

Self-perceived Quality of Life and response on warm water among women with Fibromyalgia

Bachelor's Thesis in Human Movement Science

BEV2900 - Spring 2019

Department of Neuromedicine and Movement Science, NTNU

Candidate number: 10031

Number of words in abstract: 192

Number of words in thesis: 4164

Abstrakt

Målsetning: Målet med dette studiet var å avdekke kvinners selvoppfattelse av behandling i varmt vann og hvordan det påvirker livskvaliteten deres når de lider av fibromyalgi.

Metode: Det ble søkt etter artikler som tok for seg behandling i varmt vann, på MedLine. Utvalgte søkeord ga 26 artikler som tok for seg behandling av kvinner med diagnosen fibromyalgi ved hjelp av varmt vann, samt ser på livskvalitet. Seleksjon ble gjort for å finne de artiklene som på best mulig måte svarer problemstillingen. Ti artikler ble inkludert.

Resultat: Fem hovedkategorier tar for seg ulike symptomer ved fibromyalgi. Angst og depresjon, smerte, velvære, kroppsfunksjon og arbeidsevne. Etter å ha sammenliknet alle ti artiklene for hver av de fem kategoriene, ble signifikante forbedringer funnet i alle kategorier når man så på før- og etter behandlingsmålingene. Forbedringene ble sett både innad og mellom trenings- og kontroll gruppene. Når man la til en oppfølgingsperiode snudde tendensen. Forbedringene forsvant og noen artikler dokumenterte signifikant nedgang fra etter behandling til etter oppfølgingsperioden.

Konklusjon: Kvinner med fibromyalgi responderer bra på behandling i varmt vann. Selvfølelsen øker etter behandlingsperioden og smertefølelsen reduseres. Videre bør perioden etter behandling undersøkes. Nøkkelord: Fibromyalgi, selvoppfatning, Livskvalitet, Spørreskjema, Varmt vann

Abstract

Objective: The aim of this study was to uncover women's self-perception of treatment in warm water and how it affects quality of life when diagnosed with fibromyalgia (FM).

Methods: Searching for articles dealing with warm water treatment on MedLine were done. Selected searching words gave 26 articles dealing with warm water treatment of women with FM and quality of life. Selection was made to find the articles best suited to the main issue. Ten articles were included in study.

Results: Five main categories deal with different symptoms of FM. Anxiety and depression, pain, wellness, body function and work ability. After comparing all ten articles on all five categories, significant improvements were found in all categories when looking at pre- to post-treatment. The improvements were seen within and between exercise- and control group. When adding a follow-up period, the tendency turned. The improvements disappeared and some articles documented significant decrease from post-treatment to follow-up.

Conclusion: Women with FM responds well on treatment in warm water. The self-esteem improves after treatment period and the pain experience decreases. Furthermore, the period after treatment should be examined.

Keywords: Fibromyalgia, Self-perception, Quality of Life, Questionnaire, Warm water

Introduction

There are several diagnoses today that do not have any medication with proven effect. Nevertheless, other treatments might give positive results. Therefore, it is important to investigate all kinds of treatment that seems plausible of curbing or remove the disease symptoms. Fibromyalgia (FM) is one such type of disease. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003) Medication has little or no effect on the FM symptoms. However, knowledge about the disease and physical activity have shown to give positive results. (Gowans, Dehueck, Voss, Silaj, & Abbey, 2004) FM is a chronic disease characterized by chronic widespread pain (CWP), which is increased sensitivity to pain in the skeletal muscles. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003), (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011) Palpation is used to examine tender points (TP), and if the patient experience pain in 11 out of 18 TP areas when it is palpated with 4 kg of pressure, it is considered as a TP according to the 1990 American College of Rheumatology (ACR) classification. (Wolfe et al., 1990) At least until 2010 when the criteria were revised. The cause of incorrectly examine of TP leaded to a new way to diagnose FM. The new method does not require physical or TP examination. Now the combination of widespread pain index (WPI) and symptom severity (SS) scale defines FM in this way: (WPI \geq 7 AND SS \geq 5) OR (WPI 3-6 AND SS \geq 9). (Wolfe et al., 2010)

FM is a disease with some unknown factors about the exact cause. therefore, it is only assumed that the nervous system has changed in its way to process and send information about pain to the brain. One theory is that the chemicals in the nervous system comes in imbalance. Hormones as serotonin and noradrenaline are shown to be low in patients with FM. (Höcherl et al., 2000) Serotonin is involved in both depression and anxiety, and patients with FM often suffers from anxiety and depression. (Purves et al., 2012) Medication can alleviate these ailments to make everyday life better. However, these are side effects that can occur in FM patients.

Patients with FM experience different ailments, such as fatigue, sleep disturbance, stiffness and pain in muscles, headache, irritable bowel, anxiety, depression, memory and concentration issues. (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011) This contributes to influencing patients self-perceived quality of life and interfere with their daily living. This is factors that can be measured by questionnaires as the Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQ), The MOS 36-Item Short-Form health Survey (SF-36) and Psychological General Well-Being index (PGWB). (Burckhardt et al., 1991), (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992), (Grossi et al., 2006) Also, EuroQol group's EQ-5D instrument to show anxiety and pain levels, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) to reveal anxiety and Visual Analog Scale (VAS) to reveal pain. (Shaw, Johnson, & Coons, 2005), (Marteau & Bekker, 1992), (Price, McGrath, Rafii, & Buckingham, 1983)

