

1

1 **The impact of spinal surgery on the locomotive**
2 **syndrome in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis in**
3 **CDL stage 3: a retrospective study**

4

5 Ichiro Nakae¹, Ryuki Hashida^{1,2}, Ryota Otsubo², Sohei
6 Iwanaga^{1,2}, Hiroo Matsuse^{1,2}, Kimiaki Yokosuka¹,
7 Tatsuhiro Yoshida¹, Takuma Fudo¹, Shinji Morito¹,
8 Takahiro Shimazaki¹, Kei Yamada¹, Kimiaki Sato¹, Naoto
9 Shiba^{1,2}, Koji Hiraoka¹

10

11 ¹Department of Orthopaedics, Kurume University, 67
12 Asahi-machi, Kurume, Fukuoka, 830-0011, Japan

13 ²Division of Rehabilitation, Kurume University Hospital, 67
14 Asahi-machi, Kurume, Fukuoka, 830-0011, Japan

15 ³Biostatistics Center, Kurume University, 67 Asahi-machi,
16 Kurume, Fukuoka, 830-0011, Japan

17 ⁴Department of Nursing Kurume University Hospital, 67
18 Asahi-machi, Kurume, Fukuoka, 830-0011, Japan

19

20 **Corresponding author**

21 Ryuki Hashida, M.D., Ph.D.

22 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2459-9949>

23 Department of Orthopaedic, Kurume University School of
24 Medicine, Kurume, Japan

25 67 Asahi-machi, Kurume 830-0011, Japan

26 Tel: +81-942-31-7568 Fax: +81-942-35-0709

27 E-mail: hashida_ryuuki@med.kurume-u.ac.jp

28

29 Word count: 2,904 words

30

31 **Abstract**

32 **Objectives:**

33 Locomotive syndrome (LS) is characterized by reduced
34 mobility. Clinical decision limit (CDL) stage 3 in LS
35 indicates physical frailty. Lumbar spinal canal stenosis
36 (LSS) is one cause of LS, for which lumbar surgery is
37 considered to improve the CDL stage. This study aimed to
38 investigate the efficacy of lumbar surgery and independent
39 factors for improving CDL stage in patients with LSS.

40 **Design:** A retrospective study

41 **Setting:** The study was conducted at the Department of
42 Orthopaedic Surgery at University Hospital.

43 **Participants:** A total of 157 patients aged ≥ 65 years with
44 LSS underwent lumbar surgery.

45 **Interventions:** The 25-Question Geriatric Locomotive
46 Function scale (GLFS-25) was used to test for LS, and the
47 timed up and go test (TUG) was used to evaluate
48 functional ability. Lower limb pain was evaluated using a

49 visual analog scale. Patients with at least one
50 improvement in CDL stage following lumbar surgery were
51 included in the improvement group. Differences in
52 lower-limb pain intensity between the groups were
53 evaluated using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test.

54 The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to
55 determine correlations between Δ lower limb pain and Δ
56 GLFS-25. Logistic regression analysis was used to
57 identify factors associated with improvement in LS.

58

59 **Results:** The proportion of patients with improved CDL
60 stage was 45.1% (improvement/non-improvement: 32/39).
61 Δ Lower limb pain was significantly reduced in the
62 improvement group compared to that in the
63 non-improvement group (51.0 [36.3-71.0] vs 40.0
64 [4.0-53.5]; $p = 0.0107$). Δ GLFS-25 significantly correlated
65 with Δ lower-limb pain ($r = 0.3774$, $p = 0.0031$). In a multiple
66 logistic regression analysis, TUG and age were
67 significantly associated with improvement in LS (odds

68 ratio, 1.22; 95% confidence interval: 1.07-1.47).

69 **Conclusions:** The lumbar surgery effectively improved
70 the CDL stage in patients with LSS. In addition, TUG was
71 an independent factor associated with improvement in the
72 CDL.

73

74 **Keywords:** lumbar spinal canal stenosis, locomotive
75 syndrome, low back pain, visual analog scale

76

77

78

79 **Strengths and limitations of the study:**

80 • The Japanese Orthopaedic Association defines locomotive
81 syndrome as patients with reduced motor function. We reported
82 the effect of surgical treatment on clinical decision limit 3 (CDL3),
83 which corresponds to physical frailty.

84 • We investigated improvement factors for locomotive syndrome
85 CDL stage 3 in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis in a
86 retrospective study.

87 • Seventy-one patients who underwent surgical treatment were
88 included in the study.

89 • Factors associated with improvement in locomotive syndrome
90 were analyzed using multivariate logistic analysis and decision
91 tree analysis.

