

# LOWER BACK PAIN – LBP PREVELANCE IN PHYSICALLY ACTIVE STUDENTS

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Sport and Physical Education, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, University of Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Physical Education, University of Skopje, Macedonia

<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Split, Croatia

*Original scientific paper*  
UDC: 616.711-009.7-057.875

## Abstract

Physical inactivity and intensive sports activity have been found to be associated with Lower Back Pain - LBP. The aim of this study is to present the data about the prevalence of LBP in young adults and its associations with vitality, physical activity and emotions. We also studied the impact of low back pain on daily activity. The study sample presented ( $n = 323$ ) students from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in the chronological age of  $21.06 \pm 1.93$  years. The current study assessed the level of LBP amongst students of Faculty of Sport with the level of physical activity in last six months. Average values of body mass index – BMI was: FFK – Skopje 23.13 (2.53), FTOS – Tuzla 22.94 (2.37) i FASTO – Sarajevo 22.95 (2.66). We used the questionnaire, which included the Graded Chronic Pain Scale (GCPS) for the evaluation of levels of chronic pain. With a Short Health Survey (SF-36) we have established the health status. All tested students ( $n = 323$ ) had pain intensity at some point in last six months. Seventy three percents of students ( $n = 236$ ) reported prevalence of LBP. In this study body mass index, level of physical activity were not significant independent predictors of intensity and disability scores. 3/4 of all respondents said to have had any episode LBP. The results of our study can be used by officials in the area of prevention to support efforts to improve health of the student population and to reduce the LBP risk.

Key words: **pain intensity, pain disability, physical activity, students, prevalence**

## Introduction

Low back pain (LBP) presents a significant health problem in all countries (Bučar, et al., 2012; Drozda, Lewandowski, & Górski, 2011). It is one of the leading factor of incapability for persons younger than 45 years, main assumption for LBP are degenerative skoliose changes which occurs in persons younger than 45 years.

Long-lasting sick leaves compensation, with more than 90 lost working days (Deyo, & Weinstein, 2001). Chronic low back pain is an important cause of personal suffering and disability with a number of aversive social consequences. Lower back pain is frequent disorder of musceles and bones of back. It occurs in 40% people at some point in their lifes. Lower back pain can be classified by it's duration as accute pain ( pain that lasts shorter than 6 weeks), sub-chronic (6 to 12 weeks), or chronic (more than 12 weeks). LBP can also be classified on main cause as mechanic, non-mechanic and transferred pain. Most frequent causes of LBP are: stretched muscle or stretched ligament which can ocure during irregular weight lifting or lifting ob-

jects, irregular stance or overweight body mass. In most cases starting pain in LBP is not being indenticated, and the cause for LBP isn not being searched for, and it is believed that LBP is consequence of mechanic problems like stretched muscle or stretched joint.

Life-time incidence of acute, unspecific LBP in western industrial nations varies between 60% and 85% (Bučar, et al., 2012; Nyland and Grimmer, 2003). So far, more than 60 different measuring instruments have been identified, including questionnaires and clinical tests. Von Korff et al., (1999) developed a simple, brief questionnaire to assess the severity of chronic pain problems, the Chronic Pain Grade (CPG) based on measures of pain intensity and pain related disability. There is a number of possible tools and questionnaires to assess LBP. Their overview is presented in (Table 1) Von Korff 's Chronic Pain Grade (CPG) questionnaire is among the most used ones and it has been successfully implemented for LBP epidemiological research in various surveys.

Table 1. Review of rating scales for low back pain and assessment tools

Questionnaire	Reference period	N. items	N. response options	Score range	Better function indication
Oswestry Disability Questionnaire <sup>26</sup>	Not specific	10	6	0-100	Lower scores
Quebec Back Pain Disability Scale <sup>27</sup>	Today	20	6	0-100	Lower scores
Rolland Morris Disability Questionnaire <sup>28</sup>	Today	24	1	0-24	Lower Scores
EuroQoL-5 Dimension Questionnaire (EQ-5D) <sup>29</sup>	Today	5	3	0-100	Higher scores
SF-36 Physical Functioning scale <sup>24</sup>	Now	10	3	0-100	Higher Scores
Waddell Disability Index <sup>30</sup>	Since onset of back pain	9	2	0-9	Lower scores
SF-36 Role Limitations, Physical scale <sup>24</sup>	Past 4 weeks	4	2	0-100	Higher scores
SF-36 Bodily Pain scale <sup>24</sup>	Past 4 weeks	2	5 and 6	0-100	Higher scores
Graded Chronic Pain Scale (GPCS) Questionnaire <sup>7</sup>	Past 6 months	10	7	0-100	Higher scores

