



Diagnosis, Clinical Manifestations and Management of Lumbar Spondylosis: A Systematic review

Anamika Bahuguna, Dr. Uzma Khan, Prof. (Dr) Jasmine Anandabai
PG Student, Assistant Professor
Jyotirao Phule Subharti College of Physiotherap, Swami Vivekanand
Subharti University

Abstract: Most of the people has experience low back ache at their lives. Fortunately, the majority of people only shows only moderate symptoms which are temporary in nature, with 90% of them going away after one month. Affected individuals with low back pain who have symptoms that last longer than three months are estimated to make up 15–45% of the population. There are significant negative effects on economic status and quality of life with the minority with unmanageable symptoms. Although pain in lower back is highly prevalent in the wide-ranging patients, there are many different and often inconsistent therapeutic alternatives available, which leads to increased expenditures and inconsistent therapy across the nation. This is partly because most patients have recognized pain generators which are nociceptive in nature located along the spinal column, making it difficult to determine a definite aetiology. One person described back discomfort as "an illness in search of a disease." Indeed, the variance causes of pain in lower back remain numerous, counting the wide range of degenerative changes within the spine for this imagining is nonspecific and contributory associations are uncertain.

Keywords: Low back pain, Osteophyte, Degenerative conditions, Spondylosis

Introduction

Most of the people have suffered with pain in their lower back at some point in their lives [1]. Gratefully, 90% of people experience moderate and temporary symptoms, which go away in 6 weeks for the vast majority of cases [2]. According to estimates, 15–45% of people have chronic low back pain, which is

characterized as pain sensations that last longer than three months [3]. There are significant negative effects on quality of life and financial consequences for the minority with intractable symptoms . Although low back pain is highly prevalent in the general population, there are many different and often inconsistent therapeutic alternatives available, which leads to increased expenses and inconsistent therapy across the nation [8]. One described back discomfort as "an illness in search of a disease." [4]. In fact, the differential causes of pain in lower back remain numerous, plus the wide range of degenerative changes within the axial spine for which radiological evaluation is nonspecific and causal relationships are tentative, once "red flag" diagnoses like cancer and fractures have been ruled out [5].

We shall go into more detail about these degenerative processes and how they relate to medicine. We'll talk about the methods for diagnosis and the effectiveness of current treatment choices.

Epidemiology

Population studies show that degenerative spine alterations are very common. In a research by Symmons et al. [6] involving people ages 45 to 64, osteophytes were found in the lumbar spines of 85.5% of the participants. In a study conducted by O'Neill et al. [7] on adults over 50 in the UK, it was discovered that 84% of men and 74% of women had at least one spinal osteophyte. The incidence of osteophytosis was higher in people who were more physically active, self-reportedly had back discomfort, or had higher BMI scores. Men seem to have more profound degenerative alterations than women, both in terms of the frequency and severity of osteophyte production, despite large demographic heterogeneity [8].

In asymptomatic people, radiographic evidence of lumbar spine degenerative disease is impressive. In 80% of asymptomatic individuals over 60, MRI imaging reveals disk protrusions, while in 20% of cases, degenerative spinal stenosis is detected [9]. Disk space narrowing and bone spurs were found to be similarly common in males who were classified as having no pain, moderate discomfort, or severe lower back pain, according to a research examining radiographic evidence of spine degeneration.

Furthermore, even in young people without decades of spine strain, degenerative alterations may manifest. According to Lawrence, 10% of women between the ages of 20 and 29 have disk degeneration. Although it affects 80% of patients over 40, lumbar spondylosis was discovered in 3% of people between the ages of 20 and 29 in one study. Establishing a causal relationship between imaging findings and pain sensations in affected patients is a challenging task, as evidenced by the high incidence of degeneration among young, asymptomatic individuals.[10]

