

1 The relationship between acceleration during running at optimal speed and changes in
2 the T2 times of the lumbar intervertebral disc

3

4 Takayoshi Hakkaku^{1*}, Yoshiaki Kubo², Koji Koyama², Koichi Nakazato^{1,3} Takashi

5 Okada^{1,4}, Kenji Hiranuma³

6

7 1 Graduate School of Health and Sport Science Health and Sport Science Programs,

8 Nippon Sport Science University, Tokyo, Japan

9 2 Tokyo Ariake University of Medical and Health Sciences, Tokyo, Japan

10 3 Faculty of Medical Science, Nippon Sport Science University, Tokyo, Japan

11 4 Faculty of Sport Science, Nippon Sport Science University, Tokyo, Japan

12

13 * Corresponding author

14 E-mail: 22sda07@nittai.ac.jp (TH)

15

16 **Abstract**

17 T2 times by magnetic resonance imaging techniques has been used to examine the
18 beneficial effects of exercise on the human intervertebral disc (IVDs). The magnitude,
19 frequency, and duration of running can contribute to both beneficial and detrimental
20 responses. Slow running (7-9 km/h) is considered the optimal range. By revealing the
21 detailed loading direction and acute changes in T2 times that occur in the IVDs, the
22 positive effects of running on the IVDs can be explored. This study aimed to investigate
23 the relationship between load during slow running and changes in the T2 times of lumbar
24 IVDs before and after running. Sixteen healthy male students were fitted with a triaxial
25 accelerator and ran on a treadmill at 8 km/h for 1 min. Three lumbar T2 times from the
26 L3/L4 to L5/S1 levels were measured before and after exercise using magnetic resonance
27 imaging, and the analysis divided into five regions of interest. Acceleration was $0.23 \pm$
28 0.06 root mean square in the X-axis (mediolateral), 1.37 ± 0.08 in the Y-axis (vertical),
29 and 0.30 ± 0.06 in the Z-axis (anteroposterior). An analysis of the correlation between the
30 change in T2 time and acceleration showed a strong correlation, particularly in the Z-axis

31 (anteroposterior direction) acceleration. At L3/L4, a positive correlation was observed for
32 the posterior nucleus ($r = 0.72$, $p = 0.002$, $R^2 = 0.59$), at L4/L5, a positive correlation was
33 observed for the central nucleus ($r = 0.73$, $p = 0.003$, $R^2 = 0.49$); in L5/S1, a negative
34 correlation was observed for the anterior annulus fibrosus ($r = -0.73$, $p = 0.01$, $R^2 = 0.48$).
35 These results suggest that anteroposterior loading may play a significant role in the
36 response of the IVDs.

37

38 **Introduction**

39 Human intervertebral discs (IVDs) are primarily avascular tissues, and the maintenance of
40 homeostasis in disc cells depends on nutrient exchange between the disc and the adjacent vertebrae.
41 Nutrients such as glucose and oxygen are transported into the vertebral column by two mechanisms:
42 diffusion of nutrients from the vertebral vascular supply terminating at the vertebral endplate and fluid
43 convection due to loading [1-3]. Oxygen plays an important role in disc cell metabolism, and the
44 diminished transport of these nutrients is often proposed as a factor in age-related disc degeneration
45 (IDD) [4].

46 Quantitative magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) techniques using T2 values can assess IVDs,
47 and T2 times are strongly correlated with its biochemical composition [5]. T2 times are based on two
48 parameters: water content and collagen arrangement in the IVDs, and as the IDD, the water content
49 decreases and the collagen arrangement becomes irregular, resulting in a decrease in the T2 times of
50 the nucleus pulposus [6, 7]. Investigations using T2 time to elucidate the mechanism of IDD suggest
51 that in the nucleus pulposus, which undergoes fewer degenerative changes, T2 time is temporarily
52 decreased by exercise stress and recovered by rest. However, progressive degeneration does not cause
53 changes in T2, suggesting irreversible progression [8].

54 Recently, T2 has been used to examine the beneficial effects of exercise on the IVDs. Belavy et
55 al. [9] reported that athletic individuals had longer T2 times of lumbar IVDs, whereas long-distance
56 runners exhibited longer T2 times of lumbar IVDs, suggesting greater vertebral height and IVDs
57 hypertrophy. Another study found longer T2 times of the IVDs annulus fibrosus and better IDD status
58 in men with more than 10 years of running experience, suggesting that long-term running may delay
59 IDD [10]. In contrast, prolonged dynamic loading during running has been reported to cause signs of
60 degeneration. Takatalo et al. [11] investigated the incidence of IDD in adolescents and reported that

61 running at least twice a week among endurance runners was associated with IDD. This result is
62 inconsistent with those of earlier studies that proposed that running benefits IVDs.

