

Fear-avoidance beliefs are associated with exercise compliance: Secondary analysis of a randomised controlled trial among female healthcare workers with recurrent low back pain

Annika Taulaniemi (✉ annika.taulaniemi@ukkinstituutti.fi)

UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9313-7713>

Markku Kankaanpää

Tampere University Hospital

Marjo Rinne

The UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research

Kari Tokola

UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research

Jari Parkkari

UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research

Jaana Helena Suni

UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research

Research article

Keywords: exercise adherence, Pilates, fear of pain, lumbar pain, nursing personnel

Posted Date: October 10th, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.15890/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation on May 4th, 2020. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13102-020-00177-w>.

Abstract

Background Exercise is recommended for the treatment and management of low back pain (LBP) and the prevention of chronicity. Compliance with exercise has proved to be only modest in intervention studies among people with musculoskeletal pain. Fear-avoidance beliefs (FABs) are known to affect exercise adherence. The purpose of the study was twofold: to examine which bio-psycho-social factors contributed to exercise compliance during a 6-month neuromuscular exercise intervention among female healthcare workers with recurrent LBP, and to investigate how exercising affects FABs at 6 and 12 months' follow-up.

Methods A total of 219 healthcare workers aged 30–55 years with mild-to-moderate re-current non-specific LBP were originally allocated to four groups (exercise, counselling, combined exercise and counselling, control). In the present study, the exercise groups (exercise only and exercise + counselling) and non-exercise groups (counselling only and control) were merged. Baseline factors of the exercise compliers (exercising ≥ 24 times over 24 weeks; $n=58$) were compared to those of the non-compliers (exercising <1 time/week, 0–23 times; $n=52$). The effects of the exercise programme on FABs were analysed by a generalised linear mixed model according to the intention-to-treat principle (exercisers; $n=110$ vs non-exercisers; $n=109$) at three measurement points (baseline, 6, and 12 months). A per-protocol analysis compared the more exercised to the less exercised and non-exercisers.

Results A low education level ($p=0.026$), shift work ($p=0.023$), low aerobic ($p=0.048$) and musculoskeletal ($p=0.043$) fitness level, and high FABs related to physical activity ($p=0.019$) at the baseline contributed to lower exercise compliance. The exercise programme reduced levels of both physical activity- and work-related FABs, and there was a dose response: FABs reduced more in persons with better exercise compliance.

Conclusion Healthcare workers who had lower education and fitness levels, worked shifts, and had high physical activity-related FABs had a lower compliance to the 6-month neuromuscular exercise programme. Exercising with good compliance reduced levels of FABs, which are known to be linked with prolonged LBP. In exercise interventions, motivational strategies should be targeted at persons with low education and fitness levels and high FABs in order to achieve better exercise compliance.

Introduction

Disability from low back pain (LBP) is highest in working-age groups worldwide [1]. Among healthcare workers, LBP is the leading musculoskeletal disorder, and it is also the most costly and common self-reported disease [2]. Major contributors to the high incidence of LBP are physically heavy nursing duties, such as lifting and transferring patients, and working in awkward positions[3–5].

In physically demanding work duties, maintaining a healthy back obviously requires a certain fitness level [6–8]. Low ratings of self-reported physical capacity have been shown to be a predictor for future LBP in female healthcare workers [9]. Female nurses with a recent back injury also show more impairment in

lumbar movement control [10], which has also been suggested to play an important role in maintaining a healthy back [11, 12].

Exercise is the most often recommended treatment for the management and prevention of LBP [13–17]. Thus, achieving and maintaining adherence to exercise in the management of spinal pain is important to realise the beneficial effects of exercise. Adherence is a key link between the process and outcome of exercise interventions, and poor adherence compromises the effectiveness of treatment[18].

Barriers to exercise adherence, such as pain with exercise [19], fear of movement and pain aggravation [20], low levels of physical activity [21], low self-efficacy [19], psychological dysfunction [19], poor social support [19], time management, and uncertainty about the benefits of exercise [22], have been reported among people with musculoskeletal pain [19–22]. Fear avoidance is the belief that activities should be avoided to reduce pain [23]. Fear of pain develops as a result of a cognitive interpretation of pain as something threatening, and this fear affects attention processes (hypervigilance) and leads to the avoidance of behaviours, like physical activity and exercise, which are expected to cause pain [23]. Fear-avoidance beliefs (FABs) influence treatment effects and are prognostic to poor outcomes in subacute LBP [24]. Besides FABs, there are probably several other internal factors (like a lack of interest [25], and low self-efficacy [26]) and external factors (like time management, environment, and transfer) that compromise adherence to exercise.

Among people with chronic LBP, improvements in functioning are more strongly associated with adherence to exercise than with the type of exercise [27]. Some 50–70% of people with chronic LBP are non-adherent to prescribed home exercise [28]. Thus, factors associated with adherence to exercise in LBP require more investigation [28].

In a previously reported study, we found that a 6-month modified Pilates-type neuromuscular exercise intervention, which focused on controlling the neutral lumbar spine posture and developing the muscle strength and endurance needed in heavy nursing tasks, was effective in reducing lumbar pain and lumbar movement control impairments among a sample of nursing personnel with sub-acute or recurrent LBP [29]. The target was to exercise twice a week for 24 weeks, i.e. 48 times. Compliance with the exercise was only modest; the mean attendance rate was 26.1 (of the targeted 48). The reduction of LBP intensity and lumbar movement control impairment was significantly better in those who exercised once a week or more compared to the less exercised and non-exercisers [29].

The purpose of this study was to (1) investigate the effects of baseline bio-psychosocial factors on exercise compliance among female healthcare personnel with sub-acute or recurrent LBP. Furthermore, we sought to (2) examine the effects of the exercise intervention on the development of FABs over time (at 6 and 12 months' follow-up).

Methods

Study design

This study is based on the data of a four-arm randomised controlled trial (RCT) among female healthcare personnel (NURSE-RCT, clinical trial registration NCT01465698) [30], in which healthcare personnel with sub-acute or recurrent LBP were randomised to participate in neuromuscular exercise/non-exercise and to receive/not receive back care counselling for 6 months [31]. In the secondary analysis, those receiving exercise (combined exercise + counselling, and exercise only) were merged to be exercisers, and non-exercisers (counselling only and controls) were merged to be the controls [29].

