

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Title page

EFFECT OF A PILATES EXERCISE PROGRAM ON THE FLEXION-
RELAXATION RATE IN WOMEN WITH CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN

PhD. Ana Ferri-Caruana ¹¶, PhD. Marco Romagnoli ¹&, BSc Lluís Raimon Salazar-
Bonet ²&, PhD. Walter Staiano¹¶.

¹Department of Physical Education and Sport, Faculty of Science of Physical Activity
and Sport. University of Valencia (Spain).

²International University SEK, Ecuador.

***Corresponding author:**

E-mail: ana.maria.ferri@uv.es

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

& These authors also contributed equally to this work.

* The Ethics Committee of Research in Humans of the Ethics Commission in
Experimental Research of University of Valencia has approved this study (verification
code: WA3051D6M7XSBD26).

28

Title

29

EFFECT OF A PILATES EXERCISE PROGRAM ON THE FLEXION-

30

RELAXATION RATE IN WOMEN WITH CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53 **Abstract**

54 Purpose: To evaluate the effect of a Pilates exercise program (PEP) on FRR and FRR
55 asymmetry of the erector spinae (ES) muscle during standing maximal trunk
56 flexion/extension in women with chronic low-back pain (LBP). A secondary goal was
57 to investigate the effect of PEP on full trunk flexion ROM (TFRoM), pain intensity and
58 functional capacity and analyse their relationship with the FRR. Material and methods:
59 Thirty women with chronic LPB were randomly assigned to either PEP (EG, n=15) or
60 control group (CG=15). EG followed an 8-week PEP while no specific intervention was
61 carried out on the controls. Before and after this period all variables were recorded.
62 Results: FRR did not show any significant changes between or within groups ($p>0.05$).
63 EG showed a significant statistical difference in the FRR asymmetry pre- and post-
64 intervention ($p \leq 0.05$). Full TFRoM did not show any significant changes between or
65 within groups ($p>0.05$). EG showed a significant decrease of 30% on pain intensity and
66 a significant increase of 13.4 % in functional capacity ($P \leq 0.001$) from pre to post-
67 intervention. Conclusions: An 8-week PEP does not affect FRR nor full trunk ROM,
68 however yields improvements in pain intensity and functional capacity. Professionals
69 should be aware of the negative effect on FRR asymmetry.

70

71 Key words: back, pain, strength, Pilates, electromyography, disability.

72

73

74

75

76 **Introduction**

77 Clinical practice guidelines recommend exercise therapy for patients with chronic LBP
78 [1,2] with the goal of improving disability and reducing absence from work due to
79 physical and functional recovery [3,4]. In this regard, Pilates is not only widely
80 extended in social physical activity programs and recommended among health care
81 professionals [5] but also it has been increasingly incorporated into physiotherapy
82 rehabilitation programmes [6-10] for those with chronic LBP.

83 Pilates exercises are performed based on five traditional principles: centering, control,
84 concentration, breath, precision, and flow. These principles unite the body and the mind,
85 and may affect positively performance of the different exercises (i.e. deep breathing,
86 attentional internal focus) and therefore have a positive influence on EMG parameters
87 of lumbo-pelvic muscles [11-13]. For instance, Silva et al. [13] showed that Pilates
88 exercises *double leg stretch*, *coordination*, *crisscross* and *foot work* promoted greater
89 muscle activation than traditional exercises in the upper rectus abdominis.

90 One consistent finding in patients with LBP is an ability to display the flexion-
91 relaxation phenomenon (FRP) during full trunk flexion. The FRP is defined as reduced
92 activity of lumbar extensor muscles in standing maximum trunk flexion [14].

93 The flexo-relaxation ratio (FRR) is a measure for quantifying FRP and is defined as the
94 ratio of the peak EMG amplitude during the flexion motion to the EMG amplitude in
95 full flexion. A smaller flexion-relaxation ratio (FRR) [15,16] and a smaller extension-
96 flexion ratio (EFR) [17] in patients with back pain are the most common differences in
97 ES muscle activity as compared with healthy subjects, indicating that neuromuscular
98 coordination between the trunk and the hip could be abnormal in patients with CLBP.

99 The literature review carried out by Colloca et al. [18] concluded that not only the FRP

100 assessment procedure was reliable but also showed that the absence of the FRP in
101 patients with chronic LBP could be corrected with treatment.

102 There is some controversy regarding the effect of some exercise therapies on the FRP.
103 For instance, conventional physical therapy or a lumbar stabilization exercise program
104 have shown no effect on FRP [19-21] . On the contrary, other studies have shown an
105 increased FRR after a 12-week lumbar spinal exercise program [16,22] or a higher
106 number of patients with a normal flexion-relaxation level and lumbar ROM after a
107 functional restoration rehabilitation program [23].

