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1. Introduction

While acupuncture and dry needling (DN) may be similar in terms of the tools and techniques that are used, the theoretical constructs underlying the use of monofilament needles without injectate are unique (Dunning et al., 2014). While acupuncturists often rely on diagnoses associated with traditional Chinese or Oriental medicine and claim to move energy or “qi” along meridians or channels in the body (Deadman et al., 2011), practitioners that perform DN use monofilament needles to stimulate connective tissue (Langevin, 2014; Langevin et al., 2006), muscles (Martin-Pintado-Zugasti et al., 2016) and nerves (Sim et al., 2011) to treat a variety of neuromusculoskeletal conditions (Dunning et al., 2014). Trigger point dry needling (TDN) is a type of DN used to specifically treat myofascial pain syndromes (Kuan, 2009). While TDN has gained popularity among PTs, MDs, DOs, ATCs and chiropractors in recent years (Dunning et al., 2014; Kennedy et al., 2015), the resulting damage to neural, muscle and connective tissue (Domingo et al., 2013) may lead to excessive post-needling soreness (Ga et al., 2007; Hsieh et al., 2012; Martin-Pintado-Zugasti et al., 2014; Martin-Pintado-Zugasti et al., 2015, 2016) and limited long-
term outcomes (Perreault et al., 2017). Moreover, the weak correlation between clinical outcomes and the localized twitch response (LTR) has caused a number of clinicians to conclude that TDN is only one component of DN (Perreault et al., 2017).

Inserting multiple needles for 10–30 min is common practice in both acupuncture (Coeytaux et al., 2005; Fink et al., 2001; Witt et al., 2005; Wong Lit Wan et al., 2015) and DN (Dunning et al., 2018a; Dunning et al., 2018b; Itoh et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2015). In a recent systematic review (MacPherson et al., 2013), the number of needles used was the only parameter associated with improved pain outcomes in 17,922 patients with chronic pain conditions. Of the 29 randomized clinical trials reported, 4% used between 1 and 4 needles, while 25%, 38% and 33% used between 5 and 9, 10–14 and 15–20 needles, respectively (MacPherson et al., 2013). In addition, only 4% of the trials inserted needles for 15–16 min, while 16%, 24% and 56% inserted needles for 20–24, 25–29 and 20+ minutes, respectively (MacPherson et al., 2013). Likewise, after reviewing 29 clinical trials on the use of acupuncture to treat pain, Leung et al. found that 10–14 and 15–20 needles were used in 38% and 33% of studies, respectively, and needles remained in situ for 15–32 min (Leung et al., 2008). Vickers et al. further reported that 9.1%, 33%, 26% and 31% of 29 RCTs on the use of acupuncture for chronic pain inserted 1–4, 5–9, 10–14 and 15–20 needles, respectively, for 15–30+ minutes (Vickers et al., 2018).

While needle retention between 15 and 30 min appears to provide a stronger and longer lasting analgesic effect than shorter durations (Leung et al., 2008), empirical evidence suggests that the number of needles and needle retention time are variables related to treatment outcomes (White et al., 2007). Although controlled clinical studies directly comparing dosing strategies are lacking and firm conclusions cannot be made (Vas and White, 2007), direct comparisons of needling regimens across studies may be useful. The purpose of this focused review of the literature is to specifically explore the importance of the number of needles used and needle retention time in the successful treatment of various musculoskeletal conditions.

2. Methods

Literature for this narrative review was sought that investigated the physiologic importance and clinical relevance of two variables: number of needles and needle retention time. Pubmed, Medline, Cochrane Database and Google scholar were searched from 1990–June 2019. With respect to the physiologic importance of the number of needles and needle retention time, only articles written in English that provided a western-based paradigm were considered for inclusion. As for the clinical relevance of the two variables, “dry needling,” “electric dry-needling,” “acupuncture” and “electroacupuncture” were used to search the databases in combination with each of the following terms: “neck pain,” “low back pain,” “migraine headaches,” “tension-type headaches,” “cervicogenic headaches,” “lateral epicondylitis,” “knee osteoarthritis,” “shoulder pain,” “shoulde impingement,” and “plantar fasciitis.” The reference lists of studies were also considered in an effort to identify articles relevant to the topic. While the terminology, theoretical construct and philosophy of acupuncture and dry needling are unique, both procedures insert monofilament needles without the use of medicine or injectate (Dunning et al., 2014). Therefore, only articles written in English that investigated the use of monofilament needles without injectate to treat the aforementioned conditions were considered for inclusion. Consistent with our intent to conduct a narrative review, the search was not confined to randomized control trials, systematic reviews and meta-analyses. While the primary author independently conducted the initial search of the databases, there was consensus among all three authors as to which articles should be included in the narrative review.