92

95 **1. INTRODUCTION**

96 The number of older adults who require nursing care is
97 increasing in Japan, along with the aging of a large
98 proportion of the population. Musculoskeletal disorders
99 resulting from fractures and falls and joint diseases are
100 the most common causes of nursing care and can result
101 in lost mobility. [1] In 2007, the Japanese Orthopaedic
102 Association (JOA) defined locomotive syndrome (LS) as a
103 condition in which mobility is reduced due to
104 musculoskeletal disorders. [2] Later, in 2015, they
105 established a scale to assess the severity of LS called
106 clinical decision limit (CDL), which included stages 1 and
107 2. [2] CDL stage 1 is defined as a state in which a decline
108 in mobility has begun but may be improved through
109 exercise habits and dietary correction. In contrast,
110 patients in CDL stage 2 show a progressive decline in
111 mobility. However, this classification was met with some
112 uncertainty, as disease statuses encompassed by CDL

113 stage 2 were broad, ranging from mild to severe.

114 Therefore, JOA defined the additional CDL stage 3 in

115 2020 for early detection and therapeutic intervention in

116 severe LS. [3] Patients in CDL stage 3 experience limited

117 social participation owing to a significant loss of mobility.

118 As some patients experience additional complications

119 from orthopedic diseases and require surgery, and with

120 the establishment of CDL stage 3, it is necessary to

121 evaluate the extent to which LS may be improved with

122 surgery.

123 The relationship between lumbar spinal canal stenosis

124 (LSS) and LS has recently attracted much attention in

125 spinal diseases. [4] LSS is a disease in which nerves are

126 compressed due to intervertebral discs and joint

127 degeneration, and thickening of the ligamentous tissue. In

128 one Japanese cohort study, the prevalence of LSS was

129 reported to be very high, affecting approximately 10% of

130 adults. [5] Patients with LSS have reduced lower extremity

131 function due to pain, numbness, and intermittent

132 claudication, [6] which increases the risk of falling [7] and
133 significantly impacts daily life. Lumbar spine surgeries
134 such as decompression and spinal fusion can relieve
135 symptoms and improve activities of daily living (ADL) in
136 patients with LSS.

137

138 The timed up and go test (TUG) is an objective
139 measure of functional disability that can be used to
140 evaluate various activities such as standing, accelerating,
141 walking, decelerating, and turning, which are often limited
142 in patients with lumbar degenerative diseases. [8] TUG
143 can be easily conducted with a chair and a 3-meter
144 walking space and does not require special equipment. [9]
145 A previous study used TUG to measure motor impairment
146 in patients with lumbar degenerative diseases, with <11.5
147 seconds classified as no impairment, 11.5 to 13.4 seconds
148 as mild impairment, 13.4 to 18.4 seconds as moderate
149 impairment, and >18.4 seconds as severe impairment. [8]
150 TUG is a test that is not easily affected by the patient's

151 mental state, lifestyle, or physique [10, 11]] and is highly
152 related to daily life functions such as lower limb muscle
153 strength, sense of balance, walking ability, and ease of
154 falling. Furthermore, TUG is used to evaluate motor
155 function in a wide range of subjects, from healthy patients
156 to those with lumbar degenerative diseases. [11, 12] Thus,
157 the TUG test is useful for evaluating preoperative physical
158 function in patients with LS.

159

160 It has been reported that surgical treatment of knee joint
161 [13] and hip joint disease [3] can improve the condition of
162 patients in CDL Stage 3, but there have been few reports
163 on lumbar degenerative diseases. Therefore, this study
164 aimed to investigate the efficacy of lumbar spinal surgery
165 for patients with LSS in CDL stage 3 and the preoperative
166 factors associated with the improvement of the CDL
167 stage.

168

169

170 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

171 **2.1. Patient and Public Involvement**

172 This retrospective study was conducted between May
173 2020 and April 2021 at the Department of Orthopaedic
174 Surgery at University Hospital, with 157 patients aged \geq
175 65 years with lumbar spinal stenosis who underwent
176 lumbar spinal surgery without serious complications (such
177 as ischemic heart disease or stroke). Inclusion and
178 exclusion criteria are shown in Figure 1. Among the 157
179 patients involved in this study, patients in CDL stages 0, 1,
180 and 2 were excluded (n=56). Patients with missing data
181 were excluded (n=30). Finally, patients in CDL stage 3
182 were included in this study (n=71).

183 This study was conducted following the Declaration of
184 Helsinki and was approved by the Ethics Committee of the
185 University. Consent to participate in the study was
186 obtained using an opt-out approach.

