

1 **TITLE:** Can Specific Loading through Exercise Impart Healing or Regeneration of the Intervertebral Disc?

2

3 **AUTHORS:** James Steele BSc (Hons)¹, Stewart Bruce-Low PhD¹, Dave Smith PhD², Neil Osborne PhD³,
4 Arvid Thorkeldsen DC³

5

6 **ADDRESS:** Centre for Health, Exercise and Sport Science, Southampton Solent University, Hampshire, United
7 Kingdom¹, Department of Exercise & Sport Science, Manchester Metropolitan University, Cheshire, United
8 Kingdom², Anglo European College of Chiropractic, Bournemouth, United Kingdom³

9

10 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:** James Steele

11 **CORRESPONDING EMAIL:** james.steele@solent.ac.uk

12 **CORRESPONDING TELEPHONE:** +442380319606

13 **CORRESPONDING ADDRESS:** Centre for Health, Exercise and Sport Science, Southampton Solent
14 University, East Park Terrace, Southampton, Hampshire, United Kingdom, SO14 0YN

15

16 **CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT**

17 All listed authors contributions include the conception and design, acquisition of data or analysis and
18 interpretation of data, drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and final
19 approval of the version published. Regarding responsibility for overall content, the lead author, James Steele, is
20 the guarantor.

21 **FUNDING**

22 No source of funding was associated with the preparation of this manuscript.

23 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

24 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

25 **KEY WORDS:** Low Back Pain; Resistance Training; MRI

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 *Background Context:* Low back pain (LBP) is highly prevalent and presents an enormous cost both through
3 direct healthcare and indirectly through significant work and production loss. LBP is acknowledged widely to be
4 a multifactorial pathology with a variety of symptoms, dysfunctions and a number of possible sources of pain.
5 One source that has been suspected and evidenced for some time are the intervertebral discs. Some degree of
6 disc degeneration is a physiologic process associated with aging, however, more severe degeneration and/or
7 structural abnormality may be indicative of a pathological process or injury, and is more commonly present in
8 those suffering from LBP. Much like other tissue's (i.e. muscle, bone etc.) it has been suspected that there exists
9 an optimal loading strategy to promote the health of the disc. Exercise is often prescribed for LBP and
10 effectively reduces pain and disability. However, whether specific loading through exercise might plausibly heal
11 or regenerate the intervertebral discs is unknown.

12 *Purpose:* Thus the purpose of this brief review was to examine the effects of loading upon regenerative
13 processes in the intervertebral disc and consider the potential for specific exercise to apply loading to the lumbar
14 spine to produce these effects.

15 *Study Design:* A brief narrative literature review

16 *Methods:* Studies examining the effects of loading upon the intervertebral discs were reviewed to examine the
17 plausibility of using loading through exercise to induce regeneration or healing of the intervertebral disc.

18 *Results:* Research from animal model studies suggests the existence of a dose-response relationship between
19 loading and regenerative processes. Though high loading at high volumes and frequencies might accelerate
20 degeneration or produce disc injury, high loading, yet of low volume and at low frequency appears to induce
21 potentially regenerative mechanisms including improvements in disc proteoglycan content, matrix gene
22 expression, rate of cell apoptosis and improved fluid flow and solute transport.

23 *Conclusions:* Research suggests a dose-response relationship between loading and disc regenerative processes
24 and that the loading pattern typically utilised in lumbar extension resistance exercise interventions (high load,
25 low volume, low frequency) might impart healing or regeneration of the intervertebral discs. Future research
26 should examine an exercise intervention with *in vivo* measurement of changes in disc condition. This may
27 provide further evidence for the 'black box' of treatment mechanisms associated with exercise interventions.

28

29

30

1 **Introduction & Background**

2 Low back pain (LBP) is one of the most prevalent medical disorders in society [1-4] and causes significant
3 suffering for many. It presents a cost of billions worldwide (~£5-10 billion UK [5]; ~\$100-200 billion USA [6]),
4 including extensive direct healthcare costs [5-7], and indirect costs through work and production losses (~50-
5 149 million work-days lost [8,9]. LBP is acknowledged as a multifactorial pathology presenting a wide variety
6 of physical symptoms and dysfunctions, some of which may be causative, and others which may be symptoms
7 of underlying dysfunction [10,11].

