1 **Greater Lumbar Extension During Dolphin Kick and Psoas Major Tightness in**

2 **Swimmers with Low Back Pain**

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Gakuto, Kitamura PT, B.S[1], Hiroshige, Tateuchi PT, Ph.D[1], Noriaki, Ichihashi

6 PT, Ph.D[1]

7 1. Department of Physical Therapy, Human Health Science, Graduate School of

8 Medicine, Kyoto University,

9 **Correspondence**

10 Name: Gakuto, Kitamura, PT, B.S

11 Address: Department of Human Health Science, Graduate School of Medicine,

12 Kyoto University, 53, kawara-cho, shogoin, sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8507, Japan

13 Telephone: +81-075-751-3964

14 FAX: +81-075-751-3964

15 Email: kitamura.gakuto.82m@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp

16

17

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 Context: In competitive swimming, many swimmers experience lower back pain (LBP).

22 Lumbar hyperextension may cause LBP and tight hip flexor muscle may cause lumbar

23 extension during swimming.

24 Objective: The purpose of this study was to clarify the features of the elastic moduli of the

25 muscles and the lumbar extension when swimmers with low back pain (LBP) perform a

26 dolphin kick (DK).

27 Design: Cross sectional study.

28 Setting: Single center.

29 Participants: Eleven male college swimmers were enrolled as the LBP group (who have LBP

30 when swimming and during a lumbar extension), and 21 male college swimmers were recruited

31 as control group (no LBP).

32 Interventions: The elastic moduli of the psoas major, iliacus, teres major, latissimus dorsi,

33 pectoralis major, and pectoralis minor were measured through ultrasonic shear wave

34 elastography. The lumbar and hip extension angles during a DK were measured using a video

35 camera. The passive hip extension and shoulder flexion range of motion (ROM) were measured

36 using a goniometer.

37 Main Outcome Measures: Muscle elastic moduli and lumbar extension angles during DK.

38 Results: The characteristics, muscle elastic moduli, DK motion, and ROM were compared

39 between the two groups. LBP group demonstrated significantly higher elastic modulus of the

40 psoas major and lower modulus of pectoralis minor compared to the control group. Also, LBP

41 group showed greater lumbar extension during a DK and less hip extension ROM than the

42 control group.

43 Conclusion: The higher elastic modulus of the psoas major and greater lumbar extension during

44 a DK may be related to the LBP in swimmers.

45

46 Keywords: prevention, swimming, ultrasound, posture, injury management

47   In various sports, low back pain (LBP) is frequently seen in athletes including volleyball players,

48   rhythmic gymnasts, and competitive swimming.[1] This often leads to reductions in training time and/or

49   competitive opportunities. It has been reported that about half of all competitive swimmers experience LBP.[2]

50   Therefore, the prevention of LBP in competitive swimmers is important. The physical characteristics of

51   competitive swimmers is different from those of ordinary people. To prevent LBP in swimmers, it is

52   necessary to know their physical characteristics. Competitive swimmers have a high risk of spinal

53   deformities such as spine asymmetry, thoracic kyphosis, or lumbar lordosis.[3] Intervertebral disc degeneration

54   is frequently found in the lower area of the lumbar spine (mainly at the L5/S1 level, and occasionally at the

55   L4/L5 level) and this tendency is not associated with the swimming style.[4]

56

57   Several studies have been conducted on the swimming kinematics of swimmers without LBP. It has

58   been reported that the hip joint extends to about 10 degrees during a front crawl[5] and may be larger during a

59   dolphin kick (DK) owing to its performance characteristics. In a previews study, it was reported that the

60   tightness of the hip flexor muscle can reduce hip extension that create a lumbar hyperextension and pelvic

61   anterior tilt in various movement in water.[6] Pelvic anterior tilting can make the pelvis at a lower position

62   than normal in water.[6] A study examined the swimmers experiencing LBP and reported that repetitive lumbar

63   hyperextensions during swimming may cause LBP.[7] The tight hip flexor muscle may extend lumbar spine

64   during DK and cause LBP in swimmers. Furthermore, excessive training may also cause LBP in swimmers.

