



## **A Comparative Study to Find the Effectiveness of Core Muscles Activation Over Conventional Exercises In Subjects with Mechanical Low Back Pain**

**<sup>1</sup>Karran Yangma, <sup>2</sup>Santosh Rajak, <sup>3</sup>Trishna Saikia Baruah, and <sup>\*4</sup>Abhijit Dutta,** 

<sup>1</sup>MPT Scholar ,Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Assam down town University

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Prof. Physiotherapy Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Assam down town University

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Prof. Physiotherapy Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Assam down town University

<sup>4</sup>\*Associate Prof., Associate Dean, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Assam down town University

**Abstract:** Mechanical low back pain is the main common reason for referral to physiotherapy clinic, and a chief reason for people complains, and both men and women are equally reported to be affected by this condition. It is found that core stabilization exercises have got significant improvement when compared to conventional back care exercises in improving the function and in relieving pain. To see the effectiveness of core muscles activation over conventional exercises along with Interferential Therapy (IFT) in each group for the reduction of pain and to increase the range of motion and improve the disability in subjects with mechanical low back pain. This is an experimental study where pre and post design were used with 40 subjects with mechanical low back pain were taken considering the selection criteria and divided into two groups. 20 subjects in Group-A received Core muscles activation exercises and IFT with pre and post test analysis and 20 subjects in Group-B received Conventional exercises and IFT with pre and post test analysis. Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) for pain intensity, Revised Oswestry Disability Index (R-ODI) for the disability improvement and Goniometry for range of motion. Statistical analysis was done by using paired 't' tests which showed significant improvement in reducing pain, improving the quality of life and increasing the ROM in Group-A as compared to Group-B but as  $p > 0.05$  so it was non significant. It is concluded that subjects in Group-A who received Core muscles activation exercises are more effective as compared to Group-B who received Conventional exercises and it is found that IFT with core activation exercises is very effective in reducing pain, increasing the ROM and improving the disability.

**Keywords:** Mechanical low back pain, Core muscles activation, Conventional exercises, IFT, VAS, R-ODI, Goniometry.

---

**\*Corresponding Author**

**, Associate Prof., Associate Dean, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Assam down town University**



**Received On 18 December 2020**

**Revised On 28 December 2020**

**Accepted On 18 January 2021**

**Published On 19 January 2021**

---

**Funding** This Research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial or not for profit sectors.

**Citation** Karran Yangma, Santosh Rajak , Trishna Saikia Baruah, and Abhijit Dutta, , A COMPARATIVE STUDY TO FIND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORE MUSCLES ACTIVATION OVER CONVENTIONAL EXERCISES IN SUBJECTS WITH MECHANICAL LOW BACK PAIN.(2021).Int. J. Life Sci. Pharma Res.11(1), 255-260 <http://dx.doi.org/10.22376/ijpbs/lpr.2021.11.1.L255-260>

This article is under the CC BY- NC-ND Licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)



