EFFECT OF BIO-ELECTRICAL MUSCLE STIMULATION ON CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN AND ABDOMINAL MUSCULAR ENDURANCE AND STRENGTH

Mark C. Yezak, BS, DC; Reid Amedee, BS, DC; Brett Baer, PT, DPT; Robert Williams, BS, MED
Houston Spine and Rehabilitation Centers

OBJECTIVE

Assess the safety and efficacy of treatment with the truSculpt® flex system on bio-electrical muscle stimulation for improvement of chronic low back pain and core muscular endurance and strength.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Twenty-eight established patients at the Houston Spine and Rehabilitation Centers with chronic low back pain, unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations, and pain management injections, received six 45-minute bio-electrical muscle stimulation re-education treatments with the truSculpt flex system to the abdominal region (rectus abdominis, abdominal obliques, and transverse abdominis). Patients received a total of six treatments twice per week on each of the three settings: 1) Prep, 2) Tone, and 3) Sculpt. The patients were instructed to continue their normal daily routines and asked to refrain from any new activities. At baseline and 8 to 10 days post final treatment, the patients completed Roland-Morris and Oswestry Disability questionnaires and were functionally evaluated for lumbar flexion and muscular endurance and strength. Pain levels were recorded pre- and post-testing by questionnaire.

RESULTS

All patients completed all study visits. Pain levels were reduced in 23 of 28 patients (82%; 95% CI: 63%-94%; $p<0.001$) with an average pain reduction among responders of 2.8 ± 2.2 points (0-10 VAS). Clinically significant improvement in muscle endurance (≥ 5 second improvement in plank-test duration) was seen in 20 of 28 patients (71%; 95% CI: 51%-78%; $p<0.001$) with an average increase of 33 ± 22 seconds among responders; in muscle strength (≥10° improvement in straight-leg lowering test) was seen in 6 of 28 patients (21%; 95% CI: 8%-41%; $p<0.01$) with an average improvement of 12° ± 2° among responders; and in lumbar flexion (≥15° improvement) was seen in 11 of 16 patients (69%; 95% CI: 41%-89%) with <90° lumbar flexion at baseline (average improvement among all 16 patients: 26° ± 19° [$p<0.001$]). All treatments were well tolerated and there were no unexpected or serious treatment side effects.

CONCLUSION

Six treatment sessions, twice weekly for 3 weeks, with the truSculpt flex bio-electrical muscle stimulator demonstrated clinically and statistically significant improvement in chronic low back pain that was unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations and pain management injections, and clinically and statistically significant improvements in lumbar flexion and core muscular endurance and strength.

INTRODUCTION

Bio-Electrical Muscle Stimulation (BEMS) deploys a method to send electrical impulses to muscle nerves using an external source/stimulus. This stimulus causes the muscles to contract. BEMS can increase muscle strength, range of motion, and offset the effects of disuse. It is used to prevent muscle atrophy and to retrain or re-educate muscle function after surgery or periods of disuse.[1] BEMS targets the muscle itself, specifically through the motor nerves, and can improve both muscle structure and function by recruiting more muscle fibers, similar to that seen from volitional exercise.[2] In sports medicine, muscle stimulation is frequently used to improve muscular strength when training, warming up, or recovering from injury.[3]

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a physician-initiated, prospective single-center, open-label study conducted in accordance with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the truSculpt flex (Cutera, Inc. Brisbane, CA) bio-electrical muscle stimulation system for the treatment of chronic low back pain that was unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations, and pain management injections. Secondary endpoints were changes in core muscular endurance and strength, lumbar flexion, and Roland-Morris and Oswestry Disability scores between baseline and follow-up visits.

INVESTIGATIONAL DEVICE

The truSculpt flex is a device that administers multidirectional electrical currents to stimulate contractions in muscular groups. While the device can be used to stimulate up to 8 body areas simultaneously, within this study, treatments were limited to the abdominal region and specifically to the rectus abdominis, abdominal obliques, and transverse abdominis muscle groups. The device can be set to deliver current in sequence combinations of three operational modes (Prep, Tone, or Sculpt) with the intensity for each operational mode being independently adjustable for each output channel.