63 Thus, even during running, the magnitude, frequency, and duration of force may contribute to
64 both beneficial and deleterious responses. Belavy et al. [9] used triaxial accelerometer to determine
65 the mean absolute deviation (MAD) during running and found that 0.46 to 0.78 G is the optimal range
66 for lumbar IVDs. In other words, by clarifying the detailed loading direction and T2 times of the acute
67 changes that occur in IVDs during slow running at 7–9 km/h (the optimal range), the positive effects
68 of running on IVDs can be explored. This also clarifies the inconsistency in the impact of running on
69 the IVDs. Thus, the relationship between the direction of loading and the change in T2 times of the
70 IVDs due to exercise loading in the optimal range of MAD has yet to be elucidated.

71 Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the relationship between load during slow running and
72 changes in the T2 times of lumbar IVDs before and after running. We hypothesized that investigating
73 the load applied by the MAD in the optimal range would provide clues for improving T2 times. Our
74 primary hypothesis was that the T2 times in the nucleus pulposus of the IVDs would improve after
75 slow running (MAD: 0.4–0.7 G; running speed: 7–9 km/h), and that changes would be categorized

76 into positive and negative effects depending on the direction of any of the triaxial accelerations.

77

78 **Materials and methods**

79 **Participants**

80 Our local ethics committee approved this study (no. 022-H173; January 31, 2023), which was
81 performed in accordance with the guidelines for experimental studies involving human participants
82 and met the ethical standards of the journal. The study was conducted in accordance with the principles
83 of the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants were informed of the study's purpose, experimental
84 procedures, potential benefits, and possible risks, and were enrolled after providing written informed
85 consent. Minor subjects were enrolled after obtaining parental consent. This study was conducted from
86 February to May 2023. Sixteen healthy male university students were enrolled in this study (age, 20.8
87 \pm 1.2 years; height, 172.2 \pm 4.4 cm; weight, 72.3 \pm 9.2 kg). The participants did not run daily and had
88 no history of low back pain.

89 **Procedures**

90 After arriving at the laboratory, the participants were briefed on the study, placed on their backs

91 in bed, and allowed to rest for 10 min before pre-MRI testing was performed. Thereafter, patients were
92 fitted with a triaxial accelerometer and performed a 1-minute run, followed by post-MRI testing. After
93 running, the participants rested on their backs at all times, and MRI measurements were obtained 30
94 min after running to determine IVDs changes over time.

95 **Running exercise and triaxial accelerometer**

96 Participants ran on a treadmill (Elite 5000; Johnson, Tokyo, Japan) for 1 min. The exercise
97 duration in this study was selected based on the fact that the T2 values changed even with very low
98 exercise loads (15 repetitions of trunk flexion, extension, and rotation exercises) [8]. The running
99 speed was set at 8 km/h, within the range of MAD that had a positive effect on the IVDs based on the
100 report by Bellaby et al. [9] No warm-up was performed before the run, and the experiment began as
101 soon as the participants were ready. To measure the load caused by running, a triaxial accelerometer
102 (wGT3X-BT; ActiGraph, Chiba, Japan) was fixed to the L4-L5 lumbar intervertebral region using a
103 belt, and acceleration data were collected at 100 Hz. The x axis was oriented in the mediolateral
104 direction. Acceleration was indicated on the X-axis as mediolateral acceleration, on the Y-axis as
105 vertical acceleration, and on the Z-axis as anteroposterior acceleration.

106 **Testing and MRI scanning protocol**

107 The participants were instructed not to perform any exercise on the day of the scan. T2 times
108 before and after exercise were measured using MRI (ECHELON OVAL, 1.5 T; Hitachi Medical
109 Systems, Tokyo, Japan). To avoid the effects of normal diurnal variations on the spine [12], all the
110 tests were performed at approximately noon. The resulting images were evaluated by an orthopedic
111 surgeon specializing in spinal diseases to assess IDD.

112 Sagittal T2 mapping using spin-echo multi-echo sequences (nine echo times: 12, 24, 36, 48, 60,
113 72, 84, 96, and 108 ms; repetition time, 1600 ms; number of slices, 12; slice thickness, 4 mm; gap, 5
114 mm; interslice distance, 5.0 mm; field of view, 200 mm; resolution, $1.04 \times 1.25 \times 4.00$ mm per
115 pixel; and acquisition time, 6 min 55 s).

