

1 **Effectiveness of physical therapy for locomotive syndrome: Study protocol for a systematic**
2 **review and meta-analysis**

3
4 Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok^{1,2†}, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka^{3,4†*}, Charupa Lektip^{1,2}, Jiraphat Nawarat^{1,2}, Eiji
5 Miyake^{3,4}, Keiichiro Aoki^{3,5}, Yasuko Inaba^{3,4}, Yoshinori Kagaya^{3,4}

6
7 ¹Department of Physical Therapy, School of Allied Health Sciences, Walailak University,
8 Thailand

9 ²Movement Sciences and Exercise Research Center, Walailak University, Thailand

10 ³Graduate School of Health Sciences, Showa University

11 ⁴Division of Physical Therapy, Department of Rehabilitation, School of Nursing and
12 Rehabilitation Sciences, Showa University, Japan

13 ⁵Division of Occupational Therapy, Department of Rehabilitation, School of Nursing and
14 Rehabilitation Sciences, Showa University, Japan

15

16 [Email address]

17 Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok chadapa.bn@wu.ac.th

18 Hiroyuki Ohtsuka ohtsuka@nr.showa-u.ac.jp

19 Charupa Lektip charupa.le@wu.ac.th

20 Jiraphat Nawarat nsuparoe@gmail.com

21 Eiji Miyake e.miyake@nr.showa-u.ac.jp

22 Keiichiro Aoki k.a-0525@cmed.showa-u.ac.jp

23 Yasuko Inaba inaba@nr.showa-u.ac.jp

24 Yoshinori Kagaya kagaya@nr.showa-u.ac.jp

25

26 * Corresponding author: Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

27 Graduate School of Health Sciences, Showa University, Yokohama, Kanagawa, Japan, Tel: 81-

28 45-985-6500, Fax: +81-45- 985-6557

29 Email: ohtsuka@nr.showa-u.ac.jp

30

31 †These authors contributed equally to this work.

32

33 Short title: Physical therapy for locomotive syndrome: Study protocol

34

35 **Abstract**

36 Locomotive syndrome, characterized by impaired mobility due to musculoskeletal
37 disorders, poses a significant public health challenge, especially in the aging population.
38 Locomotive syndrome limits physical activity, increases fall risk, leads to dependency, and
39 diminishes quality of life. Effective interventions are urgently required. This systematic review
40 and meta-analysis aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of physical therapy in improving the
41 symptoms of locomotive syndrome. A systematic evaluation of its effectiveness compared with
42 other interventions is crucial for informing clinical practice and policy decisions. This systematic
43 review and meta-analysis follows the PRISMA-P guidelines. Studies involving individuals
44 diagnosed with locomotive syndrome, without restrictions on age, sex, or location, were included.
45 The interventions that are reviewed encompass exercise programs, manual therapy, neuromuscular
46 stimulation, and balance training, which are compared with no intervention or alternative
47 therapies. The primary outcomes include improvements in functional mobility and physical
48 performance, a reduction in symptoms, and the progression of locomotive syndrome. Secondary
49 outcomes include adherence to therapy, safety, quality of life, patient satisfaction, and
50 psychological well-being. Randomized controlled and non-randomized controlled trials published
51 in English were searched from PubMed, CENTRAL, CINAHL, PEDro, Ichushi Web, and the
52 Thai-Journal Citation Index Center. Independent reviewers performed data extraction and assess
53 the risk of bias. A meta-analysis was conducted using RevMan 5.4 software, with subgroup
54 analyses to address heterogeneity. The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development
55 and Evaluation (GRADE) approach was used to evaluate the certainty of evidence. This review

56 aims to provide robust evidence on the effectiveness of physical therapy in managing locomotive
57 syndrome and to guide clinical practice and healthcare policy decisions.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 Locomotive syndrome (LS), a condition characterized by impaired mobility due to
61 musculoskeletal disorders, has become a significant public health concern, particularly in the aging
62 population [1–4]. This syndrome, which encompasses a range of conditions, such as osteoarthritis,
63 sarcopenia, and osteoporosis, adversely affects the quality of life by limiting physical activity and
64 increasing the risk of falls and dependency [1,2,5,6].

