

1 **Not all movements are equal: Differences in**
2 **variability of trunk motor behavior between people**
3 **with and without low back pain - A Systematic**
4 **Review**

5 **Short title: Variability of trunk motor behavior in**
6 **low back pain: A Systematic Review**

7
8 **Florian Abu Bakar¹, J. Bart Staal^{1,2}, Robert van Cingel^{2,3}, Hiroki Saito⁴,**
9 **Raymond Ostelo^{5,6}, Jaap H. van Dieën⁷**

10 *¹Han University of Applied Sciences, Research Group Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation*
11 *Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.*

12 *²Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, IQ Healthcare, Radboud University Medical Centre,*
13 *The Netherlands.*

14 *³Sports Medical Centre Papendal, Arnhem, The Netherlands.*

15 *⁴ Tokyo University of Technology, Department of Physical Therapy, Tokyo, Japan*

16 *⁵Department of Health Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam Movement*
17 *Sciences, The Netherlands*

18
19 *⁶Department of Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit*
20 *& Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Musculoskeletal Health, The Netherlands*

21 *⁷Department of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam*
22 *Movement Sciences, The Netherlands*

23 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

24 **Abstract**

25 *Background*

26 In treatment of low-back pain (LBP), motor control exercises have shown to be superior to
27 minimal interventions, but not to any other form of exercise therapy. Knowledge about
28 variability in trunk motor behavior may help to identify patients that may be more likely to
29 benefit from motor control exercises.

30 *Objective*

31 This systematic review aims to answer the question: Is variability of trunk motor behavior
32 different between people with and without LBP and if so, do people with LBP show more or
33 less variability? Furthermore, we addressed the question whether the results are dependent on
34 characteristics of the patient group, the task performed and the type of variability measure.

35 *Methods*

36 This study was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42020180003). Studies were eligible if they
37 (1) included a LBP group and a control group, (2) included adults with non-specific low back
38 pain of any duration and (3) measured kinematic variability, EMG variability and/or kinetic
39 variability. Risk of Bias was evaluated and a descriptive synthesis was performed.

40 *Results*

41 Thirty-nine studies were included, thirty-one of which were included in the descriptive
42 synthesis. In most studies and experimental conditions, variability did not significantly differ
43 between groups. When significant differences were found, less variability in patients with
44 LBP was more frequently reported than more variability, especially in gait-related tasks.

45 *Conclusions*

46 Given the considerable risk of bias of the included studies and the clinical characteristics of
47 the participants with low severity scores for pain, disability and psychological measures, there
48 is insufficient evidence to draw firm conclusions.

49 **Introduction**

50

51 Low-back pain (LBP) is a widely prevalent condition causing a high burden of disease
52 globally(1) and is associated with high economic costs(2). Unfortunately, effective treatment
53 options are scarce(3). Regarding exercise therapy, many different treatment options in the
54 management of chronic low-back pain (cLBP) have been studied. Exercise therapy is more
55 effective for pain and disability than no treatment or usual care (4). However, there is limited
56 evidence to support one type of exercise over another(3–6). Potential reasons for this are the
57 heterogeneity of the patient group and a lack of knowledge regarding mechanisms that
58 impede or facilitate recovery(7,8). Unraveling these mechanisms may facilitate improvement
59 of cLBP-management(9).

60

61 Motor control exercises are commonly applied by physiotherapists in the treatment of
62 LBP(10). Compared to minimal intervention (i.e., placebo intervention, education or advice
63 and no treatment), motor control exercises have shown to be superior, but as other treatment
64 modalities with modest effect sizes. Moreover, motor control exercises do not seem to be
65 superior to any other form of exercise therapy(10–12). This might suggest that some
66 (subgroups of) patients do benefit from motor control exercise while others do not or to a
67 lesser degree. The identification of LBP patients with motor control alterations who are more
68 likely to benefit from motor control exercises, as well as the appropriate choice of an
69 individualized exercise regimen remains challenging due to lack of evidence (13,14).

70

71 Human motor behavior is characterized by substantial variation and variability in motor
72 output. In this context, ‘variation’ refers to the array of movement possibilities a person has in
73 everyday life to achieve a movement goal (e.g., walking to the store versus running versus

74 going by bike) while 'variability' refers to differences within the same movement (e.g., within
75 the walking pattern when walking to the store)(15,16). In other words, variability refers to the
76 variance that occurs across multiple repetitions of the same movement (e.g., between strides
77 taken while walking), which are never repeated in exactly the same manner(17–19) or to
78 variance that occurs in static postures. Whether this variance is due to noise or determinism
79 and even purposeful is debated(19,20). However, regardless the nature of the source of
80 variability, its effect will be manifested in variance between motor outputs across repetitions
81 of a movement at identical phases within this movement. When considering a static posture,
82 this will be manifested in variance of motor outputs over time points.

83

84 There is an increasing body of literature suggesting differences in variability of trunk motor
85 behavior between people with and without LBP (21,22). However, there seems to be no
86 consistency in the direction of these alterations(13). Some studies reported less(23–25)
87 variability in people with LBP while others reported more(26,27) variability or no difference
88 at all(28). It could be hypothesized that different effects of cLBP on variability of trunk motor
89 behavior could provide a basis for identifying patients who may be more likely to benefit
90 from certain interventions such as motor control exercises.

91 Zooming in on motor variability, motor outputs can be studied using kinematic measures
92 (e.g., at the level of segment and joint movements), electromyography (e.g., at the level of
93 muscle activation) or kinetic measures (e.g., at the level of muscle force production).

94 Additionally, different methods to quantify variability in LBP have been applied. Some
95 authors quantified the magnitude of variability in a set of measurements, expressed by
96 measures such as standard deviation or range. Others advocated quantification of the structure
97 of variability to assess the temporal organization in the distribution of the data, expressed by a
98 large number of measures such as sample entropy (29) and the largest Lyapunov exponent

99 (30). Yet, it is unclear if and how these different measures are related. In view of the lack of
100 consensus in the literature regarding the operationalization of variability, this review will
101 classify studies in 6 subgroups: Magnitude kinematic variability; Structure kinematic
102 variability; Magnitude EMG variability; Structure EMG variability; Magnitude kinetic
103 variability and Structure kinetic variability.

104
105 Without a comprehensive overview of the literature, it remains challenging to draw any
106 conclusions regarding the association of LBP and variability in trunk motor behavior.
107 Therefore, this systematic review aims to summarize and to synthesize current knowledge
108 regarding this topic. More specifically, the objective is to answer the question: Is variability of
109 trunk motor behavior different between people with and without LBP and if so, do people
110 with LBP show more or less variability? Furthermore, the question is addressed whether the
111 results are dependent on characteristics of the patient group, the task performed and the type
112 of variability measure used.

113

114 **Methods**

115 This systematic review was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items of
116 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocol (PRISMA-P) guideline(31,32) and has been
117 registered in the PROSPERO database (CRD42020180003).

118

119 **Eligibility criteria**

120 To be included in this review, the studies had to fulfill the following criteria:

121 *Types of study*

122 Studies that investigated both a LBP group and a healthy control group (cross-sectional as
123 well as longitudinal) were included. Studies were excluded if they did not have a healthy

124 control group, were a literature review of any kind or were animal studies. Articles in
125 languages other than English were excluded.

126

127 *Types of participants*

128 Studies including adults (18 or older) with non-specific LBP, both acute (0-12 weeks) and
129 chronic (>12 weeks) were included. Studies were excluded if participants had specific forms
130 of LBP (e.g., fracture, infection, cancer, central nervous system disease, respiration disorders)
131 or were post-surgery.

132

133 *Types of outcome measures regarding variability*

134 Studies were included if the construct to be measured was kinematic variability, EMG
135 variability and/or kinetic variability. This was further subdivided into one of six subgroups of
136 variability: Magnitude kinematic variability; Structure kinematic variability; Magnitude EMG
137 variability; Structure EMG variability; Magnitude kinetic variability and Structure kinetic
138 variability. Kinematic variability was defined as measurements of variability in kinematic
139 outputs of the trunk (during movements/postures). EMG variability was defined as
140 measurements of variability in trunk muscle activity as assessed with electromyography
141 (during movement/postures). Kinetic variability was defined as measurements of variability in
142 force exertion of the trunk, as assessed with inverse dynamics or dynamometry (during
143 movement/postures).

144

145 **Search methods**

146 A comprehensive systematic literature search was performed by the first author and an
147 information specialist of our institution. Studies were identified by searching PubMed,
148 Embase, Cinahl, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Web of Science and Sport

149 Discus from inception up till May 2022. The full search strategy for all databases can be seen
150 in the supporting information. In addition, reference checking as well as citation checking of
151 the included studies was performed to identify additional relevant studies.

152

153 **Study selection**

154 The initial screening was performed by pairs of reviewers (FA-JvD, FA-RvC, FA-JBS, FA-
155 RO) and consisted of applying the criteria for eligibility by screening the abstracts and titles
156 retrieved by the search strategy(33). During all stages of the study selection process,
157 disagreements were solved by discussion and consensus between the pairs of reviewers.
158 Where no consensus could be reached, a third reviewer of the group arbitrated. Where no
159 abstract was available, full-text articles were obtained unless the article could be confidently
160 excluded by its title alone. In general, if there was any doubt about the exclusion of a
161 particular study, the study proceeded to full-text screening. For the application of the in- and
162 exclusion criteria on the selected full text articles, the authors excluded an article when one of
163 the exclusion criteria was met without registering the presence of additional exclusion criteria.
164 Studies were classified as *included or excluded* using the web-tool Rayyan(34). As a group,
165 the involved reviewers had relevant research experience in this field, were practicing
166 clinicians or had extensive training in epidemiology, methodology or movement sciences.

