

1 **Whether core stability training has a positive therapeutic**
2 **effect on LBP patients: a Meta-analysis**

3 Zecheng Li¹, Xuebin Liu² , Siya Li²

4 **Contact address**

5 Zecheng Li: College of Sports Science, Harbin Normal University, Harbin, China

6 Xuebin Liu: College of Sports Science, Harbin Normal University, Harbin, China

7 Siya Li: College of Sports Science, Harbin Normal University, Harbin, China

8 **Email**

9 Zecheng Li: 395070713@qq.com

10 Xuebin Liu: liulusprite@163.com

11 Siya Li: 1713808529@qq.com

12 **Corresponding author**

13 Zecheng Li: College of Sports Science, Harbin Normal University, Harbin, China

14 Email: 395070713@qq.com

15 **Author contributions**

16 Zecheng Li: main writer of this review, work for study design, data collection, data
17 extraction, data analysis and draft preparation.

18 Xuebin Liu: work for study design, data collection.

19 Siya Li: work for study design, data extraction.

20

21 Whether core stability training has a positive therapeutic 22 effect on LBP patients: a Meta-analysis

23 Abstract

24 **Objective:** The main goal of this study is to determine whether engaging in core stability
25 exercises benefits LBP sufferers.

26 **Background:** As a common exercise therapy, core stability training has gradually
27 become the main treatment for LBP patients to relieve pain. Although many similar
28 researches have showed a significant impact of core stability training on LBP, many
29 scholars still have the opposite experimental conclusion, that is, core stability training
30 has no significant therapeutic effect on LBP patients.

31 **Methods:** Only randomized controlled could be included in this study, and we used the
32 Web of Science, Cochrane Library, Embase, CNKI databases, China Science and
33 Technology Journal Database and PubMed for article retrieval. Among them, non-LBP
34 patients, non-core training, and articles with imperfect outcome indicators were not
35 included.

36 **Results:** This analysis incorporated findings from 21 relevant studies in total. The results
37 showed that, although that the overall effect was not significant, core stability training
38 was helpful for LBP patients. The results of two secondary outcomes (generic health and
39 specific function) showed that core stability training had no practical significance for the
40 improvement of generic health and specific function of LBP patients. The specific results
41 are as follows: pain (SMD = 2.74, 95%CI: 1.40-4.08, $P < 0.0001$), disability (SMD = 2.52,
42 95%CI: 1.69-3.36, $P < 0.00001$), generic health (SMD = 1.08, 95%CI: 0.07-2.08, $P =$

43 0.04), specific function (SMD = 1.99, 95%CI: -0.04-4.02, P = 0.05).

44 **Conclusions:** We recommend that core stability training be used for short-term therapy,
45 but not for long-term therapy.

46 Introduction

47 Low back pain (LBP) is a frequent illness that impacts people's daily activities and
48 work. It can be roughly divided into specific LBP (SLBP), non-specific LBP (NSLBP or
49 NLBP), acute LBP, chronic LBP (CLBP), chronic non-specific LBP (CNLBP) and
50 recurrent LBP. Some scholars have proposed in related studies that LBP has a serious
51 and far-reaching impact on people, so it is difficult to assess its impact on people's daily
52 lives[1]. First, LBP will affect 80% of people in their lifetime, and the lifetime prevalence
53 rate is over 80%. Secondly, when receiving LBP treatment, it will affect the daily work of
54 patients, increase the risk of other diseases and additional medical expenses while
55 causing wage losses, to a certain extent, damage the social labor force and endanger
56 social development [2, 3].

57 According to the research of Xu [4], they divided the main clinical treatment methods
58 of LBP into drug therapy, physical factor therapy, and exercise therapy. Because drug
59 therapy may be accompanied by side effects such as nausea and fatigue [5], physical
60 factor therapy is difficult to treat long-term pain, so exercise therapy will gradually
61 become the mainstream treatment of LBP. After summarizing past research and clinical
62 practice, other scholars also found that exercise therapy appears to be one of the
63 effective means to reduce pain, promote recovery in LBP patients [6, 7]. Based on this,
64 Dianne Liddle conducted a questionnaire survey on exercise therapy for LBP patients in

65 Ireland. The questionnaire includes many types of exercise techniques, such as spinal
66 muscle-related exercises, conventional muscle exercises, and specialized, customized
67 exercises [8], to establish exercise therapy recommendations and exercise rehabilitation
68 guidelines for chronic LBP management.

69 There are many kinds of exercise therapy for LBP, such as routine exercise, ball
70 stability exercise, muscle strengthening exercise, Pilates exercise and so on. Among
71 them, core stability exercise is not only a very popular and easy to practice fitness
72 method, but also an important treatment measure in the field of rehabilitation medicine
73 and sports medicine [9]. Despite the fact that several similar research have
74 demonstrated a significant impact of core stability training on LBP [10, 11]. However, in
75 recent years, many scholars have obtained the opposite conclusion in clinical trials. After
76 comparing core stability training with regular training, Shamsi argued that traditional
77 training is just as beneficial as core stability training for reducing disability and pain in
78 LBP patients, and there is no significant difference in the therapeutic effect between
79 traditional training and core stability training [12]. Similar to Shamsi, Smith also
80 concluded that core stability training had no significant effect on LBP patients after
81 including 29 related studies up to 2013 [2]. In summary, different scholars have different
82 attitudes towards the therapeutic effect of core stability training, and the influence of core
83 stability exercise on LBP patients is controversial.