SUBJECTS

Twenty-eight established patients (Table 1), seen at the Houston Spine and Rehabilitation Centers for chronic low back pain, unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations, and pain management injections, were consented and enrolled. All patients were instructed to continue their normal daily routines and asked to refrain from any new activities.

Table 1. Subject Demographics

Subjects (n)	28	
Age ± SD (Median, Range)	47.3 ± 12.6 (43.5, 31-75)	
Females, n (%)	25	(89%)
Males, n (%)	3	(11%)
Race, n (%)		
White	26	(93%)
Black or African American	1	(3.5%)
White and African American	1	(3.5%)
Ethnicity, n (%)		
Hispanic or Latino	2	(7%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	26	(93%)

BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP VISIT EVALUATIONS

Prior to the first treatment and 8 to 10 days after the final treatment, all patients were required to complete Roland-Morris and Oswestry Disability questionnaires and were functionally evaluated for lumbar flexion and core muscular endurance and strength using the testing methods described below. Pain levels, at best and at worst, were recorded pre- and post-testing by questionnaire.

Lumbar Flexion Test

Lumbar range of motion (ROM) measurements were taken with Goniometer with the patient in standing position bending forward with knees straight until an increase in low back pain was felt (higher angles indicate more ROM).

Muscular Endurance

Measured with a 3-Minute Plank Test with patients remaining in a pushup position and lifting limbs at specified times within the 3 minutes as follows: 60s Plank (1:00); 15s Left Arm Lift (1:15); 15s Right Arm Lift (1:30); 15s Left Leg Lift (1:45); 15s Right Arm Lift (2:00); 15s Left Arm and Right Leg Lift (2:15); 15s Right Arm and Left leg Lift (2:30); 30s Plank (3:00)

Muscular Strength

Measured with a Straight Leg Lowering Test as follows: A blood pressure cuff was placed under the patient's lower back just above the sacrum; the patient was then instructed to lift their legs toward the ceiling; while contracting abdominals to keep pressure on cuff at all times, lower their legs slowly; the hip angle was recorded with a goniometer when the pressure decreased by 50% from the pressure at 90° (lower angles indicate higher abdominal muscular strength).

TREATMENTS AND INVESTIGATIONAL DEVICE SETTINGS

Patients received a total of six treatment sessions with the investigational device set to the parameters shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Treatment Settings

			Median Intensity (%)						Start Intensity (%)		End Intensity (%)		Average
Week	Tx #	Mode	Start	5 min	10 min	20 min	30 min	End	Min.	Max	Min.	Max.	Intensity %
1	Tx 1	Prep	20	23	25	28	30	30	14	20	23	36	26.0
1	Tx 2	Prep	20	25	26	29	30	31.5	20	25	26	38	27.2
2	Tx 3	Tone	25	27.5	30	34	34	32	20	25	26	38	30.6
2	Tx 4	Tone	25	28	32	36	36	33	20	30	26	40	32.1
3	Tx 5	Sculpt	25	30	34	32	34	34	20	34	23	39	31.7
3	Tx 6	Sculpt	25	30	34	32	34	36	20	38	24	45	32.4

RESULTS

All patients completed all study visits. Pain levels were reduced in 23 of 28 patients (82%; Clopper-Pearson 95% CI: 63%-94%; paired-data two-tail Student's t-test: $p<0.001$) with an average reduction among responders of 2.8 ± 2.2 points (0-10 VAS). Clinically significant improvement in muscle endurance (≥ 5-sec improvement in plank-test duration) was seen in 20 of 28 patients (71%; 95% CI 51%-87%; $p<0.001$) with an average increase of 33 ± 22 sec among responders; in muscle strength (≥10° improvement in straight-leg lowering test) was seen in 6 of 28 patients (21%; 95% CI 8%-41%; $p<0.01$) with an average improvement of 12° ± 2° among responders; and in lumbar flexion (≥15° improvement or ≥90° follow-up visit ROM) was seen in 11 of the 16 patients (69%; 95% CI 41%-89%) with <90° lumbar flexion at baseline (average improvement among all 16 patients: 26° ± 19° [$p<0.001$]).

