



Sleep Status and Chronotype in University Athletes with and without Chronic Low Back Pain: A Cross-Sectional Study

Sumbul Ansari¹ Saurabh Sharma

Centre for Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation Sciences, Jamia Millia Islamia (A Central University), New Delhi, Delhi, India

Address for correspondence Saurabh Sharma (email: ssharma@jmi.ac.in).

Sleep Sci 2024;17(4):e407–e413.

Abstract

Objective This study aimed to evaluate the status of sleep, chronotype, and related variables of university athletes with and without chronic low back pain (CLBP), to find the correlation between CLBP, sleep difficulty score (SDS), and chronotype, and to determine if SDS and chronotype predict CLBP.

Methods Ninety-two university athletes [46 with CLBP (Age: 22.08±2.74 years) and 46 healthy athletes (Age: 22.32±3.11 years) completed the athlete sleep screening questionnaire (ASSQ), also, their demographic, anxiety, depression, and sports-related details were collected. A Pearson correlation and logistic regression models (univariate and multivariate) were used for the statistical analysis.

Results The results demonstrated a higher SDS and evening type preference in CLBP athletes, a significant negative correlation between CLBP and chronotype ($r = -0.40$, $p < 0.01$), a significant correlation between SDS and CLBP ($r = 0.25$, $p = 0.01$). SDS and chronotype were not found to be significant independent predictors of CLBP.

Conclusion This study concludes that there exists a correlation of CLBP, SDS, and chronotype. However, despite the relationship, SDS and chronotype cannot predict CLBP.

Keywords

- ▶ sleep
- ▶ sports
- ▶ university athletes
- ▶ chronic low back pain
- ▶ chronotype
- ▶ pain

Introduction

Pain is a physical and emotional indicator of bodily harm that drives behavior. Chronic low back pain (CLBP) is defined as pain, muscle tension, or stiffness below the costal border and above the inferior gluteal folds¹ that lasts for 12 weeks or more.² A common musculoskeletal ailment, CLBP occurs in athletes of different sports and at varying degrees of expertise, and it is harmful to them, as it restricts their performance and places them in danger of retiring from sports too soon.³ Sleep is an intricate reversible state of behavior in which a person is perceptually disconnected from and unresponsive to their surroundings.⁴ Sleep is an important

determinant of the health, well-being, and performance of collegiate athletes.⁵ The development of pain as a side effect correlates with the development of sleep disruption in the general population. Sleep problems are present in 67% to 88% of people with chronic pain.⁶ However, there is a lack of data on sleep disturbance in university athletes with CLBP. Sleep disturbance can have a negative influence on the athletes' physical performance, mental performance, risk of injury and recovery, medical health, and mental well-being.⁷

Approximately 55% to 60% of patients in the general population with low back pain (LBP) report impaired sleep after pain onset,⁸ and over half suffer from insomnia.⁹ Several studies conducted among non-athletes^{10,11} have

received
May 19, 2023
accepted
January 14, 2024

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0044-1782177>.
ISSN 1984-0659.

© 2024. Brazilian Sleep Association. All rights reserved.
This is an open access article published by Thieme under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonDerivative-NonCommercial-License, permitting copying and reproduction so long as the original work is given appropriate credit. Contents may not be used for commercial purposes, or adapted, remixed, transformed or built upon. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)
Thieme Revinter Publicações Ltda., Rua do Matoso 170, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, CEP 20270-135, Brazil

suggested that there is a correlation between poor sleep quality and LBP. Inadequate quantity or quality of sleep has also been identified as a risk factor for neck pain and LBP in female subjects,¹² and also in industrial employees being hospitalized because of LBP.¹¹ However, these studies have been conducted among the general population, and there has been a lack of focus on sleep in athletes suffering from CLBP.

