

Research Article

A Novel Image-Guided, Automatic, High-Intensity Neurostimulation Device for the Treatment of Nonspecific Low Back Pain

Miguel Gorenberg,^{1,2} Elad Schiff,^{2,3} Kobi Schwartz,⁴ and Elon Eizenberg^{2,5}

¹ Department of Nuclear Medicine, Bnai Zion Medical Center, Haifa, Israel

² The Rappaport Faculty of Medicine, Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

³ Department of Internal Medicine, Bnai Zion Medical Center, Haifa, Israel

⁴ Department of Physical Therapy, Bnai Zion Medical Center, Haifa, Israel

⁵ Pain Relief Unit, Rambam Medical Center, Haifa 31096, Israel

Correspondence should be addressed to Miguel Gorenberg, miguel.gorenberg@b-zion.org.il

Received 10 January 2011; Accepted 9 March 2011

Academic Editor: Seiji Ohtori

Copyright © 2011 Miguel Gorenberg et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Purpose. The current pilot study investigates the effectiveness of a novel device in the management of chronic low back pain (LBP). This device is able to automatically measure skin impedance in a selected body area and, immediately afterwards, to stimulate multiple points that are targeted according to differentiation in their electrical properties (peripheral nerve ends—myelinated A δ fibers) with high-intensity electrical stimulation. **Materials and Methods.** Nineteen outpatients were included in the study, 15 females (79%) and 4 men (21%), mean age 52.1 ± 10.8 years, all diagnosed with nonspecific chronic LBP. The protocol consisted of 6 treatment sessions, 2–4 days apart. Each session included a <1 minute automatic impedance screening, followed by a 20-minute treatment of lowest impedance points according to proprietary algorithms. **Outcome Measures.** The primary outcome measure consisted of changes in pain intensity as measured on a 100 mm pain visual analogue scale (VAS) obtained at enrollment, before and 2 hours after each treatment. Secondary outcome measures were the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and lumbar flexion range of motion (ROM) obtained at baseline and each week during treatment. **Results.** The mean $\pm$ SD baseline VAS score for all participants was 61 ± 14 . There were no significant changes in VAS scores between enrollment and before the first treatment (55 ± 16 ; $P = .102$). During treatment, VAS scores decreased significantly compared with baseline scores by 39 ± 17 mm ($P < .001$). Notably, VAS scores of all the patients, except for one, decreased by more than 20 mm after the fourth treatment, thus showing marked improvement in 95% of enrolled patients. ODI decreased throughout the entire treatment period, with significant changes from baseline already at the first week ($P = .001$). Lumbar flexion ROM showed a mean increase of 2.1 cm during treatment, but was not statistically significant. **Conclusion.** The results of the current pilot study show that treatment with this novel device produced a clinically significant reduction in back pain in 95% of patients after four treatment sessions. The decrease both in pain and perceived disability, combined with the improvement in ROM, support further investigation of the use of this therapy in the treatment of LBP.

1. Introduction

Despite the fact that low back pain (LBP) is one of the most common medical problems in our society [1], current analgesic therapies remain largely unsatisfactory. Conservative treatment with anti-inflammatory drugs and exercise is effective for many patients with acute LBP [2]. However, when the pain symptoms persist, they can interfere with both physical activity and sleep patterns. While analgesic

medications can provide temporary pain relief, these drugs may not improve physical function and are associated with well-known adverse effects [3]. These concerns have increased interest in nonpharmacological therapies for LBP, such as transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) [4], electroacupuncture [5], and percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (PENS) [6–8]. Unfortunately, these alternatives fall short with respect to duration and magnitude of analgesia.

Localized manual high-intensity neurostimulation devices are applied to small surface areas to stimulate peripheral nerve endings (A δ fibers), thus causing the release of endogenous endorphins [9, 10]. This procedure, often described as “hyperstimulation analgesia”, has been investigated in several controlled studies, showing a positive response in 87% of patients [9]. However, such treatments are time consuming and cumbersome, and require previous knowledge of the localization of peripheral nerve endings responsible for LBP or manual impedance mapping of the back. These limitations prevent their extensive utilization [9, 11].

The purpose of the present pilot study was to assess the effectiveness of a novel device capable of automatically measuring skin impedance in a selected body area and, immediately afterwards, of stimulating multiple points that are targeted according to differentiation in their electrical properties and proprietary image processing algorithms with high intensity yet nonpainful electrical stimulation (Nervo-Stim, Nervomatrix Ltd., Netanya, Israel).

2. Methods

2.1. Selection of Participants. This pilot study was conducted at the Bnai Zion Medical Center, Department of Physiotherapy from August 2009 to February 2010. Subjects with chronic nonspecific LBP were recruited through the hospital’s e-mail system, and most of the participants belonged to the staff working at the hospital. Participants were screened using an LBP examination form and participant history sheet. Their recruitment to the study was based on strict inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1). Nonspecific LBP was defined as pain below the twelfth costal margin and above the inferior gluteal folds, not attributed to recognizable, known, specific pathology (e.g., infection, tumour, osteoporosis, ankylosing spondylitis, fracture, inflammatory process, radicular syndrome, or cauda equine syndrome). Screening of all participants was carried out by a qualified physiotherapist who determined, by subjective and objective examination, whether the participants had nonspecific LBP. Ethics committee approval was obtained for this study, and all participants gave informed consent. NIH clinical trial 01132300.

3. Study Design

All subjects followed the treatment protocol, which consisted of 6 sessions, twice-weekly, for 3 weeks (Figure 1). Each session included an automatic screening (<1 minute) and treatment for 20 minutes with the Nervo-Stim device.

