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ABSTRACT

Background: Sacroiliac joint dysfunction represents 15% of low back pain conditions. Normal sacroiliac joint works as a safeguard and transmits upper body weight into the pelvis and lower extremities. If the SIJ is hypomobile, it cannot effectively absorb forces and other body parts may be overstressed causing musculoskeletal dysfunction. The study conducted by comparing the effectiveness of Mulligan mobilization versus muscle energy technique in chronic SIJ dysfunction.

Methods: 45 patients with chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction from both genders joined the study. They were divided into three groups 15 in each group. Group A: received Mulligan mobilization with movement using posterior and anterior innominate methods plus conventional treatment program. Group B: received muscle energy technique using a post-isometric relaxation technique to erector spinae, hamstrings, iliopsoas and quadratus lumborum plus conventional treatment program. Group C: control group obtained conventional treatment program only. Doppler imaging of vibration, palpation meter, and the visual analogue scale was utilized for evaluating patients (pre and post-treatment).

Results: The study findings revealed a statistical remarkable improvement in post-intervention values for sacroiliac mobility in Mulligan mobilization group (p > 0.0001) and a statistically significant decrease of anterior pelvic tilting angle in Mulligan mobilization and muscle energy technique groups (p > 0.0001), also a significant decrease of pain in the 3 groups compared with pre-intervention values (p > 0.0001), additionally, Mulligan mobilization group showed a statistical high detectable difference in right and left sacroiliac mobility more than muscle energy technique and control groups (p > 0.0001).

Conclusion: Mulligan mobilization is more effective than muscle energy technique in the treatment of chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction.
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INTRODUCTION

The sacroiliac joint is a frequent origin for pain in pelvic girdle and lower back with referred pain to the lower extremity [1]. It affects 10%-25% of population [2]. Sacroiliac dysfunction is a condition of changed mechanics, either an increment or diminishing from the typical normal or the presence of an abnormal movement [3]. It was recognized as a condition causing pain arising from the sacroiliac joint and is caused by the increased or abnormal motion of the ilia around the sacrum and irritation of sacroiliac joint structures (capsule, ligaments or pain receptors located within the joint) [4].

In spite of frequent occurrence of sacroiliac joint dysfunction, its assessment and management were inadequately explained in the published work. The clinical diagnosis of sacroiliac joint dysfunction is based on focused history and physical examination. Treatment of sacroiliac joint dysfunction is still questionable too [5]. Physical therapy approaches ensure correcting sacroiliac joint malalignment manually by emphasizing restoring the normal balance of lumbar and pelvic muscles. Despite that output results after management of sacroiliac joint dysfunction are restricted and there is a need for further studies to compare between various treatments techniques [6]. Different manual therapies such as passive Maitland mobilization and Mulligan's mobilization with movement [7] as well as muscle energy techniques [8] are used routinely in physical therapy practice [9].

The Mulligan concept” Mobilization with movement” (MWM) is a new technique, which is expected to produce an instantaneous improvement in the patient's abilities by simultaneous applying of pain-free accessory glides with active or passive physiological motion. Physiotherapy mobilization of the sacroiliac joint assists in restoring normal joint mechanics so that subjects may have intact sacroiliac Joint for the whole day [9].

Muscle energy techniques (MET) came from early work done by an osteopathic practitioner Fred L. Mitchell in the 1950s. MET is a safe, not invasive and low-cost technique that can be used to relax tight tense musculature, spasm or fibrotic changes due to chronic soft tissue problems and to improve joint mobility by influencing the dysfunctional soft tissues. MET can help increase muscle strength and decrease edema. This technique depends on using low amplitude muscle contractions against resistance to improve vascular circulation and has a positive influence on static and dynamic posture. It was further modified by having patients use their muscles in a controlled position against a counterforce. Later the technique was modified to use muscle contraction to restore motion and to free up areas of segmental dysfunction in extremities and vertebral column [10].

In this study, Doppler imaging of vibrations (DIV) was used for measuring sacroiliac mobility. DIV is a non-invasive, measurable, easy applied, riskless technique, was efficiently and objectively utilized for measuring sacroiliac joint mobility in a number of preceding researches. The DIV has been chosen in this study as it crossed the gap between objective invasive techniques such as anesthetic block injections and subjective noninvasive manually applied sacroiliac joint pain provocation tests [11].