116 **Acceleration and image data analysis**

117 The recorded raw acceleration data collected during treadmill running were transferred to
118 analysis software (OT BioLab, OT Bioelettronica, Italy) and filtered at a 10-Hz cut-off frequency. The
119 rms of the X-, Y-axis-, and Z-axes, resultant acceleration ($= \sqrt{x_i^2 + y_i^2 + z_i^2}$), and mean amplitude
120 deviation ($MAD = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - \bar{x}|}{n}$, $x =$ resultant acceleration) were calculated every 30 s on the analysis

121 screen, excluding the 15 s before and after the 1-min running session.

122 T2 values were calculated using the MRI software. After the images were obtained in ECHELON
123 OVAL format, they were loaded and viewed using the T2*RelaxMap feature of the MRI system
124 (Hitachi Medical Systems). After the images of the nine echo times were superimposed using the
125 software, the outlines of the lumbar IVDs were traced to determine the region of interest (ROI) in each
126 image. The T2 times for each pixel were calculated using the software, whereas the T2 times were
127 measured for each slice. The three IVDs analyzed were L3/L4 to L5/S1, which had a high incidence
128 of IDD. The IVDs was segmented into five subregions from the anterior to posterior aspect (Fig 1)
129 [13]: from front to back, the anterior annulus fibrosus (AF), anterior nucleus (AN), central nucleus
130 (CN), posterior nucleus (PN), and posterior annulus fibrosus (PF). Image calculations were performed
131 thrice for each ROI, and the average value was used as the T2 time.

132

133 Fig 1. Examples of IVDs and ROIs on MR images.

134 T2* RelaxMap of lumbar intervertebral discs in the central slice (left) and from L3/L4 to L5/S1 divided
135 into five subregions (right): 1. anterior annulus fibrosus; 2. anterior nucleus; 3. central nucleus; 4.

136 posterior nucleus; and 5. posterior annulus fibrosus.

137

138 **Statistical analysis**

139 Data are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation. Changes in T2 times and differences in IVDs

140 levels were compared using one-way analysis of variance. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used

141 to examine the correlation between changes in T2 times and triaxial acceleration, synthetic

142 acceleration, and MAD. The rate of change in T2 was determined by normalizing pre-MRI values.

143 Where a correlation was found, the adjusted R-squared was determined using simple linear regression

144 analysis. All tests were performed using statistical analysis software SPSS Statistics for Macintosh

145 (ver. 29.0.2.0; IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). The significance level was set at $p < .05$.

146

147 **Results**

148 **T2 times**

149 Disc degeneration was characterized by the Pfirrmann grade [14]. Of the 16 subjects in the study,

150 two discs were Pfirrmann grade III on L4/L5 and four discs were Pfirrmann grade III on L5/S1, and

151 the corresponding IDD was excluded from this study. The T2 values for each IVDs level are shown
152 in Table1. There were no significant differences in the changes over time in any of the ROI.

153 **Table 1. Changes in T2 relaxation times within the intervertebral disc**

154 **pre- versus post-running**

	AF(ROI1)	AN(ROI2)	CN(ROI3)	PN(ROI4)	PF(ROI5)
L3/L4 (N=16)					
pre(ms)	101.7±26.6	165.5±34.1	210.9±25.8	165.6±32.8	94.3±29.2
post(ms)	101.8±25.3	165.2±33.5	209.3±19.4	158.2±23.2	90.4±18.9
post30(ms)	100.2±25.6	163.4±38.1	209.7±24.5	160.8±24.2	89.0±18.0
L4/L5 (N=14)					
pre (ms)	97.6±28.4	165.2±44.5	224.2±30.4	173.3±31.3	97.6±24.0
post (ms)	96.7±27.2	158.0±38.4	219.3±34.5	171.5±29.0	104.2±31.7
post30 (ms)	96.6±23.3	158.6±31.0	219.8±37.5	175.2±35.0	95.2±25.1
L5/S1 (N=12)					
pre(ms)	101.0±30.7	154.1±46.2	193.5±55.0	143.7±36.2	88.3±17.8
post(ms)	105.6±28.7	155.7±44.3	191.2±54.4	141.0±29.0	86.1±26.6
post30(ms)	101.6±22.8	149.8±32.1	193.4±45.1	148.5±35.2	92.4±18.2

155 Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation. AF, annulus fibrosus; AN, anterior nucleus; CN, central
156 nucleus; PN, posterior nucleus; PF, posterior annulus fibrosus; Post, post-running; Post30, 30 min
157 post-running; Pre, pre-running; ROI, region of interest

158 **Triaxial acceleration during running**

159 The triaxial accelerations were 0.23 ± 0.06 rms in the X-axis (mediolateral), 1.37 ± 0.08 rms in
160 the Y-axis (vertical), and 0.30 ± 0.06 rms in the Z-axis (anteroposterior). The resultant acceleration
161 and MAD were 1.43 ± 0.07 rms and 0.71 ± 0.09 G, respectively.