84 Shojania [13] was proposed in 2007 that about 23% of review studies will expire
85 within two years. Therefore, different scholars ' different views and opinions on the
86 therapeutic effect of core stability training may be caused by timeliness. In addition,

87 previous studies were different in the selection of subjects and the setting of intervention
88 measures. For example, Wang's restrictive definition of core stability exercises is to
89 practice on unstable surfaces, in contrast to other scholars who chose core muscle
90 workouts and core-related stable motions, and the quantity of literatures included is
91 small, with only 5 papers included [3]; Niederer and Mueller[14] [14] only evaluated
92 individuals with chronic nonspecific LBP and found no benefit of core stability training on
93 other categories of LBP patients. According to this, we conclude that one of the reasons
94 why scholars have different views on the therapeutic effect of core stability training is that
95 the types of interventions included in the study and control group are too single.

96 Based on the above problems, this study retrieved and included the latest RCT
97 results in recent years to ensure the timeliness of the study. At the same time, a variety
98 of LBP patients including NSLBP, CLBP, and recurrent LBP were widely included in the
99 study to prevent the simplification of the study subjects from affecting the results. In
100 terms of intervention measures, we adopt a broader definition of the experimental group,
101 including core stability training, core strength training, core muscle strengthening training,
102 segmental stability and other exercises related to core stability, and in the control group
103 also included various exercise treatments. The purpose is to explore whether core
104 stability exercise therapy is superior to other exercise therapies, and whether core
105 stability exercise has a good therapeutic effect and positive impact on all kinds of LBP
106 patients.

107 **methods**

108 This review was structured using the PRISMA method (Preferred Reporting Items

109 for Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews). The procedure was also included in the
110 International Prospective Registry of Systematic Reviews. (PEOSPERO:
111 CRD42023404448).

112 **search strategy**

113 We used the following Boolean search syntax to search for potential related articles, the
114 complete search strategy sees Table 1. We deleted duplicate documents retrieved in
115 multiple databases.

116 **Table 1. search strategy**

117 **Inclusion Criteria**

118 Each study had to meet the PICO standards in order to be taken into consideration
119 for this review.

120 **Types of studies.**

121 Just the randomized controlled trial (RCT) was examined in this study. Studies
122 comparing a collection of stabilization exercises with various physical therapy or medical
123 therapy groups were also included. We only included the research with Chinese and
124 English as a language.

125 **Types of participants.**

126 We excluded studies that included participants with Lumbar surgery. Also, we did
127 not include any patients whose LBP was brought on by particular diseases or disorders.
128 Meanwhile, we did not set any limitations for age and gender.

129 **Types of interventions and comparisons**

130 As mentioned above, we only accept core stability or core stability-related training

131 as the intervention group. We have no restrictions on the control group, including various
132 exercise therapies, drug therapies, and many different physical therapies.

133 Only one control group's data can be reviewed if the study includes two or more
134 control groups (for instance, general exercise and massage treatment or general
135 exercise and massage therapy and muscle strengthening exercise).

136 **Types of outcome measures.**

137 The primary outcomes of this review were pain intensity and disability, and the
138 visual analog scale was predominantly used to generate the pain intensity measure
139 (VAS). The outcome unit we accepted is 1-100mm. If the unit is not uniform, we will
140 perform unit conversion when analyzing the data.

141 For disability, most studies which we included used the Oswestry Disability
142 Questionnaire (ODQ), the Modified Oswestry Disability Questionnaire (MODQ) and the
143 Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) to assess disability. And only a small part of studies
144 used other tools to evaluate disability, such as the Roland Morris Disability
145 Questionnaire (RMDQ), and the Functional Rating Index (FRI) questionnaire.

146 The secondary outcomes were patient-specific function and generic health. We
147 evaluated generic health by using Short-Form 36 (SF-36) and measured function by
148 using Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS).

149 **Study selection and data extraction**

150 Using predetermined criteria, we chose the titles, abstracts, and full papers of
151 pertinent studies. Then we extracted the following data from the included articles: study
152 design, information of participants (age, gender, numbers), intervention design

153 (experimental and control), treatment condition (frequency and duration), outcome
154 measure, follow-up, and drop-out. Afterwards, we created a common table by using
155 these data (S2 Table.).

156 **Table 2. Characteristics of Included Studies**

157 **Assessing the Risk of Bias**

158 We evaluated the risk of bias for each article using the Cochrane Handbook for
159 Systematic Reviews of Interventions [15]. To assess the caliber of the included research,
160 we also employed the PEDro scale, which has 11 components [16]. If two reviewers
161 dispute the results of the study, consult a third reviewer for a decision.