108 Furthermore, previous studies have investigated asymmetry in the FRP [24-26] since as
109 previously mentioned an imbalance in trunk muscle activation between the right and left
110 sides can induce pain intensity by loading the spine incorrectly in patients with non-
111 specific chronic LBP [27,28].

112 Shahvarpour et al. [21] tested the effect of an 8-week lumbar stabilization program in
113 people with chronic LBP on the EMG/kinematics of paraspinal muscles (longissimus,
114 iliocostalis and multifidus) during trunk maximal flexion-extension. Although they
115 found positive changes on pain intensity and disability following the intervention, the
116 FRR was not changed concomitantly. However, there was not a group control; thus
117 there was no way to compare results with paired participants. FRR asymmetry measures
118 were also not considered.

119 Therefore, the aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of an 8-week Pilates exercise
120 program (PEP) on FRR and FRR asymmetry of the erector spinae (ES) muscle during
121 standing maximal trunk flexion-extension in women with chronic LBP. It was
122 hypothesized that the PEP would increase the FRR and would decrease the FRR
123 asymmetry. A secondary aim of the study was to determine the effect of the PEP on

124 clinical outcomes such as full TFRoM, pain intensity and functional capacity in women
125 with LBP, and explore the relationship with the FRR.

126 **2. Material and methods**

127 **2.1 Participants**

128 The sample size was determined by preliminary power analysis to avoid 5% -error and
129 95% power of the text. Sample size of 15 subjects in each group was obtained. The
130 sample size was increased to account for possible dropouts.

131 Participants were aged between 45 and 65 years old, and were recruited from an
132 advertisement in a community sports halls where many physical activities were
133 delivered (i.e. Pilates, yoga, aerobics, TRX, ...). Seventy-nine people who joined the
134 Pilates activity were contacted before the beginning of the classes. Fifty-nine people
135 were interested in participating in the study and completed the Oswestry Disability
136 Index. Finally, sixteen participants met the inclusion criteria and were included in the
137 experimental group (EG). Posteriorly, from a convenient sample (referrals from the
138 EG), sixteen women with similar characteristics and lifestyle, met the inclusion criteria
139 and were recruited as a control group (CG). There were two drop-outs, one from the EG
140 (abandoned PEP because of a lower leg related injury) and one from the CG (received
141 back physiotherapeutic treatment). Therefore, the final number of participants for each
142 group was 15.

143 The inclusion criteria were: lumbar or lumbosacral pain (with or without radicular pain)
144 for at least six months; a score higher than 6/50 on the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI
145 [29.30] and absence of any back treatment for the last three months.

146 The exclusion criteria were: body mass index > 30 kg/m²; prior surgery of the pelvis,
147 spinal column or lower extremity; scoliosis; systemic or degenerative disease; history of
148 neurological diseases or deficits not related to back pain; pregnancy or hypertension.

149 Before testing, each participant was informed of all experimental procedures and
150 provided their informed written consent. The ethics committee of the University of V.
151 approved the study and the consent form. The study was conducted in compliance with
152 the Declaration of Helsinki.

153

154 **2.2. Exercise intervention**

155 The PEP (1 h x 2 sessions per week x 2 months) was delivered by one Pilate's
156 professional (with a mean of 6.5 years of experience in Pilates). The PEP carried out by
157 Pilate's instructor has been published in a previous study [31]. The exercises focused on
158 core stability, posture, breathing, flexibility, strength, and muscle control, being the
159 active awareness of the use of trunk muscles to stabilize the pelvic-lumbar region the
160 main approach. The exercises performed were: the hundred, the rolled up, single leg
161 circles with bent leg, spine stretch, rolling like a ball and single leg stretch. Each
162 exercise was performed as follows: 4 repetitions of 30 seconds with 2 minutes of
163 recovery between repetitions. In order to complete the 60 minutes session two exercises:
164 the "superman" and the double leg bridge were added to the mentioned PEP.

165 Before the start of the exercise program, all participants from EG received a 1-hour
166 basic introduction to the PEP and were trained in how to activate the core muscles,
167 which involve isometric contraction of the transversus abdominis, pelvic floor, and
168 multifidus muscles while exhaling during diaphragmatic breathing. Adverse events

169 were monitored by pain intensity during the execution of the exercises and before and
170 after sessions. All exercises were performed on a rubber mat of minimum $\frac{3}{4}$ inch thick.

