

Lumbar Stabilization Exercises in Non-Specific Chronic Low Back Pain: A Critical Narrative Review of Comparative Evidence and The Case For Subgroup-Informed Exercise Prescription

Dr. Hardik Sheth

(PT), BPT, MPT, PhD Scholar, Department of Physiotherapy, Janardan Rai Nagar Rajasthan Vidyapeeth University, Udaipur, Rajasthan 313001, India, ORCID: 0009-0004-2771-1440, Email: prof.drhardiksheth@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose: To critically examine the evolution and comparative evidence base for lumbar stabilization exercises in non-specific chronic low back pain, evaluate the factors sustaining their uniform clinical application, and present the case for subgroup-informed, individualized exercise prescription in clinical physiotherapy practice.

Methods: A structured narrative literature search was conducted using PubMed, PEDro, the Cochrane Library, CINAHL, and Google Scholar, supplemented by manual screening of reference lists and relevant clinical practice guidelines. Search terms included “lumbar stabilization exercises,” “motor control exercise,” “core stability,” “non-specific chronic low back pain,” “exercise prescription,” “clinical prediction rule,” “subgrouping,” “STarT Back,” and “Cognitive Functional Therapy.” Landmark and contemporary publications from 1987 to 2026 were considered, with emphasis on systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, clinical prediction studies, clinical practice guidelines, and high-quality observational studies directly relevant to the review objectives. Recent Indian studies were specifically included to contextualize the international evidence within contemporary physiotherapy practice.

Results: Cochrane-level systematic reviews and meta-analyses consistently demonstrate that lumbar stabilization exercises produce outcomes comparable but not superior to general exercise, manual therapy, and multimodal physiotherapy for pain intensity and functional disability in non-specific chronic low back pain across short-, medium-, and long-term follow-up periods. Evidence from prospective cohort studies and clinical prediction rule research identifies a specific patient subgroup with clinical features of lumbar instability who demonstrate a greater response to stabilization-specific training. Outside this subgroup, uniform prescription of stabilization protocols is not supported by current evidence. A significant evidence-to-practice gap characterized by passive modality dependence and protocol-driven stabilization exercise prescription without clinical subgrouping persists across physiotherapy settings internationally, including in Indian physiotherapy outpatient departments.

Conclusions: Lumbar stabilization exercises retain an important role in physiotherapy management of non-specific chronic low back pain when applied to clinically appropriate subgroups. Their uniform prescription across all patient presentations is not justified by current evidence. Adoption of validated clinical subgrouping frameworks and individualized exercise prescription is recommended for physiotherapy clinicians, educators, and professional bodies.

Keywords: Chronic low back pain, Exercise prescription, Lumbar stabilization, Motor control exercise, Physiotherapy, Subgroup classification.

Introduction

Non-specific chronic low back pain, defined as lumbar pain persisting beyond 12 weeks without an identifiable pathological cause, is among the most common and disabling musculoskeletal disorders worldwide. The Global Burden of Disease Study 2020 ranked low back pain as the leading cause of years lived with disability, affecting approximately 619 million people, with numbers expected to rise due to aging populations, obesity, and physical inactivity [1].

In India, a systematic review of 97 studies reported an annual prevalence of 51% and a lifetime prevalence of 66%, with the highest burden among women, rural residents, and manual workers [2]. Low back pain is a major driver of physiotherapy consultations, workplace absenteeism, and healthcare costs [3]. Its economic impact, through both

direct medical expenses and productivity losses, highlights the need for evidence-based and cost-effective physiotherapy strategies [4].

Physiotherapy management has evolved markedly over the past five decades. Earlier practice emphasized passive modalities such as electrotherapy, ultrasound, traction, and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, often combined with advice to rest [5,6]. With growing evidence, treatment shifted toward active rehabilitation incorporating strengthening, aerobic conditioning, and flexibility training. The introduction of spinal stability concepts in the 1990s further advanced this transition, emphasizing targeted retraining of deep spinal muscles as a distinct and often superior therapeutic approach.