162 **Statistical Analysis**

163 Using Review Manager Software, we conducted analyzes on each of the papers we
164 included (RevMan5.2). Because the data included in the study are continuous data, we
165 pooled the data, chose the standardized mean difference (SMD) as a useful sign, and
166 provided a 95% confidence interval (CI) for the variance.

167 The I^2 statistic was used to quantify heterogeneity, and the Cochrane Q statistic was
168 used to determine whether heterogeneity occurred among the included studies (test
169 level = 0.05). Since our data is random, we chose the random-effects (RE) model.
170 If the level of heterogeneity is too high, we will do subgroup analysis and sensitivity
171 analysis to identify the factors contributing to it. If it is impossible to pinpoint the exact
172 cause of heterogeneity, a descriptive analysis is conducted.

173 **Result**

174 **Search Results**

175 As previously noted, we search studies in the Embase, Cochrane Library, PubMed,
176 Web of Science, and CNKI databases. Fig 1 depicts the entire selection procedure for
177 qualifying studies.

178 **Fig 1. Research and study selection for PRISMA-compliant systematic reviews.**

179 We initially retrieved 964 related articles from the database. 632 articles were
180 excluded before screening, of which 413 were duplicates, 77 were excluded by
181 automated tools, and 142 were excluded for other reasons. After reviewing the title,
182 abstract, and keywords of relevant studies, reviewers rejected 302 papers. and
183 discovered that there were 6 reports that couldn't be retrieved. After reading the full text
184 of the included studies, we excluded 3 articles, reasons being: Incomplete data[17, 18](n
185 = 2), Ineligible controls [19](n = 1). That left a total of 21 studies for inclusion[12, 17,
186 20-39].

187 **Characteristics of the included studies**

188 For the primary outcomes, as shown in Supplementary Table 2, 21 studies of LPB
189 patients were eligible, with 16 studies used a visual analogue scale (VAS) to measure
190 pain. 4 studies used the ODI to measure disability, whilst 4 studies measured disability
191 by using the RMDQ, 2 studies used the ODQ to measure disability, and two studies
192 measured disability by using the MODQ. One study also included the FRI questionnaire
193 as a disability outcome measure.

194 For the secondary outcomes, we included 2 studies for measuring specific function
195 by using the Patient-Specific Functional Scale (PSFS). And we still included 2 studies as
196 a generic health outcome measure, which used the Short-Form 36 (SF-36).

197 Risk of bias and quality assessment

198 The PEDro scale revealed that none of the studies were of low quality (see S4
199 Table.) and Fig 2 depicts the risk of bias for the included research. The PEDro scale
200 showed that although only 5 articles used the blind method (blinding of participants or
201 therapists or assessors) in the research process, the overall score was still high, and
202 most participants were randomly assigned and hidden during allocation.

203 Table 3. Study quality and risk of bias.

204 Fig 2. Risk of bias of this review

205 One study of the 21 studies included in this review did not use randomized
206 techniques and did not report allocation concealment[28]. In addition, we also found one
207 study did not report complete outcome data[36]. We believed that the design features of
208 the two studies may affect the results of the experiment. Hence, it was determined that
209 the two studies had a significant probability of bias.

210 Outcomes

211 pain intensity

212 17 studies used VAS to assess the efficacy of core stability training in LBP patients.
213 Through the forest plot generated by related software, the VAS scale was significantly
214 higher in the experimental group than in the control group (SMD = 2.98, 95%CI:
215 1.79-4.18, $P < 0.00001$). Then we performed a subgroup analysis of the included studies
216 using duration as a criterion due to the high heterogeneity. It was divided into 5
217 subgroups and we excluded 5 studies by sensitivity analysis[25, 30, 34, 36, 39].

218 The results show that the heterogeneity between some groups has decreased

219 slightly, but the overall heterogeneity is still high. The subgroup heterogeneity of 8 weeks
220 duration ($I^2 = 44\%$) decreased, the heterogeneity of the 6-week subgroup did not change
221 significantly ($I^2 = 96\%$), as well as a shift in the total pooled effect (SMD = 2.74, 95%CI:
222 1.40-4.08, $P < 0.0001$). See Fig 3 for all details.

223 **Fig 3. forest plot of pain intensity**

224 **disability**

225 We performed subgroup analysis based on different outcome measures tool (Fig 4).
226 In addition, we performed a sensitivity analysis because the findings of the study were
227 highly heterogeneous, and we ultimately decided to exclude 4 related studies[22, 25, 26,
228 35]. The results of ODI (SMD = 3.66, 95%CI: 2.76-4.55, $P < 0.00001$), RMDQ (SMD =
229 1.66, 95%CI: 0.54-2.79, $P = 0.004$) and FRI (SMD = 2.68, 95% CI: 1.85-3.50, $P <$
230 0.00001) showed that core stability exercise significantly improved LBP patients, but
231 ODQ (SMD = 3.22, 95%CI: -0.64-7.08, $P = 0.10$) and MODQ (SMD = 2.83, 95%CI:
232 -1.12-6.79, $P = 0.16$) were not statistically significant.