Physical activity is defined as any bodily movement resulting in significant increase of energy consumption, above the level of consumption in standstill. Physical activity is seen in many forms and contexts, and it is under strong influence of cultural heritage. Physical exercise understands planned, structured and recurring activity, with the aim to improve functional abilities of the body or to maintain health. Physical inactivity is supposed to be associated with higher risk for recurrent LBP (Jacob, et al., 2004), but there are contradictory results reported regarding the association of LBP with the level of physical activity and physical fitness [Harreby, et al., 1999; Lis, Black, & Korn, 2007; Moroder, et al., 2011]. Moreover, physical inactivity and intensive sports have been found to be associated with LBP in some (Lis, Black, & Korn, 2007; Taimela, et al., 1997), but not all studies [Balague, Troussier, & Salminen, 1999; Widhe, 2000]. Exercise has many benefits for those patients with LBP, including positive effects on mood, anxiety, and depression, which often plague these patients. So far, research on possible associations with specific types of sport is however sparse (Knutson, 2005; Sjölie, (2004). Schools tend to have timeconsuming curricula, possibly perpetuating a sedentary lifestyle, and a high prevalence of LBP [Harreby, et al., 1999).

This work presents the data about the 6-month prevalence of LBP in young adults university students of Faculty of Sport and Physical Education its associations with physical functioning.

According to ATA (Harreby, et al., 1999). LBP survey, 61% of Americans said they have experienced low back pain, and among them, 69% felt it has affected their daily lives. Women take medication for LBP more often than men. To relieve pain, 75% of women with LBP take over-

thecounter or prescription medications, compared to 67% of men. Americans spend at least US\$ 50 billion each year on LBP, the most common cause of job-related disability and a leading contributor to absence from work. Other report (Wenig, et al., 2009; Webster, & Snook, 1994) shows that the average total LBP treatment costs per patient were estimated at € 1322 in Germany. In the workplace, low back pain is the most costly ailment, with an average cost of US\$ 8000 per claim, and accounts for one third of workers compensation costs (Cakmak, et al., 2004). Recent reports (Brennan, et al., 2007; Cakmak, et al., 2004; Nyland, & Grimmer, 2003; Smith, et al., 1997; Von Korff, et al., 1992). on the prevalence of LBP in the young adult population (variously defined as the age group from 18 to 30 years) show high prevalence of LBP already in the young adulthood. The aim of this study is to present the data about the prevalence of LBP in young adults and its associations with vitality, physical activity and emotions.

## Methods

### Sample of examinees

Enrolment in the study was on voluntary basis and it included ( $n = 323$ ) students from the The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. A research sample was made of both gender students of FFK-Faculty of Physical Education, Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Republic Macedonia ( $n = 97$ , mean chronological age of  $20.3 \pm 1.3$  years), FTOS-Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, University of Tuzla,

Bosnia and Herzegovina ( $n = 110$ , mean chronological age of  $21.2 \pm 2.1$  years), and Faculty of Sport and Physical Education, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina ( $n = 116$ , mean chronological age of  $21.4 \pm 2.0$  years). Middle values of Body mass index – BMI was: FFK – Skopje 23.13 (2.53), FTOS – Tuzla 22.94 (2.37) i FASTO – Sarajevo 22.95 (2.66).

### Sample of variable

The survey contained the following questions: AGE - year of birth, BMI - Body Mass Index ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ) and questions about physical activity: PA - average hours per week of physical activity (hours). With a physical activity questionnaires we tried to measure the physical functioning through two 2 questions: SA: Level of physical activity I: I do not practice sport regularly, II: I practice sport occasionally but not on a regular basis, III: I take part in sport at a recreational level and regularly, IV: I train in one or more sports regularly and I take part in competitions) and SSA: Hours of physical activity spend on average per week in the last six months I: 0-5 hours, II: 6-10 hours, III: 11-15 hours, IV: 16-20 hours, V: 21-30 hours).

The Graded Chronic Pain Scale (GCPS) is a standard self-assessment instrument used in medical pain research and quality management that offers a means of hierarchically classifying chronic pain severity independent of the pain syndrome (Thomas, et al., 1999). In this study the scores “pain intensity” and “pain-related disability” were analyzed. The scores range from 0 to 100 points, with 100 being maximum pain intensity or disability. This study used the questionnaire pain intensity (CPI) and pain disability scores (DS) are calculated as the average of three questions (questions 1-3 for pain intensity, questions 5-7 for disability) multiplied by 10, they range from 0 to 100 points. The fourth question assessed the number of days lost from the usual activity (such as school, work and housekeeping) due to LBP. Finally, a combination of pain intensity score and disability score were used to define the pain grade.

