1   **Effects of trunk lean and foot lift exercises in sitting position on abdominal muscle activity**

2   **and the contribution rate of transversus abdominis**

3

4   **Yoshiki Motomura[1], Hiroshige Tateuchi[1], Tomohito Komamura[2], Yuta Yagi[3], Sayaka Nakao[1], Noriaki**

5   **Ichihashi[1]**

6

7   1. Human Health Sciences, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Kyoto, Japan

8   2. Division of Rehabilitation Medicine, Chiba University Hospital, Chiba, Chiba, Japan

9   3. Department of Rehabilitation, Rinku General Medical Center, Izumisano, Osaka, Japan

10

11   **Corresponding author**

12   Yoshiki Motomura (E-mail: motomura.yoshiki.32z@kyoto-u.jp)

13

14   **ORCID**

15   Yoshiki Motomura: 0000-0002-6544-0678

16   Sayaka Nakao: 0000-0001-5714-0336

17   Noriaki Ichihashi: 0000-0003-2508-2172

18

19

20 Acknowledgements

23

24 Declarations

25 **Funding:** Not applicable.

26 **Conflicts of interest:** Not applicable.

27 **Ethics approval:** All the procedures performed in the studies involving human participants were in accordance

28 with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki

29 declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This study was approved by the ethics

30 committee of Kyoto University Graduate School and the Faculty of Medicine (R0546-2)

31 **Consent:** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants involved in the study.

32 **Data and/or Code availability:** All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published

33 article.

34 **Authors' contribution statements:** YM, HT, SN, and NI conceived and designed the research. YM, TK, and YY

35 conducted the experiments. YM, HT, and NI analyzed the data. YM, HT, SN, and NI wrote the manuscript. All

36 the authors have read and approved the manuscript.

37

38

Abstract

Purpose: Abdominal hollowing exercise has been recommended to improve trunk stability. Trunk lean and foot lift exercises while sitting may easily promote abdominal muscle activity even in people who cannot perform abdominal hollowing consciously. The purpose of the present study was to examine the changes in abdominal muscle activity and contribution rate of the transversus abdominis muscle (TrA) when leaning the trunk and lifting the foot during sitting.

Methods: The muscle stiffnesses (indicators of muscle activity) of the right rectus abdominis, external oblique, internal oblique, and TrA of 14 healthy men were measured during abdominal hollowing and the following nine sitting tasks: reference posture, 15° and maximal posterior trunk lean, 20° and maximal ipsilateral and contralateral trunk lean, and ipsilateral and contralateral foot lift. The TrA contribution rate was calculated by dividing the TrA stiffness by the sum of the abdominal muscles' stiffnesses.

Results: The TrA stiffness was significantly higher in abdominal hollowing than in reference posture, posterior and ipsilateral trunk lean, and ipsilateral foot lift, but not higher than in contralateral trunk lean and contralateral foot lift. There was no significant difference in the TrA contribution rates between abdominal hollowing and ipsilateral or contralateral foot lift.

Conclusion: The contralateral trunk lean or contralateral foot lift could enhance TrA activity for people who cannot perform abdominal hollowing consciously. The contralateral foot lift could particularly be beneficial to obtain selective activity of TrA.

58 **Keywords**

59 abdominal hollowing, muscle stiffness, transversus abdominis, internal oblique, external oblique, rectus abdominis

60

61 **Abbreviations**

62 TrA   Transversus abdominis muscle

63 ANOVA   Analysis of variance

64 SWE   Shear wave elastography

65

66

Introduction

The transversus abdominis muscle (TrA) plays an important role in trunk stabilization while moving the extremities (Hodges and Richardson 1996, 1998; Hodges et al. 1997; Okubo et al. 2013). Since the TrA acts to tighten the abdomen even when the activities of the other abdominal muscles remain unchanged, greater TrA activity may allow for a more effective increase in intra-abdominal pressure, which increases the stiffness of the lumbar spine (Hodges et al. 2005). Therefore, improving TrA contribution rate, which is the percentage of TrA activity in all the abdominal muscle activities, is required to increase spinal stiffness and reduce spinal loading (Aspden 1988).

Abdominal hollowing exercise, which retracts the abdomen consciously, has been commonly used to train the TrA (Beith et al. 2001; Koh et al. 2014). Isolated TrA activation using very low-intensity abdominal hollowing may be effective to promote muscle recruitment such as improving the delay in neuromuscular activity of TrA (Tsao and Hodges 2007). On the other hand, a previous study found that as the intensity of abdominal hollowing increased, the TrA activity increased significantly and the ratio of the TrA to the internal oblique, external oblique, and rectus abdominis did not change (Shimizu et al. 2019). That is, abdominal hollowing at a higher intensity may more effectively improve the function of the TrA that stabilizes the trunk.

