- 1 Title: Individualized exercise in chronic non-specific low back pain: a systematic review with
- 2 meta-analysis on the effects of exercise alone or in combination with psychological
- 3 interventions on pain and disability
- 4
- 5 Author names and affiliations:
- 6 Johannes Fleckenstein^a,
- 7 Philipp Flössel^b,
- 8 Tilman Engel^c,
- 9 Laura Klewinghaus^d,
- 10 Josefine Stoll^c,
- 11 Martin Behrens^{e,f},
- 12 Daniel Niederer^a
- 13
- ¹⁴ ^aGoethe-University Frankfurt, Institute of Sports Sciences, Department of Sports Medicine and
- 15 Exercise Physiology, Ginnheimer Landstr. 39, 60487 Frankfurt am Main
- ¹⁶ ^bUniversity Center for Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus,
- 17 Fetscherstr. 74, 01307 Dresden, Germany
- 18 ^cUniversity of Potsdam, University Outpatient Clinic, Sports Medicine and Sports Orthopedics, Am
- 19 Neuen Palais 10, 14469 Potsdam, Germany
- ²⁰ ^dUniversity of Wuppertal, Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, Max-Horkheimer-Str.
- 21 20, 42119 Wuppertal, Germany
- ²² ^eDepartment of Sport Science, Institute III, Otto-von-Guericke University Magdeburg, Magdeburg
- 23 39104, Germany
- ¹Department of Orthopaedics, University Medicine Rostock, Doberaner Str. 142, 18057 Rostock,
- 25 Germany

26

27 Corresponding author:

- 28 Johannes Fleckenstein, Goethe-University Frankfurt, Institute of Sports Sciences, Department of
- 29 Sports Medicine and Exercise Physiology, Ginnheimer Landstr. 39, 60487 Frankfurt am Main,
- 30 Germany, phone: +49 (0)69 798 24484, mail: johannes.fleckenstein@sport.uni-frankfurt.de

32 Contributorship

- 33 All authors contributed to the planning of the study. JF, PF and DN conducted the study, JF wrote and
- 34 DN analysed data, JF wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors read, revized and approved
- 35 the manuscript.
- 36 JF accepts full responsibility for the work and/or the conduct of the study, has access to the data, and
- 37 controlled the decision to publish.
- 38 The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others
- 39 meeting the criteria have been omitted.
- 40

41 Conflict of interest

- 42 JF received honorary for scientific counselling from the German Medical Acupuncture Association. All
- 43 other authors declare no conflict of interest.
- 44

45 Funding

- 46 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
- 47 not-for-profit sectors.
- 48

49 ABSTRACT

- 50 This systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression investigated the effects of
- 51 individualized exercise interventions consisting with or without combined psychological intervention on
- 52 pain intensity and disability in patients with chronic non-specific low-back-pain. Databases were
- 53 searched up to 31 January 2022 and we selected randomized controlled trials involving adults with
- 54 chronic non-specific low-back-pain being treated with individualized/personalized/stratified exercise
- 55 interventions with or without psychological treatment compared to any control.
- 56 Fifty-eight studies (n = 10084) were included.
- 57 At short-term follow-up (12 weeks), low-certainty evidence for pain intensity (SMD -0.28 [95%CI -0.42
- 58 to -0.14]) and very low-certainty evidence for disability (-0.17 [-0.31 to -0.02]) indicates effects of
- 59 individualized versus active exercises, and very low-certainty evidence for pain intensity (-0.40; [-0.58
- to -0.22])), but not (low-certainty evidence) for disability (-0.18; [-0.22 to 0.01]) compared to passive
- 61 controls.
- 62 At long-term follow-up (1 year), moderate-certainty evidence for pain intensity (-0.14 [-0.22 to -0.07])
- 63 and disability (-0.20 [-0.30 to -0.10]) indicates effects versus passive controls.
- 64 Sensitivity analyses indicates that the effects on pain, but not on disability (always short-term and
- 65 versus active treatments) were robust. Pain reduction caused by individualized exercise treatments in
- 66 combination with psychological interventions (in particular behavioural-cognitive therapies) (-0.28 [-
- 67 0.42 to -0.14], low certainty) is of clinical importance.
- 68 Certainty of evidence was downgraded mainly due to evidence of risk of bias, publication bias and
- 69 inconsistency that could not be explained.
- 70 Individualized exercise can be recommended from a clinical point of view to treat pain and disability in
- 71 chronic non-specific low-back-pain. Sub-group analysis suggests a combination of individualized
- 72 exercise (especially motor-control based treatments) with behavioural therapy interventions to booster
- 73 effects. Certainty of evidence was moderate for long-term follow-up.
- 74 PROSPERO registration: CRD42021247331
- 75
- 76 Keywords: sports medicine; pain therapy; spine; multimodal; integrative medicine

77 Introduction

Back pain, in particular chronic non-specific low back pain, is one of the most serious public-health problems worldwide.²¹ Its global median 1-year period prevalence in the adult population is around 37%.²¹ Together with the consequences of low back pain, such as loss of labour productivity or rates of hospital admissions, this high number of involved people results in tremendous direct and indirect costs for societies' healthcare systems and economies.⁶⁴ For those affected, pain symptoms are often accompanied by functional limitations and decreased performance, substantially deteriorating the quality of their individual and family lives.^{57, 63}

85 Exercise therapy and psychological (especially cognitive behavioural) therapy, both as stand-alone 86 treatments but especially in combination, are considered being effective in the treatment of chronic low back pain.⁴⁵ Still, current research reveals only relatively small and heterogeneous effects when 87 combining exercise and cognitive-behavioural therapies.^{19, 22, 25} This is likely to be attributed to inter-88 individual heterogeneities in the effects.³³ Stratified or even individualized/personalized therapies may 89 be the potential key to increase the (group and individual) therapeutic effect.²³ On a somatic-biological 90 91 level, patients with low back pain predominantly present deficits in motor control strategies, though 92 varying in its characteristics between individuals.^{40, 59} On a psychosocial level, dysfunctional cognition 93 (fear-avoidance-beliefs, catastrophizing) and dysfunctional pain behaviour (kinesiophobia) are known risk factors for chronification or for a worsening of symptoms in chronic low back pain.^{39, 55} 94

95

96 Functional strength/restoration, coordination (Pilates, McKenzie) and stabilization training are, based 97 on meta-analytic evidence on comparative effectiveness, likely to be the most effective types of exercise in the management of chronic non-specific low back pain.^{23, 42} Simply and mechanistically 98 99 expressed, all these training modalities improve motor control.⁵⁹ Unfortunately, such effects are only of 100 limited validity for the affected individuals due to the presence of heterogeneous influencing 101 psychosocial factors in group analyses.⁴² The latter has been addressed by a variety of validated 102 individualized psychological interventions against chronic low back pain. A prominent approach is the 103 STarT Back Screening Tool, used to classify patients with low back pain into tailored focus therapy 104 groups (exercises and cognitive-behavioural strategies) based on bio-psycho-social factors.²⁷ 105 Stratification, or even better personalisation/individualisation of exercise and psychological 106 interventions may consequently lead to better therapeutic outcomes (fewer days of illness, 107 improvement of symptomatology) than mono-interventions or, even non-personalized therapies only.¹⁵ 32 108

109 Consequently, individualized exercise with or without psychological interventions were investigated by 110 a large number of clinical trials. However, individualisation as an independent variable defining 111 exercise has not been assessed on a meta-analytical level before. There is one recently published 112 review analysing the effects of classification-based exercise to treat chronic low back pain,⁵⁶ showing 113 small and no meaningful effects. However, this study focussed on classification systems and not on 114 exercise that was individualized based on the patient's needs. In addition, exercise was often 115 combined with psychological interventions, which may have impacted the overall outcomes. 116 Consequently, the aim of this systematic review with meta-analysis and -regression is to qualify and 117 quantify the effects of individualized exercises as mono-therapies, or in combination with cognitive or

behavioural types of psychological interventions. Adding many sensitivity analysis allows to distinguish active and passive controls, and to differentiate the type of individualized exercise. This consolidates previous knowledge and builds a bridge to known effects such as the above mentioned classification systems ⁵⁶ or classical exercise.²²

- 122
- 123

124 Methods

The systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression protocol was developed using guidance from the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) statement,³⁶ registered in the PROSPERO database (CRD42021247331, Date of registration in PROSPERO: 10 May 2021, Date of first submission: 09 April 2021, update 10 February 2022, available at: https://www.crd.vork.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=247331).

130

131 Studies were identified by searching multiple databases, including PubMed, Cochrane Central 132 Register of Controlled Trials, EMBASE, Clarivate Web of Science, and Google Scholar from their 133 inception to March 2021. The search terms were identified after preliminary searches of the literature 134 and by comparing them against previous systematic reviews. A sensitive search strategy was used 135 based on the recommendations of the Cochrane Back and Neck Group for 'randomized controlled trials' (RCT) and 'low back pain',¹⁴ combined with search terms for 'exercise'. The full search strategy 136 137 is presented in the supplementary data appendix B. In addition, reference lists of relevant reviews and 138 included RCTs were manually searched, and citation tracking of all included trials was performed. A 139 grey literature search in google scholar was further performed. The searches and inclusion criteria 140 were restricted to English, German, French, Spanish, and Italian.

We tested the eligibility criteria by piloting a small sample (10 trials). Two independent researchers (JF, PF) screened titles and abstracts of the publications retrieved by the search strategy and assessed the full texts for potential inclusion. Studies not meeting the inclusion criteria were discarded. Disagreements between researchers were resolved by discussion and consultation with a third reviewer (DN), if necessary.

For the sake of brevity, the term (chronic) low back pain in this manuscript refers to chronic nonspecific low back pain if not stated otherwise.