Copyright @ International Journal of Life Science and Pharma Research, available at [www.ijlpr.com](http://www.ijlpr.com)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Mechanical low back pain (MLBP) refers to back pain that arises intrinsically from the spine, intervertebral disks, or surrounding soft tissues. Repetitive trauma and overuse are common causes of chronic mechanical low back pain, which is often secondary to workplace injury.<sup>1</sup> MLBP is a cumulative process resulting from poor posture coupled with sedentary habits that put the back under severe mechanical stress.<sup>2</sup> It is described as a musculoskeletal pain which varies with physical activities and not involving root compression or serious spinal diseases.<sup>2,3</sup> Most low back injuries are not the result of a single exposure to a high magnitude load, but instead due to cumulative trauma from sub-failure magnitude loads like repeated small loads (e.g. bending) or a sustained load (e.g. sitting).<sup>4</sup> Interferential therapy (IFT) has been reported to be one of the most common electrotherapeutic modalities used by physiotherapists worldwide.<sup>5</sup> The concept of IFT is based on crossing two medium frequency currents (with a carrier frequency between 2 and 10 KHz, most commonly 4 KHz) that reportedly generates a low-frequency 'beating'(amplitude-modulated) effect between 0 and 150 Hz in the deep tissues.<sup>6,7</sup> These beat frequencies are believed to decrease pain in the region of the application and assist with the reduction of oedema and improvement of joint range of motion (ROM) depending on the selected frequency.<sup>7</sup> It is claimed that an amplitude-modulated interference wave is the active ingredient of IFT, and that if it is delivered at frequencies of 1 to 250Hz it will elicit physiological mechanisms that lead to pain relief.<sup>8</sup> Core activation or stabilization has become a well known fitness trend that has started to transcend into the sports medicine world. Broad benefits of core stabilization have been touted, from improving athletic performance and preventing injuries, to alleviating low back pain<sup>9</sup>. The core can be described as a muscular box with the abdominals in the front, paraspinals and glutes in the back, the diaphragm as the roof, and the pelvic floor and hip girdle musculature as the bottom<sup>9,10</sup>. Core stability exercises have become a popular form of therapeutic exercise and are seen as a critical component to restoring proper kinetic function<sup>11</sup>. Core stability exercises that improve lumbopelvic stability may be included as a part of prevention and clinical rehabilitation for patients with LBP. Core stability exercises include a range of exercise programs with different approaches, having the common goal of improving lumbopelvic and abdominal control. These exercises are designed to enhance the ability of the neuromuscular and motor control systems to prevent spinal injury<sup>12</sup>. The conventional back care exercises decrease the pain and increase the strength of involved muscles, but results in frequent recurrence rates because of their effectiveness only up to one year and patients are left out with some residual pain and disability<sup>2,4</sup>. The conventional back exercises strengthen the involved muscles like the abdominals administering various back extension exercises like prone lying and lifting one leg, alternate leg and arm lifts, lifting upper trunk and both legs off the floor<sup>2,4,13</sup>. The human spine buckles invitro during a compressive load of 90 N but the spine is loaded of about 4000 –6000 N, while administering various back extension exercises like prone lying and lifting one leg, alternate leg and arm lifts, lifting upper trunk and both legs off the floor<sup>15</sup>. The efficacy of general back exercises however, appears limited in achieving these goals<sup>16</sup>. Hence, the purpose of this study is to compare the effectiveness of core muscles activation over

conventional exercises in reduction of pain and increasing Range of Motion of trunk in subjects with MLBP.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 STUDY DESIGN

The study was an experimental study which was approved by the Institutional Research and ethical committee (AdtU/Ethics/stdnt-lett/2020/001). All the experimental procedures were in accordance with the University's guidelines. Participants were recruited through random sampling.

### 2.2. PARTICIPANTS

All subjects were required to give a consent prior to the participation in the study. Pain intensity, functional disability and range of motion (ROM) of the lumbar region were assessed by Visual Analog Scale (VAS)<sup>17,18</sup>, Revised Oswestry Disability Index (ODI)<sup>18</sup> and Goniometry respectively before commencement of the treatment (Pre-test) and after the final day of the treatment (Post-test). To carry out the study, a total number of 40 (Forty) subjects were taken with Mechanical low back pain selected according to the inclusion criteria of my study. There was a randomised control distribution among Group A and Group B containing 20 numbers of subjects in each group. Group A- 20 subjects (Experimental Group- IFT and core activation exercises). Group B- 20 subjects (Control Group- IFT and conventional exercises). The exclusion criteria were as follows: Any history of fracture of the spinal area in the past, Disc pathologies, Malignancy, Inflammation in the lumbar spine, Nerve root compression. Participants of either gender aged between 18 to 45 years with back pain not exceeding 3 months were included in the study.