167

168 **Data extraction**

169 To decide on the content of the data to be extracted the checklist for critical appraisal and data
170 extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies (CHARMS-PF) was
171 used(35) as a guideline. The studies were classified into six subgroups. The data extraction
172 from full texts was performed by one review author (FA). Two other authors (RO, JBS)
173 verified the extraction table during the risk of bias assessment.

174 The following data were extracted:

175 *General study characteristics*: author, year of publication. *Clinical characteristics*: duration
176 and severity of LBP. *Outcomes*: classes of tasks, variability measures and results.

177

178 **Risk of bias assessment**

179 Risk of bias (RoB) was assessed with the Quality in Prognosis Studies (QUIPS) tool(36), a
180 tool recommended by the Cochrane Methods Prognosis group(37). The QUIPS tool considers
181 the following 6 domains of bias: Bias due to study participation, study attrition, prognostic
182 factor measurement, outcome measurement, study confounding and statistical analysis &
183 reporting.

184 Within each domain the three to seven items are usually scored. Possible responses were:
185 `yes`, `partial`, `no` or `unsure`. When specific information regarding items was not explicitly
186 provided, we labeled it with `unsure`. The responses on these items were combined to assess
187 the risk of bias per domain. The risk of bias for each domain was classified as `high`,
188 `moderate` or `low`(35). Regarding the domain `Study confounding`, it was decided that the
189 highest achievable score was `moderate` since comprehensive knowledge regarding
190 confounders is lacking. `Moderate` was scored when both, age and gender, were taken into
191 account. Additionally, it was decided not to score the domain `Prognostic Factor
192 Measurement`, since it did not differ from the domain `Study Participation` in the context of
193 this review. An overall risk of bias was not reported(38). Risk of bias was assessed by pairs of
194 independent reviewers (RO, JBS, FA) (39). A priori, a calibration process was held for
195 standardization purposes. After individual ratings, the results were compared. Disagreements
196 were solved by discussion and consensus between reviewers.

197

198 **Analysis**

199 Given the nature of the data, we refrained from doing a meta-analysis and performed a
200 descriptive synthesis of the study results. Studies from the two kinematic subgroups
201 (magnitude and structure) were included in this descriptive synthesis. Studies from the four
202 other subgroups (i.e., magnitude and structure of EMG variability and kinetic variability)
203 were not included due to heterogeneity in outcome measures and the low number of studies.
204 Within the kinematic subgroups, four different classes of outcomes to measure variability
205 were included, two for magnitude and two for structure. For magnitude measures, studies that
206 measured variability in trunk angles (mean and standard deviation of trunk segments) or
207 coordination (deviation phase or relative phase variability) were included. For structural
208 measures, studies that used the short-term Lyapunov Exponent or %Determinism were
209 included. Tasks were grouped into 5 classes of tasks; flexion-extension (consisting of trunk
210 flexion-extension, lifting and sit-to-stand), gait (consisting of treadmill and overground
211 walking and running), reaching, repositioning and static postures. Finally, the direction of the
212 outcomes was considered. The possible outcomes were ‘no difference’, ‘more variability’
213 (i.e., magnitude: larger, structure: less regular in people with LBP) or ‘less variability’ (i.e.,
214 magnitude: smaller, structure: more regular in people with LBP). In the latter two cases (i.e.,
215 ‘more variability’ or ‘less variability’) between group differences should be statistically
216 significant.

217 In the descriptive synthesis, experimental conditions from the two kinematic subgroups were
218 taken into account and presented in tables. Each table row shows the experimental condition
219 with outcomes (i.e., ‘less variability’, ‘no difference’ and ‘more variability’) within the five
220 groups of tasks. The description of the distribution of all experimental conditions identified in
221 the literature gives an indication of the direction of the reported results. For example, when
222 the overall distribution of the results is more towards less variability, one might tentatively
223 conclude that variability is reduced on average in the patients, since null findings in individual

224 studies or experimental conditions do not provide evidence for absence of a difference
225 between groups. On the other hand, when the outcomes are symmetrically distributed, with
226 similar numbers of studies showing more and less variability, this strongly suggests that on
227 average the groups do not differ. Additionally, the study references per cell are shown.

228

229 **Results**

230 **Literature search**

231 A total of 3802 articles were identified in the search after duplicates had been removed. This
232 included six articles that were included after additional reference and citation checking. These
233 articles were screened for eligibility based on title and abstract. This resulted in the exclusion
234 of 3569 articles. The remaining 233 articles were screened for eligibility based on the full
235 text. Finally, a total of 39 articles were included in this systematic review (*Fig 1*).

236

237

238 **Fig 1. Flowchart of study inclusion in the systematic review.**

239 *Full text articles were excluded when one of the exclusion criteria was met without registering the presence of
240 additional exclusion criteria.

241

242 **Study characteristics**

243 The extracted data can be seen in tables 1-5. Thirty-nine studies, with 1486 participants (754
244 with LBP and 732 controls) were included in this review. All but one study(40) had a cross-
245 sectional study design. Sample sizes for patient groups varied from 4 to 63 with an average of
246 19 subjects. Sample sizes for control groups varied from 6 to 80 with an average of 19
247 subjects. Twenty-one of the thirty-nine studies (22,40–59) matched participants with and
248 without LBP on the following factors: sex (n=21), age (n=14), body mass/Body Mass Index
249 (n=8), height (n=5) and level of activity (n=3).

250

251 **Clinical characteristics**

252 There is a lack of information regarding the exact duration of LBP. Twenty-nine of the 39
253 studies (74%) did not report the duration. In other words, for 578 out of the 754 (77%) LBP
254 participants this information was not available. For the remaining ten studies with 176
255 participants with LBP (23% of total) the average LBP duration was 40.4 months (SD 29.6).
256 Regarding gender distribution, 566 (38%) of the 1486 LBP participants were female and 782
257 (53%) were male. Due to non-reporting, the gender distribution remains unclear in 138 (9%)
258 LBP participants divided over four studies(40,60–62). The mean baseline pain level measured
259 with the Visual Analog Scale (VAS, 0-100) was 25.3 (SD17.5). This was measured in 175 of
260 the 754 LBP participants (23.2%), divided over 11 studies(42,49,56,62–69).
261 The mean baseline pain level measured with the Numeric Rating Scale (NRS, 0-10) was 3.7
262 (SD1.2). This was measured in 295 of the 754 LBP participants (39.1%), divided over 13
263 studies(22,40,46,47,51,52,54,59,70–74). The mean disability level measured with the
264 Oswestry Disability Index (ODI, 0-100) was 18.5 (SD 8.1). This was measured in 328 of the
265 754 LBP participants (43.5%), divided over 19 studies(22,45,47,50–54,56,59,62–65,67,69–
266 72). The mean disability level measured with the Roland- Morris Questionnaire (RDQ, 0-24)
267 was 6.3 (SD 4.2). This was measured in 123 of the 754 LBP participants (16.3%), divided
268 over 6 studies(40,46,49,53,66,73). The mean kinesiophobia level measured with the Tampa
269 scale (TSK, 17-68) was 34. This was measured in 141 of the 754 LBP participants (18.7%),
270 divided over 7 studies(22,52,63,66,69,71,72). One study(46) used the short form of the TSK.
271 The mean catastrophizing level measured with the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS, 0-52)
272 was 15. This was measured in 66 of the 754 LBP participants, divided over 3
273 studies(22,52,59). One study(46) used the short form of the PCS. Twenty-eight studies
274 (27,40,42–45,47,48,50,51,53–58,60,62,64,65,67,68,73–78) representing 518 of the 754 LBP

275 participants (68.7%) did not measure any psychological construct. Ten
276 studies(27,43,44,48,55,60,75–78) representing 199 of the 754 LBP participants (26.4%) did
277 not report the use of any questionnaires to characterize the sample.
278 The clinical characteristics of these participants point towards samples with relatively low
279 levels of pain, low levels of disability and low scores in the varying psychological measures.
280 Additionally, due to non-reporting, the clinical characteristics of 35% of the LBP participants
281 remain unknown.

282

283 **Tasks and task characteristics**

284 Eight type of trunk movement tasks were utilized to measure variability of trunk motor
285 behavior. Treadmill walking and running tasks were most frequently used in ten
286 studies(42,49,57,58,62,66–68,76,77), trunk flexion-extension in eight
287 studies(40,43,44,48,53,55,78,79) and lifting in six studies (22,27,46,52,71,74). Other tasks
288 were overground walking in four studies(47,51,60,69), static postures in four
289 studies(45,50,54,72), reaching in two studies (59,73), sit-to-stand in two studies(56,70),
290 (maximally) voluntary contractions of trunk muscles in two studies (63,65) and a
291 repositioning task in one study(64).

292

293 **Outcome measures**

294 Regarding the distribution of the included studies within the six subgroups, most studies
295 (n=26) (22,40,43,46,47,49–51,55–60,62,64,66–70,72,73,76–78) focused on the *magnitude of*
296 *kinematic variability*, followed by *structure of kinematic variability* (n=12) (22,27,43–
297 45,48,53,58,59,71,74,79) and *magnitude of EMG variability* (n=8) (42,52,54,57,63,66,72,76).
298 Two studies(53,71) focused on the *structure of EMG variability*. One study(80) focused on
299 the *magnitude of kinetic variability* and no study on the *structure of kinetic variability*.