The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), to measure sleep quality, the Sleep Hygiene Index, to examine sleep hygiene, and the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS), to examine daytime sleepiness, are all questionnaires used in research. However, they do not seem to befit the population of athletes for sleep assessment as their validity and reliability have not been adequately assessed in this population. The Athlete Sleep Screening Questionnaire (ASSQ), an athlete-specific questionnaire, seems to be a simple and efficient screening tool to identify sleep problems and chronotypes among athletes.^{13,14} Chronotype is an individual's 24-hour entrainment and activity-rest preference. Morning types wake up early, whereas evening types wake up late, and LBP is 1.5 times more common in evening chronotypes.¹⁵ Anxiety is also linked to both eveningness and sleep disruption in the healthy population. Athletes with higher anxiety levels tend to be more susceptible to injury. Athletes may experience stress, fatigue, anxiety, and impaired sleep and mood, psychosocial factors that may predispose them to LBP. Depression has also been linked to evening chronotype preference in the general population of healthy subjects.¹⁶ However, there is a lack of studies on the sleep status and chronotype in university athletes with CLBP. Therefore, the present study aimed to evaluate the sleep status, chronotype, and other sleep-related variables, and to find a correlation regarding CLBP, the Sleep Difficulty Score (SDS), and chronotype. The study also aimed to find if the SDS and the chronotype can independently predict CLBP. We hypothesized that there would be a higher SDS and a shift in chronotype toward evening type in athletes with CLBP. Additionally, we hypothesized that there would be a significant negative correlation between CLBP and chronotype, a significant positive correlation between CLBP and the SDS, and that the SDS and chronotype would be significant predictors of CLBP.

Materials and Methods

Study Population

The number of participants was determined through the G Power software (University of Kiel, Kiel, Germany), version 3.1.9.2, from a previous study¹⁷ with a correlation value of 0.228, α level of 0.05, and power ($1 - \beta$) of 0.90. The present study included 92 athletes: 46 with CLBP and 46 healthy athletes, based on effect estimations. CLBP was characterized as pain, muscle tension, or stiffness below the costal border and above the inferior gluteal folds¹ that lasted for 12 weeks or more.² The data were collected from various stadiums and sports complexes across Delhi NCR, India. The study population consisted of male university-level athletes with at least 1 year of athletic experience who spent at least 5 to 7 hours per week playing/practicing any sport (cricket, basketball,

volleyball, football, badminton, or tennis). The CLBP athletes ($n = 46$) were required to have had LBP for 12 weeks or more and be free from any other musculoskeletal complaints. All athletes needed to understand and write in English and be aged between 18 and 30 years.

Study Questionnaire, Screening, and Data Collection

To fulfill the purpose of the study, 46 athletes with CLBP and 46 healthy athletes were asked to fill out the questionnaires. The presence of CLBP was based on the athlete's self-reported complaints of LBP and its duration, additionally assessed by an experienced physiotherapist. Athletes who were on any kind of medication were not included in the present study. Personal information (age, height, weight, and body mass index – BMI), the sports discipline at the university, and the number of years of involvement in the sport at the university level were noted. The ASSQ^{13,14} was used to measure sleep factors, and it consists of 16 items about sleep difficulties, sleep-disordered breathing, travel, chronotype, and sleep optimization techniques. The SDS was assessed through five questions,^{1,3–6} whereas the chronotype was assessed through four questions.^{7–10,13,14} The ASSQ has a good internal consistency (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.74$), test-retest reliability ($r = 0.86$), a diagnostic sensitivity of 81%, specificity of 93%, a positive predictive value of 87%, and a negative predictive value of 90%.^{13,14} The level of anxiety was assessed using the 7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7) questionnaire.¹⁸ Depression was assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9), which consists of 9 questions.¹⁹ The subjects were requested to complete the questionnaire in the presence of an investigator. All research participants provided written informed consent.

Statistical Analysis

The IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, United States) software, version 21.0, was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics (mean \pm standard deviation, SD) and, when required, frequencies (percentages) were calculated for the athlete's data. A cross-tabulation was used to denote variables (in terms of number (n) and its corresponding percentage) in athletes with and without CLBP. An independent samples *t*-test was used to compare the mean scores of the two groups. The correlation regarding CLBP, the SDS, and chronotype was calculated using the Pearson correlation. If a statistically significant correlation was found, a univariate logistic regression (enter method) was used to find the odds ratio (OR), 95% confidence interval (95%CI), and its *p*-value. A multivariate logistic regression model was used to find if the SDS and chronotype are independent predictors of CLBP. In model 1, SDS was the predictor, and, in model 2, chronotype was the predictor; in both models, we adjusted for common covariates such as age, BMI, number of years at university level participation, anxiety, and depression. Values of $p < 0.05$ were considered statistically significant.