In (2003), Matthew et al stated that palpation meter (PALM) is an accurate tool for evaluating skeletal alignment in a clinical setting for both healthy and patient populations. It measures the tilt angle and space between any two marked points in the body. It can give the height discrepancy between the two landmarks palpated [12].

The objective of the study was to investigate and compare the effectiveness of Mulligan mobilization and muscle energy technique on sacroiliac stiffness, anterior pelvic tilting angle and pain level in chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction patients.

Methodology: The study was performed in the outpatient clinic, faculty of medicine, Tanta university through July 2015 to June 2016.

Subjects: Power analysis was performed to determine sample size which indicated a number of 45. The survey was done to include all patients with chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction depending on orthopedist referral. Simple randomization was used to include 45 out of 80 patients taking in our consideration the inclusion criteria. Subjects were assigned to 3 equivalent groups (A, B and C). Each group consisted of 15 subjects. Group A: Received Mulligan mobilization with movement (MWM) that was given 3 sets with 10 repetitions for 12 sessions using posterior and anterior innominate methods to the sacroiliac joint [13] plus conventional treatment program that consisted of ultrasonic, infrared and therapeutic exercise program in the form of sit-up exercise, bridging exercise, back extension from prone, finger to toes, knee to chest exercise and stretching back muscles [14]. Group B: Received muscle energy technique (MET) including post-isometric relaxation technique for posterior spinal stabilizers (erector spinae) and (hamstrings), anterior stabilizers (iliopsoas muscle) that stabilize the spine anteriorly and control lumbar pelvic rhythm and to (quadratus lumborum muscle) as a lateral stabilizer of the spine [15]. It was done 3 times per session for 12 sessions with a time of hold for each position 7-10 seconds [14] plus previously mentioned conventional treatment program. Group C: Received conventional treatment program only and acted as a control group.

Subjects age ranged between 30 – 50 years, had pain over the sacroiliac joint and had sacroiliac joint hypomobility or intermediate mobility with threshold difference <3 for hypo-mobility and from 3 to 7 for intermediate mobility [16]. The exclusion criteria were as follows: Acute injury or fracture in the lower limbs, pregnant females, inflammatory pathology, any hip joint pathology, previous hip operations or recently received intra-articular injections, spondylothesis/disc disease, congenital spinal deformity, previous major lumbar spine surgery, hypermobility of sacroiliac joint (Subjects with threshold difference more
than 7) [16]. A written consent was obtained from all the participants. The study was approved by the Research Ethical Committee, Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo University, (P.T.REC/012/001031). The Pan African Clinical Trial Registry database accepted the registry of the study under the identification number PACTR201604001563277.

PROCEDURES

1- Measurement procedures: The following measurements were taken for all participants in the first session and four weeks later for sacroiliac joint mobility, anterior pelvic tilting angle, and pain intensity level.

1-Sacroiliac joint mobility: measured by Doppler imaging of vibrations. The vibration generator (VG) was held by the researcher, this vibration generator tip was directed to the anterior superior iliac spine (ASIS) of the participant. Vibrations of 60 Hz were applied unilaterally through vibration generator (Thrive 707A Full Body Massager) to the ASIS. The vibrations transmitted in an upward direction up to the sacroiliac joint area. A sonographer evaluated the received vibrations using color Doppler imaging (CDI) apparatus (Toshiba Aplio 500 Platinum Ultrasound Machine). The patient was requested to lie prone at the edge of the treatment table with the ASIS slightly outside the table, with his head moved away from the ASIS receiving vibration, and his arms crossed under his head. The position of each participant was adjusted by the researcher, the VG was held by the researcher that the tip of the VG was directed toward the ASIS of the patient so that a gentle but steady contact was made by the VG applicator tip to the target ASIS. The participant was requested to uncover their lower back and superior buttock region. Pre-warmed ultrasound gel was used over the sacroiliac joint region for effective transmitting of ultrasound from transducer device to the sacroiliac joint. The transducer was used transversely extending over medial and lateral sides of the sacroiliac joint. The sonographer adjusted the scan plane until proper sacral and ilial bony landmarks were distinguished. Image quality was optimized by adjusting depth and focus.