With a 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) we tried to measure the health status, of subjective sense of health through dimensions of (physical functioning, ten questions) (Smith, et al., (1997). Body height was measured using Martin’s anthropometer with precision of 0.1 cm, BMI was measured using a Tanita TBF-300A Pro Body Composition analyzer scales 0.1 kg (Tanita Corp., Tokyo, Japan). Students were barefooted during measurements.

### Statistical analysis

The translation of the questionnaire was verified for internal consistency in our sample. This was done by the calculation of Cronbach’s alpha ( $\alpha$ ) coefficient for the group of three questions dealing with pain intensity and three questions dealing with disability in the CPG questionnaire. Quantitative data was reported using means and standard deviation. Prevalence was reported as percentage with 95% confidence interval in parentheses. Using regression analysis we tried to find the impact of individual variables. Statistical analyzes were performed with SPSS v. 23.0 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Internal reliability of questions dealing with (characteristic pain intensity, CPI) and (disability scores, DS) was tested with the Cronbach’s alpha ( $\alpha$ ) reliability measuring coefficient. The reliability is considered to be acceptable for group comparisons where the Cronbach alpha amounts more than 0.70 (Roland, & Morris, (1983).

### Results

In questions 1–3, the coefficient for FFK students was 0.75, FTOS 0.91 and for FASTO 0.89. Overall, it was 0.88. In questions 5–7, the coefficient for FFK students was 0.91, FTOS was 0.93, FASTO was 0.92 and total 0.92. On the average (Table 2), the students (both female and male) spent 11.09 (5.54) hours on physical activity per week. Body Mass Index was in normal (healthy weight) limits 23.00 (2.52). Majority of students are in the zone of normal values BMI.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Study Samples

Variable's	Faculties of Sport and Physical Education			
	FFK - Skopje	FTOS - Tuzla	FASTO - Sarajevo	Total
n, %	n=97, (30.0)	n=110, (34.0)	n=116, (35.9)	n=323, (100.0)
X, SD	X (SD)	X (SD)	X (SD)	X (SD)
AGE	20.37 (1.33)	21.25 (2.12)	21.47 (2.02)	21.03 (1.85)
BMI	23.13 (2.53)	22.94 (2.37)	22.95 (2.66)	23.00 (2.52)
PA	10.28 (5.89)	10.48 (4.71)	12.51 (6.03)	11.09 (5.54)
PN	0.98 (1.96)	2.24 (2.37)	1.67 (2.15)	1.63 (2.16)
WP	2.15 (2.39)	3.24 (2.71)	2.77 (2.73)	2.72 (2.61)
AP	1.68 (1.85)	2.65 (2.39)	2.23 (2.63)	2.18 (2.29)
DA	0.96 (1.69)	1.54 (2.05)	1.25 (1.82)	1.25 (1.85)
SA	0.87 (1.65)	1.45 (2.26)	1.06 (1.84)	1.12 (1.91)
WA	0.60 (1.21)	1.47 (2.26)	1.07 (1.62)	1.04 (1.69)
CPI	8.73 (9.21)	14.29 (12.37)	11.88 (11.60)	11.63 (11.06)
DS	3.81 (6.96)	7.89 (11.32)	5.87 (8.56)	5.85 (8.94)
SF03†	95.15 (18.69)	90.55 (22.73)	90.74 (21.96)	92.14 (21.12)
SF04†	86.85 (33.83)	76.87 (42.21)	71.98 (44.95)	78.56 (49.34)
SF05†	84.19 (36.54)	73.63 (44.12)	68.67 (46.44)	75.49 (42.36)
SF09(a)†	50.38 (28.19)	53.62 (25.87)	51.42 (25.55)	51.80 (26.53)
SF09(b)†	58.02 (32.46)	58.25 (29.51)	58.37 (29.45)	58.21 (30.47)

**Abbreviations:** n, number of study participants; X, mean; SD, standard deviation; AGE, Years; BMI, Body mass index; PA, Physical activity (Hours spend for sport on average/week during last 6 months); PN, Pain Right Now; WP, Worst Pain; AP, Average Pain; DA, Daily Activities; SA, Social Activities; WA, Work Activities, CPI, Characteristic pain intensity; DS, Disability score; SF03, Physical Functioning; SF04, Physical Health; SF05, Emotional Problems; SF09(a), Energy Functioning; SF09(b), Emotions Functioning.