Greater decrease in the abdominal cavity during abdominal hollowing reflects stronger contraction of the TrA (Richardson et al. 2004). Hides et al. (2008) reported that there was no significant difference in the TrA thickness and abdominal cavity at rest between those with and without low back pain, and the abdominal cavity during abdominal hollowing was significantly larger in those with low back pain than those without. Therefore, patients

5

86　with low back pain may have difficulty exerting voluntary TrA contraction even in the absence of atrophy. Hence,

87　training methods targeting involuntary activation of TrA are important for patients with low back pain.

88　　The prone bridge exercise activates abdominal muscles involuntarily by resisting the gravity from the posture

89　change (Okubo et al. 2010; Shiju Majeed et al. 2019). However, methods promoting abdominal muscle activity

90　through dynamic posture changes, such as prone bridge, have high physical loads and are not necessarily safe for

91　patients with low back pain (Ekstrom et al. 2008; Bhadauria and Gurudut 2017). Though some studies have

92　reported the relation between abdominal muscle activity and sagittal spinal alignment in sitting (O'Sullivan et al.

93　2002; Astfalck et al. 2010; Claus et al. 2018), these studies did not focus on exercises. However, considering these

94　studies, the TrA activity may be involuntarily increased by leaning the trunk or lifting the foot during sitting, even

95　in patients with low back pain and elderly people with difficulty in changing posture dynamically with high

96　intensity. Foot lift exercises are not changed trunk posture, but may increase abdominal muscle activity to increase

97　lumbar and pelvic stiffness, in order to stabilize the pelvis and to exert hip flexion torque effectively. Revealing

98　how the abdominal muscles activate when leaning the trunk and lifting the foot during sitting may provide

99　knowledge for rehabilitation to stabilize trunks in patients with low back pain and elderly people.

100　　The purpose of this study was to verify the effect of trunk lean and foot lift exercises during sitting on abdominal

101　muscle activity and TrA contribution rate. The hypothesis was that the activity of all abdominal muscles will be

102　highest in the posterior trunk lean because the spine is more unstable in flexion and extension than in lateral flexion

103　(Yamamoto et al. 1989). It was also hypothesized that TrA contribution rate would be highest in the contralateral

104　trunk lean where rectus abdominis activity may be more decreased among the abdominal muscles, according to

105   previous studies (Masani et al. 2009; Eriksson Crommert et al. 2017).

106

Methods

Participants

109   A total of 14 healthy men (age, 24.6 ± 2.9 years; height, 172.5 ± 6.1 cm; mass, 66.9 ± 9.0 kg) volunteered for this

110   study. The exclusion criteria were a history of low back pain lasting more than three months(Chou et al. 2007),

111   operation and neurological or orthopedic diseases in the trunk or lower limbs. A power analysis with an α error =

112   0.05, power = 0.80, and effect size f = 0.25 (medium) was performed by the G*Power 3.1 analysis software

113   (Heinrich Hein University, Duesseldorf, Germany) for one-way repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA).

114   This produced a minimum total sample size of 12. This study was approved by the ethics committee of Kyoto

115   University Graduate School and the Faculty of Medicine (R0546-2) and was conducted in compliance with the

116   Declaration of Helsinki. All participants were provided written informed consent after being briefed with the

117   objectives and the risks involved in the experiment.

118

Experimental protocol

120   To minimize the differences in muscle activity due to different spinal alignments in each participant's natural sitting

121   position, a reference posture was defined (Fig 1. a). This is the upright sitting posture, whereby the axis from ear

122   lobe to the floor lies between the anterior and posterior superior iliac spine on the sagittal plane. Further visual

123   verification was done by two of our physiotherapists to ensure no remarkable spinal curvature (e.g. thoracic or

7

124 lumbar hyperflexion). Participants randomly performed tasks maintaining the following postures (Fig 1. b-f):

125 leaning the trunk posterior to 15° and maximum from reference posture (posterior trunk lean), leaning the trunk at

126 20° and maximum to ipsilateral and contralateral from reference posture (ipsilateral and contralateral trunk lean),

127 and lifting the ipsilateral and contralateral foot about 1 cm from the floor (ipsilateral and contralateral foot lift).

128 Participants received feedback from a mirror placed 1.5-m in front of them, and were instructed to perform tasks

129 without trunk flexion/extension, lateral flexion, or rotation. The measurements were conducted while one examiner

130 confirmed there was no obvious deviation of posture during the tasks. Then the participants performed abdominal

131 hollowing with maximal effort in supine position without moving the trunk and pelvis (Fig 1. g). Lumbar lordosis

132 during abdominal hollowing was confirmed by participants using the Stabilizer Pressure Biofeedback unit (PBU,

133 Chattanooga Group, Australia) placed under the lumbar spine, with a constant pressure of 40 mmHg. This was

134 done to standardize pelvic inclination among participants during the maneuver. They were instructed to perform

135 abdominal hollowing while trying to maintain the pressure at 40 mmHg.

