

1 **Validity of self-screening with the KOJI**
2 **AWARENES™ test for range of motion and strength**
3 **in healthy subjects**

4

5 **Authors**

6 Kenji Hirohata¹, PT, PhD., Hidetaka Furuya², PT, MSc., Sho Mitomo^{1,3}, PT, PhD., Yuki
7 Osaka², PT, MSc., Koji Murofushi^{3,4}, PhD., Kazuyoshi Yagishita¹, MD, PhD.

8

9 **Affiliations**

10 1. Clinical Center for Sports Medicine and Sports Dentistry, Tokyo Medical and
11 Dental University, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

12 2. Department of Rehabilitation, Sonoda Third Hospital/Tokyo Medical Institute
13 Tokyo Spine Center, Adachi-ku, Tokyo Japan.

14 3. Japan Sports Agency, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

15 4. Sports Science Center, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo,
16 Japan.

17 5. Sports Science Center, Tokyo Medical and Dental University (TMDU), Tokyo,
18 Japan.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 *** Corresponding author**

20 Kenji Hirohata

21 Email: hirohata.spt@tmd.ac.jp

22

23 **Short title:** Self-screening with the KOJI AWARENES™ test

24 **Abstract**

25 **Objective:** This study aimed to establish the validity of the KOJI AWARENESSTM

26 sub-components by determining whether there is a connection between the sub-

27 component scores and joint range of motion, muscle strength, and balance.

28 **Methods:** Fifty healthy adults (17 females and 33 males) participated in the study,

29 completing both the KOJI AWARENESSTM and measurements of joint range of

30 motion, muscle strength, and balance. The range of motion of the upper and lower

31 extremities and trunk was measured using either a goniometer or an inclinometer. A

32 handheld dynamometer was used to measure muscle strength. Balance ability was

33 assessed using a modified balance error scoring system. Using the Mann–Whitney U

34 test or Jonckheere–Terpstra test, we compared the KOJI AWARENESSTM score and the

35 corresponding body segments, with a significance level of $P \leq 0.05$.

36 **Results:** Our results indicated that there were associations between external references

37 and many items, but no associations were found for flexion, extension, and rotation of

38 the "neck mobility," extension and external rotation of the "hip mobility," and strength

39 of the "mid-section stability strength" in the KOJI AWARENESSTM.

40 **Conclusion:** Overall, the KOJI AWARENESSTM sub-component scores showed good

41 validity, with the exception of the items related to neck and hip flexibility and trunk

42 muscle strength. Future analyses should include a wider range of age groups, such as
43 middle-aged and elderly individuals.

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Self-checking of physical function and health status can help prevent disease and
47 injury [1-5]. We developed the KOJI AWARENESS™, a self-screening test to assess
48 musculoskeletal functions, including flexibility and muscle strength. The Koji Awareness
49 screening test is fundamentally designed to screen motor function in a holistic and
50 composite manner [6]. Our previous research confirmed that the KOJI AWARENESS™
51 is a valid test that correlates strongly and positively with scores on the Functional
52 Screening Test (FMS), a well-known screening test for motor function [7]. The FMS can
53 be used to predict injury and has been demonstrated to have adequate reliability and
54 validity in systematic reviews [8-10]. Thus, the KOJI AWARENESS™ is indicated to
55 adequately assess an individual's motor function to some extent.

56 The KOJI AWARENESS™ is a self-screening test comprising 11 components,
57 which include neck mobility, shoulder mobility, shoulder blade mobility, thoracic spine
58 mobility, upper extremity stability/strength, hip mobility, hip/spine mobility, upper
59 extremity mobility and stability, midsection stability strength, lower extremity strength,

60 and ankle mobility. Each component is rated on a 2–4 Likert scale. For all components, a
61 higher score indicates a better state of physical function; however, it is unclear which
62 specific physical function (joint range of motion (ROM), muscle strength, etc.) is
63 associated with each component score. The validity of the KOJI AWARENESS™ total
64 score regarding the FMS score has been demonstrated; however, the validity of the sub-
65 components remains unclear [7].

66 Therefore, this study aimed to clarify the validity of the KOJI AWARENESS™ sub-
67 components by confirming the relationship between their scores and joint ROM, muscle
68 strength, and balance. We hypothesized that the KOJI AWARENESS™ sub-components
69 would have some validity in relation to their corresponding ROM, muscle strength, and
70 balance.

71

72 **Methods**

73 **Subjects**

74 Fifty healthy adults (17 females and 33 males) participated in this cross-
75 sectional study. All participants were recruited between June and August 2021.
76 Subjects were included if they met the following criteria: (1) healthy, with no limitations
77 in daily life activities; (2) aged between 20 and 60 years; and (3) no severe injuries in the

78 last 3 months. Subjects were excluded if they met any of the following conditions: (1)
79 severe psychiatric, neurological, or cardiovascular disease; (2) orthopedic disorder; (3)
80 pregnancy; or (4) acute infectious disease. Prior to the measurement, all subjects provided
81 written informed consent to participate in the study. The participants were instructed to
82 stop when they experienced pain or discomfort during any part of the test. This study was
83 approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Tokyo Medical and Dental University
84 (research protocol identification number: M2021-029) and followed the Declaration of
85 Helsinki Ethical Principles (52nd WMA General Assembly, Edinburgh, Scotland;
86 October 2000) for medical research involving human subjects. All 50 participants
87 completed the evaluations described below.

