

TITLE

A multi-center investigation on the effect of decompressive surgery on Balance and physical Activity Levels in patients with lumbar Spinal stenosis (B-ATLAS): Protocol for a prospective cohort study.

AUTHORS:

OB. Zielinski, MD (OZ)^{1,2#}, DW. Hallager, MD, PhD (DH)^{1,3}, KY. Jensen, PhD (KJ)⁴, LY. Carreon, MD, MSc (LC)², M.Ø. Andersen, MD (MA)², LP. Diederichsen, MD, PhD (LD)^{4,5}, RD. Bech, MD, PhD (RB)^{1,3}.

¹Spine Section, Dept. of Orthopaedic Surgery, Zealand University Hospital Køge, Køge, Denmark

²Spine Center of Southern Denmark, Sygehus Lillebælt, Middelfart, Denmark

³Dept. of Clinical Medicine, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁴Dept. of Rheumatology, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁵Dept. of Rheumatology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

#Corresponding author

OB. Zielinski, email: oz@regionsjaelland.dk

ABSTRACT

Background:

Patients with lumbar spinal stenosis may complain of poor balance, decreased physical function and problems maintaining physical activity levels due to radiculopathy. Decompressive surgery is often indicated if conservative management fails to achieve a satisfactory clinical outcome. While surgical management has proven effective at treating radiculopathy, and patients report increased physical function post-operatively, objective measures of postural control and physical activity remains sparse. This study aims to investigate the effects of decompressive surgery on balance and activity levels of elderly patients with lumbar spinal stenosis using objective measurements.

Methods and analysis:

This is a 24-month, multi-centre, prospective cohort study. Patients ≥ 65 years of age with MRI-verified symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis will be recruited from two separate inclusion centres, and all participants will undergo decompressive surgery for lumbar spinal stenosis. Pre-operative data is collected up to 3 months before surgery, with follow-up data collected at 3, 6, 12 and 24-months post-operatively. Balance measurements are performed using the Wii Balance Board, mini-Balance Evaluation Systems Test and Tandem test, and data concerning physical activity levels are collected using ActiGraph wGT3X-BT accelerometers. Patient reported outcomes regarding quality of life and physical function are collected from the EuroQol-5D, 36-Item Short Form Health Survey and Zurich Claudication Questionnaire. Primary outcomes are the change in sway area of centre of pressure and total activity counts per day from baseline to follow-up at 24-months. A sample size of 80 participants has been calculated.

Ethics and dissemination

The study has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee of Region Zealand (ID EMN-2022-08110) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (ID REG-100-2022). All results from the study will be published in international peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and international conferences. Study findings will be disseminated through national patient associations.

Trial registration number:

NCT06075862 & NCT06057428

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS:

- This study will provide new knowledge concerning the effects of lumbar spinal decompression surgery on postural control and physical activity levels.
- A follow-up period of two years ensures that changes in the primary outcomes are sufficiently documented.
- This will be the first study to correlate changes in postural control with changes in physical activity levels amongst patients with lumbar spinal stenosis.
- A pre-post prospective cohort design provides the necessary comparative control group.

INTRODUCTION:

Background:

Lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) is one of the most common degenerative diseases of the spinal column, with prevalence rising with age and up to 14% affected amongst patients ≥ 60 [1,2]. Although often asymptomatic, common symptoms of LSS include low back pain as well as lumbar radiculopathy that worsens with prolonged ambulation, lumbar extension, and standing [3-5]. Patients may also complain of poor balance, decreased physical function and problems maintaining physical activity levels, and examination findings may include a wide-based gait and abnormal Romberg results [5-7]. LSS has been shown to be a risk factor for both postural imbalance as well as falls, and patients with LSS are often physically inactive due to the ambulatory limitations that symptomatic LSS can present with, despite evidence suggesting the benefits of physical activity [8-14].

Non-operative management has been suggested as first-line treatment for LSS, with a combined approach of physical therapy and pharmacological treatment with NSAIDs and analgesics, though surgical decompression is often the treatment of choice in patients with ongoing pain despite conservative management for 3-6 months [5,15-20]. The effect of surgical decompression on disability and leg pain has been widely evaluated, and patients report overall satisfactory outcomes. However, studies of the effect on postural control and physical activity levels are scarce [17]. While patients report subjective improvements in physical activity and balance following surgery, instrumented objective measurements are lacking, and correlations with patient reported quality-of-life and physical function are not well understood [20,21]. This study aims to rectify this by investigating the postural control and physical activity of patients with LSS before and after decompressive surgery using a combination of validated objective instruments and patient-reported outcome measures.