65 The increasing prevalence of LS, particularly in aging populations, underscores the urgent
66 need for effective interventions to mitigate its impact [1,2,5,7,8]. In Japan, where the concept of
67 LS was first introduced, the aging population was particularly affected. The prevalence of LS
68 among older adults is rising, with a corresponding increase in the risk of falls and fractures, which
69 further exacerbates the associated disability and healthcare costs [1,2,4,5,7-10]. Other countries
70 with aging populations are experiencing similar challenges; this trend is also not unique to Japan
71 [11–13].

72 Given these trends, there is an urgent need for effective interventions to prevent or slow
73 the progression of LS. Physical therapy interventions, through a combination of strength training,
74 balance exercises, gait training, pain management, and flexibility exercises, provide a
75 comprehensive approach to managing LS. The robust evidence from several studies underscores
76 the effectiveness of physical therapy in preventing or slowing the progression of this condition,

77 thereby enhancing the quality of life and reducing healthcare costs associated with disability and
78 dependency [10,14–24]. However, to ensure the optimal allocation of healthcare resources and the
79 best outcomes for patients, it is critical to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of physical
80 therapy compared with other available interventions.

81 Although physical therapy is commonly prescribed to address the symptoms of LS [2-
82 4,18,19], its relative effectiveness compared to other treatments, such as pharmacological
83 approaches, surgical options, or alternative therapies, remains a subject of ongoing debate
84 [9,18,20,27-30]. Although LS encompasses distinct conditions such as osteoarthritis, osteoporosis,
85 and sarcopenia, which affect various organ systems, these conditions share common
86 pathophysiological mechanisms that lead to impaired mobility and increased fall risk. Therefore,
87 grouping these conditions together allows for a comprehensive evaluation of interventions aimed
88 at improving overall locomotor function. This systematic review and meta-analysis aim to evaluate
89 the effectiveness of physical therapy interventions in improving functional mobility and overall
90 health-related quality of life in individuals with LS. We hypothesize that physical therapy is more
91 effective than other treatment modalities (e.g., pharmacological, surgical, or alternative therapies)
92 in improving functional mobility and health-related quality of life in individuals with LS. The
93 clinical relevance of physical therapy interventions will be assessed by measuring changes in
94 functional mobility and health-related quality of life that meet or exceed established minimal
95 clinically important differences (MCIDs), indicating a meaningful impact on patient function and
96 daily activities. To account for potential biases related to age, sex, and frailty, subgroup analyses
97 will be performed. These analyses will help determine whether different demographic or clinical
98 characteristics influence the effectiveness of physical therapy in managing LS.

99 **Methods**

100 This systematic review was conducted and reported in accordance with the Preferred
101 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) statement
102 [30]. This protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic
103 Reviews (PROSPERO) database under the registration number (CRD42024515983). Adherence
104 to the PRISMA-P guidelines ensures that our review process is methodologically rigorous and
105 transparent, thus providing a reliable foundation for synthesizing existing research (Supplemental
106 Appendix 1). This study has not yet started. Data collection will begin following the acceptance
107 of this protocol, using the developed search strategy. The data collection process is expected to be
108 completed within six months from the start.

109

110 **Participants/population**

111 This systematic review includes individuals diagnosed with LS [1–4], without restrictions
112 on age, sex, or geographical location. Individuals not diagnosed with LS or those with other
113 diagnoses were excluded from the review. This approach ensures a focused and comprehensive
114 analysis of the population affected by LS.

115

116 **Interventions/exposures**

117 This systematic review examines the various physical therapy interventions in patients with
118 LS. Interventions include exercise programs, manual therapy, neuromuscular stimulation, and
119 balance training. Each of these interventions was analyzed for their effectiveness in managing and
120 improving the symptoms and overall function of individuals diagnosed with LS.

121

122 **Comparators/controls**

123 The comparators do not include interventions or other interventions (active controls). This
124 approach allows us to assess the relative effectiveness of various physical therapy interventions
125 for LS by comparing them with both a lack of intervention and alternative therapeutic strategies.

126

127 **Main outcomes**

128 The primary outcomes of this systematic review includes the following:

- 129 • Improvement in Functional Mobility: This was assessed through measures of enhanced
130 mobility, such as walking speed, gait analysis, and the ability to perform daily activities.
- 131 • Physical Performance Measures: Objective assessments, such as balance, strength, and
132 endurance tests, were used to evaluate physical performance.
- 133 • Reduction in Symptoms: This includes a decrease in pain levels, stiffness, and other
134 symptoms commonly associated with LS.
- 135 • Progression of LS: Any changes in the progression or severity of LS over time were also
136 tracked and analyzed.

