

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

3  
4 Chadapa Rungruangbaiyok<sup>1,2†</sup>, Hiroyuki Ohtsuka<sup>3,4†\*</sup>, Charupa Lektip<sup>1,2</sup>, Jiraphat Nawarat<sup>1,2</sup>, Eiji  
5 Miyake<sup>3,4</sup>, Keiichiro Aoki<sup>3,5</sup>, Yasuko Inaba<sup>3,4</sup>, Yoshinori Kagaya<sup>3,4</sup>

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

9 <sup>2</sup>Movement Sciences and Exercise Research Center, Walailak University, Thailand

10 <sup>3</sup>Graduate School of Health Sciences, Showa University

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

13 <sup>5</sup>Division 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](http://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