Effects of footstrike on low back posture, shock attenuation, and comfort in running
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Purpose
To determine if a change from rearfoot strike (RFS) to forefoot strike (FFS) would change lumbar lordosis, influence shock attenuation, or change comfort levels in healthy recreational/experienced runners.

Background/Significance
• Barefoot running (BF) is gaining popularity in the running community.
• Biomechanical changes occur with BF, primarily a change in initial contact from RFS to FFS.
• Changes in lumbar spine range of motion (ROM), particularly involving lumbar lordosis, have been associated with increased low back pain (LBP).
• However, it is not known if changing from RFS to FFS affects lumbar lordosis or LBP.

Methods and Materials
• Lumbar lordosis was measured in the sagittal plane using an Electrogoniometer (1000 Hz).
• Leg and head accelerations at impact were measured using uniaxial accelerometers (1000 Hz).
• The reliability and validity for these accelerometers has been reported to be within the frequency and amplitude range of human body motion.
• A Comfort Questionnaire (Figure 1) was selected and adapted from The Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale to determine comfort.
• Comprised of seven questions assessing the subject’s perception of stability, balance, level of frustration, comfort, likability, and agility when running using each of the two different foot strike patterns.
• Based on a 7 point scale with 1 being the opposite extremes and 4 being neutral.
• Warm up on the treadmill where a self-selected foot running pattern was determined.
• Instructions on running RFS/FFS were taught and the two conditions were visually validated.
• Each condition consisted of 90 seconds of BF with RFS or FFS; Order randomly assigned.
• Study questionnaires were completed after each condition.
• Fifteen consecutive strides from each condition were extracted for analyses.

Results
• All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS, Version 19 (IBM, Chicago, IL). The level of statistical significance was set to α=0.05.
• Paired samples t-tests were used to analyze the differences between the biomechanical variables (lumbar and head ROM, amount of flexion and extension, shock attenuation, and peak leg acceleration) in FFS and RFS running pattern.
• A nonparametric Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to compare differences in comfort questionnaire responses between the two footstrike conditions.

Lumbar Spine Motion
• There were statistically significant differences between FFS and RFS lumbar ROM, t (42) = -2.069, p=0.045 (RFS=22.1 degrees, FFS=20.9 degrees).
• There was no statistically significant difference between the FFS and RFS lumbar extension, t (42) = 1.367, p>0.19, or flexion, t (42) = -0.327, p>0.745.
• There were statistically significant differences between FFS and RFS lumbar ROM, t (42) =-8.301, p<0.001, with a lesser leg acceleration between FFS and RFS, t (42) = -9.026, p<0.001 (FFS=56.5% SD=17.14, RFS=73.4% SD=10.88).
• There was no statistically significant difference in the peak leg acceleration between FFS and RFS, t (42) = 8.301, p<0.001, with a lesser leg acceleration peak in FFS (FFS=3.8g SD=1.79, RFS=6.1g SD=2.16).
• Comfort
• Wilcoxon signed rank test results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the two running conditions for comfort/discomfort (question 7), Z=2.710, p=.007, in favor of RFS (RFS=4.3, FFS=3.0).
• There was no statistically significant difference between questions 1-6 or the average score of all questions.

Conclusions
• Change in foot strike from RFS to FFS decreased overall ROM in the lumbar spine but did not make a difference in flexion or extension in which the lumbar spine is positioned.
• Shock attenuation was greater in RFS.
• FFS was perceived a more comfortable running pattern.
• Future research investigating the effects of FFS and RFS on individuals with LBP may provide additional insight into whether a change in footstrike pattern would affect low back motion and pain in runners.
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Take home points:
• FFS running could help prevent or delay degenerative changes in intervertebral discs over RFS.
• In terms of directional preferences for the lumbar spine, changing the footstrike pattern from RFS to FFS is unlikely to be beneficial according to the current findings.

Participant Descriptive Data

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Male                | 24  | 55.8%
| Female              | 19  | 44.2%
| White               | 34  | 79.1%
| Hispanic, Latin, or Spanish Origin | 3 | 7.0%
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 4 | 9.3%
| Other               | 2   | 4.7%

Table 1: Participant descriptive data

Figure 1: Comfort questionnaire.

Figure 2: Placement of an accelerometer on the anterior medial aspect of the distal 1/3rd left tibia (top), securing the open helmet housing an accelerometer on the anterior portion of the head (middle) and placement of an electrogoniometer spanning the spinous process of the 2nd lumbar vertebrae (bottom).

Figure 3: Exemplar accelerometer time history for the leg accelerometer (solid line) and head accelerometer (dashed line).

Figure 4: Lumbar spine motion.