65   However, the physical and kinematic characteristics of swimmers with LBP have not been clarified.

66

67   Competitive swimmers have more general joint laxity than normal, but the range of motion (ROM) of

68   their internal and external shoulder rotations are smaller.[8] Furthermore, it has been reported that the ROM

69   of the internal shoulder rotations decrease as competitive swimmers continue their careers from their youth

70   level to the college level.[9] Therefore, although joint flexibility is required in competitive swimming,

71   swimming training imposes a burden on the muscles around the shoulder joint, which can tighten. The basic

72   posture in swimming used to achieve the least amount of water resistance, called a "streamline," is a posture

73   with the trunk and hip at a 0 degree extension, and a shoulder flexion of greater than 180 degrees, with both

74   hands placed above the head. As described above, swimming training can burden the muscles and tighten

75   shoulder muscles. If a swimmer experiences tightness in the shoulder muscles, a trunk extension will occur

76 as a compensation of the shoulder flexion during a streamline posture, which is frequently seen in practice.

77 As described above, repetitive lumbar extensions can cause LBP.[7] Therefore, tightness of shoulder muscles

78 may cause wrong streamline posture that is related to LBP in swimmers.

79

80   Currently, shear wave elastography is known to be able to assess muscle stiffness noninvasively.

81 However, no studies have compared the elastic moduli of the hip flexor and shoulder muscle or the lumbar

82 extension angle during a DK between swimmers with and without LBP. Therefore, the aim of the present

83 study was to compare the elastic moduli of the hip flexor and shoulder muscles as well as the ROM of the

84 passive shoulder flexion and hip extension between swimmers with and without LBP, and to clarify the

85 features of their muscle stiffness, hip and shoulder ROM, and lumbar motion during a DK. There were three

86 hypotheses. First, the elastic modulus of hip flexor muscles is higher in swimmers with LBP than those

87 without LBP. Second, the elastic modulus of shoulder muscles is higher in swimmers with LBP than those

88 without LBP. Third, the lumbar extension angle during DK is greater in swimmers with LBP than those

89 without LBP.

90

91

92 **METHODS**

93

94 **Design**

95

96   A cross sectional study was used.

97

98

99 **Participants**

100

101   Thirty-nine male college swimmers were initially enrolled in this study. The inclusion criteria of the

102 LBP group were subjects with more than 30 mm of LBP in VAS while both swimming and during a lumbar

103 extension.[10] The inclusion criteria of the control group were subjects currently with no LBP (0 mm on the

104 VAS). As a result, 11 subjects were enrolled in the LBP group (21.1 ± 1.5 years), and 21 subjects were

105   enrolled in the control group (20.6 ± 1.5 years). Three subjects were excluded because they experienced LBP

106   when swimming but not during a lumbar extension, and four were excluded because their LBP was less than

107   30 mm in VAS. The subjects were provided a full explanation, based on the Helsinki declaration, regarding

108   the aim, methods, and risks of the study, and their agreement was received. This study was conducted with

109   the approval of the ethics committee of institution of authors.

110

111   **Procedures**

112

113   The subjects answered a questionnaire after an explanation of the study and an agreement to participate.

114   In the questionnaire, the presence and intensity of their LBP, their swimming style, and the number of their

115   training years were determined. The intensity of their LBP was assessed as being between zero and 100

116   based on the visual analogue scale (VAS). The elastic moduli of the psoas major, iliacus, teres major,

117   latissimus dorsi, pectoralis major, and pectoralis minor muscles were measured using ultrasonic shear wave

118   elastography. Their lumbar and hip extension angles during a DK were measured using an underwater

119   camera. In addition, their passive hip extension and shoulder flexion ROM were measured using a

120   goniometer.

121

122   In this study, the elastic moduli of the iliacus, psoas major were analyzed since they may restrict hip

123   extension and the teres major, latissimus dorsi, pectoralis major clavicular, pectoralis major sternocostal, and

124   pectoralis minor muscles were measured because they may restrict shoulder flexion. The elastic moduli of

125   these muscles were measured using ultrasonic shear wave elastography (Aixplorer, Supersonic imagine, Aix-

126   en-Provence, France) with a linear array probe (SL10-2, Super Sonic Imagine, Aix-en-Provence, France).

127   Using this device, the muscle stiffness can be measured quantitatively based on elastic moduli, and the elastic

128   moduli of the muscles as measured through ultrasonic shear wave elastography were found in a study on

129   cadavers to be strongly related to the degree of muscle expansion.[11] In a living body, passive joint movement

130   or passive tension of a muscle are strongly related to its elastic moduli.[12] The elastic moduli (G) reflects the

131   elasticity or stiffness of a tissue, which is calculated based on the propagation velocity (V) of the shear wave

132   in the tissue, as described in the following expressions.[13]

133

134        $G=\rho V^2$

135

136   In this expression, ρ is the density of the tissue, which for muscle has been reported to be $1000\ \mathrm{kg/m^3}$.[14]

137

138   Measurements of the elastic moduli of the psoas major and iliacus muscles were conducted in a relaxed

139   supine position with the hip joint extended at 0 degrees, and the pelvis of the subject was fastened using a

140   band to avoid anterior tilting. The measurement location of the psoas major and iliacus are shown in Figure

141   1. This location was determined to be 3 to 5 cm below the anterior superior iliac spine (ASIS) and distal of

142   the inguinal ligament, based on a previous study.[15] The psoas major and iliacus were then identified as lateral

143   to the femoral artery using ultrasonic images.