Figure 1: Patient position during Doppler imaging of vibration.

The sonographer utilized Doppler mode. Doppler signals obtained from the vibration applied on ilium and sacrum appeared on the color Doppler screen as blue and red coloration. First, the sonographer established the threshold level (TL) for the ilial segment by registering color gain that appeared during the color Doppler image of ilial landmark noted receiving vibration (first set measurement) figure (2). Second, another threshold level was set when color Doppler image of the sacral segment receiving vibration was detected across target sacroiliac joint line (second set of measurement) figure (3). The sacral TL was subtracted from the ilial TL, the result pointed to the amount of vibrational loss through the sacroiliac joint.

Figure 2: Doppler imaging of vibrations screen capture for left ilial threshold level (first set of measurement).

Figure 3: Doppler imaging of vibrations screen capture for left sacral threshold level (second set of measurement).

The recordings were taken in two sets for each unilateral sacroiliac joint, for the ilial and sacral Landmark, starting with the left, to achieve two individual sets of measurements (Session 1, first set left sacroiliac joint; and Session 1, the second set left sacroiliac joint). The same measures were repeated for the right sacroiliac joint that the patient position was altered so that the contralateral right ASIS was placed properly and the patient position was adjusted to be the same as the original one, the same recordings and measurements repeated (Session 1, first set right sacroiliac joint and Session 1, second set right sacroiliac joint).

Figure 2: Doppler imaging of vibrations screen capture for left ilial threshold level (first set of measurement).

Figure 3: Doppler imaging of vibrations screen capture for left sacral threshold level (second set of measurement).

2- Anterior pelvic tilting angle: PALM was used for measuring pelvic tilting angle. A mark was put on a point just inferior to ASIS; another mark was put just inferior to PSIS. The calipers of the PALM were put on these two points. Then inclinometer determined the inclination of degrees between the two points [12].

3- Pain intensity level assessment was measured by Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). VAS consisted of a 10 cm horizontal
The therapist's caudal hand was placed on the anterior superior iliac spine on the treated side. The patient was instructed to very lightly sideband towards the treated side producing an isometric contraction in quadratus lumborum. After 7 seconds the patient was asked to relax completely, then to sideband towards the non-treated side, as the therapist simultaneously bent backward slightly, in order to sideband the patient [14].

3-Traditional therapeutic exercise program: was performed by the patient under the therapist supervision and consisted of strengthening exercises in the form of bridging exercise, back extension from prone, sit-up exercise. These exercises were performed to strengthen the abdominal and back muscles. They performed from crook lying and prone positions and stretching exercises that consisted of finger to toes, knee to chest exercise and stretching back muscles. Hold time for the stretching force was fixed to 30 seconds for every stretching maneuver followed by 30 seconds rest. Repetitions: 3 times / session [14].

4-Ultrasound treatment: The Chattanooga Intelect ultrasound made in USA. model 2013 was used in this study. Patient was in prone lying position. The sacroiliac area was covered with an ultrasound gel not having any pharmacological substances. The therapist applied US to the right and left sacroiliac joints by moving the ultrasound head in a circular motion at 90° angle. Continuous US waves with 1MHZ frequency and 1.5 watt/cm² intensity were performed by a 4cm width head. US treatment time was 8 min.

5- Infrared therapy: Beurer IL 30 Germany infrared lamp was used in the study. Patient was in prone lying position. Infrared lamp was adjusted so the energy stroked the patient at a right angle. Treatment lasted for 10 minutes.

Statistical analysis: Descriptive statistics and ANOVA were used for comparison of the mean age, weight, height, and BMI of the three groups. Two way mixed MANOVA was used to investigate the effective treatment and time on sacroiliac mobility, anterior pelvic tilting angle, and VAS.