FM is most common among women and being 10 times as likely as men to experience the criteria for FM. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003) However, another study claims that women are six times more likely to be affected by FM. (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011) With higher age, the likelihood of having the disease increases. In addition, indications suggest that FM may be hereditary. Among families with a patient diagnosed with FM, the risk of other family members getting diagnosed is higher than in general population. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003)

One study refers to a study, written in a foreign language, that FM is a complex disease containing three main subdivisions. Muscle aspect as in fatigue and stiffness in skeletal muscles, pain aspect as in neuro and muscle system working together and psychological factors as well-being and mental health. These three subdivisions must be considered when dealing with studies about FM. (Letieri et al., 2013) Since the cause of FM is so complex and unknown, the treatment is still vague. Nevertheless, studies have tested various treatments over the past three decades with various result. To uncover the question of how the subdivision of neurons affects FM, studies have tested various deposits of hormones that have been shown to be low in FM and which separately have effect on some of the symptoms given when suffering from FM. (Höcherl et al., 2000), (Purves et al., 2012) Hormone medication has been an important factor in how FM can be cured. Today, there is no medicine that fully cure FM, just to curb the symptoms temporarily. (Höcherl et al., 2000)

Studies using physical activity as a possible damper on, or full recovery from the FM symptoms is widely used. There are many types of physical activities, but since patients with FM have pain in their muscle the activity has to be adjusted to something they can manage to do. Various strength exercises covering the big muscle groups as thigh, back and abdomen. Other activities which is gentle to the body is waist high water exercise. The water gives resistance due to higher density than air, and gentleness as every movement is slower. The third subdivision deals with the psychological aspect. To cover this section, the patient's self-esteem must be taken into consideration. Knowledge about mental health has evolved the past decades, and the methods to uncover this has improved. There have been studies testing how physical activity influences the FM symptoms and self-perceived quality of life. In addition, it has been tested how patient's knowledge about the FM disease have affect symptoms and self-perceived quality of life. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003), (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011)

According to today's recommendations on health sites online, who inform that FM is a diagnose with several symptoms, one must try different treatment. Briefly, a combination of change in lifestyle and medication are used. The importance of healthy eating, being physically active and sleep well is mentioned as essential to living with FM. In addition, medication that initially only relieve pain and/or improves quality of sleep as painkiller, antidepressant, sleeping pill, antipsychotics and anticonvulsants.

The focus among health sites, when it comes to treatment is warm water exercise, tailored exercise program and cognitive behavioral therapy. Also, psychotherapy, relaxation techniques and psychological support/support group are mentioned as possible methods. There is a great agreement that talking about the disease with someone who understands your struggle gives a positive effect. In addition, knowledge about the diagnose and what causes it to be worse has an impact on how to cope with the FM. Be told that the pain is not devastating processes in the body will ease on the concerns and decreases the experience of pain. ("Treatment," 2017)

With no clear answers on how to cure FM, but many options on how to relieve it, how should diagnosed patients deal with the sickness? Physical activity is highly recommended to make everyday life better with FM, and warm water exercise is highlighted as a form of treatment. The kind of exercise, and how long or often the exercise should be, is not unambiguously determine. Since there is no proper cure against FM and all advice available is to learn to live with the disease. How does water-based exercise among adult women diagnosed with FM affect their self-perceived quality of life?

Method

The literature search database of MedLine were used to find articles included in this study. Searching words used were fibromyalgia, water OR pool OR swimming pools, "quality of life", "surveys and questionnaires", self-concept, pain OR pain measurement. AND was put between these six searching words/themes and the outcome were 49 articles, as seen in figure 1. The search results were limited to only women and age 45-64 years. 35 articles remained. After adding the searching word AND "exercise", 26 articles remained. The abstract of all these were read. This led to an exclusion of two articles for being written in Spanish and Portuguese, 14 articles for not satisfying the main issue of this study. 10 articles were included in the result, as can be seen in table 1.



Figure 1: Selection process of articles included in study

Supporting literature about hormones were found by searching in MedLine. Searching words used were fibromyalgia, hormones, serotonin and

noradrenaline. AND was put between all four words. Two articles were found which of was one review and one article. The review was rejected after reading the abstract. Additional supporting articles were found by reading the included articles. References provided there were found in Google Scholar by searching the articles name.

One book was used for information. Anxiety were the searching word in the index at the end of the book. All pages included the word anxiety were read to find information.

Results

Those ten articles included in the study has a total of 659 different participants, where 15 of them are men, included in their results. Gusi, Tomas-Carus, A. Häkkinen, K. Häkkinen, & Ortega-Alonso (2006) and Tomas-Carus et al. (2007) use the same participants but with different purpose on the outcome. Five articles use exercise group (EG) and control group (CG) and compare them up against each other. Two articles have one EG and compares pre- and post-treatment within the group. Two articles deal with former participants from EG and giving them questionnaires. One article compares two different types of water-based activity. See table 1.