187

188 **2.2. Recorded data**

189 A physical therapist performed physical function tests,
190 and the patients completed the questionnaire. Age, sex,
191 BMI, TUG, trunk and limb skeletal muscle mass, grip
192 strength, life-space assessment (LSA), prognostic
193 nutritional index (PNI), low back pain, lower limb pain, and
194 lower limb numbness were adopted as survey items for
195 preoperative factors related to the improvement of the LS.
196 Furthermore, the 25-Question Geriatric Locomotive
197 Function scale (GLFS-25) and JOA Back Pain Evaluation
198 Questionnaire (JOABPEQ) were used to evaluate the
199 patient before and after lumbar spinal surgery.

200

201 **2.3. Timed Up and Go test (TUG)**

202 TUG was conducted using a stopwatch to measure the
203 time elapsed from when the subject's body moved to the
204 time they turned at a cone 3 m away and returned to
205 sitting on the chair. A chair with a height of 42.0 cm and
206 elbow rest were used. The subject was given the following
207 instruction: "please get up from the chair, walk as fast as

12

208 possible, turn at the cone 3 m ahead, and sit on the chair

209 again. You may turn in either direction.”

210

211 **2.4. Trunk and limb skeletal muscle mass**

212 Skeletal muscle mass was assessed using the

213 bioelectrical impedance method (Inbody720, Inbody Co.,

214 Ltd., Seoul, Korea). All patients were assessed on the day

215 of admission. The participants grasped the handle of the

216 analyzer with embedded electrodes and stood on a

217 platform with the soles of their feet in contact with the

218 electrodes (two electrodes each were placed on the feet

219 and hands).

220

221 **2.5. Hand grip strength**

222 Grip strength was measured using a Smedley-type grip

223 strength meter (Takei model T.K.K. 5101, Takei Kiki Kogyo,

224 Akiha-ku Niigata, Japan). After hearing the signal, the

225 participants were instructed to grip the strength meter as

226 firmly as possible. They were instructed to “please hold

227 the grip strength meter for 3 s.” The right side was
228 measured twice, and the maximum value was adopted.

229

230 **2.6. Life-Space Assessment (LSA)**

231 The LSA was originally developed as a simple
232 questionnaire to assess physical activity in the older
233 adults and is a clinically useful index that has been utilized
234 in clinical practice and research. [14] A total score is 120,
235 with higher scores indicating higher activity levels.

236 **2.7. Prognostic nutritional index (PNI)**

237 The PNI scale reflects a patient’s inflammatory and
238 nutritional status and is associated with postoperative
239 complications in spinal disease. [15, 16]

240

241 **2.8. Evaluation of pain**

242 Low back pain, lower limb pain, and lower limb
243 numbness were evaluated using a visual analog scale
244 (VAS), with a score of 100 indicating extreme pain and 0
245 indicating no pain.

14

246

247 **2.9. GLFS-25**

248 The GLFS-25 test focuses on physical pain and ADL in
249 the preceding month. For this study, each item was scored
250 from "no disability" (0 points) to "severe disability" (4
251 points), and the total score was used to evaluate the CDL
252 stage of the LS patient. Scores were classified as follows:
253 stage 1, ≥ 7 points to <16 points; stage 2, ≥ 16 points to
254 <24 points; and stage 3, ≥ 24 points. [17]

255

256 **2.10. JOABPEQ**

257 The Japan Orthopedics Association developed the
258 JOABPEQ, a QOL assessment specific to lumbar spine
259 disease that uses patient-oriented and self-reported
260 functional status. The JOABPEQ is a disease-specific tool
261 consisting of 25 items corresponding to five subscales:
262 low back pain, lumbar spine function, walking ability,
263 social function, and mental health. The score for each

264 subscale ranges from 0-100, with higher scores indicating
265 better conditions. [18]

266 **2.11. Statistical analysis**

267 All statistical analyses were performed using JMP
268 version 15.0 statistical software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary,
269 NC, USA). The GLFS-25 was used to evaluate the CDL
270 stage. Patients with preoperative CDL stage 3 were
271 included in the study, and those with at least one
272 improvement in the CDL stage after lumbar spinal surgery
273 were included in the improvement group. [19]

274 The Wilcoxon rank-sum test was used to compare the
275 improved and non-improved groups. Logistic regression
276 and decision tree analyses were used to investigate the
277 preoperative factors associated with improvement in LS.
278 The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to
279 determine correlations between Δ lower limb pain, Δ lower
280 limb numbness, Δ low back pain, and Δ GLFS-25. In all
281 cases, statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. All data
282 are expressed as the median (interquartile range) and

283 range.