144   The shoulder position and locations of the elastic moduli measurements of the shoulder muscles are

145   shown in Figures 2A–2C. The teres major and latissimus dorsi were measured during a relaxed sitting

146   position and with the shoulder flexed at 90 degrees, rotated at 0 degrees, and the elbow flexed at 90 degrees.

147   The measurement location of the teres major and latissimus dorsi was defined as 10 cm below the acromion

148   (Figure 2A). The pectoralis major and minor were measured during a relaxed sitting position and with the

149   shoulder abducted at 90 degrees, rotated at 0 degrees, and the elbow flexed at 90 degrees. The pectoralis

150   major clavicular and sternocostal parts were measured at the midpoint between the greater tubercle and the

151   acromioclavicular joint and at midpoint between the greater tubercle and the fourth sternocostal joint,

152   respectively. The pectoralis minor was measured at the midpoint between the coracoid process and the fourth

153   sternocostal joint in the same way as in a previous study.[16]

154   Before measuring the elastic moduli, the state of each muscle was confirmed through ultrasonic

155   imaging. For all muscle measurements, the region of interest (ROI), in which area the elastic moduli can be

156   measured, was set at the center of the muscle. The elastic moduli of all muscles were measured by placing

157   an ultrasonic probe parallel to the muscle fiber. The elastic moduli of all muscles considered were measured

158   three times, and the mean value was used for a statistical analysis.

159

160   To evaluate the reliability of the elastic moduli measurement using ultrasonic elastography with a liner

161   probe, the elastic moduli of all muscles for ten of the asymptomatic subjects were measured twice to assess

162   the intra-class correlation coefficients (ICC 1.1). Consequently, the ICC 1.1 value of each muscle was as

163   follows; psoas major = 0.888, iliacus = 0.924, teres major = 0.622, latissimus dorsi = 0.756, pectoralis major

164   clavicular = 0.755, pectoralis major = 0.897, and pectoralis minor = 0.642. According to a report by Landis

165   et al., if the ICC value is higher than 0.81, the reliability of the measurement may be nearly perfect.[17]

166   Therefore, the number (k) of measurements to meet the requirement of the lowest ICC value of the teres

167   major, i.e., greater than 0.8, was calculated using the Spearman-Brown formula (a).

168

169    $\mathrm{k} = \dfrac{\rho 1 (1 - \rho 2)}{\rho 2 (1 - \rho 1)}$ (a)

170

171   In this formula, $\rho 1$ is the target ICC value, and $\rho 2$ is the resulting ICC value. As a result, all measurements

172   of the elastic moduli were conducted three times because k was approximately 2.57.

173

174   An underwater video camera (O10-SC13001-W-1, Lerving Technology, Kwai Chung N.T., Hong

175   Kong; 1920×1080 resolution, at 60 fps) and a Kinovea video player (version 0.8.15, available for download

176   at http://www.kinovea.org) were used to measure the lumbar angle during a DK. The reliability of the joint

177   angle measurement in the sagittal plane as assessed from a digital image was obtained in a previous study.[18]

178   The subjects performed an underwater DK for 15 m with full effort, and the video was taken at a point 7.5

179   m away along the sagittal plane. The subjects were instructed to perform the DK at around 0.5 m from the

180   surface of the water. The camera was set at 0.5 m below the surface of the water, 7.5 m from the starting side

181   wall of the pool, and 4 m from the subject's swimming lane.[19] Markers were put on the subject's spinous

182   process at T10, L3, S2, iliac crest (IC), greater trochanter (GT), and lateral epicondyle of the femur (LEF)

183   to measure the angle of the lumbar and hip joints. The lumbar angle (θ_1) was defined as an angle made by

184   lines A and B. Line A was produced by the markers at T10 and L3, whereas line B was produced by the

185   markers at L3 and S2 (Figure 3).[20] The hip angle (θ_2) was defined as the angle made by two lines, one

186   produced by the IC and GT, and the other produced by the GT and LEF.[19] The lumbar angle was measured

187   when the angle of the hip extension was largest when performing a DK. The average values from three

188   appropriate trials were used in the statistical analysis and false trials in which the subjects did not pass in

189   front of the video camera were excluded. The time for the 15 m DK was measured with a stopwatch.