Author – Year	Included patients (is men)	Groups (n)	Age (years) (average ± Standard deviation)	Training duration	Sessions	
Cedraschi et al. – 2004	164 (12)	Exercise (84) Control (80)	? EG (48.9±9.7) CG (49.8±9.8)	12 sessions Twice a week 6 weeks 90 minutes (2x45minutes)	Pool-sessions (8x45mins) Relaxation (4x45mins) Land sessions (2x45mins) Daily living (2x90mins) Education (6x45mins)	
Tomas-Carus et al. – 2007	34 (0)	Exercise (17) Control (17)	35-73 EG (51±10) CG (51±9)	36 sessions 3 times a week 12 weeks 60 minutes	10 mins warm-up 10 mins aerobic exercise 20 mins overall mobility and lower-limb strength 10 mins aerobic exercise 10 mins cooling down	
Tomas-Carus et al. – 2008	30 (0)	Exercise (15) Control (15)	37-71 EG (50.7 ± 10.6) CG (50.9 ± 6.7)	X sessions 3 times a week 8 months 60 minutes	10 mins warm-up 10 mins aerobic exercise 20 mins overall mobility and lower-limb strength 10 mins aerobic exercise 10 mins cooling down	
Letieri et al. – 2013	64 (0)	Exercise (33) Control (31)	? EG (58.2 ± 10.6) CG (59.6 ± 9.4)	30 sessions Twice a week 15 weeks 45 minutes	5 mins warm-up 35 mins of aquatic exercise 5 mins of stretching	
Gusi et al. – 2006	34 (0)	Exercise (17) Control (17)	35-73 EG (51±10) CG (51±9)	36 sessions 3 times a week 12 weeks 60 minutes	10 mins warm-up 10 mins aerobic exercise 20 mins overall mobility and lower-limb strength 10 mins aerobic exercise 10 mins cooling down	
Altan et al. – 2003	46 (0)	Group 1 (24) Group 2 (22)	31-56 Group 1 (43.14 ± 6.39) Group 2 (43.91 ± 6.26)	36 sessions 3 times a week 12 weeks 35 minutes	Gr. 1 Warm-up Activity Relaxation Land-based	Gr. 2 Balneotherapy
Havermark and Langius- Eklof – 2006	240 (3)	Follow-up of treatment group (240)	25-79 (51 ± 10)			
Mannerkorpi et al. – 2002	28 (0)	Follow-up of treatment group (28)	? (45 ± 8.0)			
Segura-Jiménez et al. – 2012	33 (0)	Exercise (33)	? EG (50.0 ± 7.3)	24 sessions Twice a week 12 weeks 45 minutes	10 mins warm-up 25 mins of aquatic exercise 10 mins of stretching	
Pérez de la Cruz and Lambeck – 2018	20 (0)	Ai Chi (20)	53-70 (61.45 ± 4.62)	20 sessions Twice a week 10 weeks 45 minutes	AiC	Chi

Table 1: Descriptive data from the included articles.

To check if water-based activity influences FM, the results are divided into five categories were selfperceived feelings are measured using different questionnaires and methods. The five categories are anxiety and depression, pain, wellness, body function and work function. Each category has been checked by various studies with multiple questionnaires and methods. Further, the questionnaires and methods used in a category are divided into several subcategories suited to the main category.

Anxiety and depression are measured by seven out of ten articles. There are 5 different methods on how data is collected. FIO, PGWB and EO-5D deals with both anxiety and depression as subcategories, while Beck depression inventory only includes depression and STAI only measures anxiety. When looking at difference within groups before treatment period (pre-treatment) and after



Table 2: Significant difference found within and between groups of anxiety and depression among the included articles.

the treatment period (post-treatment) results show variations, and no logical connection can be found. However, EG tend to significantly improve their self-perceived anxiety and depression while CG always reports a nonsignificant change, see table 2. When including a follow-up period, the scores tend to go back to start. Results comparing the two groups reveals that anxiety and depression significantly improves when exercise, except of anxiety in FIQ and depression in PGWB measured in the study by Cedraschi et al. (2004) (Table 2)

Pain is measured by all ten articles using four different types of measuring methods. FIQ, SF-36, VAS and EQ-5D, all with the subcategory of pain. Difference within the groups reveal that exercising has a significant improve on pain pre- to post-treatment and all the CGs had no significant change, except in the study by Cedraschi et al. (2004) where CG got significantly more pain, and EG had no significant change. Segura-Jiménez et al. (2013) measured immediately changes. Result shows significantly

improve after every session except the first and fourth session. Pain measurement between the groups states that there is a significant difference in favor of EG, see table 3. Nevertheless, Altan, Bingöl, Aykaç, Koç, & Yurtkuran (2004) found no difference between the two groups in their study. As well as for Gusi et al. (2006) when looking at pretreatment to follow-up, table 3.

Wellness is measured by six out of ten articles and using three different measuring techniques. FIQ, SF-36 and PGWB. Subcategories can be seen in table 4. Hävermark & Langius-Eklöf (2006) found significantly improve on FIQ-feel bad for both pre- to post-treatment and to follow-up. Furthermore, Mannerkorpi, Ahlmén, & Ekdahl, (2002) and Perez De La Cruz & Lambeck (2018) found significantly improve on SF-36- vitality (V) and social function (SF) pre- to post

 Table 3: Significant difference found within and between groups of pain among the included articles.

 *Significant worse.