For all 28 patients, follow-up visit Roland-Morris Disability (RMD) scores (range: 0 – 24) showed a statistically significant improvement with respect to baseline scores ($p<0.001$, pair-data two-tail Student's t test). Stratford et al.[4] demonstrated that for baseline RMD scores of 4 or more, a reduction of 4 points showed a 90% probability, the improvement was not due to chance. Using this definition for clinically significant improvement, 12 of 18 patients (67%; 95% CI: 47%-90%) with a baseline RMD score of 4 or more had a clinically significant improvement. Similarly, for all patients, follow-up visit Oswestry Disability (OD) scores (range:

0 – 50) showed a statistically significant improvement with respect to baseline scores ($p<0.01$, pair-data two-tail Student's t-test). For patients with an OD score of 10 or more (moderately disabled by low back pain), a 5-point reduction or more (≥10%) is recognized to show clinically significant improvement.[5] Using this definition, for 7 of 16 patients (44%; 95% CI: 20%-70%) with a baseline OD score of 10 or more had clinically significant improvement.

TREATMENT DISCOMFORT AND EFFECTS

The study intent was for treatments to be given at the highest intensity setting for each treatment mode that could be tolerated with minimal to moderate discomfort. As shown in Table 2, the intensity was recorded at the start of each session, 5 min, 10 min, 20 min, and 30 min into each session, and at the end of the session. The intensity was adjusted whenever the patient indicated they could tolerate a higher intensity and lowered if the patient reported more than moderate discomfort. A small intensity percentage reduction significantly lowers treatment discomfort. During 55 of 56 (98%) "Prep" mode sessions (Tx's 1 and 2), the intensity was increased throughout each session; and all "Prep" mode sessions were comfortably tolerated. In 51 or 56 (91%) "Tone" mode sessions (Tx's 3 and 4), patients requested the intensity be lowered with the requests typically made during the final 15 minutes of the session, which is consistent with the treatment parameters. Similarly, for 31 of 56 (55%) "Sculpt" mode sessions (Tx's 5 and 6), patients requested the intensity be lowered, but 15 minutes into the session which is also consistent with the treatment parameters. No treatment sessions were ended prematurely due to excessive discomfort.

Other than transient erythema, self-resolving within several hours, there were no unexpected or serious treatment side effects.

DISCUSSION

Chronic low back pain affects up to 23% of the population worldwide, with 24% to 80% of patients having a recurrence at one year.[6, 7] Low back pain is among the most common complaints of patients seeking chiropractic care and physical therapy. For persistent or chronic low back pain, there are few effective long-term treatments. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are often used as first-line treatment and may provide short-term relief.[8] While NSAIDs are effective for short-term relief of chronic low back pain, there is no difference in effectiveness between different types of NSAIDs and between NSAIDs and other commonly used pharmacotherapies, including opioids and muscle relaxants, in those with chronic pain.[8] Physical therapy plays an integral role in the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. Exercise therapy, in general, is as effective as other therapies for the treatment of chronic low back pain; and is also somewhat effective in reducing pain levels and improving the range of lumbar motion.[9] As seen in this study, the introduction of more effective bio-electrical muscle stimulation devices, which can effectively exercise muscular groups leading to improved core muscle endurance and strength and improved range of lumbar motion, offer the potential for improved outcomes from BEMS-based treatments for chronic low back pain, including for patients unable or unwilling to perform volitional core strengthening exercises due to low back pain.

CONCLUSION

Six treatment sessions, twice weekly for 3 weeks, with the truSculpt flex bio-electrical muscle stimulator, demonstrated clinically and statistically significant improvement in chronic low back pain that was unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations and pain management injections, and clinically and statistically significant improvements in lumbar flexion and core muscle endurance and strength.

References

1. Lake DA. Neuromuscular electrical stimulation. An overview and its application in the treatment of sports injuries. Sports Med. 1992 May;13(5):320-36.
2. Piva SR, Khoja SS, Toledo FGS, et al. Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation Compared to Volitional Exercise for Improving Muscle Function in Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Randomized Pilot Study. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2019 Mar;71(3):352-361.
3. Neal R. Glaviano, MEd, ATC and Susan Saliba, PhD, ATC, PT. Can the Use of Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation Be Improved to Optimize Quadriceps Strengthening? Sports Health. 2016 Jan; 8(1): 79–85.
4. Stratford PW, Binkley J, Solomon P, et al. Defining the minimum level of detectable change for the Roland-Morris Questionnaire. Phys Ther. 1996;76:359-365
5. Fairbank JCT, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry Disability Index. Spine. 2000; 25(22):2940-2953
6. Balagué F, Mannion AF, Pellisé F, Cedraschi C. Non-specific low back pain. Lancet. 2012;379(9814):482–491.
7. Hoy D, Brooks P, Blyth F, Buchbinder R. The epidemiology of low back pain. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2010;24(6):769–781.
8. Roelofs PD, Deyo RA, Koes BW, Scholten RJ, van Tulder MW. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for low back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2008;(1):CD000396
9. Hayden JA, van Tulder MW, Malmivaara A, Koes BW. Exercise therapy for treatment of non-specific low back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2005;(3):CD00033