3. Physiological overview

Although treating trigger points (TPs) with Botulinum Toxin A has been shown to reduce motor endplate activity, it did not change concomitant pain intensity and mechanical pain threshold significantly more than saline (Qerama et al., 2006). The LTR at the neuromuscular junction may, therefore, not be as important for reducing pain as previously thought. Alternatively, Shah and Gilliams (Shah and Gilliams, 2008) reported a reduction of CGRP and substance P in the upper trapezius muscle following TDN, which seemed to correlate with a reduction in pain and disability, suggesting that the needles may facilitate more of a “wash-out” effect via vasodilation (Cagnie et al., 2012; Okubo et al., 2010; Shimbara et al., 2008).

There are two primary mechanisms thought to underlie vasodilation related to acupuncture or dry needling. First, the trauma of needling temporarily increases CGRP, which binds to CGRP receptors on vascular smooth muscle and endothelium cells, leading to relaxation and nitric oxide production, respectively (Lundeberg, 2013). Second, needle insertion with manual and electric stimulation stimulates mast cells to release nitric oxide, which exaggerates the vasodilation in target tissue (Yao et al., 2014). The ability of mast cells to propagate vasodilation is particularly interesting with respect to acupuncture given the increased concentration of mast cells at acupoints and along meridians (Ding et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019; Ma, 2017). Alternatively, needle insertion with manual stimulation has been shown to cause ATP release from skeletal muscle cells, vascular endothelial cells, vascular smooth muscle cells and sensory nerve endings (Shinbara et al., 2017). The ATP eventually breaks down into adenosine, which may stimulate vasodilation via prostaglandins and nitric oxide (Shinbara et al., 2017). Although not specifically investigated in the literature, multiple needle insertions left in situ would likely have an additive vasodilation effect that lasts over time. While Cagnie et al. (2012) demonstrated a 72% increase in blood flow in the upper trapezius muscle 15 min following TDN with a single needle, the change was only observed at the site of stimulation. In contrast, Loaiza et al. (2002) achieved a 26% increase in vasodilation of all microvessels on the medial aspect of the knee joint, which persisted for 60 min, following 30 min of electroacupuncture with more than one needle. Given that Min et al. (2015) found local microcirculation to be dose dependent on needle manipulation via bilateral winding, multiple needles would likely provide a stronger effect throughout the entire tissue.

Goldman et al. (2010) also identified adenosine as playing a direct role in the anti-nociceptive effects of acupuncture and dry needling. When needles are inserted and rotated, TRPV1 receptors are activated, causing an influx of Ca ions into peripheral nerve endings and ATP release via annexin channels (Goldman et al., 2010). The extracellular ATP metabolizes to adenosine, which stimulates A1 adenosine receptors to block adenyly cyclase, attenuate cAMP and phospholipase C and, ultimately, reduce pain (Goldman et al., 2010). Extracellular ATP and ADP also activate purinergic P2X and P2Y receptors, respectively, which facilitates connective tissue remodeling (Goldman et al., 2013; Langenin et al., 2001, 2011). Given that adenosine-mediated pain reduction and tissue remodeling are both contingent on mechanotransduction (Takano et al., 2012), it is likely that inserting multiple needles and leaving them in situ with manual and electric stimulation would magnify the effect.

Neurosegmental acupuncture often targets dermatomes, myotomes and sclerotomes associated with pain so as to stimulate
endogenous neuromodulators and descending analgesic pathways (Lund and Lundeborg, 2015). After reviewing 85 RCTs, Baumeier et al. (2014) found that 80% of studies reported a significant reduction in sensory perception and pain sensitivity following acupuncture. However, needling strategies that targeted both local and ipsilateral points near measurement sites elicited the strongest effects on sensory thresholds (Baumeier et al., 2014). Additionally, inserting more needles within the segmental distribution of pain seems to lead to a more rapid analgesic response (Paley & Johnson, 2015). A number of studies have demonstrated significant reductions in pain after inserting multiple needles within a segmental distribution and leaving the needles in situ with manual and/or electric stimulation (Baumeier et al., 2015; Lang et al., 2010; Leung et al., 2008). While electric stimulation seems to provide a more robust effect than manual stimulation alone (Manheimer et al., 2010), both types of stimulation may elicit unique neurophysiological mechanisms (Langevin et al., 2015; Lv et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2014b).