88

89 **Demographic characteristics**

90 Participation in any type of exercise and/or sporting activity was recorded. Age,
91 sex, height, and weight were recorded on the testing day. Body mass index (BMI) was
92 calculated based on each participant's height and weight.

93

94 **Movement screening tests: KOJI AWARENESS™**

95 The KOJI AWARENESS™ is composed of measures of ROM, muscle strength,

96 and balance [7]. Further details on KOJI AWARENESS™ are provided in Appendices 1
97 and 2. The participants used a checklist to self-evaluate the function of each body part.
98 There were 11 designated movements for self-evaluation, and each component had
99 distinct scoring criteria, with a maximum total score of 50 points. Each component of
100 KOJI AWARENESS™ was divided to reflect the corresponding segments of the body so
101 that the subjects could immediately locate the dysfunctional body region. The KOJI
102 AWARENESS™ method was explained to the participants until they understood it.
103 Subsequently, they self-rated the motor function of each item according to the method
104 presented in Appendices 1 and 2. Unilateral and asymmetrical tests were performed on
105 both sides of the body. Up to three attempts were allowed, and the best score was retained.
106 The participants completed the assessment within an average of 20 min. To improve
107 reproducibility, all subjects completed the KOJI AWARENESS™ with guidance from
108 the same athletic trainer (ATC) who was certified by the Board of Certification, Inc.

109

110 **External references**

111 **Range of motion and flexibility**

112 A universal goniometer was used to measure the ROM of each body segment,
113 including the cervical spine (flexion, extension, lateral flexion, and rotation), shoulder

114 joint (abduction), thoracic spine (rotation while sitting), and hip joints (flexion, extension,
115 and rotation). An internal rotation behind-the-back angle test [11] was performed to assess
116 glenohumeral internal rotation flexibility. With the subjects in a standing position, they
117 were instructed to reach the highest point along the midline. The internal rotation behind-
118 the-back angle was defined as the angle between the ulna and the line of gravity. To
119 measure the internal rotation behind-the-back angle, we used a goniometer and measured
120 in 5-degree units. Active spinal flexion and extension mobilities were measured while the
121 subjects were standing. Subjects were asked to flex or extend their spines as far as
122 possible. Measurements were performed in the active end-range position. Spinal flexion
123 and extension mobilities were measured using an inclinometer. The difference in angle
124 between the spinous process of the 1st thoracic and 1st sacral spine was recorded.

125 The straight leg raise (SLR) test was performed [12, 13]. With the subject in the
126 supine position and the opposite leg attached to the table, compensation was minimized.
127 The tester lifted the leg off the table while the knee was extended. The endpoint for
128 straight leg raising was determined by one or more of three criteria: (1) the knee started
129 to flex, (2) the tester perceived firm resistance, and (3) palpable onset of posterior pelvic
130 rotation. At the endpoint, hip ROM was recorded using a goniometer.

131 The weight-bearing lunge test was also performed [14]. The subjects were

132 positioned facing a wall, with the line connecting the second toe and heel of the test foot
133 perpendicular to the wall. While maintaining this position, the subjects were instructed to
134 perform a lunge in which the knee was flexed with the goal of making contact between
135 the knee cap and wall.

136

137 **Muscle strength**

138 A handheld dynamometer (Mobie MT-100B, Sakai Med, Tokyo, JAPAN) was
139 used to measure isometric muscle strength, shoulder abduction, trunk flexion, and knee
140 extension. To measure shoulder abduction muscle strength, we referred to and modified
141 the method described by Kibler et al.[15]. The subjects were instructed to hold their arm
142 in the test position (90° abduction in the scapular plane and shoulder external rotation)
143 and to provide a one-repetition maximum voluntary isometric contraction against
144 resistance in that position. Isometric trunk flexion muscle strength was measured in a
145 sitting position with the knee flexed at 90° and the back attached to the wall. To maintain
146 the posterior pelvic tilt, measurements were taken with a towel set between the buttocks
147 and the wall, with the back in contact with the wall. A dynamometer was placed on the
148 sternum. The subjects were instructed to place their hands in front of the chest and to
149 gradually increase isometric trunk flexion strength for 3 s.

150 To measure knee extension strength, we modified the method described by
151 Hansen et al.[16]. The subjects were seated with their knees flexed at 90° and their arms
152 crossed in front of their chest. A strap was used to fix the thighs to the seated surface.
153 Another strap was attached to the leg of the table to stabilize the handheld dynamometer
154 during the measurement. The subjects were instructed to gradually increase their
155 isometric knee extension strength for 3 s. The measurements were performed three times,
156 and the average value was used for the analysis.

157

158 **Balance**

159 We used the modified Balance Error Scoring System (mBESS) to evaluate
160 postural stability [17]. The mBESS protocol comprises four conditions: feet together,
161 single-leg stance, and tandem stance on firm and foam surfaces. The subjects were
162 instructed to close their eyes and place their hands on their hips throughout each trial.
163 Upon loss of balance, participants were instructed to return to their position as quickly as
164 possible. The testers counted the number of errors during the 20-s trial. An error was
165 defined as opening the eyes, stepping, lifting hands off the hips, lifting the forefoot or
166 heel, abducting the hip by $> 30^\circ$, stumbling or falling out of position, or failing to return
167 to the test position in < 5 s [18]. The maximum total error for each 20-s condition was 10,

168 with a maximum error score given to subjects who could not maintain a position for a
169 minimum of 5 s for each stance.