8
9 The intervertebral discs, however, have been suspected to be a potential source of painful symptoms in LBP for
10 some time [12] and there is much well documented supporting evidence regarding mechanisms for how pain
11 may occur [13,14]. Despite the disc being a potential source of pain, in addition to the many biologically
12 plausible mechanisms which might instigate a pain response, there is some disparity in the literature linking the
13 presence of LBP to disc abnormality. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [15-20], radiography [21], and
14 discography [22,23] have all suggested that disc abnormalities can be present in asymptomatic participants,
15 which has brought into question the likelihood of these findings in symptomatic patients holding clinical
16 relevance to the pain they are experiencing. However, recent literature highlights that although it may be
17 difficult to attribute specific disc pathologies to LBP on an individual basis, there are consistent associations of
18 certain disc abnormalities (i.e. high intensity zone (HIZ), degree of disc degeneration, disc herniation and nerve
19 root deviation/compression) in those who suffer from LBP [24-26].

20
21 It should be considered also that the subsequent pain response after injury is in part dependent upon severity
22 [27]. In the case of abnormalities in asymptomatic participants it may be that a threshold of degeneration/injury
23 may not have been achieved to initiate a pain causing mechanism. Thus, examination of the literature should
24 consider the severity of degeneration as it relates to LBP. Adams and Roughley [13] suggest the presence of
25 some degree of degeneration is a physiologic process associated with aging, whereas more severe degeneration
26 and/or structural abnormality may be indicative of a pathological process or injury and more commonly present
27 in those suffering from LBP. Many studies support the contention that more severe degrees of degeneration
28 and/or structural abnormality are more consistently apparent in participants with LBP than those who are
29 asymptomatic [16,17,22,23,28] in a dose dependent manner [29,30]. Even if not all disc abnormalities can be
30 ascribed as the source of LBP, any degenerative changes also heighten the risk for more severe disc

1 degeneration or injury and thus pain and suffering [14]. Thus it seems that, as a consistent finding in
2 symptomatic participants, and a potential source of pain symptoms, disc degeneration or injury is a worthwhile
3 factor to consider in treatment of LBP. Exercise is a common prescription for those with LBP; however, the
4 potential for it to specifically promote positive changes in the intervertebral discs is not often considered.

5

6 **Loading, Exercise and its Effect on the Disc**

7 Biochemical analysis of the changes involved in symptomatic degenerative discs compared to asymptomatic
8 discs shows that significant metabolic abnormalities are present including; reduced glycosaminoglycans,
9 dehydration, and reduced nucleus pulposus pH [31]. Some have suggested that such metabolic abnormalities in
10 the intervertebral disc might be improved, thus potentially halting or reversing the degenerative process, through
11 appropriate loading of the lumbar spine through exercise [32,33]. However, not all exercises are equally
12 effective in loading and exercising the lumbar spine. A recent review has suggested that the use of isolated
13 lumbar extension (ILEX) may be the most effective exercise for this purpose [34]. Thus it might be considered
14 the most likely candidate for potentially improving disc condition also. Indeed, studies performing ILEX
15 resistance exercise show successful rehabilitation outcomes in terms of pain and disability in participants with
16 diagnosis of degenerative discs [35,36]. In addition, significantly favourable outcomes for participants
17 undergoing lumbar discectomy for disc herniation have been shown as a result of ILEX exercise [37]. Other
18 studies using compound trunk extension training also suggest that the presence of severe disc degeneration at
19 the least has no negative influence on the efficacy of treatment [38].