Pathology

It is thought that intervertebral disks go through a three-phase, overlapping "degenerative cascade" that may take place over several decades, as originally described by Kirk-aldy Willis and Bernard [11]. Phase I, also known as the Dysfunction Phase, delineates the preliminary consequences of recurrent micro-

trauma, characterized by the emergence of painful, circumferential tears in the outer, innervated anulus and the ensuing end-plate separation, which may jeopardize the nutritional supply and waste elimination of the disk. These tears have the potential to combine to form radial tears, which are more likely to protrude and affect the disk's ability to hold onto water. This can lead to desiccation and a decrease in disk height. Vascular tissue and nerve endings have the ability to ingrown into fissures, boosting innervation and the disk's ability to transmit pain signals. The loss of mechanical integrity, together with increasing disk resorption alterations, internal disruption, and further annular rips, along with additional facet degeneration that may cause subluxation and instability, are the characteristics of Phase II (Instability Phase). Phase III (Stabilization Phase) is characterized by ongoing disk space constriction and fibrosis, as well as osteophyte production and transdiscal bridging. [12]

Clinical Presentation

Since nociceptive pain generators have been found in the axial spine's facet joints, intervertebral disks, sacroiliac joints, nerve root dura, and myofascial structures, discomfort in the region of these degenerative alterations is not surprising [5]. Spinal stenosis, or narrowing within the spinal canal, may result from these degenerative anatomical changes in the form of disk herniation, spondylolisthesis, bulging of the ligamentum flavum [1], hypertrophy of the inferior articular process [13], or progressive ingrowth of osteophytes [14]. Clinically, this led to a constellation of pain symptoms that are collectively referred to as neurogenic claudication (NC). Lower back discomfort, leg pain, numbness, and motor weakness in the lower extremities that get worse when walking and standing erect and get better when sitting and lying down are some of the symptoms that might be associated with NC [15].

There are numerous reasons why radiculopathy may manifest clinically, all of which are described by the degenerative process. Disk bulging can impact the spinal nerve within its ventral ramus, the descending rootlets of the cauda equina, or nerve roots exiting at the next lower intervertebral canal, if they protrude centrally, posterolateral, or laterally, respectively. The neural structures that are affected by osteophyte lipping at the top or lower edges of vertebral bodies may also be affected by the previously mentioned bulging disk [17]. Depending on how they project, hypertrophic alterations to the superior articular process may encroach into nerve roots inside the upper nerve root canal, dural sac, or before they leave the subsequent lower intervertebral canal.

Diagnosis

An accurate history, a comprehensive physical examination, and the right kind of provocative testing are the first steps in the first evaluation of patients with low back pain. The subjective nature of patients' reports of persistent back pain and the inherent challenge of identifying the anatomic region of interest during provocative testing without the effect of surrounding structures confound these initial steps.

MRI, CT, plain film, and CT myelogram radiography studies can all offer helpful corroborating data to bolster an exam finding and pinpoint a degenerative lesion or location of compressed nerve. Nevertheless, imaging is a flawed science; in the absence of an obvious disk herniation or neurological impairment, it can only detect the underlying cause of LBP in 15% of patients [18]. Moreover, there is still often a gap between the degree of anatomical or radiographic alterations and the intensity of the symptoms [18]. Although there are associations between the quantity and severity of osteophytes and back pain, it is challenging to determine the clinical significance of detected radiographic alterations in individuals with LBP due to the prevalence of degenerative changes among asymptomatic patients.

Electromyographic examinations that demonstrate normal distal motor and sensory nerve conduction studies with abnormal needle exam can also establish nerve compression sensations based on the clinical history. By blocking suspected pain generators within facet joints, sacroiliac joints, or the disk space itself (by discography), or by isolating and anesthetizing irritated nerve roots (via epidural), diagnostic injections can aid in localization [19].

Management

There is some agreement over a definite therapeutic strategy, given our limited ability to identify the underlying causes of chronic lower back pain. Practitioners across the nation differ significantly in the conservative and intrusive measures they use for management [8]. Within each of the four main categories—Pharmacotherapy, Injectable Therapy, Surgery, and Physical Therapy (as well as related modalities and behavioral techniques)—we will provide a brief overview of various treatment choices for the management of persistent low back pain disorders.