170

171 **Statistical analysis**

172 The normality of the distribution of each variable was confirmed using
173 histograms and the Shapiro–Wilk test. The mean \pm standard deviation was used to
174 summarize normally distributed data, and the median (interquartile range) was used for
175 data that were not normally distributed. External references that matched each sub-
176 component of KOJI AWARENESS™ were selected and analyzed.

177 The Mann–Whitney U test was used to compare the differences between each
178 component of the KOJI AWARENESS™ score and the corresponding body segment (P
179 ≤ 0.05). The Jonckheere–Terpstra test was used to compare the KOJI AWARENESS™
180 score and more than two corresponding body segments ($P \leq 0.05$). SPSS software (version
181 21.0; IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) was used for all data analyses.

182

183 **Results**

184 Fifty subjects (men = 34, age = 27 ± 5.4 years, height = 172.5 ± 5.7 cm, weight
185 = 70.4 ± 12.0 kg, BMI = 23.6 ± 3.7 kg/m²; women = 16, age = 26 ± 4.7 years, height =

186 161.9 ± 4.6 cm, weight = 53.8 ± 5.4 kg, BMI = 20.6 ± 2.5kg/m²) participated in this study.

187 The average KOJI AWARENESS™ score was 41.6 ± 5.8. We found associations

188 between external references and many items; however, no associations with external

189 references were found regarding flexion, extension, and rotation of the “neck mobility,”

190 extension and external rotation of the “hip mobility,” and strength of the “mid-section

191 stability Strength” in the KOJI AWARENESS™(Table 1).

192

193 **Table 1. KOJI AWARENESS™ scores**

Component of KOJI AWARENESS	External references	P value
1. Neck mobility		
forward bending*	cervical flexion ROM	0.131
backward bending*	cervical extension ROM	0.743
side bending*	cervical lateral flexion ROM	0.001
rotation*	cervical rotation ROM	0.395
2. Shoulder mobility*	Internal Rotation Behind-the-Back Angle	<0.001
3. Shoulder blade mobility*	shoulder abduction ROM	0.002
4. Thoracic spine mobility[§]	thoracic rotation ROM	0.01
5. Upper extremity stability and strength[§]		
	shoulder abduction muscle s strength	0.008
	isometric trunk flexion muscles strength	0.029
6. Hip mobility		
flexion-internal rotation*	hip flexion ROM	0.025
	hip internal rotation ROM	<0.001
flexion-external rotation*	hip flexion ROM	0.022
	hip external rotation ROM	0.045
extension-internal rotation*	hp extension ROM	0.001
	hip internal rotation ROM	0.001

	extension-external rotation*	hip extension ROM	0.971
		hip external rotation ROM	0.72
7. Hip and spine mobility			
	forward bending [§]	hip flexion ROM	0.01
		straight leg raise test	<0.001
		spinal flexion mobility	0.61
	backward bending [§]	shoulder abducton ROM	0.051
		hip extension ROM	0.346
		spinal extension mobility	0.013
8. Upper and lower extremity mobility and stability[§]			
		hip flexion ROM	0.001
		hip extension ROM	0.001
		mBESS score	0.485
9. Mid-section stability strength[§]			
		lumber flexion mobility	0.581
		isometric trunk flexion muscles strength	0.256
10. Lower extremity strength[§]			
		mBESS score	<0.001
		isometric knee extension strength	0.001
		WBLT	0.052
11. Ankle mobility*			
		WBLT	<0.001
*The Mann-Whitney U test			
§The Jonckheere-Terpstra test			

194

195 Discussion

196 This study aimed to clarify the validity of the KOJI AWARENESS™ score sub-
197 components by confirming the relationship between the scores of the sub-components
198 and the joint range of motion and muscle strength that could be associated with each
199 component. The results showed that the KOJI AWARENESS™ sub-component scores
200 generally had good validity, except for items related to neck and hip flexibility and trunk

201 muscle strength.

202

203 **Neck mobility**

204 Among the items assessing neck flexibility, the side-bending scores of the KOJI
205 AWARENESS™ and goniometric measurements showed an association. In contrast, no
206 association with the goniometric measurements was found for forward bending,
207 backward bending, or neck rotation. Goniometric active cervical range measurements,
208 applied as external references, have been reported to have adequate measurement
209 reproducibility [19]. The median (interquartile range) ROM values collected in the
210 present study were 54.0° (22.3), 69.0° (18.1), and 66.3° (12.1) for anterior flexion,
211 backward flexion, and rotation of the neck, respectively. There are some variations among
212 reports regarding normative data on cervical motion [20]. Our results were similar to
213 those of previous studies [21, 22] that measured cervical ROM using goniometers and
214 compasses, as in the current study. No significant differences were found in the data
215 summarized by dividing the groups based on the KOJI AWARENESS™ neck flexibility
216 scores. This study included healthy participants within a narrow age range, which may
217 have biased the results. In the future, it will be necessary to collect and validate data from
218 the elderly and those with cervical symptoms and limited ROM.