Table 1. Studies regarding Magnitude of kinematic variability.

| Author | Year | Clinical characteristics: Duration LBP in month | Clinical characteristics: Pain | Clinical characteristics: Disability | Clinical characteristics: Psychological | Classes of tasks | Variability Measure | Direction: More variability-Less variability-No Difference |
|---------------|------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
| Asgari, M | 2015 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of coefficient of variation and variance ratio | No difference |
| Bagheri, R | 2020 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 5,5 | ODI 12,4 | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of pattern variability and offset variability | Less (pattern) No difference (offset) |
| Descarreux, M | 2005 | 48,9 | VAS 15,5 | ODI 27,4 | <i>not reported</i> | (M)VC of trunk muscles | Mean&SD of peak angular position variability | No difference |
| Dideriksen, J | 2014 | 34,2 | NPRS 3,1 | ODI 14,2 | TSK 31,8 PCS 16,1 SF-36 66,9 STAI 40,2 | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of spinal angles/angular trajectories | No difference |
| Dunk, N | 2010 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | ODI 15,9 | <i>not reported</i> | Static Postures | Mean&SD of lumbar movement patterns | More |
| Ebrahimi, S | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 5,1 | ODI 37,3 | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of DP | Less |
| Fujii, R | 2022 | 14,7 | NPRS 3,6 | RDQ 2,1 | TSK-short 21,9 PCS-short 6,4 | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of DP | No difference |
| Hamacher, D | 2014 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of stride-to-stride variability | More (dual task) No difference (single task) |
| Ippersiel, P | 2018 | 109,9 | NPRS 3,4 | ODI 25,5 | SBT 4,4 | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of DP | More |
| Lamoth, C (A) | 2006 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean & SD of relative phase, residual pattern variability | More (frontal plane) Less (transv. plane) |
| Lamoth, C (B) | 2006 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 53 | RDQ 10 | TSK 39 | Gait | Mean & SD of relative phase, residual pattern variability | More (frontal plane) Less (transv. plane) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| Mehravar, M | 2012 | 47 | VAS 10,9 | ODI 14,7 | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SEM of trunk segments | More |
| Mokhtarinia, H | 2016 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of DP | No difference |
| Müller, J | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | v Korff 50 | v Korff 41 | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of coefficient of variation | No difference |
| Pelegrinelli, A | 2020 | 30 | VAS 6 | RDQ 2 | LoBACS 94 | Gait | Mean&SD of coupling angle variability | No difference |
| Ringheim, I | 2019 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 6 | ODI 26,9 PAL 7,4 | TSK 27,1 | Static Postures | Median&IQR of coefficient of variation | More |
| Rum, L | 2021 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 46,5 | ODI 12,5 | TSK 30 | Gait | Mean & SD of AVgSD of angular displacements | More (transv. & frontal plane) No difference (sagittal plane) |
| Seay, J | 2014 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 8 | ODI 7,9 | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of Relative Phase | No difference |
| Seay, J | 2011 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 8 | ODI 7,9 | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of Relative Phase | Less |
| Selles, R | 2001 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of Relative Phase | Less |
| Shojaei, I | 2020 | <i>not reported</i> | WBPI 5,2 | RDQ 11,8 | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of DP | Less |
| Shojaei, I | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | Mean&SD of DP | Less |
| Silfies, S | 2009 | 3,1 | NPRS 3,8 | RDQ 8,1 | <i>not reported</i> | Reaching | Mean&SD of DP | More |
| Tsigkanos, C | 2021 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD lumbar angles | Less (No difference in most indices) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------|---------------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|--|---------------|
| van den Hoorn, W | 2012 | 60 | VAS 29,2 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of stride-to-stride variability | Less |
| Wildenbeest, M | 2022 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 2,4 | ODI 31,4 | PCS 13 PASS 45 SBT 1,6 EBS 3 | Reaching | Mean&SD of lumbar angles and cycle times | No difference |

303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311

NPRS Numeric Pain Rating Scale, VAS Visual Analogue Scale, Korff Pain Intensity and Disability Scores , ODI Oswestry Disability Index, RDQ Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire, PAL Physical Activity Level, TSK Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, PCS Pain Catastrophizing Scale, SF-36 Short Form Health Survey, STAI State Trait Anxiety Inventory, SBT Start Back Tool, LoBACS Low Back Activity Confidence Scale, PASS Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale, EBS Expected Back Strain Scale; DP Deviation Phase

Table 2. Studies regarding Structure of kinematic variability.

| Author | Year | Clinical characteristics: Duration LBP in month | Clinical characteristics: Pain | Clinical characteristics: Disability | Clinical characteristics: Psychological | Classes of tasks | Variability Measure | Direction: More variability-Less variability-No Difference |
|-----------|------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Asgari, M | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | LyE | No difference |
| Asgari, M | 2020 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | LyE, FM | No difference |
| Asgari, M | 2015 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | LyE, FM | Less (LyE long) No difference (FM, LyE short) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|-------------------|---|--|
| Bauer, C | 2015 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 3,5 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | REC, DET for Angular displacement, angular velocity, and angular acceleration | More with increasing LBP intensity. <i>Side note: REC can be both: Less or More with increasing LBP intensity depending on age of participant</i> |
| Bauer, C | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | DET, SaEn for Angular displacement and angular velocity | Less for angular velocity (no difference for angular displacement) |
| Chehrehrazi, M | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | NGEV, GEV | No difference |
| Dideriksen, J | 2014 | 34,2 | NPRS 3,1 | ODI 14,2 | TSK 31,8 PCS 16,1 SF-36 66,9 STAI 40,2 | Flexion-Extension | DET | Less |
| Graham, R | 2014 | 24,4 | <i>not reported</i> | ODI 15,6 RDQ 4 | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | LyE | No difference |
| Liew, B | 2020 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 4,1 | ODI 21,2 | TSK 39,4 | Flexion-Extension | NGEV, GEV | No difference |
| Shokouhyan, S | 2020 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 2,5 | ODI 12,3 | <i>not reported</i> | Static Postures | REC, DET, ENTROPY, TREND LyE | Less (rec,det,entropy, trend) in sagital angle More (LyE) |
| Tsigkanos, C | 2021 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | LyE, ApEn | Less (LyE, ApEn) in 6 of the 54 indices |
| Wildenbeest, M | 2022 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 2,4 | ODI 31,4 | PCS 13 PASS 45 | Reaching | LyE | No difference |

SBT 1,6
EBS 3

312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320

NPRS Numeric Pain Rating Scale, ODI Oswestry Disability Index, RDQ Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire, TSK Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, PCS Pain Catastrophizing Scale, SF-36 Short Form Health Survey, STAI State Trait Anxiety Inventory, SBT Start Back Tool, PASS Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale, EBS Expected Back Strain Scale; LyE Lyapunov Exponent, FM Floquet Multiplier, REC Recurrence Rate, DET Determinism, SaEn Sample Entropy, GEV Goal-Equivalent-Variability, NGEV Non-Goal Equivalent Variability, ApEn Approximate Entropy

Table 3. Studies regarding Magnitude of EMG variability.

| Author | Year | Clinical characteristics: Duration LBP in month | Clinical characteristics: Pain | Clinical characteristics: Disability | Clinical characteristics: Psychological | Classes of tasks | Variability Measure | Direction: More variability-Less variability-No Difference |
|---------------|------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|--|
| Abboud, J | 2014 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 46,5 | ODI 18,6 | TSK 36,3 SBT 2,8 | (M)VC of trunk muscles | Mean&SD of centre of gravity dispersion, Changes of muscle recruitment pattern and intensity | Less |
| Arjunan, P | 2010 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 35 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Change of variance of EMG amplitude over time | More |
| Falla, D | 2014 | 31,6 | NPRS 3,1 | ODI 13,8 | TSK 32,1 PCS 14,5 SF-36 67,6 STAI 40,1 | Flexion-Extension | RMS | Less |
| Jabobs, J | 2009 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 1,8 | ODI 13 | <i>not reported</i> | Static Postures | Variability of APA onset times | Less |
| Lamoth, C (A) | 2006 | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Mean&SD of residual pattern variability | More |
| Lamoth, C (B) | 2006 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 53 | RDQ 10 | TSK 39 | Gait | Mean&SD of residual pattern variability | More |
| Müller, J | 2017 | <i>not reported</i> | v Korff 50 | v Korff 41 | <i>not reported</i> | Gait | Coefficient of variation | No difference |
| Ringheim, I | 2019 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 6 | ODI 26,9 PAL 7,4 | TSK 27,1 | Static Postures | RMS | Less |

321
322
323
324
325

NPRS Numeric Pain Rating Scale, VAS Visual Analogue Scale, Korff Pain Intensity and Disability Scores , ODI Oswestry Disability Index, RDQ Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire, PAL Physical Activity Level, TSK Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, PCS Pain Catastrophizing Scale, SF-36 Short Form Health Survey, STAI State Trait Anxiety Inventory, SBT Start Back Tool; RMS Root Mean Square

326
327
328

Table 4. Studies regarding Structure of EMG variability.