A strong spinal segmental mechanism likely mediates the effects of TDN, as Hsieh et al. was unable to reduce trigger point noise in the absence of an intact afferent nerve irrespective of supraspinal influence (Hsieh et al., 2011). However, a number of studies have reported that deep dry needling using multiple needles to spinal muscles segmentally related to trigger points was more effective than direct microinjection at reducing myofascial pain (Couto et al., 2014; Srbely et al., 2010). For example, Cunn et al. (1980) needed multi loci along the L2-S2 myotomal level with electric stimulation and demonstrated superior benefits in patients with chronic LBP compared to standard therapy. Collectively, these studies support the idea that adequate needle stimulation at multiple points segmentally related to the region of pain is an effective treatment strategy for treating chronic pain conditions.

The anti-nociceptive effect of electroacupuncture and manual acupuncture is thought to be mediated by the gait control theory of pain (Bardoni et al., 2013; Zhao, 2008), diffusely inhibitory noxious control (Cagnie et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2012), and opioidergic pain reduction (Butts et al., 2016; Su et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2014b). While electroacupuncture may change the resting membrane potential of neighboring cells, which could result in a signalling cascade required to reduce pain and repair tissue, manual needle stimulation may influence tissue physiology via mechanotransduction (Langevin et al., 2006, 2007; Langevin et al., 2015). Notably, the perception of a deep ache or spreading warmth, often referred to as “de qi” in the acupuncture profession, is thought to be associated with the mechanical coupling of needles to connective tissue (Langevin et al., 2001), which has been shown to amplify a number of local and remote downstream effects that influence tissue remodeling and pain reduction (Goldman et al., 2013; Langevin et al., 2006). De qi is often used to measure the adequacy of both manual and electroacupuncture (Bovey, 2006; Zhou and Benharash, 2014). A number of studies have reported an association between de qi and needle depth, retention time and manipulation (Bovey, 2006; Loyeung & Cobbin, 2013). However, Bovey (Bovey, 2006) also found that treatment dosage seems to be dependent on the number of needles in which de qi is elicited. That is, inserting multiple needles with de qi for a period of time via manual and electric stimulation may have a more robust treatment effect than the temporary insertion of a single needle. The concept seems to be consistent with a recently published RCT, which demonstrated enhanced modulation of brain activity in the default mode network secondary to increasing the number of needles and the amount of manual stimulation (Lin et al., 2016). This finding is particularly noteworthy given the default mode network’s relationship (Lin et al., 2016) to chronic pain (Otto et al., 2013), low back pain (Baliki et al., 2008) and fibromyalgia (Napadow et al., 2010).

Finally, it is perhaps worth noting that the unique physiologic mechanisms responsible for itch and pain may justify needling points that are both related and unrelated to the site of discomfort (Liu and Ji, 2013). The insertion of needles close to the site of pain causes the release of histamine, which creates the perception of itch and stimulates neurons in the DRG, the dorsal horn and the brain, resulting in the desire to scratch (Liu and Ji, 2013). The noxious scratch presents a stimulus to alleviate the itch, as pain inhibits itch via interneurons at the level of the spine (Steinhoff et al., 2006). Therefore, the histamine release would likely have little effect if presented close to the site of pain. On the other hand, needles inserted away from the site of pain allows the itch stimulation to stimulate the histaminergic system in the tuberomammillary nucleus of the hypothalamus, which ultimately inhibits pain at the level of the brain (Tamaddonfard et al., 2011). Therefore, inserting needles at sites related to pain and unrelated to pain may be advantageous.

4. Mechanical neck pain

TDN has been shown to be effective for immediate and short-term relief of myofascial neck and shoulder pain compared to sham (Boyles et al., 2015; Kietrys et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2015a) and wait-list control (Mejuto-Vazquez et al., 2014). However, TDN has not been found to be more effective than wet needling (Kietrys et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2015a), trigger point compression (Llamas-Ramos et al., 2014), joint mobilization (Campa-Moran et al., 2015) and dynamic soft tissue mobilization (Campa-Moran et al., 2015); moreover, long-term outcomes are limited (Perreault et al., 2017). Although a recent systematic review suggested that the outcomes of TDN are at least consistent with acupuncture (Boyles et al., 2015), Irnich et al. found distal-point acupuncture was better able to improve pain and range of motion in patients with chronic neck pain (Irnich et al., 2002). In contrast, Itoh et al. reported that TDN to multiple myofascial trigger points (MTrPs) was superior to needling traditional acupuncture at 3-month follow-up in patients with chronic neck pain (Itoh et al., 2007). Nevertheless, multiple needles were left in situ for 10 min.