\*Higher scores on the measures are indicative of better function (Normalized score 0-100)

In (Table 3) the total of 323 of the students 236 (73.0%) had pain intensity at some point in the last six months at the time they answered the questionnaire another 87 (26.9%) answered no pain intensity. In questions dealing with pain disability 281 (86.9%) students answered no pain disability. Another, 34 (10.5%) had low intensity, 6 (1.8%) high intensity, 1 (0.3%) moderately limiting and 1 (0.3%) severely limiting.

Table 3. Distributions of Chronic Pain Grade (CPG)

Variable's	Pain intensity n, (%)				Pain disability n, (%)			
	FFK, n=97	FTOS, n=110	FASTO, n=116	TOTAL, n=323	FFK, n=97	FTOS, n=110	FASTO, n=116	TOTAL, n=323
Zero	32 (33.0)	26 (23.6)	29 (25.0)	87 (26.9)	86 (88.7)	96 (87.3)	99 (85.3)	281 (86.9)
I	65 (67.0)	84 (76.4)	87 (75.0)	236 (73.0)	10 (10.3)	11 (10.0)	13 (11.2)	34 (10.5)
II					1 (1.0)	1 (.9)	4 (3.4)	6 (1.8)
III						1 (0.9)		1 (0.3)
IV						1 (0.9)		1 (0.3)

**Abbreviations:** n, number of study participants; %, percentage; Zero: Pain free; I: Low disability, low intensity; II: Low disability, high intensity; III: High disability, moderately limiting; IV: High disability, severely limiting.

The prevalence of LBP in various young adult populations is given in the (Table 4). It can be seen that although the prevalence of LBP is generally high, there are substantial

differences in the prevalence in various countries and studies. The current study found a 6-month s prevalence of 73.0% , which should be taken as reserve.

Table 4. Low back pain prevalence rates among participants by recall period and year of publication

Referencea/Authors	Year	Country	Participants	Numberb	Recall	%c
Drozda et al. 20	2011	Poland	Adolescents	986	-	67
Camak et al. 19	2012	Turkey	Students	1552	-	41
Goubert et al. 22	2004	Belgium	General	85	6	37
Bučar et al. 5	2012	Slovenia	Students	178	6	63
Tezel et al. 31	2005	Turkey	Students	221	6	55
Nyland and Grimmer 6	2003	Australia	Students	158	12	63
Brennan et al. 1	2007	Ireland	Students	61	12	32
Schmidt 23	2007	Germany	General	9263	12	76
Wenig et al. 17	2009	Germany	General	5650	12	70
Falavigna et al. 21	2011	Brazil	Students	416	12	67
Smith et al. 32	2005	China	Students	207	12	40
Videman et al. 33	2005	Finland	Students	174	12	54
Smith et al. 34	2005	Korea	Students	202	12	39
Smith et al. 35	2004	Australia	Students	260	12	59
Feyer et al. 36	2000	Australia	Students	694	12	67
Aggarwal et al. 37	2013	India	Students	160	12	47
Noormohammadpour et al. 38	2015	Iran	Students	1335	12	39
Vincent-Onabajo et al. 39	2016	Nigeria	Students	207	12	32
Atiković et al.	2017	This study	Students	323	6	73

**Abbreviations:** <sup>a</sup>Reference number as listed in this manuscript, <sup>b</sup>Number of the participants in the study, <sup>c</sup>Prevalence rates rounded to the nearest whole number

The predictor system (Table 5) of all ten variables physical functioning in CPI ( $R^2$ ) explains 26% and DS ( $R^2$ ) explains 33% of the common variables with the criteria. The impact of the individual variables and showed that the highest and statistically most important influence of the criteria variable is as follows CPI: a)  $\beta$ :  $-.227, p < .000$ ; f)  $\beta$ :  $-.332, p < .000$  and DS: a)  $\beta$ :  $-.200, p < .001$ ; c)  $\beta$ :  $-.128, p < .025$ ; f)  $\beta$ :  $-.367, p < .000$ . It also showed that other seven factors index were statistically not significant in total. Four questions related to physical health in CPI ( $R^2$ ) explains 11% and DS ( $R^2$ ) explains 20% of the common variables with the criteria. The impact of the individual variables is statistically significant on three variables on this group questions CPI: d)  $\beta$ :  $-.252, p < 0.001$  and DS: a)  $\beta$ :  $-.125, p < .031$ ; d)  $\beta$ :  $-.288, p < .000$ . The entire system of predictor variables relating to emotional problems