284

285 3. RESULTS

286

287 Characteristics of Patients with LSS

288 Of the 157 participants who met the eligibility criteria for

289 this study, 71 patients' data were analyzed after applying

290 the exclusion criteria. Patient characteristics are shown in

291 Table 1.

292

293 Table 1: The characteristic of the patients

	Clinical Decision Limits stge3 (N=71)	
	Median	Range (min-mx)
Age (years)	77	65-91
Sex (Male/Female)	27/44	
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.6	15.4-32.1
Limb skeletal muscle mass (kg)	13.9	8.9-23.3
Trunk skeletal muscle mass (kg)	16.6	11.7-23.7
Hand grip strength (kg)	21.4	8.1-44
TUG (s)	11.5	5.4-38.4
LSA	48	0-120
PNI	51.9	36.2-64.9
Low back pain (VAS)	63	0-100
Lower limb pain (VAS)	68	0-100
Lower limb numbness	60	0-100

(VAS)		
GLFS-25	44	24-87

294 Abbreviation: BMI; Body Mass Index, TUG; Timed up and
295 go test,

296 LSA; Life space assessment, PNI; Prognostic nutritional
297 index

298 VAS; Visual Analog Scale, GLFS-25; the 25-Question
299 Geriatric Locomotive Function Scale

300 *: means statistically significant

301

302 **Surgical Results of patients with LSS**

303 Figure 2 shows the breakdown of preoperative and
304 postoperative GLFS-25 scores and CDL stages at three
305 months postoperatively. Lumbar spinal surgery improved
306 the mean GFLS-25 score from 48.8 preoperatively to 30
307 postoperatively (Fig. 2A). The rates of CDL stages at
308 three months postoperatively were as follows: CDL stages
309 0, 1, 2, and 3 were 7%, 18.3%, 19.7%, and 55%,
310 respectively. In total, the proportion of patients with
311 improved CDL stage was 45.1% (32/71) (Fig. 2B).

312

313 **Comparison of preoperative status between two**

314 **groups**

315 Patients in the improvement group were significantly
316 younger than those in the non-improvement group. In
317 addition, the LSA score was significantly higher in the
318 improvement group than in the non-improvement group
319 (Table 2). The TUG times in the improvement group were
320 significantly shorter than that in the non-improvement
321 group. The two groups had no significant differences in
322 limb skeletal muscle, trunk skeletal muscle, PNI, or VAS
323 scores.

324

325 Table 2: Comparison between two groups

	Improvement group (N=32)		Non-improvement group (N=39)		P
	Median	Range (min-max)	Median	Range (min-max)	
Age	75	65-81	78	67-91	0.008
Sex (Male/Female)	14/18		13/26		0.4
BMI (kg/m ²)	22.8	15.4-32.1	24.2	17.7-31.2	0.3
Limb skeletal	14.9	9.8-23.3	13.9	8.9-21.9	0.3

muscle mass (kg)					
Trunk skeletal muscle mass (kg)	16.8	12.4-23.3	16.5	11.7-23.7	0.3
Hand grip strength (kg)	23.3	12.8-44	20.6	8.1-43	0.1
TUG (s)	9.6	5.4-21.5	14.5	6.4-38.4	0.0002
LSA	54	4.5-120	37.5	0-110	0.02
PNI	52.4	36.9-64.9	51.2	36.2-60.5	0.2
Low back pain (VAS)	51	8-100	67	0-100	0.2
Lower limb pain (VAS)	65	18-100	69.5	0-100	0.8
Lower limb numbness (VAS)	51	0-100	65.5	0-100	0.4
GLFS-25	40	24-65	58	25-87	0.002

326 Abbreviation: BMI; Body Mass Index, TUG; Timed
 327 up and go test, LSA; Life space assessment, PNI;
 328 Prognostic nutritional index, VAS; Visual Analog
 329 Scale, GLFS-25; the 25-Question Geriatric
 330 Locomotive Function Scale

331 *: means statistically significant

332

333 With the exception of pain and lumbar function in the
 334 non-improvement group, lumbar spinal surgery improved
 335 the JOABPEQ scores in both groups. Similarly, lumbar

336 spinal surgery improved the VAS scores for low back pain,
337 lower limb pain, and lower limb numbness in both groups
338 (Supplementary table).

339

340 **Cox regression analysis for improvements in LS**

341 Multivariate regression analysis was performed with the
342 following variables related to improvements: age, sex,
343 BMI, LSA, PNI, handgrip strength, and TUG.

344 The TUG and age were significantly associated with
345 improvement in LS ($p = 0.0017$ and $p = 0.031$) (Table 3).

346 LSA, BMI, PNI, and handgrip strength were not
347 significantly associated with improvements in LS ($p = 0.38$,
348 $p = 0.45$, $p = 0.61$, $p = 0.65$).