Participants completed VAS measurements at enrollment, before and 2 hours after each treatment. Measurements for range of motion (ROM) of the lower back and completion of the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) were obtained at enrollment and each week during the study. The examiners, licensed physical therapists (HV, NB), applied the devices and obtained all VAS, ODI, and ROM measurements. Subjects were advised to avoid new treatments during the time of the study and were instructed not to alter their usual pattern of medication use.




FIGURE 1: Treatment protocol, which consisted of 6 sessions, twice-weekly, for 3 weeks. Participants completed VAS measurements at enrollment, before and 2 hours after each treatment. Measurements ROM of the lower back and completion of ODI were obtained at enrollment and each week during the study.

After enrollment, the subjects underwent a 1-week pre-observation period, after which treatment was initiated. The sessions were conducted between 9 AM and 3 PM. Ten of the identified points by the Nervo-Stim within the screened area of LBP were automatically selected for treatment according to proprietary algorithms based on their lowest impedance measurements. Electrical stimulation was performed on these 10 selected points for 20 minutes (each point for 2 minutes, in a consecutive order).

The electrical current was DC, and the duty cycle was continuous. Lowest impedance points were stimulated at 4/30 Hz. The intensity of the electrical stimulation was adjusted to produce the most intense yet not painful tolerable electrical sensation.

3.1. Sample Size. This study was considered a preliminary study in preparation for a main randomized control trial (RCT); therefore, a sample of 20 participants was considered appropriate.

3.2. Technology Description. A device, designed to automatically locate peripheral nerve endings relevant for LBP and to deliver high-intensity electrical pulses to these areas, has been developed. Using an array of miniature probes, this automated, computer-controlled device is capable of instant impedance scanning of the entire lower back (max scanned area size $20 \times 30 \text{ cm}^2$) in less than 1 minute. It analyzes the 2-dimensional data based on the measured electrical properties of each finite pixel within the scanned region by using image processing software and algorithms and delivers high-intensity electrical pulses at selected locations. The square

TABLE 1: Eligibility criteria.

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
(i) Age 18 years to 70 years	(i) Sciatica
(ii) Nonspecific low back pain that persisted at least 1 month and no longer than 12 months before the study.	(ii) Diagnosed spinal stenosis
(iii) Patients must have a baseline score ≥ 40 mm on the VAS pain scale.	(iii) Back pain potentially attributable to specific underlying diseases or conditions (e.g., pregnancy, metastatic cancer, spondylolisthesis, fractured bones, dislocated joints, disc eruption).
(iv) If taking analgesics, patients must agree to maintain a steady regimen for the duration of the study.	(iv) Unstable medical or severe psychiatric conditions or dementia
(v) <i>Able to provide written and verbal informed consent.</i>	(v) Previous back surgery
	(vi) Physically unable to undergo treatment
	(vii) Patients receiving worker's compensation or those involved in litigation
	(viii) History of pacemaker, implantable devices, or of cardiac arrhythmias
	(ix) Allergy or intolerance to adhesive materials
	(x) Clinical evidence of cardiovascular, pulmonary, renal, hepatic, neurological, hematological, or endocrine abnormalities.

(European guidelines for the management of chronic nonspecific low back pain, European Commission COST B13 Management Committee; 2004).

wave electrical pulses' frequency range is 1–8 Hz, pulse width is 50–800 μ S with a current of 0.1–40 mA.

3.3. Outcome Measures. A series of valid and reliable outcome measures were used to assess the different aspects of factors related to LBP.

The visual analog scale (VAS) was chosen as the primary outcome measure and used to quantify pain intensity. The VAS, shown to be a reliable and valid measure, consists of a standard 100 mm line with verbal anchors indicating “none” at one end (0) and “worst imaginable pain” at the other (100). Participants were told to estimate their current level of pain by indicating an appropriate mark on the line. A 20 mm reduction in pain intensity, measured on the VAS scale, resulting from the treatment, was defined as minimal clinically significant intensity differences (MCID) [12–14]. Secondary outcome measures were the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and lumbar flexion range of motion (ROM). The Oswestry Disability Index is a self-completed questionnaire by the patient which examines perceived levels of disability in 10 everyday activities of daily living to assign a subjective score of level of function. Minimal detectable change (90% confidence) is 10% while a smaller change may be attributable to error in the measurement [15, 16].

Flexion Hip-Lumbar Spine Range of Motion (ROM): finger-to-floor method involved the subject standing with feet on either side while a measurement of distance in centimeters above and below the knee obtained after each week of treatment was compared to baseline values. Patients that demonstrated a full range of motion at baseline (finger reaching the floor) were not included in the analysis.

3.4. Statistical Analysis. Categorical data are presented as absolute and relative frequencies.

Continuous data are presented as means $\pm$ SD, median, and range. Comparisons between various stages in the treat-

ment series were analyzed with paired sample *t*-tests. Whenever a statistically significant difference was found, a 95% confidence interval of the difference was calculated. Differences between the weeks were analyzed with the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. The critical level of significance was 0.05 and the *P* values presented are always 2 sided. The statistical software used was SPSS 17.0.

4. Results

Twenty-two patients who fulfilled the inclusion criteria were enrolled. Three of these patients were removed from the study prior to treatment initiation because they scored < 40 mm on the VAS immediately before the first treatment. These dropouts were excluded from all analyses. Hence, nineteen patients (5 men and 14 women) were included in the study. Their mean age was 52.1 ± 10.8 years (median = 56; range 27–71). The mean $\pm$ SD baseline VAS score for all participants was 61 ± 14 . There were no significant changes in VAS scores between enrollment and the first treatment (55.5 ± 16.4 ; $P = .10$). During treatment, VAS scores decreased significantly compared to baseline by 39 ± 17 ($P < .001$). Notably, VAS scores of all the patients, except one, decreased by more than 20 mm after the fourth treatment, thus showing a marked improvement in 95% of enrolled patients. Figure 2 shows the difference between baseline and posttreatment VAS scores. The mean $\pm$ SD baseline ODI for all participants was 26 ± 14 (range 8–64). ODI decreased throughout the entire treatment period. A significant change from baseline was notable in the third week of treatment (Figure 3), with a mean improvement of 14.3 ± 10 ($P < .001$). Lumbar flexion ROM showed a mean increase of 2.1 cm during treatment, but this change was not statistically significant.