A Cochrane review reported moderate evidence that acupuncture reduced neck pain significantly better than sham acupuncture, wait-list control and inactive treatment immediately following and/or short-term follow-up (Trinh et al., 2007). While some of the randomized control trials included combined TCM and TDN strategies (David et al., 1998; Irnich et al., 2001, 2002), all 10 trials used multiple needles and left the needles in situ from 7 to 30 min (Trinh et al., 2007). Moreover, an updated analysis of the same patient population found insufficient studies on TDN alone to justify a separate analysis (Trinh et al., 2016). A more recent systematic review of six clinical trials reported an effect size of 0.83 when acupuncture was compared to sham for the treatment of neck pain (Vickers et al., 2018). However, none of the clinical trials included (Irnich et al., 2001; MacPherson et al., 2015; Salter et al., 2006; Vas et al., 2006; White et al., 2004; Witt et al., 2006) described using a single-needle approach (Vickers et al., 2018).

A number of studies have demonstrated both statistically significant and clinically relevant improvements in neck pain following the insertion of multiple needles over 20–30 min that persist for 1-week (Vas et al., 2006), 6-months (He et al., 2004; White et al., 2004), 12-months (White et al., 2004) and 3-years (He et al., 2004) post-treatment. While a more consistent hypoalgesic response to experimentally induced heat pain with increased needle insertions has been reported (Paley & Johnson, 2015), Ceccherelli et al. found that 5 needles had the same ability to reduce myofascial neck pain at one and 3 months as 11 needles (Ceccherelli et al., 2010). While needles in both groups were left in situ for
20 min, each of the needles in the 5-needle group received twice the mechanical stimulation as the 11-needle group (Ceccherelli et al., 2010), Given that the number of needles and needle sensation are considered core components of adequate acupuncture (White et al., 2008), doubling the time of manual stimulation in the 5-needle groups may have offset the additional needles of the 11-needle group. Notably, a more recent study by the same authors concluded that three variables are important for needling patients with neck pain: 1. Segmental stimulation, 2. deep insertion into TrPs, and 3. needle insertion into traditional acupoints known to have analgesic properties (Ceccherelli et al., 2014). That is, the combination of deep insertion into TrPs with needling of segmentally related acupoints is likely the best strategy for treating mechanical neck pain.

5. Low back pain

MTrPs may be prevalent in low back conditions (Chiarotto et al., 2016), but evidence of their specific role in low back pain (LBP) is limited (Boyles et al., 2015) and inadequate (Lluch et al., 2015). Moreover, only limited evidence supports using TDN for the treatment of LBP (Pérez-Palomares et al., 2010). Significant reductions in LBP have been reported following deep TDN in elderly patients compared to superficial TDN (Itoh et al., 2004), acupuncture (Itoh et al., 2004) and sham acupuncture (Itoh et al., 2006), but the improvements were not sustained beyond a 3-week washout period (Itoh et al., 2004, 2006). Moreover, both studies left multiple needles in situ for 10 min (Itoh et al., 2004, 2006). Similarly, significant improvements in lumbar myofascial pain secondary to TDN have been demonstrated, but an average of 20 needles were inserted per patient and left in place for 10 min (Wang et al., 2015).

Physician guidelines in the UK (Savigny et al., 2009) and North America (Chou et al., 2007) support acupuncture needling for non-pharmacological management of chronic LBP. Of 17 systematic reviews, five found that acupuncture for LBP was better than either no treatment or wait list control, seven reported that acupuncture was superior to sham acupuncture or passive modalities, and three concluded that acupuncture combined with an active treatment was more effective than active treatment alone (Zeng & Chung, 2015). While the type of needling was not directly compared, the most common needling strategy for LBP incorporated an average of 10–11 needles for 20–25 min durations over 10 treatment sessions (Zeng & Chung, 2015).