Results

The mean values regarding the demographic characteristics, SDS, chronotype, and anxiety and depression scores of the two

Table 1 Characteristics of athletes with and without CLBP.

| Variable | Mean \pm SD | | p-value |
|--|-------------------|------------------|----------|
| | CLBP (n = 46) | No CLBP (n = 46) | |
| Age (in years) ^a | 22.08 \pm 2.74 | 22.32 \pm 3.11 | 0.69 |
| Height (m) ^a | 1.76 \pm 0.07 | 1.77 \pm 0.08 | 0.47 |
| Weight (kg) ^a | 71.97 \pm 10.38 | 70.57 \pm 10.4 | 0.52 |
| BMI (kg/m ²) ^a | 22.93 \pm 2.45 | 22.28 \pm 2.11 | 0.17 |
| Anxiety score ^a | 3.50 \pm 2.46 | 2.39 \pm 1.73 | 0.01* |
| Depression score ^a | 4.00 \pm 2.64 | 3.32 \pm 2.32 | 0.19 |
| Number of years at university level participation ^a | 2.35 \pm 1.38 | 2.66 \pm 1.40 | 0.29 |
| SDS ^a | 5.56 \pm 2.71 | 4.32 \pm 1.94 | 0.01* |
| Chronotype ^a | 6.84 \pm 2.85 | 9.15 \pm 2.32 | < 0.001* |
| NPRS score | 3.65 \pm 1.76 | – | – |
| Duration of pain (months) | 14.29 \pm 20.28 | – | – |

Abbreviations: BMI, Body Mass Index; CLBP, chronic low back pain; NPRS, Numeric pain rating scale; SD, standard deviation; SDS, Sleep Difficulty Score. **Notes:** ^aAn independent samples t-test was used for the group comparison. *Statistically significant difference.

groups are shown in **Table 1**. A Cross-tabulation of sports discipline, sleep, chronotype, depression, anxiety, and other sleep related characteristics of athletes with and without CLBP is shown in **Table 2**.

In the present study, we found a significant positive correlation between CLBP and the SDS ($r=0.25$; $p=0.01$), and a significant negative correlation between CLBP and chronotype ($r=-0.40$; $p<0.001$) (**Table 3**). A univariate regression analysis revealed that the SDS and chronotype

were predictors of CLBP (**Table 4**). Upon using a multivariate model for the SDS and chronotype, with age, BMI, number of years at university level participation, anxiety, and depression as covariates, we found that the SDS and chronotype were not significant independent predictors of CLBP. In both models, anxiety was also found to be significantly correlated with CLBP, thus impacting the ability of the SDS and chronotype to independently predict CLBP (**Table 5**).

Table 2 Cross-tabulation of sports discipline, sleep, chronotype, depression, anxiety, and other sleep-related characteristics of athletes with and without CLBP

| Variable | | With CLBP n (%) | Without CLBP n (%) | p-value |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Sports discipline | Cricket | 10 (21.7) | 10 (21.7) | 0.02 |
| | Basketball | 19 (41.3) | 5 (10.9) | |
| | Football | 4 (8.7) | 7 (15.2) | |
| | Volleyball | 9 (19.6) | 12 (26.11) | |
| | Badminton | 2 (4.3) | 6 (13.0) | |
| | Tennis | 2 (4.3) | 6 (13.0) | |
| SDS | None | 18 (39.1) | 25 (54.3) | 0.05 |
| | Mild | 16 (34.8) | 18 (39.1) | |
| | Moderate | 11 (23.9) | 3 (6.5) | |
| | Severe | 1 (2.2) | – | |
| Chronotype | Evening type | 10 (21.7) | 1 (2.2) | <0.01 |
| | Morning type | 36 (78.3) | 45 (97.8) | |
| Anxiety | Minimal | 31 (67.4) | 36 (78.3) | 0.36 |
| | Mild | 14 (30.4) | 10 (21.7) | |
| | Moderate | 1 (2.2) | – | |
| | Severe | – | – | |