4.1. Adverse Effects. No serious adverse effects were reported by any of the participants. One patient reported a mild




FIGURE 2: Difference between baseline and posttreatment VAS scores: VAS scores of all the patients, except one, decreased by more than 20 mm after the fourth treatment, thus showing a marked improvement in 95% of enrolled patients.




FIGURE 3: The mean $\pm$ SD baseline ODI for all participants was 26 ± 14 (range 8–64). ODI decreased throughout the entire treatment period. A significant change from baseline was notable in the third week of treatment, with a mean improvement of 14.3 ± 10 ($P < .001$).

tingling in the back, which resolved itself within 6 hours of onset.

5. Discussion

The current pilot study was aimed to assess the effectiveness of a new, innovative neurostimulation modality in the treatment of LBP.

Localized decrease in skin resistance is frequently associated with clinically active myofascial trigger points that are richly innervated by myelinated A δ fibers, the smallest in diameter ($0.2\text{--}1.5\ \mu\text{m}$) and most commonly present myelinated axons in peripheral nerves. Their extremely small size prevents their identification by any imaging modality. However, impedance mapping combined with smart

algorithms allowed their identification due to their low impedance relative to the surrounding area [17]. Electrical skin impedance measurements are considered to be vulnerable to certain sources of imprecision, including instrument error resulting from the size, pressure, and duration of probe application as well as local skin conditions such as variable thickness, hydration, and intactness of the stratum corneum [17, 18]. To overcome these limitations, a new modality was developed (Nervo-Stim), using an array of miniature probes combined with an automatic screening capability based on impedance measurements over the back with simultaneous multipoint electric high-intensity neurostimulation.

The mechanism of the analgesic effect of the new modality is not clear. Nevertheless, considerable evidence suggests that with the type of neurostimulation utilized analgesia is achieved by activating extra segmental antinociceptive mechanisms and release of endogenous endorphins, serotonin, and cortisol [10, 11, 19, 20]. The pituitary has been implicated in analgesia mediated through the release of endorphins. The endorphin moiety travels either via the blood stream to inhibit cells in the substantia gelatinosa of the spinal cord or via a reverse portal system into the cerebrospinal fluid of third ventricle to produce effects on the periaqueductal grey matter [21].

Other nonpharmacological therapies for LBP, such as TENS units, have been used for 3 decades. These are applied on large surface areas delivering low-intensity electrical stimulation to the underlying muscle nerves (type I fibers) designed to block the pain signal (gate mechanism) to the brain with a reported effectiveness of 45% rather than 36% in placebo treatments [9]. The American Academy of Neurology has advised against the use of TENS for the treatment of chronic LBP, stating that the strongest evidence indicates that it is ineffective for this condition [22].

Percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation combines the advantages of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (i.e., peripheral dermatomal-based electrical nerve stimulation) and electroacupuncture (i.e., electrical stimulation at specific acupoints via percutaneously placed needles). The main advantage of PENS over TENS is that it bypasses local skin resistance and delivers electrical stimuli in close proximity to the nerve endings located in soft tissue, muscle, or periosteum with 91% of the patients reporting that PENS was more effective than TENS in decreasing their LBP [6, 7].

The novel modality described herein was highly effective in producing acute analgesia in this LBP population with 95% of patients reporting a significant decrease in VAS scores after four treatment sessions. More importantly, the patients began to report more sustained beneficial effects on their level of pain and physical activity after 3 to 4 Nervo-Stim treatments (Figures 2 and 3). This may suggest that Nervo-Stim produces a cumulative analgesic effect over the course of a 3-week treatment period. The main advantages of the new device are the capacity to automatically identify LBP trigger point and to stimulate them without using needles and with no previous knowledge of their location. Thus, screening and stimulation are performed in a single 25-minute session in a “user-friendly fashion.”

The major limitations of the study design are the small sample size, the absence of a control group, and that control group without treatment may improve low back pain as time passes. For these reasons, this study should be regarded as a pilot study only. A larger, randomized, controlled trial is needed for confirmation of these preliminary results.

6. Conclusion

The results of the current pilot study are encouraging. The mean VAS scores of participants who received Nervo-Stim treatment showed a clinically significant reduction in back pain in 95% of patients after four treatment sessions. The decrease in pain and perceived disability, combined with the improvement in ROM, support future investigations to determine the relative effectiveness of varying frequencies and durations of electrical stimulation using this novel modality and RCT longitudinal studies in the treatment of LBP.

Authors' Contributions

All authors provided concept/idea/research design, data analysis, and consultation (including review of paper before submission). Dr. Gorenberg, Dr. Shieff, and Dr. Eizenberg provided writing.

Conflict of Interests

This paper was supported by a grant from Nervomatrix, Israel. Dr. Gorenberg and Dr. Eizenberg are stockholders in Nervomatrix.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Hagit Vitario, PT, and Natasha Bulki, PT, from the Department of Physical Therapy, Bnai Zion Medical Center, Haifa for their contribution to data collection. M. Gorenberg and E. Schiff contributed equally to the article.