Postural control:

Any deficit relating to somatosensory, motor control or cognitive systems associated with postural control can lead to postural imbalance. These deficits can include a wide range of pathological conditions such as visuo-vestibular and neurodegenerative diseases, as well as orthopaedic and rheumatological diseases of the musculoskeletal system [22-24]. Efforts have been made to quantify the degree of postural imbalance in patients with spinal stenosis compared to healthy controls and small inroads have been made in determining the effect of decompressive surgery, though the true effect size remains unclear [9,25-28].

Various methods of assessing postural control have been developed, though as of writing no gold-standard method exists. Static posturography, which aims to measure postural control by quantifying center of

pressure (COP) changes during quiet standing, has been highlighted as an objective and highly granular method, with the ability to predict falls amongst older adults [29-31]. Posturography has traditionally been performed using a force plate, capable of measuring ground reaction forces and moments, allowing for the quantification of positional and dynamic variables associated with COP position, displacement, and trajectory [32,33]. The Wii Balance Board (WBB) (Nintendo Co., Ltd., Kyoto, Japan), first released in 2007, has recently gained popularity as a low-cost, portable force-plate transducer, for use in postural control assessment. The WBB has been extensively validated against laboratory-grade force plates and shown to have good intra-device and inter-device reliability, as well as being a valid tool to measure balance amongst older adults [34,35]. Work has been done to ensure that the WBB can be calibrated to minimize measurement error, and open-source algorithms exist for the calculation of positional and dynamic variables recorded by the WBB [33,36]. As such, the use of the WBB in longitudinal monitoring for research purposes is considered viable [37].

Activity levels:

Physical activity has been demonstrated to be correlated to physical and mental wellbeing, offering significant benefits including preventing and managing cardiovascular disease, cancer, and diabetes, as well as reducing symptoms of depression and anxiety [14,38,39]. The negative consequences of sedentary behaviour are likewise well established, increasing risks of metabolic and musculoskeletal disorders as well as all-cause mortality [40]. As such, physical activity as both an intervention tool and as a measurement of effect has been becoming increasingly prevalent in the literature.

The use of accelerometers as an activity monitoring device in intervention studies has become increasingly prevalent due to the high frequency of measurements, large memory capacity, low subject interference and ability to differentiate between differing levels of activity [41]. Accelerometer use has been recommended as a clinical measurement of physical activity when undertaking intervention studies and has seen a rise in use in the field of orthopaedics [42-45].

The ActiGraph wGT3X-BT (ActiGraph, LLC, Ft. Walton Beach, FL, USA) is a triaxial accelerometer, recording inertia in three planes at a sampling rate up to 100 Hz. A proprietary filter can be applied to eliminate artifacts due to movement not caused by human activity, and data is summed as total activity count per minute, which can then be used to estimate physical activity energy expenditure (PAEE) and time spent in moderate-vigorous physical activity (MVPA). The wGT3X-BT has been widely validated against gold standard measurements such as doubly labelled water, and in appropriate patient groups such as the elderly, and has proven valid and reliable in assessing physical activity intensity [46-48].

Studies on physical activity levels after decompressive surgery amongst patients with LSS has so far been unable to demonstrate a significant effect six months post-operatively measured by accelerometer [21]. However, while comparable studies on patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty likewise found no significant improvement in activity levels after six months, studies with longer follow-up, up to a year post-operatively, have been able to show an activity level comparable to healthy control individuals [49,50]. Questions persist however regarding retention of potential increases in physical activity in the years following decompressive surgery.

Study aims and hypotheses:

The primary aim of this study is to investigate and quantify the changes in postural control and activity levels amongst elderly patients with lumbar central canal spinal stenosis following decompressive surgery, between baseline and 24-month follow-up measurements. Secondary aims are to correlate findings concerning postural control and activity levels with patient-reported physical function and health-related quality of life outcomes.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS:

Study design and setting:

This is a 24-month, multi-centre, prospective cohort study conducted at Zealand University Hospital Køge, Denmark and the Spine Centre of Southern Denmark, Middelfart. Participants in this study are patients with symptomatic MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging)-verified central canal spinal stenosis undergoing in-patient surgical decompression at either centre. Measurements of postural control and activity will be undertaken up to 3 months before decompressive surgery, as well as 3, 6, 12, and 24 months post-operatively, as presented in Figure 1. A recruitment phase of 12 months is planned, and study end is defined as 'last patient out'. Study inclusion began in September 2023, and the study is expected to be completed December 2026.