162 **Correlation between T2 times and triaxial acceleration**

163 The results of the correlation analysis between changes in T2 and acceleration are shown in Table
164 2. In the T2 times variation of L3/L4, negative correlations were observed for AN ($r = -0.58$, $p = 0.02$),
165 CN ($r = -0.54$, $p = 0.03$) and PN ($r = -0.59$, $p = 0.02$) on the X-axis and positive correlations were
166 observed for AN ($r = 0.53$, $p = 0.04$), CN ($r = 0.62$, $p = 0.01$) and PN ($r = 0.72$, $p = 0.002$) on the Z-
167 axis. In addition, the Y-axis ($r = 0.57$, $p = 0.02$), resultant acceleration ($r = 0.55$, $p = 0.03$), and MAD
168 ($r = 0.68$, $p = 0.004$) were positively correlated with PF. In the change in T2 time for L4/L5, a positive
169 correlation was observed for CN ($r = 0.73$, $p = 0.003$), and a negative correlation was observed for PF
170 at the post ($r = -0.59$, $p = 0.03$) on the Z-axis. In MAD, a negative correlation is observed for CN ($r =$
171 -0.55 , $p = 0.04$). The change in T2 times for L5/S1 showed a negative correlation with AF ($r = -0.73$,
172 $p = 0.01$) and PN at the post- ($r = -0.59$, $p = 0.05$) and post30 ($r = -0.69$, $p = 0.01$) time points on the
173 Z-axis. The strongest correlations were post30 PN ($R^2 = 0.59$) for L3-L4, CN ($R^2 = 0.49$) for L4-L5,

174 and AF ($R^2 = 0.48$) for L5-S1 on the Z-axis. The regression equations were $y=144.5 x +55.2$ for the
 175 PF of L3/4, $y=115.4 x +63.2$ for the CN of L4/5, and $y=-219.9 x +174.1$ for the AF of L5/S1,
 176 respectively.

177 **Table 2. Correlation between T2 relaxation time and triaxial**
 178 **acceleration**

		X-axis			Y-axis			Z-axis			Resultant acceleration			MAD		
		<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	R^2	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	R^2	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	R^2	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	R^2	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	R^2
L3/L4 (N=16)																
AF(ROI1)	post	0.04	0.89	-	-0.11	0.70	-	-0.07	0.80	-	-0.10	0.71	-	-0.05	0.86	-
	post30	0.12	0.67	-	-0.03	0.91	-	-0.32	0.23	-	-0.08	0.77	-	0.11	0.69	-
AN(ROI2)	post	-0.58	0.02	0.29	-0.02	0.94	-	0.53	0.04	0.23	0.01	0.99	-	0.16	0.55	-
	post30	-0.31	0.24	-	0.02	0.94	-	0.15	0.59	-	-0.01	0.99	-	0.05	0.87	-
CN(ROI3)	post	-0.54	0.03	0.25	-0.21	0.44	-	0.62	0.01	0.34	-0.17	0.53	-	0.18	0.50	-
	post30	-0.19	0.48	-	-0.15	0.58	-	0.16	0.56	-	0.12	0.67	-	0.28	0.30	-
PN(ROI4)	post	-0.36	0.17	-	0.04	0.89	-	0.06	0.84	-	-0.01	0.98	-	0.23	0.39	-
	post30	-0.59	0.02	0.31	-0.27	0.31	-	0.72	0.00	0.59	-0.04	0.88	-	0.13	0.63	-
PF(ROI5)	post	-0.16	0.55	-	0.57	0.02	0.28	-0.19	0.49	-	0.55	0.03	0.25	0.68	0.00	0.42
	post30	-0.29	0.28	-	0.34	0.20	-	-0.18	0.51	-	0.28	0.29	-	0.40	0.13	-
L4/L5 (N=14)																
AF(ROI1)	post	0.06	0.84	-	0.10	0.74	-	-0.05	0.85	-	0.10	0.74	-	0.08	0.78	-
	post30	0.02	0.94	-	-0.25	0.39	-	-0.02	0.95	-	-0.27	0.36	-	-0.26	0.37	-
AN(ROI2)	post	0.23	0.43	-	-0.01	0.99	-	0.05	0.87	-	0.03	0.93	-	0.02	0.95	-
	post30	0.10	0.73	-	-0.10	0.75	-	-0.31	0.28	-	-0.16	0.58	-	-0.01	0.97	-