The study was conducted in the form of three identical consecutive sub-studies. The participants were female healthcare workers in physically demanding duties: in old people's homes and geriatric wards (in the first sub-study in 2011, n = 56); in home service, public healthcare units, and community hospital wards (in the second sub-study in 2012; n = 80); and in university hospital wards (in the third sub-study in 2013; n = 83) in the city of Tampere, Finland. The protocol and time frame of each sub-study are presented in the study protocol [30]. The recruitment of participants, eligibility criteria, and reasons for exclusion have been previously described in detail [31]. Briefly, 30–55-year-old female healthcare workers were eligible if they had worked in their current job for at least 12 months and had experienced LBP of an intensity of 2 or above on a numeric rating scale (NRS; 0–10) [32]. The exclusion criteria were a serious earlier back injury, chronic LBP (pain duration ≥ 7 months), pregnancy or recent delivery (<12 months), and engagement in a neuromuscular-type exercise (NME) more than once a week.

The power calculations, recruitment process, randomisation, and ethical issues of the NURSE-RCT have been presented previously [30], as have the contents of the exercise intervention [29]. The present study aimed to investigate in detail which background and baseline factors are associated with compliance with exercise and to determine how exercising affects FABs.

The study design and flow of the participants are shown in Figure 1.

Fig. 1. Trial profile (CONSORT flow chart).

Footnote, Figure 1: Analysis methods for studying (1) the associations between baseline factors and exercise compliance rate, and (2) the effects of the exercise intervention on fear-avoidance beliefs (FABs).

Participants

The participants were female healthcare workers who engaged in physically demanding work and suffered from sub-acute or recurrent LBP. The mean age of the participants was 46 years, and they had worked in their current job on average for 11 years [7]. Some 87% were nurses or nursing assistants, and 70% did shift work [7]. In the pre-study screening, most of the study subjects (82%) experienced LBP on a few or most days of the week, but not daily, and 18% had LBP daily [7]. At the baseline, the mean of the pain intensity measured on a visual analogue scale (VAS; 0–100) during the previous 4 weeks [33] was 36.2 (SD 22.6) [7]. The majority of the study sample can be described as having sub-acute, mild-to-moderate, recurrent or fluctuating non-specific LBP (4).

Measurements

A wide range of measurements was taken at the baseline. In addition to background factors (age, education level, civil status, occupation, number of working years in the current job, working hours, smoking, perceived health and perceived fitness in comparison to persons of the same age and gender, current use of medication, high blood pressure (yes/no), and hormonal status); LBP intensity (VAS; 0–100) during the previous 4 weeks [33]; the frequency of LBP; the number of musculoskeletal pain sites [7]; quality of life (RAND 36) with eight sub-scales [34, 35]; depression (using the modified Finnish version of the Patient Health Questionnaire; PHQ–9)[36]; the short form of the workability index [37]; physical functioning in nursing tasks [30]; tiredness, sleepiness, and difficulties in recovering from work [38]; work-induced exertion in different body parts [39]; and psychosocial factors at work (Finnish work satisfaction questionnaire) [40] were investigated by questionnaires. FABs were measured with a questionnaire assessing FABs related to work (FAB-W) and physical activity (FAB-PA) [41]. Three questions considering long-term sick leave were removed from the original FABs questionnaire, because the participants were still in work [30].

Physical measurements included body mass index (BMI), movement control of the low back [42, 43], and performance tests for physical fitness, namely aerobic fitness by the 6-minute walk test [44], muscular strength (modified push-up [45], one-legged squat [45], vertical jump [45], modified sit-ups [46]), agility by running a figure-of-eight [47], flexibility by trunk lateral side bending [45], and rhythm coordination [47]. More precise information on the measurements is given in the study protocol article [30], the article on the repeatability of the physical measurements [43], and the baseline analysis of the study sample [7].

Exercise interventions in the NURSE-RCT

The contents of the 6-month exercise intervention have been described previously [29]. The modified 6-month Pilates-type exercise intervention programme, which focuses on controlling the neutral spine posture, started with light and easier exercises, and it was progressive in terms of demands for coordination, balance, and muscular strength over three stages. The goal was to exercise twice a week; during the first 2 months (stage I) in supervised neuromuscular exercise (NME) classes (lasting 60 minutes) and during the next 4 months (stages II and III) in one supervised class and one home session with the help of a DVD (lasting 50 minutes) or booklet produced for the study [29]. During stages II and III, the participants were also allowed to exercise in supervised group sessions more than once a week if exercise at home was inconvenient, and also only at home if the group sessions were difficult to attend. During the progression (stages II and III), the participants were allowed and/or advised to do easier exercises from the previous stage if the more challenging exercises proved too demanding.

The leaders of the neuromuscular exercise groups were all certified Pilates instructors with a background in physiotherapy, a master's degree in health sciences, or both [29]. Supervised exercise groups were organised in facilities near the workplaces of the healthcare personnel. Group sessions were provided on weekdays starting 15 minutes after the typical work shifts ended. The exercise classes, videos, and booklets were free for the participants, but they exercised in their own time [31].

Compliance with exercise

The instructors monitored the participation of supervised group exercise, and study subjects kept an exercise diary of their home practice. The structured exercise diaries were returned at the end of stage II (week 16) and stage III (week 24). Attendance of the supervised exercise sessions and the number of home exercise sessions were added together to determine the total exercise attendance rate.

Motivational strategies

All participants in the exercise group received an information letter at the beginning of the exercise intervention about the goals and principles of the exercise programme. During the 4th week of the first-stage exercise period, those who had not participated in any group-based exercise sessions received a telephone call from a research nurse (not involved in the exercise intervention or measurements), who encouraged them to start to exercise. All participants received two material packages (between stages I and II, and between stages II and III), which included an exercise DVD, exercise booklet, exercise diary for home practice, and a letter including information about the study and the importance of regular exercise. They also received two e-mails during stage II in order to encourage exercise, and a letter before the 6-month follow-up measurements from the principal investigator (JS).

To avoid any contamination to the back care counselling intervention (in the original four-arm setting), and to ensure exactly the same information to all who were allocated to the exercise group, the exercise instructors focused on instructing the standardised exercise programme (individual modifications due to musculoskeletal problems other than LBP were allowed). All other kinds of counselling (e.g. lifestyle, pain management, and ergonomics) were avoided in the exercise classes.

Statistical methods:

Power calculations (at least 160 subjects needed) for the original NURSE-RCT have been reported previously [30], as has the randomisation of the participants [31].

Partial correlation analysis was conducted between all background and baseline variables and the compliance rate to determine which of the 60 different factors could have an association with the compliance rate. Those variables showing a statistically significant association with the compliance rate were selected for bivariate analysis with the compliance rate; the analytical methods were Spearman's correlation for continuous variables and the Kruskal–Wallis test for the categorical variables.

The exercise group was split into the compliers (those who exercised once a week or more; ≥ 24 times during the 24 weeks) and non-compliers (those who exercised 0–23 times). We examined the baseline characteristics of the participants randomised to the exercisers by the compliance status for those variables showing statistically significant associations with the compliance rate in the bivariate analysis. The analytical methods were the independent samples *t*-test, the χ^2 test, or the Mann–Whitney *U* test as applicable.