190

191   The passive shoulder flexion and hip extension ROM were assessed using a goniometer. The shoulder

192   flexion ROM was assessed in a sitting position, and the hip extension ROM was assessed in a prone position.

193   All measurement of joint angle during DK and passive ROM were analyzed by the same researcher.

194

195   **Statistical Analyses**

196

197   A statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS (version 22.0, SPSS Japan, Inc., Tokyo, Japan). The

198   normality of all data obtained was confirmed through a Shapiro-Wilk test. The age, height, weight, number

199   of training years, elastic modulus of each muscle, lumbar extension, and hip extension angle applied when

200   performing a DK, as well as the passive ROM of the shoulder flexion and hip extension between the LBP

201   and asymptomatic groups were compared using a Mann-Whitney U-test. Spearman's rank correlation

202   coefficient test was conducted to investigate the relationship between swimming performance (best record

203   of 50 m crawl or 15 m DK time) and degree of lumbar extension or muscle elastic modulus. The differences

204   were shown to be statistically significant at an alpha level of 0.05.

205

206   **RESULTS**

207

208   All measurements were completed for each subject. The characteristics of the subjects are shown in

209   Table 1. There were no differences in age, height, weight or number of training years between both groups.

210   The results of the elastic moduli are shown in Table 2. The LBP group showed a higher value in the

211   elastic modulus of the psoas major compared with the control group. For the pectoralis minor, the LBP group

212   showed a lower value compared with the control group. There were no differences in the elastic moduli of

213   the other muscles between both groups.

214   The results of the lumbar and hip angle when performing a DK, along with the passive shoulder flexion

215   and hip extension ROM, are shown in Table 3. The LBP group showed a larger lumbar extension angle when

216   performing a DK than the control group.

217   The passive hip extension ROM of the LBP group was smaller than that of the control group. There

218   were no significant differences in the other joint angles between both groups.

219   The result of Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test is shown in Table 4. No significant

7

220   correlation between swimming performance and lumbar extension angle or muscle elastic modulus was

221   found (Table 4).

222

223   **DISCUSSION**

224

225   The LBP group showed a higher elastic modulus of the psoas major and lower elastic modulus of the

226   pectoralis minor than control group. Additionally, LBP group indicated a larger lumbar extension angle when

227   performing a DK and smaller passive hip extension angle than the control group.

228

229   This is the first study comparing the elastic moduli of the muscles and the joint angle when performing

230   a DK between swimmers with and without LBP.

231

232   The first hypothesis of this study was that the LBP group would show a higher elastic modulus of the

233   hip flexor muscle than the control group. This hypothesis was partially supported because the results of this

234   study demonstrated that, for the psoas major, the LBP group showed a higher elastic modulus than the control

235   group, although no significant difference was shown in the elastic modulus of the iliacus. The psoas major

236   orients from the lumbar spine, and attaches to the lesser trochanter. This muscle is a hip flexor and has an

237   extension moment arm at levels L1 through L3 of the lumbar spine at standing and lumbar extended

238   positions.[21] Furthermore, because the spine is extended to maintain a streamline position, which is a basic

239   position for swimming, the extension stress from the psoas major increases at a higher level of the lumbar

240   spine. In addition, because the psoas major has a flexion moment arm at a low level of the lumbar spine, and

241   produces a lumbar moment in a different direction between the high and low levels of the lumbar spine, it is

242   thought that the L3 vertebra moves forward and the L1 vertebra moves backward, such that the entire lumbar

243   spine becomes extended.[21, 22] Therefore, LBP may likely occur if the elastic modulus of the psoas major is

244   high because the lumbar spine will be more extended. Moreover, the psoas major causes a stronger shear

245   force at the low level area of the lumbar spine than at a high level.[21] It is known from studies on rats and

246   rabbits that lumbar intervertebral disc degeneration occurs if the vertebral disc is stressed from a continual

247   shear force.[23, 24] In humans, an overload of the intervertebral disc may be related to disc degeneration.[25] A

248   previous study reported that intervertebral disc degeneration, such as a decrease in the intervertebral disc

8

249   thickness, is related to the frequency, duration, and intensity of the LBP.[26] With the subjects of our current

250   study, an increase in the shear force at the low level of the lumbar spine may have occurred owing to the

251   high elastic modulus of the psoas major, which could be the cause of their intervertebral disc degeneration

252   and LBP. Although the iliacus has a hip flexion moment arm, as with psoas major, the iliacus is oriented

253   from the pelvis and not from the lumbar spine. Therefore, if the elastic modulus of the iliacus is high, a

254   pelvic anterior tilt and subsequent lumbar extension stress will occur; however, the stress to the lumbar spine

255   might be less compared to that of the psoas major muscle. For this reason, it is rational for the iliacus to not

256   be related to LBP in the present study, unlike with the psoas major.