IDENTIFICATION OF LITRATURE: To examine the evolution and current evidence supporting lumbar stabilization exercises, a structured narrative literature search was undertaken using PubMed, PEDro, the Cochrane Library, CINAHL, and Google Scholar, supplemented by manual screening of reference lists and relevant international clinical practice guidelines. Landmark and contemporary publications (1987–2026), including systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, clinical prediction studies, clinical practice guidelines, and observational studies, were critically evaluated. Recent Indian studies were also included to contextualize the international evidence within contemporary physiotherapy practice in India.

Evolution of Physiotherapy Rehabilitation for Non-Specific Chronic Low Back Pain

Table 1 outlines the progression of rehabilitation models across successive eras of physiotherapy practice.

Table 1. Evolution of rehabilitation approaches in the management of non-specific chronic low back pain

Period	Dominant Rehabilitation Model	Key Characteristics
Early physiotherapy era (pre-1990s)	Passive modality-based treatment (e.g., [Kumar & Sharma, 1988; Smith, 1989] [5,6])	Electrotherapy, traction, therapeutic ultrasound, rest, and avoidance of movement
Late 1990s to 2000s	Stabilization and motor control era (Hodges & Richardson, 1996 [7])	Targeted retraining of transversus abdominis and multifidus based on segmental stability theory
Mid-2000s onward	Classification-based and subgroup-informed rehabilitation (Delitto et al., 2005 [8])	Treatment-based classification, clinical prediction rules, individualized intervention matching
Contemporary approach (2015 onward)	Biopsychosocial individualized rehabilitation (O’Sullivan, 2015 [9])	Integration of physical, psychosocial, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions; Cognitive Functional Therapy; patient-centered goal setting

The widespread adoption of lumbar stabilization exercises was supported by strong neurophysiological evidence and clinical practicality. Hodges and Richardson’s seminal work demonstrated delayed activation of the transversus abdominis during limb movement in individuals with low back pain, indicating impaired neuromuscular control of deep stabilizing muscles and providing the physiological rationale for stabilization training. Their minimal equipment requirements, adaptability to outpatient settings, and structured progressive programs targeting the transversus abdominis and lumbar multifidus facilitated broad clinical uptake, improving trunk muscle activation and functional outcomes compared with passive approaches [10–12].

Common Components of Conventional Stabilization Protocols

Table 2. Clinical characteristics of conventional stabilization exercises in non-specific chronic low back pain

Intervention Component	Typical Clinical Application	Potential Advantage	Potential Limitation
Abdominal drawing-in man oeuvre (Hodges & Richardson, 1996 [10])	Deep trunk muscle activation	Improves motor awareness and trunk control	May be overemphasized across all patients
Pelvic bridging & Dead bug exercises (Stevens et al., 2006 [11])	Gluteal, lumbopelvic, and lumbar stability training	Easy to teach, progress, and supervise in groups; progressive neuromuscular challenge	Limited individualization; uniform prescription may ignore individual motor control capacity
Bird-dog, Plank & Side-plank variations (McGill, 2002 [12])	Dynamic trunk stability with limb loading; core endurance and isometric strengthening	Functional co-activation of spinal stabilizers; minimal equipment; suitable for most settings	Does not address fear-avoidance or psychosocial contributors; may provoke symptoms in sensitized patients

Although stabilization exercises have shown favorable outcomes, conventional protocols remain largely standardized and may not adequately reflect the heterogeneity of non-specific chronic low back pain. Differences in pain mechanisms, movement impairments, psychosocial influences, functional limitations, and treatment responsiveness often require individualized approaches. Uniform application risks overlooking critical psychosocial factors such as fear-avoidance beliefs, pain catastrophizing, central sensitization, and reduced self-efficacy, all of which significantly affect rehabilitation outcomes [9,13].