171 The attendance was weekly recorded for each participant. No cointervention was
172 allowed for any of the participants in the study. Both groups continued their usual
173 lifestyle and were allowed to use NSAIDS only if needed. Every three days telephone
174 calls were made to all participants in order to assure that any unusual physical activities
175 were performed.

176 **2.3. Questionnaires**

177 The measure used for LBP-related disability was the transcultural adaptation to the
178 Spanish population of the ODI [29,32] . This questionnaire was used as inclusion
179 criteria. Subjects could participate in the study if they obtained a minimal score of 12%
180 [28].

181 The version adapted to the Spanish population of the Low Back Outcome Score (LBOS)
182 questionnaire [33,34] was used to measure self-reported functional capacity. A 10-cm
183 Visual Analog Scale (VAS) was used to evaluate pain intensity during the last week
184 [35,36]. The left end of the line was anchored with “no pain,” and the right end of the
185 line was anchored with “worst pain”.

186 LBOS and VAS were measured at pre-intervention (T0) and pos-intervention (T8).

187

188 **2.4. Full trunk flexion ROM**

189 To obtain the full trunk flexion ROM (TFRoM), the angular position of the inertial
190 EMG sensor (attached with a kinesio-tape at T3 vertebrae) was measured from the start

191 to the end of the flexion movement. Full TFRoM was calculated as the average TFRoM
192 from the three flexion-extension tasks.

193 **2.5. Flexion-extension tasks**

194 All subjects were assessed with the flexion-extension task pre and post control and
195 intervention periods (T0 and T8, respectively).

196 The subjects stood with their arms by their side and their feet shoulder width apart.
197 Beginning in standing, the subjects were asked to: bend forward as far as possible (4 s
198 to flex); relax in the fully-flexed position (4 s to relax); return to upright standing (4 s to
199 extend); stand quietly for 4 s. This was repeated 3 times in succession. A metronome
200 was used to pace the movements. Subjects were instructed to keep their knees straight,
201 to not contract the abdominal muscles, and to keep their head fully flexed to minimize
202 cervical movement.

203 **2.6. EMG measurements**

204 The electromyographic activity was recorded from the ES right and left muscles with
205 one portable 2- channels device from the Shimmer branch (Realtime Technologies Ltd,
206 Dublin, Ireland) with a 16-bit analog / digital (A / D) conversion. The sampling
207 frequency was programmed at 1024 Hz.

208 During the registration, the EMG signal was monitored using the mDurance software
209 (MDurance Solutions S.L., Granada, Spain) for Android and stored in a cloud server for
210 further analysis.

211 The mDurance software digitally filtered the raw signals automatically through a
212 "Butterworth" band pass filter of the fourth order between 20 and 450 Hz. A cutting
213 frequency for the high-pass of 20 Hz was used to reduce the "artifacts" that could arise

214 during the movement to have an impact minimum in the total power recorded by the
215 EMG [37].

216 The root mean square (RMS) was calculated from the filtered EMG signal. The mean
217 RMS values, measured during the time that the different tests lasted in each of their
218 movement phases were used for the analysis.

219 The skin was shaved, rubbed, and cleaned with alcohol. Bipolar pre gelled electrodes
220 Ag/AgCl surface electrodes (MedCaT B.V, Doorndistel, Spain) were used to record the
221 EMG. Electrode placement were as SENIAM guidelines indicate [38].

222 Asymmetry in muscle activity between both (right and left) ES muscles was calculated
223 as their mean difference in RMS in the three flexion-extension tasks.

224 FRR was calculated by dividing the maximal EMG amplitude during flexion by the
225 minimum EMG amplitude at full flexion [15,22]. The mean of the 3 trials performed
226 was used to determine the FRR for each muscle for each subject. A lower FRR
227 indicated a greater state of muscle relaxation.

228 Asymmetry in the FRR was calculated as the absolute difference between FRR of the
229 right and left ES muscles.

230 **2.7. Statistical analyses**

231 The SPSS software (version 21; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) was used for the statistical
232 analysis. All data are presented as mean and standard deviation (SD), unless otherwise
233 stated. Assumptions of statistical tests such as normal distribution and homogeneity of
234 data were checked with the Shapiro-Wilk test and Levene test, respectively.