CN(ROI3)	post	-0.39	0.17	-	-0.38	0.18	-	0.73	0.00	0.49	-0.32	0.27	-	-0.27	0.36	-
	post30	-0.04	0.90	-	-0.45	0.11	-	0.09	0.75	-	-0.48	0.08	-	-0.55	0.04	0.24
PN(ROI4)	post	-0.13	0.67	-	-0.14	0.63	-	0.28	0.33	-	-0.10	0.74	-	0.06	0.85	-
	post30	0.03	0.92	-	-0.25	0.40	-	-0.15	0.62	-	-0.30	0.31	-	-0.28	0.33	-
PF(ROI5)	post	0.42	0.13	-	0.01	0.98	-	-0.59	0.03	0.29	-0.03	0.93	-	-0.05	0.86	-
	post30	0.11	0.70	-	0.27	0.35	-	-0.50	0.07	-	0.20	0.49	-	0.00	0.99	-
L5/S1 (N=12)																
AF(ROI1)	post	0.43	0.16	-	0.34	0.28	-	-0.73	0.01	0.48	0.26	0.41	-	0.24	0.45	-
	post30	0.04	0.89	-	0.42	0.18	-	-0.42	0.17	-	0.35	0.27	-	0.31	0.32	-
AN(ROI2)	post	-0.02	0.96	-	0.10	0.76	-	-0.19	0.56	-	0.07	0.84	-	0.25	0.43	-
	post30	0.04	0.91	-	-0.08	0.81	-	-0.19	0.55	-	-0.13	0.70	-	-0.11	0.73	-
CN(ROI3)	post	0.05	0.87	-	-0.18	0.58	-	-0.11	0.74	-	-0.20	0.54	-	0.08	0.80	-
	post30	0.18	0.59	-	-0.14	0.68	-	-0.02	0.95	-	-0.11	0.73	-	-0.06	0.85	-
PN(ROI4)	post	0.28	0.37	-	0.07	0.82	-	-0.59	0.05	0.28	-0.01	0.99	-	0.26	0.42	-
	post30	0.30	0.35	-	0.28	0.38	-	-0.69	0.01	0.42	0.18	0.57	-	0.21	0.50	-
PF(ROI5)	post	0.18	0.57	-	-0.16	0.63	-	-0.20	0.53	-	-0.16	0.61	-	0.06	0.86	-
	post30	-0.46	0.14	-	0.18	0.57	-	0.08	0.81	-	0.11	0.73	-	0.08	0.81	-

179 Bold text indicates the locations of significant correlations. r = Pearson's correlation coefficient, R^2

180 = adjusted R-square, AF, annulus fibrosus; AN, anterior nucleus; CN, central nuclei; PN, posterior

181 nucleus; PF, posterior annulus fibrosus; MAD, mean absolute deviation; Post, post-running; Post30,

182 30 min post-running; Pre, pre-running; ROI, region of interest

183

184 **Discussion**

185 The positive effects of running loading on IVDs have been reported in recent years; however, the
186 direction of loading by MAD in the optimal range is unclear. This study revealed that in slow running
187 in the general population, the correlation between the change in T2 times and the direction of loading
188 was different for each IVD level. In particular, in the anteroposterior direction, there were ROI with
189 high adjusted R-square values at all IVDs levels, explaining approximately 50% of the changes in T2
190 times.

191 Previous studies have suggested that for IVDs, activities such as walking provide a “probable
192 healthy” range of load based on the size, speed, direction, and type [15, 16]. Acute effects of running
193 have been reported, with an average decrease of 1 mm in lumbar IVDs height after 1 h of running and
194 a decrease in IVDs height and volume after moderate-intensity running [17, 18]. However, middle-
195 aged men with >10 years of running experience showed differences in IVDs status, suggesting that
196 long-term running may delay IDD [10]. These results suggest that the running load temporarily pushes
197 water out of the IVDs; however, repeated loading in the optimal range may produce a favorable
198 response in IVDs as a chronic change.