| Author | Year | Clinical characteristics: Duration LBP in month | Clinical characteristics: Pain | Clinical characteristics: Disability | Clinical characteristics: Psychological | Classes of tasks | Variability Measure | Direction: More variability-Less variability-No Difference |
|-----------|------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Graham, R | 2014 | 24,4 | <i>not reported</i> | ODI 15,6 RDQ 4 | <i>not reported</i> | Flexion-Extension | LyE | More |
| Liew, B | 2020 | <i>not reported</i> | NPRS 4,1 | ODI 21,2 | TSK 39,4 | Flexion-Extension | NGEV, GEV | No difference |

329
330
331
332
333
334
335

NPRS Numeric Pain Rating Scale, VAS Visual Analogue Scale, ODI Oswestry Disability Index, RDQ Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire, TSK Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, LyE Lyapunov Exponent, GEV Goal-Equivalent-Variability, NGEV Non-Goal Equivalent Variability

Table 5. Studies regarding Magnitude of kinetic variability.

| Author | Year | Clinical characteristics: Duration LBP in month | Clinical characteristics: Pain | Clinical characteristics: Disability | Clinical characteristics: Psychological | Classes of tasks | Variability Measure | Direction: More variability-Less variability-No Difference |
|----------------|------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------|--|
| Descarreaux, M | 2007 | <i>not reported</i> | VAS 20 | ODI 22,6 | <i>not reported</i> | Repositioning | Peak force variability | No difference |

336
337
338
339

VAS Visual Analogue Scale, ODI Oswestry Disability Index

340 **Risk of Bias**

341 The Risk of Bias of all included studies is presented in *Table 6*. To reach consensus, 3 rounds
 342 were needed. Domains where first and second reviewers disagreed mainly concerned ‘Study
 343 Participation’, ‘Outcome Measurement’ and ‘Study Confounding’. Consultation of a third
 344 reviewer was necessary to resolve disagreement for 10.7% of all scores, mainly concerning
 345 domains ‘Outcome Measurement’ and ‘Statistical Analysis and Reporting’. There was no
 346 discernible difference in RoB within the subgroups or within the same reported direction of
 347 variability (i.e., less, more, no difference). In total, most items were scored as ‘moderate’
 348 (53%), followed by ‘low’ (33%) and ‘high’ (13%). However, there were considerable
 349 differences in RoB within the 5 domains. Most of the studies had a low RoB in the domains
 350 ‘Outcome Measurement’ and ‘Statistical Analysis and Reporting’ (77% for both). The RoB of
 351 the domains ‘Study attrition’ and ‘Study Confounding’ was mostly rated moderate (90% and
 352 92%). The RoB of domain ‘Study Participation’ was mostly rated moderate (51%) or high
 353 (46%).

354



355 **Table 6. Risk of Bias of the included studies.**

356

| Author | Year | Study Participation | Study Attrition | Prognostic Factor Measurement | Outcome Measurement | Study Confounding | Statistical Analysis and Reporting |
|----------------|------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| Abboud, J | 2014 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Arjunan, P | 2010 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Asgari, M | 2015 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Asgari, M | 2017 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Asgari, M | 2020 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Bagheri, R | 2020 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Bauer, C | 2015 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Bauer, C | 2017 | Yellow | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Chehrerazi, M | 2017 | Red | Yellow | Blue | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Descarreaux, M | 2005 | Red | Yellow | Blue | Red | Yellow | Yellow |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Descarreaux, M | 2007 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias |
| Dideriksen, J | 2014 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Dunk, N | 2010 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Ebrahimi, S | 2017 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Falla, D | 2014 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Fujii, R | 2022 | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Graham, R | 2014 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Hamacher, D | 2014 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | High risk of bias | High risk of bias |
| Ippersiel, P | 2018 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias |
| Jabobs, J | 2009 | High risk of bias | Low risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Lamoth, C (A) | 2006 | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Lamoth, C (B) | 2006 | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Liew, B | 2020 | High risk of bias | Low risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Mehravar, M | 2012 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Mokhtarinia, H | 2016 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Müller, J | 2017 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Pelegrielli, A | 2020 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Ringheim, I | 2019 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Rum, L | 2021 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Seay, J | 2011 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | High risk of bias | High risk of bias |
| Seay, J | 2014 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | High risk of bias | High risk of bias |
| Selles, R | 2001 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Shojaei, I | 2017 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Shojaei, I | 2020 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Shokouhyan, S | 2020 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias |
| Silfies, S | 2009 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Tsigkanos, C | 2021 | High risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias |
| van den Hoorn, W | 2012 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |
| Wildenbeest, M | 2022 | Medium risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | not scored | Low risk of bias | Medium risk of bias | Low risk of bias |

357

 *Medium risk of bias*  *Low risk of bias*  *High risk of bias*  *not scored*

358

359

360 Analysis

361 Seventy-seven % of all participants were included in the descriptive synthesis, representing
 362 31 of the 39 studies. Eight studies(42,48,52,54,63,65,71,74) were excluded because synthesis
 363 was not feasible due to variance in outcome measures or the low number of studies. These
 364 studies measured EMG variability and kinetic variability. This synthesis was based on 8247
 365 observations (n experimental conditions x n subjects) and comprised 20 comparisons for 5
 366 experimental tasks and 4 outcome measures. Variability of trunk motor behavior was not
 367 consistently different between people with and without LBP. For six comparisons, no data

368 were available. In the remaining 14 comparisons, the most frequent observation was no
369 between-group differences (10 times), five times with an even distribution between more and
370 less variability. Two comparisons consistently indicated less variability in the LBP group and
371 one comparison indicated more variability in the LBP group. A-symmetric distributions of
372 outcomes suggesting less variability occurred 5 times and a-symmetric distributions
373 indicating more variability occurred 3 times (tables 7 – 10).

374 The secondary research questions focused on whether results were dependent on
375 characteristics of the patient group, the tasks performed and the types of measurement that
376 were used. Characteristics of the patient group could not be included in this descriptive
377 synthesis because of low variance in clinical characteristics (e.g., pain, disability, and
378 psychological measures), non-reporting of important characteristics in healthy controls, as
379 well as too few data on general characteristics (e.g., age, duration of LBP).

380 Regarding the influence of the tasks, gait related tasks seemed to yield the most consistent
381 differences, often showing no between-group difference, but when yielding a difference, it
382 showed less variability of trunk motor behavior in patients with LBP and it did so across all
383 measures where data were available (i.e., angles, coordination and Lyapunov exponent; no
384 data for determinism). Flexion-extension tasks were less consistent, studies showed all
385 possible outcomes (i.e., less variability, no differences and more variability) in participants
386 with LBP. For example, regarding variability in magnitude of trunk angles (table 7) no
387 between-group difference was reported most frequently, but when yielding a difference, it
388 showed more variability of trunk motor behavior. Regarding variability in magnitude of
389 coordination (table 8) less variability was reported most frequently, followed by no difference
390 and more variability. Even though flexion-extension tasks were less consistent, no difference
391 and less variability were more often found than more variability. For the other tasks (reaching,

392 repositioning, static postures) it was not possible to draw conclusions due to the low number
 393 of observations.

394 Measures of magnitude seemed to be more sensitive than measures of structure. Trends in
 395 variability of trunk motor behavior towards more or less variability were more frequently
 396 reported for measures of magnitude (i.e., angles & coordination) than for measures of
 397 structure (i.e., Lyapunov & determinism), 6 out of 8 times and 3 out of 6 times respectively.
 398 The observations for magnitude measures were based on 26 studies and 937 participants, the
 399 observations for structure on 9 studies and 361 participants.

400
 401
 402
 403

Table 7. Magnitude trunk angles.

| | Flex/ext | Gait | Reaching | Repositioning | Static postures |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Less variability | 0 | 16 (47,58,68) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No difference | 26 (22,43) | 28 (47,49,57,58,60,69) | 4 (59) | 1 (64) | 1 (50) |
| More variability | 4 (22,56) | 4 (60,69) | 0 | 0 | 5 (50,72) |
| Total | 963 | 1451 | 240 | 31 | 214 |

404 *Table description: distribution of all individual experimental conditions within a class of tasks across: Less variability – number of*
 405 *experimental conditions with less variability (i.e., smaller magnitude) in the LBP group.; no difference – number of experimental conditions*
 406 *with no difference between groups; More variability – number of experimental conditions with more variability (i.e., larger magnitude) in*
 407 *the LBP group. Total – the total amount of observations (n experimental conditions x n participants). Bold indicates the most frequent*
 408 *observation. Study references in brackets.*
 409 *Note: One study can contain multiple experimental conditions.*

410
 411
 412
 413

Table 8. Magnitude coordination.

| | Flex/ext | Gait | Reaching | Repositioning | Static postures |
|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|
| Less variability | 33 (40,55,66,76,78) | 13 (51,67,77) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No difference | 23 (40,46,55,76,81) | 21 (62,67) | 2 (82) | 0 | 0 |
| More variability | 5 (76,81) | 0 | 2 (82) | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2341 | 824 | 260 | 0 | 0 |

414 *Table description: distribution of all individual experimental conditions within a class of tasks across: Less variability – number of*
 415 *experimental conditions with less variability (i.e., smaller magnitude) in the LBP group.; no difference – number of experimental conditions*
 416 *with no difference between groups; More variability – number of experimental conditions with more variability (i.e., larger magnitude) in*
 417 *the LBP group. Total – the total amount of observations (n experimental conditions x n participants). Bold indicates the most frequent*
 418 *observation. Study references in brackets.*
 419 *Note: One study can contain multiple experimental conditions.*

420
 421
 422

423 **Table 9. Structure Lyapunov.**

424

| | Flex/ext | Gait | Reaching | Repositioning | Static postures |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Less variability | 0 | 1 (58) | 0 | 0 | 2 (45) |
| No difference | 14 (27,43,44,53) | 8 (58) | 1 (59) | 0 | 0 |
| More variability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 454 | 261 | 60 | 0 | 80 |

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

Table description: distribution of all individual experimental conditions within a class of tasks across: Less variability – number of experimental conditions with less variability (i.e., more regular structure) in the LBP group.; no difference – number of experimental conditions with no difference between groups; More variability – number of experimental conditions with more variability (i.e., less regular structure) in the LBP group. Total – the total amount of observations (n experimental conditions x n participants). Bold indicates the most frequent observation. Study references in brackets.

