

Meeting Abstract

Evaluation of the uncontrolled movement of the lumbopelvic segment in individuals without low back pain

Evaluación de movimientos no controlados del segmento lumbopélvico en individuos sin dolor lumbar

Andrés Flores-León¹, Gunther Redenz¹, Oscar F. Araneda¹, Francisco J. Berral de la Rosa²

¹Integrative Laboratory of Biomechanics and Physiology of Physical Effort, Kinesiology School, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad de Los Andes, Santiago, Chile.

²Biomechanics, Kinesiology and Kinanthropometry Laboratory, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla, España.

Low back pain (LBP) is one of the most common disorders of the human body. About 85% of the population will experience LBP during their lifetime (1,2). In most cases, LBP is shown as a functional impairment that fails to show up in imaging tests (3). Nine out of ten people who experience LBP do not show an anatomical structure associated with the symptomatology (4,5).

Functional impairment is caused by the uncontrolled movement (UCM), defined as the lack of ability to actively control the joint segment or to prevent a compensatory movement, when a certain function is performed (6). Thus, the nonspecific low back pain (NSLBP) has been described, which is the result of lumbopelvic UCM (7-9).

O'Sullivan suggests analyzing the NSLBP during functional tasks by sub classifying patterns of loss of motor control of the lumbopelvic segment in the presence of pain (10,11). Currently, the patterns, which have been validated as a clinical assessment tool, are the active extension pattern and flexion pattern related to the UCM of the lumbopelvic segment (9,12).

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the lumbopelvic UCM according to the O'Sullivan classification in asymptomatic persons with LBP. Although it has been understood that clinical management of lumbopelvic UCM must be associated with LBP (9), it is important to note that this condition without symptoms represents a potential risk of injury; therefore, it is part of the preventive management of UCM present in LBP (13,14).

Methods

Sample identification

Male volunteers aged between 18 and 23 years old (mean=20.4), who reported no episodes of LBP in the 12 months prior to the study, were recruited. From the total of recruited participants (n=51), those volunteers with structural alterations of spine alignment (n = 7) and those classified

with an UCM lumbopelvic pattern, as described by O'Sullivan which has not been currently validated (n=2) (12), were excluded after the stage of clinical measures.

Clinical measures

The clinical evaluation was conducted by a researcher who underwent a period of training, guided by an expert in the evaluation of nonspecific chronic low back pain as rated by O'Sullivan. The correlation of the data between the two evaluators was performed using Kappa index. Examiners obtained 73.33% agreement and appropriate kappa value when the clinical evaluation is performed.

Possible spinal column deviations were investigated in any of the planes using active mobility tests. According to the O'Sullivan classification for individuals with NSLBP, the UCM lumbopelvic was considered as the anterior-posterior displacement anticipatory of the low lumbar segment (L4-L5, L5-S1), visualized as a hinge effect during the performance of a biped seated transfer. Participants of the UCM group showed "Active Extension Pattern (AEP)" or "Flexion Pattern (FP)" (10).

Statistical analysis

A GraphPad Prism 6 for the statistical calculations was used. Data were analyzed with descriptive statistics.

Results

From the total of the volunteers (n=44), a 38.64% assessed participants experience lumbar UCM even though they do not experience LBP (n=17); 9 subjects with active extension pattern and 8 of them with flexion pattern.

Conclusion

The findings shown in the clinical assessment of this study indicate that individuals without LBP may experience UCM of the lumbopelvic segment, similar to that described by O'Sullivan in subjects with NSLBP (10). This movement impairment in subjects without LBP, suggests that the development of symptoms is not unique to the loss of control of the lumbopelvic segment.

References

1. Andersson GB. Epidemiological features of chronic low-back pain. *Lancet.* Aug 14 1999;354(9178):581-585.
2. Walker BF. The prevalence of low back pain: a systematic review of the literature from 1966 to 1998. *J Spinal Disord.* Jun 2000;13(3):205-217.

3. Foss IS, Holme I, Bahr R. The prevalence of low back pain among former elite cross-country skiers, rowers, orienteers, and nonathletes: a 10-year cohort study. *Am J Sports Med.* Nov 2012;40(11):2610-2616.
4. Koes BW, van Tulder MW, Thomas S. Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. *BMJ.* Jun 17 2006;332(7555):1430-1434.
5. Chiarotto A, Terwee CB, Deyo RA, et al. A core outcome set for clinical trials on non-specific low back pain: study protocol for the development of a core domain set. *Trials.* 2014;15:511.
6. Mottram S, Comerford M. A new perspective on risk assessment. *Phys Ther Sport.* Feb 2008;9(1):40-51.
7. Balague F, Mannion AF, Pellise F, Cedraschi C. Non-specific low back pain. *Lancet.* Vol 379. England: 2012 Elsevier Ltd; 2012:482-491.
8. van Dieen JH, Kuijer PP, Burdorf A, Marras WS, Adams MA. Non-specific low back pain. *Lancet.* Vol 379. England 2012:1874; author reply 1874-1875.
9. Comerford M, Mottram S. *Kinetic control: the management of uncontrolled movement.* Australia: Elsevier; 2012.
10. O'Sullivan P. Diagnosis and classification of chronic low back pain disorders: maladaptive movement and motor control impairments as underlying mechanism. *Man Ther.* Nov 2005;10(4):242-255.
11. Astfalck RG, O'Sullivan PB, Smith AJ, Straker LM, Burnett AF. Lumbar spine repositioning sense in adolescents with and without non-specific chronic low back pain--an analysis based on sub-classification and spinal regions. *Man Ther.* Oct 2013;18(5):410-417.
12. Dankaerts W, O'Sullivan P. The validity of O'Sullivan's classification system (CS) for a subgroup of NS-CLBP with motor control impairment (MCI): overview of a series of studies and review of the literature. *Man Ther.* Feb 2011;16(1):9-14.
13. Comerford MJ, Mottram SL. Functional stability re-training: principles and strategies for managing mechanical dysfunction. *Man Ther.* Feb 2001;6(1):3-14.
14. Mischiati CR, Comerford M, Gosford E, et al. Intra and inter-rater reliability of screening for movement impairments: movement control tests from the foundation matrix. *J Sports Sci Med.* Jun 2015;14(2):427-440.

Correspondencia:

Felipe Flores León
Mons. Álvaro del Portillo 12.455, Las Condes, Santiago, Chile
aflores@uandes.cl

Recibido: 22-06-2016 **Aceptado:** 04-07-2016