20 Despite these findings, there is some opposition to the use of loaded extension based exercise in LBP for fear of
21 causing further damage to the discs [39]. It is suggested that excessive cycles of flexion-extension under a high
22 compressive load may increase the risk of disc herniation [39,40]. The use of ILEX in rehabilitation consists of
23 progressive resistance exercise to train the isolated muscles that extend the lower back [41]. This type of
24 training has been considered therefore to involve increased risk of disk herniation [39]. However the
25 rehabilitation performed typically consists of relatively short times under loading and infrequent training
26 sessions. In contrast, Callaghan and McGill [40] found that the number of flexion-extension cycles was more
27 highly related to disc herniation (upward of 5000 cycles at differing loads). ILEX exercise rehabilitation
28 typically utilises a resistance that will elicit approximately ~8-12 repetitions, and at most around 15 repetitions,
29 before achieving momentary muscular failure using a repetition duration ≥ 7 seconds [41]. Therefore the risk of

1 herniation may not be as great as suggested. There is also concern however that excessive loading may increase
2 rate of disc cell apoptosis [39,42] and may therefore contribute to the inflammatory process by which disc
3 degeneration occurs. However, citing research by Lotz and Chin [42] may be questionable in concluding that
4 excessive loading is responsible for increased apoptosis in this context because the compressive loadings used in
5 this study were applied for periods ranging from 1 to 7 days. In fact, Lotz and Chin's [42] results showed that
6 the degree of apoptosis was proportional to duration of loading; thus longer exposure presented greater risk. As
7 explained, the treatment protocol used with ILEX avoids such sustained loading (through low repetition ranges
8 and frequency of exercise).

9

10 Reviews of the literature suggest the potential for a "safe window" of disc loading to exist that may stimulate
11 optimal disc health [43,44]. Evidence suggesting loaded ILEX exercise as being effective in LBP even when
12 disc degeneration is present has been highlighted [35,36]. Although some studies discussed [40,42] have been
13 interpreted [39] to suggest it could potentially present a risk to the disc, a number of further studies using animal
14 models provide evidence instead for a potential beneficial effect of mechanical loading upon disc degenerative
15 processes, demonstrating biological plausibility for the concept of ILEX resistance exercise for improving disc
16 health.

17

18 Earlier studies have suggested that continued compressive loading can contribute to harmful responses in the
19 disc in a dose-dependent manner (i.e. magnitude and duration), which might further suggest cause for concern in
20 employing ILEX resistance exercise for those with LBP [45,46]. However, this dose-dependent mechanism has
21 important implications for ILEX resistance exercise, which is also typically employed in a dose-dependent
22 manner. As explained, ILEX rehabilitation selects a resistance that allows only ~8-12 repetitions and exercise is
23 performed to momentary muscular failure using this resistance, which has been suggested as optimal for
24 strength and hypertrophic adaptations [47,48]. An exercise frequency of once per week has also been identified
25 as sufficient for improving lumbar extension strength, pain and disability [49,50]. Thus ILEX rehabilitation
26 represents a relatively high loading on the disc though at a low frequency and volume. Walsh and Lotz [51]
27 report that, in comparison to higher frequency and lower load compression, lower frequency and higher load
28 compression induces positive improvements in disc proteoglycan content, matrix gene expression and rate of
29 cell apoptosis. Thus there may be potential for ILEX rehabilitation to exert a similar adaptive effect. Indeed,

1 Maclean et al. [52,53] have also showed that anabolic and catabolic responses in the nucleus are dependent upon
2 load and frequency with anabolic genes being stimulated at low frequencies and catabolic genes being
3 stimulated at higher frequencies. They also revealed that very low loading had no effect upon gene expression
4 suggesting that some degree of loading, though at a low frequency, is required to stimulate an adaptive anabolic
5 response.

6
7 These studies have examined what might be considered regenerative processes, but as we have highlighted, a
8 loss of disc hydration is also present in degenerative discs [31] and so rehydration may also be an important
9 consideration. Ferguson et al. [54] have shown that loading increases fluid flow across the disc, which in turn
10 also enhances transport of larger solutes into the intervertebral disc. ILEX rehabilitation may enhance pressure
11 variance across the disc through its flexion-extension cycles and thus enhance interstitial fluid flow [50]. The
12 findings of Ferguson et al. [54] would lend biological plausibility to this potential mechanism also. A last
13 addition to this discussion of biological plausibility considers the type of loading upon the disc. ILEX typically
14 utilises a dynamic exercise and Wang et al. [55] have presented that while static loading contributes to catabolic
15 activity, dynamic compressive loading contrastingly promotes anabolic activity.