Advantages and Limitations of Conventional Protocol-Based Physiotherapy

Table 3. Comparative strengths and limitations of conventional protocol-based rehabilitation

Advantages	Limitations
O’Sullivan, 2015 [9] – Widely accepted and taught in physiotherapy curricula; encourages active patient participation	Evidence does not support superiority over other active exercise types; variable long-term adherence when exercise is not individually matched
Sara Giotto et al., 2016 [14] – Feasible for group rehabilitation with minimal resources	Fails to adequately address psychosocial contributors to chronic pain
Ferreira et al., 2007 [15] – Straightforward to administer in high-volume outpatient departments	Limited individualization across heterogeneous patient presentations
Gomes-Neto et al., 2017 [16] – Minimal equipment requirements reduce cost and logistical barriers	Uniform protocols may not address specific drivers of each patient’s presentation
Hicks et al., 2005 [17] – Encourages active patient participation in rehabilitation	Greater benefit only in patients meeting clinical prediction rule; not universally effective

Comparative evidence on lumbar stabilization exercises has progressed from randomized controlled trials to systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and clinical prediction studies. Collectively, findings indicate that stabilization

training improves pain and functional outcomes but is not consistently superior to other active exercise approaches in the general population with non-specific chronic low back pain. Emerging subgroup research, however, suggests that patients with clinical features of lumbar instability may benefit more from stabilization-specific protocols. The principal comparative studies supporting this evidence are summarized in Table 4 [14–17].

Table 4. Key studies informing the evidence base for lumbar stabilization exercises in non-specific chronic low back pain.

Study	Design	n	Comparison	Outcome	Principal Conclusion
Sara Giotto et al., 2016 [14]	Cochrane SR	2,628	Motor control vs general exercise/manual therapy	Pain & disability	Effective vs minimal intervention; not superior to other exercise or manual therapy
Ferreira et al., 2007 [15]	RCT	240	General exercise vs motor control vs spinal manipulation	Pain & disability	Modest short-term benefit; no sustained medium- or long-term superiority
Gomes-Neto et al., 2017 [16]	SR & MA	895	Stabilization vs other exercise/manual therapy	Pain & function	Greater improvements than general exercise; comparable to manual therapy
Hicks et al., 2005 [17]	Prospective cohort	54	Stabilization in patients with instability features	Pain & function	Greater benefit in patients meeting the clinical prediction rule

The consistent finding that no single exercise type is universally superior for non-specific chronic low back pain, combined with recognition of the condition's heterogeneity, has driven the development of subgroup-specific rehabilitation frameworks. Early treatment-based classification models introduced matching rehabilitation to patient presentation, later refined by Hicks' clinical prediction rule for identifying patients most likely to benefit from stabilization [17], O'Sullivan's multidimensional classification framework incorporating movement, psychosocial, and behavioral factors [18], and the Start Back Screening Tool for stratified care according to prognostic risk [19]. Collectively, these frameworks represent a paradigm shift from symptom-based, protocol-driven exercise prescription toward evidence-based, patient-specific clinical reasoning [20].

Conventional protocol-based rehabilitation and individualized subgroup-informed rehabilitation differ fundamentally in clinical reasoning, treatment flexibility, and exercise prescription. Their distinguishing features are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison between conventional protocol-based and individualized subgroup-informed rehabilitation approaches for non-specific chronic low back pain

Feature	Conventional Protocol-Based Rehabilitation	Individualized Subgroup-Based Rehabilitation
Exercise selection	Standardized protocols applied uniformly	Tailored to patient-specific clinical presentation and subgroup
Clinical reasoning requirement	Moderate, follows fixed protocol structure	High, requires subgroup classification and dynamic reassessment
Psychosocial factor integration	Limited, primarily biomechanical focus	Integrated, addresses fear-avoidance, self-efficacy, and behavioral factors