References

- [1] N. M. Hadler, "Workers with disabling back pain," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 337, no. 5, pp. 341–343, 1997.
- [2] J. W. Frymoyer, "Back pain and sciatica," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 318, pp. 291–300, 1988.
- [3] N. M. Hadler, "Workers with disabling back pain," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 337, no. 5, pp. 341–343, 1997.
- [4] R. Melzack, P. Vetere, and L. Finch, "Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for low back pain. A Comparison of TENS and massage for pain and range of motion," *Physical Therapy*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 489–493, 1983.
- [5] T. R. Lehmann, D. W. Russell, and K. F. Spratt, "Efficacy of electroacupuncture and TENS in the rehabilitation of chronic low back pain patients," *Pain*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 277–290, 1986.
- [6] E. S. A. Ghoname, W. F. Craig, P. F. White et al., "Percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for low back pain: a randomized crossover study," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 281, no. 9, pp. 818–823, 1999.
- [7] E. S. A. Ghoname, W. F. Craig, P. F. White et al., "The effect of stimulus frequency on the analgesic response to percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation in patients with chronic low back pain," *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 841–846, 1999.
- [8] M. A. Hamza, E. S. A. Ghoname, P. F. White et al., "Effect of the duration of electrical stimulation on the analgesic response in patients with low back pain," *Anesthesiology*, vol. 91, no. 6, pp. 1622–1627, 1999.
- [9] M. W. Flowerdew and J. G. Gadsby, "A review of the treatment of chronic low back pain with acupuncture-like transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation," *Complementary Therapies in Medicine*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 193–201, 1997.
- [10] B. Sjolund, L. Terenius, and M. Eriksson, "Increased cerebrospinal fluid levels of endorphins after electro-acupuncture," *Acta Physiologica Scandinavica*, vol. 100, no. 3, pp. 382–384, 1977.
- [11] R. Cheng and B. Pomeranz, "Electrotherapy of chronic musculoskeletal pain: comparison of electroacupuncture and acupuncture like transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation," *The Clinical Journal of Pain*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 143–149, 1987.
- [12] A. J. Beurskens, H. C. De Vet, and A. J. Köke, "Minimal clinically Responsiveness of functional status in low back pain: a comparison of different instruments important changes in chronic musculoskeletal pain intensity measured on a numerical rating scale," *European Journal of Pain*, vol. 65, pp. 71–76, 1996.
- [13] G. H. Duncan, M. C. Bushnell, and G. J. Lavigne, "Comparison of verbal and visual analogue scales for measuring the intensity and unpleasantness of experimental pain," *Pain*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 295–303, 1989.
- [14] D. D. Price, P. A. McGrath, A. Rafii, and B. Buckingham, "The validation of visual analogue scales as ratio scale measures for chronic and experimental pain," *Pain*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 45–56, 1983.
- [15] J. C. T. Fairbank, J. B. Davies, J. Couper, and J. P. O'Brien, "The Oswestry low back pain disability questionnaire," *Physiotherapy*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 271–273, 1980.
- [16] J. C. T. Fairbank and P. B. Pynsent, "The oswestry disability index," *Spine*, vol. 25, no. 22, pp. 2940–2953, 2000.
- [17] S. P. Shultz, J. B. Driban, and C. B. Swanik, "The evaluation of electrodermal properties in the identification of myofascial trigger points," *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, vol. 88, no. 6, pp. 780–784, 2007.
- [18] Y. Nakatni, "A guide for the application of ryodoraku autonomous nerve regulatory therapy," *Chan's Books & Products*, pp. 1–25, 1972.
- [19] R. Cheng and B. Pomeranz, "Electroacupuncture analgesia could be mediated by at least two pain relieving mechanisms: endorphin and non-endorphin system," *Life Sciences*, vol. 25, pp. 1957–1962, 1980.
- [20] R. Cheng, L. McKibbin, B. Roy, and B. Pomeranz, "Electroacupuncture elevates blood cortisol levels in naive horses; sham treatment has no effect," *International Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 10, no. 2-3, pp. 95–97, 1980.

- [21] J. M. G. Foster and B. P. Sweeney, "The mechanisms of acupuncture analgesia," *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 308–312, 1987.
- [22] R. M. Dubinsky and J. Miyasaki, "Assessment: efficacy of transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation in the treatment of pain in neurologic disorders (an evidence-based review): report of the therapeutics and technology assessment subcommittee of the American academy of neurology," *Neurology*, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 173–176, 2010.

Clinical Study

Prevalence, Spinal Alignment, and Mobility of Lumbar Spinal Stenosis with or without Chronic Low Back Pain: A Community-Dwelling Study

Naohisa Miyakoshi, Michio Hongo, Yuji Kasukawa, Yoshinori Ishikawa, and Yoichi Shimada

Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Akita University Graduate School of Medicine, 1-1-1 Hondo, Akita 010-8543, Japan

Correspondence should be addressed to Naohisa Miyakoshi, miyakosh@doc.med.akita-u.ac.jp

Received 31 January 2011; Accepted 8 March 2011

Academic Editor: Yasuchika Aoki

Copyright © 2011 Naohisa Miyakoshi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Although lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) occurs almost universally with aging, little is known regarding its actual prevalence and relationships to chronic low back pain (CLBP) in the general population. The presence of CLBP in subjects with LSS may have negative impacts on spinal alignment and mobility. This study evaluated the prevalence of LSS using a self-administered, self-reported history questionnaire in 630 community-dwelling individuals ≥ 50 years old. Subjects with LSS were further divided into LSS+CLBP and LSS alone groups, and spinal alignment and mobility were compared using a computer-assisted device. Prevalence of LSS was 10.8% in this cohort. Subjects in the LSS+CLBP group ($n = 46$) showed a significantly more kyphotic lumbar spinal alignment with limited lumbar extension ($P < .05$), resulting in a stooped trunk compared to subjects in the LSS alone group ($n = 22$). However, no significant difference in spinal mobility was seen between groups.