349

350 Table 3: Multivariate analysis for Improvement of
351 locomotive syndrome

Factors	Multivariate analysis for Improvement of locomotive syndrome (95% Confidence interval, P-value)
TUG	1.22 (1.07-1.47, 0.0017)
Age	1.15 (1.01-1.32, 0.031)

LSA	1.01 (0.99-1.04, 0.38)
BMI	1.07 (0.90-1.28, 0.45)
PNI	1.04 (0.90-1.21, 0.61)
Hand Grip strength	1.02 (0.94-1.12, 0.65)

352

353 Abbreviation: TUG; Timed up and go test, LSA; Life space
354 assessment, BMI; Body Mass Index, PNI; Prognostic
355 nutritional index,

356 *: means statistically significant

357

358 **Decision-tree algorithm for improvement of LS**

359 The decision-tree algorithm was performed with

360 variables related to improvements, including age, sex,

361 BMI, LSA, PNI, handgrip strength, and TUG. The TUG

362 test was selected as the first divergence variable in the

363 decision tree analysis and LSA as the second divergence

364 variable. Among patients with TUG < 12.4, CDL stage 3

365 was improved in 66.7%, and LSA was the second

366 divergence variable in patients with TUG ≥ 12.4. Patients

367 with TUG ≥ 12.4 who had LSA ≥ 40 showed improvement

368 from CDL stage 3 by 46.2%. Among patients with reduced

369 physical function, CDL stage 3 was improved upon in

370 46.2%, with an LSA score of 40 or higher (Fig. 3).

371

372 **Relationship between breakdown of CDL stage and**

373 **preoperative TUG three months postoperatively**

374 Figure 4 shows the relationship between the breakdown

375 of the CDL stage and preoperative TUG 3 months

376 following lumbar spinal surgery. In patients with CDL

377 stage 3 LS, the preoperative TUG time 3 months following

378 the procedure was significantly longer than that for those

379 in CDL stages 0 and 1 (Fig. 4). The results showed that

380 patients who had low preoperative TUG scores improved

381 to either CLD stage 0 or 1 from stage 3 following the

382 surgical procedure.

383

384 **Relationship between Δ GFLS-25 and Δ pain scales**

385 Δ GLFS-25 was significantly positively correlated with Δ

386 lower limb pain, Δ lower limb numbness, and Δ low back

387 pain (Table 4).

388

389 Table 4: The relationship between the delta 25-Question
390 Geriatric Locomotive Function Scale and each delta pain
391 scale.

	Δ Lower limb pain	Δ Lower limb numbness	Δ Low back pain	Δ GLFS-25
Δ Lower limb pain	1.0000			
Δ Lower limb numbness	0.5684*	1.0000		
Δ Low back pain	0.4479*	0.3315*	1.0000	
Δ GLFS-25	0.3615*	0.3723*	0.4103*	1.0000

392 Abbreviation: GLFS-25; the 25-Question Geriatric Locomotive
393 Function Scale

394 The numbers in the table indicate correlation coefficient

395

396 **Comparison of Δ GLFS-25 and Δ pain scales between**
397 **groups**

398 Lower limb pain and GFLS-25 scores were significantly

399 better in the improvement group than in the

400 non-improvement group ($p = 0.0107$, $p = 0.002$). Low back

401 pain and lower limb numbness in the improvement group

402 were not significantly higher than those in the

403 non-improvement group ($p = 0.0953$, $p = 0.1041$) (Fig. 5).

404

405 **4. DISCUSSION**

406 In this study, the rate of CDL stage improvement achieved
407 by lumbar spinal surgery was 45.1% (32/71) in patients
408 with CDL stage 3. The VAS score for lower extremity pain
409 was significantly improved in the group with an improved
410 CDL stage. Moreover, the Δ GLFS-25 was significantly
411 correlated with the Δ VAS of all pain scales. Thus, the
412 improvements to LS might have been associated with a
413 reduction in pain. The reduction in pain achieved by
414 lumbar spinal surgery improved the ADL and CDL stages.
415 Furthermore, the preoperative TUG test was the most
416 relevant factor for the postoperative results. Preoperative
417 evaluation of physical function is useful for determining
418 surgical indications.

419

420 The LS is caused by various orthopedic diseases,
421 resulting in reduced quality of life and shortened
422 expectancy of healthy life. [2] Fujita et al. reported that
423 LSS is a potential risk factor for LS [20] and that lumbar

424 spinal surgery effectively reduces the LS risk. [21] The
425 change in the GLFS25 score in this study was comparable
426 to that reported in previous studies. [21-23] However, in
427 this study, lumbar spinal surgery significantly improved not
428 only the GLFS25 score, but also the VAS score for low
429 back pain and lower limb pain (Supplementary data).
430 Therefore, lumbar spinal surgery may ameliorate LS by
431 improving pain and numbness and enhancing the quality
432 of life in patients with LSS. Moreover, the improvement
433 rate of CDL stage via lumbar spinal surgery in this study
434 was 45.1% (32/71). Among the patients who received the
435 surgery, 7% (5/71) had outgrowth LS. Additionally, it was
436 found that 7% of the patients who needed care due to
437 lumbar spinal surgery no longer had LS.