		(O'Sullivan, 2015 [21]; Hill et al., 2011 [22]).
Treatment flexibility	Relatively fixed across sessions	Dynamic and responsive to patient progress and changing presentation
Suitability for large patient volumes	High, efficient group supervision	More challenging but achievable with appropriate training and tools
Evidence of superiority	Not demonstrated over other active approaches for the general LBP population (Sara Giotto et al., 2016 [14].	Stratified care shown to produce better outcomes and cost-effectiveness (Hill et al., 2011 [23]; Foster et al., 2014 [24]).
Treatment intensity	Generally standardized progression	Adjusted according to patient's risk, response, and goals (O'Sullivan, 2015 [20]; Hill et al., 2011 [21]; Foster et al., 2014 [23]).

Synthesized by the author from published evidence discussed throughout this review.

Growing evidence supports individualized and stratified care models over uniform protocol-based approaches in terms of patient outcomes and cost-effectiveness. The STarT Back stratified care trial demonstrated significantly better functional outcomes and improved cost-effectiveness compared with non-stratified usual care at 12-month follow-up [23]. International clinical practice guidelines, including those from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence and the American Physical Therapy Association, recommend individualized exercise interventions based on patient presentation rather than endorsing a single modality [25,26]. In contrast, the MATCH randomized trial found that adapting a risk-stratified care strategy to a different healthcare setting did not improve outcomes or utilization, underscoring the challenges of implementing complex stratified care models across diverse environments [27].

Evidence for Lumbar Stabilization Exercises: Current State of Knowledge

Current evidence supports lumbar stabilization exercises as an effective treatment option for non-specific chronic low back pain, though their superiority over other active exercise approaches remains uncertain. A Cochrane systematic review of 32 trials involving 2,628 participants reported that motor control exercises produced outcomes comparable to general exercise, manual therapy, and other active interventions for pain and disability across all follow-up periods, with between-group differences that were small and not clinically important [14]. A large randomized controlled trial comparing general exercise, motor control exercise, and spinal manipulation reported modest short-term functional improvements with motor control exercise and spinal manipulation, but no sustained superiority at medium- or long-term follow-up [15]. A subsequent systematic review and meta-analysis found that lumbar stabilization exercises produced greater improvements in pain and disability than general exercise and achieved outcomes comparable to manual therapy [16].

Collectively, these findings suggest that lumbar stabilization exercises are a valuable component of rehabilitation, but their comparative benefit may depend on patient characteristics rather than universal application. Evidence from a clinical prediction rule indicates that individuals meeting specific criteria including aberrant lumbar movements, a positive prone instability test, greater straight-leg raise range, younger age, and lumbar hypermobility are more likely to respond favorably to stabilization-focused programs [17].

These findings support the role of lumbar stabilization exercises as a targeted intervention for selected patients rather than a universal treatment strategy.

Evidence from Indian Clinical Studies

Evidence from Indian clinical studies broadly complement the international literature by demonstrating that lumbar stabilization exercises can produce clinically meaningful improvements in patients with non-specific chronic low back pain. Randomized clinical trials have reported greater reductions in pain and disability following stabilization-based rehabilitation compared with conventional exercise programs, while comparative studies have also shown favorable short-term improvements in functional outcomes when compared with dynamic strengthening, Pilates, and conventional back extension exercises [28–30]. More recent prospective evidence has further demonstrated that the addition of lumbar stabilization exercises to conventional physiotherapy results in significantly greater improvements in pain, disability, and kinesiophobia than conventional physiotherapy alone [31].

Although these findings support the clinical value of lumbar stabilization exercises in Indian clinical settings, most available studies are single-center investigations with relatively short follow-up periods. Larger multicenter trials with longer follow-up are therefore required to establish long-term effectiveness and identify the patient subgroups most likely to benefit from stabilization-focused rehabilitation.