16

17 **Specific Loading through Exercise May Improve Disc Condition**

18 It is apparent that the intervertebral disc represents a potential source of pain and that disc degeneration is a
19 common factor in LBP. It also seems that ILEX exercise is successful in rehabilitation outcomes even in the
20 presence of such degeneration in symptomatic participants, despite concerns by some authors. As such it seems
21 reasonable to hypothesise that such exercise may in fact impart a healing or perhaps regenerative adaptation to
22 the disc itself. The concept of applied loading in order to promote tissue healing in musculoskeletal conditions
23 (i.e. Mechanotherapy) has been revisited in recent years [56] Indeed as we have discussed, there is significant
24 evidence from animal models to provide biological plausibility for how such an adaptation might occur in the
25 intervertebral discs.

26

27 Research has also shown that improvements in both lumbar extensor muscle condition [37,57] and lumbar bone
28 mineral density are produced through ILEX rehabilitation [58-63]. These results might suggest that a sufficient
29 degree of specific loading may be required to promote a positive adaptive response in muscle, bone, and thus
30 potentially the disc also. Indeed epidemiological evidence also suggests that strength training and bodybuilding

1 results in a lowered risk of disc degeneration [64]. Thus we hypothesise that specific loading through ILEX
2 exercise may possibly impart an adaptive response and healing or regeneration of the intervertebral disc.

3

4 It has been suggested that therapeutic pharmacologic interventions could possibly instigate regeneration of the
5 intervertebral disc [65,66] but, despite suggestions for therapeutic loading strategies [43,44,46] the effects of
6 exercise upon disc condition *in vivo* have not been investigated through means of a randomised controlled trial.

7 Adams et al. [14] have recently reviewed the potential for healing to occur in the symptomatic intervertebral
8 disc and suggested that potential mechanisms for disc reparation will likely predominantly involve the annulus.

9 Being that this is an area yet to be examined fully *in vivo*, and that as suggested here there may be mechanisms
10 of positive adaptation in both the annulus and nucleus, we suggest that any study seeking to test this hypothesis
11 should invariably look to examine all possible aspects of disc condition.

12

13 Taken collectively the evidence highlights potential for ILEX exercise rehabilitation to produce beneficial
14 adaptation in the intervertebral discs of symptomatic participants. It also seems apparent that there may be an
15 optimal dose (load, duration, frequency) for which these adaptations are produced. However, these potential
16 adaptations have yet to be investigated *in vivo* through use of MRI. Thus we suggest that in order to test the
17 hypothesis that “specific loading applied through use of ILEX resistance exercise can impart healing or
18 regeneration of the intervertebral disc” be examined through means of a randomised controlled trial to examine
19 *in vivo* changes in disc condition. The intervention used in the trial should follow typical recommendations for
20 ILEX rehabilitation as used in recent studies of ILEX [50,67,68] and could be investigated in both participants
21 with diagnosed disc degeneration and/or injury, in addition to those with non-specific LBP. Ideally the outcome
22 measure used would be MRI and a range of possible factors indicating disc condition be considered for changes
23 using standard validated means of assessment.

24

25 We believe further study of this kind might provide a robust test of this hypothesis and may offer some further
26 insight into the ‘black box’ of mechanisms of exercise interventions effects in LBP [69]. Should the hypothesis
27 be found to be supported then future work might consider comparative studies of interventions, both exercise
28 and other, to examine relative efficacy. However, considering the multifactorial nature of LBP, if an
29 intervention such as ILEX is found to induce positive adaptation in the intervertebral disc this might be

1 considered as representing further cost effectiveness to the approach due to the wide range of positive outcomes
2 that might be possible from such a minimal single intervention [70].

