

Effect of specific stabilization exercise versus conventional back extension in management of chronic herniated pulposus

Sucheta Golhar^{1*}, Amit V. Nagrale², Tanpreet Kaur Bagga³

¹Principal, ²Associate Professor, Department of Physiology, MIP College of Physiotherapy, Latur, Maharashtra, INDIA.

³B.P.Th., Department of Physiology, MGM's institute of Physiotherapy, Aurangabad, Maharashtra, INDIA.

Email: [sucheeta30.golhar@gmail.com](mailto:suchteeta30.golhar@gmail.com)

Abstract

Background: Local stabilizing musculature activation occurs automatically in a preparatory manner prior to movement. Failure of this preparatory stabilizing mechanism is identified as primary cause of persistence low back pain. The aim of this study was to investigate whether specific stabilization exercises or conventional back extension exercises are effective in people with Chronic Herniated Pulposus (HNP). **Materials and Methods:** 20 patients with Chronic Herniated Pulposus (HNP) were randomized into two groups. 10 patients in Group A received Specific stabilization exercise while 10 patients in Group B received conventional back extension exercise. Pain perception was measured using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). Disability was measured using the Ronald – Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ). Both the intervention periods were delivered at 5 times/week for 4 weeks. **Results:** Training of the specific stabilization exercise in group A showed a significant improvement in decreasing pain and in improving functional ability when compared to strengthening exercise in group B at $p < 0.05$ (t-test). **Conclusion:** There was decrease in the pain intensity and improvement in functional level in patients who were given conventional back extension exercise but there was a more marked relief in patients who were given Specific stabilization exercises after a treatment protocol of four weeks.

Keywords: Chronic Disc Prolapse, conventional back extension exercise, Specific stabilization exercises.

*Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Sucheta Golhar, Principal, Department of Physiology, MIP College of Physiotherapy, Latur, Maharashtra, INDIA.

Email: [sucheeta30.golhar@gmail.com](mailto:suchteeta30.golhar@gmail.com)

Received Date: 04/01/2015 Revised Date: 21/10/2015 Accepted Date: 12/10/2016

Access this article online	
Quick Response Code:	Website: www.medpulse.in
	DOI: ---

INTRODUCTION

Performing knee rehabilitation without first training the vastus medialis oblique (VMO) which is a local stability muscle can lead to patellofemoral problems and the same concept is being used on patients with low back pain. This concept of retraining the local stability system in people with low back pain has made its way into the physical therapy setting within the last four to five years and is not

altogether a new way.¹ The concept is to create stiffness in the spine before load is placed on the spine, thus controlling mid range or neutral zone. Control of this mid range helps to reduce shear force and compression during movement and spinal loading.¹ When working properly, the local intrinsic musculature fibers works before the actual motion of an extremity or of the trunk occurs.² Thus pre-contraction of the intrinsic musculature can become delayed or inhibited in the presence of pain or pathology. This delay, or inhibition of the stability system, decreased a patient's ability to control a joint neutral position during movement or underload.² A Herniated Pulposus (HNP) was defined as one that herniated beyond the vertebral body margin but contained within an intact annulus. In adult disc herniation is common and often caused by trauma. Local stabilizing musculature activation occurs automatically in a preparatory manner prior to movement.³ Failure of this preparatory stabilizing mechanism is identified as primary cause of persistence low back pain.⁴ Literature

that has developed from and is supportive of the “segmental stabilization/motor control” model has generated research highlighted by the following:

- Transverse abdominis contract separately from the other abdominal muscles and its contraction precedes that of primary mover. This preparatory spinal stabilization contraction is lacking in subject with LBP.
- The lumbar multifidus muscle function in a similar, preparatory manner in normal subjects to provide segmental stability and movement guidance between segments.⁵