235 Independent T-tests were carried out to measure differences at baseline. Two-way
236 repeated measures ANOVA (GROUP X TIME) were carried out for all dependent
237 variables. Significant interactions or main effects were further analysed using a post-hoc

238 Tukey-Kramer test. The effect sizes for repeated measure ANOVA were calculated as
239 partial eta squared (η^2_p) using the small= 0.02, medium= 0.13 and large= 0.26
240 interpretation for effect size. For pain, functional capacity, full back ROM and ES EMG
241 variables correlational analysis (Pearson's correlations) were carried out for all subjects
242 at baseline. For each ES EMG variable correlational analyses (Pearson's correlations)
243 were carried out in participants with LBP to test for the "potential" (hypothesis
244 generation stage) presence of moderator effects or of mechanisms operating during the
245 treatment. A p value of .05 was accepted as the level of significance for all statistical
246 analyses.

247

248 **Results**

249 **Participants**

250 The age, height, weight and BMI were not significantly different between groups at
251 baseline. There were no differences at baseline in the variables of the FRR ($p = .708$),
252 FRR asymmetry ($p = .973$), full TFRoM ($p = .450$), pain intensity and functional
253 capacity. There were no significant differences between groups at baseline in the LBP
254 disability index ODI ($p = .223$), the mean score for CG and EG was of 15.4 % and 10.2
255 % respectively, higher than the minimal score allowed to participate in the study (14%,
256 equivalent to 7/50). See Table 1.

257 Table 1. Mean and SD of subjects' anthropometric measurements, functional capacity
258 and pain status.

| | CG (n=15) X \pm SD | EG (n=15) X \pm SD | <i>p-values</i> |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Age (years) | 56.1 \pm 5.4 | 55.5 \pm 4.6 | 0.74 |
| Height (cm) | 157.4 \pm 1.5 | 161.5 \pm 0.9 | 0.86 |
| Weight (kg) | 66.9 \pm 6.0 | 63.7 \pm 5.6 | 0.14 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------|
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 26.0 ± 2.0 | 24.7 ± 3.0 | 0.18 |
| ODI (/50)) | 13.7 ± 4.4 | 11.1 ± 4.5 | - |
| VAS (/10) | 5.9 ± 1.8 | 5.8 ± 1.8 | 0.93 |
| LBOS (/75) | 46.9 ± 7.4 | 47.9 ± 6.8 | 0.67 |
| LBP prior to study (weeks) | 18.8 ± 6.3 | 19.7 ± 7.5 | 0.34 |

259 *n=number of subjects; X=mean; SD= standard deviation; BMI= body mass index; cm=
 260 centimetre; kg= kilogram; ODI= Oswestry disability index; VAS= Visual analogue
 261 scale;LBOS=Low Back Outcome Score; LBP=Low back pain.
 262

263 None of the 15 participants missed more than 1 session as required to be included in the
 264 analysis.

265 **Effect of the Pilates exercise program on FRR and FRR**
 266 **asymmetry**

267 There was a significant GROUP x TIME interaction for the variable of FRR asymmetry
 268 (p= .044, $\eta^2= 0.137$) (Fig 1). Follow-up tests revealed that the EG showed a significant
 269 (p=.033) increase in FRR asymmetry at post test compared to baseline, while no
 270 significant differences were found in the CG from baseline to post test.

271 ::

272 **Figure 1. FRR asymmetry for each group at pre and post-intervention.**

273 **Effect of the Pilates exercise program on full trunk flexion**
 274 **range of motion, pain intensity and functional capacity and**
 275 **their relationship with FRR.**

276 Full TFRoM did not show any significant changes between or within groups (p>0.05).
 277 There was a significant GROUP x TIME interaction for the variable of pain intensity
 278 (p= 0.003, $\eta^2= 0.268$) (Fig 2). Follow up tests revealed that participants in the EG rated

279 the pain intensity significantly lower (30%) at post-test compared to baseline, while
280 participants in the CG did not show any significant difference in the pain intensity
281 rating from baseline to post interventions.

282

283 **Figure 2. Numeric pain rating scale for each group at pre and post-intervention**
284 (mean ± SD), * p < 0.05, + p < 0.05.

285

286 There was a significant GROUP x TIME interaction for functional capacity (p < .001,
287 $\eta^2 = 0.570$) (Fig 3). Follow-up tests revealed that the EG significantly (p < .001)
288 increased functional capacity (13.4%) at post-test after the PEP intervention, while no
289 significant difference was reported for functional capacity in the CG.

290 FRR did not show any significant interactions or main effects with full TFRoM, pain
291 intensity and functional capacity. But, correlational analysis showed that FRR was
292 positively but weakly correlated with functional capacity (r=0.40, p < 0.05).

293

294 **Figure 3. Functional capacity rating scale for each group at pre- and post-**
295 **intervention** (mean ± SD), * p < 0.001, + p < 0.001.