1. Introduction

Low back pain (LBP) is a primarily cited condition among problems linked to postural imbalance [1, 2]. Recurrent or chronic LBP (CLBP) is estimated to occur in 35–79% of patients [3, 4]. Particularly in older individuals, CLBP is at least partially related to degenerative changes associated with aging [5]. The degenerative process (spondylosis) involves the intervertebral discs, facet joints, vertebral bodies, and spinal ligaments. These spondylotic changes often induce lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS).

LSS is a well-recognized spinal disorder that commonly affects older adults. The pain and disability associated with degenerative LSS represent a substantial and growing health problem among the elderly [6, 7]. Clinically symptomatic LSS occurs when compression of the nerve roots or cauda equina causes pain, numbness, and tingling, or weakness in the lower extremities. With progressive compression, ambulation may be severely affected (neurogenic claudication). Although LSS has been widely studied in the clinical setting, particularly for surgical cases, few population-based

studies have been attempted [8]. In addition, the association between LSS and CLBP remains unclear.

Spinal alignment and mobility are important factors for spinal function. Loss of lumbar lordosis correlates well with the incidence of CLBP in adults [9, 10]. Patients with a less mobile spine may show more severe symptoms. However, to the best of our knowledge, no previous community-based studies have assessed spinal alignment and mobility in subjects with LSS with or without CLBP. The objectives of this study were thus (1) to determine the prevalence of LSS in a district of Japan and (2) to compare differences in spinal alignment and mobility between LSS subjects with CLBP and without CLBP, to evaluate the impact of CLBP on spinal alignment and mobility in subjects with LSS.

2. Materials and Methods

Recruitment activities were designed to enroll a cohort of healthy, ambulatory, community-dwelling individuals ≥ 50 years old who participated in a public health examination

TABLE 1: Key questions from a self-administered, self-reported history questionnaire for the diagnosis of lumbar spinal stenosis.

Q1:	Numbness and/or pain is present in the thighs down to the calves and shins
Q2:	Numbness and/or pain increases in intensity after walking for a while, but relieved by taking a rest
Q3:	Standing for a while brings on numbness and/or pain in the thighs down to the calves and shins
Q4:	Numbness and/or pain is reduced by bending forward
Q5:	Numbness is present in both legs
Q6:	Numbness is present in the soles of both feet
Q7:	Numbness arises around the buttocks
Q8:	Numbness is present, but pain is absent
Q9:	A burning sensation arises around the buttocks
Q10:	Walking nearly causes urination

Each question is assigned one point. Lumbar spinal canal stenosis is diagnosed if (1) the score was 4 points from Q1 to Q4 or (2) the score was more than 1 point from Q1 to Q4 and more than 2 points from Q5 to Q10.

in Kamikoani, Akita, Japan. With a population of approximately 2900, the town of Kamikoani is in a mainly rural (farming/forestry) district and contains one of the highest percentages of elderly subjects among towns in Japan. In 2010, 45.6% of the population was ≥ 65 years old. Individuals who were institutionalized, unable to walk without the assistance of another person, or unable to provide self-reported data were excluded. A total of 630 eligible subjects in Kamikoani were enrolled in this study, representing approximately 22% of the total town. Subjects included 218 men and 412 women with a mean age of 71.4 years (range, 50–94 years).

All participants completed a self-administered, self-reported history questionnaire (SSHQ) for the diagnosis of LSS [11], as described later. If the participants were diagnosed with LSS using the SSHQ, they were further asked whether they had clinically relevant CLBP, and body mass index (kg/m^2), spinal inclination, and spinal alignment (angle of kyphosis) and range of motion (ROM) of the thoracic and lumbar spine were measured. These measured variables were compared between LSS subjects with CLBP (LSS+CLBP group) and those without CLBP (LSS alone group).

This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the government health authorities of Kamikoani. All subjects provided written informed consent prior to examination.

2.1. Diagnosis of LSS. Diagnosis of LSS was obtained using an SSHQ developed by Konno et al. [11]. This diagnostic tool consists of 10 key questions (Table 1). Sensitivity and specificity of the SSHQ were 84% and 78%, respectively [11]. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve was 0.782 [11]. In test-retest analysis, the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) for first and second tests was 85% [11].

2.2. Definition of Clinically Relevant CLBP. LBP was considered clinically relevant if the participant answered that pain had been moderately to severely bothersome, or if the participant needed any medical treatment. CLBP was defined if the participant had clinically relevant LBP lasting >1 year [12, 13]. All other pain episodes were classified as not clinically relevant CLBP.

2.3. Measurement of Spinal Kyphosis Angles, ROMs, and Inclinations. Kyphosis angles and ROMs of the thoracic (T1-T12) and lumbar (L1-L5) spine were measured using a device for computerized measurement of surface curvature (SpinalMouse; Idiag, Volkterswill, Switzerland) in an upright position and at maximum flexion and extension [14]. Details regarding this device have been published previously [15]. The device consists of a mobile unit of 2 rolling wheels interfacing with a base station through telemetry. By sliding the mobile unit along the spinal curvature, sagittal spinal alignment is calculated and displayed on the computer monitor. Repeating this process with the patient in flexion and extension of the spine allows measurement of ROM [15]. Spinal inclination, defined as the angle between a line from the center of T1 to S1 and a perpendicular line [16], was also measured using SpinalMouse in an upright position and at maximum flexion/extension. SpinalMouse delivers consistently reliable values for standing curvatures and ROM [15, 17]. Post and Leferink [15] reported that interrater ICCs for curvature measurement with SpinalMouse were greater than 0.92. Mannion et al. [17] reported that the intrarater ICCs ranged from 0.82 to 0.83 and interrater ICCs ranged from 0.81 to 0.86. In addition, our previous studies have shown that thoracic and lumbar angles of kyphosis and spinal ROMs measured using the SpinalMouse correlated strongly with those measured on spinal radiography ($r = 0.804$, $r = 0.863$, and $r = 0.783$, resp.; $P < .0001$) [18].