The Case for Individualized, Subgroup-Informed Exercise Prescription

The evidence base for individualized exercise prescription in non-specific chronic low back pain is both robust and practically actionable within existing physiotherapy infrastructure. Among the available approaches, the O’Sullivan Classification System provides a comprehensive mechanism-based biopsychosocial framework for understanding the multidimensional nature of non-specific chronic low back pain, identifying movement and control impairment patterns while recognizing the interaction of physical, neurophysiological, psychological, and social factors in driving pain and disability. Building on this framework, Cognitive Functional Therapy applies a multidimensional clinical reasoning process to identify modifiable factors and individualize rehabilitation [9,18].

Implementation requires a structured clinical interview and detailed movement assessment conducted by a trained physiotherapist, allowing treatment to be tailored to the individual’s underlying pain mechanisms rather than symptom presentation alone. Treatment is delivered through the Cognitive Functional Therapy model, which aims to modify maladaptive movement behaviors, address unhelpful beliefs and pain-related behaviors, and improve self-efficacy through individualized rehabilitation.

In addition to multidimensional clinical reasoning, targeted subgroup identification may further optimize exercise prescription. A clinical prediction rule has been proposed to identify patients more likely to benefit from lumbar stabilization exercises using five clinical criteria: age younger than 40 years, aberrant lumbar movements, a positive prone instability test, lumbar hypermobility, and greater straight-leg raise range. Patients meeting four or more of these criteria demonstrate a higher probability of responding favorably to stabilization-focused programs, while those not meeting these criteria may require alternative exercise approaches based on clinical assessment [17].

Another validated approach is the STarT Back Screening Tool, which stratifies patients into low-, medium-, and high-risk subgroups using a nine-item questionnaire addressing physical and psychosocial prognostic factors. The tool requires fewer than two minutes to administer, is freely available, and has been validated across multiple languages and healthcare settings, making it directly applicable to Indian physiotherapy outpatient departments. A total score of 0 to 3 indicates low risk, where brief advice and self-management support are appropriate. A score of 4 or more with a psychosocial sub score of 4 or more indicates high risk, warranting psychologically informed physiotherapy addressing fear-avoidance and disability beliefs. All other scores indicate medium risk and warrant structured exercise physiotherapy with patient education. The tool has demonstrated good test-retest reliability and construct validity across primary care physiotherapy settings [19].

Evidence supporting the clinical effectiveness of this stratified approach is provided by a large pragmatic randomized controlled trial, in which STarT Back-guided stratified care produced significantly better functional outcomes and was more cost-effective than non-stratified best usual care at 12-month follow-up [23].

A practical comparison of these three tools is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Clinical subgrouping tools applicable to physiotherapy practice for non-specific chronic low back pain

Tool	Classification / Criteria	Clinical Application
Clinical Prediction Rule for Stabilization Responders [17]	Five clinical criteria; ≥ 4 criteria indicate a greater likelihood of response to stabilization exercise	Identifies patients most likely to benefit from stabilization-specific exercise
O'Sullivan Classification System [18]	Mechanism-based biopsychosocial classification of movement and control impairment patterns	Guides individualized management based on physical and cognitive drivers
STarT Back Screening Tool [19]	Nine-item prognostic screening tool; classifies patients as low-, medium-, or high-risk	Guides treatment intensity and psychosocial support

Current international clinical practice guidelines consistently support individualized exercise approaches. The American Physical Therapy Association clinical practice guidelines advocate an impairment-based, individualized approach to exercise prescription, emphasizing that treatment should be matched to the patient's clinical presentation and modified as examination findings evolve, rather than relying on a single exercise approach for all patients [25]. This approach encourages ongoing reassessment and modification of exercise programs throughout rehabilitation to reflect changes in the patient's clinical presentation. The NICE guideline similarly recommends any exercise programmed that the patient is willing to engage with whether yoga, walking, strengthening, or aquatic exercise rather than prescribing a single modality as universally superior [26].