Note: One study can contain multiple experimental conditions.

Table 10. Structure Determinism.

Distribution of all experimental conditions

| | Flex/ext | Gait | Reaching | Repositioning | Static postures |
|------------------|----------------------|------|----------|---------------|------------------|
| Less variability | 10 (22,75) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No difference | 16 (22,75) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (45) |
| More variability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 988 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

Table description: distribution of all individual experimental conditions within a class of tasks across: Less variability – number of experimental conditions with less variability (i.e., more regular structure) in the LBP group.; no difference – number of experimental conditions with no difference between groups; More variability – number of experimental conditions with more variability (i.e., less regular structure) in the LBP group. Total – the total amount of observations (n experimental conditions x n participants). Bold indicates the most frequent observation. Study references in brackets.

Note: One study can contain multiple experimental conditions.

444 **Discussion**

445 In this systematic review on variability of trunk motor behavior in low-back pain patients,

446 studies were classified into one of six possible subgroups (i.e., magnitude kinematic

447 variability; structure kinematic variability; magnitude EMG variability; structure EMG

448 variability; magnitude kinetic variability and structure kinetic variability). Most studies

449 focused on kinematic outcome measures. Studies from the 2 kinematic subgroups were used

450 for a descriptive synthesis (table 7 – 10). The main research question of this review was

451 whether variability differed between people with and without low back pain. We showed that,

452 in most studies, variability did not differ between groups. Even though there was a substantial
453 inconsistency regarding the direction of variability, less variability in patients with LBP was
454 more frequently reported than more variability. Gait-related tasks often yielded no between-
455 group difference, but when experimental tasks did yield a difference, it indicated less
456 variability of trunk motor behavior in patients with LBP. The inconsistencies in variability of
457 trunk motor behavior that was observed may be in agreement with the heterogeneous
458 spectrum that LBP represents and has been reported before in reviews, in LBP(83,84) as well
459 as in other populations(85–87).

460 In this review, trends towards less variability in patients with LBP was more frequently
461 reported than towards more variability. This seems to be in line with van Dieën et al.
462 2017(88) who proposed a model in which changes in variability in LBP can be seen as a
463 functional adaptation acquired through reinforcement learning. During the initial phase of
464 LBP, variability might increase initially to decrease once a pattern has been found to control
465 the pain and/or threat perceived. According to this suggestion, people with longstanding LBP
466 will tend to control posture and movement more rigidly, causing more stereotypical muscle
467 activation and kinematics. Even though there is a lack of reporting, most participants of this
468 review seemed to have had chronic LBP with an average duration of 40 month.

469 The frequent occurrence of ‘no differences’ in variability between groups can have several
470 reasons. There is a possibility that the pain, disability, and psychological measures in the
471 group with LBP were not severe enough to detect significant differences between people with
472 and without LBP. Potentially, the LBP participants of this review are not representative of a
473 clinical LBP population. Most studies used open recruitment procedures (e.g., word of mouth,
474 recruitment amongst university staff etc.) which might have led to the recruitment of people
475 that experience LBP, but do not actively seek therapeutic guidance. Furthermore, larger
476 between-subjects variance of trunk kinematics in populations with LBP compared to those

477 without LBP(89) has been reported. This could lead to the representation of both groups (i.e.,
478 participants with more and participants with less variability) within one study. Finally, some
479 studies had small sample size and/or small samples per subject to estimate within-subject
480 variability in trunk motor behavior, which may have led to type 2 errors.

481 Concerning underlying mechanisms, both differences, more and less variability in LBP can be
482 explained. More variability in LBP might be related to lower muscle activation or to
483 proprioceptive impairments (13). Nociception has been shown to potentially cause reflexive
484 inhibition of muscle activity (90), which would lead to lower muscle activity and
485 consequently impaired control over joint movements. Nociception may also negatively affect
486 proprioception (91), as has been confirmed for trunk proprioception and LBP (92). This
487 would impair feedback control of trunk movement and as such could cause increased
488 variability and decreased stability. On the other hand, less variability and an increase in
489 stability might result from a protective movement strategy due to perceived or actual risk of
490 pain provocation, potentially modulated by pain related cognitions or emotions (25). With
491 acute pain, movement strategies are adapted to maintain control despite the disturbing effects
492 of pain (e.g., the limping gait with small joint excursions after ankle injury). Such alterations
493 in movement control involve high muscle activity and low variability in motor output (93).

494 These divergent mechanisms might explain the inconsistency of the literature and indicate the
495 necessity to diversify intervention approaches (94).

496 An additional question of this review was whether differences in trunk motor variability are
497 dependent on the task performed. Upon visual inspection, the distribution of the individual
498 experimental conditions within one outcome measure shows differences in direction of trunk
499 variability between the different tasks. For example, regarding variability in magnitude of
500 trunk angles (table 7), the overall distribution within gait-related tasks was towards less

501 variability whereas within flexion-extension related tasks as well as within static postures it
502 was towards more variability.

503 Besides differences in task, differences in task demands might have played a role as well.
504 Unlike the other tasks, variability during gait-related tasks was generally measured at
505 different speeds (i.e., walking and running), where higher speeds seemed to elicit a more
506 consistent difference in variability, probably due to an increase of the task demand. Possible
507 influences of task demands on variability have been reported before(84).

508 The influence of the patient characteristics could not be analyzed. Several characteristics (e.g.,
509 duration of complaints, description of pain, disability and psychological measures) remained
510 largely unknown due to non-reporting (tables 1 – 5). Overall, the characteristics point towards
511 samples with low levels of pain, low levels of disability and low scores (i.e., not deviating
512 from normal) regarding various psychological measures. A possible explanation is that most
513 studies were undertaken in movement labs and using open recruitment. Inclusion of
514 participants with more severe and/or disabling forms of LBP in these kinds of settings might
515 have been more challenging. A closer look at the few studies where LBP participants with
516 higher (i.e., moderate) reported pain scores showed differences in variability in all cases,
517 however, the direction of these differences still varied. Both directions, less variability
518 (47,51,63,66,72) as well as more variability (66,69,72) were reported.

519 Regarding the risk of bias, several issues should be acknowledged. Most studies had a cross
520 sectional design and from the longitudinal study(40) only baseline data were used. This
521 implies that causal inferences cannot be made. The QUIPS domain of ‘Study participation’
522 was most frequently scored having a ‘high risk of bias’ (46% of all included studies).

523 Regularly, essential information in this domain was lacking. Amongst others, this included
524 information regarding the source population and the recruitment period and place.

525 Furthermore, the domain ‘study attrition’ mostly scored a ‘moderate risk of bias’ (90%). On a

526 regular basis, the information needed to score the items was not provided, resulting in an
527 ‘unsure’ scoring of the item as agreed upon during the calibration process. Examples are
528 missing information on the response rate and on the occurrence of loss to follow up.
529 Concerning ‘study confounding’, most studies scored a ‘moderate risk of bias’. Due to the
530 lack of knowledge regarding confounders for variability, it was decided that a low RoB score
531 was not possible. By consensus, studies had to minimally report age and gender of the
532 participants to score a moderate RoB. Most study findings represent merely non-adjusted,
533 crude associations and generalization of the results should be taken cautiously. Maybe, this
534 represents a certain lack of awareness of the construct of confounding in the included studies.
535
536 To ensure the methodological quality, the authors published a Prospero protocol
537 (CRD42020180003) and followed Prisma guidelines(32). Nonetheless, there are limitations
538 regarding the review processes. One limitation was that meta-analysis was deemed not
539 feasible due to the nature of the data of the included studies. Therefore, statistical inference
540 was not possible. However, a descriptive synthesis was employed to summarize and
541 synthesize the data to answer the research questions. By doing so, 77% of the participants
542 were represented in the descriptive synthesis. An expected finding was the variety in
543 nomenclature and outcome measurements regarding variability(95). For example, nine of the
544 thirty articles did not use the term ‘variability’ in title and
545 abstract(27,40,44,45,50,53,74,77,78) and in the eight studies of the subgroup magnitude
546 EMG(42,52,57,63,66,72,76) six different outcome measures were used to express variability.
547 The authors anticipated this when constructing this review and conducted an extensive search
548 of the literature based on a comprehensive search strategy developed by an information
549 specialist with expertise in the field. This was supplemented with reference and citation
550 checking. However, despite the systematic approach, the possibility exists that the used search

551 terms did not comprise the large variety of measures and definitions that the construct of
552 variability represents and therefore, relevant studies may have been missed. Variation
553 between studies in movement tasks and movement task parameters (e.g., number of
554 repetitions, standardization differences) was large. For example, of the sixteen studies within
555 the subgroup of ‘flexion-extension’ twelve(22,40,46,52,56,64,65,71,74,75,78,81) employed a
556 rather low number of repetitions to measure variability(96,97). This was considered during
557 the RoB analysis. The use of the QUIPS tool in this review can be criticized, especially
558 regarding the applicability and the arbitrary cut-off points. This was addressed by comparing
559 concurrent tools with two experienced epidemiologists (JBS, RO) and by calibrating issues
560 related to application and interpretation.