137

138 **Additional outcomes**

139 The secondary outcomes of this systematic review includes the following:

- 140 • Adherence to Therapy: The extent to which patients adhere to their prescribed physical
141 therapy regimens was evaluated.
- 142 • Safety and Adverse Events: Documentation and analysis of any adverse events or safety
143 concerns associated with the physical therapy interventions was included.
- 144 • Quality of Life: Assessment of overall well-being and quality of life improvements as
145 perceived by the patients was conducted.

- 146 • Patient Satisfaction: Patient-reported satisfaction with the physical therapy treatment and
147 its outcomes were considered.
- 148 • Psychological Well-being: The impact of physical therapy on the psychological and
149 emotional well-being of patients was examined.

150

151 **Eligibility criteria**

152 This systematic review includes randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and non-RCTs
153 published in English with full-text availability. Review articles, conference abstracts, and letters
154 to the editor were excluded. These criteria ensured that the review focuses on high-quality peer-
155 reviewed studies that provide comprehensive data for rigorous analysis and synthesis while
156 excluding sources that typically lack detailed data.

157

158 **Information sources and search strategy**

159 The following databases will be used for the search: PubMed, Cochrane Central Register
160 of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), CINAHL, PEDro, Scopus, Ichushi Web (in Japanese), and Thai
161 Journal Citation Index Center (in Thailand). The search will be limited to studies published in
162 English, Japanese, and Thai focusing on human subjects. Abstracts and conference proceedings
163 will be also included, and the authors will be contacted for additional details, if necessary. This
164 comprehensive search strategy ensures a thorough and inclusive collection of relevant studies for
165 the systematic review. The primary search terms will be defined as: 'locomotive syndrome,'
166 'rehabilitation,' 'physical therapy,' 'exercise,' 'electrical stimulation,' and 'clinical trial.' A
167 preliminary version of the search strategy for the relevant databases will be included in the
168 supplementary material (Supplemental Appendix 2).

169

170 **Data extraction (selection and coding)**

171 This review will be conducted following the PRISMA guidelines. Searches will be
172 performed by two independent reviewers (HO and CR) using widely recognized databases. The
173 search terms included a combination of MeSH (Medical Subject Headings) terms from these
174 databases and free-text search terms agreed upon by all authors. Rayyan was used to manage the
175 studies across different databases.

176 Two independent reviewers (HO, CR, CL, JN, EM, YI, and YK) will assess the titles and
177 abstracts of the studies to determine their eligibility based on the inclusion criteria. Studies that
178 could not be conclusively evaluated based on the title and abstract alone were further appraised by
179 reviewing the full text. In cases of disagreement between the two reviewers, a third reviewer will
180 be available for discussion to resolve the issue.

181 For data extraction, two independent reviewers (HO and CR) gathered detailed information
182 on the study design and methodology, demographic and baseline characteristics of the participants,
183 sample size, and measures of effect. Any discrepancies in judgment between the reviewers was
184 resolved through discussion with a third reviewer. Any missing data in the articles will be
185 requested from the study authors as necessary. The data extraction process will be meticulously
186 documented and organized using a standard Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.

187

188 **Risk of bias assessment**

189 The Risk of bias in the RCTs will be assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (RoB
190 2.0). Two independent reviewers (HO and CR) will critically assess all the included studies. The
191 evaluation includes the following items.

- 192 • Bias arising from the randomization process.
- 193 • Bias due to deviations from the intended intervention.
- 194 • Bias due to missing outcome data.
- 195 • Bias in the measurement of outcome.
- 196 • Bias in the selection of the reported result.
- 197 • Overall effect.

198 For each item, each study will be evaluated as having a low, uncertain, or high risk of bias.

199 Any discrepancies between the reviewers were discussed and resolved by a third reviewer, if
200 necessary.

201 The risk of bias in non-RCTs will be assessed using the Risk of Bias Assessment Tool for
202 Nonrandomized Studies (RoBANS). Two independent reviewers (HO and CR) will critically
203 assess all the included studies. The evaluation includes the following items.