A. Exercise-Centered and Behavioral Therapies

a) Exercise Therapy

Exercise Therapy (ET), which can be customized to incorporate aerobic exercise, muscle strengthening, and stretching exercises, is still one of the conservative pillars of treatment for chronic lumbar spine pain [20]. Patients' prescribed programs vary widely in terms of frequency, intensity, and regimen, which makes it difficult to evaluate their efficacy [50]. According to a meta-analysis of recent research on the use of ET in patients whose symptoms have persisted for a variable amount of time, a graded exercise program used in an occupational context has shown promise in treating subacute lower back pain. Patients experiencing symptoms of chronic pain showed modest but statistically significant benefits in terms of pain relief and functional improvement.

b) Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS)

A "TENS" unit uses electrodes on the skin's surface to stimulate peripheral nerves electrically in an attempt to treat pain without the need for surgery. Up to a third of patients report moderate skin discomfort after treatment with such devices, which are commonly used in outpatient exercise therapy settings [21]. Even while a tiny study found that using TENS for one hour reduced pain sensations immediately, there is still little proof of long-term alleviation. In another, larger research, there was no statistically significant improvement in pain, functional status, or range of motion with TENS compared with placebo [22, 23].

c) Lumbar Corset

Patients with chronic low back pain due to degenerative processes may benefit from lumbar back supports through a number of possible but controversial methods. The purpose of supports is to reduce mechanical forces, stabilize, correct deformities, and limit mobility of the spine. They might potentially work as a placebo, but they might also provide additional benefits from massaging sore spots and providing therapeutic heat. While there is conflicting data regarding patient improvement and functional ability to return to work, there is moderate evidence currently available evaluating the efficacy of lumbar supports within a mixed population of acute, subacute, and chronic LBP sufferers to suggest that lumbar supports are not more effective than other treatment forms [22].

d) Traction

Lumbar Traction uses a harness fastened to the iliac crest to apply a longitudinal force on the axial spine. rib cage to alleviate persistent low back pain. Adjustable in terms of both level and duration, the forces that reduce spine lordosis and open intervertebral space can be continuously monitored in both bed rest and motorized conditions. Theoretically, temporary realignments of the spine can alleviate degenerative spine disease symptoms by releasing adhesions inside the facet and annulus, alleviating mechanical stress, and p However, neither pain nor everyday functioning have significantly improved for patients with radicular pain and chronic symptoms [24–25]. Regarding the dangers connected to the applied forces, not much is known. According to isolated case reports, the positioning and placement of the harness may cause blood pressure variations or breathing restrictions in addition to nerve impingement with strong forces [26].

e) Spine Manipulation

Spine Manipulation is a manual therapy technique that involves long, low-velocity lever movements that extend a joint's comfortable range of motion but do not match its anatomical range. It's yet unknown just how low back pain sufferers may benefit. The following are some ways that manipulative therapy may work: (1) release for the entrapped synovial folds; (2) hypertonic muscle relaxation; (3) disruption of articular or periarticular adhesion; (4) unbuckling of motion segments that have experienced disproportionate displacement; (5) reduction of disk bulge; (6) repositioning of tiny structures within the articular surface; (7) mechanical stimulation of nociceptive joint fibers. [27].

f) Massage Therapy

Massage Therapy for chronic LBP appears to provide some beneficial relief. Weighed against other interventions, it proved less efficacious than TENS and manipulation, comparable with corsets and exercise regimens, and superior to acupuncture and other relaxation therapies, when followed overall 1 year course. Such preliminary results need confirmation, and evaluation for cost-effectiveness, but nevertheless suggest a potential role in certain , interested patients [28].