233 **Fig 4. forest plot of disability**

234 **generic health**

235 We calculated the physical component score and mental component score of
236 patients by using the SF-36, and the results indicated that there is a significant degree of
237 heterogeneity in the outcome indicators. As Fig 5 shown that both physical component
238 score (SMD = 1.64, 95%CI: -1.75-5.04 $P = 0.34$) and mental component score (SMD =
239 0.73, 95%CI: -0.04-1.51, $P = 0.06$) were not statistically significant.

240 **Fig 5. forest plot of generic health**

241 **specific function**

242 Fig 6 shows that there were only 2 studies included in this review for specific
243 function, result have high heterogeneity (SMD = 1.99, 95%CI: -0.04-4.02, $I^2 = 98\%$) and
244 not statistically significant ($P = 0.05$). There was no subgroup analysis of the results
245 because there weren't many literatures included.

246 **Fig 6. forest plot of specific function**

247 **discussion**

248 **Summary of main findings**

249 The results of pain intensity (SMD = 2.74, 95% CI: 1.40-4.08), disability (SMD = 2.68,
250 95%CI: 1.85-3.50), health (SMD = 1.08, 95%CI: 0.07-2.08) and function (SMD = 1.99,
251 95%CI: -0.04-4.02) were all shown that core stability training has a beneficial impact and
252 effect on those with LBP. This view is consistent with the results of a meta-analysis
253 published by Smith, Wang, Han [2, 3, 6, 14, 40-42] . In terms of follow-up, not all studies
254 have followed up on the patients, but the analysis of the known follow-up results shows
255 that there are no adverse reactions to the treatment of LBP patients with core stable
256 exercise.

257 **Sustainable therapeutic effect**

258 This review does not examine the effect of core stability exercises on the long-term
259 sustainability of LBP patients, as Coulombe and Elbayomy did. Only the results of the
260 pain intensity part involve the sustainable therapeutic effect of core stability training on
261 LBP patients. Summing up the existing results, the experimental group's VAS data
262 results with interventions lasting six, eight, and twelve weeks were considerably better

263 than those with interventions lasting four and three months. This shows that the short-
264 and medium-term advantages of core stability training outweigh the long-term
265 advantages, which is consistent with the previous research results[2,3,40,41].

266 **Therapeutic effect of all LBP patients**

267 Due to the lack of relevant studies included in this review, subgroup analysis cannot
268 be performed on all types of LBP patients. On the whole, the types of LBP patients
269 included in the review are rich, involving NLBP, CNLBP, subacute NSLBP, acute NSLPB,
270 recurrent LBP. According to the findings, core stability training has different effects on
271 different types of LBP patients. The impact on some LBP patients may not be significant,
272 but on the whole, it can still have a positive impact on LBP patients, which is basically
273 consistent with the meta-analysis results of other single-type LBP patients. In summary,
274 we believed that core stability training has a positive effect on all types of LBP patients,
275 and compared with other treatment methods, core stability training also has a certain
276 improvement effect in reducing the pain and disability impact of LBP patients.

277 **Explanation of heterogeneity**

278 The heterogeneity of the four outcome indicators in this review is high, so we
279 performed sensitivity analysis and subgroup analysis on the two primary outcome
280 indicators (pain and disability). Although the heterogeneity between subgroups is slightly
281 reduced, the heterogeneity of the overall results is still high (pain intensity: $I^2 = 97\%$,
282 disability: $I^2 = 95\%$). The intervention strategies used in the control group and the
283 diversity of participants were the main differences between the studies included in this
284 study, as shown in Table 2. Considering the goal of this study, we cannot optimize it, so

285 we believe that the above two points are important reasons for the high heterogeneity of
286 the main outcome indicators of this study.

287 The heterogeneity of the results of the two secondary outcome indicators is also too
288 high. We believe that the reasons for the high heterogeneity of the secondary outcome
289 indicators should be like the reasons for the high heterogeneity of the main outcome
290 indicators. In addition, insufficient relevant studies to allow us to perform sensitivity
291 analysis and subgroup analysis may also be an important factor leading to high
292 heterogeneity.

293 **Limitation of this review**

294 There were several limitations to this review that should be mentioned. The overall
295 number of studies included in this review was too few to do a sufficient subgroup
296 analysis, which is the first limitation. The second limitation is the high heterogeneity. Due
297 to the purpose of the study, the participants and interventions of the experiment cannot
298 be unified, so the high heterogeneity may affect the credibility of the final results.

299 **Conclusion**

300 We feel that core stability training is effective for treating low back pain and has a
301 good impact on patients with all types of LBP based on the examination of the research
302 findings. However, it is only suitable for reducing the pain of LBP patients and reducing
303 the impact of disability on daily life. The findings of this study cannot conclusively
304 demonstrate that core stability training also benefits LBP patients in other ways (general
305 health, particular function). Compared with other exercise therapies, we believe that core
306 stability training has advantages in the treatment of LBP patients, but the advantages are

307 not obvious. For short-term therapy, but not for long-term therapy, we advise using core

308 stability exercises.