136

137 **Shear wave elastography**

138 In each task, muscle stiffnesses of the right TrA, internal oblique, external oblique, and rectus abdominis were

139 measured three times. The measurement sites were determined based on previous studies (Shimizu et al. 2019):

140 TrA and internal oblique muscles, 2-cm medial the anterior superior iliac spine; external oblique, 2.5-cm medial

141 from the point on the axillary line at navel height; and rectus abdominis, 4-cm lateral the navel (Fig 2). Muscle

142 stiffness was calculated using the following formula by shear wave elastography (SWE) mode (musculoskeletal

8

143　preset) of the Aixplorer ultrasound scanner (v6.4; Supersonic Imagine, Aix-en-Provence, France):

144
$$\mu \ (\text{kPa}) = \rho V s^2,$$

145　where ρ = muscle tissue density (1,000 kg/m^3), and Vs = propagation velocity of the shear wave generated by the

146　ultrasonic transducer. An ultrasonic probe (SL15-4 transducer) was in parallel to the fiber orientation of the target

147　muscle. Muscle stiffness was calculated in a 3-mm diameter Q-box at the center of the region of interest placed at

148　the center of each muscle (Fig 2). Reports state that muscle stiffness increases with muscle activity (Bouillard et

149　al. 2011), and there is high reliability of abdominal muscle stiffness measured using SWE (MacDonald et al. 2016;

150　Shimizu et al. 2019). Muscle stiffness was calculated as an average of three measurements for each muscle. After

151　calculating intra-rater reliability (ICC$_{1,3}$) of these three measurements per task, the reliability of each muscle

152　stiffness was "almost perfect": TrA, 0.93–1.00; internal oblique, 0.98–1.00; external oblique, 0.98–0.99; and rectus

153　abdominis, 0.93–1.00. The TrA contribution rate was calculated by dividing TrA stiffness by the sum of the

154　stiffnesses of all four abdominal muscles.

155

156　**Spinal and pelvic alignment**

157　Another examiner who did not operate the ultrasonic equipment carefully checked visually to ensure no obvious

158　trunk motion during the task. To verify the degree of spinal flexion and extension, sagittal spinal alignment was

159　measured twice using the Spinal Mouse (Index Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) before every measurement for muscle stiffness.

160　The intra-rater reliabilities (ICC$_{1,1}$) were then calculated. In 12 participants, excluding 2 with data loss, ICC$_{1,1}$ of

161　spinal alignment data (i.e., the sum of segmental angles from Th1/2 to L5/S) (Tateuchi et al. 2018) ranged from

162 0.73 to 0.88. The average angles of thoracic kyphosis and lumbar lordosis were calculated from these data. The

163 average angle of pelvic posterior inclination at the height of the second sacrum measured three times using an

164 inclinometer (Wixey, USA) was calculated, and intra-rater reliability ($ICC_{1,1}$) ranged from 0.89 to 0.98. The

165 average angle of the maximum spine inclination to posterior and right/left measured three times using a goniometer

166 was calculated.

167

168 **Statistical analysis**

169 Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 22.0 (SPSS Japan Inc., Tokyo, Japan). The one-way

170 repeated-measures ANOVA analysis was used to compare the paired datasets between tasks and to investigate

171 whether specific abdominal muscle stiffness or TrA contribution rates would differ depending on the task. When

172 a significant difference was observed, multiple comparisons corrected by the Holm method were performed as a

173 post-hoc test. Dunnet's test was performed to compare the thoracic kyphosis, lumbar lordosis, and pelvic

174 inclination angles between reference posture and other sitting tasks. Additionally, in order to examine the variation

175 among participants, the Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between TrA

176 contribution rates in each task and the stiffness of the internal oblique, external oblique, and rectus abdominis in

177 the reference posture. A P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

178

179 **Results**

180 The muscle stiffness for each muscle in the various tasks is shown in Table 1. All muscle stiffnesses showed

10

181 significant main effects of tasks in one-way repeated measures ANOVA. TrA stiffness was significantly higher in

182 abdominal hollowing than in all other tasks, except for contralateral trunk lean (at 20° and maximum) and foot lift.

183 TrA stiffness in the maximum contralateral trunk lean was significantly higher than that in the reference posture,

184 posterior trunk lean (at 15° and maximum), and ipsilateral foot lift. The stiffness of the internal oblique was

185 significantly higher in abdominal hollowing than in all other tasks, except for contralateral trunk lean (at 20° and

186 maximum), and was significantly higher in the maximum contralateral trunk lean than in reference posture,

187 posterior trunk lean (at 15° and maximum), ipsilateral trunk lean (at 20° and maximum), and ipsilateral foot lift.