257

258   The second hypothesis of this study was that the LBP group will show higher elastic moduli in the

259   shoulder muscles than the control group; however, a lower elastic modulus was found in the pectoralis minor

260   muscle for the LBP group than for the control group, and there were no significant differences in the elastic

261   moduli of the other shoulder muscles. Therefore, our hypothesis was not supported. The pectoralis minor is

262   oriented from the second to the fifth rib, and attached to the coracoid process, and the scapula is anterior

263   tilted, rotated downward, protracted, and depressed when this muscle is activated.[27] Although, the normal

264   scapula movement during a shoulder flexion has an upward rotation, a posterior tilt, and an external

265   rotation,[28] the short length of the pectoralis minor normalized by height can cause a scapula anterior tilt and

266   an internal rotation compared with the longer length of the pectoralis minor normalized by height.[29] To the

267   best of our knowledge, there have been no studies investigating the relationship between the stiffness of the

268   pectoralis minor and scapula kinematics; however, if the pectoralis minor is tight, the scapula kinematics

269   may be similar to the kinematics under a short pectoralis minor. Conversely, the scapular kinematics under

270   less stiffness of the pectoralis minor may be similar to that of a long pectoralis minor. In this study, a low

271   elastic modulus of the pectoralis minor in the LBP group may help the scapula tilt at the posterior and rotate

272   externally during a shoulder flexion, and the LBP subjects may be able to compensate for a glenohumeral

273   flexion by increasing the movement of their scapula. Therefore, to prevent LBP from occurring owing to a

274   lumbar extension, the LBP group may compensate for the lumbar extension during a shoulder flexion while

275   in the streamline position through an increased scapula movement. We initially hypothesized that the LBP

276   group would show higher elastic moduli of the shoulder muscles than the control group because the LBP

277   subjects would compensate for a shoulder flexion occurring from the high elastic moduli of their shoulder

278   muscles by increasing their trunk extension, thereby causing LBP. However, the LBP group showed a lower

279   elastic modulus of the pectoralis minor than the control group, and accordingly, it is thought that the low

280   elastic modulus of the pectoralis minor in the LBP group is not the cause of, but rather a compensation for,

281   LBP. In addition to the pectoralis minor, the elastic moduli of the latissimus dorsi, teres major, and pectoralis

282   major, as the shoulder muscles considered in this study, were measured. These muscles have a shoulder

283   extension moment in a shoulder flexed position,[30] and are thought to restrict a shoulder flexion, induce a

284   lumbar extension, and result in LBP if their elastic moduli are high. However, there was no significant

285   difference in the elastic moduli of the latissimus dorsi, teres major, and pectoralis major between the LBP

286   and control groups. Therefore, it is thought that these muscles did not affect the LBP in the swimmers

287   considered in this study.

288

289   The third hypothesis was that the LBP group would show a greater lumbar extension when performing

290   a DK than the control group. The LBP group showed a significantly higher lumbar extension angle during a

291   DK than the control group, which is congruent with this hypothesis. Because repetitive lumbar

292   hyperextensions while swimming can induce LBP,[7] the large angle of the lumbar extension during a DK can

293   cause LBP. In this study, the passive hip extension ROM in the LBP group was significantly lower than that

294   in the control group, and the subjects in the LBP group may have compensated for a hip extension when

295   performing a DK through a lumbar extension. However, because the angle of the hip extension during a DK

296   was about 9 degrees in both groups, it is thought that the hip was not extended to the limit of a passive hip

297   extension ROM when performing a DK. Therefore, the significant difference in the lumbar extension angle

298   during a DK may be influenced by another factor. The results of this study indicate that the elastic modulus

299   of the psoas major was higher in the LBP group than in the control. Because the high elastic modulus of the

300   psoas major can cause a lumbar lordosis, and the hip will extend the psoas major when performing a DK,

301   thereby increasing the elastic modulus of psoas major, the high lumbar extension angle during a DK in the

302   LBP group may be caused by the high elastic modulus of the psoas major. An approach to decrease the elastic

303   modulus of the psoas major, or exercising the hip extension without a trunk extension may be useful in

304   treating or preventing LBP.