RESULTS

The subjects’ general characteristics are shown in Table (1). No significant difference was detected among groups in the mean age, height, weight, BMI (p > 0.05).
The study findings can be summarized as the following, regarding RT sacroiliac mobility: the mean difference of the pretreatment values as compared to post-treatment values was -5.64°, -0.67° and -0.4° for groups A versus B, A versus C, and B versus C respectively. For LT sacroiliac mobility: the mean difference of the pretreatment values as compared to post-treatment values was -5.6°, 0.39° and 2.76° for group A, B, and C, the mean difference of the post-treatment values was 5.53°, 5.46° and -0.07° for groups A versus B, A versus C, and B versus C respectively. For anterior pelvic tilting angle: The mean difference of the pretreatment values as compared to post-treatment values was 3.13°, -0.33° and -2.23° for groups A versus B, A versus C and -2.33° for group B versus C. Finally concerning pain intensity level by visual analogue scale the mean difference of the pretreatment values as compared to post-treatment values was 5.2°, 4.14° and 3.2° for group A, B and C, the mean difference of the post-treatment values was -0.33°, -1.33° and -2.23° for groups A versus B, A versus C, and B versus C respectively. As regards to anterior pelvic tilting angle: The mean difference of the pretreatment values as compared to post-treatment values was 3.13° for group A versus C and -2.33° for group B versus C.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to investigate and compare the effects of Mulligan mobilization versus muscle energy technique in patients with chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction. The patients participated in this study had symptoms of chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction with the treatment protocol described before symptoms were improved in 4 weeks. The study findings revealed a statistical remarkable improvement in post-intervention values for sacroiliac mobility in Mulligan mobilization group and a statistically significant decrease of anterior pelvic tilting angle in Mulligan mobilization and muscle energy technique groups also a significant decrease of pain in the 3 groups compared with pre-intervention values, in addition to, Mulligan mobilization group showed a statistical high detectable difference in right and left sacroiliac mobility more than muscle energy technique and control groups also there was a significant difference in anterior pelvic tilting angle and pain level between both Mulligan mobilization and muscle energy technique groups when compared to control group, while no significant difference was detected in anterior pelvic tilting angle and pain level between Mulligan mobilization and muscle energy technique groups.

The main limitation encountered during the study was that tested variables were not all measured in the same day due to the presence of many urgent and critical cases in the doppler unit in the outpatient clinic.

Concerning the clinical effectiveness of MWM techniques, it has been established for improving joint function and this is based on a set of assumptions. The basic theory for Mulligan's efficacy is based on a mechanical model. This theory stated that due to injury minor positional faults occur and that cause joint maltracking, leading to stiffness, pain, and weakness [7]. Main reasons for positional faults were proposed as alterations in joint surfaces configuration, cartilaginous and capsular thickness, orientation and pulling of musculotendinous components. MWMs treat the previous symptoms via realigning the joint and put it on its normal track. Subsequent research also supports that the mechanisms behind the MWMs efficacy were built upon correcting biomechanical malfunction [9]. Chronic musculoskeletal disorder should be a cause of soft tissue shortening and can be long-term adaptive postural changes. Sacroiliac joint mobilization can be used to re-elongate shortened tissues and break adhesion and restore normal position [18]. Our study finding was consistent with the finding of Jeong et al. (2014) [19] who investigated the effect of sacroiliac joint mobilization on obliquity of pelvis, stability control, and pain intensity level. The study of Jeong included sacroiliac joint dysfunction patients who were divided into 2 groups, sacroiliac joint mobilization, and a control group. This study concluded that combining MWM plus function training has been valuable for diminishing pelvic malalignment, enhancing balance abilities as well as diminishing pain level. Also, Anand et al. (2015) [20] agreed with our study findings. Anand measured flexion range of motion of the lumbar spine, back performance

| Table 1: Descriptive statistics and ANOVA test for the mean age, height, weight, BMI of the three groups MWM(A), MET(B), control groups(C). |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | MWM group       | MET group       | Control group   | F-value | p-value |
| Age (years)     | 37.93 ± 3.75    | 39.73 ± 3.15    | 38.26 ± 3.59    | 1.11    | 0.33    |
| Weight (kg)     | 80.86 ± 5.84    | 81.2 ± 4.12     | 79.66 ± 2.76    | 0.5     | 0.6     |
| Height (cm)     | 158.93 ± 3.71   | 159.53 ± 2.79   | 158.26 ± 2.89   | 0.6     | 0.55    |
| BMI (kg/m²)     | 31.96 ± 1.08    | 31.89 ± 0.95    | 31.79 ± 0.39    | 0.14    | 0.86    |