188 The stiffness of the external oblique was significantly higher in the posterior trunk (at 15° and maximum) and

189 contralateral trunk leans (at 20° and maximum) than in all other tasks, but there were no significant differences

190 among the four tasks of the posterior trunk (at 15° and maximum) and contralateral trunk leans (at 20° and

191 maximum). The stiffness of rectus abdominis was significantly higher in the posterior trunk lean at maximum than

192 in all other tasks.

193   The TrA contribution rates in the various tasks is shown in Table 1. There was a significant main effect of task

194 in one-way repeated measures ANOVA. The TrA contribution rate in abdominal hollowing was significantly higher

195 than that in the posterior trunk lean (at 15° and maximum), ipsilateral trunk lean at maximum, and contralateral

196 trunk lean (at 20° and maximum). There was no significant difference in TrA contribution rate between abdominal

197 hollowing and reference posture, ipsilateral trunk lean at 20°, and ipsilateral and contralateral foot lift.

198   The results of thoracic kyphosis angle, lumbar lordosis angle, pelvic inclination angle, and maximum spinal

199 inclination angle are shown in Table 2. The thoracic kyphosis and lumbar lordosis angles were not significantly

11

200   different between reference posture and other sitting tasks. The pelvic posterior inclination angle was significantly

201   higher in the posterior trunk lean than in reference posture.

202   The additional Pearson correlation analysis showed that the TrA contribution rate in those with high external

203   oblique stiffness in the reference posture tended to be low in the ipsilateral foot lift ($r = -0.742$, $p = 0.002$) and high

204   during maximum abdominal hollowing ($r = 0.519$, $p = 0.057$).

205

Discussion

207   The present study was the first, to our knowledge, to investigate noninvasively the effects of trunk lean and foot

208   lift exercises during sitting on abdominal muscle activity. High TrA activity was exerted in the contralateral trunk

209   lean and contralateral foot lift during sitting, and the TrA contribution rate in the contralateral foot lift was a similar

210   level to that in maximum abdominal hollowing. These exercises can be performed in elderly people and patients

211   with low back pain, who have difficulty with consciously contracting abdominal muscles such as abdominal

212   hollowing. Our results have elucidated the specific exercises which maximize the activation of TrA and improve

213   TrA contribution rate. Therefore, these may be useful in the consideration of targeted TrA exercises to stabilize the

214   trunk of elderly people and patients with low back pain.

215   Although the TrA activity was highest in abdominal hollowing, TrA activity in the contralateral trunk lean during

216   sitting showed no significant difference to that in abdominal hollowing and tended to be higher than that in

217   reference posture, posterior trunk lean, and ipsilateral foot lift. These results differed from our hypothesis that

218   higher TrA activity will be exerted in the posterior trunk lean because the spine is more unstable in flexion and

12

219   extension than in lateral flexion (Yamamoto et al. 1989). The TrA may have an important role holding the trunk

220   and maintaining the posture predictively while other muscles contract (Hodges and Richardson 1997; Allison et

221   al. 2008). On the other hand, previous study showed using wire electromyography that the activity of the TrA and

222   internal oblique increased when pulled to contralateral sides, while the activity of the external oblique and rectus

223   abdominis increased when pulled posteriorly (Eriksson Crommert et al. 2017). This study supports our results.

224   Therefore, the present study indicates that all abdominal muscles, even the TrA working to stabilize the trunk, may

225   be specifically activated in postures with external moments in the opposite direction to their anatomical

226   orientations. Moreover, the neutral zone, which is the range of inter-vertebral motion whereby spinal stiffness (i.e.

227   the force required to make a constant displacement between the vertebrae) is the lowest (Panjabi 1992), has been

228   reported to increase with ligament damage and disc degeneration (Panjabi et al. 1989; Hasegawa et al. 2008).

229   Busscher et al. (2009) indicated that the lumbar vertebrae had less spinal stiffness in lateral bending in a wider

230   range of motion than the lower thoracic vertebrae and might have less resistance of passive tissue such as ligaments.

231   Therefore, TrA activity is more likely to increase in lateral trunk lean than posterior trunk lean due to its anatomical

232   function. The present study supports the role of TrA in increasing spinal stiffness. However, because this study did

233   not verify the load on the spine during the task, further studies should determine whether direction-specific activity

234   of the TrA reflects direction-specific properties of the spine.

235   The TrA contribution rate was significantly higher in the foot lift than in the posterior or the contralateral trunk

236   lean, which differed from our hypothesis. This may be because the stiffness of the lumbar spine and pelvis

237   increased with TrA activity (Tesh et al. 1987), making it easier to exert muscle strength of the hip flexors during

238   foot lift. The reason why the activity of the rectus abdominis and oblique abdominal muscles, which are the global

239   muscles (Bergmark 1989), did not increase much may be because the trunk load from gravity was lower in foot

240   lift than in contralateral trunk lean. Therefore, the increase in TrA contribution rate in foot lift may be attributed to

241   these circumstances. On the other hand, the low TrA contribution rate during contralateral trunk lean may be due

242   to the requirement to stabilize not only the lumbopelvic region but also the entire spinal alignment against gravity,

243   rendering isolated TrA activity insufficient. In other words, the rectus abdominis, external oblique and internal

244   oblique muscles may have been activated to stabilize the thorax.