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)

| Variable | | With CLBP n (%) | Without CLBP n (%) | p-value |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Depression | Minimal | 29 (63.0) | 31 (67.4) | 0.80 |
| | Mild | 15 (32.6) | 14 (30.4) | |
| | Moderate | 2 (4.3) | 1 (2.2) | |
| | Moderately severe | – | – | |
| | Severe | – | – | |
| Naps per week | None | 13 (28.3) | 18 (39.1) | 0.68 |
| | Once or twice | 21 (45.7) | 16 (34.8) | |
| | Three or four times | 8 (17.4) | 8 (17.4) | |
| | Five to seven times | 4 (8.7) | 4 (8.7) | |
| Sleep disturbance while traveling | No | 25 (54.3) | 24 (52.2) | 0.51 |
| | Yes | 21 (45.7) | 22 (47.8) | |
| Experiencing daytime dysfunction while traveling for sport | No | 28 (60.9) | 31 (67.4) | 0.02 |
| | Yes | 18 (39.1) | 15 (32.6) | |
| Loud snorer | No | 34 (73.9) | 42 (91.3) | 0.23 |
| | Yes | 12 (26.1) | 4 (8.7) | |
| Choking, gasping, or stopping breathing for periods of time during sleep | No | 44 (95.7) | 41 (89.1) | |
| | Yes | 2 (4.3) | 5 (10.9) | |
| Caffeinated products per day | Less than 1 per day | 15 (32.6) | 19 (41.3) | 0.59 |
| | 1-2 per day | 12 (26.1) | 14 (30.4) | |
| | 3 per day | 13 (28.3) | 7 (15.2) | |
| | 4 per day | 3 (6.5) | 4 (8.7) | |
| | 5 or more per day | 3 (6.5) | 2 (4.3) | |
| Using electronic device within 1 hour of going to bed | Not at all | 2 (4.3) | 5 (10.9) | 0.17 |
| | 1-3 times per week | 4 (8.7) | 10 (21.7) | |
| | 4-6 times per week | 5 (10.9) | 4 (8.7) | |
| | Everyday | 35 (76.1) | 27 (58.7) | |

Abbreviations: CLBP, chronic low back pain; SDS, Sleep Difficulty Score.

Table 3 Correlation regarding CLBP, SDS, and chronotype.

| | | CLBP |
|------------|--------------------------|----------|
| SDS | Correlation (<i>r</i>) | 0.25 |
| | p-value | 0.01* |
| Chronotype | Correlation (<i>r</i>) | –0.40 |
| | p-value | < 0.001* |

Abbreviations: CLBP, chronic low back pain; SDS, Sleep Difficulty Score.

Note: *Statistically significant.

Discussion

The main findings of the present study were a positive significant correlation between CLBP and the SDS, and a negative significant correlation between CLBP and chronotype; The SDS and chronotype were not found to be significant independent predictors of CLBP.

Table 4 Univariate logistic regression of SDS and chronotype as predictors of CLBP.

| | OR (95%CI) | p-value |
|------------|------------------|----------|
| SDS | 0.71 (0.58–0.85) | < 0.001* |
| Chronotype | 1.26 (1.04–1.52) | 0.01* |

Abbreviations: 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; CLBP, chronic low back pain; OR, odds ratio; SDS, Sleep Difficulty Score.

Note: *Statistically significant.

CLBP and the SDS

In the present study, we found a positive correlation between CLBP and the SDS. A higher mean \pm SD value for the SDS was reported in the group of athletes with CLBP compared to those without the condition (5.56 ± 2.71 versus 4.32 ± 1.94 respectively), as well as a higher percentage of athletes with CLBP falling in the moderate and severe SDS categories

Table 5 Models of predictors of CLBP (multivariate regression analysis).

| | OR (95%CI) | p-value |
|---|------------------|----------|
| Model 1 | | |
| SDS | 1.28 (1.03–1.58) | 0.02* |
| Age (in years) | 0.99 (0.80–1.24) | 0.98 |
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 1.16 (0.94–1.43) | 0.14 |
| Depression | 0.93 (0.72–1.21) | 0.63 |
| Anxiety | 1.41 (1.03–1.92) | 0.03* |
| Number of years at university level participation | 0.83 (0.52–1.31) | 0.42 |
| Model 2 | | |
| Chronotype | 0.66 (0.53–0.83) | < 0.001* |
| Age (in years) | 0.97 (0.77–1.23) | 0.85 |
| BMI (kg/m ²) | 1.22 (0.97–1.53) | 0.08 |
| Depression | 1.03 (0.79–1.36) | 0.95 |
| Anxiety | 1.40 (1.03–1.90) | 0.02* |
| Number of years at university level participation | 0.98 (0.60–1.61) | 0.95 |

Abbreviations: 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; BMI, Body mass index; CLBP, chronic low back pain; OR, odds ratio; SDS, Sleep Difficulty Score.
Note: *Statistically significant.