148

149 Eligibility criteria:

150 This study followed the participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) 151 framework.

151 man 152

153 Population

154 The population of interest was patients suffering from chronic non-specific low back pain that have

155 been treated with any approach of stratified, personalized and/or individualized exercise. Chronic non-

156 specific low back pain is defined as pain without a known pathoanatomical cause ³⁴, chronicity of pain

157 lasting longer than 3 month, or recurrent low back pain defined as two episodes per year.²² All studies

158 had to research populations were the aforementioned criteria were fulfilled for the majority of their 159 included patients to be considered potentially eligible. 160 161 Intervention (exposure): 162 The interventions/exposures were all forms of individualized, tailored, personalized, or stratified 163 exercise of any frequency, intensity, volume or type, with a duration of at least 4 weeks. Interventions 164 that consisted of exercise alone or exercise combined with psychological interventions (i.e. 165 behavioural or cognitive, or combined behavioural-cognitive therapy) were considered. 166 167 Comparison: 168 Eligible comparators were all matched or non-matched conservative (non-surgery) control/comparator 169 groups, that could be either active, passive, or no treatment (real) controls 170 171 Outcomes 172 We reported the following outcomes up to 1 year after randomisation: 173 Pain intensity, measured with a pain scale (for example, visual analogue scale (VAS), numerical rating 174 scale (NRS), or McGill pain score) 175 Disability, measured with a back pain-specific scale (for example, the Roland-Morris Disability 176 Questionnaire (RMDQ)⁴⁹, or the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI)¹²). The two scales can be matched.⁵ 177 178 All scores were normalized to VAS-scores (range 0 to 10, with 0 indicating no burden and 179 10 = maximum suffering from symptom).⁵⁴ 180 181 Planned secondary outcomes were the number of days of absence from work and a measure of 182 quality of life. 183 184 Study design: Only RCTs were eligible. 185 186 Data extraction: We designed and piloted a data collection form created with Excel (Microsoft). Two 187 researchers (JF, PF) independently extracted the study characteristics and outcome data. 188 Disagreements were resolved through discussion or with assistance from a third researcher (DN), if 189 necessary. From each study we extracted: number of study arms, predetermined duration of chronic 190 non-specific low back pain, real duration of low back pain, number of participants (total and in study 191 arms), age, sex, type of interventions (individualized, exercise, psychological), type of control, length 192 of training period (both intervention and controls, training frequency (sessions per week), single 193 training duration (minutes), number of adverse events. 194 195 For the effect size calculations, change scores of the outcomes and standard deviations of the change 196 scores of the outcomes were retrieved. If not directly retrievable from the studies, the required data

197 was calculated/imputed from the available data (baseline, change score, follow-up-values, and their

198 standard deviations) according to the formulas defined in the Cochrane handbook. In addition (or,

199 were not applicable), missing data was requested from the corresponding authors.

200 Effect sizes were processed as negative values (indicating a decrease in pain, which equals a 201 symptom improvement), i.e. higher negative values indicate larger effect sizes.

202

203 Study risk of bias assessment: Two researchers independently assessed the risk of bias (RoB) for the 204 outcomes of interest of the included trials. We assessed the RoB for each study/outcomes using the 205 following RoB assessment tools recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration:²⁶ random sequence 206 generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants, providers and outcome assessment, 207 incomplete outcome data (dropouts) and selective outcome reporting. In the selective outcome data, 208 we accounted for a broader assessment considering also the selective non-reporting RoB due to 209 missing results in index meta- analyses (e.g., missing or unavailable outcome results crosschecked from method plans) according to published criteria.^{43, 44} For each study, the score of the items 210 indicated high, low or some concerns (not enough information reported) regarding RoB.²⁶ As both pain 211 212 and disability are considered comparable in terms of the impact of bias on the effect sizes, they were 213 rated cumulatively.

214

215 Certainty assessment:

216 Certainty of evidence was assessed applying the framework as provided by the Grading of 217 Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) system of rating quality of 218 evidence and grading strength of recommendations in systematic reviews (see supplementary data 219 appendix F.¹⁷ The five GRADE domains were applied: study limitations, indirectness, inconsistency, 220 imprecision and publication bias.

221

To interpret the clinical relevance of the meta-analyses results, we considered a 1.5-point difference in pain and a 1.0-point difference on a 10 point VAS in disability to be clinically important for the comparisons of exercise versus any comparator group .²² We interpreted smaller differences in the effectiveness of exercise treatments compared to other conservative treatments as 'probably meaningful', when the 95% confidence interval was entirely on one side of the no effect line. This is relevant given similar inconveniences and adverse effects for comparison of treatments considered in this review.⁴⁷

229

230 Statistics: Meta-analysis and -regression

For data pooling, random-effects meta-analyses were modelled. Main analyses were calculated separated by outcome (pain versus disability), by the combined comparator (active/exercise or passive comparator group), and by the intervention duration (short- and long-term-effects). Weighted standardized mean differences between the intervention and control/comparator groups (Hedge's g) were used as effect size estimators. For pooling analyses, mean effect sizes and their 95% confidence intervals were calculated; summary estimate data were displayed using Forest plots. To test for overall effects, Z-statistics at a 5% alpha-error-probability level were calculated.

- 238 Between-effects heterogeneity was assessed using the I²- and, using restricted maximum-likelihood
- estimators, Tau²-statistic. In case of heterogeneity (tau² > 0) a prediction interval for the true outcomes was also provided.
- 241 Sensitivity analyses were performed including only effect sizes from studies without a serious overall
- RoB and using the exercise type, the type of psychological intervention, and the characteristics of the comparator group.
- To detect outliers on study level, Studentized residuals and Cook's distances were used. Outliers were Bonferroni-corrected with two-sided alpha = 0.05.
- To check the included studies for a potential publication bias, Funnel plots and Egger's regression test, to check a potential funnel plot asymmetry using the standard error of the observed outcomes as predictor, were used.
- All pooled effects analyses were performed using the MAJOR package for jamovi (version 1.6.23, jamovi.org, Sydney, Australia).
- 251

252 Meta-regressions were further calculated. Independent variables were the intervention duration, the 253 type of comparator (active versus passive), known effective versus rather ineffective exercise types, 254 control group matched to the intervention group "yes versus no", behavioural treatment "yes versus 255 no", number of the participants, overall RoB rating, and mean age of the participants. The dependent 256 variables were the effect sizes for pain and disability (continuous). For the regression model, a syntax 257 for IBM SPSS was used (D.B. Wilson; Meta-Analysis Modified Weighted Multiple Regression; MATRIX 258 procedure Version 2005.05.23). Inverse variance-weighted regression models with random intercepts 259 and fixed slopes were calculated. Homogeneity analysis (Q and p-values), meta-regression estimates 260 (95% confidence intervals and p-values), and Z-statistics were calculated.

261 Results

Our electronic database searches identified 1,172 unique citations. We screened the full-texts of 109 publications, identified 73 as potentially eligible, and included 58 RCTs of individualized exercise treatment for chronic low back pain in this systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression. At least, 53 studies contained sufficient data to be included into the qualitative analysis, with five studies lacking sufficient follow-up data. Figure 1 provides detail about the flow of citations and studies through our search and selection process. References to included and excluded studies at the full-text stage are provided within supplementary data appendix D.

269

Study characteristics: A total of 10084 participants were included in 58 trials (Table 1, supplementary data appendix D). The sample size of trials ranged between 69 and 238 participants (IQR) with a median of 121 participants for each study. Reported inclusion criteria for low back pain in trials was more than 12 (6 to 12) weeks prior to study inclusion, and if reported the median time of perceived burden was 111 (55-450) weeks. Thirteen studies included as well sub-chronic pain duration and subacute intervals of low back pain,^{2, 4, 8, 13, 16, 20, 24, 29, 31, 46, 48, 52, 60} but consisted with a major share of participants with chronic or chronic-recurrent pain.

277 The median year of publication of RCTs was 2015 (range 1993-2021). The median age of participants 278 was 45.4 years (IQR 41.7-49.4), and the median percentage of females was 55.7% (50.2%-62.5%). 279 The median training period was 8.0 (6.0-12.0) weeks, and the median number of training sessions per 280 week was 2.0 (1.5-3.0) for the individualized exercise and 1.5 (1.0-2.4) for the control exercises. 281 Duration of training was 50.0 (35.0-60.0) minutes for individualized, and 50.0 (30.0-60.0) minutes for 282 control exercise. Twenty-four (41.4%) studies investigated mixed individualized exercises, and 22 283 studies (37.9%) sensorimotor training (SMT). Other individualized interventions included aerobic 284 (n = 5), pilates (n = 1), McKenzie (n = 4), back schools (n = 4), and yoga (n = 1).

Thirty-four (58.6%) studies added some form of psychological intervention to the exercise procedure, i.e., cognitive-behavioural therapy (n = 9, 15.5%), behavioural therapy (n = 2, 3.4%), or other (n = 24, 34.8%).

In total, 61 control groups could be identified, with eleven studies presenting more than one control group. Forty-two (68.9%) of control interventions were non-individualized active exercises, and 21 (34.4%) no treatments with advice to stay active and usual care. Other controls were true controls (no treatment, n = 3), passive controls (n = 5), and medications (n = 1). Eleven of these control groups were matched (i.e., same type of exercise except individualisation).

293

294 There was not sufficient data to analyse secondary data.

295

296 >>INSERT FIGURE 1<<

297 >>INSERT TABLE 1<<

- 298
- 299

300 RoB assessement:

RoB assessments on study level (as derived from the outcomes) are summarized in Figure 2 and supplementary data appendix E. Of the 58 studies, 26 (44.3%) had an overall unclear RoB (i.e., some concerns), and 32 (55.7%) a high overall RoB. In summary, there was a considerably high overall RoB and this due to deviations from intended interventions (Figure 2, supplementary data appendix C).