561 Recommendations for future studies include a clearer conceptualization as well as an
562 operationalization of ‘variability’. While conceptual frameworks of variability have been
563 described in the domains of sport and overuse injury(95,97), it remains challenging to transfer
564 recommendations to the domain of LBP due to differences in scope. To achieve this, a broad
565 consensus regarding definitions as well as parameters to employ when studying variability
566 may be necessary. Future studies on variability should present rationales regarding issues like
567 whether and which magnitude or structure measures are used, regarding the movement tasks
568 (e.g., task complexity, the number of repetitions), as well as how to deal with possible
569 confounders (e.g., age, gender, duration and severity of complaints, psychological factors, or
570 endurance/fatigue related issues). Finally, it is recommended to include a broader spectrum of
571 LBP participants (e.g., age, levels of pain and disability, psychological measures) and to
572 provide complete description regarding the study participation and the clinical characteristics
573 of the participants.

574 In conclusion, this systematic review provided an overview of the methods to measure
575 variability in trunk motor behavior in people with LBP compared to people without and
576 addressed the question whether variability of trunk motor behavior differed between them.
577 In most of the studies and experimental conditions included, variability did not differ between
578 groups, but when differences between groups were found, less variability in people with LBP
579 was more frequently observed. Regarding implications for practice, as of now, a translation of
580 the results towards the clinical setting is challenging and not recommended.

581

582

583

584 **Acknowledgments**

585 We thank Thomas Pelgrim (TP), information specialist at the HAN University of Applied
586 Sciences, for his contribution to the search strategy.

587

588 **Authors Contributions**

589 **Conceptualization:** Florian Abu Bakar, J.Bart Staal, Robert van Cingel, Raymond Ostelo,
590 Jaap van Dieën.

591 **Data curation:** Florian Abu Bakar, J.Bart Staal.

592 **Formal analysis:** Florian Abu Bakar, Jaap van Dieën.

593 **Investigation:** Florian Abu Bakar.

594 **Methodology:** Florian Abu Bakar, J.Bart Staal, Robert van Cingel, Raymond Ostelo, Jaap
595 van Dieën.

596 **Project administration:** Florian Abu Bakar.

597 **Supervision:** J.Bart Staal, Robert van Cingel, Raymond Ostelo, Jaap van Dieën.

598 **Writing – original draft:** Florian Abu Bakar.

599 **Writing – review & editing:** Florian Abu Bakar, J.Bart Staal, Robert van Cingel, Hiroki
600 Saito, Raymond Ostelo, Jaap van Dieën.

601

602

603 **References**

604

- 605 1. Hoy D, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, Woolf A, Bain C, et al. The global burden of low
606 back pain: estimates from the Global Burden of Disease 2010 study. *Ann Rheum Dis*.
607 2014 Jun;73(6):968–74.
- 608 2. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, et al. Low
609 back pain 1 What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. *The Lancet*.
610 2018;391:2356–67.
- 611 3. Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, Chou R, Cohen SP, Gross DP, et al. Prevention and
612 treatment of low back pain: evidence, challenges, and promising directions. *The*
613 *Lancet*. 2018;6736(18):1–16.
- 614 4. Hayden JA, Ellis J, Ogilvie R, Malmivaara A, van Tulder MW. Exercise therapy for
615 chronic low back pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2021;2021(9).
- 616 5. Hayden JA, Ellis J, Ogilvie R, Stewart SA, Bagg MK, Stanojevic S, et al. Some types
617 of exercise are more effective than others in people with chronic low back pain: a
618 network meta-analysis. *J Physiother [Internet]*. 2021;67(4):252–62. Available from:
619 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphys.2021.09.004>
- 620 6. Owen PJ, Miller CT, Mundell NL, Verswijveren SJJM, Tagliaferri SD, Brisby H, et al.
621 Which specific modes of exercise training are most effective for treating low back
622 pain? Network meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54(21):1279–87.
- 623 7. van Middelkoop M, Rubinstein SM, Verhagen AP, Ostelo RW, Koes BW, van Tulder
624 MW. Exercise therapy for chronic nonspecific low-back pain. *Best Pract Res Clin*
625 *Rheumatol*. 2010;24(2):193–204.
- 626 8. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, et al.
627 Series Low back pain 1 What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. *The*
628 *Lancet*. 2018;391(10137):2356–67.
- 629 9. Sterling M, Keefe FJ. Physical rehabilitation research and pain science. *Pain*.
630 2021;162(11):2621–4.
- 631 10. Saragiotto BT, Maher CG, Yamato TP, Costa LO, Menezes Costa LC, Ostelo RW, et
632 al. Motor control exercise for chronic non-specific low-back pain. *Cochrane Database*
633 *Syst Rev [Internet]*. 2016 Jan 10 [cited 2016 Jan 11];1:CD012085. Available from:
634 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26863390>
- 635 11. Byström MG, Rasmussen-Barr E, Johannes W, Grooten A, Grooten WJA. Motor
636 Control Exercises Reduces Pain and Disability in Chronic and Recurrent Low Back
637 Pain: A Meta-Analysis. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013;38(6).
- 638 12. Macedo LG, Maher CG, Latimer J, McAuley JH. Motor control exercise for persistent,
639 nonspecific low back pain: A systematic review. *Phys Ther*. 2009;89(1):9–25.
- 640 13. Van Dieën JH, Peter Reeves N, Kawchuk G, Van Dillen LR, Hodges PW. Analysis of
641 motor control in patients with low back pain: A key to personalized care? *Journal of*
642 *Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy*. 2019;49(6):380–8.
- 643 14. Saragiotto BT, Maher CG, Hancock MJ, Koes BW. Subgrouping Patients With
644 Nonspecific Low Back Pain: Hope or Hype? *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical*
645 *Therapy*. 2017;47(2):44–8.

- 646 15. Hadders-Algra M. Variation and variability: Key words in human motor development.
647 Phys Ther. 2010;90(12):1823–37.
- 648 16. Harbourne RT, Stergiou N. Movement variability and the use of nonlinear tools:
649 principles to guide physical therapist practice. Phys Ther. 2009;89(3):267–82.
- 650 17. Bernstein N. The coordination and regulation of movements. Oxford, England.:
651 Pergamon Press; 1967.
- 652 18. Bartlett R, Wheat J, Robins M. Is movement variability important for sports
653 biomechanists? Sports biomechanics / International Society of Biomechanics in Sports
654 [Internet]. 2007 May [cited 2016 May 7];6(2):224–43. Available from:
655 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17892098>
- 656 19. Hamill J, Palmer C, van Emmerik RE a. Coordinative variability and overuse injury.
657 Sports Med Arthrosc Rehabil Ther Technol [Internet]. 2012;4(1):45. Available from:
658 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3536567&tool=pmcentrez
659 &rendertype=abstract%5Cnhttp://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23186012%5Cnhttp:
660 //www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC3536567](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3536567&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract%5Cnhttp://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23186012%5Cnhttp://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC3536567)
- 661 20. Stergiou N, Harbourne RT, Cavanaugh JT. Optimal movement variability: A new
662 theoretical perspective for neurologic physical therapy. Journal of Neurologic Physical
663 Therapy [Internet]. 2006 [cited 2019 Jan 17];30(3):120–9. Available from:
664 [https://journals.lww.com/jnpt/Abstract/2006/09000/Optimal_Movement_Variability__
665 A_New_Theoretical.6.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/jnpt/Abstract/2006/09000/Optimal_Movement_Variability__A_New_Theoretical.6.aspx)
- 666 21. van den Hoorn W, Bruijn SM, Meijer OG, Hodges PW, van Dieën JH. Mechanical
667 coupling between transverse plane pelvis and thorax rotations during gait is higher in
668 people with low back pain. 2012 Jan 10;45(2).
- 669 22. Dideriksen JL, Gizzi L, Petzke F, Falla D. Deterministic accessory spinal movement in
670 functional tasks characterizes individuals with low back pain. Clin Neurophysiol
671 [Internet]. 2014 Aug [cited 2017 Apr 1];125(8):1663–8. Available from:
672 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1388245713013503>
- 673 23. Asgari M, Sanjari MA, Mokhtarinia HR, Moeini Sedeh S, Khalaf K, Parnianpour M.
674 The effects of movement speed on kinematic variability and dynamic stability of
675 the trunk in healthy individuals and low back pain patients. Clin Biomech (Bristol,
676 Avon). 2015 Aug;30(7):682–8.
- 677 24. Mazaheri M, Heidari E, Mostamand J, Negahban H, van Dieën JH. Competing effects
678 of pain and fear of pain on postural control in low back pain? Spine (Phila Pa 1976).
679 2014 Dec 1;39(25):E1518-23.
- 680 25. Karayannis N V, Smeets RJEM, van den Hoorn W, Hodges PW. Fear of Movement Is
681 Related to Trunk Stiffness in Low Back Pain. PLoS One. 2013 Jan;8(6):e67779.
- 682 26. Abboud J, Nougrou F, Pagé I, Cantin V, Massicotte D, Descarreaux M. Trunk motor
683 variability in patients with non-specific chronic low back pain. Eur J Appl Physiol.
684 2014;114(12):2645–54.
- 685 27. Asgari N, Sanjari MA, Esteki A. Local dynamic stability of the spine and its
686 coordinated lower joints during repetitive Lifting: Effects of fatigue and chronic low
687 back pain. Hum Mov Sci. 2017 Aug;54:339–46.
- 688 28. Williams JM, Haq I, Lee RY. An experimental study investigating the effect of pain
689 relief from oral analgesia on lumbar range of motion, velocity, acceleration and
690 movement irregularity. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2014 Sep;15:304.
- 691 29. Donker SF, Roerdink M, Greven AJ, Beek PJ. Regularity of center-of-pressure
692 trajectories depends on the amount of attention invested in postural control. Exp Brain
693 Res. 2007;181(1).
- 694 30. Bruijn SM, van Dieën JH, Meijer OG, Beek PJ. Is slow walking more stable? J
695 Biomech. 2009;42(10).