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

This narrative review synthesizes contemporary evidence from systematic reviews, randomized controlled trials, clinical practice guidelines, subgrouping frameworks, and recent Indian studies to examine the role of lumbar stabilization exercises in non-specific chronic low back pain. By integrating international evidence with the Indian clinical context, the review highlights important evidence-to-practice gaps that have received limited attention in previous literature.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. As a narrative review, the study did not employ a formal systematic review methodology, risk-of-bias assessment, or quantitative meta-analysis. The narrative design also introduces the potential for selection and interpretive bias in the identification and synthesis of evidence, since study selection and interpretation were not governed by a formal systematic review protocol. Furthermore, although recent Indian studies were incorporated, the available evidence from India remains limited in both number and methodological quality. This restricts the strength of conclusions regarding Indian physiotherapy practice.

Scope for Future Studies

Future research should prioritize high-quality multicenter randomized controlled trials in India comparing subgroup-informed exercise prescription with the routine uniform prescription of lumbar stabilization exercises. Further studies should also evaluate long-term functional outcomes, cost-effectiveness, implementation feasibility, and clinician adherence to validated subgrouping frameworks within routine physiotherapy practice.

Recommendations for Clinical Practice and Physiotherapy Education

The evidence reviewed above supports four specific recommendations for physiotherapy clinicians, educators, and professional bodies.

Clinical practice: Physiotherapists managing patients with non-specific chronic low back pain should incorporate at least one validated clinical subgrouping tool into their initial assessment before determining an appropriate

management strategy, including exercise prescription. The STarT Back Screening Tool provides a practical first-line screening approach, while lumbar stabilization exercises should be reserved for patients meeting validated clinical prediction criteria for a stabilization response, as summarized in Table 6 [17,19].

Physiotherapy education: Bachelor of Physiotherapy and Master of Physiotherapy curricula should expand coverage of clinical subgrouping frameworks, evidence-based exercise prescription reasoning, and the psychosocial dimensions of chronic pain management. Training in the application of the Start Back Screening Tool, the O'Sullivan Classification System, and Cognitive Functional Therapy principles should be integrated alongside traditional exercise technique training, reflecting contemporary approaches to individualized low back pain management [9]. The aim should be to develop physiotherapists who can determine when and for whom a specific exercise is appropriate, not merely how to perform or instruct it. This recommendation is consistent with the growing evidence supporting prognostic screening and targeted treatment approaches for patients with non-specific chronic low back pain, which have demonstrated advantages over non-stratified physiotherapy management [21].

Physiotherapy research: There is a notable absence of randomized controlled trials from India comparing subgroup-specific exercise prescription against uniform stabilization approaches in patients with non-specific chronic low back pain. Given the high prevalence of this condition and the documented divergence between clinical practice and international evidence-based recommendations [4,32], context-specific research examining whether stratified care models produce superior outcomes in Indian healthcare settings is a clear and pressing priority.

Professional development: The National Commission for Allied and Healthcare Professions (NCAHP), the Indian Association of Physiotherapists (IAP), and State Allied and Healthcare Councils are well positioned to accelerate this transition by developing continuing professional development programs focused on evidence-based low back pain management aligned with current international clinical practice guidelines [25,26]. Structured continuing professional development in subgrouping tools and individualized exercise prescription would represent a tangible step toward closing the evidence-to-practice gap identified in this review.

Conclusion

Lumbar stabilization exercises represent a clinically valuable and evidence-supported intervention for a specific and identifiable subgroup of patients with non-specific chronic low back pain [17]. They are not, however, a universal prescription for the broad and heterogeneous population who present with this condition in physiotherapy outpatient departments. Their uniform, protocol-driven application without clinical subgrouping reflects a significant disconnect from the current evidence base [14–16] and is unlikely to produce optimal outcomes across all patient presentations.