In an overview of systematic reviews, acupuncture was found to be an effective stand-alone intervention for low back pain (Liu et al., 2015b); furthermore, even a short course of personalized acupuncture has been found to be superior to usual care at 12 and 24-months (Thomas et al., 2006). While Brinkhaus et al. reported clinically relevant reductions in low back pain compared to wait list control at 8-weeks follow-up (Brinkhaus et al., 2006), Molsberger et al. noted that conventional orthopaedic therapy combined with acupuncture was superior to therapy alone at 3-months follow-up (Molsberger et al., 2002). The German Acupuncture Trials for low back pain further found acupuncture to be more effective for low back pain than guideline-based conventional therapy at 6-months follow-up (Haake et al., 2007). Importantly, the above trials incorporated 17 (Brinkhaus et al., 2006), 12–16 (Molsberger et al., 2002) and 14–20 needles (Haake et al., 2007), respectively, into local, distal and ah shi points, manually stimulated the needles to achieve “de qi” and left the needles in situ for an average of 30 min across 10–12 treatment sessions.

An international survey of 18 experts in acupuncture representing 10 different countries demonstrated “broad consistency” among treatment strategies for low back pain (Molsberger et al., 2008). According to the experts, evidence-based acupuncture treatment for LBP requires an average of 12 needles into both local and distal points for 25 min over 11 sessions, which is consistent with a more recent systematic review of 43 textbooks, 54 randomized control trials and 38 case studies (Yuan et al., 2008). While individualized acupuncture treatments are common for treating chronic LBP, local acupuncture points are often inserted into structures consistent with lumbar spinal segments (MacPherson et al., 2004), and an average of 2–3 ah shi points (Yuan et al., 2008) is recommended (Molsberger et al., 2008).

6. Headaches

6.1. Tension-type and cervicogenic headaches

While evidence of the involvement of MTrPs in the causation (Fernandez-de-Las-Penas, 2015) and symptomatology (Arendt-Nielsen, 2015; Couppé et al., 2007; Fernandez-de-Las-Penas et al., 2006) of tension-type headaches (TTH) is steadily increasing, the effectiveness of TDN for the treatment of tension-type and cervicogenic headaches (CH) continues to be a topic of debate in the literature (Aloiso-Blanco et al., 2011; France et al., 2014). Compared with friction massage, significant reductions in pain intensity following TDN at TrP locations have been reported; however, the improvements in headache frequency and intensity were the same in both groups 48 h post-treatment (Kamali et al., 2019). Venancio et al. compared DN with lidocaine and botox injections in 45 patients with myofascial headaches (Venancio et al., 2009). While all three groups reported significant within-group improvements in pain intensity, frequency and duration of headaches, and obtainment time and duration of relief at one and 4-weeks, they did not continue making gains beyond the 4-week mark (Venancio et al., 2009).

A recent study found that TDN for TTH improved headache frequency, headache duration and quality of life compared to superficial penetrating sham, but multiple needles were inserted and left in place for 20 min (Gildir et al., 2019). Yet, a number of TDN clinical trials have reported significant improvements in pain and headache index scores in patients with CH (Sedighi et al., 2017) and TTH (Karakurom et al., 2001), regardless of needle insertion depth. Given that subcutaneous needle insertions neither targeted nor reached muscle tissue, a primary strategy of targeting TrPs must be questioned. Additionally, both studies inserted multiple needles and left the needles in situ for 15 min and 30 min, respectively (Karakurom et al., 2001; Sedighi et al., 2017).

A number of studies suggest that acupuncture is also effective for both CH and TTH. In an overview of eight Cochrane reviews, Lee and Ernst concluded that acupuncture is effective for TTH (Lee and Ernst, 2011). One Cochrane review reported statistically significant and clinically relevant effects on TTH following acupuncture compared to routine medical care and sham acupuncture (Linde et al., 2009b). Acupuncture also had a slight advantage over conventional physical therapy, massage and relaxation treatment (Linde et al., 2009b). While the number of needles used in the 11 clinical trials included by Linde et al. (2009b) and 12 trials included in the update to Linde et al. (2016a) varied, none described a single-needle insertion strategy. Moreover, only two clinical trials (White et al., 1996, 2000) inserted needles for a brief period of time. Similarly, a review of 37 acupuncture trials published between 1966 and 2012 concluded that most acupuncture strategies for CH require needle insertions at multiple local specific points and acupoints in the vicinity of the head, neck and upper extremity with electric stimulation (Zhang et al., 2014a).
6.2. Migraine headaches