219

220 **Shoulder mobility/shoulder blade mobility**

221 The KOJI AWARENESS™ shoulder mobility score is associated with internal
222 rotation behind-the-back angle. Similarly, scoring of “shoulder blade mobility” was also
223 associated with maximum shoulder joint abduction angle. In scoring “shoulder mobility,”
224 points are determined by the ability to touch the opposite shoulder blade with the hand
225 behind the back. In scoring “shoulder blade mobility,” points were determined by whether
226 the maximum abduction position could be maintained. Among young healthy adult men
227 and women in this study, the median difference in shoulder internal rotation ROM
228 between those with a “shoulder mobility” score of 1 point and those with a score of zero
229 points was approximately 40°. The median difference in shoulder abduction ROM
230 between patients with “shoulder blade mobility” scores of 1 point and those with a score
231 of zero points was approximately 7°. These scores are valid as assessments that reflect
232 the degree of shoulder internal rotation and abduction ROM. However, this study did not
233 include elderly patients or those with a history of shoulder disease. Shoulder joint ROM
234 decreases with age [23]. The “shoulder mobility” and “shoulder blade mobility” scores
235 of the KOJI AWARENESS™ may indicate a floor effect when targeting individuals with
236 shoulder ROM limitations due to aging or other reasons. In such cases, it may be

237 necessary to modify the rating to ensure that it is responsive to those with shoulder ROM
238 limitations, such as the addition of another grading level.

239

240 **Thoracic spine mobility**

241 In this study, the median thoracic rotation angle, measured using a goniometer,
242 was 51.8° (20.8). Summarized using the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring system, the
243 median values were 38.3°, 49.0°, and 56.5° for 1, 2, and 3 points, respectively. Our
244 evaluation of thoracic rotation angle measurements in the lumbar locked position has been
245 proven to be sufficiently reliable [24]. Johnson et al. measured thoracic rotation angles in
246 46 healthy adults in the lumbar locked position and reported a mean value of $40.8 \pm 10.7^\circ$
247 [24]. Using a similar method, Furness et al. reported a mean thoracic rotation angle of
248 approximately 41° in 12 healthy male and female subjects [25]. Our measurement results
249 were similar to those of previous studies and were considered valid. The KOJI
250 AWARENESS™ score for “thoracic spine mobility” was determined on a four-point
251 scale from 0 to 3, with difficulty adjusted by varying the upper extremity position. As the
252 score increased by 1 point, the thoracic rotational ROM increased by approximately 7°.
253 The KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring for “thoracic spine mobility” was statically found to
254 reflect the actual thoracic rotation angle and is a valid ordinal scale to determine the

255 thoracic flexibility of the subject.

256

257 **Upper extremity stability and strength**

258 The KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring for “upper extremity stability and strength”
259 was based on four types of posture-holding ability. This score is associated with isometric
260 shoulder abduction and trunk flexion muscle strength. In isometric shoulder abduction,
261 the deltoid and serratus anterior muscles act as the primary muscles [26, 27]. Abdominal
262 muscle activity is important for isometric trunk flexion [28, 29]. In the position used for
263 KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring, the activity of the serratus anterior muscles, which act
264 on scalene protraction, and the abdominal muscle group, which stabilizes the trunk
265 against gravity, is important [26]. In particular, the closer the trunk approaches the
266 horizontal and the longer the lever arm, the greater the activity of the serratus anterior and
267 abdominal muscle groups required to maintain posture [30]. The KOJI AWARENESS™
268 score for “upper extremity stability and strength” reflects the function of the shoulder
269 abductor and trunk flexor muscles to some extent. However, all subjects in this study
270 scored >3 points, and none of the subjects scored 0–2 points. Future analyses should
271 include data on targets that correspond to 0–2 points to confirm the validity of the level
272 setting. The present study confirmed the sequence of 3 and 4 points in the KOJI

273 AWARENESS™ scoring for “upper extremity stability and strength”.

274

275 **Hip mobility**

276 In the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring for “hip mobility,” hip flexibility was
277 assessed using a two-plane combined motion. The patterns included flexion–internal
278 rotation, flexion–external rotation, extension–internal rotation, and extension–external
279 rotation. The patterns of flexion–internal rotation, flexion–external rotation, and
280 extension–internal rotation were associated with goniometric ROM measurements;
281 however, no association was observed with hip extension–external rotation. An
282 investigation of 120 healthy adults, including both males and females, aged 22–60 years
283 (mean = 39.1 years), showed that the mean ROM of external rotation of the hip joint in
284 hip extension was $41.8 \pm 10.2^\circ$ [31]. The mean value in the current study was $53.1 \pm 9.8^\circ$,
285 which is higher than that reported in previous studies. The participants in this study were
286 in their 20s, and the fact that they were younger than those in previous studies may have
287 influenced the results. In addition, patients with strong anteversion of the femur and hip
288 had significantly reduced ROM of external rotation during hip extension [32]. In the study
289 population, those with a history of developmental dysplasia of the hip and those with hip
290 symptoms were excluded. Therefore, patients with general hip flexibility were included.

291 Therefore, it is possible that there was less variation in the ROM data, and fewer points
292 were deducted in the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring, resulting in no association. Future
293 studies should be conducted on those with decreased hip extension and external rotation
294 ROM, such as the elderly and/or those who present with hip symptoms.

295

296 **Hip and spine mobility: forward bending**

297 The KOJI AWARENESS™ score for “hip and spine mobility (forward bending)”
298 was associated with goniometric hip flexion ROM and passive SLR angle. A similar
299 assessment to the KOJI AWARENESS™ score is the finger–floor distance (FFD), which
300 measures the distance between the fingertips and the floor when the trunk is bent forward
301 to the maximum extent possible while holding the standing knee joint extension position.
302 A previous study [33] reported that FFD was more strongly associated with pelvic motion
303 than with lumbar motion during forward bending. In other words, FFD is thought to
304 reflect hip flexibility rather than spinal flexion. Another report indicated that pelvic
305 motion during forward bending was reduced when the passive SLR angle was reduced
306 [34]. The data obtained in our study support those of previous studies; KOJI
307 AWARENESS™ scoring for “hip and spine mobility” could be an alternative assessment
308 method to FFD.