2.4. Statistical Analysis. All data are presented as mean and standard deviation (SD). Statistical analysis was performed using StatView version 5.0 software (Abacus Concepts, Berkeley, CA). Statistical differences between the two groups were compared using an unpaired t -test. Values of $P < .05$ were considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Prevalence of LSS. Overall, 68 participants (10.8%) were diagnosed with LSS. These comprised 19 men and 49 women, with a mean age of 73.9 years (range 55–87 years). Prevalences of LSS in men and women were thus 8.7% and 11.9%, respectively. The prevalence of LSS tended to increase with age (Figure 1).

3.2. Prevalence of CLBP in Subjects with LSS. In 68 subjects with LSS, 46 subjects (67.6%) complained of clinically relevant CLBP. No significant differences were apparent between the LSS alone group ($n = 22$) and the LSS+CLBP group ($n = 46$) with regard to age, gender distribution, height, weight, or body mass index (Table 2). Subjects who




FIGURE 1: Prevalence of lumbar spinal stenosis with age.

TABLE 2: Demographic characteristics in LSS subjects with or without CLBP.

Variables	LSS alone (n = 22)	LSS+CLBP (n = 46)	Total (n = 68)
Male : female	8 : 14	11 : 35	19 : 49
Age (years)	72.8 (6.0)	74.4 (7.1)	73.9 (6.7)
Height (cm)	151.6 (7.3)	148.5 (9.7)	150.8 (9.0)
Weight (kg)	55.0 (8.5)	52.6 (8.8)	54.4 (9.2)
Body mass index (kg/m ²)	24.1 (4.3)	23.9 (3.0)	24.0 (3.4)

LSS: lumbar spinal stenosis; CLBP: chronic low back pain.
Data are presented as mean (SD).

had both LSS and CLBP were distributed across all ages (Table 3). Prevalence of CLBP in subjects with LSS seemed to be irregular with age, probably because the numbers of LSS subjects were smaller in younger age groups.

3.3. Comparisons of Spinal Alignment and Mobility in LSS Subjects with or without CLBP. With regard to spinal alignment, the LSS+CLBP group showed a significantly lower angle of thoracic kyphosis in an upright position, and significantly higher angles of lumbar kyphosis in upright, flexed, and extended positions compared to the LSS alone group (Table 4). The LSS+CLBP group also showed significantly higher angles of spinal inclination in the upright and extended positions compared to the LSS alone group. However, with regard to spinal mobility, no significant differences in any variables with spinal ROMs were seen between the LSS alone and LSS+CLBP groups (Table 5).

4. Discussion

Little is known about the actual prevalence of symptoms associated with LSS in the general population. The present study showed that the prevalence of LSS among individuals ≥ 50 years old in a healthy aged cohort from a rural district in Japan was 10.8%. This number is similar to that reported by

Vogt et al. [8] in their population-based survey, which found that among 5995 men ≥ 65 years old who participated in the Osteoporotic Fractures in Men Study, 12.2% experienced symptoms of numbness/tingling/weakness extending into the leg, suggestive of LSS.

However, the prevalence of LSS may vary between studies, as the diagnosis of LSS remains problematic with different diagnostic criteria applied in different studies. Typically, the preliminary diagnosis is based on clinical symptoms and signs. After referral to an orthopedic surgeon or neurosurgeon, imaging studies confirm the diagnosis. In the present study, the diagnosis of LSS was obtained based on an SSHQ to identify LSS with a high sensitivity, specificity, and reproducibility [11]. This self-reported diagnostic tool is useful for a population-based survey. This diagnostic tool was developed according to a retrospective derivation study, a prospective derivation study, and a validation study using more than 500 surgical cases diagnosed by board-certified spine surgeons approved by the Board of the Japanese Society for Spine Surgery and Related Research as the gold standard for diagnosing LSS [11].

The clinical hallmark finding of LSS is neurogenic intermittent claudication, presenting as intermittent pain or paresthesia in the legs brought on by walking and standing, and classically relieved with flexion. However, other symptoms are also frequent. Amundsen et al. reported that the most common symptoms in patients with LSS were back pain including LBP (prevalence, 95%), claudication (91%), leg pain (71%), weakness (33%), and voiding disturbances (12%) [19, 20]. LBP is thus considered one of the major symptoms of LSS.

However, relationships between LSS and CLBP remain unclear. In particular, the exact sagittal profile of the spine and spinal mobility in subjects with LSS alone or in combination with CLBP has still yet to be exactly defined. The present study showed that 67.6% of subjects with LSS experienced CLBP and that spinal alignment differed between subjects with LSS and CLBP and subjects with LSS alone, irrespective of the equivalent age and gender distributions. In this study, spinal alignment and mobility were measured using a computer-assisted device that is useful for fieldwork. The results of the present study indicate that subjects with LSS and CLBP showed more kyphotic lumbar spinal alignment with a stooped trunk (i.e., increased spinal inclination) compared to subjects with LSS alone. Thoracic kyphosis was decreased in subjects with LSS and CLBP, probably because of compensation for increased lumbar kyphosis due to CLBP. In addition, lumbar flexion was not restricted by the presence of CLBP in subjects with LSS, whereas lumbar extension was limited. However, total spinal mobility was not restricted by the presence of CLBP in subjects with LSS.