in CPI ( $R^2$ ) explains 4% and DS ( $R^2$ ) explains 6% of the common variables with the criteria. The results are shown only one statistically significant variable CPI: a)  $\beta$ :  $-.173, p < .010$  and DS: a)  $\beta$ :  $-.251, p < .000$ . In a group of nine questions relating to energy and emotions the predictor system (Table 5) for CPI ( $R^2$ ) explains 13% and DS ( $R^2$ ) explains 11% of the common variables with the criteria. The most statistically important influence of the criteria variable are as follows two variables CPI: i)  $\beta$ :  $-.206, p < .022$ ; e)  $\beta$ :  $-.147, p < .038$  and DS: i)  $\beta$ :  $-.229, p < .012$ . Multiple regression analysis showed significant relationship between Low Back Pain Characteristics and SF-36 Subscales ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, a statistically significant relationship was seen between LBP and physical functioning, physical health, emotional problems, energy and emotions (Table 4).

Table 5. Multivariate linear regression analysis with low back pain intensity and disability score as dependant variables and SF Subscale as independent variables

Variable's SF Subscale	R	R Square	Independent predictor variable's	Beta	p value
CPI	.514	.264	a) Vigorous activities, such as running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports?	-.227	.000
			f) Bending, kneeling or stooping?	-.332	.000
SF03	.575	.330	a) Vigorous activities, such as running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports?	-.200	.001
			c) Lifting or carrying groceries?	-.128	.025
			f) Bending, kneeling or stooping?	-.367	.000
CPI	.338	.114	d) Had difficulty performing the work or other activities (for example it took extra effort)?	-.252	.001
SF04	.457	.209	a) Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities?	-.125	.031
			d) Had difficulty performing the work or other activities (for example it took extra effort)?	-.288	.000
SF05	.201	.040	a) Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities?	-.173	.010
			DS	.252	.064
CPI	.371	.138	i) Did you feel tired?	-.206	.022
SF09	.331	.110	e) Did you have a lot of energy?	-.147	.038
			i) Did you feel tired?	-.229	.012

**Abbreviations:** CPI, Characteristic pain intensity; DS, Disability score; Beta, individual impact of each standardized predictor variable on the criterion variable; p, the set level of statistical significance of each predictor variable's impact on the criterion variable  $p < 0.05$ .

## Discussion

Result of research in (Table 2) can be compared with the previous researches (Fairbank, & Pynsent, 2000) where the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  amounted to 0.91 and research [Nyland, & Grimmer, 2003]. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  amounted to 0.77 for questions 1-3 and 0.88 for questions 5-7.

**Relation between LBP and hours of physical activity (LTPA):** In one similar study, researchers (Jespersen, et al., 2012; Webster, & Snook, 1994), find: 1) the correlation between LBP intensity and hours of leisure time physical activity (LTPA) throughout the 52 weeks was low and non-significant, and 2) maintaining LTPA during an episode of acute LBP did not have a positive effect on LBP in the following 4 weeks. The correlation between weekly (LTPA) and LBP data was negative, but numerically low ( $r = -0.069$ ) and statistically insignificant ( $p = 0.08$ ). For example, one study (Pavletić, et al., 2013) suggests the mechanisms by which exercises may prevent low back pain: 1) they strengthen the back muscles and increase trunk flexibility; 2) they increase blood supply to the spine muscles and joints and intervertebral disks, minimizing injury and enhancing repair and 3) they improve mood and thereby alter the perception of pain. Many clinicians have recommended exercise for patients with low back pain. However, it has not clearly been determined what type and how much exercises one should carry out (Pavletić, et al., 2013).

**Differences between genders in physical activity:** Looking at the differences between the genders, it can be stated that female students are less active than male students (Atiković, et al., 2017). Having in mind that the questionnaire did not include the reasons for physical inactivity, we can guess that it lays in large amount of school and house related commitments. Engagement in sport and recreational activities and body mass index in this study did not show statistically significant negative impact on LBP, because majority of students are in the zone of normal values BMI. There are no clear associations with biological parameters such as BMI (Balague, Troussier, & Salminen, 1999; Taimela, et al., 1997). The start of the student life is an important period in the life of each individual. It represents the start of the period with increased responsibility and independence, but, at the same time, it results with poorer health status, involving worse nutrition and nutritive habits, and rapid reduction of physical activities. Associative factors vary across studies. In this study gender as a irrelevant factor is of great concern in this young population entering the workforce and en route to a greater exposure to risk factors for pain intensity but it is with a negative sign for pain disability. In view of the gender difference in pain prevalence, there is clearly a need for more research into the reasons underlying the gender difference. Findings concerning an association with gender have been ambiguous (Taimela, et al., 1997; Widhe, 2000); Nyland, & Grimmer, 2003). found that females had higher intensity

