the Netherlands. His research focuses on shoulder pathology and more specifically rotator cuff disorders. The main purpose is to evaluate shoulder kinematics, muscle activity and results of innovative radiologic imaging to characterize subacromial pain syndrome within the SuSy project (Dutch Arthritis Association, grant number 13-1-303). As muscle degeneration plays an important role in various shoulder pathologies, he also studies shoulder muscle degeneration within the collaboration between the Orthopaedic, Human Genetic and Radiology department. By these projects he aims to improve diagnostic and pathophysiological insight in patients with rotator cuff disease for patient-based treatment optimization.

Jurriaan H. de Groot, Msc., PhD, is assistant professor at the department of Rehabilitation Medicine (Research and Innovation). He received his M.Sc. degree (1988) in Biology from the Wageningen University and his Ph.D. degree (1997) in Biomechanical Engineering from the Delft University of Technology where he defended his thesis 'The Shoulder, A kinematic and dynamic analysis of motion and loading'. He was a post-doc researcher associated to the dept. of Biology at the Leiden University involved in kinematics and biomechanics of reptile tongues, e.g. snake tongue flicking and chameleon tongue projection. In 2001 he became senior researcher at the dept. for Rehabilitation Medicine at the Leiden University Medical Center where he heads the Laboratory for Kinematics and Neuromechanics. Since 2008 he hold a position as an Assistant Professor. His research focus is on the innovation of diagnostics and treatment of patients with central neurological and neuromuscular diseases and patients with painfull shoulders (massive rotator cuff tears and sub-acromial pain syndrome). He is teacher and track coordinator of the Bachelor and Master program Technical Medicine, a multidisciplinary program within the Medical Delta. He is/was principal co-investigator on different Reumafonds, ZonMW and STW funded projects and published over 80 papers in peer reviewed journals.

Pieter Bas de Witte, MD, PhD, currently is an orthopedic surgeon, working as a clinical clinical fellow in Erasmus Universisty Medical Center, Rotterdam. In the past years, he has been involved in many research projects, mainly performed at the Orthopaedics departments of Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC) in the Netherlands, and Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), Harvard Medical School in Boston (USA). In 2013 he received his SMBWO registration as a clinical epidemiologist, and in March 2015, he completed a PhD-project on the subject of Subacromial Impingement Syndrome and its underlying mechanisms, entitled: "Pinching subacromial problems" – A clinical and biomechanical approach. For this project, he participated in several studies with a broad range of study design types, including clinical trials, retrospective cohort studies and biomechanical basic science studies. Several of his studies were published in international medical journals and presented at international Orthopaedic meetings and at the International Shoulder Group meetings. Additionally, he received a research grant of the Dutch Rheumatoid Arthritis Association, an AGIKO research grant from The Netherlands Organization for health research and development (ZonMw) and several traveling grants for international Orthopaedic meetings.

Maaike G.J. Gademan, Msc., PhD is a Clinical Epidemiologist and holds a master in Human Movement Sciences. Since 2014 she has been working in the field of orthopaedics and epidemiology. One of her main research topics is modelling outcomes after hip and knee arthroplasty. Currently, she is co-principal investigator in several large (multi-center) studies and she is an academic editor of Plos One.

Rob G.H.H. Nelissen, MD, PhD, is currently Professor of Orthopaedics and chairman of the department Orthopaedics & Rehabilitation at Leiden University Medical Center in Netherlands. He is director of the Residency Program in Orthopaedic Surgery. He obtained his medical degree in 1985 and a Ph.D. degree in 1995 from Leiden University. In 2011 he was trained at the European Health Leadership Program. Dr. Nelissen has been the president-elect of the Netherlands Orthopaedic Association and European Rheumatoid Arthritis Surgical Society, and now is a board member of the Netherlands Arthroplasty Register (www.LROI.nl; hip, knee, shoulder, elbow, ankle, wrist and hand). Among his accomplishments, he was one of the founders of the arthroplasty register, with currently more than 700.000 THip and TKnee arthroplasties registered (96% validity). He has established also an elaborate epidemiological network of orthopaedic practices in the greater Leiden-The Hague area with > 2000 prospective hip and knee arthroplasty CRF's annually. The latter already created the KART (knee meniscal tear cohort), Paprika, RAAK cohorts (hip-knee prostheses cohorts) and at present the LOAS (Leiden Longitudinal Osteoarthritis Study). He and his group developed the gold standard for implant bone fixation (RSA, a tool to measure 3D migration in up to 0.1 mm and 0.1°). He participated in 3 EU FP-7 grants (DeSSOs, MXL, on performance and design of total joint joint implants). Dr. Nelissen has co-authored more than 200 peer reviewed papers on different topics in the field of orthopaedics, he has supervised over 30 PhD students and a numerous number of medical and technical engineering students. At Leiden University Medical Center is active with the profile areas Ageing (mobility) and Innovative Health and Quality Care.

Jochem Nagels, MD, is consultant in orthopaedics and has been employed at the Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC) in the Netherlands since 2008. His medical training started in Rotterdam in the Netherlands, at the Erasmus University Medical Center (EMC) from 1990–1996. After a period of being a junior house officer and PhD researcher, he became a resident in orthopaedics between 2002–2007 and was trained at the Amphia Hospital (Breda), the HAGA-hospital (The Hague), Reinier de Graaf Gasthuis (Delft) and the LUMC (Leiden) all in the Netherlands. Since then he specialized in upper extremity surgery, especially (revision) arthroplasty of the shoulder, elbow and wrist, secondary surgery for obstetric and traumatic brachial plexus lesions, massive rotator-cuff tears and traumasurgery. He has published around 40 papers in various journals mainly addressing conditions of the upper extremity. Since 2014 he is also involved within the Medical Delta of the Netherlands (collaboration of the LUMC, the Erasmus MC and the Technical University of Delft) in development of education for a recently introduced bachelor curriculum at the Technical University of Delft: "Clinical Technology".