Table 2: Alterations in the measured variables in the MWM, MET and control group at baseline and following treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RT sacroiliac mobility</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-treatment</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWM group</td>
<td>3.86 ± 1.55 TU</td>
<td>8.4 ± 3.04 TU</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET group</td>
<td>3.55 ± 1.92 TU</td>
<td>4.0 ± 2.23 TU</td>
<td>p = 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>4.1 ± 1.85 TU</td>
<td>4.33 ± 1.91 TU</td>
<td>p = 0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LT sacroiliac mobility</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-treatment</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWM group</td>
<td>3.46 ± 1.92 TU</td>
<td>9.06 ± 2.46 TU</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET group</td>
<td>2.86 ± 1.55 TU</td>
<td>3.53 ± 1.78 TU</td>
<td>p = 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>3.13 ± 1.99 TU</td>
<td>3.6 ± 1.68 TU</td>
<td>p = 0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anterior pelvic tilting angle</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-treatment</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWM group</td>
<td>4.26 ± 1.22 degrees</td>
<td>1.13 ± 0.99 degrees</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET group</td>
<td>4.15 ± 1.24 degrees</td>
<td>1.53 ± 0.83 degrees</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>4.06 ± 1.86 degrees</td>
<td>3.86 ± 1.72 degrees</td>
<td>p = 0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pain intensity level</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Post-treatment</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWM group</td>
<td>5.93 ± 1.38</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.45</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET group</td>
<td>5.2 ± 1.42</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.25</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>5.26 ± 1.98</td>
<td>2.06 ± 1.33</td>
<td>p = 0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scale score and pain before and immediately after applying mobilization. The study results revealed that modified sustained natural apophyseal glides for the lumbar spine affected immediately on improving lumbar flexion range of motion, back performance, and diminishing pain level. The study results agreed with results of Teys et al. (2006) [21] who studied the initial efficacy of MWM on pressure pain threshold and shoulder range of motion. The results indicated that MWM has an immediate positive effect on both range of motion and pain. The work of Labour et al. (2016) [22] supported our study findings. They concluded that mobilization with movement is an effective method for improving lumbosacral flexion range of motion, decreasing pain and disability for pregnant women suffering from sacroiliac joint dysfunction. Their study was conducted on 40 pregnant women who were divided into 2 equal groups (postural correction exercises group and mobilization with movement group). On the other hand, our findings contradicted the findings of Richard et al. (1988) [23] who investigated the effects of sacroiliac joint mobilization upon the standing pelvic position. The pelvic position was assessed (pre and post sacroiliac joint mobilization). Richard measured apparent leg lengths (because its discrepancies give a clinical indicator for pelvic asymmetries) and concluded that Richard et al concluded that mobilization did not have any influence upon leg lengths. The difference in finding between our study and Richard’s study may be due to single session intervention used that may not be enough to produce changes in pelvis position. Additionally, the findings of the study of Maria et al. (2015) [24] were on the contrary to the finding of our study. The study included 49 asymptomatic subjects that were divided into two groups either sustained natural apophyseal glide mobilization or a sham mobilization. The study revealed that no statistical difference in the range of motion was detected, on the contrary to our study because the study subjects are asymptomatic and this contradicted to Mulligan original theory that depends on correction of positional faults in symptomatic subjects.