To analyse the effects of the exercise programme on FABs, the mean differences in time (at three measurement points: baseline, 6 months, and 12 months) between the two groups (exercisers vs non-exercisers) were tested using a generalised linear mixed model (GLMM) (Fig. 1). To take the interaction between back counselling and exercise into consideration, all analyses were first adjusted for counselling. Second, the sub-study was included as a random effect in all the GLLM analysis models to indicate the possible heterogeneity between the study sites and study time in the three consecutive sub-studies. Other confounding factors were background variables (age, civil status, education), work-related factors (shift work/regular work, psycho-social factors at work [40], perceived work-induced lumbar exertion [39]), and health-related factors (BMI, hormonal status, perceived health, perceived fitness, blood pressure, current medication, self-reported physical activity and fitness components). Only those confounding factors that improved the model in the second stage in the sense of Bayesian information criteria were included in the final adjusted model.

After analysis according to the intention-to-treat (ITT) principle (Fig. 1), the study sample was assigned into two groups in order to investigate the effectiveness of the exercise on FABs, based on a per-protocol (PP) analysis. The mean difference in time (0, 6, 12 months) of exercise compliers (≥ 24 exercise sessions) were estimated and compared to the results of a combined group of non-compliers and non-exercisers (0–23 exercise sessions + controls).

The correlation between the change in LBP intensity from the baseline to 6 months [29] and the change in the results of the FAB measurements after the intervention period were calculated by Spearman's correlation coefficient (r_s). Associations between professional status and fear avoidance at the baseline were analysed by analysis of variance (ANOVA).

All the analyses were conducted using SPSS (IBM Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0 Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).

Results

Compliance

The target was for the participants to exercise twice a week—i.e. 48 sessions over 24 weeks. The mean attendance rate was 26.3 (12.2) exercise sessions. Some 53% of the participants exercised 1–2 times/week. The mean compliance rate was 1.1 times/week during the whole intervention. During the last 8 weeks, the mean attendance rate of the group-based exercise decreased, but the home-based exercise rate increased (total amount remaining 1.1 times /week). Only two persons out of the 110 exercised regularly twice a week during the 6-month intervention period.

Of those who were allocated to the exercise group, 10% did not exercise at all, and another 10% took part in only 1–5 exercise sessions in the 6-month period. Of the whole study sample ($n = 219$), 80% ($n = 176$) and 72% ($n = 157$) participated in the 6-month and 12-month follow-up measurements, respectively [31].

At 6 months, 22 persons had dropped out, and 91% of them (n = 20) belonged to the least exercised group (0–5 exercise sessions). The dropout rate (n = 21) was equal among non-exercisers (Fig.1).

Baseline factors associated with exercise compliance

The bivariate associations between exercise attendance rates and continuous background and baseline variables is presented in Table 1. The associations for categorical variables are shown in Table 2. Between-group differences for those variables that had statistically significant correlations with compliance rates in the bivariate analysis are presented in Table 3 for the exercise compliers vs non-compliers.

	Correlation with compliance (r_s)	Missing	p -value
Running figure-of-eight	-0.27	9	0.006
One-legged squat	0.19	2	0.048
6MWT	0.28		0.003
Quality of life:			
Physical functioning	0.19	4	0.045
Energy	0.15	4	0.12
Social functioning	0.18	4	0.06
General health	0.23	4	0.019
Workability	0.26		0.006
Depression; PHQ-9	-0.20	1	0.038
Musculoskeletal exertion	0.25	2	0.009
FABs (total)	-0.26	7	0.009
FAB-PA	-0.32	1	0.001
Intensity of LBP	-0.06	2	0.54

6MWT = 6-minute walk test, FAB = fear-avoidance beliefs, FAB-PA = fear-avoidance beliefs related to physical activity, LBP = low back pain, PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire, 9 items

Exercise non-compliers had more often a lower education level ($p = 0.03$), were employed as assistant nurses ($p = 0.05$), and did shift work ($p = 0.02$) compared to the exercise compliers (Table 3). From the baseline variables, higher fitness results in the one-legged squat ($p = 0.043$) and 6-minute walk test ($p = 0.048$) were detected for exercise compliers (Table 3).

Table 2. Association between baseline categorical variables and exercise compliance rate, analysed by the Kruskal–Wallis test.					
	n	Compliance; median	Range of compliance; min, max	Missing	p- value
Education level				1	0.040
low (secondary school or less)	30	18	0, 40		
medium (high school)	74	28.5	0, 55		
high (university)	5	16	0, 29		
Work type					0.001
regular daytime work	30	31.5	5, 55		
shift work	72	21.4	0, 44		
other working time	8	33	2, 43		
Occupation					0.003
assistant nurse	43	16	0, 41		
nurse	56	28	0, 55		
other (radiographer, PT, midwife)	11	35	4, 50		
Sub-study			0, 39		0.012
Nurse I	27	12	0, 50		
Nurse II	41	24	0, 55		
Nurse III	42	29			
Perceived health in comparison to others of the same age and gender					0.037
moderate					
good or very good	45	22	0, 55		
	65	28	0, 50		
Perceived fitness in comparison to others of the same age and gender					0.06
worse					
equal	32	23	0, 55		
better	52	22	0, 44		
	26	31	0, 55		
Frequency of LBP				8	0.051
on some days of the week	46	45	0, 43		
on most days	38	61	0, 55		
daily	18	48	0, 42		

LBP = low back pain, PT = physiotherapist

Fear-avoidance beliefs

At the baseline, there was a difference in the levels of FABs between occupational groups in the whole study sample ($n = 219$). Nursing assistants had more FABs related to physical activity (FAB-PA, mean 15.5, SD 6.0, $n = 89$) than nurses (12.0, SD 5.9, $n = 102$) and other professionals (11.6, SD 6.8, $n = 28$) ($F = 9.5$, $p < 0.001$).