Recruitment:

Patients referred for surgical decompression at either the Spine Section at Zealand University Hospital, Køge or the Spine Center of Southern Denmark, Middelfart, will be invited to participate. The full scope of the study, as well as any associated risks and benefits, will be explained prior to the collection of informed consent. Participants will be assessed for eligibility (see below), and eligible participants will undergo pre-operative data collection procedures prior to their scheduled surgery.

Eligibility criteria:

Inclusion criteria: (1) age ≥ 65 years at time of evaluation, (2) planned for decompressive spinal surgery due to symptomatic LSS at ≥ 1 level, (3) central canal LSS grade C or D by Schizas' classification [51] at ≥ 1 level, verified by MRI, and (4) a minimum of 3 months of unsuccessful non-operative treatment.

Exclusion criteria: (1) signs of malignancy or infection in the spinal column, (2) severe comorbidities defined as American Society of Anaesthesiologist's (ASA) physical status classification score ≥ 3 , (3) revision surgery defined as previous decompressive surgery at the same vertebral level, (4) any spinal surgery up to one year prior to the date of evaluation, (5) Mini Mental State Examination score ≤ 27 , or (6) degenerative spondylolisthesis ≥ 3 mm on pre-operative imaging.

Participants may withdraw from the study at any time. Participants will be inquired as to their reason for withdrawal, though providing a reason is not mandatory. Reasons for withdrawal, as well as causes of loss to follow-up, will be recorded.

Intervention:

All patients will undergo intervention in the form of open decompressive surgery at ≥ 1 vertebral level due to central spinal stenosis. Treatment before and after the surgical procedure will remain as standard-of-care, including rehabilitative and physiotherapeutic efforts.

Outcome measures:

Primary outcome measure of postural control:

The primary outcome measure will be the mean change in sway area of COP (cm^2) from baseline (pre-operative) to 24 months post-operative. Sway area denotes the area in which COP oscillates during quiet standing and will be defined as the area of the ellipse which contains the true mean of $(Y_n, X_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ with 95% probability, as derived by Schubert and Kirchner [52].

Measures of postural control will be calculated from the vertical forces recorded from the WBB (Nintendo Co., Ltd., Kyoto, Japan) using the BrainBLoX interface developed by the neuromechanics laboratory at University of Colorado Boulder [53]. The WBB will be calibrated according to guidelines set forth by Clark et al [34]. As data from the WBB is sampled at a variable rate, a Sliding Window Average with Relevance Interval Interpolation method will be used to resample the signal at 100Hz. The resulting data will be processed using a fourth-order, low-pass Butterworth filter with a 10Hz cutoff frequency and centered using the arithmetic mean. Postural control measures will be calculated using custom software based on standardized methods set forth by Quijoux et al [33].

Consultations will be conducted in an unperturbed room. Measurements are taken while patients stand on the WBB in a standardized and consistent location, with their arms hanging by their sides, and being told to focus on a visible point ahead of them at head height. Patients will be told to stand as still as possible [54].

Measurements are recorded through two sets of five trials of 90 seconds each, with eyes open and eyes closed respectively. Rests of 15 second intervals are given between each trial, and a rest of 60 seconds will be given between each set. The number of trials and the lengths of these are based upon recommendations from reliability studies by Doyle et al and Ruhe et al [54,55]. A Visual Analog Scale (VAS) concerning current degree of leg pain will be recorded before each set.

The need to take a corrective step during the trial to avoid falling will be recorded.

Secondary outcome measures of postural control:

Secondary outcome measures will be change in mean COP velocity in the antero-posterior and medio-lateral plane (mm) from baseline to 24-months post-operative, and change in the Danish version of the Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test (Mini-BESTest) and Tandem test score from baseline to 24-months post-operative. The Mini-BESTest was initially developed to aid in the analysis of various postural control systems while being brief and simple to administer; it has since been validated for use in elderly populations and has previously been applied in studies concerning patients with LSS to identify various balance limitations [56-59].

Primary outcome measure of activity level:

The primary outcome measure will be the mean change in Total Activity Counts per day (TAC/d) from baseline to 24 months post-operative, as measured by the ActiGraph wGT3X-BT accelerometer.

At each data collection visit, participants will be instructed to wear the accelerometer for seven consecutive days and instructed to wear the accelerometer on their hip during all waking hours except when bathing or swimming. A wear-time diary will be issued, and participants will be instructed in their use.

The accelerometer will be set to sample at a rate of 30 Hz, and an epoch length of 60 seconds will be implemented. As the study population concerns elderly patients, the low-frequency extension filter will be applied, to better help capture slower movements that may be prevalent amongst this group. Non-wear time will be defined using the Choi et al algorithm, consisting of 90 minutes of zero counts per minute (cpm) with an allowance of 2 minutes of activity when it is placed between two 30-minute windows of zero cpm [60]. Sampling rate, epoch length, filter choice and non-wear-time definition are chosen in accordance with recommendations set forth by Migueles et al for older adults, while activity intensity levels (sedentary, light, moderate and vigorous intensity) will be defined using cut-points generated and validated by Bammann et al [31,47,38].