THE PROCESS OF MUSCLE HYPERTROPHY UTILIZING A NOVEL BIO-ELECTRICAL MUSCLE STIMULATION DEVICE

Robin Nye, RN, BSN; Alysa Hoffmeister, BS

WHY TRUSCULPT® FLEX

After the age of 30, inactive individuals can lose as much as 3-8% muscle mass per decade.[1] This happens when the protein in muscle breaks down faster than it is being built through the process of protein synthesis. Strength and resistance training is traditionally the most effective method to avoid or reverse this process. A new approach to achieve similar results can be accomplished with truSculpt flex by Cutera, a bio-electrical muscle stimulation device.

truSculpt flex is a muscle-sculpting device that offers personalized treatments based on patient fitness level, shape, and goals. Only truSculpt flex with Multi-Directional Stimulation (MDS) deploys a unique method of electrical muscle stimulation to target specific muscle groups using three treatment mode options, covering the largest treatment area in the body sculpting industry. Low levels of energy achieve deep muscle contractions at high intensity via a proprietary handpiece design with truGel to optimize results and increase practice revenue.

HOW TRUSCULPT FLEX WORKS

During traditional strength training, the brain sends a signal to the nervous system and motor neurons to contract skeletal muscle voluntarily. During a truSculpt flex treatment, the process bypasses the brain, and instead, the device sends an electrical signal to the handpiece pairs or quads through a hydrogel pad which is the conductive medium that minimizes discomfort and maximizes safety and efficacy. The electric current deploys proprietary waveforms and carrier frequencies. The waveform targets skeletal muscles while the carrier frequency causes preferential deactivation of the alpha motor neurons that involuntarily contract the skeletal muscles under the handpieces. Since the action potential and subsequent depolarization of the neurons is a threshold (all-or-nothing) event, the entire muscle group under the handpiece pair is engaged for locomotion. The current delivery also incorporates a range of beat frequencies that tell the muscles the speed and intensity of the contractions which continually change throughout the treatment duration. The selectivity of the waveform for the muscle type and alpha motor neurons makes the device/treatment insensitive to the amount of subcutaneous adipose tissue overlying the skeletal muscle.

truSculpt flex includes 16 handpieces to allow up to 8 areas to be treated simultaneously. The device is pre-programmed with three treatment modes, Prep, Tone and Sculpt, that offer five different contraction sequences to simulate a traditional workout at an accelerated intensity and an increase to the basal metabolic rate. This simulation continually confuses and challenges the muscle at an intensity and duration that is beyond the level that can be achieved during regular exercise. A typical abdominal workout may include up to ten minutes of various movements to contract, hold and relax the abdominal muscles. Although the rectus abdominus and external obliques muscle are the primary target, they are being assisted by other muscle groups including but not limited to latissimus dorsi and splenius capitis. Conversely, truSculpt flex allows for selective targeting of motor neurons to contract specific skeletal muscles without the assistance of surrounding muscle groups for forty-five minutes. A fit adult could perform up to 100 crunches before reaching a point of exhaustion. During a forty-five-minute truSculpt flex treatment, a fit adult could perform the equivalent of up to 54,000 crunches.[2] Other muscle stimulation devices are limited to stimulating only one to two muscle groups at a time, simulating one to two workout routines, in a single linear direction, at a constant speed. Although the intensity can be increased, it is common to reach the maximum intensity and no longer be able to challenge the muscle.