- 204 • Selection of participants.
- 205 • Confounding variables.
- 206 • Measurement of exposure.
- 207 • Blinding of the outcome assessment.
- 208 • Incomplete outcome data.
- 209 • Selective outcome reporting.

210 For each item, each study will be evaluated as having a low, unclear, or high risk of bias.

211 Any discrepancies between the reviewers were be discussed and resolved by a third reviewer, if
212 necessary.

213

214 **Data synthesis**

215 If numerous RCTs consistently corroborate their findings, a meta-analysis will be
216 conducted. For this process, RevMan 5.4 software will be employed. For the analysis of continuous
217 data, weighted mean differences (MD), including means and standard deviations, will be utilized.
218 The standardized mean difference (SMD) will be applied to coalesce multiple measurements of
219 identical outcome variables. To derive aggregate estimates, a random-effects model will be
220 adopted, accompanied by forest plots to graphically represent the findings. The I^2 test will be used
221 to assess heterogeneity; a value surpassing 50% in the I^2 test indicates substantial heterogeneity,
222 necessitating the execution of a subgroup analysis. Consequently, a comprehensive table
223 summarizing the results will be compiled in alignment with the reported findings.

224

225 **Subgroup analysis**

226 When multiple trials are present within each subgroup, the analyses will be stratified based
227 on participant demographics, including sex (male/female), nature of the intervention, and type of
228 control group (either no intervention or active control). Furthermore, subgroup analyses will be
229 conducted in cases with a significant degree of heterogeneity. These analyses may help identify
230 variations in treatment effects across different participant characteristics and intervention types,
231 providing a more nuanced understanding of the data.

232

233 **Assessment of certainty of evidence**

234 The certainty of evidence will be evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations,
235 Assessment, Development, and Evaluations (GRADE) approach. This systematic method will be
236 used to assess the quality of evidence across the domains of risk of bias, consistency of effects,
237 imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias.

238 Each outcome will be rated as high, moderate, low, or very low. The initial rating for RCTs
239 will be high; however, it might be downgraded based on the aforementioned domains. Conversely,
240 the rating for observational studies started as low but was upgraded if the evidence showed a large
241 effect, a dose-response gradient, or if all plausible biases reduced an apparent treatment effect.

242 Two independent reviewers (HO and CR) will be conducted the GRADE assessment, and
243 any discrepancies will be resolved through discussion or consultation with a third reviewer. The
244 results of the GRADE assessment will be summarized in a table that provided a clear and
245 transparent evaluation of the certainty of the evidence for each outcome.

246

247 **Patient and public involvement**

248 There will be no patient or public involvement in the design, conduct, reporting, or
249 dissemination of this systematic review.

250

251 **Ethical considerations**

252 No ethical approval will be required for this systematic review, as it involved the analysis
253 of data from previously published studies and did not involve direct contact with patients or the
254 collection of primary data.

255

256 **Discussion**

257 Several studies have explored the benefits of physical therapy for managing
258 musculoskeletal conditions, thereby providing a foundation for our research. For instance, the
259 meta-analysis by Liu and Latham (2009) highlighted the effectiveness of progressive resistance

260 strength training in improving physical function in older adults [17]. Sherrington et al. (2011)
261 conducted a meta-analysis demonstrating the benefits of exercise in preventing falls among older
262 adults [18]. Furthermore, Fransen et al. (2015) reviewed the impact of exercise on knee
263 osteoarthritis and found significant improvements in pain and physical function [19]. Despite these
264 findings, the relative effectiveness of various physical therapy interventions, specifically for LS,
265 remains unclear. Our research aimed to fill this gap by systematically evaluating and synthesizing
266 existing evidence and providing a comprehensive assessment of the impact of physical therapy on
267 this condition.

268 Our systematic review and meta-analysis has several strengths that enhanced the reliability
269 and applicability of our findings. First, we used a rigorous and transparent methodology adhering
270 to the PRISMA-P guidelines, which ensured a systematic and unbiased approach to data collection,
271 extraction, and analysis. The inclusion of both RCTs and non-RCTs allowed for a comprehensive
272 evaluation of the evidence. Second, our extensive search strategy that included multiple databases
273 and languages (English, Japanese, and Thai), ensured a thorough and inclusive collection of
274 relevant studies, thereby minimizing the risk of publication bias. Third, we employed robust
275 statistical methods, such as random-effects models and subgroup analyses, to account for
276 heterogeneity and provide a nuanced understanding of treatment effects across different
277 populations and intervention types. Additionally, the use of Cochrane's risk-of-bias tool and the
278 GRADE approach to assessed the certainty of evidence that further strengthened the credibility of
279 our findings.