The typical back exercise programs, like gym based rehabilitation program, pool therapy, and Pilates are too advanced for low back pain patients prior to retraining the tonic holding capacity and isolated co-contraction of multifidus (MF) and transverses abdominis (TrA).⁵ The co-contraction of the TrA and the MF muscles occurred prior to any movement of the limbs, back injury patients were unable to recruit their TrA and MF muscles early enough to stabilize the spine prior to movement. Furthermore, the MF muscle showed poor recruitment in back injury patients, again showing how the recruitment of these deep trunk muscles is very important.⁶ The aim of this study was to investigate whether specific stabilization exercises or conventional back extension exercises are effective in people with Chronic Herniated Pulposus. We hypothesized that the training programs

consisting of specific stabilization exercises or conventional back extension exercises would be effective in reducing patient self-reported pain, disability and improving activity of deep stabilizing muscles (TrA and MF) as these muscles undergo atrophy after injury.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in MGMs Institute of Physiotherapy, Aurangabad from July 2011-December 2011. This was a randomized clinical trial study design. Consent to carry out the study was granted by the Institutional ethical clearance committee. Patient diagnosed as Chronic Herniated Pulposus (HNP) for more than 3 months, both males and females between 20 and 40 years old were included in the study. The exclusion criteria consisted of Back pain attributed to any specific pathology: e. g., disc to any specific pathology, tumor, infection or fracture etc, inability to walk without a walking aid. After taking the written consent and baseline examination, using drawing lots and sealed envelope; patients were randomized to two groups ie A and B. 10 patients in Group A received Specific stabilization exercise while 10 patients in Group B received conventional back extension exercise. Pain perception was measured using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). Disability was measured using the Ronald – Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ). Both the intervention periods were delivered at 5 times/week for 4 weeks.

Table 1: Both experimental groups followed two different exercise regimens separately.

WK	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP A	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP B
I	1) TrA Contraction in crook lying Position (Drawing in)	1) Prone with single arm/leg lifts
	2) 4 point kneeling and trying to Hollow the lower abdominal	2) Prone with alternate arm and leg lifts
	3) TrA Contraction in sitting and standing	3) Prone on elbows
II	4) Heel slides with transverses abdominis contraction	4) Prone with double – arm / leg lifts
III	5) Abdominal hollowing with legs Supported and hips and knees at 90°	5) Prone on hands
	6) Bridging	6) Quadruped position and extend one arms / leg
IV	7) Abdominal hollowing with legs unsupported and hips and knees at 90°	7) Quadruped position and extend alternate arm and leg
	8) Single leg bridging with spine n neutral position	8) Prone with both double arm and double leg lifts

GROUP A



Figure 1:



Figure 2:

Figure 3:

Figure 4:



Figure 5:



Figure 6:

Figure 1: TrA contraction in crook lying position.

Figure 2: 4 point kneeling and trying to hollow the lower abdominal

Figure 3: Heel slides with TrA contraction.

Figure 4: Bridging

Figure 5: Abdominal hollowing with legs unsupported and hips and knees at 90°

Figure 6: Single leg bridging with spine in neutral position



Figure 1:

Figure 3:

Figure 2:

Figure 4:

RESULT

The results of this study were analyzed in terms of pain relief by the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), a responsive pain scale that yields reliable and valid data. (11) Disability by the Ronald – Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ), a 24-item scale (0 = 'no disability'), (24 = 'highest disability') with clinically acceptable reliability and validity. (12)

Statistical Analysis

Table 1: Age-wise and sex-wise distribution of patients

Age Group (yrs)	Male		Female		Total
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B	
	20-25	-	2	2	
26-30	5	1	3	6	15
Total	5	3	5	7	20




Figure 1: Age-wise and sex-wise distribution of patients

Table 2: Distribution of patients according to duration of pain

Duration of pain	Group A	Group B	χ^2 -value
0 – 6mths	3	2	
7 – 12mths	5	4	0.53
13 – 18mths	1	2	Not –Significant
19 – 24mths	1	2	p>0.05
Total	10	10	




Figure 2:

Table 3: Intra rater reliability of pain on VAS in group A and B

Statistics	Group A	Group B
ICC	0.82	0.90
P – value	0.007 Significant, p<0.05	0.001 Significant, p<0.05