(► **Table 2**). The development of pain as a side effect correlates with the development of sleep disruption and vice versa.²⁰ In the literature, sleep disruption is increasingly being acknowledged as a clinically significant symptom in persons with CLBP. Although it is unknown if sleep disruption is a cause or a consequence of chronic pain, it is believed that when individuals are sleep-deprived, their pain increases.²¹ Sleep disruption has been shown to have a detrimental impact on mood, pain intensity, and overall quality of life.⁶ Lack of sleep or poor sleep quality tends to decrease the pain threshold and mental ability to manage pain, and it has been proposed that better daytime pain control may lead to increased quality of sleep.²² Chronic pain has a vicious loop effect on sleep, with mutually detrimental interactions involving pain and sleep-related disorders in the general population.²³ The effects of poor sleep quality on pain perception are not well understood, and there is no proper biological mechanism linking sleep and pain. Evidence shows that lack of sleep increases the concentration of cytokines and inflammatory mediators, leading to a greater perception of pain.^{24,25} Haack et al.²⁴ established a link between decreased sleep time, greater body pain perception, and elevated interleukin 6 (IL-6) levels in healthy women with experimentally-produced pain.²⁴ Heffner et al.²⁵ validated this finding by revealing that poor sleep quality is linked to elevated IL-6 levels and affective pain rating in persons with CLBP.²⁵ Sleep deprivation, regardless of duration or quality, certainly interferes with the normal control of

inflammatory mediators and immunological processes, perhaps leading to increased neuronal sensitivity and perception of pain. However, despite the relationship between CLBP and the SDS, the SDS cannot independently predict CLBP.

CLBP and Chronotype

A score ≤ 4 on the sum of questions 7 to 10 of the ASSQ indicates that the athlete is an evening type, whereas a score > 4 indicates that the athlete is of the morning type.^{13,14} The evening chronotype was prevalent in athletes with CLBP (21.7%) compared to healthy athletes (2.2%), whereas the morning chronotype was prevalent in healthy athletes (98.7%) compared with CLBP athletes (78.3%) (► **Table 2**). The findings of the present study indicated that CLBP and chronotype move in the opposite direction: if one increases, the other decreases. This bidirectional relationship can be attributed to several factors. The CLBP-related sleep abnormalities include a substantial reduction in total sleep duration, increased night waking, a delay in the initiation of sleep, and trouble sustaining sleep.¹¹ A recent study²⁶ found that evening and intermediate chronotypes are linked to debilitating musculoskeletal pain, although emotional discomfort, sleeplessness, and concomitant disorders also play a role.²⁶ Another research,²⁷ involving a small group ($n=31$) of healthy men, reported that evening-type people are more sensitive to pain than morning-type people. Interestingly, people with the evening chronotype experience a higher degree of musculoskeletal pain compared with those with the morning chronotype. Pain may be influenced by circadian pain cycles and chronotypes taken together.²⁶ More recently, epidemiological studies²⁸ in the general population have revealed that subjects with the evening chronotype are more likely to experience LBP (OR = 1.5; 95% CI = 1.3–1.8) than people with the morning chronotype. However, despite the relationship between CLBP and chronotype, the chronotype of the athlete cannot independently predict CLBP.