309

310 **Hip and spine mobility: backward bending**

311 The KOJI AWARENESS™ score for “hip and spine mobility (backward
312 bending)” is associated with shoulder abduction ROM and spinal extension mobility. The
313 KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring involves upper extremity elevation; therefore, shoulder
314 abduction ROM may be relevant. In this study, spinal extension mobility was measured
315 as an external criterion using dual inclinometry of the first thoracic and first sacral spine
316 angles in the maximum extension position. The median spinal extension mobility for the
317 current study subjects was 29.8°, 40.0°, and 55.5° for the 1-, 2-, and 3-point KOJI
318 AWARENESS™ backward bending scores, respectively. Better-performing patients had
319 larger spinal extension angles, with a difference of approximately 10-15° between each
320 point. The KOJI AWARENESS™ backward bending score was found to reflect spinal
321 extension mobility.

322

323 **Upper and lower extremity mobility and stability**

324 As the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring for “upper and lower extremity mobility
325 and stability” requires holding the posture in the single-leg standing position, we analyzed
326 the relationship between this score and hip extension/flexion ROM and mBESS. The

327 score was associated with hip extension/flexion ROM; however, it was not associated
328 with mBESS scores. The posture required by the test requires mobility of hip flexion on
329 the raised side and hip extension on the supporting side. Therefore, this scoring may have
330 been associated with hip extension/flexion ROM. Regarding balance, Iverson et al. found
331 that BESS scores progressively increased with age in a study of adult men and women
332 aged 20–69 years [35]. In our study, the participants were limited to those who were
333 approximately 27 years old, which may have reduced the variability in the mBESS scores
334 and may not have been associated with the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring for “upper
335 and lower extremity mobility and stability.” Future analyses should target a wide range
336 of age groups, including middle-aged and elderly individuals.

337

338 **Lower extremity strength**

339 In the KOJI AWARENESS™ score, “lower extremity strength” was assessed
340 with single-leg standing from the chair seated or half-kneeling position and was scored
341 on a five-point Likert scale of 0–4 points. The higher the score, the better the balance and
342 the greater the knee extensor strength. Kishigami et al. reported that the ability of elderly
343 Japanese individuals to stand up from a chair is related to the cross-sectional area of the
344 quadriceps muscle [36]. Our results support the findings of this previous study. Single-

345 leg standing tasks from a chair are used in a wide variety of fields, including sports science
346 and geriatrics [36-39]. However, for some subjects, such as the elderly, the difficulty level
347 may be too high. Therefore, the exercise task was set from half-kneeling at one or two
348 points on the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring, which makes the scoring system more
349 adaptable to subjects with relatively low physical function. In this study, the number of
350 participants who scored 0–2 points was limited because of their relatively young age.
351 Future analyses should include data from elderly individuals.

352

353 **Ankle mobility**

354 The KOJI AWARENESS™ score for “ankle mobility” was associated with the
355 dorsiflexion angle on the weight-bearing lunge test (WBLT). The WBLT is one of the
356 leading methods for evaluating ankle dorsiflexion flexibility in the weight-bearing
357 position [40-42]. In the WBLT, the tibial forward tilt angle or toe–wall distance is
358 commonly measured in the maximal dorsiflexion position [40, 42]. The criterion used in
359 the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring was whether the toe–wall distance was greater than
360 or equal to the subject's knuckle. Langarika-Rocafort et al. reported that the tibial forward
361 tilt angle and toe–wall distance during the WBLT are correlated [43]. The results of the
362 current study support those of previous studies. Thus, ankle mobility scoring in KOJI

363 AWARENESS™ was found to be a valid method.

364

365 **Clinical implication**

366 The KOJI AWARENESS™ was designed to enable a self-check of physical
367 functions, such as flexibility, muscle strength, and balance. Self-checking of health and
368 physical condition leads to positive lifestyle changes. Self-monitoring of weight and food
369 intake is a lifestyle therapy recommended for obese individuals [44, 45]. Feedback on
370 sleep parameters using personal health monitors improves sleep outcomes [46]. Self-
371 monitoring has been used to monitor changes in physical activity [47]. Thus, awareness
372 of one's own condition increases intrinsic motivation and causes behavioral changes. This
373 may also be true for flexibility, muscle strength, and balance. The results of this study
374 confirm that KOJI AWARENESS™ sub-component scoring is, to some extent, valid for
375 assessing physical function. Various researchers have reported that a decline in
376 musculoskeletal functions, such as flexibility, muscle strength, and balance, is a risk
377 factor for physical pain and orthopedic disorders [48-51]. If KOJI AWARENESS™
378 becomes commonplace and the practice of self-assessing and improving the scores of
379 musculoskeletal and other physical functions becomes widespread, it can be expected to
380 reduce the risk of developing pain and orthopedic diseases.