MUSCLE HYPERTROPHY

During a truSculpt flex treatment, similar to strength training, muscle fibers undergo trauma or microscopic tears, and then cells attempt to repair the damage which results in increasing muscle size and strength. This repair process, known as hypertrophy, begins after each treatment and involves releasing hormones, such as testosterone, to activate cell recovery, form new blood capillaries, repair muscle fibers, and manage the gain in muscle mass. The amount of released growth hormones depends on the intensity of the activity, hormone levels (which is higher in men, individuals with genetically more muscle mass, or individuals who frequently workout), and the metabolism level which helps convert amino acids into protein to bulk up muscles.

Due to the aerobic nature of a truSculpt flex treatment, lactic acid build-up does not occur. Lactic acid or lactate is a byproduct of anaerobic exercise. When the body needs a quick energy source i.e., running a 100-yard dash, it does not have the ability to use oxygen to convert glucose into energy as quickly as it needs. In this instance, glucose is broken down without oxygen and the byproduct is lactic acid. This byproduct is then broken down in the liver and excreted naturally. However, delayed onset of muscle soreness, commonly known as DOMS, can occur. This soreness is derived from the micro-trauma to the muscle and inflammation, can last 24 to 72 hours, and subsides on its own.

PROTEIN SYNTHESIS

After a truSculpt flex session, protein synthesis occurs in the treated muscles for approximately 24 to 48 hours.[3] During a series of 4-6 truSculpt flex treatments; the body goes into a state of constant muscle protein synthesis. Muscle protein synthesis is how your body repairs and rebuilds damaged muscle fibers. Muscles grow or hypertrophy when the amount of protein synthesized in the muscle exceeds the amount that is broken down. Protein synthesis is stimulated by the presence of amino acids which are derived from external sources of proteins like eggs, milk, meat and some plant sources. It is widely known that to optimize muscle hypertrophy, it is ideal to eat 1.2 – 2.2 grams of protein per kilogram of body weight per day.[4]

Building muscle is not an instant process. There may be immediate swelling of the muscles after a truSculpt flex session, as well as changes at a microscopic level. However, observable results take time. Many factors are involved in the process of muscle hypertrophy and individuals will respond at different intervals. The body needs to repair, build and increase muscle size over several weeks. In traditional resistance training, it can take 4-16 weeks to see marked visible differences in the definition, size and strength of muscles. Just as an injury to bone takes time to heal, the hypertrophy of muscles and the process of healing and building takes time as well. Some individuals may see results sooner than others and there are many reasons for that. Age, sex, diet, previous exercise experience or current fitness level, physiological potential/genetics, amount of adipose tissue on top of the muscle, and proper rest are some of the factors that contribute to how rapidly the muscles will respond.

CONCLUSION

truSculpt flex offers a high level of intensity and an increase to the basal metabolic rate to provide accelerated muscle mass growth over traditional strength training and other muscle-sculpting technologies with limited fatigue or soreness. In addition, two common symptoms of aging, reduced muscle mass and declining metabolism are both treated with truSculpt flex which makes this treatment an excellent adjunct to any medical practice focused on decreasing the signs of aging, improving appearance, and body confidence.

---

[1] Melton LJ, III, Khosla S, Crowson CS et al. Epidemiology of sarcopenia. J Am Geriatric Soc. 2000; 625-630.
[2] Data on file
[3] Turner, M, Schneider M.D., MS. How long does it take to build muscle: Understanding Muscle Hypertrophy. 2019;
[4] Kim IY, Schutzler S Schrader A, Spencer HJ Azhar G, Ferrando AA, Wolfe RR. American Journal of Physiology Endocrinology and metabolism 2016;310(1):E73-80. Doi:10.1152/ajpendo.00365.2015

EFFECT OF BIO-ELECTRICAL MUSCLE STIMULATION ON CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN AND ABDOMINAL MUSCULAR ENDURANCE AND STRENGTH

Mark C. Yezak, BS, DC; Reid Amedee, BS, DC; Brett Baer, PT, DPT; Robert Williams, BS, MED
Houston Spine and Rehabilitation Centers

OBJECTIVE

Assess the safety and efficacy of treatment with the truSculpt® flex system on bio-electrical muscle stimulation for improvement of chronic low back pain and core muscular endurance and strength.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Twenty-eight established patients at the Houston Spine and Rehabilitation Centers with chronic low back pain, unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations, and pain management injections, received six 45-minute bio-electrical muscle stimulation re-education treatments with the truSculpt flex system to the abdominal region (rectus abdominis, abdominal obliques, and transverse abdominis). Patients received a total of six treatments twice per week on each of the three settings: 1) Prep, 2) Tone, and 3) Sculpt. The patients were instructed to continue their normal daily routines and asked to refrain from any new activities. At baseline and 8 to 10 days post final treatment, the patients completed Roland-Morris and Oswestry Disability questionnaires and were functionally evaluated for lumbar flexion and muscular endurance and strength. Pain levels were recorded pre- and post-testing by questionnaire.