	Compliers (≥ 24 exercise sessions), n=58			Non-compliers (0–23 exercise sessions), n=52			Missing	p-value
	Mean (SD)	n	%	Mean (SD)	n	%		
Running figure-of-eight; seconds <input type="checkbox"/>	7.7 (1.0)			8.0 (1.2)			9	0.20
One-legged squat; (0–12 reps) <input type="checkbox"/>	9.9 (2.3)			8.9 (2.9)			2	0.043
6MWT; metres <input type="checkbox"/>	623.0 (43.8)			603.4 (56.2)			-	0.048
Quality of life:								
Physical functioning (0–100) <input type="checkbox"/>	87.3(11.1)			83.4 (13.4)			4	0.17
General health (0–100) *	70.2(16.4)			64.5 (17.5)			4	0.08
Workability (3–27) <input type="checkbox"/>	22.2 (2.6)			21.9 (2.9)				0.20
PHQ-9 <input type="checkbox"/>	16.4 (4.5)			17.5 (5.3)			1	0.29
Musculoskeletal exertion*	12.2 (3.8)			13.5(4.0)			2	0.10
FABs total <input type="checkbox"/>	23.2 (12.9)			27.3(14.5)			7	0.07
FAB-PA; <input type="checkbox"/>	12.6(6.9)			15.4 (6.4)			1	0.019
LBP intensity; (VAS 0–100) <input type="checkbox"/>	36.9 (19.9)			35.9 (19.9)			1	0.79
Education level ^o							-	0.026
low (secondary school or less)		14	24.1		23	44.2		
medium or high		44	75.9		29	55.8		
Work type; ^o							-	0.023
regular work		24	41.4		11	21.2		
shift work		34	58.6		41	78.8		
Profession; ^o							-	0.052
assistant nurse		18	31.0		25	48.1		
nurse		31	53.4		25	48.1		
other (radiographer, PT, midwife)		9	15.5		2	3.8		
Sub-study; ^o							-	0.042
Sub-study I		9	15.5		18	34.6		
Sub-study II		22	37.9		19	36.5		
Sub-study III		27	46.6		15	28.8		
Perceived health in comparison to others of the same age and sex; ^o							-	0.14
moderate		20	34.5		25	48.1		
good or very good		38	65.5		27	51.8		
Frequency of LBP; ^o							8	0.12
on some days of the week		21	38		25	54		
on most days		26	46		12	26		
daily		9	16		9	20		

*normal distribution, independent samples t -test, \square Mann–Whitney U test, $^{\circ}$ χ^2 test. FAB-PA = physical activity-related fear-avoidance beliefs, LBP = low back pain, PHQ-9 = Nine-item Patient Health Questionnaire measuring depression; PT = physical therapist; VAS = visual analogue scale of 0–100 during the past 4 weeks

Exercise compliers showed lower values for FAB-PA at the baseline compared to non-compliers ($p = 0.02$, Table 3). During the exercise intervention, both FAB-PA ($p = 0.028$, adjusted for perceived occupational physical loading) and also FAB-W ($p = 0.007$, adjusted for age, shift work, perceived health, fitness and occupational physical loading, and push-ups) decreased in the exercise group compared to the non-exercisers (Fig. 2; ITT analysis). There was a dose-response; both FAB-PA ($p = 0.006$) and FAB-W ($p = 0.016$) decreased more in the high exercise compliance group compared to the less exercised and non-exercisers (Fig. 2; PP analysis). A reduction in FAB-PA (from the baseline to 6 months) did not correlate with a reduction in LBP intensity ($r_p = 0.03$, $p = 0.54$), but there was a correlation between a reduction in FAB-W and a reduction in LBP intensity ($r_s = 0.16$, $p = 0.05$).

Fig. 2. Effects of the exercise program on fear avoidance beliefs

Footnote to Fig 2: Effects and effectiveness of the modified Pilates-type neuromuscular exercise (NME) with a focus on controlling the neutral spine on a) physical activity-related fear-avoidance beliefs, and b) work-related fear-avoidance beliefs (the mean difference in percentage with 95% confidence intervals analysed by general linear mixed models).

Discussion

In this 6-month modified, Pilates-type exercise study for female healthcare personnel with sub-acute or recurrent, non-specific LBP, those possessing a lower basic education level, working as assistant nurses, working shifts, and having lower levels of fitness and higher levels of physical activity-related FABs at the baseline had a lower exercise compliance. Exercising during the intervention reduced levels of FAB-PA and FAB-W, and there was a dose-response: the levels of FAB-PA and FAB-W decreased more in more exercised persons.

In exercise interventions, levels of exercise adherence usually drop over time [27, 48]. In the present intervention, participation in the supervised groups decreased across time, but the amount of home-based exercise increased commensurately. The exercise videos and booklets probably helped in maintaining the same exercise adherence level throughout the 6-month intervention, because shift work makes attending regular group-based exercise demanding. Nevertheless, the compliance rate was lower than we expected.

It has been suggested that factors associated with exercise adherence among LBP patients can be divided into three categories [49]: 1) physical factors like pain [49] and perceived health status [50]; 2) psychological factors like the fear of pain [51], diagnostic uncertainty [20], self-efficacy [19], and depression and anxiety [19]; and 3) environmental factors, such as difficulty in integrating exercise into daily life [20, 49], lack of time [20, 49, 51], and intervention-related variables [28]. This classification is partly insufficient: it is difficult to place education level, which is a socio-demographic background factor,

into any of those categories. Education level has been shown to affect compliance with exercise progression among people with chronic LBP [52], strength training [50], and leisure-time physical activity [53]. In the present study, exercise compliance was the lowest in the first sub-study, which included those working in an old people's home and on geriatric wards. The majority of the group had a lower education level and worked as assistant nurses.

Physical factors

In previous studies, LBP intensity [49] and older age [52] compromised compliance with exercise or exercise progression. Contradictory to earlier studies, they had no effect in the present study. A higher physical fitness level at the baseline contributed to better exercise adherence. We know from experience that those with greater physical fitness are more prone to take part in exercise programmes in workplaces than those with poor fitness, but the scientific evidence is lacking.

Psychological factors

FABs related to physical activity are known to affect exercise adherence [20]; activities or exercises are avoided for fear of increasing pain [51]. If an exercise programme is unlikely to produce an immediate tangible benefit, such as pain relief, it is also difficult for many people—for whom pain relief is their primary concern—to recognise the value of exercise [20]. In the present study, those with higher levels of FAB-PA at the baseline exercised less than those with lower levels of FAB-PA.

Cognitive and psychological interventions [23] and graded activity [54] are usually considered helpful in the management of fear avoidance-related pain. We hypothesise that this modified, slowly progressing Pilates-type exercise programme, which was conducted at the pace of the participant's calm breathing tempo, might have given the participants positive experiences of movement. They could move in a way that they could control; the movements were not harmful or dangerous and could even release pain. This might explain the reduction of FAB levels during the exercise intervention. No adverse events were reported during the exercise intervention period [31].