and disability scores. Competitors had higher pain disability scores than students engaging in sports at recreational level. Gender and level of physical activity were significant independent predictors of intensity and disability scores at multivariate linear regression. In study (Brennan, et al., 2007) reported that physically less active students could be at an even higher risk for suffering from LBP: medical schools tend to have a time consuming curricula with a great deal of learning material. The academic rigor of such a curriculum might perpetuate a sedentary lifestyle among medical students, possibly making them prone to the occurrence of LBP (Harreby, et al., 1999; Von Korff, et al., 1992).

**The influence of engagement in physical activity or vitality in sports in relation to LBP:** In this study, the strongest relations of LBP with vitality were found for two factors: vigorous activities: such as fast running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports and bending, kneeling or stooping. The influence of engagement in physical activity or vitality in sports in relation to LBP has been variably reported: it was associated to LBP as a protective factor, in other reports the influence of sports as physical activity was not an independent factor of LBP (Moroder, et al., 2011). Brennan et al., (2007) showed two significance factors as having an association with lower back pain. They were age and hours of personal training physical activity. All other factors investigated (height, weight, body mass index, gender, academic program, year of study, hours of academic program physical activity, number of sports participated in within academic program and the number of sports participated in within personal training) were not found to be significant. The paper from the authors Harreby et al. (Taimela, et al., 1997). gives the four most painful activities in relation to LBP as also observed in our study: lifting or carrying heavy loads, forward bending, sitting for more than half an hour and job activities. It is evident that with such a high prevalence of LBP more data on the etiology and risk factors is needed and that the risk factors may differ from one population to the other. According to the literature, exercise has positive effects on LBP (Brennan, et al., 2007; Lis, Black, & Korn, 2007; Moroder, et al., 2011). Interventional studies published in the last years have shown beneficial effects of specific workout programs such as pilates (Lis, Black, & Korn, 2007) or other specific lumbar muscle control exercises for amelioration of LBP. Links have also been found between occupational activities (lifting and loading) and lower back pain (Andersson, 1999; Moroder, et al., 2011). Although previous research indicates that very low levels of physical activity may increase back pain, our results suggest that excessive physical activity (vigorous activities, such as: running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports) may also increase pain incidents due to activities of daily living (ADLs) (Atiković et al., 2017). In general, the proposition that more research is needed in the future to investigate the relationship between low back pain and college sports activities, and to develop a better

understanding of the relationships between sport-specific loading on the lumbar spine for each sport and the impact that such a loading may have. This would hopefully lead to the development of management techniques and LBP prevention tactics that can be applied to younger patients who participate in sports. Variables which were not assessed in this study but should be investigated in future studies are: tobacco smoking, previous low back injury, sleeping material (type), physical characteristics of the respondents, posture mostly adopted during daily activities, psychological distress, a comparison of college study programs, gender, and to identify which sports activities in the course are associated with the development of LBP. It would be necessary to take account of the basic elements of pain assessment: the distribution of pain, the quality of pain, the duration of pain, the way pain occurs, factors that aggravate pain and reduce the impact on daily life and sleep activities, associated symptoms, the circumstances and manner of first pain, previous similar symptoms, prior treatment, and the current treatment.

## Conclusion

In our setting and results there is a high prevalence of LBP amongst students population of Faculty of Sport and Physical Education, with several modifiable risk factors identified. In this study, SF03: vigorous activities: such as fast running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports and bending, kneeling or stooping, lifting or carrying groceries, SF4: Had difficulty performing the work or other activities, Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities, SF05: Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities, SF09: Did you feel tired, did you have a lot of energy were significantly associated with LBP. We believe that future studies should look at rarely investigated constructs such as: anxiety, family history, degenerative diseases of the joints, osteoporosis, depression, smoking, menstrual cycle and take anatomic differences in muscle strength into account. Students at risk of LBP need to modify their activity and postures during ADL to prevent painful movements. The results of our study can be used as evidence with officials in the area of prevention, to support efforts to improve the health of student populations and to reduce the risk to suffer of LBP. Information about LBP and preventive workout programs should be incorporated into study programs. Student population may be rather ignorant about LBP and students would often want access to more information about this problem. The knowledge and exercises for LBP prevention should be introduced to physically active young adults and adolescents during the organized learning process in high-school and university study processes.