305

306 The funnel plot (supplementary data appendix E) highlights the RoB across studies (publication bias 307 on meta-level for the main outcomes pain and disability (short-term, in comparison to any comparator 308 group). For the detailed main analyses, both the rank correlation and the regression test indicated no 309 funnel plot asymmetry for pain in the short-term follow-up versus active treatments (Egger's regression 310 test = -1.407, p = 0.2; rank correlation: -0.202, p = .1) but versus passive treatments (test = -3.313, p = 311 0.001; rank = -0.373, p = 0.009). In the long-term follow-ups on pain, no publication bias was 312 indicated (rank = 0.117, Egger = 0.18, both p > .05; versus active; rank = 0.029, Egger = 0.288, both p 313 > .05 versus passive). No funnel plot asymmetry was detected in any disability model (rank between -314 0.029 and -0.173, Eggers between -0.623 and -0.030, all p> .05). Only for the pain model of short-315 term follow-up versus passive measures, a publications bias is supposable, whereas it is unlikely for 316 the pain contrast to active measures or long-term pain and disability models.

317

318 >>INSERT FIGURE 2<<

319

320 Overall GRADE assessment:

The overall certainty of the evidence was rated as low for meta-analytic outcomes of self-reported pain and disability. The main reasons for downgrading the evidence were RoB, inconsistency, and publication bias. Imprecision and indirectness were no problem, as this systematic review encompassed specific populations, types of interventions, and outcome measures (see Table 2 and the certainty of evidence section in supplementary data appendix F,).

326

327 Results of individual studies:

328 Pain intensity was assessed in 46 studies at short-term (closest to 12 weeks after randomisation or

329 after 12 weeks of intervention) or at long-term follow-up (closest to 12 months after randomisation).

330 Mean pain intensity at baseline was 4.90 (standard deviation 1.38) on a VAS in the individualized

groups and 4.89 (1.45) in controls. Pain following individualized exercise was reduced to 2.88 (1.25) at

332 12 weeks and 3.15 (1.09) at 52 weeks. Pain intensity in controls decreased to 3.62 (1.24) at 12 weeks

and 3.49 (1.14) at 52 weeks.

Disability was assessed in 45 studies at short-term or at long-term follow-up. Mean disability at baseline was 3.53 (1.42) VAS in the individualized groups and 3.46 (1.51) in controls. Disability following individualized exercise was reduced to 2.41 (1.48) at 12 weeks and 2.47 (1.39) at 52 weeks.

337 At 12 and 52 weeks, disability in controls was reduced to 2.65 (1.51) and 2.70 (1.21),. For individual

- 338 differences in studies see supplementary data appendix C.
- 339

340 Pain intensity

Individualized exercise significantly reduced pain compared with all active comparators at short-term follow-up (closest to 12 weeks after randomisation; $l^2 = 73\%$, k = 32 SMD -0.28; 95% Cl -0.42 to -0.14; Figure 3), but not at long-term follow-up (closest to 12 months; $l^2 = 41\%$, k = 16 SMD -0.10; 95% Cl -0.21 to 0.01; supplementary data appendix H). Mean clinically important differences did not

345 suggest relevance at short-term (-0.67 cm VAS) or long-term follow-up (-0.19).

The intensity of pain following the intervention showed that individualized exercise significantly reduced pain compared with passive treatments or true control at short-term follow-up ($I^2 = 89\%$, k = 32 SMD - 0.40; 95% CI -0.58 to -0.22; Figure 4), and at long-term follow-up ($I^2 = 29\%$, k = 17SMD -0.14; 95% CI -0.22 to -0.07; supplementary data appendix H). Mean clinically important differences did not suggest relevance at short-term (-0.33 cm VAS) or long-term follow-up (-0.18).

- 351
- 352 Disability

Under consistency, individualized exercise did significantly reduce disability compared with all active comparators at short-term follow-up ($I^2 = 73\%$, k = 32 SMD -0.17; 95% CI -0.31 to -0.02, Figure 5), but not at long-term follow-up ($I^2 = 69\%$, k = 15 SMD -0.12; 95% CI -0.27 to 0.03, supplementary data appendix H). Mean clinically important differences did not suggest relevance at short-term (-0.33 cm VAS) or long-term follow-up (-0.18).

358 Individualized exercise did not reduced disability compared with passive treatments or true control at

359 short-term follow-up I^2 = 54%, k = 22 SMD -0.09; 95% CI -0.18 to 0.01, Figure 6) but significantly at

360 long-term follow-up ($l^2 = 51\%$, k = 15 SMD -0.20; 95% CI -0.30 to -0.10, supplementary data

361 appendix H). Mean clinically important differences did not suggest relevance at short-term (0.18 VAS)

- or long-term follow-up (-0.96).
- 363

364 Certainty of evidence:

Main outcomes on pain intensity have been graded with low (vs. active at short- and long-term) and very low at short-term and moderate at long-term (vs. passive interventions). Certainty of disability outcomes was graded as very low (vs. active) at short- and long-term) and moderate (vs. passive at short- and long-term, see *supplementary data appendix F*).

369

370 Sensitivity and moderator analyses

371 All effects at short-term follow-up were calculated in comparison to other active treatments (exercises).

372 The effect on pain, but not on disability, was robust when only studies with utmost moderate overall

RoB were pooled (according to Table 1, and supplementary data appendix E)

374 Most further sensitivity analyses, i.e., i) individualized multimodal (mixed) exercise interventions, ii)

- 375 individualized exercise in combination with psychological intervention, iii) individualized exercise
- interventions based on SMT, iv) only studies with matched control groups, v) only studies with the
- inclusion criterion of low back pain lasting for at least 12 weeks, and vi) only studies with an additional
- 378 behavioural treatment showed individualized exercise to significantly reduce pain intensity at short-
- term follow-up compared with other active treatments, but not disability (Table 2, supplementary data
- 380 appendix I1-I7). In contrast, the comparisons to vi) only true control comparators revealed superior
- 381 effects by the individualisation in both pain and disability.

383	>>INSERT TABLE 2<<<
384	
385	Mean differences when compared to controls ranged from -0.09 to -1.27 VAS (depending on the
386	sensitivity scenario) for pain intensity, with largest clinical effects for combined treatments of
387	individualized exercise and cognitive behavioural therapy (-1.27 VAS), and from -0.09 to -0.80 for
388	disability (see supplementary data appendix G). On an individual level, all effects of individualized
389	exercise on pain were clinically important (> 1.50 VAS). Effects on disability were clinically important
390	at both short-term and long-term follow-up, except for individualized exercise not including
391	psychological interventions and studies including low back pain episodes shorter than 12 weeks.
392	Controls showed clinical important effects when including psychological interventions, and on long-
393	term disability.
394	
395	Dose-response relationships have been performed by means of meta-regression analysis
396	(supplementary data appendix 18). The independent variables (intervention duration, type of
397	comparator, distinction between rather effective or ineffective exercise, matched control group,
398	additional psychological intervention, total study size (n), overall risk of bias rating, and mean age)
399	explained 13% of the pain and 6% of the disability effect size heterogeneity. For pain, the only
400	significant contributor was the training duration (in weeks, longer durations mediated larger effect
401	sizes). For disability, no significant regressors could be identified (see supplementary data appendix
402	18).
403	
404	Adverse Events
405	Adverse events have been reported by 14 (24%) of studies, with a total of 553 events, of which 50

406 (9%) were at least possibly treatment-related. Retrieved data did not allow to distinguish between

407 types of active interventions or perform further analysis.

408 Discussion

409	This systematic review and meta-analysis with meta-regression found that individualized exercise
410	interventions versus other active exercise interventions, or passive controls and usual care were
411	associated with reduced self-reported pain intensity and disability at short- and long-term follow-up.
412	Our analysis revealed medium effect sizes for the reduction of pain intensity by individualized exercise
413	with low levels of certainty when compared to active and very low certainty compared to passive
414	treatments at the follow-ups closest to 12 weeks. Disability was reduced with low certainty and small
415	effects size compared to active controls. At long-term follow-up (closest to 12 months) moderate
416	certainty suggests small effect sizes comparing individualized exercise to passive treatments. We
417	could not detect effects on pain intensity at long-term follow-up compared to active controls (low to
418	moderate certainty). Sensitivity analysis (Table 2) revealed on a low level of certainty that the
419	combination of individualized exercise in combination with psychological interventions (e.g., cognitive
420	and/or behavioural therapy) showed moderate effect sizes on pain and disability compared to both
421	active and passive treatments. Effects obtained following individualized exercise were mostly clinically
422	relevant. Sensitivity analysis also showed superiority of motor-controlled individualized interventions
423	(low certainty), and of individualized exercise when compared to real controls (moderate certainty).
424	Meta-regression did not reveal any substantial influencers.
425	
426	These data indicate that general individualized exercise can be recommended in principle to achieve
427	improvements in in pain intensity and disability in low back pain patients
428	
429	From a clinical and therapeutic point of view, we calculated MCIDs implicating individualized exercise
430	to better reduce pain and disability compared to both, active and passive controls. However, MCID
431	mostly failed to be relevant by definition, i.e. below 1.5 points on the VAS for pain and 1.0 point for
432	disability outcomes. Anyhow, we consider (based on the confidence intervals) most effects on pain as
433	probably clinically relevant when individualized exercises are compared to passive measures or other
434	exercises. The clinical relevance may be strengthened due to the following reasons: i) adding a
435	stratification and /or personalisation to the exercise intervention is simple and almost time and cost
436	neutral, ii) at 12 weeks pain intensity was reduced by individualized exercise by 40% and at 26 weeks
437	by 38%, which from a patient's perspective is of clear benefit, iii) all results are at least consistent in
438	the point that there is a trend (or, even, mostly a significant between-group difference leading to a
439	probable relevant effect) towards individualized treatments that becomes larger when not comparing
440	to active but passive controls, iv) taking into account the strong known placebo effects in low back
441	pain ⁶¹ emphasizes the small effects retrieved in our study. As all studies were patient-examiner
442	blinded -what hands-on trials cannot be blamed for- this observation seems robust.
443	
444	Compared to other low back pain treatments, the observed effect sizes in our study are superior to,
	E2

e.g., paracetamol (which has been declared being not effective compared to placebo),⁵³, somewhat
 larger than therapeutic ultrasound (small to no effects versus placebo),¹⁰ non-steroidal