B. Pharmacotherapy

a) NSAIDS

Along with non-pharmacologic therapy to control pain and edema, medicine is often used to treat lumbar spondylosis successfully, minimize disability, and enhance quality of life. Several studies have looked at the efficacy of different oral medications in the management of low back pain caused by degenerative processes. On the optimal approach for pharmacologic management, there is still disagreement, though [29]. Since NSAIDS have analgesic and anti-inflammatory properties, they are commonly considered a suitable initial step in treatment. Sufficient evidence exists to support the effectiveness of pain management in the setting of persistent low back pain , with gastrointestinal (GI) problems typically serving as the main barrier to use. In the long run, COX2 inhibitors improve function and provide a little amount of relief from chronic low back pain. Although they cause less GI problems, research has shown that long-term use of them increases cardiovascular risk, which has led to a reduction in their use . [30]

b) Opioid Medications

Patients experiencing gastrointestinal side effects or inadequate pain relief with NSAID management may find that opioid drugs serve as an alternate or supplemental treatment. Practitioners' practices regarding the prescription of opioids for patients with chronic low back pain vary greatly, with arrange of 3–66% of Numerous literature reviews have examined the usage of opioids by individuals with chronic LBP [31]. These patients frequently have higher functional impairment ratings and experience greater distress or struggle .Although there is a small short-term benefit of using opioids for the treatment of chronic LBP, two meta-analyses [32,33] highlight the low quality of the studies that are currently available as well as the high prevalence of tolerance and misuse associated with long-term narcotic usage within this patient population.

c) Muscle Relaxants**(i) Injection Therapy**

Antispasmodic or antispasticity drugs, which are muscle relaxants, may be helpful for treating chronic low back pain caused by degenerative conditions. Muscle relaxants continue to offer moderate to high evidence of efficacy for both short-term pain alleviation and general functioning, according to multiple trials comparing benzodiazepines or non-benzodiazepines with placebos [34].

(ii) Epidural Steroid Injections

Corticosteroids are well recognized for their capacity to reduce inflammation through blockade of pro-inflammatory mediators. Within the span of less than one decade (1998–2005), the number of ESI procedures performed has increased by Because of lumbar spine deterioration, epidural steroid injections (ESI) are now frequently used as an interventional technique to treat persistent axial and radicular pain. It is possible to administer these injections via caudal, transforaminal, or interlaminar techniques. Typically, local anesthesia and steroids are injected into the epidural space at the target vertebral level and bathe the departing nerve roots using needles guided under fluoroscopy and contrast. The theory behind symptomatic relief is that it happens via complementary pathways. In addition to providing prompt diagnostic confirmation, local anesthetics have the potential to stop the "pain spasm cycle" and prevent the transmission of pain signals [35-36]. 121% Despite this widespread utilization, controversy remains regarding the efficacy of these injections, fueled by the expense and their frequent but potential risks related to needle placement and adverse medication reactions. Available published data cites wide ranges in reported success rates due to variation in study designs, distinct procedural techniques, small cohorts,

and imperfect control groups [For example, prior to the year 2000, few efficacy studies of lumbar ESI. citing, among many, randomized controlled trials (RCT) by Arden and Carette of unilateral sciatic pain, findings ta-used fluoroscopy to determine the proper needle placement. Even with skilled providers, research indicates that needle location may be incorrect in as many as 25% of cases if fluoroscopic guided confirmation is not obtained [38]. Both review articles and practicing doctors need to analyse these methodological variations between research in order to compile ideas regarding the usefulness and efficacy of ESI for treating LBP. In one such evaluation, the effectiveness of interlaminar lumbar injections was found to have low long-term benefit and good evidence for short-term pain alleviation. [39].