To achieve a suitable degree of intraclass correlation between measurement intervals, a valid day of measurement will be defined as awake wear-time \geq 10 hours per day, and a valid week of measurement will be defined as \geq 4 valid days of wear-time during the seven-day interval [31].

Secondary outcome measures of physical activity

Secondary outcome measures will be change in time spent MVPA per day (min/d) and sedentary time (hours/d) from baseline to 24-months post-operative, as calculated from accelerometer data, and change in self-reported activity level as measured by International Physical Activity Questionnaire short form (IPAQ-SF) score. The IPAQ-SF will be issued to all patients upon completion of a week of activity measurements using the wGT3X-BT accelerometer. While the validity of the IPAQ-SF concerning absolute measurements of activity is dubious, for the purpose of estimating self-reported physical activity, the IPAQ-SF has proven sufficient [61].

Patient-reported outcome measures:

Primary outcomes of postural control and activity levels will be compared to patient-reported outcome measures of quality-of-life and physical function as additional secondary outcome measures. Change in quality-of-life and physical function will be collected through surveys using the Danish versions of the European Quality of Life – 5 Dimensions (EQ-5D) questionnaire, the Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) and the Zurich Claudication Questionnaire (ZCQ). Both the EQ-5D and SF-36 have been translated and validated for use in Danish and are used extensively in clinical settings in Denmark [62,63]. The ZCQ, also known as the Swiss Spinal Stenosis Measure, was initially developed for the purpose of assessing symptom severity for LSS, physical function, and surgical management satisfaction [64,65].

All data collection tools used in the study will be administered by either the Principal Investigator (PI) or a licensed physiotherapist employed at either study centre, trained in the use of the data collection tools by the PI. For an overview of data collection tools administered during the study period, see table 1. The order

of tests during each data collection visit will remain consistent to account for subject fatigue. For an overview of the order of tests, see Figure 2.

Data collection tool	Baseline, pre-operative	3m post-operative	6m post-operative	12m post-operative	24m post-operative
Electronic Health Record					
Comorbidities	X				
Spinal history	X				
Medications	X	X	X	X	X
Participant interview					
Height	X				
Weight	X				
History of falls*	X	X	X	X	X
Activity monitoring					
wGT3X-BT accelerometer	X	X	X	X	X
Balance measurements					
WBB, eyes open	X	X	X	X	X
WBB, eyes closed	X	X	X	X	X
mini-BESTest	X	X	X	X	X
Tandem test	X	X	X	X	X
Patient reported outcome measures					
EQ-5D	X	X	X	X	X
SF36	X	X	X	X	X
ZCQ**	X	X	X	X	X

Sample size:

Previous studies on the effects of decompressive surgery on postural control and physical activity are sparse and show varying effect sizes depending on methodology and choice of outcome variable. For the calculation of sample size, a conservative effect size of 0.25 was decided upon for both postural control and physical activity measures based on the available literature [21,25,28]. To ensure 80% power with $\alpha = 0.05$ for a two-sided test, and with an assumption of 10% loss to follow-up, a population of 80 participants will be necessary. An interim analysis of the standard deviation (SD) of the pre-operative data is planned after the first 30 patients have been included, which may result in an amendment to the target sample size if the calculated SD varies greatly from the literature.

Data collection and analysis:

All data pertaining to the study will be entered into a Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) database. REDCap is a secure, web-based software platform designed to support data capture for research studies, which enables audit trails for tracking data manipulation and export procedures [66,67]. Full access to the dataset will be limited to the members of the Data Monitoring Committee while a pseudonymized version will be made available to all members of the study group.

Statistical analysis will be conducted using R 4.3.2 (R Core Team, 2021). Patient characteristics and variables of postural control and activity levels at baseline and at each data collection visit will be detailed. Continuous variables will be presented as means with SD or medians with inter-quartile range, depending on normality. Categorical variables will be presented as frequencies and percentages. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test will be used to test for normality where appropriate.

Differences between means from baseline to 24-months post-operative will be reported with 95% confidence intervals and will be assessed using paired T-tests for continuous variables, Wilcoxon signed-rank test for ordered categorical variables, and McNemar's test for binary categorical variables. Multivariable linear regression analysis will be used to adjust for potential confounders and linear regression will be used to test for trend across the data collection visits. Throughout, a p-value of 0.05 will be considered statistically significant.