381

382 **Limitations**

383 This study had several limitations. First, there were several sub-components of
384 KOJI AWARENESS™ that could not be validated. Second, only healthy young adults
385 were recruited; additional studies are needed to include older adults and those with
386 orthopedic conditions for all sub-components. Finally, only Japanese patients were
387 included in this study; however, different races have different bone morphologies and
388 limb lengths relative to body height [52]. In the KOJI AWARENESS™ scoring, several
389 components are affected by upper and lower extremity lengths, and the effect of these
390 physical differences may lead to different results when surveyed in other racial groups.
391 Therefore, caution should be exercised when applying the results of this study in other
392 countries.

393

394 **Acknowledgments**

395 The authors thank all the participants who were included in this study. We thank Editage
396 for editing and reviewing this manuscript for English language. This work was supported
397 by MHLW Program (Grant Number 22JA1006).

398

399 **References**

- 400 1. Tucker KL, Sheppard JP, Stevens R, Bosworth HB, Bove A, Bray EP, et al. Self-
401 monitoring of blood pressure in hypertension: A systematic review and individual patient data
402 meta-analysis. *PLoS Med.* 2017;14(9):e1002389. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002389.
- 403 2. Lee K, Kwon H, Lee B, Lee G, Lee JH, Park YR, et al. Effect of self-monitoring on
404 long-term patient engagement with mobile health applications. *PLoS One.*
405 2018;13(7):e0201166. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0201166.
- 406 3. Chew HSJ, Rajasegaran NN, Chin YH, Chew WSN, Kim KM. Effectiveness of
407 Combined Health Coaching and Self-Monitoring Apps on Weight-Related Outcomes in People
408 With Overweight and Obesity: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Med Internet Res.*
409 2023;25:e42432. doi: 10.2196/42432.
- 410 4. Vetrovsky T, Borowiec A, Juřík R, Wahlich C, Śmigielski W, Steffl M, et al. Do physical
411 activity interventions combining self-monitoring with other components provide an additional
412 benefit compared with self-monitoring alone? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports*
413 *Med.* 2022;56(23):1366-74. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105198.
- 414 5. Mairs L, Mullan B. Self-Monitoring vs. Implementation Intentions: a Comparison of
415 Behaviour Change Techniques to Improve Sleep Hygiene and Sleep Outcomes in Students. *Int J*
416 *Behav Med.* 2015;22(5):635-44. doi: 10.1007/s12529-015-9467-1.

- 417 6. Murofushi K, Yamaguchi D, Katagiri H, Hirohata K, Furuya H, Mitomo S, et al. The
418 relationship between movement self-screening scores and pain intensity during daily training. J
419 Med Invest. 2022;69(3.4):204-16. doi: 10.2152/jmi.69.204.
- 420 7. Murofushi K, Yamaguchi D, Katagiri H, Hirohata K, Furuya H, Mitomo S, et al.
421 Validity of the KOJI AWARENESS self-screening test for body movement and comparison with
422 functional movement screening. PLoS One. 2022;17(12):e0277167. doi:
423 10.1371/journal.pone.0277167.
- 424 8. Moran RW, Schneiders AG, Major KM, Sullivan SJ. How reliable are Functional
425 Movement Screening scores? A systematic review of rater reliability. Br J Sports Med.
426 2016;50(9):527-36. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094913.
- 427 9. Cuchna JW, Hoch MC, Hoch JM. The interrater and intrarater reliability of the
428 functional movement screen: A systematic review with meta-analysis. Phys Ther Sport.
429 2016;19:57-65. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2015.12.002.
- 430 10. Shojaedin SS, Letafatkar A, Hadadnezhad M, Dehkhoda MR. Relationship between
431 functional movement screening score and history of injury and identifying the predictive value of
432 the FMS for injury. Int J Inj Contr Saf Promot. 2014;21(4):355-60. doi:
433 10.1080/17457300.2013.833942.

- 434 11. Sraj SA. Internal Rotation Behind-the-Back Angle: A Reliable Angular Measurement
435 for Shoulder Internal Rotation Behind the Back. *Sports Health*. 2015;7(4):299-302. doi:
436 10.1177/1941738113502159.
- 437 12. Foo Y, Héroux ME, Chia L, Diong J. Involuntary hamstring muscle activity reduces
438 passive hip range of motion during the straight leg raise test: a stimulation study in healthy
439 people. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2019;20(1):130. doi: 10.1186/s12891-019-2511-6.
- 440 13. Ribeiro-Alvares JB, Dornelles MP, Fritsch CG, de Lima ESFX, Medeiros TM, Severo-
441 Silveira L, et al. Prevalence of Hamstring Strain Injury Risk Factors in Professional and Under-
442 20 Male Football (Soccer) Players. *J Sport Rehabil*. 2020;29(3):339-45. doi: 10.1123/jsr.2018-
443 0084.
- 444 14. Bennell KL, Talbot RC, Wajswelner H, Techovanich W, Kelly DH, Hall AJ. Intra-rater
445 and inter-rater reliability of a weight-bearing lunge measure of ankle dorsiflexion. *Aust J*
446 *Physiother*. 1998;44(3):175-80. doi: 10.1016/s0004-9514(14)60377-9.
- 447 15. Kibler WB, Sciascia A, Dome D. Evaluation of apparent and absolute supraspinatus
448 strength in patients with shoulder injury using the scapular retraction test. *Am J Sports Med*.
449 2006;34(10):1643-7. doi: 10.1177/0363546506288728.