245   TrA acts to tighten the abdomen. It is, however, a thin muscle, therefore is independently not adequate to

246   contribute to spinal stiffness. It is hence suggestive that TrA plays a supportive role in helping the activities of

247   other abdominal muscles. Therefore, high TrA contribution rate (i.e. higher TrA activity when those of other

248   abdominal muscles remain unchanged) may be important in allowing for more effective increase of intra-

249   abdominal pressure, which leads to the increase of spinal stiffness (Hodges et al. 2005; Hides et al. 2006). However,

250   a recent Cochrane review about nonspecific low back pain reported that there were no differences in the effect on

251   improving disability due to low back pain between the specific training for TrA and multifidus muscles and general

252   trunk exercises such as stretching and resistance training (Saragiotto et al. 2016). This is believed to be due to

253   diversity of potential causes of nonspecific back pain (Kiesel et al. 2007). Thus, specific training of the TrA may

254   not necessarily be important for all low back pain patients. In the present study, the variation in the degrees of

255   abdominal muscle stiffness among participants may have affected our results. The additional Pearson correlation

256   analysis have verified the relationship between the TrA contribution rates in each task and the stiffness of the

257   internal oblique, external oblique and rectus abdominis muscles in the reference posture. The results showed that

258   TrA contribution rate in those with high stiffness of external obliques in the reference posture tended to be low

259   during ipsilateral foot lifting (r = -0.742) and high during maximum abdominal hollowing (r = 0.519). This suggest

260   that the particular exercises required to improve TrA contribution rate may differ according to the properties of

261   abdominal muscles during the sitting position. Further study should better understand which subgroups of patients

262   with low back pain require exercise with a high TrA contribution rate (Hill et al. 2008; Macedo et al. 2014).

263   In this study, characteristics of abdominal muscles were investigated using SWE. Since measurement values of

264   muscle stiffness in this study were similar to those in a previous SWE study (Shimizu et al. 2019), verification of

265   abdominal muscle activities using abdominal muscles' stiffnesses is considered appropriate. Neuromuscular

266   activity measured by a surface or wire electromyography and muscle thickness by an ultrasonic device have been

267   commonly used to verify abdominal muscle activity. However, abdominal muscle thickness changes during

268   contraction may not necessarily be proportional to increases in abdominal muscle activities (Hodges et al. 2003;

269   Whittaker et al. 2013). In addition, surface electromyography cannot measure the TrA, a deep muscle, and wire

270   electromyography is invasive. The SWE in the present study can measure a deep muscle noninvasively and may

271   be useful for verifying abdominal muscle (especially TrA) activity.

272   This study had some limitations. First, spinal lateral flexion and rotation could not be evaluated objectively.

273   Since spinal motion greatly influences abdominal muscle activity because of abdominal muscle anatomy, the

274   experiment paid attention to spinal motion. To avoid fatigue due to an increase in the number of tasks measured,

275   only spinal mobilities in flexion and extension were measured by the Spinal Mouse. However, there were no

276 significant differences in thoracic kyphosis, lumbar lordosis, and pelvic inclination angles between tasks; thus,

277 evident spinal motion probably did not occur in this study. The second limitation was that only men participated

278 in the present study. The mobilities of and load on the sacroiliac joint are reported to be greater in women than in

279 men (Joukar et al. 2018); therefore, since lower fibers of the TrA increase the stiffness of the sacroiliac joint, results

280 may differ in a female study population. Third, the tasks used in present study were not exercises whereby TrA

281 was activated in isolation. Lastly, they may not be appropriate for all patients with low back pain.

282

283 **Conclusion**

284 This study investigated noninvasively the effects of trunk lean and foot lift exercises during sitting on abdominal

285 muscle activity. Higher TrA activity was exerted by leaning the trunk to the contralateral side and lifting the

286 contralateral foot. Furthermore, TrA contribution rate in the contralateral foot lift was similar to that in maximum

287 abdominal hollowing. As elderly people and patients with low back pain who have difficulty in consciously

288 contracting abdominal muscles can easily perform trunk lean and foot lift during sitting, these results may be useful

289 for rehabilitation to stabilize the trunks in elderly people and patients with low back pain.

16

290 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

291 **Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest**

292 Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

293

294 **Research involving Human Participants and/or Animals**

295 Ethics approval: All the procedures performed in the studies involving human participants were in accordance with

296 the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration

297 and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This study was approved by the ethics committee of

298 Kyoto University Graduate School and the Faculty of Medicine (R0546-2)

299

300 **Informed consent**

301 Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants involved in the study.