438

439 Moderate physical activity is important for maintaining and
440 improving life functions and preventing disease
441 progression, disability, and frailty in older adults. [24-26] In
442 addition, previous studies have reported that LSA is

443 significantly correlated with ADL in community-dwelling
444 older individuals. [14, 27] A cohort study of relatively
445 healthy community-dwelling older people reported LSA
446 scores of 62.9 ± 24.7 [14] or 64.1 ± 24.7 . [27] Therefore, it
447 can be inferred that patients with LSS in this study were
448 more physically inactive as they had lower LSA scores
449 (median score of 48) than those in previous studies. In the
450 decision tree analysis, even in patients with reduced
451 physical function (TUG ≥ 12.4 seconds), CDL stage 3 was
452 improved with a 50% probability if the LSA was 40 or
453 higher. Therefore, increasing preoperative physical
454 activity may have affected the postoperative outcomes.

455

456 This study aimed to identify preoperative factors
457 associated with the improvement of CDL stage 3 in
458 patients with LSS. In the decision tree analysis, the
459 preoperative factor most associated with LS improvement
460 was the TUG test score. In this study, five of 71 patients
461 (7%) got rid of their LS 3 months after lumbar spinal

462 surgery (Figure 2). The median TUG time of these
463 patients was 6.2 seconds, and their preoperative physical
464 function was clearly higher than that before the procedure
465 (Figure 4). In this study, the Δ VAS score for low back pain
466 in the improvement group tended to be higher than that in
467 the non-improvement group. Moreover, the Δ VAS score
468 for lower-limb pain in the improvement group was
469 significantly higher than that in the non-improvement
470 group. The Δ VAS score for low back and lower limb pain
471 was correlated with the Δ GLFS-25 score (Table 4), and
472 the total GLFS-25 score was associated with pain in the
473 patients with LSS. [28] Thus, improving low back and
474 lower limb pain through lumbar spinal surgery might
475 improve GLFS-25 scores. These patients may have been
476 identified as being in CDL stage 3 because their ADL was
477 severely limited due to pain, although their physical
478 function was not impaired. Improved low back and lower
479 limb pain due to lumbar spinal surgery may have
480 dramatically improved ADL and allowed patients to break

481 free from LS. However, the results of the
482 non-improvement group suggested that it was challenging
483 to improve LS by lumbar spinal surgery in patients who
484 had experienced a significant preoperative decline in
485 physical function prior to the surgery. In summary, older
486 patients with CDL stage 3 LSS without any preoperative
487 decline in physical function may have a good
488 postoperative course in which they no longer have LS;
489 such patients should be encouraged to undergo lumbar
490 spinal surgery earlier. It has been suggested that
491 preoperative physical function assessment is important in
492 determining the indication for lumbar spinal surgery and
493 that TUG is an important factor among them.

494

495 This study had some limitations. First, it was a
496 single-center study. Second, owing to the small sample
497 size, we were unable to divide the patients into
498 decompression and lumbar fusion groups. Third, we
499 assessed LS using only the GLFS-25; however, this is

500 difficult to assess by 2 step and stand-up tests in patients
501 with the severe LS. Kato et al. showed the use of the
502 GLFS-25 assessment to be appropriate for patients with
503 several LS and musculoskeletal diseases requiring
504 surgery. [29]

505 This study showed that improvement in the low back and
506 lower limb pain through lumbar spinal surgery might be
507 beneficial for improving CDL stage 3. TUG score was an
508 independent factor associated with the improvement of
509 CDL stage 3 in patients with lumbar spinal canal stenosis.

510

511 **Acknowledgments:** None

512 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from
513 any funding agency in the public, commercial or
514 not-for-profit sectors

515 **Competing interests:** None

516 **Author contributions:** IN, RH, participated in study
517 conception and design, interpretation of data, and drafting
518 of the manuscript. SI, RO, TF, SM performed data
519 acquisition. KY, TY, TS, KY, KH, KS, HM, NS participated
520 in interpretation of data and critical revision.

521

522 **Reporting statement:**

523 **Patient consent form:** Consent to participate in the study

524 was obtained using an opt-out approach. No identifying

525 information of the patients has been shared.