## References

- Aggarwal, N., Anand, T., Kishore, J., & Ingle, G. K. (2013). Low back pain and associated risk factors among undergraduate students of a medical college in Delhi. *Educ Health*, vol. 26, pp. 103-108.
- Andersson, G. (1999). Epidemiological features of chronic lowback pain. *Lancet*, vol. 354, pp. 581-585.
- Atiković, A., Pavletič, M. S., Kalinski, S. D., Bilalić, J., & Kurt, A. (2017). Prevalence and risk factors of low back pain among undergraduate students in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Gazz Med Ital - Arch Sci Med*, vol. 176, pp. 229-236.
- Balagué, F., Troussier, B., & Salminen, J. J. (1999). Non-specific low back pain in children and adolescents: risk factors: a review. *Eur Spine J*, vol. 8, pp. 429-438.
- Brennan, G., Shafat, A., Donncha, C. M., & Vekins, C. (2007). Lower back pain in physically demanding college academic programs: a questionnaire based study. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorder*, vol. 8, pp. 67, R. A. Deyo, and J. N. Weinstein, "Primary care-Low back pain", *New Engl J Med*, vol. 344, pp. 363-370.
- Bučar Pajek, M., Peček, M., Čuk, I., & Pajek J. (2012). Low back pain in physically active young adults. *SI Med J*, vol. 81, pp. 205-217.
- Cakmak, A., Yücel, B., Ozyalçın, S.N., Bayraktar, B., Ural, H.I., Duruöz, M.T., & Genç A. (2004). The frequency and associated factors of low back pain among a younger population in Turkey. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*, vol. 29, pp. 1567-1572.
- Smith, D.R., Wei, N., Ishitake, T., & Wang, R. S. (2005). Musculoskeletal Disorders among Chinese Medical Students. *Kurume Med J*, vol. 52, pp. 139-14.
- Drozda, K., Lewandowski, J., & Górski, P. (2011). Back pain in lower and upper secondary school pupils living in urban areas of Poland. The case of Poznań. *Cad. Saúde Pública*, vol. 27, pp. 1520-1528.
- Euro QoL questionnaire: EuroQol Group. EQ-5D. Available from: <http://www.euroqol.org/> [cited 2013 Dec 11].
- Fairbank, J. C. & Pynsent, P. B. (2000). The Oswestry Disability Index. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*, vol. 22, pp. 2940-2952.
- Falavigna, A., Teles, A. R., Mazzocchin, T., et al. (2011). Increased prevalence of low backpain among physiotherapy students compared to medical students. *Eur Spine J*, vol. 20, pp. 500-505.
- Feyer, A. M., Herbison, P., Williamson A. M. et al. (2000). The role of physical and psychological factors in occupational low back pain: A prospective cohort study. *Occup Environ Med*, vol. 57, pp. 116-120.
- Goubert, L., Crombez, G. & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2004). Low back pain, disability and back pain myths in a community sample: prevalence and interrelationships. *Eur J Pain*, vol. 8, pp. 385-394.