- 447 anti-inflammatory drugs (small effects versus placebo),⁵⁸ spinal manipulative therapy (small effects
- 448 versus standard care),⁷ and comparable to acupuncture (low-certainty evidence to reduce pain and

449 improve function compared to sham and no treatment).³⁷ Hayden et al. recently assessed the effects 450 of exercise on chronic low back pain and disability to be small compared to no treatment, usual care or 451 placebo comparisons, and other conservative treatments.²² Certainty of evidence is low to moderate, 452 and studies did not meet the threshold for minimal clinically important difference.²² The mean 453 difference between groups as assessed by the meta-analysis on classification-based exercise in low 454 back pain,⁵⁶ was presented as the difference to all comparators, suggesting small effects. All above 455 mentioned reviews are principally in line with our results, suggesting effects on very low to moderate 456 certainty, which are at first sight not clinically important. The problem of the above made assumptions 457 is that the clinical relevance of the effect cannot just be defined by the MCID.⁶ Medical assessment 458 should include other factor as well, such as regression, baseline severity, or even expectations. If the 459 MCID is calculated on the basis of a comparison to no treatment controls, it reflects well the clinical state of art.^{6, 22} In the case of the present systematic review, patients usually received at least advice, 460 461 and a larger number of no-treatment controlled studies is missing (see Table 1). Calculating the mean 462 differences compared to no treatment controls (n = 4) or usual care and advice only (n = 16; see463 supplementary data appendix G) resulted in clinically relevant intragroup differences for the 464 individualized exercise group, but not controls, making our findings more likely. Consequently, the 465 MCID is a context-specific value rather than a fixed number,³ and gives insight into relative but also 466 absolute effects. The absolute symptom reduction varied between 40% (pain) and 33% (disability) 467 from baseline, which can indeed be considered clinically relevant from a pain physician's perspective. 468 Especially with regard to the combined approaches (adding psychological interventions or exercise 469 based on motor control) the reduction of pain intensity (on a low to moderate certainty level) is 470 promising from a clinical point of view. In this context, the impact of the results as shown by Tagliaferri 471 et al. can be regarded clinically relevant.⁵⁶ Summarising our data, the overall low certainty, RoB, 472 MCID, and SMDs, data support the conclusion that individualized exercise interventions versus other 473 active exercise interventions or usual care or passive controls are associated with clinically relevant 474 reduced self-reported pain intensity and disability. 475

Recent clinical practice guidelines^{1, 30, 38, 47} are basically in line with our findings. The German national
guideline on chronic non-specific low back pain¹ strongly recommends the combination of exercise
treatments with education, the latter based on behavioural therapy, to treat sub-acute and chronic low
back pain, and to promote physical activity.

480 The NICE guidelines³⁸ universally recommend to consider a combined physical and psychological

481 intervention, incorporating a cognitive behavioural approach. Physical programs refers to a group

exercise program (biomechanical, aerobic, mind-body or a combination of approaches) for people
with specific episodes or flare-up of low back pain with or without sciatica that should take people's

484 specific needs, preferences and capabilities into account when choosing the type of exercise.

The guideline of the North American Spine Association³⁰ recommends cognitive behavioural therapy in combination with physical therapy, as compared with physical therapy alone, to improve pain levels in patients with low back pain over 12 months on level A. Cognitive behavioural therapy in combination with physical therapy is recommended to improve functional outcomes (disability) and return to work in low back pain patients on a level B.

We belief that our results strengthen the use of exercise therapies in multimodal settings for low back pain therapies. On the basis of our data, the guideline statements in regard of patients' needs and differentiation among exercise modalities seem justified. Personalisation is an important option in tailoring exercise to patient's needs. Different exercise modalities seem to have different impact on pain and disability. Furthermore, the bio-psycho-social dimension of low back pain should also be addressed using adequate psychological interventions.

496

497 Promising research deficits regarding that should be subject to future research include aspects like 498 digitalisation⁹ or cost-effectiveness.³⁵. From a therapist's point of view, different forms of exercise 499 therapy should be compared with each other to determine a potentially superior mode of exercise 500 training for rehabilitation. However, given the current paucity of literature, pairwise meta-analyses may 501 be limited in drawing such conclusions. Network meta-analysis may be more suitable for determining 502 potentially superior modes of exercise training and have recently gained momentum in the field of 503 sports medicine.⁴² Studies should focus on strong methodological rigor and larger sample sizes to 504 reduce the RoB and increase the certainty in observations. To ensure a low risk of bias, placebo- or sham-controlled trials should be considered.²⁸ Furthermore, the studies should follow current 505 506 guidelines for intervention description (e.g., the template for intervention description and replication 507 checklist²⁸) to enable transparent evaluation and replication of intervention programs and should 508 report factors potentially influencing the findings (e.g. comorbidities and pain management). Despite of a low adverse effects risk being attributed to exercise therapies,⁴¹ the reporting of adverse events in 509 510 retrieved studies was poor. Our observations mainly rely on one large study,¹⁶ including almost 75% 511 (n = 414) of reported adverse events, of which 98 are treatment-related. The strengths of our study 512 include the overall assessment of individualized exercise intervention to give a concise overview of the 513 different modalities how personalisation in exercise therapy might be performed (Supplementary File 514 Appendix C). We also retrieved studies that included patients with sub-chronic low back pain, and 515 sensitivity analysis suggested these patients not to distort our analysis. This group of patients could 516 also benefit from individualized exercise. Statistical sensitivity analyses were finally conducted for all 517 outcomes to further check the robustness and validity of the results. 518

519 Limitations

520 There were no included studies with a low RoB. We also could not assess the effect of individualized 521 exercise on the number of days of absence from work and measures of quality of life, because the 522 included studies did not report these important variables consistently. Consequently, our outcome is 523 restricted to pain or disability only. It should also be noted that the results only apply to land-based 524 interventions. In regard to our certainty assessment downgrading was necessary due to supposed 525 inconsistency. When individual study sample sizes are small, point estimates may vary substantially 526 but, because variation may be explained by chance, l^2 may be low. Conversely, when study sample 527 size is large, a relatively small difference in point estimates can yield a large $l^{2.51}$. This might also be a 528 reason for the supposed publication bias regarding pain outcomes. 529 In addition, the terms personalized and especially stratified do not exactly mean the same, but

530 address same aspects of medicine. We adhere to the definition, that the term 'stratification' more

- 531 accurately "reflects the realistic effects of medicines at population level, while the term 'personalized
- 532 medicine' reflects the possibly overambitious promise of specifically tailoring a treatment on an
- 533 individual level.^{11, 62} In addition, individualisation within our studies covers a broad field of
- 534 interventions, what should not automatically imply all types of intervention being equally efficient. We
- 535 are aware that future studies will need to more accurately define exercise in this regard.
- 536 Finally, although exercise training is considered relatively safe in general,⁴¹ adverse events could not
- 537 be adequately assessed given insufficient reporting.
- 538
- 539 Conclusions
- 540 This systematic review shows on average low-certainty evidence for the effectiveness of individualized
- 541 exercise on pain and disability in chronic non-specific low back pain. The effects are of clinical
- 542 importance when assessing individualized exercise by its own. Given the little extra effort to
- 543 individualise exercise, practitioners should be encouraged to use this approach. Effects are larger
- 544 when combining exercise and cognitive-behavioural interventions for the treatment of chronic low back
- 545 pain. With regard to the bio-psycho-social dimension of low back pain, it is important to address
- 546 psychosocial characteristics, such as inappropriate beliefs about pain, pain catastrophizing, and/or
- 547 depression, besides bodily functions.⁵⁰

|--|

550	
551	Figure 1: Flow Chart. RCT = randomized controlled trial, LBP = chronic non-specific low back pain
552	
553	Figure 2. Risk of bias rating on an individual study level, displayed as traffic light plot for each
554	study/outcome with green lights = low, yellow = unclear/moderate, and red = high risk of bias. The
555	aggregate Cochrane Risk-of-bias appraisal results summary plot is displayed in the supplementary
556	data appendix E.
557	
558	Figure 3. Forest plot for the effect sizes for the short-term follow-up (closest to 12 weeks
559	following randomisation) of individualized exercise versus other active treatments on pain
560	intensity. The plot depicts model fit, individual study and pooled effect size estimates (standardized
561	mean differences (SMD) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI)). The size of the
562	boxes corresponds to the respective studies' (inverse variance) weighting.
563	
564	Figure 4. Forest plot for the effect sizes for the short-term follow-up (closest to 12 weeks
565	following randomisation) of individualized exercise versus passive treatments, true control,
566	and usual care on pain intensity. The plot depicts model fit, individual study and pooled effect size
567	estimates (standardized mean differences (SMD) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95%
568	CI). The size of the boxes corresponds to the respective studies' (inverse variance) weighting.
569	
570	Figure 5. Forest plot for the effect sizes for the short-term follow-up (closest to 12 weeks
571	following randomisation) of individualized exercise versus other active treatments on
572	disability. The plot depicts model fit, individual study and pooled effect size estimates (standardized
573	mean differences (SMD) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The size of the boxes
574	corresponds to the respective studies' (inverse variance) weighting.
575	
576	Figure 6. Forest plot for the effect sizes for the short-term follow-up (closest to 12 weeks
577	following randomisation) of individualized exercise versus passive treatments or true control
578	on disability. The plot depicts model fit, individual study and pooled effect size estimates
579	(standardized mean differences and corresponding 95% confidence intervals). The plot depicts model
580	fit, individual study and pooled effect size estimates (standardized mean differences (SMD) and
581	corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The size of the boxes corresponds to the
582	respective studies' (inverse variance) weighting.