Sleep-Related Dichotomous Variables

In the present study, there was no statistically significant difference in the number of naps per week: both athletes with and without CLBP reported a similar number, indicating no effect of CLBP on naps. On the contrary, according to one research,²⁹ persons with CLBP have poor daytime functioning and report an increase in daytime napping as a result of poor sleep quality, which has a substantial influence on pain perception, function, and quality of life.²⁹ Napping may reduce pain hypersensitivity, regardless of the vigilance status.³⁰ In the present study, there was a similar frequency distribution of sleep disturbance while traveling, suggesting that the presence or absence of CLBP does not impact this outcome. A dissimilar frequency distribution was found for experiencing daytime dysfunction while traveling for sport in athletes with and without CLBP, and a plausible reason could be uncomfortable positions in vehicles/aircraft during travelling, which might further strain the back and further compromise sleep due to pain; this, in turn, would result in poor daytime functioning. In the present study, we did not

find any significant difference between the two groups of athletes in terms of loud snoring, choking, gasping, or stopping breathing for periods of time during sleep, intake of caffeinated products per day, and use of electronic devices every day within 1 hour of going to bed. According to the findings of other studies^{31,32} as well, there is no relationship between caffeine use and LBP.

A potential strength of the present study is that the authors have used an athlete-specific questionnaire to assess sleep and chronotype. Although the present study contributed to important findings regarding the issue of CLBP and sleep in university athletes, a limitation is the inclusion of only male participants; future studies could consider gender variations too. We could not include female participants because, during the screening of CLBP athletes, we found only one female athlete with CLBP due to the fact that there is limited participation of females in Indian sports scenarios. We did not include this data in the study. Considering the gender variation in sleep, which indicates a higher prevalence of poor sleep quality in female subjects than in male subjects (65.1% versus 49.8% respectively),³³ a separate study on female athletes or a comparison of male and female athletes could be performed in the future.

Conclusion

We conclude that university athletes with CLBP have clinically significant sleep problems (higher SDS than healthy athletes), and that there is a significant correlation involving CLBP, the SDS, and chronotype; however, despite the association, the SDS and chronotype were not found to be significant independent predictors of CLBP.

Ethical Approval

All procedures in the present study were performed in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional/national research committee (Institutional Ethics Committee, Jamia Millia Islamia, no. 24/5/322/JMI/IEC/2021) and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The study has been registered on the Clinical trials registry, (CTRI/2021/09/036675).

Informed Consent

Written informed consent was obtained from all individual athletes included in the study.

Data Availability

The statistical clinical data used to support the findings of this study are included in the article.

Funding Source

The authors declare that they have received no funding from sources in the public, private or non-profit sectors for the conduction of the present study.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the athletes for participating in the study.

References

- Oksuz E. Prevalence, risk factors, and preference-based health states of low back pain in a Turkish population. *Spine* 2006;31(25):E968–E972
- Cho Y-K, Kim D-Y, Jung S-Y, Seong J-H. Synergistic effect of a rehabilitation program and treadmill exercise on pain and dysfunction in patients with chronic low back pain. *J Phys Ther Sci* 2015;27(04):1187–1190
- Wippert P-M, Puschmann A-K, Arampatzis A, Schiltewolf M, Mayer F. Diagnosis of psychosocial risk factors in prevention of low back pain in athletes (MiSpEx). *BMJ Open Sport Exerc Med* 2017;3(01):e000295
- Halson SL. Sleep in elite athletes and nutritional interventions to enhance sleep. *Sports Med* 2014;44(Suppl 1, Suppl 1):S13–S23
- Kroshus E, Wagner J, Wyrick D, et al. Wake up call for collegiate athlete sleep: narrative review and consensus recommendations from the NCAA Interassociation Task Force on Sleep and Wellness. *Br J Sports Med* 2019;53(12):731–736
- Smith MT, Haythornthwaite JA. How do sleep disturbance and chronic pain inter-relate? Insights from the longitudinal and cognitive-behavioral clinical trials literature. *Sleep Med Rev* 2004;8(02):119–132
- Charest J, Grandner MA. Sleep and athletic performance: impacts on physical performance, mental performance, injury risk and recovery, and mental health. *Sleep Med Clin* 2020;15(01):41–57
- Alsaadi SM, McAuley JH, Hush JM, Maher CG. Prevalence of sleep disturbance in patients with low back pain. *Eur Spine J* 2011;20(05):737–743
- Tang NKY, Wright KJ, Salkovskis PM. Prevalence and correlates of clinical insomnia co-occurring with chronic back pain. *J Sleep Res* 2007;16(01):85–95
- Alsaadi SM, McAuley JH, Hush JM, et al. Detecting insomnia in patients with low back pain: accuracy of four self-report sleep measures. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2013;14(01):196
- van de Water ATM, Eadie J, Hurley DA. Investigation of sleep disturbance in chronic low back pain: an age- and gender-matched case-control study over a 7-night period. *Man Ther* 2011;16(06):550–556
- Auvinen JP, Tammelin TH, Taimela SP, et al. Is insufficient quantity and quality of sleep a risk factor for neck, shoulder and low back pain? A longitudinal study among adolescents. *Eur Spine J* 2010;19(04):641–649
- Bender AM, Lawson D, Werthner P, Samuels CH. The clinical validation of the athlete sleep screening questionnaire: an instrument to identify athletes that need further sleep assessment. *Sports Med Open* 2018;4(01):23
- Samuels C, James L, Lawson D, Meeuwisse W. The Athlete Sleep Screening Questionnaire: a new tool for assessing and managing sleep in elite athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(07):418–422
- Merikanto I, Lahti T, Seitsalo S, et al. Eveningness has the increased odds for spinal diseases but the decreased odds for articular diseases with prospective hospital treatments. *Biol Rhythm Res* 2017;48(02):263–274
- Haraden DA, Mullin BC, Hankin BL. The relationship between depression and chronotype: A longitudinal assessment during childhood and adolescence. *Depress Anxiety* 2017;34(10):967–976
- Rabin JM, Mehra R, Chen E, Ahmadi R, Jin Y, Day C. Assessment of sleep health in collegiate athletes using the Athlete Sleep Screening Questionnaire. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2020;16(08):1349–1356
- Williams N. The GAD-7 questionnaire. *Occup Med (Chic Ill)* 2014;64(03):224