305

306   There was no correlation between swimming performance and degree of lumbar extension during DK,

307 as demonstrated by the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient test. Therefore, increased lumbar extension

308 during DK does not necessarily improve the swimming performance. However, it may increase the lumbar

309 spine load. Thus, higher lumbar extension degree during DK is not an appropriate technique to improve

310 swimming performance or reduce lumbar spine load.

311

312 There may be several factors causing LBP in swimmers; extended training period being one of them.

313 However, no significant relationship was found between LBP and number of training years using Mann-

314 Whitney U-test. These results may be partially explained by the participants' team. In this study, the

315 participants were the members of a swimming club. Thus, their practice frequency and training year were

316 similar. So, the effects of extended training on swimmers with LBP are unclear.

317

318 There are certain limitations to the present study. First, as a cross-sectional study, it is impossible to

319 indicate the cause and effect relationship between LBP and the elastic moduli of the muscles or the lumbar

320 angle during a DK. Second, the inclusion criteria for the LBP in this study differ from those of many other

321 previous studies because many other studies include LBP patients whose LBP has continued for longer than

322 3 months, and thus the results of this study are incommensurable with those of other studies. Third, the

323 stiffness of the psoas major is thought to cause a lumbar extension when swimming; however, swimming

324 styles other than a DK were not assessed. In competitive swimming, swimmers spend a significant amount

325 of their training time using a crawl stroke regardless of their particular swimming style. Therefore, the

326 lumbar motion during a crawl stroke may be related to LBP. To clarify the cause and effect relationship

327 between the elastic moduli of the muscles and LBP, or the same criteria of LBP as applied in other studies,

328 further longitudinal researches are needed.

329

330 **CONCLUSION**

331

332 This study indicated that swimmers suffering from LBP during lumbar extension have a higher

333 elastic modulus of their psoas major, lower elastic modulus of their pectoralis minor, and a greater lumbar

334 extension during a DK than swimmers without LBP. This study also showed that lumbar extension during

335 DK and muscle elastic modulus are not related to swimming performance. Therefore, these issues in

336 swimmers with LBP must be resolved to prevent LBP.

337

338 **Reference**

339 1. Vidal-conti J. The relationship between low back pain and sport practice in young people. *International*

340 *Journal of Orthopedics and Rehabilitation*. 2014;1:67-73.

341 2. Masiero S, Carraro E, Celia A, Sarto D, Ermani M. Prevalence of nonspecific low back pain in

342 schoolchildren aged between 13 and 15 years. *Acta Paediatr*. 2008;97(2):212-216.

343 3. Zaina F, Donzelli S, Lusini M, Minnella S, Negrini S. Swimming and spinal deformities: A cross-

344 sectional study. *J Pediatr*. 2015;166(1):163-167.

345 4. Kaneoka K, Shimizu K, Hangai M, et al. Lumbar intervertebral disk degeneration in elite competitive

346 swimmers: a case control study. *Am J Sports Med*. 2007;35(8):1341-1345.

347 5. SANDERS RH. Kinematics, coordination, variability, and biological noise in the prone flutter kick at

348 different levels of a "learn-to-swim" programme. *J Sports Sci*. 2007;25(2):213-227.

349 6. Kenal KA, Knapp LD. Rehabilitation of injuries in competitive swimmers. *Sports Medicine*.

350 1996;22(5):337-347.

351 7. Wanivenhaus F, Fox AJS, Chaudhury S, Rodeo SA. Epidemiology of injuries and prevention strategies

352 in competitive swimmers. *Sports health*. 2012;4(3):246-251.

353 8. Jansson A, Saartok T, Werner S, Renström P. Evaluation of general joint laxity, shoulder laxity and

354 mobility in competitive swimmers during growth and in normal controls. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*.

355 2005;15(3):169-176.

356 9. Riemann BL, Witt J DG. Glenohumeral joint rotation range of motion in competitive swimmers. *J*

357 *Sports Sci*. 2015;29:1191-1199.

358 10. Teodorczyk-Injeyan JA, McGregor M, Triano JJ, Injeyan HS. Elevated Production of Nociceptive CC-

359 chemokines and sE-selectin in Patients with Low Back Pain and the Effects of Spinal Manipulation.

360 *Clin J Pain*. 2017;0:1.