302

References

304 Allison GT, Morris SL, Lay B (2008) Feedforward Responses of Transversus Abdominis Are Directionally

305   Specific and Act Asymmetrically: Implications for Core Stability Theories. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther

306   38:228–237. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2008.2703

307 Aspden RM (1988) A new mathematical model of the spine and its relationship to spinal loading in the

308   workplace. 319–323.

309 Astfalck RG, O'Sullivan PB, Straker LM, et al (2010) Sitting postures and trunk muscle activity in adolescents

310   with and without nonspecific chronic low back pain: an analysis based on subclassification. Spine (Phila

311   Pa 1976) 35:1387–1395. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181bd3ea6

312 Beith ID, Synnott RE, Newman SA (2001) Abdominal muscle activity during the abdominal hollowing

313   manoeuvre in the four point kneeling and prone positions. Man Ther 6:82–87. doi:

314   10.1054/math.2000.0376

315 Bergmark A (1989) Stability of the lumbar spine: A study in mechanical engineering. Acta Orthop 60:1–54. doi:

316   10.3109/17453678909154177

317 Bhadauria EA, Gurudut P (2017) Comparative effectiveness of lumbar stabilization, dynamic strengthening, and

318   Pilates on chronic low back pain: randomized clinical trial. J Exerc Rehabil 13:477–485. doi:

319   10.12965/jer.1734972.486

320 Bouillard K, Nordez A, Hug F (2011) Estimation of individual muscle force using elastography. PLoS One. doi:

321   10.1371/journal.pone.0029261

18

322   Busscher I, Van Dieën JH, Kingma I, et al (2009) Biomechanical characteristics of different regions of the

323   human spine: An in vitro study on multilevel spinal segments. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 34:2858–2864. doi:

324   10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181b4c75d

325   Chou R, Snow V, Casey D, et al (2007) Clinical Guidelines Diagnosis and Treatment of Low Back Pain : A Joint

326   Clinical Practice Guideline from the American College of Physicians and the American. Ann Intern Med

327   147:478–491.

328   Claus AP, Hides JA, Moseley GL, Hodges PW (2018) Different ways to balance the spine in sitting: Muscle

329   activity in specific postures differs between individuals with and without a history of back pain in sitting.

330   Clin Biomech 52:25–32. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2018.01.003

331   Ekstrom RA, Osborn RW, Hauer PL (2008) Surface Electromyographic Analysis of the Low Back Muscles

332   During Rehabilitation Exercises. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther 38:736–745. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2008.2865

333   Eriksson Crommert M, Tucker K, Holford C, et al (2017) Directional preference of activation of abdominal and

334   paraspinal muscles during position-control tasks in sitting. J Electromyogr Kinesiol 35:9–16. doi:

335   10.1016/j.jelekin.2017.05.002

336   Hasegawa K, Kitahara K, Hara T, et al (2008) Evaluation of lumbar segmental instability in degenerative

337   diseases by using a new intraoperative measurement system. J Neurosurg Spine 8:255–262. doi:

338   10.3171/spi/2008/8/3/255

339   Hides J, Stanton W, Freke M, et al (2008) MRI study of the size, symmetry and function of the trunk muscles

340   among elite cricketers with and without low back pain. Br J Sports Med 42:509–513. doi:

19

341   10.1136/bjsm.2007.044024

342   Hides J, Wilson S, Stanton W, et al (2006) An MRI investigation into the function of the transversus abdominis

343   muscle during "drawing-in" of the abdominal wall. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 31:175–178. doi:

344   10.1097/01.brs.0000202740.86338.df

345   Hill JC, Dunn KM, Lewis M, et al (2008) A primary care back pain screening tool: Identifying patient subgroups

346   for initial treatment. Arthritis Care Res 59:632–641. doi: 10.1002/art.23563

347   Hodges PW, Eriksson AEM, Shirley D, Gandevia SC (2005) Intra-abdominal pressure increases stiffness of the

348   lumbar spine. 38:1873–1880. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.08.016

349   Hodges PW, Gandevia SC, Richardson CA (1997) Contractions of specific abdominal muscles in postural tasks

350   are affected by respiratory maneuvers. J Appl Physiol 83:753–760.

351   Hodges PW, Pengel LHM, Herbert RD, Gandevia SC (2003) Measurement of muscle contraction with

352   ultrasound imaging. Muscle and Nerve 27:682–692. doi: 10.1002/mus.10375

353   Hodges PW, Richardson CA (1996) Inefficient muscular stabilization of the lumbar spine associated with low

354   back pain. A motor control evaluation of transversus abdominis. Spine (Phila. Pa. 1976). 21:2640–50.

355   Hodges PW, Richardson CA (1997) Contraction of the abdominal muscles associated with movement of the

356   lower limb. Phys Ther 77:132–142; discussion 142-144.