3

4 **References**

- 5 1. World Health Organisation (WHO). The World Health Report 1998: Life in the 21st century: A vision
6 for all. Geneva: Office of Publications, World Health Organisation; 1998
- 7 2. Waddell G, Burton AK. Occupational health guidelines for the management of low back pain at work:
8 evidence review. *Occup Med* 2001;51:126–135
- 9 3. Walker BF. The prevalence of low back pain: a systematic review of the literature from 1966 to 1998. *J*
10 *Spinal Disord* 2000;13(3):205–217
- 11 4. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Low back pain: early management of
12 persistent non-specific low back pain. London: Royal College of General Practitioners; 2009
- 13 5. Maniadakis N, Gray A. The economic burden of back pain in the UK. *Pain* 2000;84 (1):95–103.
- 14 6. Katz JN. Lumbar disc disorders and low back pain: socioeconomic factors and consequences. *J Bone*
15 *Joint Surg Am* 2006;88(suppl 2):21–24
- 16 7. Van Tulder MW, Koes BW, Bouter LM. A cost-of-illness study of back pain in The Netherlands. *Pain*
17 1995;62(2):233–240
- 18 8. Guo HR, Tanaka S, Halperin WE, Cameron LL. Back pain prevalence in US industry and estimates of
19 lost workdays. *Am J Public Health* 1999;89:1029–1035
- 20 9. Waddell G, Aylward M, Sawney P. Back Pain, incapacity for work and social security benefits: an
21 international literature review and analysis. Glasgow: The Royal Society of Medicine Press Ltd; 2002
- 22 10. National Research Council (NRC). Work-related musculoskeletal disorders: A Review of the evidence.
23 National Academy Press: Washington, DC; 1998
- 24 11. National Research Council (NRC), and The Institute of Medicine (IOM). Musculoskeletal disorders
25 and the workplace: Low back and upper extremities. National Academy Press: Washington, DC; 2001
- 26 12. Mixter WJ, Barr JS. Rupture of the intervertebral disc with involvement of the spinal canal. *N Eng J*
27 *Med* 1934;211:210–215
- 28 13. Adams MA, Roughley PJ. What is intervertebral disc degeneration, and what causes it? *Spine*
29 2006;31(18):2151–2161

- 1 14. Adams MA, Stefanakis M, Dolan P. Healing of a painful intervertebral disc should not be confused
2 with reversing disc degeneration: implications for physical therapies for discogenic back pain. *Clin*
3 *Biomech* 2010;25:961–971
- 4 15. Boden SD, Davis DO, Dina TS, Patronas NJ, Wiesel SW. Abnormal magnetic-resonance scans of the
5 lumbar spine in asymptomatic subjects. A prospective investigation. *J Bone Joint Surg* 1990;72:403–
6 408
- 7 16. Jensen MC, Brant-Zawadzki MN, Obuchowski N, Modic MT, Malkasian D, Ross JS. Magnetic
8 resonance imaging of the lumbar spine in people without back pain. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331(2):69–73
- 9 17. Weishaupt D, Zanetti M, Hodler J, Boos N. MR imaging of the lumbar spine: prevalence of
10 intervertebral disk extrusion and sequestration, nerve root compression, end plate abnormalities and
11 osteoarthritis of the facet joints in asymptomatic volunteers. *Radiology* 1998;209(3):661-669
- 12 18. Borenstein DG, O'Mara J, Boden SD, Lauerman WC, Jacobson A, Platenberg C, Schellinger D, Wiesel
13 SW. The value of magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine to predict low back pain in
14 asymptomatic subjects. *J Bone Joint Surg* 2001;83(9):1306–1311
- 15 19. Barento A, Hellström M, Cederlund CG, Nyman R, Sward L. Back pain and MRI changes in the
16 thoraco-lumbar spine of top athletes in four different sports: a 15 year follow-up study. *Knee Surgery,*
17 *Sports Traumatology. Arthroscopy* 2009;17:1125–1134
- 18 20. Maurer M, Soder RB, Baldisserotto M. Spine abnormalities depicted by magnetic resonance imaging in
19 adolescent rowers. *Am J Sports Med* 2011;39(2):392–397
- 20 21. Iwamoto J, Abe H, Tsukimura Y, Wakano K. Relationship between radiographic abnormalities of
21 lumbar spine and incidence of low back pain in high school rugby players: a prospective study. *Scand J*
22 *Med Sci Sports* 2005;15:163–168
- 23 22. Holt EP. The question of lumbar discography. *J Bone Joint Surg* 1968;50:720–726
- 24 23. Walsh TR, Weinstein JN, Spratt KF, Lehmann TR, Aprill C, Sayre H. Lumbar discography in normal
25 subjects. A controlled, prospective study. *J Bone Joint Surg* 1990;72:1081–1088
- 26 24. Endean A, Palmer KT, Coggon D. Potential of magnetic resonance imaging findings to refine case
27 definition for mechanical low back pain in epidemiological studies. *Spine* 2011;36(2):160–169
- 28 25. McNee P, Shambrook J, Harris EC, Sampson M, Palmer KT, Coggon D. Predictors of long-term pain
29 and disability in patients with low back pain investigated by magnetic resonance imaging: A
30 longitudinal study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2011;12:234