361 11. Eby SF, Song P, Chen S, Chen Q, Greenleaf JF, An KN. Validation of shear wave elastography in

362 skeletal muscle. *J Biomech*. 2013;46(14):2381-2387.

363 12. Maïsetti O, Hug F, Bouillard K, Nordez A. Characterization of passive elastic properties of the human

364 medial gastrocnemius muscle belly using supersonic shear imaging. *J Biomech*. 2012;45(6):978-984.

365   13.   Hug F, Tucker K, Gennisson JL, Tanter M, Nordez A. Elastography for muscle biomechanics: Toward

366   the estimation of individual muscle force. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*. 2015;43(3):125-133.

367   14.   Gennisson JL, Cornu C, Catheline S, Fink M, Portero P. Human muscle hardness assessment during

368   incremental isometric contraction using transient elastography. *J Biomech*. 2005;38(7):1543-1550.

369   15.   Jiroumaru T, Kurihara T, Isaka T. Establishment of a recording method for surface electromyography in

370   the iliopsoas muscle. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2014;24(4):445-451.

371   16.   Umehara J, Nakamura M, Fujita K, et al. Shoulder horizontal abduction stretching effectively increases

372   shear elastic modulus of pectoralis minor muscle. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 2017;26(7):1159-1165.

373   17.   Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*.

374   1977;33(1):159-174.

375   18.   Moral-Muñoz JA, Esteban-Moreno B, Arroyo-Morales M, Cobo MJ H-VE. Agreement between face-

376   to-face and free software video analysis for assessing hamstring flexibility in adolescents. *J Strength

377   Cond Res*. 2015;29(9):2661-2665.

378   19.   Atkison RR, Dickey JP, Dragunas A, Nolte V. Importance of sagittal kick symmetry for underwater

379   dolphin kick performance. *Hum Mov Sci*. 2014;33(1):298-311.

380   20.   Claus AP, Hides JA, Moseley GL, Hodges PW. Is "ideal" sitting posture real?: Measurement of spinal

381   curves in four sitting postures. *Man Ther*. 2009;14(4):404-408.

382   21.   Bogduk N, Pearcy M, Hadfield G. Anatomy and biomechanics of psoas major. *Clin Biomech (Bristol,

383   Avon)*. 1992;7(2):109-119.

384   22.   Penning L. Psoas muscle and lumbar spine stability: A concept uniting existing controversies. Critical

385   review and hypothesis. *Eur Spine J*. 2000;9(6):577-585.

386   23.   Kim J, Yang SJ, Kim H, Kim Y, Park JB, Dubose C LT. Effect of shear force on intervertebral disc

387   (IVD) degeneration : An In vivo rat study. *Ann Biomed Eng*. 2012;40(9):1996-2004.

388   24.   Xia DD, Lin SL, Wang XY, Wang YL, Xu HM, Zhou F TJ. Effects of shear force on intervertebral

389   disc : an in vivo rabbit study. *Eur Spine J*. 2015;24:1711-1719.

390   25.   Stokes IAF, Iatridis JC. Mechanical conditions that accelerate intervertebral disc degeneration: Overload

391   versus immobilization. *Spine*. 2004;29(23):2724-2732.

392   26.   Videman T, Battié MC, Gibbons LE, Maravilla K, Manninen H, Kaprio J. Associations between back

393   pain history and lumbar MRI findings. *Spine*. 2003;28(6):582-588.

394   27.   Schenkman M, Rugo de Cartaya V. Kinesiology of the shoulder complex. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*.

395   1987;8(9):438-450.

396   28.   McClure PW, Michener LA, Sennett BJ, Karduna AR. Direct 3-dimensional measurement of scapular

397   kinematics during dynamic movements in vivo. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 2001;10(3):269-277.

398   29.   Borstad JD, Ludewig PM. The effect of long versus short pectoralis minor resting length on scapular

399   kinematics in healthy individuals. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2005;35(4):227-238.

400   30.   Kuechle DK, Newman SR, Itoi E, Morrey BF. Kuechle--Shoulder muscle moment arms during

401   horizontal flexion and elevation. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 1997;6(5):429-439.

402

403

Figure 1. Measurement cites of shear elastic modulus for psoas major and iliacus muscles

405

406   The measurement locations of the psoas major (PM) and iliacus (IL) are shown. First, the femoral artery

407   was identified through ultrasonic imaging as 3 to 5 cm below the anterior superior iliac spine (ASIS) and

408   distal of the inguinal ligament (InL). These muscles were then identified lateral to the femoral artery. At

409   this location, the probe was set parallel to the muscle fiber, and the elastic moduli were measured.