- 696 31. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
697 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015:
698 Elaboration and explanation. *BMJ (Online)*. 2015;349(January):1–25.
- 699 32. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
700 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
701 statement. *Revista Espanola de Nutricion Humana y Dietetica*. 2016;20(2):148–60.
- 702 33. Polanin JR, Pigott TD, Espelage DL, Grotperter JK. Best practice guidelines for abstract
703 screening large-evidence systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Res Synth Methods*.
704 2019 Sep 24;10(3):330–42.
- 705 34. Mourad Ouzzani, Hossam Hammady, Zbys Fedorowicz and AElmagarmid. Rayyan —
706 a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews (2016) 5*:210
707 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct 26]. Available from: <https://rayyan.qcri.org/welcome>
- 708 35. Riley RD, Moons KGM, Snell KIE, Ensor J, Hooft L, Altman DG, et al. A guide to
709 systematic review and meta-analysis of prognostic factor studies. *BMJ (Online)*.
710 2019;364.
- 711 36. Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Côté P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias
712 in studies of prognostic factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(4):280–6.
- 713 37. Group CCPM: The Cochrane Collaboration Prognosis Methods Group, Review Tools.
714 [Internet]. 2018. Available from: <https://methods.cochrane.org/prognosis/welcome>
- 715 38. Grooten WJA, Tseli E, Äng BO, Boersma K, Stålnacke BM, Gerdle B, et al.
716 Elaborating on the assessment of the risk of bias in prognostic studies in pain
717 rehabilitation using QUIPS—aspects of interrater agreement. *Diagn Progn Res*.
718 2019;3(1):1–11.
- 719 39. Gartlehner G, Affengruber L, Titscher V, Noel-Storr A, Dooley G, Ballarini N, et al.
720 Single-reviewer abstract screening missed 13 percent of relevant studies: a crowd-
721 based, randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2020;121:20–8.
- 722 40. Shojaei I, Salt EG, Bazrgari B. A prospective study of lumbo-pelvic coordination in
723 patients with non-chronic low back pain. *J Biomech [Internet]*. 2020;102:109306.
724 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2019.07.050>
- 725 41. Asgari N, Sanjari MA, Esteki A. Local dynamic stability of the spine and its
726 coordinated lower joints during repetitive Lifting: Effects of fatigue and chronic low
727 back pain. *Hum Mov Sci*. 2017;54:339–46.
- 728 42. Arjunan SP, Kumar DK, Poon WM, Rudolph H, Hu Y. Variability in surface
729 electromyogram during gait analysis of low back pain patients. *J Med Biol Eng*.
730 2010;30(3):133–8.
- 731 43. Asgari M, Sanjari MA, Mokhtarinia HR, Moeini Sedeh S, Khalaf K, Parnianpour M.
732 The effects of movement speed on kinematic variability and dynamic stability of the
733 trunk in healthy individuals and low back pain patients. *Clinical Biomechanics*
734 [Internet]. 2015;30(7):682–8. Available from:
735 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2015.05.005>
- 736 44. Asgari M, Mokhtarinia HR, Sanjari MA, Kahrizi S, Philip GC, Parnianpour M, et al.
737 Trunk Dynamic Stability Assessment for Individuals With and Without Nonspecific
738 Low Back Pain During Repetitive Movement. *Hum Factors*. 2020;
- 739 45. Shokouhyan SM, Davoudi M, Hoviattalab M, Abedi M, Bervis S, Parnianpour M, et al.
740 Linear and Non-linear Dynamic Methods Toward Investigating Proprioception
741 Impairment in Non-specific Low Back Pain Patients. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*.
742 2020;8(November):1–12.
- 743 46. Fujii R, Imai R, Shigetoh H, Tanaka S, Morioka S. Task-specific fear influences
744 abnormal trunk motor coordination in workers with chronic low back pain: a relative
745 phase angle analysis of object-lifting. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2022;23(1):1–13.

- 746 47. Bagheri R, Takamjani IE, Pourahmadi MR, Jannati E, Fazeli SH, Hedayati R, et al.
747 Trunk–pelvis kinematics variability during gait and its association with trunk muscle
748 endurance in patients with chronic low back pain. *J Appl Biomech*. 2020;36(2):76–84.
- 749 48. Chehrehazi M, Sanjari MA, Mokhtarinia HR, Jamshidi AA, Maroufi N, Parnianpour
750 M. Goal equivalent manifold analysis of task performance in non-specific LBP
751 and healthy subjects during repetitive trunk movement: Effect of load, velocity,
752 symmetry. *Hum Mov Sci*. 2017 Jan;51:72–81.
- 753 49. Pelegrinelli ARM, Silva MF, Guenka LC, Carrasco AC, Moura FA, Cardoso JR. Low
754 back pain affects coordination between the trunk segments but not variability during
755 running. *J Biomech*. 2020 Mar 5;101.
- 756 50. Dunk NM, Callaghan JP. Lumbar spine movement patterns during prolonged sitting
757 differentiate low back pain developers from matched asymptomatic controls. *Work*.
758 2010;35(1):3–14.
- 759 51. Ebrahimi S, Kamali F, Razeghi M, Haghpanah SA. Comparison of the trunk-pelvis and
760 lower extremities sagittal plane inter-segmental coordination and variability during
761 walking in persons with and without chronic low back pain. *Hum Mov Sci*. 2017
762 Apr;52:55–66.
- 763 52. Falla D, Gizzi L, Tschapek M, Erlenwein J, Petzke F. Reduced task-induced variations
764 in the distribution of activity across back muscle regions in individuals with low back
765 pain. *Pain*. 2014 May;155(5):944–53.
- 766 53. Graham RB, Oikawa LY, Ross GB. Comparing the local dynamic stability of trunk
767 movements between varsity athletes with and without non-specific low back pain. *J*
768 *Biomech*. 2014 Apr;47(6):1459–64.
- 769 54. Jacobs J v., Henry SM, Nagle KJ. People With Chronic Low Back Pain Exhibit
770 Decreased Variability in the Timing of Their Anticipatory Postural Adjustments.
771 *Behavioral Neuroscience*. 2009;123(2):455–8.
- 772 55. Mokhtarinia HR, Sanjari MA, Chehrehazi M, Kahrizi S, Parnianpour M. Trunk
773 coordination in healthy and chronic nonspecific low back pain subjects during
774 repetitive flexion-extension tasks: Effects of movement asymmetry, velocity and load.
775 *Hum Mov Sci*. 2016 Feb 1;45:182–92.
- 776 56. Mehravar M, Tajali S, Negahban H, Shaterzadeh MJ, Salehi R, Narimani R, et al.
777 Principal component analysis of kinematic patterns variability during sit to stand in
778 people with non-specific chronic low back pain. *J Mech Med Biol*. 2012;12(2).
- 779 57. Mueller J, Engel T, Mueller S, Stoll J, Baur H, Mayer F. Effects of sudden walking
780 perturbations on neuromuscular reflex activity and threedimensional motion of the
781 trunk in healthy controls and back pain symptomatic subjects. *PLoS One*.
782 2017;12(3):1–20.
- 783 58. Tsigkanos C, Demestiha T, Spiliopoulou C, Tsigkanos G. Gait kinematics in Low Back
784 Pain: A non-linear approach. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*. 2021;34(4):707–14.
- 785 59. Wildenbeest MH, Kiers H, Tuijt M, van Dieën JH. Associations of low-back pain and
786 pain-related cognitions with lumbar movement patterns during repetitive seated
787 reaching. *Gait Posture*. 2022;91:216–22.
- 788 60. Hamacher D, Hamacher D, Schega L. A cognitive dual task affects gait variability in
789 patients suffering from chronic low back pain. *Exp Brain Res*. 2014
790 Nov;232(11):3509–13.
- 791 61. Seay JF, Van Emmerik REA, Hamill J. Low back pain status affects pelvis-trunk
792 coordination and variability during walking and running. *Clinical Biomechanics*.
793 2011;26(6):572–8.
- 794 62. Seay JF, van Emmerik REA, Hamill J. Trunk bend and twist coordination is affected
795 by low back pain status during running. *Eur J Sport Sci*. 2014;14(6):563–8.