Missing data:

We estimate loss to follow-up at 10%. Additionally, data may be missing due to participants missing one or more data collection visits during the study period. Missing data during the post-operative data collection period will be handled using a linear mixed effects model. Patients who do not participate in any post-operative data collection visits will be excluded from analysis.

Patient and Public Involvement:

A Patient Committee (PC) has been assembled during the preliminary study preparations, with the stated purpose of providing patient-directed feedback during the study period. The PC members consist of volunteers from the list of included participants and rotate with respect to availability. Meetings are planned to occur before, during and after the inclusion period, and feedback is gathered concerning, but not limited to, study design, burden of participation, patient recruitment and dissemination of results.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION:

The study will be performed according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol has been approved by the Regional Ethics Committee of Region Zealand (Case ID EMN-2022-08110) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (Case ID REG-100-2022). Major modifications to the study design that necessitate an amendment to the protocol will be sought to be approved by the Regional Ethics Committee of Region Zealand and will be communicated to the participants either electronically or in-person. Participants will be informed of the full scope of the study by licensed health personnel trained by the PI before informed consent is collected, and enrolment in the study will not affect the participants' future course of treatment. No compensation will be received from study participation. All study-related measurements are non-invasive and are not considered to cause any risk or significant discomfort, and participants are covered by the National Danish Patient Insurance Association in case of any adverse events related to the study.

All results from the study, positive, negative, and inconclusive, will be published in peer-reviewed international journals and presented at national and international scientific meetings. Authorship allocation will follow the Vancouver Recommendations. All participants will receive an invitation to a seminar after the study period has ended, whereupon the results of the study will be presented.

The authors plan to deposit the full dataset at the Danish National Archives after the study period has ended. A pseudonymized version of the dataset will be kept by the authors for an additional 10 years and will be made available to other researchers at reasonable request. The statistical code used during the analysis of the results from the study will be made publicly available.

FUNDING STATEMENT:

This work is supported by the Dept. of Orthopaedic Surgery at Zealand University Hospital Køge, Denmark, the cross-regional fund of Region Zealand and Region of Southern Denmark, and 'A.V. Lykfeldts og Hustrus Legat'. OZ has received a travel grant of 8,000 DKK from the Guildal Foundation. As of writing, no other specific grants have been received from public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST STATEMENT:

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to the present study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

The primary design of the study was conceived by RB. OZ, LC, MA, LD and RB developed the final study design, which was implemented across the inclusion centers by OZ, RB and MA. DH and KJ provided statistical expertise and guidance, while the primary statistical analysis will be conducted by OZ, DH and KJ. OZ wrote the protocol in its current form, while DH, KJ, LC, MA, LD and RB contributed to the refinement of the protocol. All authors approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES:

1. Kalichman L, Cole R, Kim DH, et al. Spinal stenosis prevalence and association with symptoms: the Framingham Study. *Spine Journal*. 2009;9(7):545-550. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2009.03.005
2. Jensen RK, Jensen TS, Koes B, Hartvigsen J. Prevalence of lumbar spinal stenosis in general and clinical populations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Spine Journal*. 2020;29(9):2143-2163. doi:10.1007/s00586-020-06339-1
3. Lee BH, Moon SH, Suk KS, Kim HS, Yang JH, Lee HM. Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: Pathophysiology and Treatment Principle: A Narrative Review. *Asian Spine J*. 2020;14(5):682-693. doi:10.31616/asj.2020.0472
4. Battié MC, Jones CA, Schopflocher DP, Hu RW. Health-related quality of life and comorbidities associated with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine Journal*. 2012;12(3):189-195. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2011.11.009