International clinical practice guidelines, Cochrane-level systematic reviews, and validated clinical subgrouping frameworks collectively support an individualized model of care grounded in comprehensive clinical assessment, patient-specific goal setting, and exercise selection based on clinical reasoning rather than convention [9,19,25,26,32]. The transition to this model requires coordinated action across clinical practice, professional education, and continuing professional development.

The goal of this review is not to discard lumbar stabilization exercises, but to prescribe them to the right patient, at the right time, and for the right clinical reason.

References:

1. GBD 2021 Low Back Pain Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of low back pain, 1990-2020, its attributable risk factors, and projections to 2050: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *Lancet Rheumatol.* 2023;5:e316-e329. doi: 10.1016/S2665-9913(23)00098-X.
2. Shetty GM, Jain S, Thakur H, Khanna K. Prevalence of low back pain in India: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *WOR.* 2022;73(2). doi: 10.3233/WOR-205300.

3. Singhal A, Mathai KI, Wilson V. LBP - a leading cause of workplace absenteeism: Are we doing enough? *J Mar Med Soc.* 2016;18(2). doi: 10.4103/0975-3605.204459.
4. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, et al. Lancet low back pain series working group. What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. *Lancet.* 2018;391. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30480-X.
5. Shipton EA. Physical therapy approaches in the treatment of low back pain. *Pain Ther.* 2018;7(2). doi: 10.1007/s40122-018-0105-x.
6. Waddell G. 1987 Volvo award in clinical sciences: A new clinical model for the treatment of low-back pain. *Spine.* 1987;12(7). doi: 10.1097/00007632-198709000-00002.
7. Smith BE, Littlewood C, May S. An update of stabilization exercises for low back pain: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disord.* 2014;15(1). doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-15-416.
8. Fritz JM, Cleland JA, Childs JD. Subgrouping patients with low back pain: Evolution of a classification approach to physical therapy. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2007;37(6). doi: 10.2519/jospt.2007.2498.
9. O'Sullivan, PB, Caneiro JP, O'Keeffe M, Smith A, Dankaerts W, Fersum K, et al. Cognitive functional therapy: An integrated behavioral approach for the targeted management of disabling low back pain. *Phys Ther.* 2018;98(5). doi: 10.1093/ptj/pty022.
10. Hodges PW, Richardson CA. Inefficient muscular stabilization of the lumbar spine associated with low back pain. *Spine.* 1996;21(22). doi: 10.1097/00007632-199611150-00014.
11. Bliven KCH, Anderson BE. Core stability training for injury prevention. *Sports Health: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* 2013;5(6). doi: 10.1177/1941738113481200.
12. Brumitt J, Matheson JW, Meira EP. Core stabilization exercise prescription, part i: Current concepts in assessment and intervention. *Sports health.* 2013;5. doi: 10.1177/1941738113502451.
13. Chiarotto A, Koes BW. Nonspecific low back pain. *N Engl J Med.* 2022;386(18). doi: 10.1056/NEJMcp2032396.
14. Saragiotto BT, Maher CG, Yamato TP, Costa L, Costa L, Ostelo R, et al. Motor control exercise for nonspecific low back pain: A cochrane review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2016;41. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0000000000001645.
15. Ferreira ML, Ferreira PH, Latimer J, Herbert RD, Hodges PW, Jennings MD, et al. Comparison of general exercise, motor control exercise and spinal manipulative therapy for chronic low back pain: A randomized trial. *Pain.* 2007;131(1-2). doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2006.12.008.
16. Gomes-Neto M, Lopes JM, Conceição CS, Araujo A, Brasileiro A, Sousa C, et al. Stabilization exercise compared to general exercises or manual therapy for the management of low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physical Therapy in Sport.* 2017;23. doi: 10.1016/j.ptsp.2016.08.004.
17. Hicks GE, Fritz JM, Delitto A, McGill SM. Preliminary development of a clinical prediction rule for determining which patients with low back pain will respond to a stabilization exercise program. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.* 2005;86(9). doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2005.03.033.
18. O'sullivan P. Diagnosis and classification of chronic low back pain disorders: Maladaptive movement and motor control impairments as underlying mechanism. *Manual Therapy.* 2005;10(4). doi: 10.1016/j.math.2005.07.001.
19. Hill JC, Dunn KM, Lewis M, Mullis R, Main CJ, Foster NE, et al. A primary care back pain screening tool: Identifying patient subgroups for initial treatment. *Arthritis & Rheumatism.* 2008;59(5). doi: 10.1002/art.23563.
20. Kamper SJ, Apeldoorn AT, Chiarotto A, Smeets RJ, Ostelo RW, Guzman J, et al. Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for chronic low back pain: Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2015;350. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h444.
21. Ogbeivor C, Elsabbagh L. Management approach combining prognostic screening and targeted treatment for patients with low back pain compared with standard physiotherapy: A systematic review & meta-analysis. *Musculoskeletal Care.* 2021;19(4). doi: 10.1002/msc.1541.