93.9% of migraineurs have palpable MTrPs (Calandre et al., 2006), which have been linked to peripheral sensitization and pressure pain mapping, and TrP discomfort seems to overlap with pain (Baron et al., 2017; Do et al., 2018). Moreover, active MTrPs of the ipsilateral head and neck muscles may be a contributing factor in subjects with unilateral migraine (Fernandez-de-Las-Penas et al., 2006), and anesthetic injections that target local MTrPs seem to decrease the number and intensity of migraine attacks significantly (Giamberardino et al., 2007). However, there are a limited number of studies that have used DN to treat migraine headaches. Similar reductions in frequency and duration of migraines have been found following both DN and metoprolol, but the trend favored metoprolol (Hesse et al., 1994).

There is robust evidence for the use of acupuncture for migraine headaches. According to the NICE guidelines (Carville et al., 2012), up to 10 sessions of acupuncture is recommended for prophylactic management of migraine headaches when medication is ineffective or unifying. In fact, acupuncture seems to be as effective as some medications (Da Silva, 2015; Linde et al., 2016; Molsberger, 2012) and may be a useful adjunct to routine primary care for migraine headache prophylaxis (Jena et al., 2006) by providing inhibitory input to the trigeminocervical nucleus (Yang et al., 2016). Nevertheless, firm clinical recommendations on where to needle and how many needles to insert cannot be made for patients that suffer from migraine headaches (Linde et al., 2009a). However, after reviewing clinical trials, totalling 4985 patients, Linde et al. found that acupuncture was able to reduce the frequency of migraine headaches and had similar effects as prophylactic drugs (Linde et al., 2016b). The authors further recommended a needle dosage consistent with MacPherson et al. – i.e. multiple needle insertions left in situ for greater than 15 min (MacPherson et al., 2013).

Previous studies on patients with migraine headaches have demonstrated positive results inserting from 12 to 20 (Aclecrim-Andrade et al., 2006) to 30 (Coeytaux et al., 2005) needles per session for 20–30 min. A recent systematic review found that acupuncture led to persistent improvements in pain and function compared to no acupuncture and sham acupuncture in patients with chronic pain (Vickers et al., 2018). Notably, of the 29 studies included, all nine of the clinical trials associated with headaches incorporated multiple needles (Vickers et al., 2018). Moreover, the three trials specifically related to migraines described inserting 12 (Li et al., 2012), 10–25 (Diener et al., 2006) and a maximum of 25 (Linde et al., 2005) needles over 30 min (Vickers et al., 2018). According to one trial, needing a greater number of acupuncture points than typically required for patients with migraine resulted in significant benefits compared to patients that only received pharmaceutical treatment (Allais et al., 2002).

7. Knee osteoarthritis

An increased prevalence of MTrPs has been found for a number of lower quarter orthopaedic conditions, to include pain related to knee osteoarthritis (OA) (White et al., 2007). However, a recent systematic review found only limited evidence to support the use of TDN for lower quarter conditions (Morihsa et al., 2016). Itoh et al. found that TDN was a better treatment strategy than traditional acupuncture for knee OA (Itoh et al., 2008); however, this trial only included 24 patients. Although TDN resulted in less pain than traditional acupuncture or sham acupuncture immediately following treatment, there was no between-groups difference in pain reduction at 5 weeks, and both TDN and traditional acupuncture demonstrated similar functional improvements at all time points (Itoh et al., 2008). A single treatment of TDN immediately following anesthesia but prior to receiving a total knee arthroplasty resulted in less pain 1-month post-operatively compared to placebo, but there was no between-groups difference at 3-months or 6-months follow-up (Mayoral et al., 2013). Moreover, there was no between-groups difference in function, range of motion or strength any time point (Mayoral et al., 2013).

A combined approach that included both traditional acupuncture and TDN, led to significantly greater reductions in knee pain compared to minimal acupuncture or wait list control immediately following an 8-week treatment regimen (Witt et al., 2005). While a statistically significant difference in WOMAC scores was not present between the combined acupuncture and minimal acupuncture group at the 26- and 52-week follow-up, the patients that received the combined approach reported considerably better outcomes on all WOMAC subscales (Witt et al., 2005). Notably, the average number of needles inserted in the combined approach and minimal acupuncture groups was 17 and 12, respectively, and both groups left the needles in situ for 30 min (Witt et al., 2005). In addition, a recent study randomly allocated 242 patients with knee OA to receive either manual therapy, exercise and DN or manual therapy and exercise alone (Dunning et al., 2018). The DN group received 9 standardized needle placements, 4 optional ah shi points, and the needles were left in situ for 20–30 min with manual, periosteal and electric stimulation for 8–10 treatments over a 6-week period. Notably, the group receiving periosteal electrical DN reported significantly greater improvements in pain intensity, stiffness, disability and medication intake compared to the group that received manual therapy and exercise alone (Dunning et al., 2018). Moreover, there was a large effect size between the groups for all variables at the 3-month follow-up (Dunning et al., 2018).