410

Figure 2A. Measurement position for the shear elastic modulus of the teres major and latissimus dorsi

412

The measurement position for the teres major and latissimus dorsi is shown in Figure 2A. The subject sat

with a shoulder flexed at 90 degrees, rotated at 0 degrees, and the elbow flexed at 90 degrees.

415

Figure 2B. Measurement position for the shear elastic modulus of the pectoralis major and minor shoulder

muscles

The position used during the measurement of the pectoralis major and minor is shown in Figure 2B. The

position was the shoulder abducted at 90 degrees, rotated at 0 degrees, and with the elbow flexed at 90

degrees.

423

Figure 2C. Measurement sites of shear elastic modulus for pectoralis major clavicular part, sternocostal part, and pectoralis minor muscles

The measurement locations of the pectoralis major clavicular (PMaC), sterncostal (PMaS), and pectoralis minor (PMi) are shown in Figure 2C. The pectoralis major clavicular part was measured at the midpoint between the greater tubercle (GT) and acromioclavicular joint (ACJ), the pectoralis minor (PMi) was measured at the midpoint between the coracoid process (CP) and fourth sternocostal joint (4th SCJ), and the sterncostal (PMaS) was measured at the midpoint between the greater tubercle and the fourth sternocostal joint.

433

Figure 3. Measurement method of lumbar and hip joint angle during a DK

435

The measurement method of the lumbar and hip joint angle is shown in Figure 3. The lumbar angle (θ_1)

was defined as the angle created by two lines, one produced by the markers at T10 and L3, and the other

produced by the markers at L3 and S2. The hip angle (θ_2) was defined as the angle made by two lines, one

produced by the iliac crest (IC) and greater trochanter (GT), and the other produced by the GT and lateral

epicondyle of the femur (LEF).

441

442   **Table 1. Characteristics of the participants**

443

	LBP group (n = 11)	Control group (n = 21)	*P* value
age, y	21.1 (1.5)	20.6 (1.5)	.558
height, cm	176.4 (5.7)	173.2 (5.9)	.208
body mass, kg	68.3 (8.0)	65.9 (7.2)	.238
training years, y	12.6 (3.5)	12.1 (3.4)	.785

444   Abbreviations: LBP, low back pain.

445

446

447   **Table 2. Shear elastic modulus of each muscle**

448

Shear elastic modulus, kPa				
Muscles	**LBP group (n = 11)**	**Control group (n = 21)**	**Effect size (*r*)**	***P* value**
psoas major	17.9 (4.3)	13.1 (2.6)	0.516	.003
iliacus	14.2 (4.7)	11.6 (2.5)	0.228	.208
teres major	9.4 (3.6)	8.5 (1.7)	0.140	.434
latissimus dorsi	8.8 (2.6)	8.1 (1.6)	0.088	.639
pectoralis major clavicular part	10.3 (3.8)	10.4 (3.4)	0.025	.907
pectoralis major sterncostal part	8.5 (3.7)	8.3 (2.8)	0.025	.907
pectoralis minor	5.4 (2.1)	7.6 (3.5)	0.389	.027

449   Abbreviations: LBP, low back pain.

450

451 **Table 3. Angle of each joint**

452

Joint angle, deg				
	LBP group (n = 11)	**Control group (n = 21)**	**Effect size (*r*)**	***P* value**
Lumbar extension during DK	22.1 (4.0)	15.3 (2.6)	0.701	<.001
Hip extension during DK	9.5 (4.3)	8.7 (5.3)	0.070	.690
Passive shoulder flexion	199.5 (11.4)	202.9 (8.8)	0.107	.546
Passive hip extension	23.6 (7.4)	29.3 (4.9)	0.364	.040

453 Abbreviations: DK, dolphin kick; LBP, low back pain.

454 **Table 4. Correlation Between Swimming Performance and Lumbar Extension or Muscle Elastic**

455 **Modulus**

Variables	Correlation coefficient		Correlation coefficient	
	Best records of 50m crawl	*P* value	15m DK time	*P* value
Lumbar extension angle	.088	.630	.101	.583
Psoas major	-.033	.859	.037	.839
Iliacus	-.009	.962	.158	.387
Teres major	.175	.337	.031	.865
Latissimus dorsi	.219	.229	.229	.207
Pectoralis major clavicular part	-.084	.647	-.060	.745
Pectoralis major sterncostal part	.041	.826	-.012	.949
Pectoralis minor	.129	.483	.063	.734

456 Abbreviations: DK, dolphin kick.