5. Katz JN, Dalgas M, Stucki G, et al. Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis diagnostic value of the history and physical examination. *Arthritis Rheum*. 1995;38(9):1236-1241. doi:10.1002/art.1780380910
6. Deer T, Sayed D, Michels J, Josephson Y, Li S, Calodney AK. A Review of Lumbar Spinal Stenosis with Intermittent Neurogenic Claudication: Disease and Diagnosis. *Pain Medicine (United States)*. 2019;20:S32-S44. doi:10.1093/pm/pnz161
7. Fanuele JC, Birkmeyer NJO, Abdu WA, Tosteson TD, Weinstein JN. *The Impact of Spinal Problems on the Health Status of Patients Have We Underestimated the Effect?* Vol 25. <http://journals.lww.com/spinejournal>
8. Kim HJ, Chun HJ, Han CD, et al. The risk assessment of a fall in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011;36(9). doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181f92d8e
9. Truszczyńska A, Drzał-Grabiec J, Trzaskoma Z, Rapała K, Tarnowski A, Górniak K. A comparative analysis of static balance between patients with lumbar spinal canal stenosis and asymptomatic participants. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2014;37(9):696-701. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2014.09.003
10. Torstensson T, Arkan Sayed-Noor ;, And ;, Knutsson B. *Physical Inactivity Before Surgery for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis Is Associated With Inferior Outcomes at 1-Year Follow-Up: A Cohort Study*. Vol 16.; 2022.
11. Norden J, Smuck M, Sinha A, Hu R, Tomkins-Lane C. Objective measurement of free-living physical activity (performance) in lumbar spinal stenosis: are physical activity guidelines being met? *Spine Journal*. 2017;17(1):26-33. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2016.10.016
12. Slater J, Kolber MJ, Schellhase KC, et al. The Influence of Exercise on Perceived Pain and Disability in Patients With Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am J Lifestyle Med*. 2016;10(2):136-147. doi:10.1177/1559827615571510
13. World Health Organization. *Step Safely: Strategies for Preventing and Managing Falls across the Life-Course.*; 2021.
14. Bull F, Willumsen J. *WHO Guidelines on Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour.*; 2020.
15. Kovacs FM, Urrútia G, Alarcón JD. Surgery versus conservative treatment for symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011;36(20). doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31820c97b1
16. Sengupta DK, Herkowitz HN. Lumbar spinal stenosis: Treatment strategies and indications for surgery. *Orthopedic Clinics of North America*. 2003;34(2):281-295. doi:10.1016/S0030-5898(02)00069-X
17. Lurie J, Tomkins-Lane C. Management of lumbar spinal stenosis. *BMJ (Online)*. 2016;352. doi:10.1136/bmj.h6234
18. Pearson A, Lurie J, Tosteson T, Zhao W, Abdu W, Weinstein JN. Who should have surgery for spinal stenosis? Treatment effect predictors in SPORT. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012;37(21):1791-1802. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3182634b04
19. Mazanec DJ, Podichetty VK, Hsia A. Lumbar canal stenosis: start with nonsurgical therapy. *Cleve Clin J Med*. 2002;69(11):909-917. doi:10.3949/ccjm.69.11.909

20. Weinstein JN, Tosteson TD, Lurie JD, et al. Surgical versus Nonsurgical Therapy for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2008;358(8):794-810. doi:10.1056/nejmoa0707136
21. Smuck M, Muaremi A, Zheng P, et al. Objective measurement of function following lumbar spinal stenosis decompression reveals improved functional capacity with stagnant real-life physical activity. *Spine Journal*. 2018;18(1):15-21. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2017.08.262
22. Kim SD, Allen NE, Canning CG, Fung VSC. Postural instability in patients with Parkinson's disease: Epidemiology, pathophysiology and management. *CNS Drugs*. 2013;27(2):97-112. doi:10.1007/s40263-012-0012-3
23. Ruhe A, Fejer R, Walker B. Center of pressure excursion as a measure of balance performance in patients with non-specific low back pain compared to healthy controls: A systematic review of the literature. *European Spine Journal*. 2011;20(3):358-368. doi:10.1007/s00586-010-1543-2
24. Fujimoto C, Egami N, Kinoshita M, Sugawara K, Yamasoba T, Iwasaki S. Postural stability in vestibular neuritis: Age, disease duration, and residual vestibular function. *Laryngoscope*. 2014;124(4):974-979. doi:10.1002/lary.24342
25. Truszczyńska A, Drzał-Grabiec J, Trzaskoma Z, Rachwał M, Rapała K, Górniak K. Static balance after surgical decompression of lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*. 2015;28(4):865-871. doi:10.3233/BMR-150646
26. Kneis S, Bruetsch V, Dalin D, Hubbe U, Maurer C. Altered postural timing and abnormally low use of proprioception in lumbar spinal stenosis pre- and post- surgical decompression. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2019;20(1). doi:10.1186/s12891-019-2497-0
27. Iversen MD, Kale MK, Sullivan JT. Pilot Case Control Study of Postural Sway and Balance Performance in Aging Adults with Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis. *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy*. 2009;32(1):15-21. doi:10.1519/00139143-200932010-00004
28. Ujigo S, Kamei N, Yamada K, et al. Balancing ability of patients with lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *European Spine Journal*. Published online 2023. doi:10.1007/s00586-023-07782-6
29. Mancini M, Horak FB. The relevance of clinical balance assessment tools to differentiate balance deficits. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2010;46(2):239-248. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20485226>
30. Piirtola M, Era P. Force platform measurements as predictors of falls among older people - A review. *Gerontology*. 2006;52(1):1-16. doi:10.1159/000089820
31. Migueles JH, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Ekelund U, et al. Accelerometer Data Collection and Processing Criteria to Assess Physical Activity and Other Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Practical Considerations. *Sports Medicine*. 2017;47(9):1821-1845. doi:10.1007/s40279-017-0716-0
32. Chen B, Liu P, Xiao F, Liu Z, Wang Y. Review of the upright balance assessment based on the force plate. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(5):1-14. doi:10.3390/ijerph18052696
33. Quijoux F, Nicolăi A, Chairi I, et al. A review of center of pressure (COP) variables to quantify standing balance in elderly people: Algorithms and open-access code*. *Physiol Rep*. 2021;9(22). doi:10.14814/phy2.15067