309 **Supporting information**

310 **S1 Table. search strategy**

311 **S2 Table. Characteristics of Included Studies**

312 **S3 Figure. Research and study selection for PRISMA-compliant systematic reviews**

313 **S4 Table. Study quality and risk of bias.**

314 **S5 Figure. Risk of bias of this review**

315 **S7 Figure. forest plot of disability**

316 **S8 Figure. forest plot of generic health**

317 **S9 Figure. forest plot of specific function**

318 **Author contributions**

319 Zecheng Li: main writer of this review, work for study design, data collection, data

320 extraction, data analysis and draft preparation.

321 Xuebin Liu: work for study design, data collection.

322 Siya Li: work for study design, data extraction.

323 **References**

324 1. Katz RT. Impairment and disability rating in low back pain. Clinics in occupational and

325 environmental medicine. 2006;5(3):719-40, viii.

326 2. Smith BE, Littlewood C, May S. An update of stabilisation exercises for low back pain: a

327 systematic review with meta-analysis. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2014;15(1):1-21.

328 3. Wang X-Q, Zheng J-J, Yu Z-W, Bi X, Lou S-J, Liu J, et al. A meta-analysis of core

- 329 stability exercise versus general exercise for chronic low back pain. PloS one.
330 2012;7(12):e52082.
- 331 4. Xu Simao, Zhang Jingzhi, Liu Xiaolong. Meta-analysis of the effect of core stability
332 training on chronic nonspecific low back pain. Journal of Henan Normal University (Natural
333 Science Edition). 2022;50(02):150-6. doi: 10.16366/j.cnki.1000-2367.2022.02.019.
- 334 5. Zhao Yalan. Observation on the curative effect of oxycodone-acetaminophen tablet in
335 the treatment of low back pain. Chinese contemporary medicine. 2010;17(30):42.
- 336 6. Coulombe BJ, Games KE, Neil ER, Eberman LE. Core stability exercise versus general
337 exercise for chronic low back pain. Journal of athletic training. 2017;52(1):71-2.
- 338 7. Hayden J, Van Tulder MW, Malmivaara A, Koes BW. Exercise therapy for treatment of
339 non-specific low back pain. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2005;(3).
- 340 8. Liddle SD, Baxter GD, Gracey JH. Physiotherapists' use of advice and exercise for the
341 management of chronic low back pain: a national survey. Manual therapy.
342 2009;14(2):189-96.
- 343 9. Akuthota V, Ferreiro A, Moore T, Fredericson M. Core stability exercise principles.
344 Current sports medicine reports. 2008;7(1):39-44.
- 345 10. Sung PS, Yoon B, Lee DC. Lumbar spine stability for subjects with and without low back
346 pain during one-leg standing test. Spine. 2010;35(16):E753-E60.
- 347 11. Desai I, Marshall PW. Acute effect of labile surfaces during core stability exercises in
348 people with and without low back pain. Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology.
349 2010;20(6):1155-62.
- 350 12. Shamsi MB, Rezaei M, Zamanlou M, Sadeghi M, Pourahmadi MR. Does core stability

351 exercise improve lumbopelvic stability (through endurance tests) more than general exercise
352 in chronic low back pain? A quasi-randomized controlled trial. *Physiotherapy theory and*
353 *practice*. 2016;32(3):171-8.

354 13. Shojania KG, Sampson M, Ansari MT, Ji J, Doucette S, Moher D. How quickly do
355 systematic reviews go out of date? A survival analysis. *Annals of internal medicine*.
356 2007;147(4):224-33.

357 14. Niederer D, Mueller J. Sustainability effects of motor control stabilisation exercises on
358 pain and function in chronic nonspecific low back pain patients: A systematic review with
359 meta-analysis and meta-regression. *PLoS one*. 2020;15(1):e0227423.

360 15. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane
361 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj*. 2011;343.

362 16. Maher CG, Sherrington C, Herbert RD, Moseley AM, Elkins M. Reliability of the PEDro
363 scale for rating quality of randomized controlled trials. *Physical therapy*. 2003;83(8):713-21.

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

367 18. Moon HJ, Choi KH, Kim DH, Kim HJ, Cho YK, Lee KH, et al. Effect of lumbar
368 stabilization and dynamic lumbar strengthening exercises in patients with chronic low back
369 pain. *Annals of rehabilitation medicine*. 2013;37(1):110-7.

370 19. Cairns MC, Foster NE, Wright C. Randomized controlled trial of specific spinal
371 stabilization exercises and conventional physiotherapy for recurrent low back pain. *LWW*;
372 2006.