296

297 Discussion

298 The aim of the present study was to evaluate the effect of an 8-week PEP on FRR and
299 FRR asymmetry of the ES muscle during standing maximal trunk flexion/extension in
300 women with chronic LBP. A secondary goal was to investigate the effect of the PEP on
301 full TFRoM, pain intensity and functional capacity and their relationship with FRR.

302 Since Pilates has shown positive results on EMG parameters due to its principles when
303 compared to other studies using conventional therapy or strength and stability exercises
304 in chronic LBP patients [19-21], we expected to find an improvement in the FRR.

305 However, our results did not show any significant changes between or within groups.

306 As in our study, Shahvarpour et al. [21] did not observe a FRR after an 8-week
307 stabilization program in a group of chronic LBP patients. This could be explained by the
308 fact that in our study participants had no previous Pilates experience. Performing basic
309 Pilates exercises imply learning new concepts such as breathing, concentration and
310 attentional focus while performing an exercise and this *mental* part might be a challenge
311 for beginners. A longer familiarisation/intervention period or doing the study on
312 experienced participants may have provided more positive results on FRR.

313 Our results differ from other studies. Neblett et al. found that 94% of those chronic LBP
314 participants concluding the treatment achieved FRP, even if several failed to improve
315 ROM to normal levels. However, they used a sEMG biofeedback training to teach
316 patients how to relax their backs during flexion, which may have positively influenced
317 the results of the dynamic test of full trunk flexion- extensión movement. Marshall et al.
318 [22] also found an improvement of the FRR in chronic LBP patients, however, there
319 was no way of verifying if the patients showed an impaired FRP at baseline or any
320 changes in PRP following the intervention, since there was no healthy control group.

321 FRR asymmetry was statistically significantly higher from pre- to post intervention. (p
322 <0.05). As studies on FRR asymmetry after an exercise intervention program are scarce,
323 comparison with other studies is difficult. However, since the focus of the PEP program
324 is deep muscle strengthening in a symmetrical fashion and correct alignment of the
325 trunk, we expected an improvement on FRR asymmetry. In this line, Rutkowska et al.

326 [40] did not measure the FRR asymmetry, but they found that asymmetry of EMG
327 activity in ES after a 4-week training programme was maintained yet it was not
328 statistically significant. This is the first study showing that a PEP program has a
329 negative effect on FRR asymmetry. A possible explanation may be due to the fact that
330 the PEP participants start the program with LBP and they may be unconsciously altering
331 the movement pattern of exercises to avoid pain. So, health care professionals should be
332 aware of possible negative motor control adjustments of LBP participants during a PEP
333 program. We did not specify participants LBP location (right-left), therefore it would
334 be interesting for future studies to determine the relationship between LBP location and
335 FRR asymmetry after an exercise intervention.

336 More research on EMG parameters is necessary to give scientific support to the
337 philosophical and conceptual premises of Pilates if it is to be systematically included in
338 rehabilitation and training programmes.

339 There is controversy regarding the effect of a Pilates exercise intervention on trunk
340 ROM in people with chronic LBP [21,41-43] . The results of Shahvarpour et al. [21] are
341 very similar to ours since they found that although pain was decreased and functional
342 capacity improved, full TFRoM was not improved concomitantly. Our study supports
343 the idea that not only TFRoM does not change but FRR does as well. This could be
344 explained by the fact that participants from the study presented a low score in the ODI
345 (11/50), thus changes in neuromuscular efficiency improvement may be more difficult to
346 achieve. Further research should investigate whether similar findings exist in
347 individuals with more severe pain or higher levels of disability.

348 Our results on pain reduction are in line with most of the studies that show
349 improvements (between 16% - 54%) on pain after a PEP intervention [6-8,41-46].

350 Therefore, we support the idea that Pilates exercises are a good option to improve pain

351 intensity, but our study shows no relationship between pain improvement and FRR. Our
352 hypothesis is that participants with chronic LBP may have learnt to stiffen the lumbar
353 spine during the PEP, producing no changes on FRR during the trunk flexion-extension
354 task.

355 Regarding functional capacity, our participants improved 9.8 %, which is a result lower
356 compared to the result obtained by Kofotolis et al. [47] with a 33.3% improvement on
357 disability in female chronic LBP patients. Improvement on function in the present
358 study (7.4 points) can be considered clinically significant, as a improvement of 7.5
359 (10%) change in the 75 point LBOS is widely used as a criterion of clinically significant
360 change for patients with only LBP [48]. Interestingly, FRR was positively correlated
361 with functional capacity. One previous study [49] has demonstrated that increases in the
362 FRP following a 12-week exercise intervention was the best predictor of improvements
363 in self-reported disability. However, in our study the correlation of functional capacity
364 with FRR was very weak, therefore we cannot assume that the improvement in
365 functional capacity is explained by an improvement in the FRR.