- 1 26. Shambrook J, McNee P, Harris EC, Kim M, Sampson M, Palmer KT, Coggon D. Clinical presentation
2 of low back pain and association with risk factors according to findings on magnetic resonance
3 imaging. *Pain* 2011;152:1659–1665
- 4 27. DeLeo JA, Winkelstein BA. Physiology of chronic spinal pain syndromes: From animal models to
5 biomechanics. *Spine* 2002;27:2526–2537
- 6 28. Kjaer P, Leboeuf-Yde C, Kowsholm L, Sorenson JS, Bendix T. Magnetic resonance imaging and low
7 back pain in adults: a diagnostic study of 40 year old men and women. *Spine* 2005;30(10):1173–1180
- 8 29. Cheung KMC, Karppinen J, Chan D, Ho DWH, Song Y, Sham P, Cheah KSE, Leong JCY, Luk KDK.
9 Prevalence and pattern of lumbar magnetic resonance imaging changes in a population study of one
10 thousand forty-three individuals. *Spine* 2009;34(9):934–940
- 11 30. de Schepper EIT, Damen J, van Meurs JBJ, Ginai AZ, Popham M, Hofman A, Koes BW, Bierma-
12 Zeinstra SM. The association between lumbar disc degeneration and low back pain. *Spine*
13 2010;35(5):531–536
- 14 31. Kitano T, Zerwekh JE, Usui Y, Edwards ML, Flicker PL, Mooney V. Biochemical changes associated
15 with the symptomatic human intervertebral disk. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1993;293:372–377
- 16 32. Mooney V, Verna J, Morris C. Clinical management of chronic, disabling low back syndromes. In:
17 Morris C, ed. *Rehabilitation of the Spine: A Practitioners Manual*. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2006
- 18 33. Mayer J, Mooney V, Dagenais S. Evidence informed management of chronic low back pain with
19 lumbar extensor strengthening exercises. *Spine J* 2008;8:96–113
- 20 34. Steele J, Bruce-Low S, Smith D. A review of the specificity of exercises designed for conditioning the
21 lumbar extensors. *Br J Sports Med*. Online First
- 22 35. Highland TR, Dreisinger TE. Degenerative disc disease in a collegiate volleyball player. *Med Sci*
23 *Sports Exerc* 1992;24(5):S163
- 24 36. Nelson BW, O'Reilly E, Miller M. The clinical effects of intensive, specific exercise on low back pain:
25 A controlled study of 895 consecutive patients with a one year follow up. *Orthopedics*
26 1995;18(10):971–981.
- 27 37. Choi G, Raiturker PP, Kim MJ, Jin CD, Chae YS. The effect of early isolated lumbar extension
28 exercise program for patients with herniated disc and undergoing lumbar discectomy. *Neurosurgery*
29 2005;57(4):764–772