357   Hodges PW, Richardson CA (1998) Delayed postural contraction of transversus abdominis in low back pain

358   associated with movement of the lower limb. J Spinal Disord 11:46–56. doi: 9493770

359   Joukar A, Shah A, Kiapour A, et al (2018) Sex Specific Sacroiliac Joint Biomechanics During Standing Upright:

20

360   A Finite Element Study. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 43:E1053–E1060. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0000000000002623

361   Kiesel KB, Underwood FB, Mattacola CG, et al (2007) A Comparison of Select Trunk Muscle Thickness

362   Change Between Subjects With Low Back Pain Classified in the Treatment-Based Classification System

363   and Asymptomatic Controls. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther 37:596–607. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2007.2574

364   Koh HW, Cho SH, Kim CY (2014) Comparison of the Effects of Hollowing and Bracing Exercises on Cross-

365   sectional Areas of Abdominal Muscles in Middle-aged Women. J Phys Ther Sci 26:295–299. doi:

366   10.1589/jpts.26.295

367   MacDonald D, Wan A, McPhee M, et al (2016) Reliability of Abdominal Muscle Stiffness Measured Using

368   Elastography during Trunk Rehabilitation Exercises. Ultrasound Med Biol 42:1018–1025. doi:

369   10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2015.12.002

370   Macedo LG, Maher CG, Hancock MJ, et al (2014) Predicting Response to Motor Control Exercises and Graded

371   Activity for Patients With Low Back Pain: Preplanned Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Controlled

372   Trial. Phys Ther 94:1543–1554. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20140014

373   Masani K, Sin VW, Vette AH, et al (2009) Postural reactions of the trunk muscles to multi-directional

374   perturbations in sitting. Clin Biomech 24:176–182. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2008.12.001

375   O'Sullivan PB, Grahamslaw KM, Kendell M, et al (2002) The Effect of Different Standing and Sitting Postures

376   on Trunk Muscle Activity in a Pain-Free Population. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 27:1238–1244. doi:

377   10.1097/00007632-200206010-00019

378   Okubo Y, Kaneoka K, Imai A, et al (2010) Electromyographic analysis of transversus abdominis and lumbar

379   multifidus using wire electrodes during lumbar stabilization exercises. J Orthop Sport Phys Ther 40:743–

380   750. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2010.3192

381   Okubo Y, Kaneoka K, Shiina I, et al (2013) Abdominal Muscle Activity During a Standing Long Jump. J Orthop

382   Sport Phys Ther 43:577–582. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2013.4420

383   Panjabi M, Abumi K, Duranceau J, Oxland T (1989) Spinal stability and intersegmental muscle forces. A

384   biomechanical model. Spine (Phila. Pa. 1976). 14:194–200.

385   Panjabi MM (1992) The stabilizing system of the spine. Part II. Neutral zone and instability hypothesis. J. Spinal

386   Disord. 5:390–396; discussion 397.

387   Richardson CA, Hides JA, Wilson S, et al (2004) Lumbo-pelvic joint protection against antigravity forces: motor

388   control and segmental stiffness assessed with magnetic resonance imaging. J Gravit Physiol 11:119–122.

389   Saragiotto BT, Maher ÃCG, Tie Ã (2016) Motor Control Exercise for Nonspecific Low Back Pain. Spine (Phila

390   Pa 1976) 41:1284–1295. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012004.

391   Shiju Majeed A, Anish TS, Sugunan A, Arun MS (2019) The effectiveness of a simplified core stabilization

392   program (TRICCS—Trivandrum Community-based Core Stabilisation) for community-based intervention

393   in chronic non-specific low back pain. J Orthop Surg Res 14:86. doi: 10.1186/s13018-019-1131-z

394   Shimizu I, Tateuchi H, Motomura Y, et al (2019) Abdominal girth as an index of muscle tension during

395   abdominal hollowing: Selecting the optimal training intensity for the transversus abdominis muscle. J

396   Biomech. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2019.04.018

397   Tateuchi H, Akiyama H, Goto K, et al (2018) Sagittal alignment and mobility of the thoracolumbar spine are

398   associated with radiographic progression of secondary hip osteoarthritis. Osteoarthr Cartil 26:397–404.

399   doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2017.12.005

400   Tesh KM, Dunn JS, Evans JH (1987) The abdominal muscles and vertebral stability. Spine (Phila Pa 1976)

401   12:501–508.