### 2.3. SOURCE OF DATA


The subjects were taken from Physiotherapy OPD, Assam downtown University and Physiotherapy OPD, Downtown Hospital.

### 2.4. PROCEDURES

The subjects were allocated in two different treatment groups, Group-A (IFT & Core Activation exercises) and Group-B (IFT& Conventional exercises) by random sampling, consisting of 20 subjects in each group, demographic data was collected. The demographic data was collected and the assessment before the intervention was taken from the subjects. According to the taken data the intervention has been started for each group for the duration of 12 weeks for each subject. After completion of the 12 weeks intervention period, the post –intervention data has been collected from the subjects. Each group received Interferential Therapy for 15 minutes followed by the respective group of exercises. Under this, there were four exercises where in the first one (Fig.no.1) the subject was made to lie over the swiss ball with both the hands behind the head and ask them to raise the trunk upwards. In the second one (Fig.no.2), the subjects were made to lie on the couch with both the calves resting on the ball and ask them to move the ball sideways while rolling the ball. In the third one (Fig.no.3), subjects were made to lie on the couch with both the feet together resting on the ball and straightened the leg. In the fourth one

(Fig.no.4), the subjects were made to lie prone over the ball and asked to raise one leg and one arm in the alternate

way<sup>15,16</sup>. All these exercises were maintained for 10 seconds and repeated 10 times.



**Fig 1:** Supine with trunk lift

**Fig 2:** Rocking the ball in either side



**Fig 3:** Supine and straightened the legs

**Fig 4:** Alternate arm and leg lift

## 2.5. Conventional exercises

Under this, the first exercise (Fig.no.5), the subjects were made to lie supine on the couch with both the legs raising upwards and hold the position. In the second exercise (Fig.no.6), the subjects were made in crooks lying with both the hands behind the head and raised the trunk and bent

sideways reaching the knees. In the third one (Fig.no.7), the subjects were made to lie prone and ask them to raise the leg one by one and hold the position. In the last one (Fig.no.8), the subjects were asked to lie in a prone position and asked to raise the trunk upto shoulder level<sup>2</sup>. All these exercises were maintained for 5 seconds and repeated 10 times.



**Fig 5:** Supine with leg lifts

**Fig 6:** Crook lying with Crunches

**Fig 7: Prone lying with leg lifts****Fig 8: Prone with trunk lifts**

## 2.6. OUTCOME MEASURES

Visual analogue Scale (VAS), Revised Oswestry Disability Index (R-ODI) and Goniometry were included as the outcome measures for Pain , Disability percentage and the Range of motion respectively.

## 3. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Descriptive data was presented as mean±standard deviation and number (percentage). The paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test was used to compare the results after 12 weeks in each group. The significance level of this study was set at  $p<0.05$ .

## 4. RESULTS

The present study was undertaken to find out the effectiveness of Core muscles activation over Conventional exercises. The subjects were randomly allocated and divided into two groups,i.e Group-A where the subjects received IFT with Core muscles activation exercises and Group-B where the subjects received IFT with Conventional exercises. The

effect of Group-A and Group-B was compared by VAS score, Revised ODI for functional ability and Goniometer for Range of Motion. 40 mechanical low back pain patients were selected randomly and they were included for analysis after the informed consent was given by the patients. Considering Group-A (Core muscles activation) where  $N = 20$  and Group-B (Conventional exercises) where  $N = 20$ . Results for the comparison of Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) between both the groups has been demonstrated in Table 1. A change of outcomes in both the groups is evident although there was no significant difference. Table 2 shows the comparison between both the groups in the Revised Oswestry Disability Index (R-ODI) to find the percentage of disability and quality of life in both the groups. It shows that there is reduction in the disability of subjects in group-A as compared to group-B but there was no significant difference in the p value. Table 3 shows the comparison between both the groups in Range of Motion (ROM) using goniometry which shows that there is increase in the range of motion after the intervention for group-A as compared to group-B but as the p value is greater than 0.05 it is considered non significant, which means there is no significant difference between both the groups.