- 450 16. Hansen EM, McCartney CN, Sweeney RS, Palimenio MR, Grindstaff TL. Hand-held
451 Dynamometer Positioning Impacts Discomfort During Quadriceps Strength Testing: A Validity
452 and Reliability Study. *Int J Sports Phys Ther.* 2015;10(1):62-8.
- 453 17. Smulligan KL, Wingerson MJ, Seehusen CN, Wilson JC, Howell DR. Postconcussion
454 Dizziness Severity Predicts Daily Step Count during Recovery among Adolescent Athletes. *Med
455 Sci Sports Exerc.* 2022;54(6):905-11. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002877.
- 456 18. Bell DR, Guskiewicz KM, Clark MA, Padua DA. Systematic review of the balance error
457 scoring system. *Sports Health.* 2011;3(3):287-95. doi: 10.1177/1941738111403122.
- 458 19. Fletcher JP, Bandy WD. Intrarater reliability of CROM measurement of cervical spine
459 active range of motion in persons with and without neck pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.*
460 2008;38(10):640-5. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2008.2680.
- 461 20. Chen J, Solinger AB, Poncet JF, Lantz CA. Meta-analysis of normative cervical motion.
462 *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 1999;24(15):1571-8. doi: 10.1097/00007632-199908010-00011.
- 463 21. Buck CA, Dameron FB, Dow MJ, Skowlund HV. Study of normal range of motion in
464 the neck utilizing a bubble goniometer. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 1959;40:390-2.
- 465 22. Youdas JW, Carey JR, Garrett TR. Reliability of measurements of cervical spine range
466 of motion--comparison of three methods. *Phys Ther.* 1991;71(2):98-104; discussion 5-6. doi:
467 10.1093/ptj/71.2.98.

- 468 23. Soucie JM, Wang C, Forsyth A, Funk S, Denny M, Roach KE, et al. Range of motion
469 measurements: reference values and a database for comparison studies. *Haemophilia*.
470 2011;17(3):500-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2516.2010.02399.x.
- 471 24. Johnson KD, Kim KM, Yu BK, Saliba SA, Grindstaff TL. Reliability of thoracic spine
472 rotation range-of-motion measurements in healthy adults. *J Athl Train*. 2012;47(1):52-60. doi:
473 10.4085/1062-6050-47.1.52.
- 474 25. Furness J, Climstein M, Sheppard JM, Abbott A, Hing W. Clinical methods to quantify
475 trunk mobility in an elite male surfing population. *Phys Ther Sport*. 2016;19:28-35. doi:
476 10.1016/j.ptsp.2015.09.003.
- 477 26. Neumann DA, Camargo PR. Kinesiologic considerations for targeting activation of
478 scapulothoracic muscles - part 1: serratus anterior. *Braz J Phys Ther*. 2019;23(6):459-66. doi:
479 10.1016/j.bjpt.2019.01.008.
- 480 27. Hecker A, Aguirre J, Eichenberger U, Rosner J, Schubert M, Sutter R, et al. Deltoid
481 muscle contribution to shoulder flexion and abduction strength: an experimental approach. *J*
482 *Shoulder Elbow Surg*. 2021;30(2):e60-e8. doi: 10.1016/j.jse.2020.05.023.
- 483 28. Kim SY, Kang MH, Kim ER, Jung IG, Seo EY, Oh JS. Comparison of EMG activity on
484 abdominal muscles during plank exercise with unilateral and bilateral additional isometric hip
485 adduction. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2016;30:9-14. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2016.05.003.

- 486 29. Snarr RL, Esco MR. Electromyographical comparison of plank variations performed
487 with and without instability devices. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2014;28(11):3298-305. doi:
488 10.1519/JSC.0000000000000521.
- 489 30. Can EN, Harput G, Turgut E. Shoulder and Scapular Muscle Activity During Low and
490 High Plank Variations With Different Body-Weight-Bearing Statuses. *J Strength Cond Res.*
491 2024;38(2):245-52. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000004622.
- 492 31. Kouyoumdjian P, Coulomb R, Sanchez T, Asencio G. Clinical evaluation of hip joint
493 rotation range of motion in adults. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2012;98(1):17-23. doi:
494 10.1016/j.otsr.2011.08.015.
- 495 32. Boschung A, Antioco T, Steppacher SD, Tannast M, Novais EN, Kim YJ, et al. Limited
496 External Rotation and Hip Extension Due to Posterior Extra-articular Ischiofemoral Hip
497 Impingement in Female Patients With Increased Femoral Anteversion: Implications for Sports,
498 Sexual, and Daily Activities. *Am J Sports Med.* 2023;51(4):1015-23. doi:
499 10.1177/03635465231153624.
- 500 33. Becker L, Schömig F, Cordes LM, Duda GN, Pumberger M, Schmidt H. Finger-Floor
501 Distance Is Not a Valid Parameter for the Assessment of Lumbar Mobility. *Diagnostics (Basel).*
502 2023;13(4). doi: 10.3390/diagnostics13040638.