The same review evaluating the transforaminal injection approach to unilateral sciatica found strong evidence for short-term, and moderate evidence for long-term symptom and functional improvement, based on the findings from several RCT. Vad et al. studied 48 patients with herniated nucleus pulposus or radicular pain, treated with transforaminal ESI versus trigger point injections, citing an 84% improvement in functional scoring compared with 48% in the control group, extending for a follow-up period of 1 year. Lutz et al. treated and followed a different cohort of 69 patients with the same underlying diagnoses, with transforaminal ESI for 80 weeks demonstrating 75% of patients with a successful long-term outcome, defined as 50% reduction in pain scores. In spinal stenosis, transforaminal ESI has achieved 50% pain reduction, improved walking, and improved standing tolerance in symptomatic patients extending through 1 year follow-up. Furthermore, prospective trials by Yang and Riew found patients with severe lumbar radiculopathies and spinal stenosis treated with transforaminal injections experienced such sustained functional and symptomatic benefits so as to avoid intended surgical intervention [40].

(iii) Facet Injections

Facet joints are paired diarthrodial articulations between neighboring vertebrae; they are also known as zygapophysial joints. These joints have free and encapsulated nerve terminals, mechanoreceptors, and nociceptors, according to anatomical research. They are innervated by the medial branches of the dorsal rami. Pain signals are produced by joint inflammation and are responsible for 15–45% of cases of low back pain [41]. Anaesthesia is injected directly into the joint space or related medial branch (MBB) during diagnostic blocks of the joint. Single diagnostic facet blocks had a false-positive rate of 22% to 47% [84] and a medial branch block rate of 17–47% in the lumbar spine [42], according to systematic studies of prospective and retrospective trials.

(iv) SI Joint Injections

The sacroiliac joint space is a diarthrodial synovial joint with debated innervation patterns that involve both myelinated and unmyelinated axons. Injury or inflammation at the joint creates pain signals which are implicated in 10–27% of patients with low back pain and may also refer to the buttocks, groin, thigh, and lower extremities.

There is moderate evidence to support the use of both diagnostic and therapeutic block soft he SI joint. Pereira treated 10 patients with MRI-guided bilateral SI joint injections of steroid, eight of whom reported “good to excellent” pain relief persisting through 13 months follow-up. Maugers compared corticosteroid versus placebo injections under fluoroscopic guidance in SI joints of 10 symptomatic patients, reporting patient benefit only in the corticosteroid group. That benefit waned slowly over time, from 70% of patients at 1 month, to 62% at 3 months, and 58% at 6 months]. At this point, there is limited evidence to support radio-frequency neurotomy (ablation procedure) of the SI joint[43].

A recent meta-analysis provided the following guiding principles with regard to the frequency the se procedures should be implemented in clinical practice. In cases of ESI, facet, and sacroiliac injections, diagnostic injections should be considered at intervals of no sooner than 1–2 weeks apart. Therapeutic injections may be performed at most every 2–3 months, provided the patient experiences greater than 50% relief within 6 weeks. Injections should be per-formed only as they are medically necessary given their associated risks and significant costs [44].

C. Surgical Options

Surgical interventions are generally reserved for patients who have failed conservative options. Patients must be considered as appropriate “surgical candidates,” taking into consideration medical comorbidities as well as age, socio-economic status, and projected activity level following a procedure. Many surgical approaches have been developed to achieve one of the two primary goals: spinal fusion or spine decompression (or both).

Spinal fusion is considered in patients with mal-alignment or excessive motion of the spine, as seen with DDD and spondylolisthesis. Several surgical fusion approaches exist, all involving the addition of a bone graft to grow between vertebral elements to limit associated motion. Decompression surgery is indicated for patients with clear [45,46].

Conclusion

The diagnosis of lumbar spondylosis is challenging. Although there are many different definitions in the literature, we decided to define it generally as degenerative disorders of the spine. As it While it might not be difficult to detect radiographically, its widespread presence in all patient groups

makes accurate diagnosis of symptomatic cases quite challenging. Furthermore, despite significant research efforts to develop conservative and more invasive means of controlling symptoms and delaying progressive decline, there is still no definitive, gold-standard therapy strategy to the vast spectrum of patient presentations.