**Table 1 Comparison of Group-A and Group-B in VAS**

Post test	Mean ± SD	N	t statistic	df	P value	Remarks
Group-A	5.75 ± 1.039	20	-1.16	19	0.26	NS
Group-B	6.1 ± 1.042	20		19		

\*NS= Non significant

**Table 2 Comparison of Group-A and Group-B in R-ODI**

Post test	Mean ± SD	N	t statistic	df	P value	Remarks
Group-A	0.45 ± 0.031	20	-0.66	19	0.51	NS
Group-B	0.49 ± 0.027	20		19		

\*NS= Non significant

**Table 3 Comparison of Group-A and Group-B in Goniometry for ROM**

Measure	Group	Mean ± SD	N	t statistic	df	P value	Remarks
Flexion	A	54.6 ± 17.936	20	1.697	19	0.1	NS
	B	51.55 ± 40.576	20				
Extension	A	23.6 ± 4.989	20	-1.421	19	0.17	NS
	B	24.3 ± 2.010	20				
Rt. Lat. F	A	24.85 ± 0.239	20	1.853	19	0.07	NS
	B	24.15 ± 2.871	20				
Lt. Lat. F	A	24.8 ± 0.378	20	-0.438	19	0.66	NS
	B	24.85 ± 0.45	20				
Rt. Rot	A	18 ± 0	20	1.831	19	0.08	NS
	B	17.85 ± 0.134	20				

\*NS= Non significant

## 5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to find the effectiveness of Core muscles activation over Conventional exercises in subjects with mechanical low back pain. The results would agree with the evidence that Group-A (core muscles activation) is more effective in reducing pain, increasing the range of motion and improving the disability of the lower back region than Group-B (conventional exercises) according to the mean values of all the outcomes. But according to the p value in the post test of all the outcomes i.e  $p > 0.05$  which shows that it is not statistically significant. Our results show that Group-A has much more effectiveness than Group-B in reducing pain, improving the disability and increasing the range of motion but the p value for all the outcomes in post intervention is not significant. Comparing both Group-A and Group-B, it is found that both the treatments are beneficial in the study but in comparison with Group-B, Group-A has much more effectiveness in improving all the outcome measures. Einstein Jerome et al,<sup>2</sup> reported that the core stabilization group showed significant improvement when compared to the conventional exercises group in improving function and in relieving pain. Both Group-A and Group-B showed significant improvement in relieving the pain, improving the disability and increasing the range of motion but in case of Group-A, the amount of interventions was higher with decrease in pain intensity, improving the quality of life and increasing the range when compared to Group-B. For this study paired 't' test was used during the analysis and both male and female subjects participated in the study.

Sobhy M Aly et al,<sup>17</sup> also reported that the core stabilization exercises are more effective in improving the strength and endurance of the trunk muscles than the dynamic exercises in patients with low back pain. Inter group analysis of both the groups post-test in Range of motion (Goniometer) has been found that all the ranges are non significant because  $p > 0.05$  but looking at the graph and the mean values of all the ranges it is found that Group-A has much more effectiveness than Group-B in relieving the pain, improving the quality of life and increasing the range of the trunk. As per the result, it is found that the group with Core muscles activation (Group-A) has got more effect along with the use of an electrotherapy modality for reduction of pain as compared to the Conventional exercises group (Group-B). In a study of Mohammad Reza<sup>19</sup> et al where 600 subjects were assessed, where they concluded muscle endurance and weakness are associated with LBP. In another study of Md. Waseem Akhtar<sup>20</sup> et. al where 120 subjects were taken as sample. They were randomly divided into two groups core exercises and conventional along with TENS and Ultrasound, where they concluded Core Stabilization Exercises are more effective than routine physical exercises in terms of pain. The reason behind better outcome measurements in Group A compare to Group B can be because of involvement of Core muscles with Swiss ball, which usually leads to activation of deep core muscles like transverse abdominis, rectus abdominus, multifidus and other muscles of core stabilization. As it is known that MLBP is a result of poor posture and activating the Deep Core Muscles will help in regaining the correct posture. The only advantage of both the exercises is

that both the core activation and conventional exercises can be done by the patient himself if he/she is able to do it.