After examining 22 interventions across 114 RCTs and conducting a sensitivity analysis of higher-quality studies, Corbett et al. found that acupuncture was one of the most effective strategies for treating knee OA (Corbett et al., 2013). Moreover, a number of Cochrane reviews support the use of acupuncture for the treatment of knee OA (Lee and Ernst, 2011; Manheimer et al., 2010). Optimal needle dosage for knee OA is still a topic of debate throughout the literature. However, large-scale trials have demonstrated that standardized and semi-standardized acupuncture regimens that target both local and distal points via 9 (Berman et al., 1999, 2004; Vas et al., 2004), 10 (Jubb et al., 2008), 7–15 (Scharf et al., 2006) and 17 (Witt et al., 2005) needles and leave the needles in situ for ≥20 min, are effective in alleviating pain and disability related to knee OA. Moreover, after reviewing 8 of 13 clinical trials that provided “adequate acupuncture,” which required a minimum of four needle insertions over 20 min, acupuncture was found superior to no treatment and both penetrating and nonpenetrating sham acupuncture at 12.26 and 52 weeks (White et al., 2007). In an exploratory review of the same 13 trials, at least 6 needles were used in most trials (Vas and White, 2007). However, the authors concluded that a minimum of 4 needles, including the insertion of two needles level with the joint line at the medial and lateral infrapatellar sulci, are likely required to achieve meaningful reductions in pain and disability in patients with knee OA (Vas and White, 2007).

Importantly, a few studies do not support the use of acupuncture to treat knee osteoarthritis. Foster et al. reported acupuncture was not superior to a non-penetrating sham and provided no added benefit when used as an adjunct to advice and exercise (Foster et al., 2007). Yet, according to a recent meta-analysis (MacPherson et al., 2013), while Witt et al. (2005) incorporated the largest number of needles to treat joint OA and reported the largest effect size, Foster et al. used the least number of needles and reported the smallest effect size (Foster et al., 2007). Hinman et al. also failed to show a benefit of acupuncture needleing over laser or sham laser.
acupuncture and physical therapy may be superior to suboptimal dosages. However, findings have been mixed, with some studies showing no significant differences between acupuncture and physical therapy treatments. In general, the acupuncture literature advocates needling at the origin of the wrist extensors and common extensor tendon along with tender points and segmentally relevant acupoints over ten treatment sessions. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis concluded that acupuncture may be effective for lateral epicondylitis (Cox et al., 2016). While the two studies included had a high risk of bias, Haker and Lundeberg provided 10, 20 min treatments of acupuncture with an average of eight needles (Haker and Lundeberg, 1990), and Huang et al. performed “floating” acupuncture with needle retention over 1–2 days (Huang et al., 1998). In a more robust review of 19 RCTs, acupuncture was equal to or superior to conventional treatment for lateral epicondylitis such as anesthetic injections, steroid injections, NSAIDs and ultrasound (Gadagu et al., 2014). Moreover, three of the RCTs demonstrated that acupuncture was superior to prednisolone injection (Shen, 1999), triamcinolone acetonide, lidocaine injections (Chen, 2010) and oral meloxicam (Zhang and Wu, 2007) for lateral epicondylitis (Gadagu et al., 2014). Of the 19 RCTs included, only one described a single insertion at a distal point for lateral epicondylitis for 5 min, while the rest inserted up to 12 needles into local and distal points for 20–30 min (Gadagu et al., 2014).

10. Plantar fasciitis

Augmenting conservative physical therapy for plantar fasciitis with TrP lidocaine injections has been shown to reduce treatment time required to return to previous activity by 83.9% (Imamura et al., 1998). Moreover, improvements in pain and pain pressure threshold at the medial calcaneal tubercle persisted at the 6-month and 2-year follow-up, suggesting that TDN may be an important strategy for treating plantar fasciitis (Imamura et al., 1998). However, a recent network meta-analysis compared 8 different therapies for the treatment of plantar fasciitis, including NSAIDs, corticosteroid injections, autologous whole blood, platelet-rich plasma, extracorporeal shockwave therapy, ultrasound, botox and TDN, and found that only extracorporeal shockwave therapy was better than placebo at one, two, three and 6-months follow-up (Li et al., 2018). While TDN and ultrasound were found to have potential short-term efficacy, they were not satisfactory treatments for long-term outcomes (Li et al., 2018).