The area will remain a crucial subject for research due to the high prevalence of low back pain in the general population as well as its effects on society and economy. Gene research, risk factor analysis, and experimental therapy methods have provided significant hints. There's no question that in the years to come, these and other initiatives will improve methods for treating illness symptoms as well as its progression and, eventually, prevention.

REFERENCES:-

1. Frymoyer JW. Back pain and sciatica. *N Engl J Med*.1988;318:291–300.
2. GB. Epidemiological features of chronic low pain. *Lancet*.1999;354:581–5.
3. Dillane J, Fry J, Kalton G. Acute back syndrome—a study from general practice. *Br MedJ*.1966;2:82–4.
4. practice. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA:Lippincott-Raven;1997.
5. Van Tulder M W , Koes B W , Bouter LM . Acost of illness study of back pain in The Netherlands. *Pain*.1995;62:233–40.
6. Osteophytosis: A population based survey. *J Rheumatol*.1999;26:842–8.
7. Jensen M C, Brant-Zawadzki M N, Obuchowski N, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine in people without backpain. *N Eng l JMed*.1994;331(2):69–73.
8. Frymoyer JW, Newberg A, Pope MH, et al. Spine radiographs in patients with low-back pain. An epidemiological study in men. *JBoneJointSurgAm*.1984;66 (7):1048–55.
9. Lawrence JS. Disc degeneration. Its frequency and relationship to symptoms. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 1969;28:121–38.
10. Kirkaldy-Willis W, Bernard T. Managing low back pain. New York: Churchill livingstone;1983.
11. Kirkaldy-Willis WH, Wedge JH, Yong-Hing K, et al. Pathology and pathogenesis of lumbar spondylosis and stenosis. *Spine*.1978;3:319–28.
12. Buckwalter JA, Saltzman C, Brown T. The impact of osteoarthritis: implications for research. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*.2004;427:S6–15.
13. Heine J, Überdie. Arthritis deformans. *Virchows Arch Pathol Anat*.1926;260:521–663.
14. Miller JA, Schmatz C, Schultz AB. Lumbar disc degeneration: correlation with age, sex, and spine level in 600 autopsy speci-mens. *Spine*.1988;13:173–8.2477–85.

15. Humzah MD, Soames RW. Human intervertebral disc: structure and function [Review]. *Anat Rec.*1988;220:337–56.
16. Lamer TJ. Lumbar spine pain originating from vertebral osteophytes. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.*1999;24(4):347–51.
17. Hayden JA, van Tulder MW, Malmivaara AV, et al. Meta-analysis: exercise therapy for nonspecific low back pain. *Ann InternMed.*2005;142:765–75.
18. Hayden JA, van Tulder MW, Tomlinson G. Systematic review: strategies for using exercise therapy to improve outcomes in chronic low backpain. *Ann Intern Med.*2005;142:776–85.
19. Deyo RA, Walsh NE, Martin DC, et al. A controlled trial of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) and exercise for chronic lowback pain. *N Engl JMed.*1990;322:1627–34.
20. Van Tulder MW, Koes B, Malmivaara. Outcome of non-invasive treatment modalities on backpain: an evidence based review. *Eur SpineJ.*2006;15(1):S64–81.
21. Milne S, Welch V, Brosseau L. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for chronic low back pain, vol. 4. Oxford:The Cochrane Library;2004.
22. Heymans MW, VanTulder MW, Esmail R,etal. Back schools for Non-specific low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane collaboration back review group.*Spine.*2005;30(19):2153–63.
23. Van der Heijden GJMG, Beurskens AJHM, Dirx MJM, et al. Efficacy of lumbar traction: a randomized clinical trial. *Physio-therapy.*1995;81:29–35.
24. Borman P, Keskin D, Bodur H. The efficacy of lumbar traction in the management of patients with low back pain. *Rheumatol Int.*2003;23:82–6.
25. Werners R, Pynsent PB, Bulstrode CJ K. Randomized trial comparing interferential therapy with motorized lumbar traction and massage in the management of low back pain in a primary caresetting. *Spine.*1999;24:1579–84.
26. Oliphant D. Safety of spinal manipulation in the treatment of lumbar disk herniations: a systematic review and risk assessment. *J Manipulative Physio l Ther.*2004;27:197–210.
27. Furlan AD, Brosseau L, Imamura M, et al. Massage for low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review Group. *Spine.* 2002;27(17):1896–910.
28. Schnitzer T J, Ferraro A, Hunsche E, et al. A comprehensive review of clinical trials on the efficacy and safety of drugs for the treatment of low back pain. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2004;28:72–95.
29. Treatment of low back pain. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2004;28:72–95.
30. Hickey RF. Chronic low back pain: a comparison of diflunisal with paracetamol. *NZ MedJ.*1982;95(707):312–4.
31. Fillingim RB, Doleys DM, Edwards RR, et al. Clinical characteristics of chronic back pain as a