583	Table 1. C	haracter	stics of	include	ed studi	i es. Inclu	sion crit	teria of L	BP indicates	if the study	had a defined or	nset of the	current LBF	episode,	wherea	s duratio	on
584	of LBP refe	ers to the	overall	duration	of the c	omplaint	if indica	ited. I = ii	ndividualized	group, C(s	s) = control group	(s), SMT =	sensorimot	or training	g, BT = t	ehaviou	ıral
585	therapy, C	BT = cog	nitive be	havioura	al therap	y, LBP =	chronic	c non-spe	ecific low bac	k pain, w =	weeks, y = years	s, n = numl	per, min = m	ninute, Ro	B = Risł	of Bias	
Autho	or, Year	Study arms (n)	Inclu sion criter ia LBP	Durati on of LBP (w)	N total	N group s	Age Mea n (y)	Femal es (%)	Indi- vidualized inter- vention	Psycho- logical inter- vention	controls	trainin g period (w)	training frequenc y (session s per	freque ncy (sessio ns per week)	traini ng durat ion (min)	traini ng durat ion (min)	Overall RoB
			(w)										week)	control		contr ol	
Aasa	, 2015	2	12	330	70	l: 35; C: 35	42	55.7	SMT	no	active control	8	1.5	1.5	25	60	some concerr
Ande	rsen, 2016	3	12		140	l: 46; Cs: 47	45.6	55.7	mixed	other	C1: passive control C2: active control	10	3	1	50	150	high
Apelo	doorn, 2012	2	6	4	156	l: 74; C: 82	42	57.1	SMT	no	active control	8					high
Azev	edo, 2018	2	12		148	l: 74; C: 74	41.9	61.5	mixed	other	active control	8	1.5	1.5	53	53	high
Brady	y, 2018	2	12	111	48	l: 24; C: 24	54	81.3	mixed	other	active control	12	1	1			some concerr
Cairn	is, 2006	2		100	97	l: 47; C: 50	38	51.5	SMT	no	active control	12	1	1	30	30	high
Cher	kin, 1998	3	1		321	l: 133; C: 122 C2: 66	40.7	48.0	McKenzie	no	C1: passive control C2: usual care and advice	4	2.3	2.3			high

Cuesta-Vargas, 2011	2		15	49	l: 25; Cs: 24	38.4	55.1	aerobic	other	active control	15	3	3	80	60	high
Descarreaux, 2002	2	1		20	l: 10; C: 10	34	30.0	SMT	no	active control	6	7	7			high
Diaz-Arribas, 2015	3			461	l: 132; C1: 120 C2: 209	47	82.0	SMT	ВТ	C1: true control C2: active control	8	2	2	50	45	high
Ford, 2016	2	6	15	300	l: 156; C: 144	43	49.0	mixed	no	advice and usual care	5	2	0.4			some concerns
Garcia, 2018	2		43	147	l: 74; C: 73	56	76.2	McKenzie	no	true control	5	2	2	35	35	some concerns
Geisser, 2005	4	12	300	100	l: 26; Cs: 24-25	38	59.0	SMT	other	all active controls						high
Godfrey, 2020	2	12		248	l: 124; C: 124	48	59.3	mixed	no	active control	2	1		60		some concerns
Goertz, 2017	3	4		131	l: 44; C1: 44 C2: 43	73	38.9	mixed	other	C1: active control C2: advice and usual care	12					high .
Gudavalli, 2006	2	12		235	l: 112; C: 123	41	37.4	mixed	no	passive control	4	3.5	3.5	38	4.50	some concerns
Hansen, 1993	3	4	144	180	l: 60; C1: 61 C2: 59	41.4	31.7	SMT	no	C1: true control C2: active control	4	2	2	60	60	high
Heinrich, 2009	3	1	9	251	l: 76; C1: 53	45.8	6	mixed	CBT	C1: mixed, no CBT	12	2.5	2.5	205	75	some concerns

					C2:					C2: advice and						
					125					usual care						
Henry, 2014	2	52		102	l: 77;	42	50.0	SMT	no	active control	6	1	1			some
					C: 25											concerns
Highland, 2018	2	12		68	l: 34;	44.3	63.2	yoga	no	advice and	8	1.5		60		some
					C: 34					usual care						concerns
Hill, 2011	2			851	l: 568;	49.5	58.8	mixed	other	active control	16					some
					C: 283											concerns
Hill, 2020	2			524	l: 231;	61.1	60.7	Mixed	other	advice and	26					high
					C: 293					usual care						
Hueppe, 2019	2	12		552	l:258	53.5	36.7	mixed	other	advice and	16	Individual		60		some
					C;294					usual care						concerns
Hurley, 2015	3	12		246	l: 83;	45.4	67.9	aerobic	no	C1:active control	8	5	1	30	60	some
					C1: 82					C2: advice and						concerns
					C2: 81					usual care						
Jay, 2015	2	12		25	l: 12;	46	0.0	mixed	CBT	advice and	10	4		35		some
					C: 12					usual care						concerns
Jensen, 2011	2			351	l: 176;	42	52.1	mixed	other	advice and	12					high
					C: 175					usual care						
Kim, 2020	2	7	100	39	I: 20;	24	46.2	SMT	other	advice and	6	5	5			high
					C: 19					usual care						
Lang, 2021	2	12		174	l: 117;	46	59.8	Aerobic	other	advice and	12					some
					C: 57					usual care						concerns
Lehtola, 2016	2	6		70	l: 35;	49.5	60.0	SMT	no	active control	8	0.8	0.8	45	45	some
					C: 35											concerns
Leibetseder,	2	12		44	l: 22;	58	63.6	Aerobic	no	active control	3	6	6	80	180	high
2007					C: 22											
Lomond, 2015	2	48		33	l: 21;	36	100.0	SMT	other	active control	6			53	53	high
					C: 12											

Long, 2004	3			230	l: 80; C1: 70 C2: 80		47.4	McKenzie	other	C1: active control C2: advice and usual care	2	3	3	38	38	high
Macedo, 2012	2	12	87.35	172	l: 86; C: 86	49.2	59.3	SMT	СВТ	active control	8	1.5	1.5	60	60	high
Magalhães, 2018	2		67	66	l: 33; C: 33	46.9	74.2	Mixed	no	active control	6	2	2	60	60	high
Michaelson, 2016	2	12	326	70	l: 35; C: 35	42	55.7	SMT	no	active control	8	1.5	1.5			some concerns
Moore, 2000	2			226	l: 113; C: 113	49.4 5	54.0	back school	other	advice and usual care	12					some concerns
O'Keeffe, 2020	2	26		206	l: 106; C: 100	48	73.8	Mixed	СВТ	active control	8	1.5	1	45	75	high
Paolucci, 2011	2			50	l: 29; C: 21	58	62.0	back school	BT	medication	3	3		60		high
Petersen, 2011	2	6	95.5	350	l: 175; C: 175	73.5	55.7	McKenzie	no	passive control	12	1.3	1.3			high
Rabiei, 2021	2	12		73	l: 37; C: 36	43	53.4	SMT	other	active control	8	2	2		60	high
Rabin, 2014	2			105	l: 48; C: 57	36	53.3	SMT	BT	active control	8	1.4	1.4	15	30	some concerns
Rasmussen- Barr, 2009	2	8	519	71	l: 36; C: 35	38	50.7	SMT	no	advice and usual care	8	1	1	45	15	some concerns
Salas, 2019	2	13		16	l: 8; C: 8	73.5 5	62.5	mixed	no	active control	5	3	3			high
Sandal, 2021	2	12		461	l:232 C:229	47.5	55	mixed	other	advice and usual care	12	Individual		indivi dual		some concerns
Saner, 2015	2	6	540	106	l: 52;	41.6	37.7	mixed	no	active control	12	2	2	30	30	some

					C: 54											concerns
Schaller, 2016	2			412	l: 201; C: 211	50	30.6	back school	other	passive control	8	2	0.25	60	30	high
Soukup, 1999	2		564	69	l: 34; C: 35	39	59.4	mixed	other	advice and usual care	13	1.5	0	60	0	some concerns
Suh, 2019	4	12		60	l: 15; Cs: 15	54.8 1	55.0	SMT	other	all active controls	6	5	5	45	45	high
Thanawat, 2017	2	12		126	l: 62; C: 64	44	83.3	mixed	other	active control	8	3	3	35	35	high
Tsauo, 2009	2	12		37	l: 20; C: 17	47.4 6	32.4	mixed	no	advice and usual care	12			180		some concerns
Van Baal, 2020	2	12	432	34	l: 18; C: 16	44	76.5	SMT	no	active control	7	1.5	1	40	40	high
Van Dillen, 2016	2	6	540	101	l: 47; C: 54	43	47.5	SMT	no	active control	26	1.5	1	40	40	high
Vasseljen, 2012	3	12		109	l: 36; C1: 36 C2: 37	39	65.1	SMT	no	all active controls	8	1	1	40	50	high
Verra, 2018	2	26	468	139	l: 107; C: 32	46	100.0	mixed	BT	active control	4	4				some concerns
Vibe Fersum, 2013	2	12		121	l: 62; C: 59	42	52.1	mixed	CBT	active control	12	1	1	28	30	some concerns
Von Korff, 2005	2			240	l: 119; C: 121	49.8	62.5	back school	other	advice and usual care	8	0.5	0	60		some concerns
Wajswelner, 2012	2	12	722	87	l: 44; C: 43	49	55.2	pilates	no	active control	6	2	2	60	60	some concerns
Wälti, 2015	2	12		28	l: 14; C: 14	41.5	53.6	SMT	other	active control	8	2	2	30	30	some concerns