Moderators (or treatment effect modifiers) are baseline characteristics that influence the outcome of treatment [55]. *Mediators* are factors that change during or as a consequence of an intervention and thereby influence outcome [55]. Thus, it might be hypothesised that the earlier reported reduction of LBP intensity during the exercise intervention [29] might have been mediated by a reduction in the fear of movement. Nevertheless, there was no correlation between the reduction of LBP intensity and the reduction of FAB-PA, but exercise adherence was the key factor. Those with a lower FAB-PA at the baseline exercised more, and those who exercised more gained more positive results in pain reduction [29]. While we measured pain intensity only at the baseline and after the 6-month exercise intervention—i.e. not during the intervention period—we cannot say anything about causality. Exercising more might have reduced the pain levels due to exercise-induced hypoalgesia [56–58], or a rapid reduction of pain intensity at the beginning of the exercise intervention might have decreased the levels of FAB-PA, and thus increased the motivation to exercise.

The reduction of FABs during the intervention was statistically significant, but we do not know if it is clinically relevant (three questions related to returning to work were removed from the original FAB Questionnaire). All the participants engaged in physically demanding work and had low back troubles, which is a challenging combination and a risk for prolonged LBP. For those healthcare workers with previous LBP, both the physical workload and FABs are important in the development of new episodes of LBP [59].

Previous physical inactivity has been shown to interfere with progression through the difficulty levels of Pilates among people with chronic LBP [52]. In the recruitment of participants in the NURSE-RCT, those who were already engaged in neuromuscular-type exercise more than once a week were excluded, but the screening did not include other questions about the participants' previous physical activity levels.

Environmental factors

We knew beforehand by experience that women aged 30–55 years and engaged in shift work form a challenging group. There are several other activities, especially family issues (small children and/or taking care of ageing parents or relatives) that compete for time resources. In our study, placing the exercise classes in locations close to workplaces, starting the classes when the typical work shifts ended, and producing exercise videos were attempts to make participation as easy as possible.

A lack of time is the most frequently reported barrier to leisure-time physical activity or exercise, both among the general population [25, 60] and among people with LBP [51]. Those working shifts had a lower exercise compliance than those working at regular times. Among nursing personnel, shift work is also associated with sleeping problems, fatigue, and lack of energy [61, 62], which might compromise exercise adherence.

Increasing the attractiveness of an exercise programme has been suggested to increase adherence [63]. In 2012–2014, when the study interventions were conducted, Pilates was quite a popular exercise type in Finland. “Back-friendly” exercise can be performed in many ways, but we reasoned that a Pilates type of exercise intervention would have been more attractive than a typically conventional/traditional neuromuscular exercise form.

The intensity of the training content—both being physically too hard or too easy—is an attendance barrier to exercise programmes among healthcare workers [64]. The use of skilful exercise instructors—who demonstrate exercises, observe exercise practice, give feedback, and make subsequent corrections in technique—has been suggested to increase exercise adherence [20, 21]. To ensure skilful exercise instruction, we recruited only certified Pilates instructors with a high level of basic education who were able to advise participants to exercise “on their level” during the progression of the exercise programme.

In our study, participants exercised in their leisure time. Financial incentives from the employer in the form of exercise during working hours or subsidies for the time used for exercise play an important role in decision-making also among people with LBP [65]. Among Danish healthcare workers, adherence to

group-based supervised exercise at the workplace was greater than adherence to exercise at home [66]. However, even when the exercise is offered to workers during working hours, studies report only moderate compliance at best [67].

Increasing adherence to exercise is an important factor for the longer-term effectiveness of an intervention. According to the literature, the following actions may enhance adherence to exercise:

- Self-regulation behaviour, like strategic planning [51] and self-monitoring [50];
- Integration of educational components in exercise sessions [68], like goal-setting [21, 69] and education [21];
- Supplementary printed material, motivation strategies, and positive re-enforcement [69];
- A favourable environment [51];
- Action planning to overcome barriers to exercise [51];
- Programme organisation and leadership skills [19], including encouragement [51];
- Pleasure associated with exercise [51];
- Reduced fear of pain and pain itself [51];
- Identification of especially those who have a low education level, and targeting motivating efforts at them [50].

Understanding the causality and reasons for exercise adherence is complicated, multidimensional, and difficult to study. People do not always behave in the way they intend to behave. Motivation alone is not sufficient to trigger an action, and one is often confronted with obstacles [51]. In the present study, exercise compliance was lower among those with a lower level of basic education working as assistant nurses. The levels of FABs were also higher among this group. In clinical practice, motivational strategies with a focus on decreasing FABs especially among people with a low education level could be beneficial. Unfortunately, there is a lack of measurement methods to identify those who would benefit most from motivational actions.

Limitations

This study was a secondary analysis of the NURSE-RCT. Investigating associations between individual factors at the baseline and exercise compliance was not planned simultaneously with planning the RCT, and it was not written into the study protocol [30]. We arrived at the idea for the study after we detected the dose response of exercising on LBP intensity and movement control impairments [29]. Due to the four-arm setting of the original NURSE-RCT (combined exercise + counselling, exercise only, counselling only, controls), targeting motivational strategies at exercisers (exercise only and the combined group) would have been difficult without contaminating the back care counselling intervention.

Several additional measurements might have been beneficial: the immediate effects of the exercise sessions (to pain or other bodily sensations), home environment, previous physical activity (in earlier

years), and the number and ages of the participants' children were not ascertained in the study. This might have broadened our understanding of the factors affecting compliance. We measured only the number of exercise sessions, which were either supervisor-documented (for group sessions) or self-reported (for home practice). The research calls for standard validated measures of exercise adherence [18].

Conclusion

Participants with lower education and fitness levels who worked shifts and had high physical activity-related fear-avoidance beliefs at the baseline had a lower compliance with the 6-month neuromuscular exercise programme. Exercising with good compliance reduced levels of FABs, which are known to be linked with prolonged LBP. In exercise interventions, motivational strategies should be targeted at those with low education and fitness levels and high fear-avoidance beliefs to achieve better exercise compliance. In exercise intervention studies, strategies to enhance and/or maintain exercise adherence need to be taken more seriously, because adherence is a key link between intervention and outcomes.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The participants gave their informed consent at their first visit to the research centre (i.e. at the baseline measurement of the study), and the trial was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Pirkanmaa Hospital District, Finland (ETL code R08157).

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available from the principal researcher (JS; jaana.suni@ukkinstituutti.fi) of the NURSE RCT upon reasonable request

Funding

Funding was received from the Social Insurance Institution of Finland (37/26/2011 and 31/26/2015) for planning and conducting the study interventions and collecting the data, and from Tampere University Hospital (9R015, 9S017, 9T015, and 9U017) for the data analysis and reporting.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Authors' contributions

All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

AT is the corresponding author, and she drafted the manuscript. She planned the exercise intervention, trained the other exercise instructors, produced the exercise videos and booklets, and supervised some of the exercise groups. She conducted the literature search and the bivariate statistical analysis.

MK contributed to the design of the present study and the interpretation and presentation of the results.

MR contributed to the interpretation and presentation of the results.