34. Clark RA, Bryant AL, Pua Y, McCrory P, Bennell K, Hunt M. Validity and reliability of the Nintendo Wii Balance Board for assessment of standing balance. *Gait Posture*. 2010;31(3):307-310. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2009.11.012
35. Scaglioni-Solano P, Aragón-Vargas LF. Validity and reliability of the Nintendo Wii Balance Board to assess standing balance and sensory integration in highly functional older adults. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. 2014;37(2):138-143. doi:10.1097/MRR.0000000000000046
36. Leach JM, Mancini M, Peterka RJ, Hayes TL, Horak FB. Validating and calibrating the Nintendo Wii balance board to derive reliable center of pressure measures. *Sensors (Switzerland)*. 2014;14(10):18244-18267. doi:10.3390/s141018244
37. Monteiro-Junior R, Ferreira A, Puell V, et al. Wii Balance Board: Reliability and Clinical Use in Assessment of Balance in Healthy Elderly Women. *CNS Neurol Disord Drug Targets*. 2015;14(9):1165-1170. doi:10.2174/1871527315666151111120403
38. Pedersen BK, Andersen BA. *Fysisk Aktivitet Håndbog Om Forebyggelse Og Behandling*. 4th ed. Sundhedsstyrelsen; 2018. www.sst.dk
39. Aadahl M, Kjær M, Jørgensen T. Associations between overall physical activity level and cardiovascular risk factors in an adult population. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2007;22(6):369-378. doi:10.1007/s10654-006-9100-3
40. Park JH, Moon JH, Kim HJ, Kong MH, Oh YH. Sedentary Lifestyle: Overview of Updated Evidence of Potential Health Risks. *Korean J Fam Med*. 2020;41(6):365-373. doi:10.4082/KJFM.20.0165
41. Sylvia LG, Bernstein EE, Hubbard JL, Keating L, Anderson EJ. Practical guide to measuring physical activity. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2014;114(2):199-208. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2013.09.018
42. Sliepen M, Lipperts M, Tjur M, Mechlenburg I. Use of accelerometer-based activity monitoring in orthopaedics: Benefits, impact and practical considerations. *EFORT Open Rev*. 2019;4(12):678-685. doi:10.1302/2058-5241.4.180041
43. Sliepen M, Brandes M, Rosenbaum D. Current Physical Activity Monitors in Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis: A Review. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2017;69(10):1460-1466. doi:10.1002/acr.23170
44. Mackenzie SP, McLean M, Spasojevic M, et al. Wrist-mounted accelerometers provide objective evidence of disease and recovery in patients with frozen shoulder. *JSES Int*. 2022;6(1):111-115. doi:10.1016/j.jseint.2021.09.014
45. van Dijk-Huisman HC, Weemaes ATR, Boymans TAEJ, Lenssen AF, de Bie RA. Smartphone app with an accelerometer enhances patients' physical activity following elective orthopedic surgery: A pilot study. *Sensors (Switzerland)*. 2020;20(15):1-19. doi:10.3390/s20154317
46. Chomistek AK, Yuan C, Matthews CE, et al. Physical Activity Assessment with the ActiGraph GT3X and Doubly Labeled Water. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2017;49(9):1935-1944. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001299
47. Bammann K, Thomson NK, Albrecht BM, Buchan DS, Easton C. Generation and validation of ActiGraph GT3X+ accelerometer cut-points for assessing physical activity intensity in older adults.