- 1 38. Kleinstuck F, Dvorak J, Mannion AF. Are “structural abnormalities” on magnetic resonance imaging
2 a contraindication to the successful conservative treatment of chronic nonspecific low back pain? *Spine*
3 2006;31(19):2250–2257
- 4 39. McGill SM. *Low back disorders: evidence-based rehabilitation and prevention*. 2nd ed. Human
5 Kinetics: Champaign; 2007
- 6 40. Callaghan JP, McGill SM. Intervertebral disc herniation: studies on a porcine model exposed to highly
7 repetitive flexion/extension motion with compressive force. *Clin Biomech* 2001;16(1):28–37
- 8 41. Smith D, Bruce-Low S, Bissell G. Twenty years of specific, isolated lumbar extension research: A
9 review. *J Orthop* 2011;5(1):e14
- 10 42. Lotz JC, Chin JR. Intervertebral disc cell death is dependent on the magnitude and duration of spinal
11 loading. *Spine* 2000;25(12):1477–1483
- 12 43. Stokes IAF, Iatridis JC. Mechanical conditions that accelerate intervertebral disc degeneration:
13 Overload versus immobilization. *Spine* 2004;29(23):2724–2732
- 14 44. Chan ACW, Ferguson SJ, Gantenbein-Ritter B. The effects of dynamic loading on the intervertebral
15 disc. *Eur Spine J* 2011;20:1796–1812
- 16 45. Lotz JC, Colliou OK, Chin JR, Duncan NA, Lienenberg E. Compression-induced degeneration of the
17 intervertebral disc: and in vivo mouse model and finite-element study. *Spine* 1998;23(23):2493–2506
- 18 46. Kroeber MW, Unglaub F, Wang H, Schmid C, Thomsen M, Nerlich A, Richter W. New in vivo animal
19 model to create intervertebral disc degeneration and to investigate the effects of therapeutic strategies
20 to stimulate disc regeneration. *Spine* 2002;27(23):2684–2690
- 21 47. Fisher J, Steele J, Bruce-Low S, Smith D. Evidence based resistance training recommendations. *Med*
22 *Sport* 2011;15(3):147–162
- 23 48. Fisher J, Steele J, Smith D. Evidence based resistance training recommendations for muscular
24 hypertrophy. *Med Sport* 2013;17(4):217–235
- 25 49. Graves JE, Pollock ML, Foster D, Leggett SH, Carpenter DM, Vuoso R, Jones A. Effect of training
26 frequency and specificity on isometric lumbar extension strength. *Spine* 1990;15(6):504–509
- 27 50. Bruce-Low S, Smith D, Burnett S, Fisher J, Bissell G, Webster L. One lumbar extension training
28 session per week is sufficient for strength gains and reductions in pain in patients with chronic low
29 back pain ergonomics. *Ergonomics* 2012;55(4):500–507