Table 4: Intra rater reliability of RMDQ in group A and B

Statistics	Group A	Group B
ICC	0.83	0.88
P – value	0.008 Significant, p<0.05	0.002 Significant, p<0.05

Table 5: Comparison of pain in VAS for different days Students paired t-test: Group A) Descriptive statistics

Week	Mean	N	SD	SEM
Week 1	6.00	5	1.22	0.54
Week 2	3.40	5	1.14	0.50
Week 3	2.00	5	0.70	0.31
Week 4	0.60	5	0.54	0.24

Table 5: Comparison of pain in VAS for different days Students paired t-test: Group B) Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences						
	Mean	SD	SE M	95% CI of the Difference		t(df =4)	P-value
				Lower	Upper		
Week 1 – Week 2	2.60	0.54	0.22	1.91	3.28	10.61	0.000 S, p<0.05
Week 2 – Week 3	1.40	0.89	0.40	0.28	2.51	3.50	0.025 S, p<0.05
Week 3 – Week 4	1.40	0.89	0.40	0.28	2.51	3.50	0.025 S, p<0.05
Week 1 – Week 4	5.40	1.14	0.50	3.98	6.81	10.59	0.000 S, p<0.05

Table 6: Comparison of pain in VAS Students paired t-test: Group B

A) Descriptive statistics				
Weeks	Mean	N	SD	SEM
Week 1	6.20	5	1.09	0.48
Week 2	5.00	5	0.70	0.31
Week 3	4.20	5	0.83	0.37
Week 4	2.60	5	0.54	0.24

Table 6: Comparison of pain in VAS Students paired t-test: Group B
B) Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t(df=4)	P-value
	Mean	SD	SEM	95%CI of the Difference			
				Lower	Upper		
Week 1 – Week 2	1.20	0.83	0.37	0.16	2.23	3.20	0.033 S, p<0.05
Week 2 – Week 3	0.80	0.44	0.20	0.24	1.35	4.00	0.016 S, p<0.05
Week 3 – Week 4	1.60	0.54	0.24	0.91	2.28	6.53	0.003 S, p<0.05
Week 1 – Week 4	3.60	0.54	0.24	2.91	4.28	14.69	0.000 S, p<0.05




Figure 3: Comparison of Pain in VAS for Group A And Group B

Table 7: Comparison of RMDQ for different weeks Students paired t-test: Group A A) Descriptive statistics

Weeks	Mean	N	SD	SEM
Week 1	12.20	5	2.77	1.24
Week 2	7.20	5	1.78	0.80
Week 3	5.40	5	1.51	0.67
Week 4	2.80	5	0.83	0.37

Table 7: Comparison of RMDQ for different weeks Students paired t-test: Group B Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t (df=4)	P-value
	Mean	SD	SEM	95% CI of the Difference			
				Lower	Upper		
Week 1 – Week 2	5.00	1.80	0.73	1.12	2.879	6.325	0.003 S, p<0.05
Week 2 – Week 3	2.00	0.70	0.31	1.12	2.879	6.325	0.003 S, p<0.05
Week 3 – Week 4	2.60	1.14	0.50	1.18	4.01	5.09	0.003 S, p<0.05
Week 1 – Week 4	9.40	2.07	0.92	6.82	11.97	10.13	0.000 S, p<0.05

r							
Week 1 – Week 2	5.00	2.12	0.94	2.36	7.63	5.27	0.033 S, p<0.05
Week 2 – Week 3	1.80	0.83	0.37	0.76	2.83	4.81	0.016 S, p<0.05
Week 3 – Week 4	2.60	1.14	0.50	1.18	4.01	5.09	0.003 S, p<0.05
Week 1 – Week 4	9.40	2.07	0.92	6.82	11.97	10.13	0.000 S, p<0.05

Table 8: Comparison of RMDQ for different weeks Students paired t-test: Group B A) Descriptive statistics

Weeks	Mean	N	SD	SEM
Week 1	12.00	5	2.34	1.04
Week 2	9.00	5	1.00	0.44
Week 3	7.80	5	0.83	0.37
Week 4	5.80	5	1.30	0.58