586 Table 2. Sensitivity analysis of outcomes pain and disability at short-term follow-up comparing individualized exercise with active controls. Bold

587 standardized mean differences (SMD) indicate significant effects towards the individualized group. Certainty of evidence was rated according to the GRADE

588	system. ¹⁸ SMT	= sensorimotor	training
-----	---------------------------	----------------	----------

Sensitivity analysis	Outcome	k (included	SMD [95 %	I ² -statistics	Certainty of
		studies)	confidence interval]		evidence
Studies with utmost moderate	pain	10	-0.24 [-0.42 to -0.05]	61%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
overall risk of bias	disability	11	-0.26 [-0.53 to 0.01]	83%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
Individualized multimodal	pain	10	-0.17 [-0.33 to -0.001]	15%	<i>Moderate</i> ($\odot \odot \odot \circ$)
(mixed) exercise interventions		4.0	0.041.0.544.0.001	740/	
without any form of	disability	10	-0.21 [-0.51 to 0.09]	/1%	$Low (\bigcirc \bigcirc \circ \circ)$
psychological therapy					
Individualized exercise	pain	22	-0.28 [-0.42 to -0.14]	78%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
including psychological	disability	22	-0.15 [-0.32 to 0.01]	74%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙००)
interventions					
Individualized exercise based	pain	19	-0.35 [-0.51 to -0.18]	55%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
on motor control principles	disability	19	-0.18 [-0.36 to 0.01]	55%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
Only matched comparator	pain	6	-0.36 [-0.74 to 0.02]	86%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
groups (same intervention	disability	6	-0.19 [-0.57 to 0.18]	80%	low(0000)
except individualisation)	and all may	·			2011 (0:00)
Only LBP at inclusion > 12	pain	23	-0.33 [-0.49 to -0.17]	64%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
weeks	disability	22	-0.10 [-0.27 to 0.07]	66%	<i>Very Low</i> (⊙○○○)
Only studies with a true control	pain	14	-0.48 [-0.69 to -0.27]	78%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)
comparator group					
	disability	17	-0.18 [-0.280 to 0.08]	73%	<i>Low</i> (⊙⊙∘∘)

589 **REFERENCES**

1.	Bundesärztekammer (BÄK), Kassenärztliche Bundesvereinigung (KBV),
	Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften
	(AWMF). Nationale VersorgungsLeitlinie Nicht-spezifischer Kreuzschmerz.
	Available at: www.kreuzschmerz.versorgungsleitlinien.de.
2.	Apeldoorn AT, Ostelo RW, van Helvoirt H, Fritz JM, Knol DL, van Tulder MW, de
	Vet HC. A randomized controlled trial on the effectiveness of a classification-based
	system for subacute and chronic low back pain. Spine. 37:1347-1356, 2012
3.	Beaton DE, Boers M, Wells GA. Many faces of the minimal clinically important
	difference (MCID): a literature review and directions for future research. <i>Current</i>
	opinion in rheumatology. 14:109-114, 2002
4.	Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Battié M, Street J, Barlow W. A comparison of physical
	therapy, chiropractic manipulation, and provision of an educational booklet for the
	treatment of patients with low back pain. The New England journal of medicine.
-	339:1021-1029, 1998
5.	Chiarotto A, Maxwell LJ, Terwee CB, Wells GA, Tugwell P, Ostelo RW. Roland-
	Morris Disability Questionnaire and Oswestry Disability Index: which has Beller
	Real Dain? Systematic Daview and Mate Analysis, <i>Dhysical therapy</i> , 06:1620, 1627
	2016
6	Cook CE Clinimetrics Corner: The Minimal Clinically Important Change Score
0.	(MCID): A Necessary Pretense The Journal of manual & manipulative therapy
	16:E82-83, 2008
7.	de Zoete A, Rubinstein SM, de Boer MR, Ostelo R, Underwood M, Havden JA.
	Buffart LM, van Tulder MW, International IPDSMTg, The effect of spinal
	manipulative therapy on pain relief and function in patients with chronic low back
	pain: an individual participant data meta-analysis. <i>Physiotherapy</i> . 112:121-134, 2021
8.	Descarreaux M, Normand MC, Laurencelle L, Dugas C. Evaluation of a specific home
	exercise program for low back pain. Journal of manipulative and physiological
	therapeutics. 25:497-503, 2002
9.	Du S, Hu L, Dong J, Xu G, Chen X, Jin S, Zhang H, Yin H. Self-management
	program for chronic low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Patient
	education and counseling. 100:37-49, 2017
10.	Ebadi S, Henschke N, Forogh B, Nakhostin Ansari N, van Tulder MW, Babaei-
	Ghazani A, Fallah E. Therapeutic ultrasound for chronic low back pain. The Cochrane
	database of systematic reviews. 7:CD009169, 2020
11.	Erikainen S, Chan S. Contested futures: envisioning "Personalized," "Stratified," and
1.	"Precision" medicine. New Genet Soc. 38:308-330, 2019
12.	Fairbank JC, Couper J, Davies JB, O'Brien JP. The Oswestry low back pain disability
10	questionnaire. Physiotherapy. 66:2/1-2/3, 1980
13.	Ford JJ, Hanne AJ, Surkitt LD, Chan AY, Richards MC, Slater SL, Hinman RS,
	$\mathbf{P}(T)$ and \mathbf{I} \mathbf{I} $\mathbf{P}(T)$ $\mathbf{P}(T$
	ruideling head advice for low heat disorders in primery early a rendemiand
	guideline-based advice for low back disorders in primary care: a randomised
14	guideline-based advice for low back disorders in primary care: a randomised controlled trial. <i>British journal of sports medicine</i> . 50:237-245, 2016 Furlan AD, Malmiyaara A, Chou R, Maher CG, Devo RA, Schoene M, Bronfort G
14.	guideline-based advice for low back disorders in primary care: a randomised controlled trial. <i>British journal of sports medicine</i> . 50:237-245, 2016 Furlan AD, Malmivaara A, Chou R, Maher CG, Deyo RA, Schoene M, Bronfort G, van Tulder MW. Editorial Board of the Cochrane Back NG, 2015 Updated Method
14.	guideline-based advice for low back disorders in primary care: a randomised controlled trial. <i>British journal of sports medicine</i> . 50:237-245, 2016 Furlan AD, Malmivaara A, Chou R, Maher CG, Deyo RA, Schoene M, Bronfort G, van Tulder MW, Editorial Board of the Cochrane Back NG. 2015 Updated Method Guideline for Systematic Reviews in the Cochrane Back and Neck Group <i>Spine</i>
	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13.

638	15.	George SI. What is the effectiveness of a biopsychosocial approach to individual
639		physiotherapy care for chronic low back pain? . Internet Journal of Allied Health
640		Sciences and Practice 6:1-10, 2008
641	16.	Goertz CM, Salsbury SA, Long CR, Vining RD, Andresen AA, Hondras MA, Lyons
642		KJ, Killinger LZ, Wolinsky FD, Wallace RB. Patient-centered professional practice
643		models for managing low back pain in older adults: a pilot randomized controlled
644		trial. BMC Geriatr. 17:235, 2017
645	17.	Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y,
646		Glasziou P, DeBeer H, Jaeschke R, Rind D, Meerpohl J, Dahm P, Schunemann HJ.
647		GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of
648		findings tables. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 64:383-394, 2011
649	18.	Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Atkins D,
650		Kunz R, Brozek J, Montori V, Jaeschke R, Rind D, Dahm P, Meerpohl J, Vist G,
651		Berliner E, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Murad MH, Schunemann HJ, Group GW.
652		GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. Journal of clinical
653		epidemiology. 64:1311-1316, 2011
654	19.	Hajihasani A, Rouhani M, Salavati M, Hedayati R, Kahlaee AH. The Influence of
655		Cognitive Behavioral Therapy on Pain, Quality of Life, and Depression in Patients
656		Receiving Physical Therapy for Chronic Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review. PM &
657		R : the journal of injury, function, and rehabilitation. 11:167-176, 2019
658	20.	Hansen FR, Bendix T, Skov P, Jensen CV, Kristensen JH, Krohn L, Schioeler H.
659		Intensive, dynamic back-muscle exercises, conventional physiotherapy, or placebo-
660		control treatment of low-back pain. A randomized, observer-blind trial. Spine. 18:98-
661		108, 1993
662	21.	Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, Hoy D,
663		Karppinen J, Pransky G, Sieper J, Smeets RJ, Underwood M, Lancet Low Back Pain
664		Series Working G. What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. <i>Lancet</i>
665		(London, England). 391:2356-2367, 2018
666	22.	Hayden JA, Ellis J, Ogilvie R, Malmivaara A, van Tulder MW. Exercise therapy for
667		chronic low back pain. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 9:CD009790,
668		2021
669	23.	Hayden JA, Ellis J, Ogilvie R, Stewart SA, Bagg MK, Stanojevic S, Yamato TP,
670		Saragiotto BT. Some types of exercise are more effective than others in people with
671		chronic low back pain: a network meta-analysis. Journal of physiotherapy. 67:252-
672		262, 2021
673	24.	Heinrich J, Anema JR, de Vroome EM, Blatter BM. Effectiveness of physical training
674		for self-employed persons with musculoskeletal disorders: a randomized controlled
675		trial. BMC public health. 9:200, 2009
676	25.	Henschke N, Ostelo RW, van Tulder MW, Vlaeyen JW, Morley S, Assendelft WJ,
677		Main CJ. Behavioural treatment for chronic low-back pain. The Cochrane database of
678		systematic reviews. 2010:CD002014, 2010
679	26.	Higgins JPT, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC: Chapter 8: Assessing risk
680		of bias in a randomized trial. Available at:
681		https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-08 Accessed 11 November,
682		2021
683	27.	Hill JC, Whitehurst DG, Lewis M, Bryan S, Dunn KM, Foster NE, Konstantinou K,
684		Main CJ, Mason E, Somerville S, Sowden G, Vohora K, Hay EM. Comparison of
685		stratified primary care management for low back pain with current best practice
686		(STarT Back): a randomised controlled trial. Lancet (London, England). 378:1560-
687		1571, 2011