- 503 34. Hasebe K, Sairyo K, Hada Y, Dezawa A, Okubo Y, Kaneoka K, et al. Spino-pelvic-
504 rhythm with forward trunk bending in normal subjects without low back pain. Eur J Orthop Surg
505 Traumatol. 2014;24(Suppl 1):193-9. doi: 10.1007/s00590-013-1303-1.
- 506 35. Iverson GL, Koehle MS. Normative data for the balance error scoring system in adults.
507 Rehabil Res Pract. 2013;2013:846418. doi: 10.1155/2013/846418.
- 508 36. Kishigami K, Kanehisa H, Qi S, Arimitsu T, Miyachi M, Iemitsu M, et al. Relationship
509 between thigh muscle cross-sectional areas and single leg stand-up test in Japanese older women.
510 PLoS One. 2022;17(6):e0269103. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0269103.
- 511 37. Murakami S, Takeuchi S, Okamoto H, Muramatsu N, Sakurai H, Wada I, et al. Stand-
512 up test could be a helpful adjunct for screening elbow disorders in Little League baseball players.
513 J Orthop Sci. 2023;28(2):352-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jos.2021.11.019.
- 514 38. Ohsawa T, Shiozawa H, Saito K, Tajika T, Yamamoto A, Iizuka Y, et al. Relation
515 between the stand-up test and gait speed, knee osteoarthritis, and osteoporosis using calcaneal
516 quantitative ultrasound - Cross-sectional study. J Orthop Sci. 2016;21(1):74-8. doi:
517 10.1016/j.jos.2015.10.016.
- 518 39. Asahi R, Nakamura Y, Kanai M, Watanabe K, Yuguchi S, Kamo T, et al. Stand-up test
519 predicts occurrence of non-traumatic vertebral fracture in outpatient women with osteoporosis. J
520 Bone Miner Metab. 2021;39(5):883-92. doi: 10.1007/s00774-021-01229-y.

- 521 40. Powden CJ, Hoch JM, Hoch MC. Reliability and minimal detectable change of the
522 weight-bearing lunge test: A systematic review. *Man Ther.* 2015;20(4):524-32. doi:
523 10.1016/j.math.2015.01.004.
- 524 41. Cady K, De Ste Croix M, Deighan M. Back foot influence on dorsiflexion using three
525 different positions of the weight bearing lunge test. *Phys Ther Sport.* 2021;47:1-6. doi:
526 10.1016/j.ptsp.2020.10.005.
- 527 42. Hall EA, Docherty CL. Validity of clinical outcome measures to evaluate ankle range of
528 motion during the weight-bearing lunge test. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2017;20(7):618-21. doi:
529 10.1016/j.jsams.2016.11.001.
- 530 43. Langarika-Rocafort A, Emparanza JI, Aramendi JF, Castellano J, Calleja-González J.
531 Intra-rater reliability and agreement of various methods of measurement to assess dorsiflexion in
532 the Weight Bearing Dorsiflexion Lunge Test (WBLT) among female athletes. *Phys Ther Sport.*
533 2017;23:37-44. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2016.06.010.
- 534 44. Garvey WT, Mechanick JI, Brett EM, Garber AJ, Hurley DL, Jastreboff AM, et al.
535 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF CLINICAL ENDOCRINOLOGISTS AND AMERICAN
536 COLLEGE OF ENDOCRINOLOGY COMPREHENSIVE CLINICAL PRACTICE
537 GUIDELINES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF PATIENTS WITH OBESITY. *Endocr Pract.* 2016;22
538 Suppl 3:1-203. doi: 10.4158/EP161365.GL.

- 539 45. Pellegrini CA, Verba SD, Otto AD, Helsel DL, Davis KK, Jakicic JM. The comparison
540 of a technology-based system and an in-person behavioral weight loss intervention. *Obesity*
541 (Silver Spring). 2012;20(2):356-63. doi: 10.1038/oby.2011.13.
- 542 46. Hsiao WH, Paterno MT, Iradukunda F, Hawkins M. The Preliminary Efficacy of a
543 Sleep Self-management Intervention Using a Personalized Health Monitoring Device during
544 Pregnancy. *Behav Sleep Med*. 2021;19(6):705-16. doi: 10.1080/15402002.2020.1851230.
- 545 47. Shuger SL, Barry VW, Sui X, McClain A, Hand GA, Wilcox S, et al. Electronic feedback
546 in a diet- and physical activity-based lifestyle intervention for weight loss: a randomized
547 controlled trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2011;8:41. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-8-41.
- 548 48. Kim R, Wiest C, Clark K, Cook C, Horn M. Identifying risk factors for first-episode
549 neck pain: A systematic review. *Musculoskelet Sci Pract*. 2018;33:77-83. doi:
550 10.1016/j.msksp.2017.11.007.
- 551 49. Hides J, Stanton W, Freke M, Wilson S, McMahon S, Richardson C. MRI study of the
552 size, symmetry and function of the trunk muscles among elite cricketers with and without low
553 back pain. *Br J Sports Med*. 2008;42(10):809-13. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2007.044024.
- 554 50. Park SH. Tools for assessing fall risk in the elderly: a systematic review and meta-
555 analysis. *Aging Clin Exp Res*. 2018;30(1):1-16. doi: 10.1007/s40520-017-0749-0.

- 556 51. Murofushi K, Yamaguchi D, Kaneoka K, Oshikawa T, Katagiri H, Hirohata K, et al.
557 The effectiveness of corrective exercises on the KOJI AWARENESS score and activity-related
558 pain intensity. *J Med Invest.* 2023;70(1.2):208-12. doi: 10.2152/jmi.70.208.
- 559 52. Abe T, Brown JB, Brechue WF. Architectural characteristics of muscle in black and
560 white college football players. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1999;31(10):1448-52. doi:
561 10.1097/00005768-199910000-00014.

562

563 **Supporting Information**

564 **S1 Appendix. KOJI AWARENESS™ movement test.**

565 **S2 Appendix. Scoring and criteria of KOJI AWARENESS™**