Associations of increased lumbar kyphosis and LBP among non-LSS subjects have been discussed in the literature [1, 21–23]. Jackson and McManus [1] found a significant decrease in lumbar lordosis (i.e., increased lumbar kyphosis) for the LBP group compared with normal controls. Results from several other studies support the concept that increased lumbar kyphosis is associated with increased LBP [21–23]. Increased spinal kyphosis is known to have significant

TABLE 3: Prevalence of CLBP in subjects with LSS with age.

	Age (years)				Total
	50–59	60–69	70–79	80–	
Male					
No. of LSS	1	2	12	4	19
No. of LSS+CLBP	1	1	7	2	11
Prevalence of CLBP in LSS (%)	100	50	58.3	50	57.9
Female					
No. of LSS	3	7	32	7	49
No. of LSS+CLBP	2	5	21	7	35
Prevalence of CLBP in LSS (%)	66.6	71.4	65.6	100	71.4
Total					
No. of LSS	4	9	44	11	68
No. of LSS+CLBP	3	6	28	9	46
Prevalence of CLBP in LSS (%)	75	66.6	63.7	81.8	67.6

LSS: lumbar spinal stenosis; CLBP: chronic low back pain.

TABLE 4: Comparisons of spinal alignment in LSS subjects with or without CLBP.

Variables	LSS alone (<i>n</i> = 22)	LSS+CLBP (<i>n</i> = 46)	Total (<i>n</i> = 68)
Upr thoracic kyphosis angle (°)	40.7 (5.3)	35.0 (11.9)*	36.9 (10.5)
Upr lumbar kyphosis angle (°)	−10.7 (12.4)	0.1 (20.4)*	−3.6 (18.7)
Upr spinal inclination (°)	5.5 (6.8)	12.1 (11.9)*	9.8 (10.9)
Flex thoracic kyphosis angle (°)	45.2 (10.1)	40.3 (13.1)	41.9 (12.3)
Flex lumbar kyphosis angle (°)	9.5 (17.0)	24.9 (18.6)*	19.6 (19.4)
Flex spinal inclination (°)	85.9 (30.2)	87.1 (25.3)	86.7 (26.8)
Ext thoracic kyphosis angle (°)	32.7 (10.4)	26.7 (15.0)	28.8 (13.8)
Ext lumbar kyphosis angle (°)	−18.5 (9.9)	−5.7 (20.7)*	−10.0 (18.7)
Ext spinal inclination (°)	−14.8 (11.9)	−5.2 (18.3)*	−8.4 (17.0)

* Significant difference versus LSS alone group ($P < .05$ by unpaired *t*-test).
LSS: lumbar spinal stenosis; CLBP: chronic low back pain; upr: upright position; flex: flexed position; ext: extended position.
Data are presented as mean (SD).

associations with decreased back extensor strength [24]. Thus, although we did not measure back extensor strength in this study, decreased back extensor strength might be a causal factor for CLBP in the LSS+CLBP group.

The limitations of this study should be noted. First, neither radiographic nor magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)

TABLE 5: Comparisons of spinal ROM in LSS subjects with or without CLBP.

Variables	LSS alone (<i>n</i> = 22)	LSS+CLBP (<i>n</i> = 46)	Total (<i>n</i> = 68)
Thoracic flex-upr ROM (°)	7.9 (4.7)	7.1 (5.9)	7.4 (5.5)
Thoracic upr-ext ROM (°)	9.1 (5.8)	10.8 (9.5)	10.2 (8.4)
Thoracic ROM (°)	17.0 (7.6)	18.0 (10.7)	17.7 (9.7)
Lumbar flex-upr ROM (°)	20.1 (12.6)	25.2 (14.4)	23.5 (13.9)
Lumbar upr-ext ROM (°)	10.7 (9.9)	8.2 (6.8)	9.1 (8.0)
Lumbar ROM (°)	30.9 (16.1)	33.4 (16.0)	32.5 (16.0)
Total flex-upr ROM (°)	28.0 (14.5)	32.3 (16.1)	30.9 (15.6)
Total upr-ext ROM (°)	19.9 (10.8)	19.0 (11.9)	19.3 (11.4)
Total ROM (°)	47.9 (18.6)	51.4 (21.6)	50.2 (20.5)

LSS: lumbar spinal stenosis; CLBP: chronic low back pain; upr: upright position; flex: flexed position; ext: extended position; ROM: range of motion.

Data are presented as mean (SD).

data were available in this study to evaluate spondylotic severity and/or neurologic compression. In addition to lumbar kyphosis, several other factors including disc degeneration, facet osteoarthritis, and neurologic compression might differ between individuals with and without CLBP. Furthermore, the prevalence of lumbar instability, spondylolysis, and spondylolisthesis was unknown in this cohort. Second, this study did not evaluate pain intensity. Since differences in pain intensity may be associated with different modifications of spinal curves, a wide variety of physical

and mental outcome scores for LBP including the Oswestry Disability Index, Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire, and the simple Visual Analogue Scale may help to address this problem. However, because this study was performed as part of a public health examination, conducting radiographic or MRI examination was impossible, and insufficient time was available to obtain these validated questionnaires and scales for LBP.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, the prevalence of LSS among individuals ≥ 50 years old in a rural Japanese cohort was 10.8%. Among subjects with LSS, 67.6% had CLBP. Subjects with LSS and CLBP showed more kyphotic lumbar spinal alignment with limited lumbar extension, resulting in a stooped trunk compared to subjects with LSS alone. However, the presence of CLBP did not affect total spinal mobility in subjects with LSS.