Table 8: Comparison of RMDQ for different weeks Students paired t-test: Group B B) Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t (df=4)	P-value
	Mean	SD	SEM	95% CI			
				Lower	Upper		
Week 1 – Week 2	3.00	1.41	0.63	1.24	4.75	4.743	0.033 S, p<0.05
Week 2 – Week 3	1.20	0.83	0.37	0.16	2.23	3.207	0.016 S, p<0.05
Week 3 – Week 4	2.00	0.70	0.31	1.12	2.879	6.325	0.003 S, p<0.05
Week 1 – Week 4	6.20	1.48	0.66	4.35	8.04	9.347	0.000 S, p<0.05




Figure 4: Comparison of RMDQ for different weeks for Group A and Group B

Table 9: Comparison of pain on VAS and RMDQ in both the groups

A) Descriptive Statistics					
Parameters	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM
Pain on VAS	Group A	5	0.60	0.54	0.24
	Group B	5	2.60	0.54	0.24
RMDQ	Group A	5	2.80	0.83	0.37
	Group B	5	5.80	1.30	0.58

Table 9: Comparison of pain on VAS and RMDQ in both the groups

B) Unpaired t-test					
Parameters	t-test or Equality of Means				
	t (df=8)	p-value	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% CI
Pain on VAS	5.7	0.000	-2.00	0.34	Lower
		S, p<0.05			-2.79
RMDQ	4.33	0.003	-3.00	0.69	-4.59
		S, p<0.05			-1.40

DISCUSSION

This study is based on the current trends in exercise management for chronic low back pain: comparison between specific stabilization exercise and conventional back extension exercise. The objective is to investigate the effect of the two exercises i.e. specific stabilization exercise and the conventional back extension exercises on relieving chronic low back pain. To analyze the above objective in this study we took visual analogue pain scale, Ronald and Morris disability questionnaire as outcome measures in terms of pain and functional status. The reliability and validity of the above measurement scales and questionnaire are well established.

1. **Pain as an outcome:** Study group A shows significant improvement in VAS then group B.
2. **Functional improvement as an outcome:** Study group A shows significant improvement in

Ronald and Morris questionnaire value then group B this is because majority of patients with chronic disc prolapsed have lumbar instability specific stabilization exercise target the muscles which gives stability to the spine like multifidus and transverse abdominis muscle as the strength and improves the lumbar instability reduces.

The limitations of study were small sample size so study with large sample is needed. The age group should be expanded.

CONCLUSION

Training of the specific stabilization exercise in study group A showed a significant improvement in decreasing pain and in improving functional ability when compared to strengthening exercise in group B after a treatment protocol of four weeks.

REFERENCES

1. Emerson P. the evaluation of spinal stability in the physical therapy field. CNI Review, Online Library. A medical review journal.2001; 12(1).
2. Decandido P, reinig JW, Dwyer AJ. Magnetic resonance assessment of the distribution of lumbar spine disc degenerative changes. J Spinal Discord. 1988; 1: 9-15.
3. Adams Michael A, Freeman Brain JC, Morrison Helen, et al. Mechanical initiation of intervertebral disc degeneration. Spine. 2000; 25: 1625 – 1636.
4. Kazemi M. Adolescent lumbar disc herniation in a Tae Kwon Domartial artist: a case report. J Can Chiropr Assoc. 1999; 43(4): 236 – 242.
5. Richardson C, Jull G, Hodges P. Therapeutic exercise for spinal segmental stabilization in low back pain. Scientific Basis and Clinical Approach. Churchill Livingstone. 1999; pp. 61 – 96.
6. O’Sullivan Peter B, Phyty Dip Manip Grad, Twomey Lance T. Evaluation of specific stabilization exercise in the treatment of chronic low back pain with radiologic diagnosis of spondylolysis or spondylolysis thesis. Spine. 1997; 22(24): 2959 – 2967.

Source of Support: None Declared
Conflict of Interest: None Declared