526 **Data sharing statement:**

527 Hashida, Ryuki, 2022, "The impact of spinal surgery on

528 the locomotive syndrome in patients with lumbar spinal

529 stenosis", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/QPA7XO>, Harvard

530 Dataverse, DRAFT VERSION

531 **Research Ethics Approval: Human Participants**

532 This study was conducted in accordance with the Herkinsi

533 Declaration and was approved by the Ethics Committee of

534 Kurume University (Approval ID:22025)

535 **References:**

- 536 1 Niwa H, Ojima T, Watanabe Y et al. Association between the
537 25-question Geriatric Locomotive Function Scale score and the
538 incidence of certified need of care in the long-term care insurance
539 system: the TOEI study. *J Orthop Sci* 2021 Jul;26:672–7.
- 540 2 Nakamura K, Ogata T. Locomotive syndrome: definition and
541 management. *Clin Rev Bone Miner Metab* 2016;14:56–67.
- 542 3 Miyazaki S, Tsuruta K, Yoshinaga S et al. Effect of total hip
543 arthroplasty on improving locomotive syndrome in hip disease
544 patients: A prospective cohort study focused on total clinical decision
545 limits stage 3. *J Orthop Sci* 2022 Mar;27:408–13.
- 546 4 Eklund A, Blaschke E. Relationship between changed
547 alveolar-capillary permeability and angiotensin converting enzyme
548 activity in serum in sarcoidosis. *Thorax* 1986 Aug;41:629–34.
- 549 5 Ishimoto Y, Yoshimura N, Muraki S et al. Prevalence of
550 symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis and its association with physical
551 performance in a population-based cohort in Japan: the Wakayama
552 Spine Study. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2012 Oct;20:1103–8.
- 553 6 Sontheimer DL. Peripheral vascular disease: diagnosis and

- 554 treatment. *Am Fam Physician* 2006 Jun 1;73:1971–6.
- 555 7 Lee BH, Kim TH, Park MS et al. Comparison of effects of
556 nonoperative treatment and decompression surgery on risk of patients
557 with lumbar spinal stenosis falling: evaluation with functional mobility
558 tests. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2014 Jul 2;96:e110.
- 559 8 Gautschi OP, Smoll NR, Corniola MV et al. Validity and
560 reliability of a measurement of objective functional impairment in
561 lumbar degenerative disc disease: the timed up and go (TUG) test.
562 *Neurosurgery* 2016 Aug;79:270–8.
- 563 9 Lin SI, Lin RM. Disability and walking capacity in patients
564 with lumbar spinal stenosis: association with sensorimotor function,
565 balance, and functional performance. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2005
566 Apr;35:220–6.
- 567 10 Joswig H, Stienen MN, Smoll NR et al. Effects of smoking on
568 subjective and objective measures of pain intensity, functional
569 impairment, and health-related quality of life in lumbar degenerative
570 disk disease. *World Neurosurg* 2017 Mar;99:6–13.
- 571 11 Stienen MN, Joswig H, Smoll NR et al. Influence of body
572 mass index on subjective and objective measures of pain, functional

573 impairment, and health-related quality of life in lumbar degenerative

574 disc disease. *World Neurosurg* 2016 Dec;96:570–577.e1.

575 12 Podsiadlo D, Richardson S. The timed “UP & Go”: a test of

576 basic functional mobility for frail elderly persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc*

577 1991 Feb;39:142–8.

578 13 Miyazaki S, Yoshinaga S, Tsuruta K et al. Total knee

579 arthroplasty improved locomotive syndrome in knee osteoarthritis

580 patients: A prospective cohort study focused on total clinical decision

581 limits Stage 3. *BioMed Res Int* 2021;2021:3919989.

582 14 Baker PS, Bodner EV, Allman RM. Measuring life-space

583 mobility in community-dwelling older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003

584 Nov;51:1610–4.

585 15 Ushirozako H, Hasegawa T, Yamato Y et al. Does

586 preoperative prognostic nutrition index predict surgical site infection

587 after spine surgery? *Eur Spine J* 2021 Jun;30:1765–73.

588 16 Acarbaş A. A novel prognostic marker in patients undergoing

589 spinal surgery: prognostic nutritional index. *J Neurol Surg A Cent Eur*

590 *Neurosurg* 2019 Nov;80:470–4.

591 17 Seichi A, Hoshino Y, Doi T et al. Development of a screening

592 tool for risk of locomotive syndrome in the elderly: the 25-question
593 Geriatric Locomotive Function Scale. *J Orthop Sci* 2012
594 Mar;17:163–72.

595 18 Clinical Outcomes Committee of the Japanese Orthopaedic
596 Association SoEoBP, Cervical M, Subcommittee on Low Back P,
597 Cervical Myelopathy Evaluation of the Clinical Outcome Committe of
598 the Japanese Orthopaedic A, Fukui M, Chiba K, Kawakami M, Kikuchi
599 S, Konno S, Miyamoto M et al. JOA back pain evaluation
600 questionnaire: initial report. *J Orthop Sci*2007 Sep;12(5):443-50.