KT verified the bivariate statistical analysis, and he conducted all the multivariate analyses. He also contributed to the presentation of the results of the statistical analysis.

JP is the responsible medical doctor of the study. He contributed to the design of the study and the interpretation and presentation of the results.

JS is the principal researcher of the NURSE-RCT. She is responsible for measurement selection and development, and for data collection and management. She contributed to the design of the study and the interpretation and presentation of the results of the present study.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the nursing personnel who participated in the NURSE-RCT, the instructors who supervised the exercise groups, and the personnel who conducted the measurements at the UKK Institute for Health Promotion Research. They also wish to thank the head nurses and other personnel of Social and Health Services at the City of Tampere and Tampere University of Applied Sciences for organising locations for exercising close to the workplaces.

Abbreviations

ANOVA: Analysis of variance

BMI: Body mass index

DVD: Digital video disc

FABs: Fear-avoidance beliefs

FAB-PA: Fear-avoidance beliefs related to physical activity

FAB-W: Work-related fear-avoidance beliefs

GLMM: Generalised linear mixed model

ITT: Intention to treat

LBP: Low back pain

NME: Neuromuscular exercise

NRS: Numeric rating scale; 0–10

PHQ–9: Patient health questionnaire, 9 items

PP: per protocol

RCT: Randomised controlled trial

SD: Standard deviation

VAS: Visual analogue scale; 0–100

References

1. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, Hoy D, Karppinen J, Pransky G, Sieper J *et al*: *What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. Lancet* 2018, *391*(10137):2356–2367.
2. Chen MJ, Weng SS: *Psychological symptoms among hospital nurses in Taiwan: a cross sectional study. BMC women's health* 2017, *17*(1):101.
3. Jensen JN, Holtermann A, Clausen T, Mortensen OS, Carneiro IG, Andersen LL: *The greatest risk for low-back pain among newly educated female health care workers; body weight or physical work load? BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2012, *13*:87.
4. Yassi A, Lockhart K: *Work-relatedness of low back pain in nursing personnel: a systematic review. Int J Occup Environ Health* 2013, *19*(3):223–244.
5. Lagerstrom M, Hansson T, Hagberg M: *Work-related low-back problems in nursing. Scand J Work Environ Health* 1998, *24*(6):449–464.
6. Frost DM, Beach TA, Callaghan JP, McGill SM: *Exercise-Based Performance Enhancement and Injury Prevention for Firefighters: Contrasting the Fitness- and Movement-Related Adaptations to Two Training Methodologies. Journal of strength and conditioning research* 2015, *29*(9):2441–2459.
7. Taulaniemi A, Kuusinen L, Tokola K, Kankaanpaa M, Suni JH: *Bio-psychosocial factors are associated with pain intensity, physical functioning, and ability to work in female healthcare personnel with recurrent low back pain. Journal of rehabilitation medicine: official journal of the UEMS European Board of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine* 2017.

- 8.Kolu P, Tokola K, Kankaanpaa M, Suni J: *Evaluation of the Effects of Physical Activity, Cardiorespiratory Condition, and Neuromuscular Fitness on Direct Healthcare Costs and Sickness-Related Absence Among Nursing Personnel With Recurrent Nonspecific Low Back Pain. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2017, 42(11):854–862.*
- 9.Rasmussen CD, Jorgensen MB, Clausen T, Andersen LL, Stroyer J, Holtermann A: *Does self-assessed physical capacity predict development of low back pain among health care workers? A 2-year follow-up study. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2013, 38(3):272–276.*
- 10.Babiolakis CS, Kuk JL, Drake JD: *Differences in lumbopelvic control and occupational behaviours in female nurses with and without a recent history of low back pain due to back injury. Ergonomics 2015, 58(2):235–245.*
- 11.Suni JH, Taanila H, Mattila VM, Ohrankammen O, Vuorinen P, Pihlajamaki H, Parkkari J: *Neuromuscular exercise and counseling decrease absenteeism due to low back pain in young conscripts: a randomized, population-based primary prevention study. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2013, 38(5):375–384.*
- 12.Luomajoki HA, Bonet Beltran MB, Careddu S, Bauer CM: *Effectiveness of movement control exercise on patients with non-specific low back pain and movement control impairment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Musculoskeletal science & practice 2018, 36:1–11.*
- 13.Choi BK, Verbeek JH, Tam WW, Jiang JY: *Exercises for prevention of recurrences of low-back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2010(1):CD006555.*
- 14.Balague F, Mannion AF, Pellise F, Cedraschi C: *Non-specific low back pain. Lancet 2012, 379(9814):482–491.*
- 15.Steffens D, Maher CG, Pereira LS, Stevens ML, Oliveira VC, Chapple M, Teixeira-Salmela LF, Hancock MJ: *Prevention of Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA internal medicine 2016, 176(2):199–208.*
- 16.Shiri R, Falah-Hassani K: *Does leisure time physical activity protect against low back pain? Systematic review and meta-analysis of 36 prospective cohort studies. Br J Sports Med 2017, 51(19):1410–1418.*
- 17.Falla D, Hodges PW: *Individualized Exercise Interventions for Spinal Pain. Exerc Sport Sci Rev 2017, 45(2):105–115.*
- 18.Jordan JL, Holden MA, Mason EE, Foster NE: *Interventions to improve adherence to exercise for chronic musculoskeletal pain in adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2010(1):CD005956.*
- 19.Jack K, McLean SM, Moffett JK, Gardiner E: *Barriers to treatment adherence in physiotherapy outpatient clinics: a systematic review. Manual therapy 2010, 15(3):220–228.*