- 373 20. Zhang Y, Tang S, Chen G, Liu Y. Chinese massage combined with core stability
374 exercises for nonspecific low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Complementary*
375 *therapies in medicine*. 2015;23(1):1-6.
- 376 21. Waseem M, Karimi H, Gilani SA, Hassan D. Treatment of disability associated with
377 chronic non-specific low back pain using core stabilization exercises in Pakistani population.
378 *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2019;32(1):149-54.
- 379 22. Sung PS. Disability and back muscle fatigability changes following two therapeutic
380 exercise interventions in participants with recurrent low back pain. *Medical science monitor:*
381 *international medical journal of experimental and clinical research*. 2013;19:40.
- 382 23. Puntumetakul R, Areeudomwong P, Emasithi A, Yamauchi J. Effect of 10-week core
383 stabilization exercise training and detraining on pain-related outcomes in patients with clinical
384 lumbar instability. *Patient preference and adherence*. 2013:1189-99.
- 385 24. Macedo LG, Latimer J, Maher CG, Hodges PW, McAuley JH, Nicholas MK, et al. Effect
386 of motor control exercises versus graded activity in patients with chronic nonspecific low back
387 pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Physical therapy*. 2012;92(3):363-77.
- 388 25. Javadian Y, Behtash H, Akbari M, Taghipour-Darzi M, Zekavat H. The effects of
389 stabilizing exercises on pain and disability of patients with lumbar segmental instability.
390 *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2012;25(3):149-55.
- 391 26. Inani SB, Selkar SP. Effect of core stabilization exercises versus conventional exercises
392 on pain and functional status in patients with non-specific low back pain: a randomized
393 clinical trial. *Journal of back and musculoskeletal rehabilitation*. 2013;26(1):37-43.
- 394 27. Hosseinfar M, Akbari M, Behtash H, Amiri M, Sarrafzadeh J. The effects of stabilization

395 and McKenzie exercises on transverse abdominis and multifidus muscle thickness, pain, and
396 disability: a randomized controlled trial in nonspecific chronic low back pain. *Journal of*
397 *physical therapy science*. 2013;25(12):1541-5.

398 28. Hlaing SS, Puntumetakul R, Khine EE, Boucaut R. Effects of core stabilization exercise
399 and strengthening exercise on proprioception, balance, muscle thickness and pain related
400 outcomes in patients with subacute nonspecific low back pain: a randomized controlled trial.
401 *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*. 2021;22(1):1-13.

402 29. França FR, Burke TN, Hanada ES, Marques AP. Segmental stabilization and muscular
403 strengthening in chronic low back pain-a comparative study. *Clinics*. 2010;65(10):1013-7.

404 30. Ferreira ML, Ferreira PH, Latimer J, Herbert RD, Hodges PW, Jennings MD, et al.
405 Comparison of general exercise, motor control exercise and spinal manipulative therapy for
406 chronic low back pain: a randomized trial. *Pain*. 2007;131(1-2):31-7.

407 31. Amit K, Manish G, Taruna K. Effect of trunk muscles stabilization exercises and general
408 exercises on pain in recurrent non specific low back ache. *Int Res J Med Sci*. 2013;1(1):23-6.

409 32. Aluko A, DeSouza L, Peacock J. The effect of core stability exercises on variations in
410 acceleration of trunk movement, pain, and disability during an episode of acute nonspecific
411 low back pain: a pilot clinical trial. *Journal of manipulative and physiological therapeutics*.
412 2013;36(8):497-504. e3.

413 33. Alp A, Mengi G, Avsaroglu A, Mert M, SiĞIRLI D. Efficacy of core-stabilization exercise
414 and its comparison with home-based conventional exercise in low back pain patients.
415 *TURKIYE FIZIKSEL TIP VE REHABILITASYON DERGISI-TURKISH JOURNAL OF*
416 *PHYSICAL MEDICINE AND REHABILITATION*. 2014;60.

- 417 34. Akhtar MW, Karimi H, Gilani SA. Effectiveness of core stabilization exercises and routine
418 exercise therapy in management of pain in chronic non-specific low back pain: A randomized
419 controlled clinical trial. *Pakistan journal of medical sciences*. 2017;33(4):1002.
- 420 35. Yang Guanghui, Guo Dexin. Analysis of the effect of core muscle group stability training
421 on patients with chronic nonspecific low back pain. *Journal of Shandong Medical College*.
422 2022;44(02):129-31.
- 423 36. Xu Qian, Ji Shanshan, Wang Liang, Zhu Dongyan, Huang Zhidong, Cao Hui, et al. The
424 clinical effect of Babbitt core muscle group stability training combined with health education in
425 the treatment of chronic nonspecific low back pain. *Guangxi medicine*. 2017;39(9):1358-61.
426 doi: 10.11675/j.issn.0253-4304.2017.09.20.
- 427 37. Wang Yanjie, Sun Yuliang, He Benxiang. To observe the effect of core stability training
428 on chronic nonspecific low back pain. *Western Chinese medicine*.2018;31(05):93-6.
- 429 38. Guo Mei. The effect of core stability training on nonspecific low back pain. *Chinese*
430 *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*. 2016;31(01):88-90.
- 431 39. Zeng Yong, Zou Jiahua, Deng Guangrui, Zhu Wensheng, Zhou Jie, Zhang Zheng, et al.
432 To observe the effect of core muscle training on chronic nonspecific low back pain. *Chinese*
433 *practical medicine*. 2013;8(10):252-3. doi: 10.14163/j.cnki.11-5547/r.2013.10.044.
- 434 40. Elbayomy M, Zaki L, Koura G. Core strengthening for chronic nonspecific low back pain:
435 systematic review. *Bioscience Research*. 2018;15(4):4506-19.
- 436 41. Gomes-Neto M, Lopes JM, Conceicao CS, Araujo A, Brasileiro A, Sousa C, et al.
437 Stabilization exercise compared to general exercises or manual therapy for the management
438 of low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physical therapy in Sport*.