366 This study had some limitations. First, the fact that patients were recruited from
367 advertisements, may affect the generalizability of results. Secondly, using one
368 inclinometer to measure TFRoM does not account for movements of the pelvis.
369 Methods using twin inclinometers or the motion system analysis could be alternatives,
370 as these would remove any pelvis movement from the equation.

371 **Conclusion**

372 The intervention of an 8-week PEP in women with chronic LBP did not positively or
373 negatively affect the FRR, but it did negatively affect the FRR asymmetry (primary
374 outcome). Health professionals should be aware of the increased asymmetry on the ES

375 that is caused by the application of a PEP program on chronic LBP patients. Further
376 research is needed to understand the cause of pain intensity and functional capacity
377 improvement after a PEP program.

378 Furthermore, the PEP yielded improvements in pain intensity and functional capacity
379 (secondary outcome) and it can be administered safely since it is well tolerated by
380 female chronic LBP patients.

381 **Acknowledgements**

382 The authors would like to thank Berta Dabaliña, Amparo Soler and the professional
383 staff from “Sagunto Patronato Municipal de Deportes” for participant recruitment and
384 delivery of the PEP program.

385 Financial Disclosure statement: The author(s) received no specific funding for this
386 work.

387 **References**

388 1. Airaksinen O, Brox JI, Cedraschi C, Hildebrandt J, Klaber-Moffett J, Kovacs F,
389 et al. European guidelines for the management of chronic nonspecific low back pain.
390 European spine journal. 2006;15(Suppl 2):s192.

391 2. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, Forcica MA. Noninvasive treatments for
392 acute, subacute, and chronic low back pain: a clinical practice guideline from the
393 American College of Physicians. Annals of internal medicine. 2017;166(7):514–30.

394 3. Schaafsma F, Schonstein E, Ojajärvi A, Verbeek J. Physical conditioning
395 programs for improving work outcomes among workers with back pain. Scandinavian
396 journal of work, environment & health. 2011;1–5.

397 4. Staal JB, Rainville J, Fritz J, Van Mechelen W, Pransky G. Physical exercise

398 interventions to improve disability and return to work in low back pain: current insights
399 and opportunities for improvement. *Journal of occupational Rehabilitation*.
400 2005;15(4):491–505.

401 5. Yamato TP, Maher CG, Saragiotto BT, Hancock MJ, Ostelo RW, Cabral CM, et
402 al. Pilates for low back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2015;(7).

403 6. Valenza MC, Rodríguez-Torres J, Cabrera-Martos I, Díaz-Pelegrina A, Aguilar-
404 Ferrándiz ME, Castellote-Caballero Y. Results of a Pilates exercise program in patients
405 with chronic non-specific low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical
406 rehabilitation*. 2017;31(6):753–60.

407 7. da Silva ML, Miyamoto GC, Franco KFM, dos Santos Franco YR, Cabral CMN.
408 Different weekly frequencies of Pilates did not accelerate pain improvement in patients
409 with chronic low back pain. *Brazilian journal of physical therapy*. 2019;

410 8. Cruz-Díaz D, Bergamin M, Gobbo S, Martínez-Amat A, Hita-Contreras F.
411 Comparative effects of 12 weeks of equipment based and mat Pilates in patients with
412 Chronic Low Back Pain on pain, function and transversus abdominis activation. A
413 randomized controlled trial. *Complementary therapies in medicine*. 2017;33:72–7.

414 9. Miyamoto GC, Franco KFM, van Dongen JM, dos Santos Franco YR, de
415 Oliveira NTB, Amaral DDV, et al. Different doses of Pilates-based exercise therapy for
416 chronic low back pain: a randomised controlled trial with economic evaluation. *Br J
417 Sports Med*. 2018;52(13):859–68.

418 10. Hasanpour-Dehkordi A, Dehghani A, Solati K. A comparison of the effects of
419 pilates and mckenzie training on pain and general health in men with chronic low back
420 pain: A randomized trial. *Indian journal of palliative care*. 2017;23(1):36.