## 2.7. LIMITATION AND FUTURE SCOPE

Limitations for this study includes that the sample size was small in the study, all measurements for a given subject in the study were measured by the same individual, the study didn't include a long term follow up, the inclusions of all the subjects are from the limited number of places, there was no follow up for the interventions. Whereas the future recommendations include. future studies can be done with a large sample size, this study was done in both male and female subjects but in future we can recommend a separate study for male and female subjects, follow up and recording of the effects of the interventions may give more better results for the patients with mechanical low back pain, should not be limited to only one particular community, study can be done with larger sample size with more longer duration to have more luminous outcome and also to prove the effective result of the therapy interventions used, further studies can be done with young adults to find the prevalence of mechanical low back pain in young age group.

## 6. CONCLUSION

This study has shown that subjects who received Core activation exercises (Group-A) are more effective when comparing the other group Conventional exercises (Group-B). As Group A focused on activating Deep Core muscles, which focussed in correcting the poor posture, leading to MLBP. Although the choice of treatment modalities might vary according to the therapist but here it is found that the use of IFT along with the Core activation exercises is very effective in reducing the pain and increasing the range of motion and for improving the disability as well. It is recommended to do long term treatment and follow-up, to assess the chances of recurrence of MLBP or Efficacy of Core Stabilization Exercise.

## 7. AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Karran Yangma MPT Scholar Carried out the research work on field in data collection and did review of literature. Prepared the thesis as a part of the curriculum of Masters in Physiotherapy. Santosh Rajak, Assistant Prof. Physiotherapy Guided the scholar as a Co-guide in the study and guided in selection criteria along with review of literature. Trishna SaikiaBaruah, Assistant Prof. Physiotherapy Guided the scholar in the study and guided in data collection along with review of literature. Abhijit Dutta (Corresponding Author), Associate Prof., Associate Dean Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Assam down town University Guided as the main supervisor/guide in the whole study along with methodology, result analysis, discussion of the study.