20. Slade SC, Patel, S., Underwood, M., Keating, J. L.: *What Are Patient Beliefs and Perceptions About Exercise for Nonspecific Chronic Low Back Pain? A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies. Clin J Pain* 2014, *30*(11):995–1005.
21. Nicolson PJA, Bennell KL, Dobson FL, Van Ginckel A, Holden MA, Hinman RS: *Interventions to increase adherence to therapeutic exercise in older adults with low back pain and/or hip/knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med* 2017, *51*(10):791–799.
22. Escolar-Reina P M-MF, Gascón-Cánovas JJ, Montilla-Herrador J, Jimeno-Serrano FJ, de Oliveira Sousa SL, del Baño-Aledo ME, Lomas-Vega R.: *How do care-provider and home exercise program characteristics affect patient adherence in chronic neck and back pain: a qualitative study. BMC Health Serv Res* 2010, *10*(60).
23. Linton SJ, Shaw WS: *Impact of psychological factors in the experience of pain. Phys Ther* 2011, *91*(5):700–711.
24. Wertli MM, Rasmussen-Barr E, Weiser S, Bachmann LM, Brunner F: *The role of fear avoidance beliefs as a prognostic factor for outcome in patients with nonspecific low back pain: a systematic review. The spine journal: official journal of the North American Spine Society* 2014, *14*(5):816–836 e814.
25. Carraca EV, Mackenbach JD, Lakerveld J, Rutter H, Oppert JM, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Compernelle S, Roda C, Bardos H, Teixeira PJ: *Lack of interest in physical activity - individual and environmental attributes in adults across Europe: The SPOTLIGHT project. Prev Med* 2018, *111*:41–48.
26. Costa Lda C, Maher CG, McAuley JH, Hancock MJ, Smeets RJ: *Self-efficacy is more important than fear of movement in mediating the relationship between pain and disability in chronic low back pain. Eur J Pain* 2011, *15*(2):213–219.
27. Van Dillen LR, Norton BJ, Sahrman SA, Evanoff BA, Harris-Hayes M, Holtzman GW, Earley J, Chou I, Strube MJ: *Efficacy of classification-specific treatment and adherence on outcomes in people with chronic low back pain. A one-year follow-up, prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial. Manual therapy* 2016, *24*:52–64.
28. Beinart NA, Goodchild CE, Weinman JA, Ayis S, Godfrey EL: *Individual and intervention-related factors associated with adherence to home exercise in chronic low back pain: a systematic review. The spine journal: official journal of the North American Spine Society* 2013, *13*(12):1940–1950.
29. Taulaniemi A, Kankaanpää M, Tokola K, Parkkari J, Suni JH: *Neuromuscular exercise reduces low back pain intensity and improves physical functioning in nursing duties among female healthcare workers; secondary analysis of a randomised controlled trial. BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2019, *20*(1):328.
30. Suni JH, Rinne M, Kankaanpää M, Taulaniemi A, Lusa S, Lindholm H, Parkkari J: *Neuromuscular exercise and back counselling for female nursing personnel with recurrent non-specific low back pain:*

study protocol of a randomised controlled trial (NURSE-RCT). *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2016, 2(1):e000098.

31.Suni JH, Kolu P, Tokola K, Raitanen J, Rinne M, Taulaniemi A, Parkkari J, Kankaanpaa M: *Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of neuromuscular exercise and back care counseling in female healthcare workers with recurrent non-specific low back pain: a blinded four-arm randomized controlled trial. BMC public health* 2018, 18(1):1376.

32.Dionne CE, Dunn KM, Croft PR, Nachemson AL, Buchbinder R, Walker BF, Wyatt M, Cassidy JD, Rossignol M, Leboeuf-Yde C *et al*: *A consensus approach toward the standardization of back pain definitions for use in prevalence studies. Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2008, 33(1):95–103.

33.Ostelo RW, Deyo RA, Stratford P, Waddell G, Croft P, Von Korff M, Bouter LM, de Vet HC: *Interpreting change scores for pain and functional status in low back pain: towards international consensus regarding minimal important change. Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2008, 33(1):90–94.

34.Hays RD, Sherbourne CD, Mazel RM: *The RAND 36-Item Health Survey 1.0. Health Econ* 1993, 2(3):217–227.

35.Aalto AM, Aro, A. R., Teperi, J.: *RAND–36 as a measure of Health-Related Quality of life. Reliability, construct validity and reference values in the Finnish general population. RAND–36 terveyteen liittyvän elämänlaadun mittarina. Mittarin luotettavuus ja suomalaiset väestöarvot.* In. Helsinki: Stakes, Tutkimuksia 101; 1999.

36.Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB: *The PHQ–9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med* 2001, 16(9):606–613.

37.Ilmarinen J: *Work ability—a comprehensive concept for occupational health research and prevention. Scand J Work Environ Health* 2009, 35(1):1–5.

38.Karhula K, Harma M, Sallinen M, Hublin C, Virkkala J, Kivimaki M, Vahtera J, Puttonen S: *Association of job strain with working hours, shift-dependent perceived workload, sleepiness and recovery. Ergonomics* 2013, 56(11):1640–1651.

39.Ketola R, Toivonen R, Häkkänen M, Luukkonen R, Takala E-P, E V-J: *Effects of ergonomic intervention in work with video display units. Scand J Work Environ Health* 2002, 28(1):18–24.

40.Haukka E, Pehkonen I, Leino-Arjas P, Viikari-Juntura E, Takala EP, Malmivaara A, Hopsu L, Mutanen P, Ketola R, Virtanen T *et al*: *Effect of a participatory ergonomics intervention on psychosocial factors at work in a randomised controlled trial. Occup Environ Med* 2010, 67(3):170–177.

41.Waddell G, Newton M, Henderson I, Somerville D, Main CJ: *A Fear-Avoidance Beliefs Questionnaire (FABQ) and the role of fear-avoidance beliefs in chronic low back pain and disability. Pain* 1993, 52(2):157–168.

42. Luomajoki H, Kool J, de Bruin ED, Airaksinen O: *Reliability of movement control tests in the lumbar spine. BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007, 8:90.
43. Taulaniemi RPA, Kankaanpää MJ, Tokola KJ, Luomajoki HA, JH S: *Reliability of musculoskeletal fitness tests and movement control impairment test battery in female health-care personnel with recurrent low back pain. J Nov Physiother* 2016, 6(1):282.
44. Jenkins S, Cecins N, Camarri B, Williams C, Thompson P, Eastwood P: *Regression equations to predict 6-minute walk distance in middle-aged and elderly adults. Physiotherapy theory and practice* 2009, 25(7):516–522.
45. Suni JH, Oja P, Laukkanen RT, Miilunpalo SI, Pasanen ME, Vuori IM, Vartiainen TM, Bos K: *Health-related fitness test battery for adults: aspects of reliability. Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1996, 77(4):399–405.
46. Engström LM, Ekblom, B., Forsberg, A., v Koch, M. & Seger, J.: (in Swedish) *Livsstil–Prestation–Hälsa. Motionsvanor, fysisk prestationsförmåga och hälsotillstånd bland svenska kvinnor och män I åldern 20–65 år*, vol. 64. Ödeshög, Sverige: AB Danagård Grafiska; 1993.
47. Rinne MB, Pasanen ME, Miilunpalo SI, Oja P: *Test-retest reproducibility and inter-rater reliability of a motor skill test battery for adults. Int J Sports Med* 2001, 22(3):192–200.
48. Hakkinen A, Ylinen J, Kautiainen H, Tarvainen U, Kiviranta I: *Effects of home strength training and stretching versus stretching alone after lumbar disk surgery: a randomized study with a 1-year follow-up. Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005, 86(5):865–870.
49. Boutevillain L, Dupeyron A, Rouch C, Richard E, Coudeyre E: *Facilitators and barriers to physical activity in people with chronic low back pain: A qualitative study. PloS one* 2017, 12(7):e0179826.
50. Rhodes RE, Lubans DR, Karunamuni N, Kennedy S, Plotnikoff R: *Factors associated with participation in resistance training: a systematic review. Br J Sports Med* 2017, 51(20):1466–1472.
51. Mathy C, Cedraschi C, Broonen JP, Azzi A, Henrotin Y: *Volition and low back pain: When patients talk. Annals of physical and rehabilitation medicine* 2015, 58(6):326–331.
52. Franco KFM, Franco Y, Oliveira NTB, Padula RS, Cabral CMN: *Predictive factors for progression through the difficulty levels of Pilates exercises in patients with low back pain: a secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial. Brazilian journal of physical therapy* 2018, 22(6):512–518.
53. O'Donoghue G, Kennedy A, Puggina A, Aleksovskaja K, Buck C, Burns C, Cardon G, Carlin A, Ciarapica D, Colotto M et al: *Socio-economic determinants of physical activity across the life course: A “DEterminants of Diet and Physical ACTivity” (DEDIPAC) umbrella literature review. PloS one* 2018, 13(1):e0190737.
54. Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, Chou R, Cohen SP, Gross DP, Ferreira PH, Fritz JM, Koes BW, Peul W et al: *Prevention and treatment of low back pain: evidence, challenges, and promising directions. Lancet*