402   Tsao H, Hodges PW (2007) Immediate changes in feedforward postural adjustments following voluntary motor

403   training. Exp Brain Res 181:537–546. doi: 10.1007/s00221-007-0950-z

404   Whittaker JL, McLean L, Hodder J, et al (2013) Association Between Changes in Electromyographic Signal

405   Amplitude and Abdominal Muscle Thickness in Individuals With and Without Lumbopelvic Pain. J

406   Orthop Sport Phys Ther 43:466–477. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2013.4440

407   Yamamoto I, Panjabi MM, Crisco T, Oxland T (1989) Three-dimensional movements of the whole lumbar spine

408   and lumbosacral joint. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 14:1256–60. doi: 10.1097/00007632-198911000-00020

409

410

411

412

413

Fig. 1 Task postures. a reference posture; b posterior trunk lean; c ipsilateral trunk lean; d contralateral trunk lean;

e ipsilateral foot lift; f contralateral foot lift; g abdominal hollowing with maximal effort. The reference posture

was defined as a natural posture for each participant where the perpendicular line from ear hole to the floor was

between the anterior and posterior superior iliac spine on the sagittal plane

418

419

Fig. 2 Representative images and measurement sites of the stiffness of abdominal muscles

421

422

423

424 **Table 1** The stiffnesses of abdominal muscles and the contribution rate of transversus abdominis during tasks

	Transversus abdominis [kPa]	Internal oblique [kPa]	External oblique [kPa]	Rectus abdominis [kPa]	Contribution rate of transversus abdominis [%]
Abdominal hollowing with maximal effort (1)	39.5 ± 18.0 [2,3,4,5,6,9]	48.2 ± 20.9 [2,3,4,5,6,9,10]	12.4 ± 9.3	18.2 ± 8.9 [2]	33.8 ± 7.5 [3,4,6,7,8]
Reference posture (2)	11.3 ± 4.7	13.8 ± 7.9	6.8 ± 4.3	7.9 ± 3.2	28.7 ± 8.4 [3,4]
Posterior trunk lean at 15° (3)	12.3 ± 10.7	11.3 ± 10.1	36.3 ± 14.1 [1,2,5,6,9,10]	36.1 ± 19.0 [2,7,9]	12.0 ± 7.7
Posterior trunk lean at max (4)	9.3 ± 4.3	10.7 ± 4.8	66.4 ± 21.1 [1,2,5,6,9,10]	70.6 ± 22.0 [1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10]	6.1 ± 2.8
Ipsilateral trunk lean at 20° (5)	13.3 ± 6.4	14.3 ± 6.0	8.0 ± 4.9	18.0 ± 17.7	25.9 ± 8.9 [4]
Ipsilateral trunk lean at max (6)	18.8 ± 9.4	20.5 ± 10.1 [3,4]	12.8 ± 6.9	20.1 ± 10.2 [2]	25.8 ± 7.0 [3,4]
Contralateral trunk lean at 20° (7)	19.6 ± 8.1 [2,4]	26.5 ± 10.6 [3,4,5,9]	42.1 ± 10.3 [1,2,5,6,9,10]	13.7 ± 6.2	19.5 ± 7.7 [4]
Contralateral trunk lean at max (8)	26.1 ± 11.5 [2,3,4,9]	36.1 ± 15.3 [2,3,4,5,6,9]	55.4 ± 19.0 [1,2,5,6,9,10]	27.7 ± 18.4	18.3 ± 7.0 [4]
Ipsilateral foot lift (9)	14.0 ± 4.6	15.4 ± 6.4	9.6 ± 7.0	9.2 ± 5.7	29.3 ± 7.7 [3,4,8]
Contralateral foot lift (10)	18.0 ± 7.8 [2,4]	20.7 ± 7.7 [2,4]	7.1 ± 7.1	13.6 ± 11.4	31.2 ± 8.8 [3,4,7,8]

425 Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation

426 [1-10] P <0.05 vs. the task, which is corresponded to numbers

427 **Table 2** Spinal alignment during each task

	Thoracic kyphosis [°] (n=12)	Lumbar lordosis [°] (n=12)	Pelvic inclination [°] (n=14)	Spinal inclination [°] (n=14)
Reference posture	29.1 ± 6.0	2.8 ± 7.3	1.0 ± 9.1	
Posterior trunk lean at 15°	31.0 ± 6.1	4.0 ± 9.6	11.9 ± 8.8 *	
Posterior trunk lean at max	32.0 ± 6.4	5.8 ± 8.0	24.8 ± 11.5 *	28.7 ± 5.2
Ipsilateral trunk lean at 20°	34.0 ± 8.2	10.9 ± 10.8	-1.5 ± 9.6	
Ipsilateral trunk lean at max	29.6 ± 6.8	8.2 ± 6.4	-1.8 ± 8.9	28.5 ± 3.8
Contralateral trunk lean at 20°	31.2 ± 6.4	8.7 ± 7.6	-1.4 ± 9.5	
Contralateral trunk lean at max	31.1 ± 6.8	6.8 ± 6.9	-4.2 ± 8.7	29.4 ± 4.6
Ipsilateral foot lift	28.2 ± 5.9	7.9 ± 8.4	1.7 ± 10.1	
Contralateral foot lift	26.8 ± 6.0	7.1 ± 6.5	0.2 ± 9.9	

428 Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation

429 The positive values in pelvic inclination represent the sacral posterior inclination angle on the sagittal plane

430 * P <0.05 vs. reference posture

431