- 421 11. Esco MR, Olson MS, Martin RS, Woollen E, Ellis M, Williford HN.
422 Abdominal EMG of selected Pilates' mat exercises. *Medicine & Science in Sports &*
423 *Exercise*. 2004;36(5):S357.
- 424 12. Calatayud J, Casaña J, Martín F, Jakobsen MD, Andersen LL, Colado JC.
425 Electromyographic effect of using different attentional foci during the front plank
426 exercise. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation*. 2019;98(1):26–9.
- 427 13. Silva GB, Morgan MM, de Carvalho WRG, Silva E, de Freitas WZ, da Silva FF,
428 et al. Electromyographic activity of rectus abdominis muscles during dynamic Pilates
429 abdominal exercises. *Journal of bodywork and movement therapies*. 2015;19(4):629–
430 35.
- 431 14. Floyd WF, Silver PHS. The function of the erectores spinae muscles in certain
432 movements and postures in man. *The Journal of physiology*. 1955;129(1):184.
- 433 15. Geisser ME, Haig AJ, Wallbom AS, Wiggert EA. Pain-related fear, lumbar
434 flexion, and dynamic EMG among persons with chronic musculoskeletal low back pain.
435 *The Clinical journal of pain*. 2004;20(2):61–9.
- 436 16. Neblett R, Mayer TG, Gatchel RJ, Keeley J, Proctor T, Anagnostis C.
437 Quantifying the lumbar flexion–relaxation phenomenon: theory, normative data, and
438 clinical applications. *Spine*. 2003;28(13):1435–46.
- 439 17. Sihvonen T, Partanen J, Hänninen O, Soimakallio S. Electric behavior of low
440 back muscles during lumbar pelvic rhythm in low back pain patients and healthy
441 controls. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 1991;72(13):1080–7.
- 442 18. Colloca CJ, Hinrichs RN. The biomechanical and clinical significance of the
443 lumbar erector spinae flexion-relaxation phenomenon: a review of literature. *Journal of*

- 444 manipulative and physiological therapeutics. 2005;28(8):623–31.
- 445 19. Mannion AF, Taimela S, Müntener M, Dvorak J. Active therapy for chronic low
446 back pain: part 1. Effects on back muscle activation, fatigability, and strength. *Spine*.
447 2001;26(8):897–908.
- 448 20. Ritvanen T, Zaproudina N, Nissen M, Leinonen V, Hänninen O. Dynamic
449 surface electromyographic responses in chronic low back pain treated by traditional
450 bone setting and conventional physical therapy. *Journal of manipulative and*
451 *physiological therapeutics*. 2007;30(1):31–7.
- 452 21. Shahvarpour A, Henry SM, Preuss R, Mecheri H, Larivière C. The effect of an
453 8-week stabilization exercise program on the lumbopelvic rhythm and flexion-
454 relaxation phenomenon. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 2017;48:1–8.
- 455 22. Marshall P, Murphy B. Changes in the flexion relaxation response following an
456 exercise intervention. *Spine*. 2006;31(23):E877–83.
- 457 23. Mayer TG, Neblett R, Brede E, Gatchel RJ. The quantified lumbar flexion-
458 relaxation phenomenon is a useful measurement of improvement in a functional
459 restoration program. *Spine*. 2009;34(22):2458–65.
- 460 24. Kim S-J, Cho B-H. The effects of empowered motivation on exercise adherence
461 and physical fitness in college women. *Journal of exercise rehabilitation*. 2013;9(2):278.
- 462 25. Ning X, Haddad O, Jin S, Mirka GA. Influence of asymmetry on the flexion
463 relaxation response of the low back musculature. *Clinical Biomechanics*.
464 2011;26(1):35–9.
- 465 26. Rose-Dulcina K, Genevay S, Dominguez D, Armand S, Vuillerme N. Flexion-
466 Relaxation Ratio Asymmetry and Its Relation With Trunk Lateral ROM in Individuals