439 2017;23:136-42.

440 42. Han K, Tang Z, Bai Z, Su W, Zhang H. Effects of combined cognitive and physical

441 intervention on enhancing cognition in older adults with and without mild cognitive impairment:

442 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*. 2022; 14.

443

Supporting information

S1 Table. search strategy

	Search term
#1	core exercise or core training or core stability exercise* or core stability training or core stability or “core stability exercise therapy” or core stability strength training or core stabilization training
#2	nonspecific low back pain* or Chronic Low Back Pain* or LBP or low back pain or NLBP or CNLBP or NSLBP
#3	health or physical fitness* or health status* or fitness, medical* or healthy or healthiness or well-being*
#4	#1 AND #2 AND #3

S2 Table. Characteristics of Included Studies

Article	participants	Age (year)	Sex (male/female)	Number (T/C)	Intervention design		Treatment condition		Outcome measure	Follow-up	Drop out
					Experimental	Control	Frequency	Duration			
Akhtar 2017	CNLBP	T:46.39±7.43 C:45.50±6.61	NA	60/60	Core stabilization exercises	Routine physical therapy exercise	40min/d 1d/week	6weeks	VAS	NA	12
ALP 2014	female chronic LBP	T:48 (36-63) C:51 (25-64)	0/48	24/24	core-stabilization exercise	home-based conventional exercise	3d/week C:20group/d 7d/week	6weeks	VAS	NA	0
Aluko 2013	acute NSLPB	T: 36.2 (9.8) C: 35.8 (9.1)	T :3/13 C: 2/15	16/17	Core stabilization exercises	regular exercise	≥3 times/d	6weeks	VAS RMDQ	3months	0
Amit 2013	recurrent NLBP	50-60	NA	40/40	Trunk Muscles Stabilization	general exercise	30-40min/d 3d/week	6weeks	VAS	NA	0
Ferreira 2007	CNLBP	T:51.9 (15.3) C:54.8 (15.3)	T:27/53 C:24/56	80/80	motor control exercise	general exercise	60min/d	8weeks	VAS RMDQ PSFS	12months	13
França 2010	CNLBP	T:42.07(8.15) C:41.73(6.42)	T:4/11 C:4/11	15/15	segmental stabilization	muscular strengthening	30min/d 2d/week	6weeks	VAS ODQ	NA	0
Guo 2014	NLBP	T:38.39±3.80 C:37.90±4.26	T:20/26 C:19/27	46/46	AND core-stabilization exercise	Massage and drug therapy AND drug therapy	Massage treatment: 1 time / d for 8 weeks Drug treatment: Oral ibuprofen, 3	8weeks	VAS	NA	0

times / d, 0.15 g /

time, ≤ 2 weeks


Hlaing 2021	Subacute NSLBP	34.78±9.07	T:5/13 C:9/9	18/18	Core stabilization exercise	Strengthening exercise	30min/d 3d/week	4weeks	VAS MODQ	NA	0
Hosseinfar 2007	CNLBP	T:40.1±10.8 C:36.6±8.2	NA	15/15	stabilization exercise	McKenzie	60min/d 3d/week	6weeks	VAS FRI	NA	0
Inani 2013	NLBP	T:27.80 (7.34) C:32.93 (6.43)	T:9/6 C:11/4	15/15	core stabilization exercises general exercise	conventional exercises	3d/week	3month	VAS DOI	2months	0
Javadian 2012	CNLBP	NA	NA	15/15	AND Core stabilization exercise	general exercise	NA	8weeks	VAS MODQ	3months	0
<p>medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.</p>											
Macedo 2012	CNLBP	T:49.6 (16.3) C:48.7 (13.7)	T:35/45 C:29/57	86/86	motor control exercises	graded activity	60min/d 2d/week (first 4 weeks) 1d/week (next 4 weeks)	8weeks	RMDQ SF36 PSFS	12months	14
Puntumetakul 2013	LBP	T:44.73±9.21 C:44.93±7.86	T:4/17 C:4/17	21/21	core stabilization exercises	general exercise	20min/d 2d/week	10weeks	SF36 RMDQ	3months	4
Shamsi 2016	CNLBP	T:39.2(11.7) C:47.9(10.2)	T:7/15 C:6/15	24/24	core stabilization exercises	general exercise	T:20min/d 3d/week C:14min/d 3d/week	6weeks	VAS DOQ	NA	5
Sung 2013	recurrent LBP	T:47.7 ± 8.9 C:53.1 ± 9.1	T:9/5 C:6/10	25/21	core stabilization exercise	spinal flexibility exercise	40min/d 1d/week	4weeks	ODI	NA	0
Wang 2018	CNLBP	T:16.80±5.55 C:32.94±6.00	T:23/7 C:19/11	30/30	core stabilization exercise	Traditional waist rehabilitation training	1time/d	8weeks	VAS ODI	NA	0
Waseem 2019	CNLBP	T: 46.39 ± 7.43 C: 45.50 ± 6.61	T : 35/18 C : 36/19	60/60	Core stabilization exercises	Routine physical therapy exercises	3d/week	6weeks	ODI	NA	12
Xu 2017	CNLBP	T:35.61±8.24 C:34.78±9.38	26/24	25/25	Ball core stability strength training	conventional conservative treatment Pilates	5d/week	8weeks	VAS ODI	6months	0
Yang 2022	CNLBP	T:34.62±6.45 C:35.01±6.50	T:30/21 C:29/23	52/51	core stabilization exercise	AND conventional suspension	T:3group/d 7d/week C:30min/d 5d/week	12weeks	VAS ODI	NA	0