199 The IVDs in adults suggest that pumping by motion (fluid flow or convection) plays a role in

200 transporting larger nutrients [19]. Thus, the transport of nutrients in IVDs requires motor loading,
201 which may affect water movement. In this study, an optimal speed range of 8 km/h and running time
202 were determined based on the reports of Chokan et al. and Bellaby et al. [8, 9]. Chokan et al. showed
203 that in the nucleus pulposus, the T2 times significantly decreased after exercise and returned to the
204 pre-exercise rest time. The results showed that there was a change in T2 times for trunk exercises
205 (flexion-extension/rotation) and no change in T2 times for running, despite a similar exercise duration
206 as in the present study, suggesting that T2 times are related to trunk range of motion and cause
207 differences.

208 While T2 times may be affected by the range of motion, the direction of exercise loading at a
209 running speed of 8 km/h suggests that loading in the anteroposterior direction of the Z-axis may affect
210 T2 times by nearly 50%, based on the adjusted R-square value. Previous recommendations for
211 beneficially modulating the IVDs include [15]: (a) use dynamic loading; (b) emphasize axial loading;
212 and (c) choose exercises that load the IVDs in the range of 0.2–0.8 MPa, corresponding to an
213 intradiscal pressure of 0.3–1.2 MPa [16]. In trunk motion, the greatest impact on intradiscal pressure
214 is in flexion-extension [20], a movement that produces a range of 0.3-1.2 MPa, the optimal pressure

215 for IVDs during the movement. Meadows et al. also observed that in their investigation of disc
216 mechanics in disc strain, disc anterior-posterior shear, and mechanics due to flexion were related to
217 the nucleus pulposus T2 values [21].

218 Therefore, IVDs may have been more susceptible to anteroposterior loading, and L3/L4 and
219 L4/L5 [22], with greater flexion range of motion positively correlated with the application of optimal
220 intradiscal pressure. In contrast, L5/S1 had greater posterior shear forces due to flexion than the other
221 levels [21]. Shear forces may induce IDD [23, 24], and a negative correlation may be observed
222 between different ranges of trunk motion and applied internal pressure at different IVDs levels.
223 Interestingly, L3/L4 was also affected by influences other than the Z-axis; L3/L4 had greater lateral
224 flexion and rotation than the bottom two, and the X-axis was negatively correlated. This characteristic
225 of cranial IVDs may be due to the high incidence of IDD in gymnasts with high rotational stress, which
226 suggests that changes in T2 times are influenced by range of motion[25, 26].

227 Based on the present results, the hypothesis that slow running improves the T2 times of the
228 nucleus pulposus was rejected because it did not significantly change the T2 times. However, the
229 results partially support the hypothesis because it was improved by loading in the anteroposterior

230 direction. This study had several limitations. In this study, a treadmill was used to maintain a constant
231 running speed within the optimal loading range of the IVDs. However, the similarity in the triaxial
232 acceleration data between treadmill and ground running suggests that the results for the loading
233 direction were unaffected [27]. Although only male subjects were included in the study, sex was
234 standardized because sex differences have been observed in pelvic movements during running [28],
235 which may have affected the loading pattern. Finally, although there is a correlation, other factors may
236 also have an effect. Further investigation is needed on factors other than speed that may contribute to
237 IDD. The next investigation should be a slow-running motion analysis to determine the reasons for
238 the high anteroposterior loading. Despite these limitations, the evidence suggests that IVDs are a
239 beneficial response to certain types of loading and may have public health implications. IDD is an
240 important factor in spinal pain. Understanding how IVDs respond to certain types of stress will lead
241 to improved exercise guidelines for the prevention and management of spinal pain.

242

243 **Conclusion**

244 The results of this study suggest that changes in the T2 times of the IVDs due to running at 8

245 km/h correlate with acceleration, suggesting that anteroposterior loading may contribute to the
246 important response of the IVDs.