References

- [1] R. P. Jackson and A. C. McManus, "Radiographic analysis of sagittal plane alignment and balance in standing volunteers and patients with low back pain matched for age, sex, and size: a prospective controlled clinical study," *Spine*, vol. 19, no. 14, pp. 1611–1618, 1994.
- [2] C. Tüzün, I. Yorulmaz, A. Cindaş, and S. Vatan, "Low back pain and posture," *Clinical Rheumatology*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 308–312, 1999.
- [3] P. R. Croft, G. J. Macfarlane, A. C. Papageorgiou, E. Thomas, and A. J. Silman, "Outcome of low back pain in general practice: a prospective study," *British Medical Journal*, vol. 316, no. 7141, pp. 1356–1359, 1998.
- [4] H. J. M. Van Den Hoogen, B. W. Koes, W. Devillé, J. T. M. Van Eijk, and L. M. Bouter, "The prognosis of low back pain in general practice," *Spine*, vol. 22, no. 13, pp. 1515–1521, 1997.
- [5] R. A. Deyo and J. E. Bass, "Lifestyle and low-back pain. The influence of smoking and obesity," *Spine*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 501–506, 1989.
- [6] M. A. Ciol, R. A. Deyo, E. Howell, and S. Kreif, "An assessment of surgery for spinal stenosis: time trends, geographic variations, complications, and reoperations," *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 285–290, 1996.
- [7] H. Davis and R. B. Keller, "Increasing rates of cervical and lumbar spine surgery in the United States, 1979–1990," *Spine*, vol. 19, no. 10, pp. 1117–1124, 1994.
- [8] M. T. Vogt, P. M. Cawthon, J. D. Kang, W. F. Donaldson, J. A. Cauley, and M. C. Nevitt, "Prevalence of symptoms of cervical and lumbar stenosis among participants in the osteoporotic fractures in men study," *Spine*, vol. 31, no. 13, pp. 1445–1451, 2006.
- [9] M. Djurasovic and S. D. Glassman, "Correlation of radiographic and clinical findings in spinal deformities," *Neurosurgery Clinics of North America*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 223–227, 2007.
- [10] S. D. Glassman, K. Bridwell, J. R. Dimar, W. Horton, S. Berven, and F. Schwab, "The impact of positive sagittal balance in adult spinal deformity," *Spine*, vol. 30, no. 18, pp. 2024–2029, 2005.
- [11] S. I. Konno, S. I. Kikuchi, Y. Tanaka et al., "A diagnostic support tool for lumbar spinal stenosis: a self-administered, self-reported history questionnaire," *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*, vol. 8, article 102, 2007.
- [12] C. H. Kang, M. J. Shin, S. M. Kim, S. H. Lee, and C. S. Lee, "MRI of paraspinal muscles in lumbar degenerative kyphosis patients and control patients with chronic low back pain," *Clinical Radiology*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 479–486, 2007.
- [13] N. Miyakoshi, Y. Shimada, Y. Kasukawa, H. Saito, H. Kodama, and E. Itoi, "Total dorsal ramus block for the treatment of chronic low back pain: a preliminary study," *Joint Bone Spine*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 270–274, 2007.
- [14] N. Miyakoshi, M. Hongo, S. Maekawa et al., "Factors related to spinal mobility in patients with postmenopausal osteoporosis," *Osteoporosis International*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 1871–1874, 2005.
- [15] R. B. Post and V. J. M. Leferink, "Spinal mobility: sagittal range of motion measured with the SpinalMouse, a new non-invasive device," *Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery*, vol. 124, no. 3, pp. 187–192, 2004.
- [16] Y. Kasukawa, N. Miyakoshi, M. Hongo et al., "Relationships between falls, spinal curvature, spinal mobility and back extensor strength in elderly people," *Journal of Bone and Mineral Metabolism*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 82–87, 2010.
- [17] A. F. Mannion, K. Knecht, G. Balaban, J. Dvorak, and D. Grob, "A new skin-surface device for measuring the curvature and global and segmental ranges of motion of the spine: reliability of measurements and comparison with data reviewed from the literature," *European Spine Journal*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 122–136, 2004.
- [18] N. Miyakoshi, M. Hongo, T. Tani, S. Maekawa, Y. Shimada, and E. Itoi, "Relationship between spinal mobility and quality of life in patients with osteoporosis," *Osteoporosis Japan*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 143–146, 2004 (Japanese).
- [19] T. Amundsen, H. Weber, F. Lilleås, H. J. Nordal, M. Abdelnoor, and B. Magnaes, "Lumbar spinal stenosis: clinical and radiologic features," *Spine*, vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 1178–1186, 1995.
- [20] T. Amundsen, H. Weber, H. J. Nordal, B. Magnaes, M. Abdelnoor, and F. Lilleås, "Lumbar spinal stenosis: conservative or surgical management? A prospective 10-year study," *Spine*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 1424–1436, 2000.
- [21] C. Barrey, J. Jund, O. Nosedá, and P. Roussouly, "Sagittal balance of the pelvis-spine complex and lumbar degenerative diseases. A comparative study about 85 cases," *European Spine Journal*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 1459–1467, 2007.
- [22] P. Korovessis, M. Stamatakis, and A. Baikousis, "Segmental roentgenographic analysis of vertebral inclination on sagittal plane in asymptomatic versus chronic low back pain patients," *Journal of Spinal Disorders*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 131–137, 1999.
- [23] Y. Takemitsu, Y. Harada, T. Iwahara, M. Miyamoto, and Y. Miyatake, "Lumbar degenerative kyphosis. Clinical, radiological and epidemiological studies," *Spine*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 1317–1326, 1988.
- [24] N. Miyakoshi, M. Hongo, S. Maekawa, Y. Ishikawa, Y. Shimada, and E. Itoi, "Back extensor strength and lumbar spinal mobility are predictors of quality of life in patients with postmenopausal osteoporosis," *Osteoporosis International*, vol. 18, no. 10, pp. 1397–1403, 2007.