280 Several practical and operational challenges were anticipated in conducting this study.
281 Dealing with the heterogeneity of the included studies, such as variations in study design,
282 intervention types, and outcome measures, should be carefully considered. This was addressed

283 through subgroup analyses and the use of random-effect models to account for variability. Efficient
284 data extraction and management are critical when employing standardized forms and software,
285 such as Rayyan, for study screening. Assessing the risk of bias and ensuring accurate data
286 extraction required multiple reviewers and a rigorous validation process.

287 When interpreting the results, it is important to distinguish between statistically significant
288 differences and clinically meaningful outcomes. Even if a result is statistically significant, it does
289 not necessarily translate into a clinically relevant improvement. Therefore, we used minimal
290 clinically important differences (MCIDs) as a benchmark to determine whether the observed
291 changes in functional mobility and quality of life were clinically significant. This ensures that the
292 results not only demonstrate statistical validity but also have practical implications for patient care.
293 For example, a small, statistically significant improvement in gait speed might not meet the
294 threshold for MCID, meaning that while the intervention had an effect, it may not be sufficient to
295 make a meaningful difference in a patient's daily life. This approach allows clinicians to base
296 treatment decisions on changes that are both statistically supported and clinically relevant,
297 ensuring that the interventions offer real-world benefits to patients.

298 Adherence to physical therapy is another significant factor that can influence patient
299 outcomes. We evaluated the adherence rates and explored strategies to improve adherence,
300 considering their feasibility and impact on study outcomes. In addition, understanding the long-
301 term sustainability of physical therapies is crucial. We included follow-up studies to assess the
302 duration of the observed effects and provide a comprehensive understanding of the long-term
303 effectiveness of physical therapy.

304 **Conclusion**

305 This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to provide compelling evidence
306 supporting the effectiveness of physical therapy for managing LS. By addressing the practical and
307 operational challenges and employing a rigorous and comprehensive methodology, our research
308 contributed to the optimization of physical therapy interventions for this condition. These findings
309 may guide clinical practice, healthcare providers in making evidence-based decisions, and
310 ultimately enhance the quality of life of individuals with LS.

311

312 **Acknowledgments**

313 We thank Ms. Tomoko Morimasa and Ms. Asae Ito, (librarian, Showa University) for their
314 advice on creating the search strategy. Finally, we would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com)
315 for the English language editing.

316

317 **Funding**

318 This study was supported by School of Nursing and Rehabilitation Sciences Showa
319 University Research Fund (Grant Numbers 2024No.4: H.O.).

320

321 **Competing interests**

322 The authors declare no competing interests.

323

324 **Author Contributions**

325 **Conceptualization:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, and Yoshinori Kagaya

326 **Data curation:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok and Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

327 **Formal analysis:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok and Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

328 **Funding Acquisition:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, Eiji Miyake, Keiichiro

329 Aoki, Yasuko Inaba, and Yoshinori Kagaya

330 **Investigation:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok and Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

331 **Methodology:** Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

332 **Project administration:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, and Yoshinori Kagaya

333 **Resources:** Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

334 **Software:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok and Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

335 **Supervision:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, Charupa Lektip, Jiraphat Nawarat,

336 Eiji Miyake, Keiichiro Aoki, Yasuko Inaba, and Yoshinori Kagaya

337 **Validation:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, Charupa Lektip, Jiraphat Nawarat,
338 Eiji Miyake, Keiichiro Aoki, Yasuko Inaba, and Yoshinori Kagaya.