247

248 **Acknowledgements**

249 The authors would like to thank all members of the research team and all participants of the study.

250 This study was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (,) KAKENHI
251 (30434153).

252


253 **References**

- 254 1. Huang YC, Urban JP, Luk KD. Intervertebral disc regeneration: do nutrients lead the
255 way? *Nat Rev Rheumatol.* 2014;10(9):561-6. Epub 20140610. doi: 10.1038/nrrheum.2014.91.
256 PubMed PMID: 24914695.
- 257 2. Urban JP, Holm S, Maroudas A, Nachemson A. Nutrition of the intervertebral disk. An
258 in vivo study of solute transport. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1977;(129):101-14. PubMed PMID:
259 608268.
- 260 3. Urban JP, Smith S, Fairbank JC. Nutrition of the intervertebral disc. *Spine (Phila Pa*
261 *1976).* 2004;29(23):2700-9. doi: 10.1097/01.brs.0000146499.97948.52. PubMed PMID:
262 15564919.
- 263 4. Grunhagen T, Wilde G, Soukane DM, Shirazi-Adl SA, Urban JP. Nutrient supply and
264 intervertebral disc metabolism. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2006;88 Suppl 2:30-5. doi:
265 10.2106/JBJS.E.01290. PubMed PMID: 16595440.

- 266 5. Huang L, Liu Y, Ding Y, Wu X, Zhang N, Lai Q, et al. Quantitative evaluation of lumbar
267 intervertebral disc degeneration by axial T2* mapping. *Medicine*. 2017;96(51).
- 268 6. Marinelli NL, Haughton VM, Anderson PA. T2 relaxation times correlated with stage of
269 lumbar intervertebral disk degeneration and patient age. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*.
270 2010;31(7):1278-82. Epub 20100401. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A2080. PubMed PMID: 20360340;
271 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7965459.
- 272 7. Stelzeneder D, Welsch GH, Kovacs BK, Goed S, Paternostro-Sluga T, Vlychou M, et al.
273 Quantitative T2 evaluation at 3.0T compared to morphological grading of the lumbar
274 intervertebral disc: a standardized evaluation approach in patients with low back pain. *Eur J Radiol*.
275 2012;81(2):324-30. Epub 20110218. doi: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2010.12.093. PubMed PMID:
276 21315527.
- 277 8. Chokan K, Murakami H, Endo H, Mimata Y, Yamabe D, Tsukimura I, et al. Evaluation
278 of Water Retention in Lumbar Intervertebral Disks Before and After Exercise Stress With T2
279 Mapping. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2016;41(7):E430-6. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0000000000001283.
280 PubMed PMID: 27018906.
- 281 9. Belavy DL, Quittner MJ, Ridgers N, Ling Y, Connell D, Rantalainen T. Running exercise
282 strengthens the intervertebral disc. *Sci Rep*. 2017;7:45975. Epub 20170419. doi:
283 10.1038/srep45975. PubMed PMID: 28422125; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5396190.
- 284 10. Mitchell UH, Bowden JA, Larson RE, Belavy DL, Owen PJ. Long-term running in
285 middle-aged men and intervertebral disc health, a cross-sectional pilot study. *PLoS One*.
286 2020;15(2):e0229457. Epub 20200221. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0229457. PubMed PMID:
287 32084224; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7034897.
- 288 11. Takatalo J, Karppinen J, Nayha S, Taimela S, Niinimäki J, Blanco Sequeiros R, et al.
289 Association between adolescent sport activities and lumbar disk degeneration among young adults.
290 *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2017;27(12):1993-2001. Epub 20170319. doi: 10.1111/sms.12840.
291 PubMed PMID: 28075521.
- 292 12. Tyrrell A, Reilly T, Troup J. Circadian variation in stature and the effects of spinal
293 loading. *Spine*. 1985;10(2):161-4.
- 294 13. Belavy DL, Brisby H, Douglas B, Hebelka H, Quittner MJ, Owen PJ, et al.
295 Characterization of Intervertebral Disc Changes in Asymptomatic Individuals with Distinct