601 19 Shimizu T, Kato S, Demura S et al. The efficacy of surgical
602 treatment on locomotive syndrome and physical function in patients
603 with lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *J Orthop Sci* 2021 May;26:327–31.

604 20 Fujita N, Sakurai A, Miyamoto A et al. Lumbar spinal canal
605 stenosis leads to locomotive syndrome in elderly patients. *J Orthop Sci*
606 2019 Jan;24:19–23.

607 21 Fujita N, Michikawa T, Miyamoto A et al. Lumbar spinal
608 surgery improves locomotive syndrome in elderly patients with lumbar
609 spinal canal stenosis: A multicenter prospective study. *J Orthop Sci*
610 2020 Mar;25:213–8.

- 611 22 Makino T, Kaito T, Fujiwara H et al. Does fusion status after
612 posterior lumbar interbody fusion affect patient-based QOL outcomes?
613 An evaluation performed using a patient-based outcome measure. *J*
614 *Orthop Sci* 2014 Sep;19:707–12.
- 615 23 Alimi M, Hofstetter CP, Pyo SY et al. Minimally invasive
616 laminectomy for lumbar spinal stenosis in patients with and without
617 preoperative spondylolisthesis: clinical outcome and reoperation rates.
618 *J Neurosurg Spine* 2015 Apr;22:339–52.
- 619 24 Aoyagi Y, Shephard RJ. Habitual physical activity and health
620 in the elderly: the Nakanojo Study. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2010
621 Jul;10;Suppl 1:S236–43.
- 622 25 Peterson MJ, Giuliani C, Morey MC et al. Physical activity as
623 a preventative factor for frailty: the health, aging, and body
624 composition study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2009 Jan;64:61–8.
- 625 26 Boyle PA, Buchman AS, Barnes LL et al. Association
626 between life space and risk of mortality in advanced age. *J Am Geriatr*
627 *Soc* 2010 Oct;58:1925–30.
- 628 27 Peel C, Sawyer Baker P, Roth DL et al. Assessing mobility in
629 older adults: the UAB Study of Aging Life-Space Assessment. *Phys*

36

630 *Ther* 2005 Oct;85:1008–119.

631 28 Chiba D, Tsuda E, Wada K et al. Lumbar spondylosis, lumbar

632 spinal stenosis, knee pain, back muscle strength are associated with

633 the locomotive syndrome: rural population study in Japan. *J Orthop*

634 *Sci* 2016 May;21:366–72.

635 29 Kato S, Kurokawa Y, Kabata T et al. Improvement of

636 locomotive syndrome with surgical treatment in patients with

637 degenerative diseases in the lumbar spine and lower extremities: a

638 prospective cohort study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2020 Aug

639 3;21:515.

640

641

642 **Figure captions:**

643 **Figure 1. Diagram of the inclusion and exclusion**
644 **criteria in this study**

645 Abbreviations: CDL, clinical decision limit; LSS, lumbar
646 spinal canal stenosis

647 **Figure 2.**

648 **Fig. 2-A The mean GLFS-25 scores preoperatively and**
649 **3 months postoperatively**

650 **Fig. 2-B The ratio in patients' CDL stage at 3 months**
651 **postoperatively**

652 Abbreviations: CDL, clinical decision limit; GLFS-25,
653 25-Question Geriatric Locomotive Function Scale

654 **Fig. 3: Decision tree analysis for preoperative factors**
655 **associated with improvement in locomotive**
656 **syndrome**

657 Abbreviations: CDL, clinical decision limit; LSA, life space
658 assessment; TUG, timed up and go test

659 **Fig. 4: The relationship between the breakdown of the**
660 **CDL stage and preoperative TUG at three months**

661 **after lumbar spinal surgery**

662 Abbreviations: CDL, clinical decision limit; TUG, timed up

663 and go test

664 *: means statistically significant

665 **Fig. 5: Comparison between the two groups on Δ**

666 **GLFS-25, Δ Lower limbs pain, Δ Low back pain, and Δ**

667 **Lower limb numbness**

668 Abbreviations: GLFS-25; 25-Question Geriatric

669 Locomotive Function Scale

670 *: means statistically significant

671

Fig. 1: Diagram of the inclusion and exclusion criteria in this study




Fig. 2-A : The mean GLFS-25 scores preoperatively and 3 months postoperatively




Fig. 2-B : The ratio in patients' CDL stage at 3 months postoperatively




Fig. 3 : Decision tree analysis




Fig. 4 : The relationship between the breakdown of the CDL stage and preoperative TUG at three months after lumbar spinal surgery




Fig. 5 : Comparison between the two groups on Δ GLFS-25, Δ Lower limbs pain, Δ Low back pain, and Δ Lower limb numbness