$ \begin{array}{ c $	Test	Article	Significant difference within groups	Significant difference between groups		
$ P = P = 2 \ c \ la \ Cruz \ and Lambeck 2018 P = 0 05 P = 0.05 P = 0.001 No data P = 0.001 No data P = 0.001 No data P = 0.001 P = 0 post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P = 0.001) P = 0 post-treatment to 12 months follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to 12 months follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.01) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.05) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.05) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.05) P = 0 post-treatment to follow-up (P = 0.05) P = 0 post-treatment (P = 0.05) P = 0 po$			(Pre- and post-treatment)			
Image: Product of the second		Cedraschi et al 2004	Yes:	Yes		
Pere de la Cruz and Pere de la Cruz and Pere to post-treatment of follow-up (P<0.01) (P<0.05) (P<0.01) (P<0.05) (P<0.01) (P<0.01) (P<0.02) (P<0.01) (P<0.02) (P<0.02) (P<0.02) (P<0.02) (P<0.02) (P<0.02) (P<0.03) (P<0.03) (P<0.05) (P<0.02) (P<0.03) (P<0.05) (P<0.0			CG* P<0.05	P ⊲0.05		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline FG & FG & FG \\ \hline Tomas-Cause et al 2008 & P-0.05 \\ \hline Tomas-Cause et al 2008 & P-0.001 \\ \hline Havemark and & Yes: & No data \\ \hline Langius-Eklof 2006 & P-0.001 \\ \hline No: & pre-treatment to follow-up & P-0.01 \\ \hline Mannerkorpi et al 2002 & pre-to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P-0.01) \\ \hline Tomas-Cause et al 2007 & Pre-to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P-0.05) \\ \hline Mannerkorpi et al 2007 & Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P-0.05) \\ \hline No: & Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P-0.05) \\ \hline No: & Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P-0.05) \\ \hline No: & Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P-0.05) \\ \hline No: & Baseline to 12 months follow-up \\ \hline Perez de la Ctuz and & P'es \\ \hline Altan et al 2003 & Yes \\ \hline Segura-Jimenez et al 2012 & Session 1 and 4 \\ \hline Letieri et al 2013 & FG (P-0.05) \\ \hline Segura-Jimenez et al 2012 & Session 1 and 4 \\ \hline Letieri et al 2013 & FG (P-0.05) \\ \hline No: \\ \hline GG \\ \hline Perez de la Ctuz and \\ I ambeck 2018 & P-0.01 \\ \hline Fere de la Ctuz and \\ \hline Perez de la $			No:			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			EG			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	-	Tomas-Carus et al	No data	Yes		
$ \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Havematk and \\ Langius-Eklof 2006 & P<0.001 & No data \\ P<0.001 & No \\ \hline P < 0.051 & Perture the follow-up \\ Perture the post-treatment of to Elow-up (P<0.01) & Pere to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.05) & Pere to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01) & Pere to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.05) & Pere to post-treatment and to 130 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & No data \\ 2002 & Pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & No & Both groups pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & No & Both groups pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & No & Both groups & No & Dot data \\ 2012 & Session 12.3,5.24 & No & Session 1 and 4 & Letien et al 2013 & Yes & Gig (P<0.05) & No & Gig & P<0.05 & No & CG & Perez de la Cruz and & Yes $	Pai	2008		P ⊲0.05		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline Langius-Eklof 2006 & P=0.001 & No: \\ & P=0.001 & No: \\ & pre-to post-treatment to follow-up (P=0.01) & Pre-to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P=0.01) & Pre-to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P=0.01) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & No data & Peco (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & No data & Peco (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & No data & Peco (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P=0.05) & Pre-to post-treatment and post pre-to post pre-to post pre-to post pre-to post post pre-to p$	~	Havermark and	Yes:	No data		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	E	Langius-Eklof 2006	P<0.001			
Image: Pre-treatment to follow-up Mannerkorpi et al 2002 pre- to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01) No data Tomas-Carus et al 2007 2007 Yes Pre- to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01)			No:			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Mannerkcopi et al 2002 & pre- to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01) & Pre- to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01) & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.01) & Group 2 pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & No data & Pre- to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & Pre- to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & Pre- to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & Pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & Pre- treat$			pre-treatment to follow-up			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline $2002 & $pre-to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01) & $Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.01) & $Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & $Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment and $Pres $$No data $$Pre-to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.01) & $Pre-treatment to follow-up (P<0.01) & $Pre-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & $No data $$Pre-to post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) & $Pre-treatment $$Pre-to post-treatment $$$Pre-to post-treatment $$$Pre-to post-treatment $$$$Pre-to post-treatment $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$		Mannerkorpi et al	Yes:	No data		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		2002	pre- to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline $Tomas-Carus et al 2007 Interval $$Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up $$($Pe-0.05)$ ($Pe-0.05)$ ($Pe-0.$			(P<0.05), and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.01)			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \begi$		Tomas-Carus et al	No data	Yes		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \$		2007		Pre- to post-treatment and follow-up		
$ \frac{1}{2} 1$	-			(P <0.05)		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \hline \\ $	air	Mannerkorpi et al	Yes:	No data		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c } \hline \be$	I	2002	pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up			
Image: Section of the section of t	-36		(P <0.05)			
Image: Percent de la Cruz and la mbeck 2018 Baseline to 12 months follow-up No data Image: Lambeck 2018 P<0.01	ES		No:			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Perez de la Cruz and & P<0.01 & P<0.02 & P<0.05 & No data & P<0.001 & P<0.05 & No data & P<0.001 & P<0.05 & No data & P<0.001 & P<0.05 & P<0.05$			Baseline to 12 months follow-up			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Lambeck 2018 & P=0.01 & No \\ \hline Altan et al 2003 & Yes & No \\ Both groups pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre-treatment to follow-up (P=0.01) & Both groups P=0.01 & Both$		Perez de la Cruz and	Yes	No data		
Altan et al 2003 Yes No Both groups pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.05)		Lambeck 2018	P≪0.01			
Segura-Jimenez et al 2012 Both groups pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre- treatment to follow-up (P<0.01) Group 2 pre-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) Both groups Segura-Jimenez et al 2012 Yes No data 2012 Session 2,3,5-24 No No data Letieri et al 2013 Yes: Yes EG (P<0.05)		Altan et al 2003	Yes	No		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $			Both groups pre- to post-treatment and group 1 pre-	Both groups		
Group 2 pre-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) Segura-Jimenez et al 2012 Yes No data 2012 Session 2,3,5-24 No No Letieri et al 2013 Yes: Yes EG (P<0.05) No: P<0.05 No: P<0.05			treatment to follow-up (P<0.01)			
Segura-Jimenez et al 2012 Yes No No data 2012 Session 1 and 4 Letieri et al 2013 Yes: Session 1 and 4 Letieri et al 2013 Yes: Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Yes P<0.05			Group 2 pre-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05)			
2012 Session 2,3,5-24 No No Session 1 and 4 Letieri et al 2013 Yes: EG (P<0.05)		Segura-Jimenez et al	Yes	No data		
Session 1 and 4 No Letieri et al 2013 Yes: Yes Letieri et al 2013 Yes: Yes EG (P<0.05)		2012	Session 2,3,5-24			
Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Session 1 and 4 Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Yes: BC Yes Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Yes Pre-to post-treatment (P<0.05) No No	VAS		No			
Letieni et al 2013 Yes: Yes EG (P<0.05)			Session 1 and 4			
EG (P<0.05) P<0.05 No: CG Perez de la Cruz and Yes Lambeck 2018 P<0.001		Letieri et al 2013	Yes:	Yes		
No: CG Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Yes P<0.001			EG (P<0.05)	P ⊲0.05		
CG No data Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Yés No data P<0.001	-		No:			
Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018 Yes No data Gusi et al 2006 No data Yes Pre- to post-treatment (P<0.05) No No No Pre-treatment to follow-up			CG			
Lambeck 2018 P=0.001 Gusi et al 2006 No data Yes Pre- to post-treatment (P<0.05)		Perez de la Cruz and	Yes	No data		
Gusi et al 2006 No data Yes Pre- to post-treatment (P<0.05)		Lambeck 2018	P<0.001			
Pre- to post-treatment (P<0.05) No Pre-treatment to follow-up	0	Gusi et al 2006	No data	Yes		
No Pre-treatment to follow-up	EQ-5I			Pre- to post-treatment (P<0.05)		
Pre-treatment to follow-up				No		
				Pre-treatment to follow-up		