339 **Visualization:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, Charupa Lektip, Jiraphat
340 Nawarat, Eiji Miyake, Keiichiro Aoki, Yasuko Inaba, and Yoshinori Kagaya

341 **Writing – original draft:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok and Hiroyuki Ohtsuka

342 **Writing – review & editing:** Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka, Charupa Lektip,
343 Jiraphat Nawarat, Eiji Miyake, Keiichiro Aoki, Yasuko Inaba, and Yoshinori Kagaya

345 **References**

- 346 1. Nakamura K. A "super-aged" society and the "locomotive syndrome". J Orthop Sci.
347 2008;13: 1-2. doi: 10.1007/s00776-007-1202-6.
- 348
- 349 2. Seichi A, Hoshino Y, Doi T, Akai M, Tobimatsu Y, Iwaya T. Development of a screening
350 tool for risk of locomotive syndrome in the elderly: The 25-question Geriatric Locomotive
351 Function Scale. J Orthop Sci. 2012;17: 163-172. doi: 10.1007/s00776-011-0193-5.
- 352
- 353 3. Yoshimura N, Muraki S, Oka H, Tanaka S, Ogata T, Kawaguchi H, Akune T, Nakamura
354 K. Association between new indices in the locomotive syndrome risk test and decline in
355 mobility: Third survey of the ROAD study. J Orthop Sci. 2015;20:896-905. doi:
356 10.1007/s00776-015-0741-5.
- 357
- 358 4. Kataoka H, Miyatake N, Ichikawa H, Arakawa Y, Mori Y. Relationship of locomotive
359 syndrome with health-related quality of life among patients with obstructive sleep apnea
360 syndrome. J Phys Ther Sci. 2017;29:1129-1133. doi: 10.1589/jpts.29.1129.
- 361
- 362 5. Muraki S, Akune T, Oka H, En-Yo Y, Yoshida M, Saika A, Suzuki T, Yoshida H, Ishibashi
363 H, Tokimura F, Yamamoto S, Nakamura K, Kawaguchi H, Yoshimura N. Impact of knee
364 and low back pain on health-related quality of life in Japanese women: The Research on
365 Osteoarthritis Against Disability (ROAD). Mod Rheumatol. 2010;20:444-451. doi:
366 10.1007/s10165-010-0307-5.
- 367

- 368 6. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, Boirie Y, Cederholm T, Landi F, et al. Sarcopenia:
369 European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age Ageing*. 2010;39: 412-423. doi:
370 10.1093/ageing/afq034.
371
- 372 7. Ishibashi H. Locomotive syndrome in Japan. *Osteoporos Sarcopenia*. 2018;4(3):86-94. doi:
373 10.1016/j.afos.2018.09.004.
374
- 375 8. Taniguchi M, Ikezoe T, Tsuboyama T, Tabara Y, Matsuda F, Ichihashi N. Prevalence and
376 physical characteristics of locomotive syndrome stages as classified by the new 2020
377 criteria in older Japanese people: Results from the Nagahama study. *BMC Geriatr*.
378 2021;21:1-9. doi: 10.1186/s12877-021-02440-2.
379
- 380 9. Muraki S, Akune T, Oka H, En-Yo Y, Yoshida M, Nakamura K, Kawaguchi H, Yoshimura
381 N. Prevalence of falls and association with knee osteoarthritis, lumbar spondylosis, and
382 knee and lower back pain in Japanese men and women. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*.
383 2011;63(10):1425-1431. doi: 10.1002/acr.20562.
384
- 385 10. Nakamura K. The concept and treatment of locomotive syndrome: Its acceptance and
386 spread in Japan. *J Orthop Sci*. 2011;16: 489-491. doi: 10.1007/s00776-011-0108-5.
387
- 388 11. Cieza A, Causey K, Kamenov K, Hanson SW, Chatterji S, Vos T. Global estimates of the
389 need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019: A systematic
390 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*. 2021;396(10267):2006-