RESULTS

All patients completed all study visits. Pain levels were reduced in 23 of 28 patients (82%; 95% CI: 63%-94%; $p<0.001$) with an average pain reduction among responders of 2.8 ± 2.2 points (0-10 VAS). Clinically significant improvement in muscle endurance (≥ 5 second improvement in plank-test duration) was seen in 20 of 28 patients (71%; 95% CI: 51%-78%; $p<0.001$) with an average increase of 33 ± 22 seconds among responders; in muscle strength (≥10° improvement in straight-leg lowering test) was seen in 6 of 28 patients (21%; 95% CI: 8%-41%; $p<0.01$) with an average improvement of 12° ± 2° among responders; and in lumbar flexion (≥15° improvement) was seen in 11 of 16 patients (69%; 95% CI: 41%-89%) with <90° lumbar flexion at baseline (average improvement among all 16 patients: 26° ± 19° [$p<0.001$]). All treatments were well tolerated and there were no unexpected or serious treatment side effects.

CONCLUSION

Six treatment sessions, twice weekly for 3 weeks, with the truSculpt flex bio-electrical muscle stimulator demonstrated clinically and statistically significant improvement in chronic low back pain that was unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations and pain management injections, and clinically and statistically significant improvements in lumbar flexion and core muscular endurance and strength.

INTRODUCTION

Bio-Electrical Muscle Stimulation (BEMS) deploys a method to send electrical impulses to muscle nerves using an external source/stimulus. This stimulus causes the muscles to contract. BEMS can increase muscle strength, range of motion, and offset the effects of disuse. It is used to prevent muscle atrophy and to retrain or re-educate muscle function after surgery or periods of disuse.[1] BEMS targets the muscle itself, specifically through the motor nerves, and can improve both muscle structure and function by recruiting more muscle fibers, similar to that seen from volitional exercise.[2] In sports medicine, muscle stimulation is frequently used to improve muscular strength when training, warming up, or recovering from injury.[3]

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a physician-initiated, prospective single-center, open-label study conducted in accordance with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the truSculpt flex (Cutera, Inc. Brisbane, CA) bio-electrical muscle stimulation system for the treatment of chronic low back pain that was unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations, and pain management injections. Secondary endpoints were changes in core muscular endurance and strength, lumbar flexion, and Roland-Morris and Oswestry Disability scores between baseline and follow-up visits.

INVESTIGATIONAL DEVICE

The truSculpt flex is a device that administers multidirectional electrical currents to stimulate contractions in muscular groups. While the device can be used to stimulate up to 8 body areas simultaneously, within this study, treatments were limited to the abdominal region and specifically to the rectus abdominis, abdominal obliques, and transverse abdominis muscle groups. The device can be set to deliver current in sequence combinations of three operational modes (Prep, Tone, or Sculpt) with the intensity for each operational mode being independently adjustable for each output channel.

SUBJECTS

Twenty-eight established patients (Table 1), seen at the Houston Spine and Rehabilitation Centers for chronic low back pain, unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations, and pain management injections, were consented and enrolled. All patients were instructed to continue their normal daily routines and asked to refrain from any new activities.

Table 1. Subject Demographics

Subjects (n)	28	
Age ± SD (Median, Range)	47.3 ± 12.6 (43.5, 31-75)	
Females, n (%)	25	(89%)
Males, n (%)	3	(11%)
Race, n (%)		
White	26	(93%)
Black or African American	1	(3.5%)
White and African American	1	(3.5%)
Ethnicity, n (%)		
Hispanic or Latino	2	(7%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	26	(93%)

BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP VISIT EVALUATIONS

Prior to the first treatment and 8 to 10 days after the final treatment, all patients were required to complete Roland-Morris and Oswestry Disability questionnaires and were functionally evaluated for lumbar flexion and core muscular endurance and strength using the testing methods described below. Pain levels, at best and at worst, were recorded pre- and post-testing by questionnaire.