Table 4: Significant difference found within and between groups of wellness among the included articles. *No data on RE and V

Test	Article	Significant difference within the group (pre- and post-treatment)	Significant difference between the groups	
	Cedraschi et al 2004	No EG and CG	No	
el bad	Tomas-Carus et al 2008	No data	No	
FIQ – Fe	Havermark and Langius-Eklof 2006	Yes Pre- and post-treatment (P<0.001) Pre-treatment and follow-up (P<0.05)	No data	
	Mannerkorpi et al 2002	No	No data	
(E)	Cedraschi et al 2004	No EG and CG*	No *	
and role emotional (R	Tomas-Carus et al 2007	No data	Yes: Pre- to post-treatment, SF and RE (P<0.05) V (P<0.01) Pre-treatment to follow-up, RE (P<0.01) No: Pre-treatment to follow-up. V and SF	
vítalíty (V), social function (SF	Mannerkorpi et al 2002	Yes: SF- pre- to post-treatment and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05), and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01) V- pre- to post-treatment and to 12 months follow-up (P<0.01), and to 30 months follow-up (P<0.05) No: RE	No data	
SF-36-7	Perez de la Cruz and Lambeck 2018	Yes: V (P<0.001) and SF (P<0.01) No: RE	No data	
PQWB - Vitality, positive wellbeing (PW)	Cedraschi et al 2004	Yes: -V-EG, pre-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) No: -V and PW - CG PW - EG	Yes: V(P<0.05) No: PW	

treatment, and to follow-up, when exercise in water. Cedraschi et al. (2004) detected a significant improvement on PGWB- V, see table 4. Looking at the difference between groups reveals that Tomas-Carus et al. (2007) found a significant difference between pre- and post-treatment among social function (SF), role emotional (RE) and vitality (V). In addition, Cedraschi et al. (2004) found a difference for V. However, RE were the only subcategory that stayed improved from pre-treatment to follow-up. (Table 4)

Test	Article	Significant difference	
		(pre- and post-treatment)	between groups
FIQ – Physical function (PF), fatigue (F), moming thechess (MT) and Stiffness (S)	Cedraschi et al 2004	Yes: F and MT - EG (P<0.01) No: PF and S - EG and CG F and MT-CG	Yes: F (P<0.01) No: PF, MT and S
	Tomas-Carus et al 2008	No data	Yes: PF and S (P<0.05) No: MT and F
	Havenmark and Langius-Eklof 2006	Yes: F, MT and S - pre- to post-treatment (P<0.001) F and S- Post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.01) * MT- Post-treatment to follow-up (P<0.05) * No: PF	No data
	Mannerkorpi et al 2002	Yes: PF- pre- to post-treatment and 12 months (P<0.01) F- pre- to post-treatment (P<0.01) and to 12- and 30 months (P<0.05) S- pre- to post-treatment (P<0.01) and to 30 months (P<0.05) No: MT PF- Baseline to 30 months S- Baseline to 12 months	No data

Table 5: Significant difference found within and between groups of body function among the included articles. *Significant worse

Body function is measured by four out of ten articles using FIQ and the subcategories of physical function (PF), fatigue (F), morning tiredness (MT) and stiffness (S). EG tend to have significantly improvement in all articles when looking at difference between pre- and post-treatment, but there is no consistent result showing improvement other than F. Hävermark & Langius-Eklöf (2006) found a significant decrease in F, S and MT from post-treatment to follow-up. Also, looking at difference between groups does not state any difference. Cedraschi et al. (2004) found a significantly improve on F, while Tomas-Carus et al. (2008) found significant improvement on PF and S. Both in favor of EG (Table 5).