22. Foster NE, Delitto A. Embedding psychosocial perspectives within clinical management of low back pain: Integration of psychosocially informed management principles into physical therapist practice—challenges and opportunities. *Physical Therapy*. 2011;91(5). doi: 10.2522/ptj.20100326.
23. Hill JC, Whitehurst DG, Lewis M, Bryan S, Dunn KM, Foster NE, et al. Comparison of stratified primary care management for low back pain with current best practice (STarT back): A randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2011;378(9802). doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60937-9.
24. Rhon DI, Greenlee TA, Poehlein E, Beneciuk JM, Green CL, Hando BR, et al. Effect of risk-stratified care on disability among adults with low back pain treated in the military health system: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(7). doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.21929.
25. Delitto A, George SZ, Dillen LV, Whitman JM, Sowa G, Shekelle P, et al. Low back pain. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*. 2012;42(4). doi: 10.2519/jospt.2012.42.4.A1.
26. Campos TFD. Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: Assessment and management NICE guideline [NG59]. *Journal of Physiotherapy*. 2017;63(2). doi: 10.1016/j.jphys.2017.02.012.
27. Cherkin D, Balderson B, Wellman R, Hsu C, Sherman KJ, Evers SC, et al. Effect of low back pain risk-stratification strategy on patient outcomes and care processes: The MATCH randomized trial in primary care. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2018;33(8). doi: 10.1007/s11606-018-4468-9.
28. Inani SB, Selkar SP. Effect of core stabilization exercises versus conventional exercises on pain and functional status in patients with non-specific low back pain: A randomised clinical trial. *J Back Musculoskeletal Rehabil*. 2013;26(1):37-43.doi.org/10.3233/bmr-2012-0348.
29. Bhadauria EA, Gurudut P. Comparative effectiveness of lumbar stabilization, dynamic strengthening, and Pilates on chronic low back pain: A randomized clinical trial. *J Exerc Rehabil*. 2017;13(4):477-485.doi.org/10.12965/jer.1734972.486.
30. Niederer D, Mueller J. Sustainability effects of motor control stabilisation exercises on pain and function in chronic nonspecific low back pain patients: A systematic review with meta-analysis and meta-regression. *PLoS One*. 2020 Jan 15;15(1):e0227423. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0227423.
31. Kalita A, Wankhar D. Effectiveness of lumbar stabilization exercises versus conventional physiotherapy in improving pain, kinesiophobia and disability in non-specific chronic low back pain patients: A prospective interventional study. *J Clin Diagn Res*. 2026. doi.org/10.7860/jcdr/2026/84705.23152.
32. Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, Chou R, Cohen SP, Gross DP, et al. Lancet low back pain series working group. Prevention and treatment of low back pain: Evidence, challenges, and promising directions. *Lancet*. 2018;391. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30489-6.