- The OUTDOOR ACTIVE validation study. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6 June).
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252615
48. Aguilar-Farias N, Peeters GMEE (Geeske), Brychta RJ, Chen KY, Brown WJ. Comparing ActiGraph equations for estimating energy expenditure in older adults. *J Sports Sci*. 2019;37(2):188-195.
doi:10.1080/02640414.2018.1488437
 49. Harding P, Holland AE, Delany C, Hinman RS. Do activity levels increase after total hip and knee arthroplasty? *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2014;472(5):1502-1511. doi:10.1007/s11999-013-3427-3
 50. von Rottkay E, Rackwitz L, Rudert M, Nöth U, Reichert JC. Function and activity after minimally invasive total hip arthroplasty compared to a healthy population. *Int Orthop*. 2018;42(2):297-302.
doi:10.1007/s00264-017-3541-z
 51. Schizas C, Theumann N, Burn A, et al. *Qualitative Grading of Severity of Lumbar Spinal Stenosis Based on the Morphology of the Dural Sac on Magnetic Resonance Images*. Vol 35.
<http://journals.lww.com/spinejournal>
 52. Schubert P, Kirchner M. Ellipse area calculations and their applicability in posturography. *Gait Posture*. 2014;39(1):518-522. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.09.001
 53. Cooper J, Siegfried K, Ahmed A. BrainBLoX: Brain and Biomechanics Lab in a Box Software. Published online 2014.
 54. Ruhe A, Fejer R, Walker B. The test-retest reliability of centre of pressure measures in bipedal static task conditions - A systematic review of the literature. *Gait Posture*. 2010;32(4):436-445.
doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2010.09.012
 55. Doyle RJ, Ragan BG, Rajendran K, Rosengren KS, Hsiao-Weckler ET. Generalizability of Stabilogram Diffusion Analysis of center of pressure measures. *Gait Posture*. 2008;27(2):223-230.
doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2007.03.013
 56. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric techniques to improve the balance evaluation systems test: The mini-bestest. *J Rehabil Med*. 2010;42(4):323-331.
doi:10.2340/16501977-0537
 57. O'Hoski S, Sibley KM, Brooks D, Beauchamp MK. Construct validity of the BESTest, mini-BESTest and briefBESTest in adults aged 50 years and older. *Gait Posture*. 2015;42(3):301-305.
doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.06.006
 58. Thornes E, Robinson HS, Vøllestad NK. Dynamic balance in patients with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis; A cross-sectional study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2018;19(1). doi:10.1186/s12891-018-2111-x
 59. Beyer N, Eriksen K, Henriksen Sara. MINI BESTest-af Dynamisk Balance Evaluering af balance-Test af systemer. Published online 2010. Accessed September 22, 2023.
<https://www.fysio.dk/fafo/maleredskaber/mini-bestest>
 60. Choi L, Ward SC, Schnelle JF, Buchowski MS. Assessment of wear/nonwear time classification algorithms for triaxial accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2012;44(10):2009-2016.
doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e318258cb36

61. Lee PH, Macfarlane DJ, Lam TH, Stewart SM. *Validity of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire Short Form (IPAQ-SF): A Systematic Review.*; 2011.
<http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/8/1/115>
62. Jensen CE, Sørensen SS, Gudex C, Jensen MB, Pedersen KM, Ehlers LH. The Danish EQ-5D-5L Value Set: A Hybrid Model Using cTTO and DCE Data. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy.* 2021;19(4):579-591. doi:10.1007/s40258-021-00639-3
63. Bjorner JB, Thunedborg K, Kristensen TS, Modvig J, Bech P. The Danish SF-36 Health Survey. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1998;51(11):991-999. doi:10.1016/S0895-4356(98)00091-2
64. Bouknaitir JB, Carreon LY, Brorson S, Andersen MØ. Translation and Validation of the Danish Version of the Zurich Claudication Questionnaire. *Global Spine J.* 2022;12(1):53-60. doi:10.1177/2192568220947745
65. Fujimori T, Ikegami D, Sugiura T, Sakaura H. Responsiveness of the Zurich Claudication Questionnaire, the Oswestry Disability Index, the Japanese Orthopaedic Association Back Pain Evaluation Questionnaire, the 8-Item Short Form Health Survey, and the Euroqol 5 dimensions 5 level in the assessment of patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *European Spine Journal.* 2022;31(6):1399-1412. doi:10.1007/s00586-022-07236-5
66. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
67. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform.* 2019;95. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208

FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS:

Table 1: Overview of the data collections tools administered during the course of the study.

**during the previous 3 months; **questions 13 through 18 pertaining to the effect of surgical treatment are only administered at post-operative data collection visits. WBB: Wii Balance Board.*

Figure 1: Flowchart of participant timeline and patient recruitment flow during the study period.

Figure 2: Overview of the order of tests administered during each data collection visit. Total time needed for all tests at each visit is estimated to be 65 minutes.

Mini-BESTest: Mini Balance Evaluation Systems Test, WBB: Wii Balance Board, VAS: Visual Analog Scale.

Figure 1




Figure 2