- 467 With and Without Chronic Nonspecific Low Back Pain. *Spine*. 2020;45(1):E1–9.
- 468 27. Marras WS, Davis KG, Ferguson SA, Lucas BR, Gupta P. Spine loading
469 characteristics of patients with low back pain compared with asymptomatic individuals.
470 *Spine*. 2001;26(23):2566–74.
- 471 28. Grabiner MD, Koh TJ, El Ghazawi A. Decoupling of bilateral paraspinal
472 excitation in subjects with low back pain. *Spine*. 1992;17(10):1219–23.
- 473 29. Fairbank JC, Couper J, Davies JB, O’Brien JP. The Oswestry low back pain
474 disability questionnaire. *Physiotherapy*. 1980;66(8):271–3.
- 475 30. Ostelo RW, Deyo RA, Stratford P, Waddell G, Croft P, Von Korff M, et al.
476 Interpreting change scores for pain and functional status in low back pain: towards
477 international consensus regarding minimal important change. *Spine*. 2008;33(1):90–4.
- 478 31. Patti A, Bianco A, Paoli A, Messina G, Montalto MA, Bellafiore M, et al. Pain
479 perception and stabilometric parameters in people with chronic low back pain after a
480 Pilates exercise program: a randomized controlled trial. *Medicine*. 2016;95(2).
- 481 32. Flórez García M. Adaptación transcultural a la población española de la escala
482 de incapacidad por dolor lumbar de Oswestry. *Rehabilitación*. 1995;29:138–45.
- 483 33. Crespo AM, Ara MT, Negro MDM, Tejada MT. Adaptación transcultural del
484 cuestionario LBOS a la población española. *Rehabilitación*. 2006;40(3):132–40.
- 485 34. Greenough CG, Fraser RD. Assessment of outcome in patients with low-back
486 pain. *Spine*. 1992;17(1):36–41.
- 487 35. Huskisson EC. Measurement of pain. *The lancet*. 1974;304(7889):1127–31.
- 488 36. Love A, Leboeuf C, Crisp TC. Chiropractic chronic low back pain sufferers and

489 self-report assessment methods. Part I. A reliability study of the Visual Analogue Scale,
490 the Pain Drawing and the McGill Pain Questionnaire. *Journal of Manipulative and*
491 *Physiological Therapeutics*. 1989;12(1):21–5.

492 37. Clancy EA, Morin EL, Merletti R. Sampling, noise-reduction and amplitude
493 estimation issues in surface electromyography. *Journal of electromyography and*
494 *kinesiology*. 2002;12(1):1–16.

495 38. Hermens HJ, Freriks B, Merletti R, Stegeman D, Blok J, Rau G, et al. European
496 recommendations for surface electromyography. *Roessingh research and development*.
497 1999;8(2):13–54.

498 39. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated
499 guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *Annals of internal medicine*.
500 2010;152(11):726–32.

501 40. Rutkowska-Kucharska A, Szpala A. The use of electromyography and magnetic
502 resonance imaging to evaluate a core strengthening exercise programme. *Journal of*
503 *back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2018;31(2):355–62.

504 41. Bhadauria EA, Gurudut P. Comparative effectiveness of lumbar stabilization,
505 dynamic strengthening, and Pilates on chronic low back pain: randomized clinical trial.
506 *Journal of exercise rehabilitation*. 2017;13(4):477.

507 42. Llewellyn H, Konstantaki M, Johnson MI, Francis P. The effect of a Pilates
508 exercise programme on perceived functional disability and pain associated with non-
509 specific chronic low back pain. *MOJ Yoga & Physical Therapy*. 2017;2(1).

510 43. Natour J, Cazotti L de A, Ribeiro LH, Baptista AS, Jones A. Pilates improves
511 pain, function and quality of life in patients with chronic low back pain: a randomized

- 512 controlled trial. *Clinical rehabilitation*. 2015;29(1):59–68.
- 513 44. Patti A, Bianco A, Paoli A, Messina G, Montalto MA, Bellafiore M, et al.
514 Effects of Pilates exercise programs in people with chronic low back pain: a systematic
515 review. *Medicine*. 2015;94(4).
- 516 45. Miyamoto GC, Costa LOP, Galvanin T, Cabral CMN. Efficacy of the addition
517 of modified Pilates exercises to a minimal intervention in patients with chronic low
518 back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Physical therapy*. 2013;93(3):310–20.
- 519 46. Rydeard R, Leger A, Smith D. Pilates-based therapeutic exercise: effect on
520 subjects with nonspecific chronic low back pain and functional disability: a randomized
521 controlled trial. *Journal of orthopaedic & sports physical therapy*. 2006;36(7):472–84.
- 522 47. Kofotolis N, Kellis E, Vlachopoulos SP, Gouitas I, Theodorakis Y. Effects of
523 Pilates and trunk strengthening exercises on health-related quality of life in women with
524 chronic low back pain. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*.
525 2016;29(4):649–59.
- 526 48. Khatri M, Murray M, Greenough CG. Minimum clinically important difference
527 in low back outcome score in individuals with low back pain. In: *Orthopaedic*
528 *Proceedings*. The British Editorial Society of Bone & Joint Surgery; 2003. p. 236–236.
- 529 49. Watson PJ, Booker CK, Main CJ, Chen ACN. Surface electromyography in the
530 identification of chronic low back pain patients: the development of the flexion
531 relaxation ratio. *Clinical Biomechanics*. 1997;12(3):165–71.
- 532
- 533
- 534

535

536

537


538

539


540

541

FRR asymmetry



Pain



Functional Capacity