A recent systematic review concluded that TDN is effective for reducing pain related to plantar fasciitis (He and Ma, 2017). Of the 7 RCTs investigated, however, only two studies performed TDN (He and Ma, 2017). Eftekharasadat et al. provided 4 treatments of TDN to calf muscles for 5 min and reported an immediate reduction in pain compared to conventional care, but differences were no longer present at 4-weeks (Eftekharasadat et al., 2016). While Cotchet et al. provided a more comprehensive TDN approach, needling TrPs in muscles of the affected foot and lower extremity, the authors did not achieve a minimal, clinically important reductions (Copay et al., 2007; Landorf and Radford, 2008) in pain compared to sham (Cotchet et al., 2014). In contrast, two trials targeted tenderness at the medial calcaneal tubercle and reported significantly better outcomes than steroid injections and conventional care, respectively. While Li et al. used mini-scalpel needling to disrupt the proximal attachment of the plantar fascia (Li et al., 2014), Kumnerdee and Pattpong (Kumnerdee and Pattpong, 2012) inserted 2–6 needles with electric stimulation for 30 min. Of the three remaining RCTs reported by He and Ma, two RCTs incorporated the traditional Chinese practice of “warm needling” (Qian and Chen, 2015; Wang et al., 2014).
et al., 2016), and one RCT only inserted needles at distal acupoints on the hand and wrist (Zhang et al., 2011).

A recent randomized control trial treated 111 patients with either impairment-based manual therapy, exercise and ultrasound or impairment-based manual therapy, exercise, ultrasound plus electrical DN. DN consisted of an 8-point standardized approach, whereby needles were inserted into muscles, connective tissue and peri-neural tissue of the affected foot, to include the proximal insertion of the plantar aponeurosis at the medial calcaneal tubercle (Dunning et al., 2018a). Moreover, needles were manually stimulated to elicit a de qi response and left in situ with electric stimulation for 20 min. After 6 treatments, the electrical dry needling group reported significant improvements in pain and function compared to those only receiving impairment-based manual therapy, exercise and ultrasound at the 3-month follow-up (Dunning et al., 2018a). Moreover, according to patient self-reports using the global rating of change, 78% of the patients that received electrical DN reported a successful outcome compared to 21% in the comparison group (Dunning et al., 2018a).

Clinical trials that have successfully used acupuncture for the management of plantar fasciitis by targeting TrPs, tender points and acupoints have left multiple needles in situ for 15 (Tillu and Gupta, 1998) or 30 (Karagounis et al., 2011; Kumnerdee & Pattapong, 2012) minutes. In one such case, Perez-Milan and Foster found that an average of four treatments was needed to achieve >50% pain reduction in 82% of patients with plantar fasciitis when TrPs, acupoints and a single tender point at the medial calcaneal tubercle were needled with electric stimulation for 20–30 min (Perez-Millan and Foster, 2001).

11. Conclusion

For most neuromusculoskeletal conditions, it appears that when DN is confined to brief, single needle insertions at only TrP locations, the treatment may be suboptimal compared to strategies where multiple needles are inserted and left in situ for 20–30 min durations, and with larger effect sizes often demonstrated when using electric dry needling as opposed to dry needling alone. Importantly, trigger point dry needling is still practiced by many healthcare practitioners; however, using a single needle to repeatedly prick trigger points one at a time with fast-in and fast-out pistoning maneuvers has not yet been shown to produce significant and clinically meaningful long term improvements in pain and disability in wide array of musculoskeletal conditions. While trigger point dry needling is not ineffective, it is likely more powerful when packaged as part of a multifaceted needling framework. The number of needles and treatment duration are two variables that affect treatment dosage, and they should therefore be tailored to each condition and individual patient.

12. Clinical relevance

- The number of needles and treatment duration are two variables that affect treatment dosage, and they should therefore be tailored to each condition and individual patient.
- While trigger point dry needling is not ineffective, it is likely more powerful when packaged as part of a multifaceted needling framework.
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