- function of gender and oral opioid use. *Spine*.2003;28:143–50.
32. Turk DC, Okifuji A. What factors affect physicians' decisions to prescribe opioids for chronic non cancer pain patients ? *Clin J Pain*.1997;13:330–6.
 33. Abdi S, Datta S, Trescot A M, et al. Epidural steroids in the management of chronic spinal pain: a systematic review. *Pain Physician*. 2007;10:185–212.
 34. Koes BW, Scholten RJ, Mens JM, et al. Efficacy of epidural steroid injections for low-back pain and sciatica: a systematic review of randomized clinical trials. *Pain*.1995;63(3):279–88.
 35. Stitz M Y, Sommer H M. Accuracy of blind versus fluoroscopically guided caudal epidural injection . *Spine*.1999;24(13):1371–6.
 36. Arden NK, Price C, Reading I, et al. A multicentre randomized controlled trial of epidural corticosteroid injections for sciatica : the WEST study. *Rheumatology*. 2005;44:1399–406.
 37. Botwin KP, Gruber RD, Bouchlas CG, et al. Fluoroscopically guided lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injections in degenerative lumbar stenosis: an outcome study. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*.2002;81:898–905.
 38. Riew KD, Park JB, Cho YS, et al. Nerve root blocks in the treatment of lumbar radicular pain: a minimum 5-year follow up. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*.2006; 88:1722–5.
 39. Riew KD, Yin Y, Gilula L, Bridwell, et al. The effect of nerve-root injections on the need for operative treatment of lumbar radicular pain. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2000; 82:1589–93.
 40. Yang SC, Fu TS, Lai PL, et al. Transforaminal epidural steroid injection for discectomy candidates: an outcome study with a minimum of 2 year follow-up. *Chang Gung Med J*.2006;29:93–9.
 41. Sehgal N, Dunbar E E , Shah RV, et al. Systematic review of diagnostic utility of facet (zygapophysial) joint injections in chronic spinal pain: an update. *Pain Physician*. 2007;10(1):213–28.
 42. Boswell MV, Colson JD, Sehgal N, et al. A systematic review of therapeutic facet joint interventions in chronic spinal pain. *Pain Physician*.2007;10:229–53.
 43. Fuchs S, Erbe T, Fischer HL, et al. Intra-articular hyaluronic acid versus glucocorticoid injections for non-radicular pain in the lumbar spine. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*.2005;16:1493–8.
 44. Manchikanti L, Pampati VS, Bakhit C, et al. Effectiveness of lumbar facet joint nerve blocks in chronic low back pain: a randomized clinical trial. *Pain Physician*. 2001;4:101-17
 45. Ibrahim T, T leyjeh I M, Gabbar O. Surgical versus non-surgical treatment of chronic low back pain: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. In: *International orthopedics*. Available via Springer Link. 2006. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/b9634hh822764233/>. Accessed 21 Nov 2006.