- 19 Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med* 2001;16(09):606–613
- 20 Doufas AG, Panagiotou OA, Ioannidis JPA. Concordance of sleep and pain outcomes of diverse interventions: an umbrella review. *PLoS One* 2012;7(07):e40891
- 21 Menefee LA, Cohen MJM, Anderson WR, Doghramji K, Frank ED, Lee H. Sleep disturbance and nonmalignant chronic pain: a comprehensive review of the literature. *Pain Med* 2000;1(02):156–172
- 22 Liszka-Hackzell JJ, Martin DP. Analysis of nighttime activity and daytime pain in patients with chronic back pain using a self-organizing map neural network. *J Clin Monit Comput* 2005;19(06):411–414
- 23 Lavigne GJ, Nashed A, Manzini C, Carra MC. Does sleep differ among patients with common musculoskeletal pain disorders? *Curr Rheumatol Rep* 2011;13(06):535–542
- 24 Haack M, Sanchez E, Mullington JM. Elevated inflammatory markers in response to prolonged sleep restriction are associated with increased pain experience in healthy volunteers. *Sleep* 2007;30(09):1145–1152
- 25 Heffner KL, France CR, Trost Z, Ng HM, Pigeon WR. Chronic low back pain, sleep disturbance, and interleukin-6. *Clin J Pain* 2011;27(01):35–41
- 26 Heikkala E, Oura P, Korpela T, Karppinen J, Paananen M. Chronotypes and disabling musculoskeletal pain: A Finnish birth cohort study. *Eur J Pain* 2022;26(05):1069–1078
- 27 Jankowski KS. Morning types are less sensitive to pain than evening types all day long. *Eur J Pain* 2013;17(07):1068–1073
- 28 Merikanto I, Lahti T, Seitsalo S, et al. Behavioral trait of morningness-eveningness in association with articular and spinal diseases in a population. *PLoS One* 2014;9(12):e114635
- 29 Kelly GA, Blake C, Power CK, O'keeffe D, Fullen BM. The association between chronic low back pain and sleep: a systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2011;27(02):169–181
- 30 Faraut B, Léger D, Medkour T, et al. Napping reverses increased pain sensitivity due to sleep restriction. *PLoS One* 2015;10(02):e0117425
- 31 AlShayhan FA, Saadeddin M. Prevalence of low back pain among health sciences students. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol* 2018;28(02):165–170
- 32 McPartland JM, Mitchell JA. Caffeine and chronic back pain. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1997;78(01):61–63
- 33 Fatima Y, Doi SAR, Najman JM, Mamun AA. Exploring gender difference in sleep quality of young adults: findings from a large population study. *Clin Med Res* 2016;14(3-4):138–144