- 796 63. Abboud J, Nougrou F, Pagé I, Cantin V, Massicotte D, Descarreaux M. Trunk motor
797 variability in patients with non-specific chronic low back pain. *Eur J Appl Physiol.*
798 2014 Dec;114(12):2645–54.
- 799 64. Descarreaux M, Blouin JS, Teasdale N. Repositioning accuracy and movement
800 parameters in low back pain subjects and healthy control subjects. *European Spine*
801 *Journal.* 2005;14(2):185–91.
- 802 65. Descarreaux M, Lalonde C, Normand MC. Isometric Force Parameters and Trunk
803 Muscle Recruitment Strategies in a Population With Low Back Pain. *J Manipulative*
804 *Physiol Ther.* 2007;30(2):91–7.
- 805 66. Lamoth CJC, Meijer OG, Daffertshofer A, Wuisman PIJM, Beek PJ. Effects of chronic
806 low back pain on trunk coordination and back muscle activity during walking: Changes
807 in motor control. *European Spine Journal.* 2006 Feb;15(1):23–40.
- 808 67. Seay JF, van Emmerik REA, Hamill J. Low back pain status affects pelvis-trunk
809 coordination and variability during walking and running. *Clinical Biomechanics*
810 [Internet]. 2011;26(6):572–8. Available from:
811 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2010.11.012>
- 812 68. van den Hoorn W, Bruijn SM, Meijer OG, Hodges PW, van Dieën JH. Mechanical
813 coupling between transverse plane pelvis and thorax rotations during gait is higher in
814 people with low back pain. *J Biomech.* 2012;
- 815 69. Rum L, Brasiliano P, Vannozzi G, Laudani L, Macaluso A. Non-specific chronic low
816 back pain elicits kinematic and neuromuscular changes in walking and gait termination.
817 *Gait Posture* [Internet]. 2021;84(October 2020):238–44. Available from:
818 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.12.005>
- 819 70. Ippersiel P, Robbins S, Preuss R. Movement variability in adults with low back pain
820 during sit-to-stand-to-sit. *Clinical Biomechanics* [Internet]. 2018;58:90–5. Available
821 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2018.07.011>
- 822 71. Liew BXW, de Nunzio AM, Srivastava S, Falla D. Influence of low back pain and its
823 remission on motor abundance in a low-load lifting task. *Sci Rep* [Internet].
824 2020;10(1). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-74707-4>
- 825 72. Ringheim I, Indahl A, Roeleveld K. Reduced muscle activity variability in lumbar
826 extensor muscles during sustained sitting in individuals with chronic low back pain.
827 *PLoS One.* 2019;14(3):1–13.
- 828 73. Silfies SP, Bhattacharya A, Biely S, Smith SS, Giszter S. Trunk control during
829 standing reach: A dynamical system analysis of movement strategies in patients with
830 mechanical low back pain. *Gait Posture.* 2009;29(3):370–6.
- 831 74. Bauer CM, Rast FM, Ernst MJ, Oetiker S, Meichtry A, Kool J, et al. Pain intensity
832 attenuates movement control of the lumbar spine in low back pain. *Journal of*
833 *Electromyography and Kinesiology.* 2015 Dec 1;25(6):919–27.
- 834 75. Bauer CM, Rast FM, Ernst MJ, Meichtry A, Kool J, Rissanen SM, et al. The effect of
835 muscle fatigue and low back pain on lumbar movement variability and complexity. *J*
836 *Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2017;33:94–102.
- 837 76. Lamoth CJC, Daffertshofer A, Meijer OG, Beek PJ. How do persons with chronic low
838 back pain speed up and slow down? Trunk-pelvis coordination and lumbar erector
839 spinae activity during gait. *Gait Posture.* 2006;23(2):230–9.
- 840 77. Selles RW, Wagenaar RC, Smit TH, Wuisman PIJM. Disorders in trunk rotation
841 during walking in patients with low back pain: A dynamical systems approach. *Clinical*
842 *Biomechanics.* 2001;16(3):175–81.
- 843 78. Shojaei I, Vazirian M, Salt EG, van Dillen LR, Bazrgari B. Timing and magnitude of
844 lumbar spine contribution to trunk forward bending and backward return in patients

- 845 with acute low back pain. *J Biomech* [Internet]. 2017;53(January):71–7. Available
846 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.12.039>
- 847 79. Bauer CM, Rast FM, Ernst MJ, Meichtry A, Kool J, Rissanen SM, et al. The effect of
848 muscle fatigue and low back pain on lumbar movement variability and complexity. *J*
849 *Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2017 Apr;33:94–102.
- 850 80. Descarreaux M, Lalonde C, Normand MC. Isometric force parameters and trunk
851 muscle recruitment strategies in a population with low back pain. *J Manipulative*
852 *Physiol Ther*. 2007;30(2):91–7.
- 853 81. Ippersiel P, Robbins S, Preuss R. Movement variability in adults with low back pain
854 during sit-to-stand-to-sit. *Clinical Biomechanics* [Internet]. 2018;58(July):90–5.
855 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2018.07.011>
- 856 82. Silfies SP, Bhattacharya A, Biely S, Smith SS, Giszter S. Trunk control during
857 standing reach: A dynamical system analysis of movement strategies in patients with
858 mechanical low back pain. *Gait Posture*. 2009 Apr;29(3):370–6.
- 859 83. Hodges PW, van Dieën JH, Kawchuk G, van Dillen L, Reeves NP. Motor Control
860 Changes in Low-Back Pain: Divergence in Presentations and Mechanisms. *Journal of*
861 *Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*. 2018;(31):1–24.
- 862 84. Hiroki Saito, Hiroshi takasaki, Yoshiteru Watanabe, Toshiki Kutsuna T, Futohashi,
863 Masayoshi Kubo, Yasuaki Kusumoto HT. How does spinal movement variability
864 change in people with low back pain?: protocol for a systematic review. 2020;
- 865 85. Blyton SJ, Snodgrass SJ, Pizzari T, Birse SM, Likens AD, Edwards S. *Gait & Posture*
866 The impact of previous musculoskeletal injury on running gait variability : A
867 systematic review. *Gait Posture* [Internet]. 2023;101:124–33. Available from:
868 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2023.01.018>
- 869 86. Leporace G, Metsavaht L, de Oliveira LP, Nadal J, Batista LA. Motor coordination
870 during gait after anterior cruciate ligament injury: A systematic review of the literature.
871 *Rev Bras Ortop (Sao Paulo)*. 2013;48(4):293–9.
- 872 87. Baida SR, Gore SJ, Franklyn-Miller AD, Moran KA. Does the amount of lower
873 extremity movement variability differ between injured and uninjured populations? A
874 systematic review. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2018;28(4):1320–38.
- 875 88. van Dieën JH, Flor H, Hodges PW. Low-Back Pain Patients Learn to Adapt Motor
876 Behavior With Adverse Secondary Consequences. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*.
877 2017;45(4):223–9.
- 878 89. Laird RA, Gilbert J, Kent P, Keating JL. Comparing lumbo-pelvic kinematics in people
879 with and without back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC*
880 *Musculoskelet Disord*. 2014 Jul;15:229.
- 881 90. Hodges PW, Richardson CA. Inefficient muscular stabilization of the lumbar spine
882 associated with low back pain. A motor control evaluation of transversus abdominis.
883 *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1996;21(22):2640–50.
- 884 91. Eva-Maj M, Hans W, Per-Anders F, Mikael K, Måns M. Experimentally induced deep
885 cervical muscle pain distorts head on trunk orientation. *Eur J Appl Physiol*.
886 2013;113(10).
- 887 92. Tong MH, Mousavi SJ, Kiers H, Ferreira P, Refshauge K, van Dieën J. Is There a
888 Relationship Between Lumbar Proprioception and Low Back Pain? A Systematic
889 Review With Meta-Analysis. In: *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*.
890 2017.
- 891 93. Srinivasan D, Mathiassen SE. Motor variability in occupational health and
892 performance. *Clinical Biomechanics* [Internet]. 2012;27(10):979–93. Available from:
893 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2012.08.007>

- 894 94. van Dieën JH, Reeves NP, Kawchuk G, van Dillen LR, Hodges PW. Motor Control
895 Changes in Low Back Pain: Divergence in Presentations and Mechanisms. *J Orthop*
896 *Sports Phys Ther.* 2019;49(6):370–9.
- 897 95. Cowin J, Nimphius S, Fell J, Culhane P, Schmidt M. A Proposed Framework to
898 Describe Movement Variability within Sporting Tasks: A Scoping Review. *Sports Med*
899 *Open* [Internet]. 2022;8(1). Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s40798-022-00473-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40798-022-00473-4)
900 4
- 901 96. Dupeyron A, Rispens SM, Demattei C, van Dieën JH. Precision of estimates of local
902 stability of repetitive trunk movements. *Eur Spine J.* 2013 Dec;22(12):2678–85.
- 903 97. Nordin AD, Dufek JS. Reviewing the Variability-Overuse Injury Hypothesis: Does
904 Movement Variability Relate to Landing Injuries? *Res Q Exerc Sport* [Internet].
905 2019;90(2):190–205. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2019.1576837>

906
907
908

909 **Supporting information**

- 910 - **S1 Appendix. Search strategy for all databases.** (DOC)
- 911 - **S1 Checklist. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis**
912 **(PRISMA) Abstract checklist.** (DOC)
- 913 - **S2 Checklist. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis**
914 **(PRISMA) checklist.** (DOC)
- 915 - **S3 Checklist. Quality in Prognostic Studies (QUIPS) Tool.** (PDF)
- 916 - **S1 File. Registered protocol.** This is the review protocol which was registered with
917 PROPERO. (PDF)