2018, 391(10137):2368–2383.

55.Nicholas MK, Linton SJ, Watson PJ, Main CJ, Decade of the Flags” Working G: *Early identification and management of psychological risk factors (“yellow flags”) in patients with low back pain: a reappraisal. Phys Ther* 2011, 91(5):737–753.

56.Sluka KA, Frey-Law L, Hoeger Bement M: *Exercise-induced pain and analgesia? Underlying mechanisms and clinical translation. Pain* 2018, 159 Suppl 1:S91-S97.

57.Mata Diz JB, de Souza JR, Leopoldino AA, Oliveira VC: *Exercise, especially combined stretching and strengthening exercise, reduces myofascial pain: a systematic review. Journal of physiotherapy* 2017, 63(1):17–22.

58.Black CD, Huber JK, Ellingson LD, Ade CJ, Taylor EL, Griffeth EM, Janzen NR, Sutterfield SL: *Exercise-Induced Hypoalgesia Is Not Influenced by Physical Activity Type and Amount. Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2017, 49(5):975–982.

59.Jensen JN, Albertsen K, Borg V, Nabe-Nielsen K: *The predictive effect of fear-avoidance beliefs on low back pain among newly qualified health care workers with and without previous low back pain: a prospective cohort study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2009, 10:117.

60.Borodulin K, Sipila N, Rahkonen O, Leino-Arjas P, Kestila L, Jousilahti P, Prattala R: *Socio-demographic and behavioral variation in barriers to leisure-time physical activity. Scandinavian journal of public health* 2016, 44(1):62–69.

61.Books C, Coody LC, Kauffman R, Abraham S: *Night Shift Work and Its Health Effects on Nurses. The health care manager* 2017, 36(4):347–353.

62.Leyva-Vela B, Jesus Llorente-Cantarero F, Henarejos-Alarcon S, Martinez-Rodriguez A: *Psychosocial and physiological risks of shift work in nurses: a cross-sectional study. Cent Eur J Public Health* 2018, 26(3):183–189.

63.Palazzo C, Klinger E, Dorner V, Kadri A, Thierry O, Boumenir Y, Martin W, Poiraudreau S, Ville I: *Barriers to home-based exercise program adherence with chronic low back pain: Patient expectations regarding new technologies. Annals of physical and rehabilitation medicine* 2016, 59(2):107–113.

64.Ilvig PM, Bredahl TVG, Justesen JB, Jones D, Lundgaard JB, Sogaard K, Christensen JR: *Attendance barriers experienced by female health care workers voluntarily participating in a multi-component health promotion programme at the workplace. BMC public health* 2018, 18(1):1340.

65.Aboagye E, Hagberg J, Axen I, Kwak L, Lohela-Karlsson M, Skillgate E, Dahlgren G, Jensen I: *Individual preferences for physical exercise as secondary prevention for non-specific low back pain: A discrete choice experiment. PloS one* 2017, 12(12):e0187709.

66. Jakobsen MD, Sundstrup E, Brandt M, Andersen LL: *Effect of physical exercise on musculoskeletal pain in multiple body regions among healthcare workers: Secondary analysis of a cluster randomized controlled trial. Musculoskeletal science & practice* 2018, 34:89–96.
67. Andersen LL, Jorgensen MB, Blangsted AK, Pedersen MT, Hansen EA, Sjogaard G: *A randomized controlled intervention trial to relieve and prevent neck/shoulder pain. Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008, 40(6):983–990.
68. Kjaer P, Kongsted A, Ris I, Abbott A, Rasmussen CDN, Roos EM, Skou ST, Andersen TE, Hartvigsen J: *GLA:D((R)) Back group-based patient education integrated with exercises to support self-management of back pain - development, theories and scientific evidence. BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2018, 19(1):418.
69. Kolt GS, McEvoy JF: *Adherence to rehabilitation in patients with low back pain. Manual therapy* 2003, 8(2):110–116.

Figures





Figure 1

Trial profile (CONSORT flow chart). Analysis methods for studying (1) the associations between baseline factors and exercise compliance rate, and (2) the effects of the exercise intervention on fear-avoidance beliefs (FABs).

A Physical activity-related fear avoidance beliefs


Intention-to-treat analysis

Difference between groups in longitudinal analysis (GLMM):
 raw p-value = 0.025;
 adjusted' p-value = 0.028
 'perceived occupational physical loading



Per-protocol analysis


Difference between groups according to exercise compliance in longitudinal analysis (GLMM):
 raw p-value = 0.006;
 adjusted' p-value = 0.006
 'perceived occupational physical loading



B Work-related fear avoidance beliefs

Intention-to-treat analysis

Difference between groups in longitudinal analysis (GLMM):
 raw p-value < 0.001;
 adjusted' p-value = 0.007
 'perceived occupational physical loading



Per-protocol analysis

Difference between groups in longitudinal analysis (GLMM):
 raw p-value = 0.002;
 adjusted' p-value = 0.016
 'age, shiftwork, perceived health, fitness and occupational physical loading, and push-ups




Figure 2

Effects of the exercise program on fear avoidance beliefs Effects and effectiveness of the modified Pilates-type neuromuscular exercise (NME) with a focus on controlling the neutral spine on a) physical activity-related fear-avoidance beliefs, and b) work-related fear-avoidance beliefs (the mean difference in percentage with 95% confidence intervals analysed by general linear mixed models).