Work ability is also covered by four out of ten articles using FIQ. This time, the subcategories are work missed (WM) and job ability (JA). Mannerkorpi et al. (2002) found significantly improvement from pretreatment to 30 months of follow-up, and from post-treatment to both 12- and 30 months of follow-up. Beyond that, no other articles can determine those results, see table 6. Tomas-Carus et al. (2008) had not included these two subcategories in the study. In total, water-based exercise tends to better participants self-perceived feeling on some of FM symptoms, especially pain. However, all number shows that from post-treatment to follow-up tests the resulting scores goes towards the starting point of pre-treatment.

Test	Article	Significant difference within the groups	Significant difference between the groups	
		(pre- and post-treatment)		
Cedraschi et al 2004		No:	No:	
ljol		WM and JA	WM and JA	
and	Tomas-Carus et al	No data	No data	
Ŷ	2008			
≷ €	Havermark and	No:	No data	
y(J	Langius-Eklof 2006	WM and JA		
niss Dilit	Mannerkorpi et al 2008	Yes:	No data	
al	-	WM- pre-treatment to 30 months (P<0.05) and		
Mo		post-treatment to 12- and 30 months (P<0.05)		
-		No:		
E		WM- pre- to post-treatment		
		JA		

Table 6:	Significant	difference found	l within and	hetween	orouns of wor	k ability amo	ng the inclu	ded article

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to assess if water-based exercise among adult women diagnosed with FM affect their self-perceived quality of life. Results in this study shows that warm water exercise influences quality of life in a positive way. However, maintaining the good results where to be difficult. Therefore, the period after treatment is as important as researching as the treatment itself. What it means to have good quality of life is not easy to say. Nevertheless, in this study the five categories presented in the result are good standards on quality of life.

Anxiety and depression are common among patients with FM. All articles in this study dealing with anxiety and depression found a difference between EG and CG, except of Cedraschi et al. (2004) who had no difference for anxiety in FIQ and no difference for depression in PGWB. However, another study supports that exercise, or other forms of therapy, in warm water affects anxiety and depression. (Gowans, Dehueck, Voss, Silaj, & Abbey, 2004) When it comes to efficiency of different types of treatment in water, Altan et al. (2004) looked at difference between exercise and balneotherapy. EG had better result, and it lasted for a longer period. Letieri et al. (2013) observed a decrease in depression in favor of the EG. Also, Gowans et al. (2004) getting the same results in depression.

The results on pain are more unambiguous. It is easier to determine whether it is pain or not and an improvement can be recognizable. Articles included in this study shows that all types of water treatment alleviate the pain. Yet, Gusi et al. (2006) found that pain got back towards

the beginning point in the follow-up period. Also, Segura-Jiménez et al. (2013) saw an immediately reduce in pain after each session, but pain at the beginning of every session the pain was still the same as previous sessions. How long the reduced pain levels maintained in hours after each session were not measured. Segura-Jiménez et al. (2013) mentioned in their discussion that this should be researched. Altan et al. (2004) did not find any difference between the two groups in their study. This can probably be explained by the fact that both groups were threatened with a form of water therapy. The knowledge of FM until now indicates that warm water relieves the pain, even without any form of exercise in combination. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003)

Results from categories of wellness and body function suffers from coincidence and few results. There is no consistent improvement among all articles. Both categories are difficult to measure as they depend on different people's own perceptions. Several factors as the trainer, program, group dynamic and composition of group has an impact on the result. How important these factors are to quality of life is uncertain as factors as pain, anxiety and depression are more covered.

The last category, work ability, had no answers among the articles dealing with this issue. Even though, Mannerkorpi et al. (2002) found an improvement in WM for the follow-up period. An issue with this category is that the participants are often at high age. With a study including few participants, and with some of them are retired as well, the result will become nonsignificant. This might occur in some of these studies. In Tomas-Carus et al. (2007) and Tomas-Carus et al. (2008) it is pointed out that their own study is not representative enough, since the participants are too few, and the conclusion must be verified. This applies to Perez De La Cruz & Lambeck (2018), Mannerkorpi et al. (2002), Gusi et al. (2006) and Altan et al. (2004) as well. Tomas-Carus et al. (2008) chose to exclude WM and JA from their results on FIQ. There is not written anything about why this has been done. These two subcategories are a part of FIQ. The exclusion must be considered as acceptable because the results were irrelevant for the issue.