As regards to the underlying mechanisms by which MWM produces pain relief are biomechanical and neurophysiological mechanisms [7]. From the biomechanical aspect, it was suggested that MWM achieve correction of joint mal-tracking as well as mechanical malfunction. Neurophysiologically; stimulation of descending pain control pathways in addition to alterations in central pain mechanism. Additionally, the concentrations of inflammatory mediators were altered by wide range motion performed during applying MWM techniques with the patients and result in inhibition of nociceptors that are stimulated by such inflammatory substances. MWM achieves a pain relief effect and this would be related to the enhancement of disability level. This was supported by the work of Benjamin et al. (2015) [25]. They studied the immediate impacts of lumbar Mulligan sustained natural apophyseal glides in nonspecific low back pain patients. Subjects were randomized to either a real- sustained natural apophyseal glides group or a sham- sustained natural apophyseal glides group. All outcome measures were significantly different only in the real treatment group. This study showed that sustained natural apophyseal glides for lumbar spine had an immediate effect on reducing pain, improving function and kinematic algorithms in nonspecific low back pain patients. Also, Karthikeyan et al. (2015) [26] agreed with our study findings. Karthikeyan et al compared between the effect of Mulligan sustained natural apophyseal glide technique and slump stretching in spondylogenic referred low back pain patients. Percentage change in pain intensity level and disability index post-intervention in Mulligan group was found to be more significant than the other group. Hagan et al. (2016) [27] agreed with the findings of our study. They investigated the use of MWM for sacroiliac joint in their case report in a patient with sacroiliac joint dysfunction. The patient was tested immediately following the MWM intervention and at discharge. The Numeric Pain Rating Scale scores reduced. Sacroiliac joint pain provocation tests were negative. The patient-specific functional scale improved. The finding of our study contradicts the finding of Collins et al. (2004) [28] who studied the effect of MWM technique in subacute ankle sprains. The study yielded that MWM treatment has a mechanical, not analgesic impact that disagreed with our study and the reason for this difference was due to small sample size in Collin’s study that should be considered to have influenced the statistical analysis as pain measures have lower sensitivity to change than mechanical measures (dorsiflexion range of motion).

Concerning to group (B) MET group, our study revealed that MET has no significant effect on sacroiliac mobility, this was matched with the study of Fryer et al. (2011) [29] who concluded that pelvic asymmetry is produced by muscle imbalance and alteration in muscle tone. Muscle energy techniques apply shortening and elongation for muscles and fascial components so; it is probably that MET has an effect on correcting obliquity of the pelvis and asymmetry by affecting muscles and fascial structures more than affecting the sacroiliac joint in a direct way. It has been suggested that MET treats muscle imbalances in the lumbar and pelvic areas e.g. asymmetrical pelvic position. MET can adjust asymmetrical positions of the pelvis by focusing on contracting hip extensors and hip flexors in the affected lower back region and putting the pelvic bones in the right position [30]. The finding of our study was supported by the work of Enas et al. (2015) [31] who investigated the efficacy of muscle energy technique for correcting forward tilting of the pelvis in lumbar spondylosis patients. The two groups of the study showed significant improvement in tilting of the pelvis, pain intensity level, and functional abilities. The group that received MET was better than the other group in all the measured variables. The study results agreed with that of Zelle et al. (2005) [5] who discussed that restoring shortened muscle length and flexibility by mobility and corrective exercises was crucial in treating and modifying overall faulty postures and correcting im-
balances affecting the pelvic ring mobility. The analgesic effect of MET could be explained by both spinal and supraspinal mechanisms; Stimulation of mechanoreceptors in both muscle and joint takes place during an isometric contraction [14]. This results in sympathetic excitation as well as stimulation of the periaqueductal gray area which plays a crucial part in alteration of descending pathway of pain signals. Suppression of nociceptive impulses takes place at the spinal cord level through gate control theory of pain by simultaneous transmission of both painful signals and mechanical receptors activation. MET stimulates joint mechanoreceptors through joint movement. This was supported by the study of Degenhard et al. (2007) [32] who reported that myofascial trigger point suppression was improved by applying different forms of MET. Also, Selkow et al. (2009) [30] agreed with our study findings in their randomized controlled trial that consisted of 20 subjects with lumbopelvic pain, randomized into 2 groups MET and control groups. Subjects in MET group showed a decrease in pain scores in lumbopelvic area than the control group. On the other hand, Ballentine et al. (2003) [33] still argue and hesitate about the efficacy of MET in form of post-isometric relaxation. They suggested that the post-isometric relaxation theory and its consequent hypoalgesic effects are poorly supported by research.

CONCLUSION
The data obtained from this study revealed that both Mulligan mobilization with movement and muscle energy technique had significant effect on decreasing anterior pelvic tilting angle and pain level in chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction patients and no statistically significant difference was detected between both groups in anterior pelvic tilting angle and pain intensity level, while Mulligan mobilization with movement was superior to muscle energy technique in improving sacroiliac mobility. Finally, it could be concluded that Mulligan mobilization with movement is more effective than muscle energy technique in managing patients with chronic sacroiliac joint dysfunction.
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