- 1 51. Walsh AJ, Lotz JC. Biological response of the intervertebral disc to dynamic loading. *J Biomech*
2 2004;37(3):329–337
- 3 52. Maclean JJ, Lee CR, Alini M, Iatridis JC. Anabolic and catabolic mRNA levels of the intervertebral
4 disc vary with the magnitude and frequency of in vivo dynamic compression. *J Orthop Res*
5 2004;22(6):1193–1200
- 6 53. Maclean JJ, Lee CR, Alini M, Iatridis JC. The effects of short-term load duration on anabolic and
7 catabolic gene expression in the rat tail intervertebral disc. *J Orthop Res* 2005;23(5):1120-1127
- 8 54. Ferguson SJ, Ito K, Nolte LP. Fluid flow and convective transport of solutes within the intervertebral
9 disc. *J Biomech* 2004;37(2):213–221
- 10 55. Wang DL, Jiang SD, Dai LY. Biologic response of the intervertebral disc to static and dynamic
11 compression in vitro. *Spine* 2007;32(23):2521–2528
- 12 56. Khan KM, Scott A. Mechanotherapy: how physical therapists' prescription of exercise promotes tissue
13 repair. *Br J Sports Med* 2009;43:247–251
- 14 57. Mooney V, Gulick J, Perlman M, Levy D, Pozos R, Leggett S, Resnick D. Relationships between
15 myoelectric activity, strength and MRI of lumbar extensor muscles in back pain patients and normal
16 subjects. *J Spinal Disord* 1997;10(4):348–356
- 17 58. Pollock ML, Gazarella L, Graves JE, Carpenter DM, Leggett SH, Lowenthal D, Fulton MN, Foster D,
18 Tucci J, Mananquil RR. Effects of isolated lumbar extension resistance training on bone mineral
19 density of the elderly. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1992;24(5):S66
- 20 59. Braith RW, Mills RM, Welsch MA, Keller JW, Pollock ML. Resistance exercise training restores bone
21 mineral density in heart transplant recipients. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1996;28(6):1471–1477
- 22 60. Braith RW, Magyari PM, Fulton MN, Aranda J, Walker T, Hill JA. Resistance exercise training and
23 alendronate reverse glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis in heart transplant recipients. *J Heart Lung*
24 *Transplant* 2003;22(10):1082–1090
- 25 61. Mitchell MJ, Baz MA, Fulton MN, Lisor CF, Braith RW. Resistance training prevents vertebral
26 osteoporosis in lung transplant recipients. *Transplantation* 2003;76(3):557–562
- 27 62. Braith RW, Magyari PM, Fulton MN, Lisor CF, Vogel SE, Hill JA, Aranda JM. Comparison of
28 calcitonin versus calcitonin + resistance exercise as prophylaxis for osteoporosis in heart transplant
29 recipients. *Transplantation* 2006;81(8):1191–1195

- 1 63. Braith RW, Conner JA, Fulton MN, Lisor CF, Casey DP, Howe KS, Baz MA. Comparison of
2 Alendronate vs Alendronate plus mechanical loading as prophylaxis for osteoporosis in lung transplant
3 recipients: a pilot study. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2007;26(2):132–137
- 4 64. Schumann B, Bolm-Audorff U, Bergmann A, Ellegast R, Elsner G, Grifka J, Haerting J, Jager M,
5 Michaelis M, Seidler A. Lifestyle factors and lumbar disc disease: results of a German multi-center
6 case-control study (EPILIFT). *Arthritis Res Ther* 2010;12(5):R193
- 7 65. Ireland D. Molecular mechanisms involved in intervertebral disc degeneration and potential new
8 treatment strategies. *Bioscience Horizons* 2009;2(1):83–89
- 9 66. Smith LJ, Nerurkar NL, Choi K, Harfe BD, Elliot DM. Degeneration and regeneration of the
10 intervertebral disc: lessons from development. *Dis Model Mech* 2011;4(1):31–41
- 11 67. Smith D, Bissell G, Bruce-Low S, Wakefield C. The effect of lumbar extension training with and
12 without pelvic stabilization on lumbar strength and low back pain. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*
13 2011;24:1–9
- 14 68. Steele J, Bruce-Low S, Smith S, Jessop D, Osborne N. A Randomised Controlled Trial of Limited
15 Range of Motion Lumbar Extension Exercise in Chronic Low Back Pain. *Spine* 2013;38(15):1245–
16 1252
- 17 69. Helmhout PH, Staal JB, Maher CG, Petersen T, Rainville J, Shaw WS. Exercise therapy and low back
18 pain: Insights and proposals to improve the design, conduct, and reporting of clinical trials. *Spine*
19 2008;33(16):1782-1788
- 20 70. Helmhout PH, Harts C, Staal JB, de Bie RA. Rationale and design of a multicentre randomized
21 controlled trial on a ‘minimal intervention’ in Dutch army personnel with nonspecific low back pain.
22 *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2004;5:40
23
24
25
26
27