Self-perceived changes are basically difficult to uncover. Patients who assign for the study have an expectation in some way. In this case, an improvement in health status might be one. Many of the patients were assigned into an EG or a CG. This largely determines what expectations the patients make before starting, and the post-treatment test can be affected by this. A participant in EG might count on an improvement, while participants in the CG feels

the opposite. They expect on nothing and might answer the same as they should not feel any different. Just participating in a project with other will have a psychological effect. The feeling of doing something about it helps, as well as being with other people dealing with the same problems. When being with others, the thoughts of having pain or other negative feelings are set to side. (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011) Problem with self-perceived measuring is that participants are different, and everyone perceives different. On the other hand, a participant who reports improvement indicates that the individual feeling better. Using the same participants on pre- and post-treatment will give the same outcome. A difficult topic is the question of experienced improvement versus actually improvements. When it comes to self-perceived improvements, both experienced- and actually improvements will count as betterment. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003)

There are good indications on improvements pre- to post-treatment when exercise in waist high water, but when the follow-up period is added in, the self-perceived scores goes back towards the pre-treatment test results. It is demanding for the participants to maintain the training in everyday life without it being arranged. If the participants are equally active as during the treatment, and it is becoming a habit, then the self-perceived results might go back to where it was. To uncover this, more studies with longer follow-up periods should take place or studies giving former participants questionnaires and asking how the training status are. An ethical problem is that the CG need to be offered the same treatment after the study. For the sake of research, one should look at how the CG develops in the follow-up period. (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011)

As result has shown, water therapy has many benefits on FM symptoms. However, Saltskaar Jentoft, Grimstvedt Kvalvik, & Mengshoel (2001) compared land-based and water-based exercise and concluded that both gives a positive effect on FM symptoms and physical capacity. When to recommend one method over the other, all possible factors must be considered. To exercise in a pool is more expensive and consuming, as well as the availability is not necessarily good. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003) Warm water, without the exercise, has shown by Altan et al. (2004) and Perez De La Cruz & Lambeck (2018) to be soothing on FM symptoms. Therefore, a good option for those who struggle with exercise. In general, FM exercising programs should focus on land exercise to include as many as possible. Nevertheless, water-based exercise should be an option.

Gusi et al. (2006) and Tomas-Carus et al. (2007) using the same participants. This does not affect the ending result in this study. Gusi et al. (2006) looks more closely into the category of pain and anxiety using EQ-5D. Tomas-Carus et al. (2007) uses STAI for looking at anxiety and SF-36 when looking at pain. Both gets the same result for anxiety. However, in pain there are a slightly difference between data measured with SF-36 and EQ-5D. With the SF-36, Tomas-Carus et al. (2007) found a significant difference from pre- to post-treatment between EG and CG in favor of EG. This occurred to last during the follow-up period of 12 weeks. Gusi et al. (2006) also found significant difference between the groups with the EQ-5D. The difference where in favor of EG as well. Though, the difference did not last during the follow-up period of 12 weeks. The same participant got different score in the follow-up period. One of SF-36 and EQ-5D might be unqualified and should be studied moreover.

From 1990 to 2010, patient where diagnosed with FM when 11/18 TP occurred. (Cuesta-Vargas & Adams, 2011) After 2010, the diagnosis was changed due to missing patient. Many of the articles in this study deals with the old system, which means that the articles before and after 2010 not necessarily can be compared to each other. The fact that the criteria changed indicates that the original criteria were not good enough. Clauw & Crofford (2003) criticized the old system for being too selective capturing women and those with high apprehension. Also, FM is a CWP disorder and only 20% of patients which categories with CWP also categories with FM. The 80% other have no real diagnose because of those TP. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003) Thus, they mention that abandoning the criteria of having 11/18 TP will lead to a totally different disorder were more men is included and less apprehension among patients.

Symptoms around FM responsible of giving patient the diagnose is complex. Many of the factors connected with FM are related to stress and what stress does to the body. This has been researched several of times and even though the human body has evolved in history. The stress response which is triggered might not refer to a treat of survival, but the amount of trigger and the frequency will overcome the threshold of what is tolerated. (Clauw & Crofford, 2003) Most of FM symptoms were improved by exercising in warm water. The studies included here supports this. Tomas-Carus et al. (2007), Gusi et al. (2006) Tomas-Carus et al. (2008) and Cedraschi et al. (2004) uses exercise sessions that lasts for 60 minutes or more while Altan et al. (2004), Letieri et al. (2013), Perez De La Cruz & Lambeck (2018) and Segura-Jiménez et al. (2013) uses sessions lasting shorter than 60 minutes. The duration of the session

seems to have no impact on the improvement. In addition, the number of sessions during a week seems to be two-three. No studies have tested one session, or more than three sessions per week. One session a week reduces the likelihood of it to becoming a habit, which is important for maintaining the symptoms on a low level in everyday life. Too many sessions increase the risk of other injuries due to shorter recovery period.

Conclusion

Patients with FM responds well on exercising in warm water. In addition, patients have shown to relieve some of the FM symptoms, especially pain, just by being in warm water. The self-esteem improves after treatment period and the pain experience decreases. These experiences of improvements are not lasting if one does not maintain warm water therapy or physical activity in any form. Therefore, this is not a healing measure. Further research should look at the period after treatment. Maintenance of exercising seems to be the biggest issue and that's why it is important to find out what motivates patients with FM to exercise.

References

- Altan, L., Bingöl, U., Aykaç, M., Koç, Z., & Yurtkuran, M. (2004). Investigation of the effects of poolbased exercise on fibromyalgia syndrome. *Rheumatology International*, 24(5), 272–277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00296-003-0371-7
- Burckhardt, C. S., Clark, S. R., & Bennett, R. M. (1991). The fibromyalgia impact questionnaire: development and validation. *J Rheumatol*, 18(5), 728–33.
- Cedraschi, C., Desmeules, J., Rapiti, E., Baumgartner, E., Cohen, P., Finckh, A., ... Vischer, T. L. (2004).
 Fibromyalgia: a randomised, controlled trial of a treatment programme based on self
 management. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*, 63(3), 290–296.
- Clauw, D. J., & Crofford, L. J. (2003). Chronic widespread pain and fibromyalgia: what we know, and what we need to know. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Rheumatology*, *17*(4), 685–701.
- Cuesta-Vargas, A. I., & Adams, N. (2011). A pragmatic community-based intervention of multimodal physiotherapy plus deep water running (DWR) for fibromyalgia syndrome: a pilot study. *Clinical Rheumatology*, 30(11), 1455.