- 296 Physical Activity Histories Using Three Different Quantitative MRI Techniques. *J Clin Med.*
297 2020;9(6). Epub 20200612. doi: 10.3390/jcm9061841. PubMed PMID: 32545639; PubMed
298 Central PMCID: PMC7357091.
- 299 14. Pfirrmann CW, Metzdorf A, Zanetti M, Hodler J, Boos N. Magnetic resonance
300 classification of lumbar intervertebral disc degeneration. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).*
301 2001;26(17):1873-8. doi: 10.1097/00007632-200109010-00011. PubMed PMID: 11568697.
- 302 15. Belavy DL, Albracht K, Bruggemann GP, Vergroesen PP, van Dieen JH. Can Exercise
303 Positively Influence the Intervertebral Disc? *Sports Med.* 2016;46(4):473-85. doi:
304 10.1007/s40279-015-0444-2. PubMed PMID: 26666742.
- 305 16. Chan SC, Ferguson SJ, Gantenbein-Ritter B. The effects of dynamic loading on the
306 intervertebral disc. *Eur Spine J.* 2011;20(11):1796-812. Epub 20110504. doi: 10.1007/s00586-
307 011-1827-1. PubMed PMID: 21541667; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3207351.
- 308 17. Dimitriadis AT, Papagelopoulos PJ, Smith FW, Mavrogenis AF, Pope MH, Karantanas
309 AH, et al. Intervertebral disc changes after 1 h of running: a study on athletes. *J Int Med Res.*
310 2011;39(2):569-79. doi: 10.1177/147323001103900226. PubMed PMID: 21672362.
- 311 18. Kingsley MI, D'Silva LA, Jennings C, Humphries B, Dalbo VJ, Scanlan AT. Moderate-
312 intensity running causes intervertebral disc compression in young adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.*
313 2012;44(11):2199-204. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0b013e318260dbc1. PubMed PMID: 22648342.
- 314 19. Ferguson SJ, Ito K, Nolte LP. Fluid flow and convective transport of solutes within the
315 intervertebral disc. *J Biomech.* 2004;37(2):213-21. doi: 10.1016/s0021-9290(03)00250-1.
316 PubMed PMID: 14706324.
- 317 20. Wilke H, Neef P, Hinz B, Seidel H, Claes L. Intradiscal pressure together with
318 anthropometric data--a data set for the validation of models. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon).*
319 2001;16 Suppl 1:S111-26. doi: 10.1016/s0268-0033(00)00103-0. PubMed PMID: 11275349.
- 320 21. Meadows KD, Peloquin JM, Newman HR, Cauchy PJK, Vresilovic EJ, Elliott DM. MRI-
321 based measurement of in vivo disc mechanics in a young population due to flexion, extension, and
322 diurnal loading. *JOR Spine.* 2023;6(1):e1243. Epub 20230109. doi: 10.1002/jsp2.1243. PubMed
323 PMID: 36994458; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10041375.
- 324 22. Panjabi MM. The stabilizing system of the spine. Part II. Neutral zone and instability
325 hypothesis. *J Spinal Disord.* 1992;5(4):390-6; discussion 7. doi: 10.1097/00002517-199212000-

- 326 00002. PubMed PMID: 1490035.
- 327 23. Kim J, Yang SJ, Kim H, Kim Y, Park JB, Dubose C, et al. Effect of shear force on
328 intervertebral disc (IVD) degeneration: an in vivo rat study. *Ann Biomed Eng.* 2012;40(9):1996-
329 2004. Epub 20120420. doi: 10.1007/s10439-012-0570-z. PubMed PMID: 22527013.
- 330 24. Xia DD, Lin SL, Wang XY, Wang YL, Xu HM, Zhou F, et al. Effects of shear force on
331 intervertebral disc: an in vivo rabbit study. *Eur Spine J.* 2015;24(8):1711-9. Epub 20150318. doi:
332 10.1007/s00586-015-3816-2. PubMed PMID: 25784595.
- 333 25. Koyama K, Nakazato K, Min SK, Gushiken K, Hatakeda Y, Seo K, et al. Anterior Limbus
334 Vertebra and Intervertebral Disk Degeneration in Japanese Collegiate Gymnasts. *Orthop J Sports*
335 *Med.* 2013;1(3):2325967113500222. Epub 20130821. doi: 10.1177/2325967113500222. PubMed
336 PMID: 26535240; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4555487.
- 337 26. Sward L, Hellstrom M, Jacobsson B, Nyman R, Peterson L. Disc degeneration and
338 associated abnormalities of the spine in elite gymnasts. A magnetic resonance imaging study. *Spine*
339 *(Phila Pa 1976).* 1991;16(4):437-43. doi: 10.1097/00007632-199104000-00009. PubMed PMID:
340 1828629.
- 341 27. Vanhelst J, Zunquin G, Theunynck D, Mikulovic J, Bui-Xuan G, Beghin L. Equivalence
342 of accelerometer data for walking and running: treadmill versus on land. *J Sports Sci.*
343 2009;27(7):669-75. doi: 10.1080/02640410802680580. PubMed PMID: 19424900.
- 344 28. Perpiñá-Martínez S, Arguisuelas-Martínez MD, Pérez-Domínguez B, Nacher-Moltó I,
345 Martínez-Gramage J. Differences between Sexes and Speed Levels in Pelvic 3D Kinematic
346 Patterns during Running Using an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU). *International Journal of*
347 *Environmental Research and Public Health.* 2023;20(4):3631.
- 348



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.30.24308204>; this version posted May 31, 2024. 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/).