688	28.	Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, Altman DG,
689		Barbour V, Macdonald H, Johnston M, Lamb SE, Dixon-Woods M, McCulloch P,
690		Wyatt JC, Chan AW, Michie S. Better reporting of interventions: template for
691		intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. BMJ (Clinical
692		research ed.). 348:g1687, 2014
693	29.	Kim SH, Park KN, Kwon OY. Classification-Specific Treatment Improves Pain,
694		Disability, Fear-Avoidance Beliefs, and Erector Spinae Muscle Activity During
695		Walking in Patients With Low Back Pain Exhibiting Lumbar Extension-Rotation
696		Pattern: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Journal of manipulative and physiological
697		therapeutics. 43:123-133, 2020
698	30.	Kreiner DS, Matz P, Bono CM, Cho CH, Easa JE, Ghiselli G, Ghogawala Z, Reitman
699		CA, Resnick DK, Watters WC, 3rd, Annaswamy TM, Baisden J, Bartynski WS, Bess
700		S, Brewer RP, Cassidy RC, Cheng DS, Christie SD, Chutkan NB, Cohen BA,
701		Dagenais S, Enix DE, Dougherty P, Golish SR, Gulur P, Hwang SW, Kilincer C, King
702		JA, Lipson AC, Lisi AJ, Meagher RJ, O'Toole JE, Park P, Pekmezci M, Perry DR,
703		Prasad R, Provenzano DA, Radcliff KE, Rahmathulla G, Reinsel TE, Rich RL, Jr.,
704		Robbins DS, Rosolowski KA, Sembrano JN, Sharma AK, Stout AA, Taleghani CK,
705		Tauzell RA, Trammell T, Vorobeychik Y, Yahiro AM. Guideline summary review: an
706		evidence-based clinical guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain.
707		The spine journal : official journal of the North American Spine Society. 20:998-1024,
708		2020
709	31.	Lehtola V, Luomajoki H, Leinonen V, Gibbons S, Airaksinen O. Sub-classification
710		based specific movement control exercises are superior to general exercise in sub-
711		acute low back pain when both are combined with manual therapy: A randomized
712		controlled trial. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 17:135, 2016
713	32.	Lin CW, Haas M, Maher CG, Machado LA, van Tulder MW. Cost-effectiveness of
714		guideline-endorsed treatments for low back pain: a systematic review. <i>European spine</i>
715		journal : official publication of the European Spine Society, the European Spinal
716		Deformity Society, and the European Section of the Cervical Spine Research Society.
717		20:1024-1038, 2011
718	33.	Macedo LG, Hodges PW, Bostick G, Hancock M, Laberge M, Hanna S, Spadoni G,
719		Gross A, Schneider J. Which Exercise for Low Back Pain? (WELBack) trial
720		predicting response to exercise treatments for patients with low back pain: a validation
721		randomised controlled trial protocol. BMJ open. 11:e042792, 2021
722	34.	Maher C, Underwood M, Buchbinder R. Non-specific low back pain. The Lancet.
723		389:736-747, 2017
724	35.	Miyamoto GC, Lin CC, Cabral CMN, van Dongen JM, van Tulder MW. Cost-
725		effectiveness of exercise therapy in the treatment of non-specific neck pain and low
726		back pain: a systematic review with meta-analysis. British journal of sports medicine.
727		53:172-181, 2019
728	36.	Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P,
729		Stewart LA. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis
730		protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev. 4:1, 2015
731	37.	Mu J, Furlan AD, Lam WY, Hsu MY, Ning Z, Lao L. Acupuncture for chronic
732		nonspecific low back pain. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews.
733		12:CD013814, 2020
734	38.	National Guideline C: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Clinical
735	-	
736		Guidelines. In: Low Back Pain and Sciatica in Over 16s: Assessment and
130		Guidelines. In: Low Back Pain and Sciatica in Over 16s: Assessment and Management. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Clinical Guidelines,
737		Guidelines. In: Low Back Pain and Sciatica in Over 16s: Assessment and Management. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Clinical Guidelines, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (UK)

 identification and management of psychological risk factors ("yellow flags") i identification and management of psychological risk factors ("yellow flags") i patients with low back pain: a reappraisal. <i>Physical therapy</i>. 91:737-753, 201 Niederer D, Engel T, Vogt L, Arampatzis A, Banzer W, Beck H, Moreno Cata Brenner-Fliesser M, Guthoff C, Haag T, Honning A, Pfeifer AC, Platen P, Schiltenwolf M, Schneider C, Trompeter K, Wippert PM, Mayer F. Motor Co Stabilisation Exercise for Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Prosp Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 	in 1 ala M, introl pective
 patients with low back pain: a reappraisal. <i>Physical therapy</i>. 91:737-753, 201 Niederer D, Engel T, Vogt L, Arampatzis A, Banzer W, Beck H, Moreno Cata Brenner-Fliesser M, Guthoff C, Haag T, Honning A, Pfeifer AC, Platen P, Schiltenwolf M, Schneider C, Trompeter K, Wippert PM, Mayer F. Motor Co Stabilisation Exercise for Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Prosp Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju Adverse and Stabilisation Exercise for Patients and Prosp 	1 ala M, ontrol pective
 742 40. Niederer D, Engel T, Vogt L, Arampatzis A, Banzer W, Beck H, Moreno Cata 743 Brenner-Fliesser M, Guthoff C, Haag T, Honning A, Pfeifer AC, Platen P, 744 Schiltenwolf M, Schneider C, Trompeter K, Wippert PM, Mayer F. Motor Co 745 Stabilisation Exercise for Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Prosp 746 Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> 747 <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 748 41. Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 740 Adverse serverts of serveral serveral serveral serveral serveral serveration and the serveral server	ala M, ontrol pective
 743 Brenner-Fliesser M, Guthoff C, Haag T, Honning A, Pfeifer AC, Platen P, 744 Schiltenwolf M, Schneider C, Trompeter K, Wippert PM, Mayer F. Motor Co 745 Stabilisation Exercise for Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Prosp 746 Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> 747 <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 748 41. Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 	ntrol bective
 Schiltenwolf M, Schneider C, Trompeter K, Wippert PM, Mayer F. Motor Co Stabilisation Exercise for Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Prosp Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 	ontrol pective
 745 Stabilisation Exercise for Patients with Non-Specific Low Back Pain: A Prosp 746 Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> 747 <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 748 41. Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 	pective
 746 Meta-Analysis with Multilevel Meta-Regressions on Intervention Effects. <i>Jou</i> 747 <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 748 41. Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 	
 747 <i>clinical medicine</i>. 9, 2020 748 41. Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju 740 Absence counts of the second se	ırnal of
748 41. Niemeijer A, Lund H, Stafne SN, Ipsen T, Goldschmidt CL, Jorgensen CT, Ju	U
	ıhl CB.
Adverse events of exercise therapy in randomised controlled trials: a systemat	tic
review and meta-analysis. British journal of sports medicine. 54:1073-1080, 2	2020
751 42. Owen PJ, Miller CT, Mundell NL, Verswijveren S, Tagliaferri SD, Brisby H,	Bowe
752 SJ, Belavy DL. Which specific modes of exercise training are most effective f	for
753 treating low back pain? Network meta-analysis. British journal of sports medi	icine.
754 54:1279-1287, 2020	
755 43. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Higgins JPT. Tools for assessing risk of reporting bia	uses in
studies and syntheses of studies: a systematic review. <i>BMJ open.</i> 8:e019703, 2	2018
757 44. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Kirkham J, Dwan K, Kramer S, Green S, Forbes A. E	3ias due
to selective inclusion and reporting of outcomes and analyses in systematic re-	views of
759 randomised trials of healthcare interventions. <i>The Cochrane database of system</i>	matic
760 <i>reviews</i> . 2014:MR000035, 2014	
761 45. Pergolizzi JV, Jr., LeQuang JA. Rehabilitation for Low Back Pain: A Narrativ	/e
762 Review for Managing Pain and Improving Function in Acute and Chronic Con	nditions.
763 <i>Pain and therapy</i> . 9:83-96, 2020	
764 46. Petersen T, Larsen K, Nordsteen J, Olsen S, Fournier G, Jacobsen S. The McH	Kenzie
765 method compared with manipulation when used adjunctive to information and	1 advice
in low back pain patients presenting with centralization or peripheralization: a	ι
randomized controlled trial. <i>Spine</i> . 36:1999-2010, 2011	
768 47. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, Forciea MA, Clinical Guidelines Committe	e of the
769 American College of P, Denberg TD, Barry MJ, Boyd C, Chow RD, Fitterman	n N,
Harris RP, Humphrey LL, Vijan S. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subaci	ute, and
//I Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American Co	ollege of
 Physicians. Annals of internal medicine. 166:514-530, 2017 Physicians. Dam E. Ang. D. Amidacan I. Nilson Wilson L. Conductoremics. 	f
48. Rasmussen-Barr E, Ang B, Arvidsson I, Nilsson-wikmar L. Graded exercise 1	IOT
774 recurrent low-back pain: a randomized, controlled that with 6-, 12-, and 30-m	onth
775 10110W-ups. Spine. 34:221-228, 2009 776 10 Delend M. Feirhenk I. The Delend Merrie Dischility Questionnaire and the C	Januacter
777 49. Kolalu IVI, Falibalik J. The Kolalu–Molfis Disability Questionnalie and the C	Jswestry
778 50 Poussal NA Nije I Maaus M Mulius V Faut C Oostandorn P Cantral sand	itization
778 50. Roussel NA, Nijs J, Meeus M, Mijnus V, Payt C, Oostendorp K. Central sensi 770 and altered central pain processing in chronic low back pain: fact or myth? Th	
780 <i>Clinical journal of pain</i> 29:625-638, 2013	e
781 51 Rucker G. Schwarzer G. Carpenter IR. Schumacher M. Undue reliance on I(2)) in
781 SI. Rucker G, Schwarzer G, Carpenter JR, Schumacher W. Onduc Tenance on I(2 782 assessing heterogeneity may mislead <i>BMC Med Res Methodol</i> 8:79 2008) 111
783 52 Saner I Kool I Siehen IM Luomaioki H Bastiaanan CH da Ria DA A toilo	red
	icu
784 exercise program versus general exercise for a subgroup of patients with low l	hack
 784 785 785 786 786 787 788 789 780 780 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 784 785 784 785 785 786 786 786 786 787 788 788 789 780 780 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 785 785 786 786 787 788 788	back ne-vear
 784 785 786 786 786 787 788 789 789 780 780 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 785 785 786 786 786 787 788 789 789 780 780 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 788 788 788 789 780 780 780 780 781 781 781 782 784 784 785 786 786 786 786 786 786 787 788 788	back ne-year
 784 784 785 785 786 786 787 53. 53. 787 786 787 787 787 786 787 787 787 788 789 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 785 785 786 787 787 787 788 788 789 789 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 787 787 787 788 788 788 789 789 780 780 780 781 782 783 784 784 785 787 787 787 787 788 788 788 789 789 780 780 781 781 782 782 783 784 784 785 785 786 787 788 788 788 789 789 780 780 781 782 783 784 784 784 785 785 786 787 788 788	back ne-year Jaher
 784 exercise program versus general exercise for a subgroup of patients with low l 785 pain and movement control impairment: A randomised controlled trial with or 786 follow-up. <i>Manual therapy</i>. 20:672-679, 2015 787 53. Saragiotto BT, Machado GC, Ferreira ML, Pinheiro MB, Abdel Shaheed C, M 788 CG, Paracetamol for low back pain. <i>The Cochrane database of systematic</i> 	back ne-year Iaher