- 391 2017. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32340-0.
- 392
- 393 12. Beard JR, Officer A, de Carvalho IA, Sadana R, Pot AM, Michel JP, Peeters GM. The
394 World report on ageing and health: A policy framework for healthy ageing. *Lancet*.
395 2016;387(10033):2145-2154. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00516-4.
- 396
- 397 13. Dennison EM, Mohamed MA, Cooper C. Epidemiology of osteoporosis. *Rheum Dis Clin*
398 North Am. 2006;32(4):617-629. doi: 10.1016/j.rdc.2006.08.003.
- 399
- 400 14. Peeters G, van Schoor NM, Lips P. Fall risk: The clinical relevance of falls and how to
401 integrate fall risk with fracture risk. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol*. 2009;23: 797-804. doi:
402 10.1016/j.berh.2009.09.004.
- 403
- 404 15. Clynes M, Edwards M, Buehring B, Dennison E, Binkley N, Cooper C. Definitions of
405 sarcopenia: Associations with previous falls and fracture in a population sample. *Calcif*
406 Tissue Int. 2015;97(5):445-452. doi: 10.1007/s00223-015-0044-z.
- 407
- 408 16. Prince MJ, Wu F, Guo Y, Gutierrez Robledo LM, O'Donnell M, Sullivan R, et al. The
409 burden of disease in older people and implications for health policy and practice. *Lancet*.
410 2015;385: 549-562. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61347-7.
- 411
- 412 17. Liu CJ, Latham NK. Progressive resistance strength training for improving physical
413 function in older adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009;3. doi:

414 10.1002/14651858.CD002759.pub2.

415

416 18. Sherrington C, Tiedemann A, Fairhall N, Close JC, Lord SR. Exercise to prevent falls in
417 older adults: An updated meta-analysis and best practice recommendations. N S W Public
418 Health Bull. 2011;22: 78-83. doi: 10.1071/NB10056.

419

420 19. Fransen M, McConnell S, Harmer AR, Van der Esch M, Simic M, Bennell KL. Exercise
421 for osteoarthritis of the knee: A Cochrane systematic review. Br J Sports Med. 2015;49:
422 1554-1557. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095424.

423

424 20. Brosseau L, Wells GA, Pugh AG, Smith CA, Rahman P, Suarez-Almazor ME. Ottawa
425 Panel evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for therapeutic exercises and manual
426 therapy in the management of osteoarthritis. Phys Ther. 2014;94: 1017-1025. doi:
427 10.2522/ptj.20130329.

428

429 21. American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM). Exercise and physical activity for older
430 adults. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2009;41(7):1510-1530. doi:
431 10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181a0c95c.

432

433 22. Bennell KL, Dobson F, Hinman RS. Exercise in osteoarthritis: Moving from prescription
434 to adherence. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2014;28: 93-117. doi:
435 10.1016/j.berh.2014.01.009.

436

- 437 23. Pisters MF, Veenhof C, van Meeteren NL, Ostelo RW, de Bakker DH, Dekker J. Long-
438 term effectiveness of exercise therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee: A
439 systematic review. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2010;62(7):1087-1096. doi:
440 10.1002/acr.20182.
- 441
- 442 24. Akune T, Muraki S, Oka H, Tanaka S, Kawaguchi H, Nakamura K, Yoshimura N. Exercise
443 habits during middle age are associated with lower prevalence of sarcopenia: The ROAD
444 study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2014;25(3):1081-1088. doi: 10.1007/s00198-013-2550-z.
- 445
- 446 25. Muraki S, Akune T, Oka H, Mabuchi A, En-Yo Y, Yoshida M, Yoshimura N. Association
447 of occupational activity with radiographic knee osteoarthritis and lumbar spondylosis in
448 elderly patients of population-based cohorts: A large-scale population-based study.
449 *Arthritis Rheum*. 2011;63(2):400-407. doi: 10.1002/art.30108.
- 450
- 451 26. Skou ST, Roos EM, Laursen MB, Rathleff MS, Arendt-Nielsen L, Simonsen O, Rasmussen
452 S. A randomized, controlled trial of total knee replacement. *N Engl J Med*.
453 2015;373(17):1597-1606. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1505467.
- 454
- 455 27. Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, Chou R, Cohen SP, Gross DP, Maher CG. Prevention
456 and treatment of low back pain: Evidence, challenges, and promising directions. *Lancet*.
457 2018;391(10137):2368-2383. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30489-6.
- 458
- 459

460

461 28. Mafi JN, McCarthy EP, Davis RB, Landon BE. Worsening trends in the management and
462 treatment of back pain. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2013;173: 1573-1581. doi:
463 10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.8992.

464

465 29. Artus M, Jordan KP, Croft PR. The clinical course of low back pain: A meta-analysis
466 comparing outcomes in randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and observational studies. *BMC*
467 *Musculoskelet Disord.* 2014;15:68. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-15-68.

468

469 30. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
470 PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLOS*
471 *Med.* 2021;18: e1003583. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583.

472