Lumbar Flexion Test

Lumbar range of motion (ROM) measurements were taken with Goniometer with the patient in standing position bending forward with knees straight until an increase in low back pain was felt (higher angles indicate more ROM).

Muscular Endurance

Measured with a 3-Minute Plank Test with patients remaining in a pushup position and lifting limbs at specified times within the 3 minutes as follows: 60s Plank (1:00); 15s Left Arm Lift (1:15); 15s Right Arm Lift (1:30); 15s Left Leg Lift (1:45); 15s Right Arm Lift (2:00); 15s Left Arm and Right Leg Lift (2:15); 15s Right Arm and Left leg Lift (2:30); 30s Plank (3:00)

Muscular Strength

Measured with a Straight Leg Lowering Test as follows: A blood pressure cuff was placed under the patient's lower back just above the sacrum; the patient was then instructed to lift their legs toward the ceiling; while contracting abdominals to keep pressure on cuff at all times, lower their legs slowly; the hip angle was recorded with a goniometer when the pressure decreased by 50% from the pressure at 90° (lower angles indicate higher abdominal muscular strength).

TREATMENTS AND INVESTIGATIONAL DEVICE SETTINGS

Patients received a total of six treatment sessions with the investigational device set to the parameters shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Treatment Settings

			Median Intensity (%)						Start Intensity (%)		End Intensity (%)		Average
Week	Tx #	Mode	Start	5 min	10 min	20 min	30 min	End	Min.	Max	Min.	Max.	Intensity %
1	Tx 1	Prep	20	23	25	28	30	30	14	20	23	36	26.0
1	Tx 2	Prep	20	25	26	29	30	31.5	20	25	26	38	27.2
2	Tx 3	Tone	25	27.5	30	34	34	32	20	25	26	38	30.6
2	Tx 4	Tone	25	28	32	36	36	33	20	30	26	40	32.1
3	Tx 5	Sculpt	25	30	34	32	34	34	20	34	23	39	31.7
3	Tx 6	Sculpt	25	30	34	32	34	36	20	38	24	45	32.4

RESULTS

All patients completed all study visits. Pain levels were reduced in 23 of 28 patients (82%; Clopper-Pearson 95% CI: 63%-94%; paired-data two-tail Student's t-test: $p<0.001$) with an average reduction among responders of 2.8 ± 2.2 points (0-10 VAS). Clinically significant improvement in muscle endurance (≥ 5-sec improvement in plank-test duration) was seen in 20 of 28 patients (71%; 95% CI 51%-87%; $p<0.001$) with an average increase of 33 ± 22 sec among responders; in muscle strength (≥10° improvement in straight-leg lowering test) was seen in 6 of 28 patients (21%; 95% CI 8%-41%; $p<0.01$) with an average improvement of 12° ± 2° among responders; and in lumbar flexion (≥15° improvement or ≥90° follow-up visit ROM) was seen in 11 of the 16 patients (69%; 95% CI 41%-89%) with <90° lumbar flexion at baseline (average improvement among all 16 patients: 26° ± 19° [$p<0.001$]).

For all 28 patients, follow-up visit Roland-Morris Disability (RMD) scores (range: 0 – 24) showed a statistically significant improvement with respect to baseline scores ($p<0.001$, pair-data two-tail Student's t test). Stratford et al.[4] demonstrated that for baseline RMD scores of 4 or more, a reduction of 4 points showed a 90% probability, the improvement was not due to chance. Using this definition for clinically significant improvement, 12 of 18 patients (67%; 95% CI: 47%-90%) with a baseline RMD score of 4 or more had a clinically significant improvement. Similarly, for all patients, follow-up visit Oswestry Disability (OD) scores (range:

0 – 50) showed a statistically significant improvement with respect to baseline scores ($p<0.01$, pair-data two-tail Student's t-test). For patients with an OD score of 10 or more (moderately disabled by low back pain), a 5-point reduction or more (≥10%) is recognized to show clinically significant improvement.[5] Using this definition, for 7 of 16 patients (44%; 95% CI: 20%-70%) with a baseline OD score of 10 or more had clinically significant improvement.