790 791	54.	Shafshak TS, Elnemr R. The Visual Analogue Scale Versus Numerical Rating Scale in Measuring Pain Severity and Predicting Disability in Low Back Pain. <i>J Clin</i>
792		Rheumatol. 27:282-285, 2021
/93	55.	Lagliaferri SD, Miller CI, Owen PJ, Mitchell UH, Brisby H, Fitzgibbon B, Masse-
/94 705		Alarie H, Van Oosterwijck J, Belavy DL. Domains of Chronic Low Back Pain and
795 706		Assessing Treatment Effectiveness: A Clinical Perspective. Pain practice : the official
/96	54	journal of World Institute of Pain. 20:211-225, 2020
/9/	56.	lagliaferri SD, Mitchell UH, Saueressig I, Owen PJ, Miller CI, Belavy DL.
/98		Classification Approaches for Treating Low Back Pain Have Small Effects That Are
/99		Not Clinically Meaningful: A Systematic Review with Meta-analysis. The Journal of
800		orthopaedic and sports physical therapy. 1-49, 2021
801	57.	Ulger O, Demirel A, Oz M, Tamer S. The effect of manual therapy and exercise in
802		patients with chronic low back pain: Double blind randomized controlled trial.
803	50	Journal of back and musculoskeletal renabilitation. 30:1303-1309, 2017
804	58.	van der Gaag wH, Roelois PD, Enthoven wI, van Tuider WW, Koes BW. Non-
805		steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for acute low back pain. The Cochrane database of
806	50	systematic reviews. 4:CD015581, 2020
807	59.	van Dieen JH, Reeves NP, Kawchuk G, van Dillen LR, Hodges PW. Analysis of
808		Motor Control in Patients with Low Back Pain: A Key to Personalized Care? The
809	(0)	Journal of orthopaedic and sports physical therapy. 49:380-388, 2019
810	60.	Van Dillen LR, Norton BJ, Sahrmann SA, Evanoff BA, Harris-Hayes M, Holtzman
811		GW, Earley J, Chou I, Strube MJ. Efficacy of classification-specific treatment and
812		adherence on outcomes in people with chronic low back pain. A one-year follow-up,
813	(1	prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial. <i>Manual therapy</i> . 24:52-64, 2016
814	61.	van Lennep J, Trossel F, Perez R, Otten RHJ, van Middendorp H, Evers AWM,
815		Szadek KM. Placebo effects in low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis
816	\sim	of the literature. European journal of pain (London, England). 25:18/6-189/, 2021
81/	62.	WHO: Priority Medicines for Europe and the World 2013 Update p. 180. Available at:
818		http://www.who.int/medicines/areas/priority_medicines/MasterDocJune28_FINAL_
819	(\mathbf{a})	Web.pdf Accessed Jan 31st, 2021
820	63.	Wong CK, Mak KY, Kwok IS, Isang JS, Leung MY, Funabashi M, Macedo LG,
821		Dennett L, wong AY. Prevalence, incidence, and Factors Associated with Non-
822		Specific Chronic Low Back Pain in Community-Dwelling Older Adults Aged 60
823	()	Years and Older: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. <i>The journal of pain</i> . 2021
824 825	04.	Zemedikun DI, Kigozi J, wynne-Jones G, Guariglia A, Koberts I. Methodological
823 826		considerations in the assessment of direct and indirect costs of back pain: A systematic
826 827		scoping review. <i>PloS one</i> . 16:e0251406, 2021
041		



	(which	was not	certified	d by pee	r review) is the a
Aasa 2015		-	+	104	+	- CARTING
Andersen_2016	Ŧ	X	+	Ŧ	+	
Apeldoorn_2012	Ŧ	-		Ŧ	H	
Azevedo 2018	Ŧ		Ŧ	H	Ŧ	
Brady_2018	Ŧ	•	Ŧ	Ŧ	(+)	-
Cairns_2006	8		Ŧ	+	+	
Cherkin_1998	+	8	+	Ŧ	+	8
Cuesta-Vargas 2011	8	-	Ŧ	+	+	
Descarreaux_2002	×		8			8
Diaz-Arribas_2015	•	8	÷	+	+	
Ford_2016	+	-	+	+	+	-
Garcia_2018	+	-	+	+	+	-
Geisser_2005	-	-	+	-	+	8
Godfrey_2020	+	-	+	+	+	-
Goertz_2017	+	8	+	+	+	8
Gudavalli_2006	+	-	+	•	+	•
Hansen_1993	8	-	+	•	+	
Heinrich_2009	-	-	+	÷	+	-
Henry_2014	+	-	+	•	+	-
Highland_2018	+	-	+	•	+	-
Hill_2011	+	-	+	•	+	-
Hill_2020	+		+	+	+	8
Hueppe_2019	+	-	+	+	+	-
Hurley_2015	+	-	+	+	+	-
Jay_2015	-	-	+	+	+	•
Jensen_2011	(+		+	•	+	8
Kim_2020	+	8	+	+	+	8
Lang_2021	Ŧ	-	Ŧ	•	+	-
Lehtola 2016	+	-	+	•	÷	-
Leibetseder_2007	•	-	+	•	+	
Lomond_2015	+		•		•	
Long_2004	+	8	-	•	•	
Macedo_2012	+		(+)	•	(+)	8
Magalhães_2018	÷		+	•	•	
Michaelson_2016	•	-	•	•	•	-
Moore_2000	•		(+)	•	+	<u> </u>
O'Keeffe_2020	+		+	•	•	
Paolucci 2011	(+)			•		
Petersen_2011	•			•	(+)	
Rabiei_2021	<u> </u>		+	•	•	
Rabin_2014	•		+	•	•	O
Rasmussen-Barr 2009	-		•		+	
Salas_2019			•		+	
Sandal_2021		0	•		•	0
Saner_2015	+		+		•	
Schaller_2016			•		+	
Soukup_1999	+					
Sun_2019						
Tesus 2000						
Van Baol 2000						
Van Dillen 2020						
Vasselien 2012						
Vers 2019						
Vibe Forsum 2012						
Von Korff 2005					-	0
Waisweiner, 2012	4	0	4	4	•	0
Wālti 2015	•	ē	•	•	Ă	0

Domains: D1: Bias arising from the randomization process. D2: Bias due to deviations from intended intervention. D3: Bias due to missing outcome data. D4: Bias in measurement of the outcome. D5: Bias in selection of the reported result.

High Same concern: Low Study-ID (Intervention vs comparator)

10 Mixed





⁹ Yoga 10 Mixed

10 Mixed





⁹ Yoga

10 Mixed