## 8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Conflict of interest declared none.

## 9. REFERENCES

1. Will J S ,Bury DC,Miller J A.. Mechanical Low Back Pain ., Am Fam Physician. 2018 October 1; ;98 (7):421-428.PMID:3025425.
2. Reddy. A , S.B. , Jerome E.N. Effects of core stabilization program and conventional exercises in the management of patients with chronic mechanical low back pain. Int J Physiother(2015 April); Vol 2(2), 441-447.
3. G.R.V., Mathias L, Ghori MM. . Effectiveness of core stabilization exercises and motor control exercises in patients with low back ache. Int J Physiotherapy. 2015.June.7; Vol 2(3):544-51. .
4. Prahalada Karnati DVN, Reddy R S Kumar. Core stabilization program and conventional exercises in the patients with low back pain- A comparative study. Int J Physiother. 2015. February ;Vol 2(1):352-60. .
5. Abulkhair Beatti, Anton Rayner, Tina Souvlis et al. The analgesic effect of interferential therapy on clinical and experimentally induced pain. Physical Therapy Reviews. 2010.15(4):243-252; DOI:10.1179/174328810X12647087218992.
6. The International society for electrophysical agents in physical therapy (ISEAPT), Interferential therapy, 2017.
7. Goats GC. Interferential current therapy. Br J Sports Med 1990;24(2):87-92. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.24.2.87. PMID: 1702337; PMCID: PMC1478878.
8. Johnson M I., Tabasam G .An Investigation Into the Analgesic Effects of Different Frequencies of the Amplitude-Modulated Wave of Interferential Current Therapy on Cold-Induced Pain in Normal Subjects, Arch Phys Med Rehabil.2003. September; 84(9):1387-94. doi: 10.1016/s0003-9993(03)00151-5. PMID: 13680579.9. Akuthota V, Ferreiro A, Moore T, Fredericson M. .Core stability exercise principles. American College of Sports Medicine, 2008 Feb;7(1):39-44. doi: 10.1097/01.CSMR.0000308663.13278.69. PMID: 18296944.
9. Richardson C et al. Therapeutic exercise for Spinal Segmental Stabilization in Low Back Pain: Scientific Basis and Clinical Approach. Edinburgh, NY: Churchill Livingstone, 1999.
10. Coulombe BJ Games KE, Neil ER, Eberman LE .Core Stability Exercise Versus General Exercise for Chronic Low Back Pain, Journal of Athletic Training 2017;52(1):71-72. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-51.11.16. Epub 2016 Nov 16. PMID: 27849389; PMCID: PMC5293521.
11. Noormohammadpour P N , Kordi M, Mansournia MA, Akbari-Fakhrabadi M, Kordi R. . The Role of a Multi-Step Core Stability Exercise Program in the Treatment of Nurses with Chronic Low Back Pain: A Single-Blinded Randomized Controlled Trial, Asian Spine J.2018 June;12(3):490-502. doi: 10.4184/asj.2018.12.3.490. Epub 2018 Jun 4. PMID: 29879777; PMCID: PMC6002169.
12. Sudhir G et al. Prevalence and Risk factors for low back pain in 1,355 young Adults: A Cross-sectional Study. Asian Spine J. 2017; 11(4): 610-617.
13. O'Sullivan PB:Lumbar segmental 'instability': clinical presentation and specific stabilizing exercise management. Man Ther. 2000; 5(1):2-12.
14. Van Dieen JH, Cholewicki J, Radebold. Trunk muscle recruitment patterns in patients with low back pain enhance the stability of the lumbar spine. Spine.2003 Apr 15; 28(8): 834-41. PMID: 12698129.
15. Akuthota V et al. Core strengthening, Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2004;85(3 Suppl 1): S86-92. DOI: 10.1053/j.apmr.2003.12.005.
16. Sobhy MA et al. Trunk muscle response to core stability exercises in patients with chronic low back pain: A randomized controlled trial. Int J Physiotherapy and Res. 2017; 5(1):1836-1845.DOI: 10.16965/ijpr.2016.201.
17. Yasuchika Aoki, Shiro Sugiura, Koichi Nakagawa, Arata Nakajima. Evaluation of Nonspecific Low Back Pain Using a New Detailed Visual Analogue Scale for Patients in Motion, Standing, and Sitting: Characterizing Nonspecific Low Back Pain in Elderly Patients. Research Gate 2012 November, DOI: 10.1155/2012/680496
18. E Fahmy, H Shaker, W. Ragab, H, Helmy & M Gaber. Efficacy of Spinal extension exercise program versus muscle energy technique in treatment of chronic mechanical low back pain. The Egyptian Journal of Neurology, Psychiatry and Neurosurgery, December 2019
19. Mohammad Reza Nourbakhsh, Amir Massoud Arab. Relationship Between Mechanical factors and Incidence of Low Back pain. Journal of Orthopedic & Sports Physical Therapy, September 2002 Volume 32 Issue 9, pages 447 – 460, doi/10.2519/jospt.2002.32.9.447
20. Muhammad Waseem Akhtar, Hossein Karimi and Syed Amir Gilani. Effect of Core Stabilization exercises and routine exercise therapy in management of pain in chronic non specific low back pain: A randomized controlled clinical trial. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences, 2017, jul – Aug; 33(4) 1002 – 1006, DOI : 10.12669/pjms.334.12664