- Harreby, M., Nygaard, B., Jessen, T., et al. (1999). Risk factors for low back pain in a cohort of 1389 Danish school children: an epidemiologic study. *Eur Spine J*, vol. 8, pp. 444-450.
- Jacob, T., Baras, M., Zeev, A. & Epstein, L. (2004). Physical activities and low back pain: a community-based study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*, vol. 36, pp. 9-15.
- Jespersen, T., Jørgensen, M. B., Hansen, J. V., Holtermann, A., & Søgaard, K. (2012). The relationship between low back pain and leisure time physical activity in a working population of cleaners—a study with weekly follow-ups for 1 year. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disord*, vol. 13, pp. 28.
- Knutson, K. L. (2005). Sex Differences in the Association between Sleep and Body Mass Index in Adolescents. *J Pediatr*, vol. 147, 830-834.
- Kopec, J. A., Esdaile, J. M., Abrahamowicz M., et al. (1995). The Quebec back pain disability scale: measurement properties. *Spine*, vol. 20, pp. 341-352.
- Lis, A. M., Black, K. M., & Korn, H. (2007). Association between sitting and occupational LBP. *Eur Spine J*, vol. 16, pp. 283-298.
- Moroder, P., Runer, A., Resch, H. & Tauber, M. (2011). Low back pain among medical students. *Acta Orthop Belg*, vol. 77, pp. 88-92.
- Noormohammadpour, P., Rostami, M., Mansournia, M. A., Farahbakhsh, F., Pourgharib Shahi M. H. & Kordi, R. (2016). Low back pain status of female university students in relation to different sport activities. *Eur Spine J*, vol. 25(4), pp. 1196-1203.
- Nyland, L. J., & Grimmer, K. A. (2003). Is undergraduate physiotherapy study a risk factor for low back pain? A prevalence study of LBP in physiotherapy students. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorder*, vol. 4, pp. 22.
- Pavletić, M., Hedbávný, P., Kremnický, J., & Atiković, A. (2013) Risk factors for the development of low back pain in 110 Bosnian students faculty of physical education and sport. In Vlatko Šeparović. VI International Symposium Sport and Health. Tuzla: University of Tuzla, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, vol. 6, pp. 1-5. ISSN 1840-4790.
- Roland, M. O., & Morris, R.W. (1983). A study of the natural history of back pain. Part 1: Development of a reliable and sensitive measure of disability in low back pain. *Spine* vol. 8, pp. 141-144.
- Schmidt, C. O. (2007). Back pain in the German adult population: prevalence, severity and sociodemographic correlates in a multiregional survey. *Spine*, vol. 32, pp. 2005-2011.
- Sjölie, A. N. (2004). "Associations between activities and low back pain in adolescents. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*, vol. 4, 352-359.
- Smith, B. H., Penny, K. I. et al. (1997). The Chronic Pain Grade questionnaire: Validation and reliability in postal research. *Pain*, vol. 71, pp. 141-147.
- Smith, D. R., & Leggat, P. A. (2004). Musculoskeletal disorders among rural Australian nursing students. *Austr J Rural Health*, vol. 12, 241-245.
- Smith, D. R., Choe, M. A., Chae, Y. R., J. Jeong, S., & Jeon, M. Y. (2005). An Musculoskeletal symptoms among Korean nursing students. *Contemp Nurse*, vol. 19, pp. 151-160.
- Videman, T., Ojarvi, A., Riihimaki, H.J.D. (2005). Troup Low back pain among nurses: A follow-up beginning at entry to the nursing school. *Spine J*, vol. 30, pp. 2334-2341.
- Taimela, S., Kujala, U. M., Salminen, J. J., & Viljanen, T. (1997). The prevalence of low back pain among children and adolescents. *Spine*, vol. 22, pp. 1132-1136.
- Tezel, A., Kavrut, F., Kara, C., Demir, T., & Kavrut, R. (2005). Musculoskeletal disorders in left-and right-handed Turkish dental students. *Int J Neurosci*, vol. 115, pp. 255-266.
- Thomas, E., Silman, A. J., Croft, P. R., Papageorgiou, A. C., Jayson, M. I., & Macfarlane, G. J. (1999). Predicting who develops chronic low back pain in primary care: a prospective study. *Br Med J*, vol. 318, pp. 1662-1667.
- Tveito, T. H., Hysing, M., & Eriksen, H. R. (2004). Low back pain interventions at the workplace: a systematic literature review. *Occup Med (Lond)*, vol. 54, pp. 3-13.
- Vincent-Onabajo, G. O., Nweze, E., Gujba, F. K. et al. (2016). Prevalence of Low Back Pain among Undergraduate Physiotherapy Students in Nigeria. *Pain Res Treatment*, vol. 2, pp. 1-4.
- Von Korff, M., Ormel, J., Keefe, F. and Dworkin, S. (1992). Grading the severity of chronic pain. *Pain*, vol. 50 pp. 133-149.
- Waddell, G., & Main, C. J. (1984). Assessment of severity in low-back disorders. *Spine*, vol. 9, pp. 204-208.
- Ware, J., & Sherbourne, C. (1992). The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey 1: conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care*, vol. 30, pp. 473-483.
- Webster, B. S., & Snook, S. H. (1994). The cost of 1989 compensation low back pain claims. *Spine*, 19: 1111-1116.
- Wenig, C. M., Schmidt, C. O., Kohlmann, T., & Schweikert, B. (2009). Costs of back pain in Germany. *Eur J Pain*, vol. 13, pp. 280-286.
- Widhe, T. (2000). *Spine: posture, mobility and pain. A longitudinal study from childhood to adolescence.* *Eur Spine J*, 10: 118-123.

Submitted: May 05, 2017

Accepted: June 02, 2017

Correspondence to:

**Muhamed Tabaković, PhD.**

Faculty of Sport and Physical Education

University of Sarajevo

Bosnia and Herzegovina

E-mail: muhamed.tabakovic@gmail.com