TREATMENT DISCOMFORT AND EFFECTS

The study intent was for treatments to be given at the highest intensity setting for each treatment mode that could be tolerated with minimal to moderate discomfort. As shown in Table 2, the intensity was recorded at the start of each session, 5 min, 10 min, 20 min, and 30 min into each session, and at the end of the session. The intensity was adjusted whenever the patient indicated they could tolerate a higher intensity and lowered if the patient reported more than moderate discomfort. A small intensity percentage reduction significantly lowers treatment discomfort. During 55 of 56 (98%) "Prep" mode sessions (Tx's 1 and 2), the intensity was increased throughout each session; and all "Prep" mode sessions were comfortably tolerated. In 51 or 56 (91%) "Tone" mode sessions (Tx's 3 and 4), patients requested the intensity be lowered with the requests typically made during the final 15 minutes of the session, which is consistent with the treatment parameters. Similarly, for 31 of 56 (55%) "Sculpt" mode sessions (Tx's 5 and 6), patients requested the intensity be lowered, but 15 minutes into the session which is also consistent with the treatment parameters. No treatment sessions were ended prematurely due to excessive discomfort.

Other than transient erythema, self-resolving within several hours, there were no unexpected or serious treatment side effects.

DISCUSSION

Chronic low back pain affects up to 23% of the population worldwide, with 24% to 80% of patients having a recurrence at one year.[6, 7] Low back pain is among the most common complaints of patients seeking chiropractic care and physical therapy. For persistent or chronic low back pain, there are few effective long-term treatments. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are often used as first-line treatment and may provide short-term relief.[8] While NSAIDs are effective for short-term relief of chronic low back pain, there is no difference in effectiveness between different types of NSAIDs and between NSAIDs and other commonly used pharmacotherapies, including opioids and muscle relaxants, in those with chronic pain.[8] Physical therapy plays an integral role in the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. Exercise therapy, in general, is as effective as other therapies for the treatment of chronic low back pain; and is also somewhat effective in reducing pain levels and improving the range of lumbar motion.[9] As seen in this study, the introduction of more effective bio-electrical muscle stimulation devices, which can effectively exercise muscular groups leading to improved core muscle endurance and strength and improved range of lumbar motion, offer the potential for improved outcomes from BEMS-based treatments for chronic low back pain, including for patients unable or unwilling to perform volitional core strengthening exercises due to low back pain.

CONCLUSION

Six treatment sessions, twice weekly for 3 weeks, with the truSculpt flex bio-electrical muscle stimulator, demonstrated clinically and statistically significant improvement in chronic low back pain that was unresponsive to physical therapy, chiropractic manipulations and pain management injections, and clinically and statistically significant improvements in lumbar flexion and core muscle endurance and strength.

References

1. Lake DA. Neuromuscular electrical stimulation. An overview and its application in the treatment of sports injuries. Sports Med. 1992 May;13(5):320-36.
2. Piva SR, Khoja SS, Toledo FGS, et al. Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation Compared to Volitional Exercise for Improving Muscle Function in Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Randomized Pilot Study. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2019 Mar;71(3):352-361.
3. Neal R. Glaviano, MEd, ATC and Susan Saliba, PhD, ATC, PT. Can the Use of Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation Be Improved to Optimize Quadriceps Strengthening? Sports Health. 2016 Jan; 8(1): 79–85.
4. Stratford PW, Binkley J, Solomon P, et al. Defining the minimum level of detectable change for the Roland-Morris Questionnaire. Phys Ther. 1996;76:359-365
5. Fairbank JCT, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry Disability Index. Spine. 2000; 25(22):2940-2953
6. Balagué F, Mannion AF, Pellisé F, Cedraschi C. Non-specific low back pain. Lancet. 2012;379(9814):482–491.
7. Hoy D, Brooks P, Blyth F, Buchbinder R. The epidemiology of low back pain. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2010;24(6):769–781.
8. Roelofs PD, Deyo RA, Koes BW, Scholten RJ, van Tulder MW. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for low back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2008;(1):CD000396
9. Hayden JA, van Tulder MW, Malmivaara A, Koes BW. Exercise therapy for treatment of non-specific low back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2005;(3):CD00033