- Gowans, S. E., Dehueck, A., Voss, S., Silaj, A., & Abbey, S. E. (2004). Six-month and one-year followup of 23 weeks of aerobic exercise for individuals with fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Care & Research*, 51(6), 890–898.
- Grossi, E., Groth, N., Mosconi, P., Cerutti, R., Pace, F., Compare, A., & Apolone, G. (2006).
 Development and validation of the short version of the Psychological General Well-Being Index (PGWB-S). *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 4(1), 88.
- Gusi, N., Tomas-Carus, P., Häkkinen, A., Häkkinen, K., & Ortega-Alonso, A. (2006). Exercise in waisthigh warm water decreases pain and improves health-related quality of life and strength in the lower extremities in women with fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Care & Research: Official Journal of the American College of Rheumatology*, 55(1), 66–73.
- Hävermark, A.-M., & Langius-Eklöf, A. (2006). Long-term follow up of a physical therapy programme for patients with fibromyalgia syndrome. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 20(3), 315– 322.
- Höcherl, K., Färber, L., Ladenburger, S., Vosshage, D., Stratz, T., Müller, W., & Grobecker, H. (2000).
 Effect of tropisetron on circulating catecholamines and other putative biochemical markers in serum of patients with fibromyalgia. *Scandinavian Journal of Rheumatology. Supplement*, *113*, 46–48.
- Letieri, R. V., Furtado, G. E., Letieri, M., Góes, S. M., Pinheiro, C. J. B., Veronez, S. O., ... Dantas, E. M. (2013). Pain, quality of life, self perception of health and depression in patients with fibromyalgia, submitted to hydrocinesiotherapy. *Revista Brasileira de Reumatologia*, *53*(6), 494–500.
- Mannerkorpi, K., Ahlmén, M., & Ekdahl, C. (2002). Six-and 24-month follow-up of pool exercise therapy and education for patients with fibromyalgia. *Scandinavian Journal of Rheumatology*, *31*(5), 306–310.

- Marteau, T. M., & Bekker, H. (1992). The development of a six-item short-form of the state scale of the Spielberger State—Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 31(3), 301–306.
- Perez De La Cruz, S., & Lambeck, J. (2018). A new approach towards improved quality of life in fibromyalgia: a pilot study on the effects of an aquatic Ai Chi program. *International Journal of Rheumatic Diseases*, 21(8), 1525–1532.
- Price, D. D., McGrath, P. A., Rafii, A., & Buckingham, B. (1983). The validation of visual analogue scales as ratio scale measures for chronic and experimental pain. *Pain*, *17*(1), 45–56.
- Purves, D., Augustine, G. J., Fitzpatrick, D., Hall, W. C., LaMantia, A.-S., & White, L. E. (2012). *Neuroscience* (5th edition). Sunderland, Massachusetts USA: Sinauer.
- Saltskaar Jentoft, E., Grimstvedt Kvalvik, A., & Marit Mengshoel, A. (2001). Effects of pool-based and land-based aerobic exercise on women with fibromyalgia/chronic widespread muscle pain.
 Arthritis Care & Research: Official Journal of the American College of Rheumatology, 45(1), 42–47.
- Segura-Jiménez, V., Carbonell-Baeza, A., Aparicio, V. A., Samos, B., Femia, P., Ruiz, J. R., & Delgado-Fernández, M. (2013). A warm water pool-based exercise program decreases immediate pain in female fibromyalgia patients: uncontrolled clinical trial. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 34(07), 600–605.
- Shaw, J. W., Johnson, J. A., & Coons, S. J. (2005). US valuation of the EQ-5D health states: development and testing of the D1 valuation model. *Medical Care*, 203–220.
- Tomas-Carus, P., Gusi, N., Häkkinen, A., Häkkinen, K., Leal, A., & Ortega-Alonso, A. (2008). Eight months of physical training in warm water improves physical and mental health in women with fibromyalgia: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, *40*(4), 248–252.

- Tomas-Carus, P., H\u00e4kkinen, A., Gusi, N., Leal, A., H\u00e4kkinen, K., & Ortega-Alonso, A. (2007). Aquatic training and detraining on fitness and quality of life in fibromyalgia. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 39(7), 1044–1050.
- Treatment. (2017, October 20). Retrieved May 13, 2019, from nhs.uk website: https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/fibromyalgia/treatment/
- Ware, J. E., & Sherbourne, C. D. (1992). The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care*, 30(6), 473–483.
- Wolfe, F., Smythe, H. A., Yunus, M. B., Bennett, R. M., Bombardier, C., Goldenberg, D. L., ... Clark, P. (1990). The American College of Rheumatology 1990 Criteria for the Classification of Fibromyalgia. Report of the Multicenter Criteria Committee. *Arthritis and Rheumatism*, *33*(2), 160–172.
- Wolfe, Frederick, Clauw, D. J., Fitzcharles, M.-A., Goldenberg, D. L., Katz, R. S., Mease, P., ... Yunus, M. B. (2010). The American College of Rheumatology preliminary diagnostic criteria for fibromyalgia and measurement of symptom severity. *Arthritis Care & Research*, 62(5), 600–610.