Author	Condition	Group	T: n/N	C: n/N	Intervention	Duration	Outcome	Scale	Time	Score
Zeng 2013	CNLBP	NA	16/16	16/16	AND Core muscle group stability training Chinese massage	3times/d 7d/week	Interference Interference electrotherapy electrotherapy	VAS	NA	0
Zhang 2015	NSLBP	T:48.7±3.89 C:51.6±4.03	T:29/17 C:31/15	46/46	AND Core stability exercises	40min/d 7d/week	Chinese massage	VAS ODI	12months	7

LBP, low back pain; CNLBP, chronic non-specific low back pain; NSLBP, non-specific low back pain; NLBP, non-specific low back pain; T, Experimental group; C, Control group; VAS, visual analog scale; ODI, Oswestry Disability Index; ODQ, Oswestry Disability Questionnaire; MODQ, Modified Oswestry Disability Questionnaire; RMDQ, Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire; FRI, Functional Rating Index; SF36, Short-Form 36; PSFS, Patient-Specific Functional Scale.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316>; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Functional Scale.



S3 Figure. Research and study selection for PRISMA-compliant systematic reviews


S4 Table. Study quality and risk of bias.

Article	PEDro											Sum PEDro
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Akhtar 2017	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	9
ALP 2014	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8
Aluko 2013	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8

Amit 2013	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	9
Ferreira 2007	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	9
França 2010	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Guo 2014	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Hlaing 2021	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Hosseinifar 2007	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Inani 2013	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Javadian 2012	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Macedo 2012	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Puntumetakul 2013	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	9
Shamsi 2016	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Sung 2013	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Wang 2018	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Waseem 2019	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Xu 2017	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Yang 2022	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8
Zeng 2013	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Zhang 2015	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	8

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316>; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).


PEDro-scale-items: 1) Was eligibility criteria specified? 2) Were all subjects randomly allocated? 3) Were allocations concealed? 4) Were the groups similar at baseline? 5) Was there blinding of all participants? 6) Was there blinding of all therapists? 7) Was there blinding of all assessors? 8) Was there measures of at least one key outcome for more than 85% of the subjects initially allocated to groups? 9) Did all subjects for whom outcome measures were available receive the treatment or control condition as allocated or, where this was not the case, data for at least one key outcome was analyzed by "intention to treat"? 10) Were the results of between group statistical comparisons reported for at least one key outcome? 11) Did the study have both point measures and measures of variability for at least one key outcome?




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316>; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias
Akhtar 2017	+	?	+	?	+	+	+
ALP 2014	+	?	?	+	?	+	+
Aluko 2013	+	+	?	?	+	+	+
Amit 2013	?	?	?	?	?	+	+
Ferreira 2007	?	+	?	?	+	+	+
França 2010	+	?	?	+	+	+	+
Guo 2014	+	?	?	?	+	+	+
Hlaing 2021	-	-	?	+	+	+	+
Hosseiniifar 2007	+	?	?	?	+	+	+
Inani 2013	+	+	?	?	+	+	+
Javadian 2012	?	?	?	?	+	+	+
Macedo 2012	+	+	?	?	?	+	+
Puntumetakul 2013	+	+	?	+	+	+	+
Shamsi 2016	?	?	?	?	+	+	+
Sung 2013	+	+	?	?	+	+	+
Wang 2018	?	?	?	?	+	+	+
Waseem 2019	+	+	+	?	+	+	+
Xu 2017	+	?	?	?	-	+	+
Yang 2022	+	?	?	?	+	+	+
Zeng 2013	?	?	?	?	+	+	+
Zhang 2015	+	+	?	?	+	+	+


S5 Figure. Risk of bias of this review




S6 Figure. forest plot of pain intensity



S7 Figure. forest plot of disability



S8 Figure. forest plot of generic health



S9 Figure. forest plot of specific function

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316>; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316>; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.23290316>; this version posted May 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .