

Review Article

An evidence-based clinical guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis (update)

D. Scott Kreiner, MD^{a,*}, William O. Shaffer, MD^b, Jamie L. Baisden, MD^c,
Thomas J. Gilbert, MD^d, Jeffrey T. Summers, MD^e, John F. Toton, MD^f,
Steven W. Hwang, MD^g, Richard C. Mendel, MD^h, Charles A. Reitman, MDⁱ

^aAhwatukee Sports and Spine, 4530 E. Muirwood Drive, Suite 110, Phoenix, AZ 85048-7693, USA

^bNorthwest Iowa Bone, Joint & Sports Surgeons, 1200 1st Ave. E, Suite C, Spencer, IA 51301-4342, USA

^cDepartment of Neurosurgery, Medical College of Wisconsin, 9200 W. Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53226-3522, USA

^dCenter for Diagnostic Imaging, 5775 Wayzata Blvd, Suite 140, Saint Louis Park, MN 55416-2660, USA

^eNewSouth NeuroSpine, 2470 Flowood Drive, Flowood, MS 39232-9019, USA

^f1310 Prentice Drive, Ste. G, Healdsburg, CA 95448-5005, USA

^gDepartment of Neurosurgery, Tufts Medical Center, 800 Washington St, Boston, MA 02111-1552, USA

^h255 Baptist Blvd, Ste. 305, Columbus, MS 39705-2006, USA

ⁱBaylor Clinic, 6620 Main St, 13th Floor, Suite 1325, Houston, TX 77030, USA

Received 15 December 2011; accepted 17 November 2012

Abstract

BACKGROUND CONTEXT: The evidence-based clinical guideline on the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis by the North American Spine Society (NASS) provides evidence-based recommendations to address key clinical questions surrounding the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. The guideline is intended to reflect contemporary treatment concepts for *symptomatic degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis* as reflected in the highest quality clinical literature available on this subject as of July 2010. The goals of the guideline recommendations are to assist in delivering optimum efficacious treatment and functional recovery from this spinal disorder.

PURPOSE: Provide an evidence-based educational tool to assist spine care providers in improving quality and efficiency of care delivered to patients with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis.

STUDY DESIGN: Systematic review and evidence-based clinical guideline.

METHODS: This report is from the Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis Work Group of the NASS's Evidence-Based Clinical Guideline Development Committee. The work group consisted of multidisciplinary spine care specialists trained in the principles of evidence-based analysis. The original guideline, published in 2006, was carefully reviewed. A literature search addressing each question and using a specific search protocol was performed on English language references found in MEDLINE, EMBASE (Drugs and Pharmacology), and four additional, evidence-based, databases to identify articles published since the search performed for the original guideline. The relevant literature was then independently rated by a minimum of three physician reviewers using the NASS-adopted standardized levels of evidence. An evidentiary table was created for each of the questions. Final recommendations to answer each clinical question were arrived at via work group discussion, and grades were assigned to the recommendations using standardized grades of recommendation. In the absence of Levels I to IV evidence, work group consensus statements have been

DOI of original article: 10.1016/j.spinee.2012.11.059

FDA device/drug status: Not applicable.

Author disclosures: **DSK:** Nothing to disclose. **WOS:** Consulting: DePuy Spine (B, iliolumbar module 12/09, and none since, Paid directly to institution/employer); Trips/Travel: Synthes (Financial reimbursement); Relationships Outside the One Year Requirement: DePuy Spine (Upcoming Committee Meeting [Cervical Epidural Work Group], 01/2007, Royalties, C for sacropelvic module). **JLB:** Nothing to disclose. **TJG:** Scientific Advisory Board: Steady State Imaging (Option on 20,000 shares); Other Office: Medical Director (Option on 20,000 shares). **JTS:** Board of

Directors: First Choice Insurance Group (A), International Spine Intervention Society (ISIS) (None). **JFT:** Nothing to disclose. **SWH:** Nothing to disclose. **RCM:** Nothing to disclose. **CAR:** Nothing to disclose.

The disclosure key can be found on the Table of Contents and at www.TheSpineJournalOnline.com.

* Corresponding author. Ahwatukee Sports and Spine, 4530 E. Muirwood Drive, Suite 110, Phoenix, AZ 85048-7693, USA. Tel.: 480-763-5808

E-mail address: skreiner@ahwatukeesportsandspine.com (D.S. Kreiner)

developed using a modified nominal group technique, and these statements are clearly identified as such in the guideline.

RESULTS: Sixteen key clinical questions were assessed, addressing issues of natural history, diagnosis, and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. The answers are summarized in this document. The respective recommendations were graded by the strength of the supporting literature that was stratified by levels of evidence.

CONCLUSIONS: A clinical guideline for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis has been updated using the techniques of evidence-based medicine and using the best available clinical evidence to aid both practitioners and patients involved with the care of this condition. The entire guideline document, including the evidentiary tables, suggestions for future research, and all references, will be available electronically at the NASS Web site (www.spine.org) and will remain updated on a timely schedule. © 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords:

Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis; Natural history; Diagnosis; Imaging; Medical/interventional treatment

Introduction

In an attempt to improve and evaluate the knowledge base concerning the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis, the Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis Work Group of the North American Spine Society's (NASS) Evidence-Based Clinical Guideline Development Committee has developed an evidence-based clinical guideline on the topic. The Institute of Medicine has defined a clinical guideline as “systematically developed statements to assist practitioner and patient decisions about health care for specific clinical situations” [1].

The application of the principles of evidence-based medicine (EBM) to guideline development helps to create an explicit linkage between the final recommendations in the guideline and the evidence on which these recommendations are based [2]. When using the principles of EBM, the clinical literature is extensively searched to answer specific questions about a disease state or medical condition. The literature that is identified in the search is then rated as to its scientific merit using levels of evidence, determined by specific rule sets that apply to human and clinical investigations. The specific questions asked are then answered using studies of the highest possible levels of evidence that have been obtained from the searches. As a final step, the answers to the clinical questions are reformulated as recommendations that are assigned grades of strength related to the best clinical evidence available at the time of answering each question. The intent of the grade of recommendation is to indicate the strength of the evidence used by the work group in answering the question asked.

Methods

For this clinical guideline, the guideline development process was broken down into 12 steps. In Step 1, guideline participants, trained in the principles of EBM, carefully reviewed the key questions and content of the 2006 guideline. In Step 2, multidisciplinary teams composed of surgical, medical, interventional, and radiological specialists were

assigned to groups and assigned a subset of the questions to be considered and updated. Step 3 consisted of each group reviewing the original search parameters used in the 2006 guideline, and as necessary, updating the search terms and parameters to direct the literature search according to the NASS-instituted Literature Search Protocol. The literature search was then completed in Step 4 by a medical research librarian according to the NASS Literature Search Protocol and stored in a cross-referencing database for future use or reference. The following electronic databases were searched for English language publications: MEDLINE (PubMed), EMBASE (Drugs and Pharmacology), Cochrane Database of Systematic reviews, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and Web of Science. Work group members then reviewed all abstracts from the literature search in Step 5. The best research evidence available was identified and used to answer the targeted clinical questions. That is, if adequate Level I, II, or III studies were available to answer a specific question, the work group was not required to review Level IV or V evidence. In Step 6, the members independently developed evidentiary tables summarizing study conclusions, identifying strengths and weaknesses, and assigning levels of evidence. To systematically control for bias, at least three work group members reviewed each article selected and independently assigned a level of evidence as per the NASS Levels of Evidence Table. The final level of evidence assigned was that agreed on by at least two-thirds of the reviewers.

To update and formulate evidence-based recommendations and incorporate expert opinion when necessary, work groups participated in webcasts in Step 7. Expert physician opinion was incorporated only in which Levels I to IV evidence was insufficient, and the work groups deemed a recommendation was warranted. For transparency in the incorporation of consensus, all consensus-based recommendations in this guideline are clearly stated as such. Voting on guideline recommendations was conducted using a modification of the nominal group technique in which each work group member independently and anonymously ranked a recommendation on a scale ranging from 1

Table
Linking levels of evidence to grades of recommendation

Grade of recommendation	Standard language	Levels of evidence	
A	Recommended	Two or more consistent Level I studies	
B	Suggested	One Level I study with additional supporting Level II or III studies	Two or more consistent Level II or III studies
C	May be considered and is an option	One Level I, II, or III study with supporting Level IV studies	Two or more consistent Level IV studies
I (insufficient or conflicting evidence)	Insufficient evidence to make recommendation for or against	A single Level I, II, III, or IV study without other supporting evidence	More than one study with inconsistent findings*

Note: A technical report, including the literature search parameters and evidentiary tables developed by the authors, can be accessed at <http://www.spine.org/Documents/2011StenosisTechReport.pdf>.

* Note that in the presence of multiple consistent studies and a single outlying inconsistent study, the grade of recommendation will be based on the level of the consistent studies.

(extremely inappropriate) to 9 (extremely appropriate) [3]. Consensus was obtained when at least 80% of work group members ranked the recommendation as 7, 8, or 9. When the 80% threshold was not attained, up to three rounds of discussion and voting were held to resolve disagreements. If disagreements were not resolved after these rounds, no recommendation was adopted. When the recommendations were established, work group members developed guideline content, referencing the literature that supported the recommendations.

In Step 8, the completed guideline was submitted to the NASS Evidence-Based Guideline Development Committee and the NASS Research Council for review and comment. Revisions to recommendations were considered only when substantiated by a preponderance of appropriate levels of evidence. Once evidence-based revisions were incorporated, the guideline was submitted to the NASS Board of Directors for review and approval in Step 9. In Step 10, the NASS Board–approved guideline was submitted for inclusion in the National Guidelines Clearinghouse.

In Step 11, the recommendations will be submitted to the AMA Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement, a multispecialty collaborative group engaged in the development of evidence-based performance measures. In Step 12, the guideline recommendations will be reviewed every 3 years and the literature base updated by an EBM-trained multidisciplinary team with revisions to the recommendations developed in the same manner as in the original guideline development.

Results

Definition and natural history

Question #1: What is the best working definition of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis?

Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis describes a condition in which there is diminished space available for the neural and vascular elements in the lumbar spine secondary to degenerative changes in the spinal canal. When symptomatic, this causes a variable clinical syndrome of gluteal and/or lower extremity pain and/or fatigue that may occur

with or without back pain. Symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis has certain characteristic provocative and palliative features. Provocative features include upright exercise such as walking or positionally induced neurogenic claudication. Palliative features commonly include symptomatic relief with forward flexion, sitting, and/or recumbency.

Work Group Consensus Statement

Question #2: What is the natural history of symptomatic degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis?

Because of the limitations of the available literature, the work group was unable to definitively answer the question posed related to the natural history of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. In lieu of an evidence-based answer, the work group did reach consensus on the following statements addressing natural history.

In the absence of reliable evidence, it is the work group's opinion that the natural history of patients with clinically mild to moderately symptomatic degenerative lumbar stenosis can be favorable in about one-third to one-half of patients.

Work Group Consensus Statement

Based on evaluation of studies that contained varying and often relatively minimal or simple interventions, it appears that the natural history of mild to moderate degenerative lumbar stenosis may be favorable for 33% to 50% of patients. It is the consensus of the work group that some of the medical treatments used in the studies reviewed likely did not significantly alter the symptomatic course of the disease.

In the absence of reliable evidence, it is the work group's opinion that in patients with mild or moderately symptomatic degenerative lumbar stenosis, rapid or catastrophic neurologic decline is rare.

Work Group Consensus Statement

The literature evaluated for the degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis guideline project included numerous reports describing the clinical course of patients with mild to moderate spinal stenosis. None of these reports described rapid

or catastrophic neurologic decline in patients identified with mild or moderate lumbar spinal stenosis. Although anecdotal experience may indicate the possibility of such a decline, evidence suggests that the occurrence of such a decline is exceedingly rare.

In the absence of reliable evidence, it is the work group's opinion that information in the literature is insufficient to define the natural history of clinically or radiographically severe degenerative lumbar stenosis.

Work Group Consensus Statement

It should be noted that all the series reviewed excluded patients with severe neurologic compromise (or loss or dysfunction) who were regarded as candidates for surgery; therefore, no conclusions can be drawn about this patient population.

Diagnosis and imaging

Question #3: What are the most appropriate historical and physical findings consistent with the diagnosis of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis?

The diagnosis of lumbar spinal stenosis may be considered in older patients presenting with a history of gluteal or lower extremity symptoms exacerbated by walking or standing which improves or resolves with sitting or bending forward. Patients whose pain is not made worse with walking have a low likelihood of stenosis [4–7].

Grade of Recommendation: C

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of self-administered questionnaires to improve accuracy of the diagnosis of spinal stenosis [4,7,9].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against certain physical findings for the diagnosis of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis including an abnormal Romberg test, thigh pain exacerbated with extension, sensorimotor deficits, leg cramps, and abnormal Achilles tendon reflexes [4,7,9].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the diagnostic reliability of patient-reported dominance of lower extremity pain and low back pain [8].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Question #4: What are the most appropriate diagnostic tests for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis?

In patients with history and physical examination findings consistent with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis,

magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is suggested as the most appropriate noninvasive test to confirm the presence of anatomic narrowing of the spinal canal or the presence of nerve root impingement [10–16].

Grade of Recommendation: B

In patients with history and physical examination findings consistent with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis for whom MRI is either contraindicated or inconclusive, computed tomography (CT) myelography is suggested as the most appropriate test to confirm the presence of anatomic narrowing of the spinal canal or the presence of nerve root impingement [12,13,15,17].

Grade of Recommendation: B

In patients with history and physical examination findings consistent with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis for whom MRI and CT myelography are contraindicated, inconclusive, or inappropriate, CT is the preferred test to confirm the presence of anatomic narrowing of the spinal canal or the presence of nerve root impingement [10,18–21].

Grade of Recommendation: B

MRI or CT with axial loading is suggested as a useful adjunct to routine imaging in patients who have clinical signs and symptoms of lumbar spinal stenosis, a dural sac area of less than 110 mm² at one or more levels, and suspected but not verified central or lateral stenosis on routine unloaded MRI or CT [22–32].

Grade of Recommendation: B

It is suggested that readers use well-defined, articulated, and validated criteria for anatomic canal narrowing on MRI, computed tomography myelography (CTM), and CT to improve interobserver and intraobserver reliability [10,33–39].

Grade of Recommendation: B

Imaging correlation with clinical findings

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against a correlation between clinical symptoms or function with the presence of anatomic narrowing of the spinal canal on MRI, CTM, or CT [40–49].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Electrodiagnostics

Few studies are dedicated to evaluating the utility of standard electrodiagnostic studies in lumbar spinal stenosis. Studies reviewed suggest that electrodiagnostic studies are

helpful for the evaluation of patients in which stenosis alone may not account for neurologic symptoms.

In the absence of reliable evidence, it is the work group's opinion that imaging studies be considered as a first-line diagnostic test in the diagnosis of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis.

Work Group Consensus Statement

Electromyographic paraspinal mapping is suggested to confirm the diagnosis of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis in patients with mild or moderate symptoms and radiographic evidence of stenosis [50,51].

Grade of Recommendation: B

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of F wave, H reflex, motor-evoked potential, motor nerve conduction studies, somatosensory-evoked potentials, dermatomal sensory-evoked potentials, and lower extremity electromyography (EMG) in the confirmation of lumbar spinal stenosis. These studies may be used to help identify other comorbidities [43,50,52–57].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Outcome measures for medical/interventional and surgical treatment

Question #5: What are the appropriate outcome measures to evaluate the treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis?

The NASS has a publication entitled *Compendium of Outcome Instruments for Assessment and Research of Spinal Disorders*. To purchase a copy of the Compendium, visit https://webportal.spine.org/Purchase/ProductDetail.aspx?Product_code=68cdd1f4-c4ac-db11-95b2-001143edb1c1.

For additional information about the Compendium, please contact the NASS Research Department at nassresearch@spine.org.

Medical/interventional treatment

Question #6: Do medical/interventional treatments improve outcomes in the management of spinal stenosis compared to the natural history of the disease?

A systematic review of the literature yielded no studies to answer this question. An extensive review of all articles cited in the reference section found no direct comparison of active treatment (medical/interventional) to an untreated control group (natural history).

Question #7: What is the role of pharmacological treatment in the management of spinal stenosis?

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of pharmacological treatment in the management of spinal stenosis [58–68].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Question #8: What is the role of physical therapy/exercise in the treatment of spinal stenosis?

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against the use of physical therapy or exercise as stand-alone treatments for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis [68,69].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

In the absence of reliable evidence, it is the work group's opinion that a limited course of active physical therapy is an option for patients with lumbar spinal stenosis.

Work Group Consensus Statement

Question #9: What is the role of manipulation in the treatment of spinal stenosis?

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against spinal manipulation for the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis [70].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Question #10: What is the role of contrast-enhanced, fluoroscopic guidance in the routine performance of epidural steroid injections for the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis?

Contrast-enhanced fluoroscopy is recommended to guide epidural steroid injections to improve the accuracy of medication delivery [71–74].

Grade of Recommendation: A

Question #11: What is the role of epidural steroid injections (ESI) in the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis?

Interlaminar epidural steroid injections are suggested to provide short-term (2 weeks to 6 months) symptom relief in patients with neurogenic claudication or radiculopathy. There is, however, conflicting evidence concerning long-term (21.5–24 months) efficacy [69,75–77].

Grade of Recommendation: B

A multiple injection regimen of radiographically guided transforaminal epidural steroid injection or caudal injections is suggested to produce medium-term (3–36 months) relief of pain in patients with radiculopathy or neurogenic intermittent claudication from lumbar spinal stenosis [78–82].

Grade of Recommendation: C

Question 12: What is the role of ancillary treatments such as bracing, traction, electrical stimulation and

transcutaneous electrical stimulation (TENS) in the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis?

The use of a lumbosacral corset is suggested to increase walking distance and decrease pain in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. There is no evidence that results are sustained once the brace is removed [83–85].

Grade of Recommendation: B

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against traction, electrical stimulation, or transcutaneous electrical stimulation for the treatment of patients with lumbar spinal stenosis.

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation for or against acupuncture in for the treatment of patients with lumbar spinal stenosis [86].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Question #13: What is the long-term (2 to 10 years) result of medical/interventional management of spinal stenosis?

Medical/interventional treatment may be considered to provide long-term (2–10 years) improvement in patients with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis and has been shown to improve outcomes in a large percentage of patients [63,87–89].

Grade of Recommendation: C

Because of the limited availability of evidence, the work group defined long-term results as any study that included 2 or more years of follow-up.

Surgical treatment

Question #14: Does surgical decompression alone improve surgical outcomes in the treatment of spinal stenosis compared to medical/interventional treatment?

Decompressive surgery is suggested to improve outcomes in patients with moderate to severe symptoms of lumbar spinal stenosis [87,90–97].

Grade of Recommendation: B:

Medical/interventional treatment may be considered for patients with moderate symptoms of lumbar spinal stenosis [87,98–101].

Grade of Recommendation: C

In the absence of evidence for or against any specific treatment, it is the work group's recommendation that

medical/interventional treatment be considered for patients with mild symptoms of lumbar spinal stenosis.

Work Group Consensus Statement

There is insufficient evidence at this time to make a recommendation for or against the placement of an interspinous process spacing device in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis [89,102].

Grade of Recommendation: I (insufficient evidence)

Question #15: Does the addition of lumbar fusion, with or without instrumentation, to surgical decompression improve surgical outcomes in the treatment of spinal stenosis compared to treatment by decompression alone?

For patients with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis with concomitant spondylolisthesis, please refer to treatment recommendations and supporting evidence available in the NASS guideline *Diagnosis and Treatment of Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis (2008)*, available at http://www.spine.org/Documents/Spondylolisthesis_Clinical_Guideline.pdf.

Decompression alone is suggested for patients with leg predominant symptoms without instability [103–105].

Grade of Recommendation: B

Question #16: What is the long-term result (4+ years) of surgical management of spinal stenosis?

Surgical treatment may be considered to provide long-term (4+ years) improvement in patients with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis and has been shown to improve outcomes in a large percentage of patients [87,106–125].

Grade of Recommendation: C

Surgical decompression may be considered in patients aged 75 years or older with lumbar spinal stenosis [97,116].

Grade of Recommendation: C

Discussion

This evidence-based clinical guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis has several functions. It is an educational tool for both clinicians and patients, and as such, this particular guideline is intended to facilitate the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. This guideline also serves to focus and rate the clinical data on this topic. An evidence-based guideline such as this allows a physician access to the best and most current evidence and reduces the burden of “keeping up with the literature” that spans

innumerable journals from a broad spectrum of disciplines. In addition, this evidence-based clinical guideline has the potential to improve the appropriateness and effectiveness of patient care by basing decisions on the best evidence available. Finally, the creation of this guideline serves to identify knowledge gaps in the clinical literature on the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. High-quality clinical guidelines ideally identify and suggest future research topics to improve guideline development and thus patient care, as detailed in the current guideline. The NASS Web site, www.spine.org, contains the complete clinical guideline summarized in this article, along with extensive descriptive narratives on each topic outlining the evidence and the work group rationale for the answers to each question. In addition, more extensive descriptions are provided for the guideline development process used at NASS, along with all the references used in this guideline and suggestions for future research studies on the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis.

References

- [1] Crossing the Quality Chasm. A new Health System for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine, 2001.
- [2] Heffner JE. Does evidence-based medicine help the development of clinical practice guidelines? *Chest* 1988;113(3 Suppl):172S–8S.
- [3] Murphy MK, Black LA, Lamping DL, et al. Consensus development methods, and their use in clinical guideline development. *Health Technol Assess* 1998;2:1–88.
- [4] Konno S, Kikuchi S, Tanaka Y, et al. A diagnostic support tool for lumbar spinal stenosis: a self-administered, self-reported history questionnaire. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2007;8:102.
- [5] Konno S, Hayashino Y, Fukuhara S, et al. Development of a clinical diagnosis support tool to identify patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Eur Spine J* 2007;16:1951–7.
- [6] Sugioka T, Hayashino Y, Konno S, et al. Predictive value of self-reported patient information for the identification of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Fam Pract* 2008;25:237–44.
- [7] Katz JN, Dalgas M, Stucki G, et al. Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. Diagnostic value of the history and physical examination. *Arthritis Rheum* 1995;38:1236–41.
- [8] Wai EK, Howse K, Pollock JW, et al. The reliability of determining “leg dominant pain”. *Spine J* 2009;9:447–53.
- [9] Matsumoto M, Watanabe K, Tsuji T, et al. Nocturnal leg cramps: a common complaint inpatients with lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *Spine* 2009;34.
- [10] Kent DL, Haynor DR, Larson EB, Deyo RA. Diagnosis of lumbar spinal stenosis in adults: a metaanalysis of the accuracy of CT, MR, and myelography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1992;158:1135–44.
- [11] Bischoff RJ, Rodriguez RP, Gupta K, et al. A comparison of computed tomography-myelography, magnetic resonance imaging, and myelography in the diagnosis of herniated nucleus pulposus and spinal stenosis. *J Spinal Disord* 1993;6:289–95.
- [12] Jia LS, Shi ZR. MRI and myelography in the diagnosis of lumbar canal stenosis and disc herniation. A comparative study. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 1991;104:303–6.
- [13] Modic MT, Masaryk T, Boumpfhey F, et al. Lumbar herniated disk disease and canal stenosis: prospective evaluation by surface coil MR, CT, and myelography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1986;147:757–65.
- [14] Postacchini F, Amatruda A, Morace GB, Perugia D. Magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *Ital J Orthop Traumatol* 1991;17:327–37.
- [15] Schnebel B, Kingston S, Watkins R, Dillin W. Comparison of MRI to contrast CT in the diagnosis of spinal stenosis. *Spine* 1989;14:332–7.
- [16] Barz T, Melloh M, Staub LP, et al. Nerve root sedimentation sign: evaluation of a new radiological sign in lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2010;5:892–7.
- [17] Engelhorn T, Rennert J, Richter G, et al. Myelography using flat panel volumetric computed tomography: a comparative study in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2007;32:E523–7.
- [18] Bell GR, Rothman RH, Booth RE, et al. A study of computer-assisted tomography. II. Comparison of metrizamide myelography and computed tomography in the diagnosis of herniated lumbar disc and spinal stenosis. *Spine* 1984;9:552–6.
- [19] Bolender NF, Schonstrom NS, Spengler DM. Role of computed tomography and myelography in the diagnosis of central spinal stenosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1985;67:240–6.
- [20] Herkowitz HN, Garfin SR, Bell GR, et al. The use of computerized tomography in evaluating non-visualized vertebral level scaddad to a complete block on a lumbar myelogram. A review of thirty-two cases. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1987;69:218–24.
- [21] Johansen JG. Computed tomography in assessment of myelographic nerve root compression in the lateral recess. *Spine* 1986;11:492–5.
- [22] Wang YC, Jeng CM, Wu CY, et al. Dynamic effects of axial loading on the lumbar spine during magnetic resonance imaging in patients with suspected spinal stenosis. *J Formos Med Assoc* 2008;107:334–9.
- [23] Danielson BI, Willén J, Gaultz A, et al. Axial loading of the spine during CT and MR in patients with suspected lumbar spinal stenosis. *Acta Radiol* 1998;39:604–11.
- [24] Manenti G, Liccardo G, Sergiacomi G, et al. Axial loading MRI of the lumbar spine. *In Vivo* 2003;17:413–20.
- [25] Willén J, Danielson B. The diagnostic effect from axial loading of the lumbar spine during computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in patients with degenerative disorders. *Spine* 2001;26:2607–14.
- [26] Willén J, Danielson B, Gaultz A, et al. Dynamic effects on the lumbar spinal canal: axially loaded CT-myelography and MRI in patients with sciatica and/or neurogenic claudication. *Spine* 1997;22:2968–76.
- [27] Willén J, Wessberg PJ, Danielsson B. Surgical results in hidden lumbar spinal stenosis detected by axial loaded computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging: an outcome study. *Spine* 2008;33:E109–15.
- [28] Sortland O, Magnaes B, Hauge T. Functional myelography with metrizamide in the diagnosis of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Acta Radiol Suppl* 1977;355:42–54.
- [29] Lian P, Liu DX, Sun RH, et al. Correlative study on findings of dynamic myelography and surgical operation in non-bony lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 1994;107:924–8.
- [30] Moon ES, Kim HS, Park JO, et al. Comparison of the predictive value of myelography, computed tomography and MRI on the treadmill test in lumbar spinal stenosis. *Yonsei Med J* 2005;46:806–11.
- [31] Wilmlink JT, Penning L. Influence of spinal posture on abnormalities demonstrated by lumbar myelography. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 1983;4:656–8.
- [32] Zander DR, Lander PH. Positionally dependent spinal stenosis: correlation of upright flexion-extension myelography and computed tomographic myelography. *Can Assoc Radiol J* 1998;49:256–61.
- [33] Lurie JD, Tosteson AN, Tosteson TD, et al. Reliability of readings of magnetic resonance imaging features of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2008;33:1605–10.
- [34] Song KS, Jang EC, Jung HJ, et al. Observer variability in the evaluation of multiple lumbar stenosis by routine MR-myelography and MRI. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2008;21:569–74.

- [35] Coste J, Judet O, Barre O, et al. Inter- and intraobserver variability in the interpretation of computed tomography of the lumbar spine. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1994;47:375–81.
- [36] Drew R, Bhandari M, Kulkarni AV, et al. Reliability in grading the severity of lumbar spinal stenosis. *J Spinal Disord* 2000;13:253–8.
- [37] Speciale AC, Pietrobon R, Urban CW, et al. Observer variability in assessing lumbar spinal stenosis severity on magnetic resonance imaging and its relation to cross-sectional spinal canal area. *Spine* 2002;27:1082–6.
- [38] Hamanishi C, Matukura N, Fujita M, et al. Cross-sectional area of the stenotic lumbar dural tube measured from the transverse views of magnetic resonance imaging. *J Spinal Disord* 1994;7:388–93.
- [39] Cihangiroglu M, Yildirim H, Bozgeyik Z, et al. Observer variability based on the strength of MR scanners in the assessment of lumbar degenerative disc disease. *Eur J Radiol* 2004;51:202–8.
- [40] Zeifang F, Schiltenswolf M, Abel R, Moradi B. Gait analysis does not correlate with clinical and MR imaging parameters in patients with symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2008;9:89.
- [41] Sirvanci M, Bhatia M, Ganiyusufoglu KA, et al. Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis: correlation with Oswestry Disability Index and MR imaging. *Eur Spine J* 2008;17:679–85.
- [42] Ogikubo O, Forsberg L, Hansson T. The relationship between the cross-sectional area of the cauda equina and the preoperative symptoms in central lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2007;32:1423–8; discussion 1429.
- [43] Egli D, Hausmann O, Schmid M, et al. Lumbar spinal stenosis: assessment of cauda equina involvement by electrophysiological recordings. *J Neurol* 2007;254:741–50.
- [44] Geisser ME, Haig AJ, Tong HC, et al. Spinal canal size and clinical symptoms among persons diagnosed with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Clin J Pain* 2007;23:780–5.
- [45] Haig AJ, Tong HC, Yamakawa KS, et al. Spinal stenosis, back pain, or no symptoms at all? A masked study comparing radiologic and electrodiagnostic diagnoses to the clinical impression. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2006;87:897–903.
- [46] Haig AJ, Geisser ME, Tong HC. Electromyographic and magnetic resonance imaging to predict lumbar stenosis, low-back pain, and no back symptoms. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2007;89:358–66.
- [47] Chiodo A, Haig AJ, Yamakawa KS, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging vs. electrodiagnostic root compromise in lumbar spinal stenosis: a masked controlled study. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2008;87:789–97.
- [48] Kapural L, Mekhail N, Bena J, et al. Value of the magnetic resonance imaging in patients with painful lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) undergoing lumbar epidural steroid injections. *Clin J Pain* 2007;23:571–5.
- [49] Lohman CM, Tallroth K, Kettunen JA, Lindgren KA. Comparison of radiologic signs and clinical symptoms of spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2006;31:1834–40.
- [50] Haig AJ, Tong HC, Yamakawa KS, et al. The sensitivity and specificity of electrodiagnostic testing for the clinical syndrome of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2005;30:2667–76.
- [51] Yagci I, Gunduz OH, Ekinçi G, et al. The Utility of lumbar Paraspinal Mapping in the diagnosis of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2009;88:843–51.
- [52] Micankova Adamova B, Vohanka S. The results and contribution of electrophysiological examination in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Scripta Medica Facultatis Medicae Universitatis Brunensis Masarykianae* 2009;82:38–45.
- [53] Liu X, Konno S, Miyamoto M, et al. Clinical usefulness of assessing lumbar somatosensory evoked potentials in lumbar spinalstenosis. Clinical article. *J Neurosurg Spine* 2009;11:71–8.
- [54] Molitor H. Somato-sensory evoked potentials in root lesions and stenosis of the spinal canal (their diagnostic significance in clinical decision making). *Neurosurg Rev* 1993;16:39–44.
- [55] Liu X, Konno S, Miyamoto M, et al. Clinical value of motor evoked potentials with transcranial magnetic stimulation in the assessment of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Int Orthop* 2009;33:1069–74.
- [56] Senocak O, Hürel DM, Sener U, et al. Motor conduction time along the cauda equina in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2009;34:1410–4.
- [57] Shen N. Evaluation of degree of nerve root injury by dermatomal somatosensory evoked potential following lumbar spinal stenosis. *Neural Regen Res* 2008;3:1249–52.
- [58] Eskola A, Pohjolainen T, Alaranta H, et al. Calcitonin treatment in lumbar spinal stenosis: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, cross-over study with one-year follow-up. *Calcif Tissue Int* 1992;50:400–3.
- [59] Sahin F, Yilmaz F, Kotevoglou N, Kuran B. The efficacy of physical therapy and physical therapy plus calcitonin in the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Yonsei Med J* 2009;50:683–8.
- [60] Tafazal SI, Ng L, Sell P. Randomised placebo-controlled trial on the effectiveness of nasal salmon calcitonin in the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Eur Spine J* 2007;16:207–12.
- [61] Eskola A, Alaranta H, Pohjolainen T, et al. Calcitonin treatment in lumbar spinal stenosis: clinical observations. *Calcif Tissue Int* 1989;45:372–4.
- [62] Podichetty VK, Segal AM, Lieber M, Mazanec DJ. Effectiveness of salmon calcitonin nasal spray in the treatment of lumbarcanal stenosis: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled, parallel group trial. *Spine* 2004;29:2343–9.
- [63] Waikakul W, Waikakul S. Methylcobalamin as an adjuvant medication in conservative treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2000;83:825–31.
- [64] Iwamoto J, Takeda T, Ichimura S. Effect of administration of lipoprostaglandin E on physical activity and bone resorption in patients with neurogenic intermittent claudication. *J Orthop Sci* 2001;6:242–7.
- [65] Murakami M, Takahashi K, Sekikawa T, et al. Effects of intravenous lipoprostaglandin E1 on neurogenic intermittent claudication. *J Spinal Disord* 1997;10:499–504.
- [66] Matsudaira K, Seichi A, Kunogi J, et al. The efficacy of prostaglandin E1 derivative in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2009;34:115–20.
- [67] Yaksi A, Ozgonenel L, Ozgonenel B. The efficiency of gabapentin therapy in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2007;32:939–42.
- [68] Goren A, Yildiz N, Topuz O, et al. Efficacy of exercise and ultrasound in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil* 2010;24:623–31.
- [69] Koc Z, Ozcakar S, Sivrioglu K, et al. Effectiveness of physical therapy and epidural steroid injections in lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 2009;34:985–9.
- [70] Murphy DR, Hurwitz EL, Gregory AA, Clary R. A non-surgical approach to the management of lumbar spinal stenosis: a prospective observational cohort study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2006;7:16.
- [71] Mehta M, Salmon N. Extradural block: Confirmation of the injection site by x-ray monitoring. *Anaesthesia* 1985;40:1009–12.
- [72] Renfrew DL, Moore TE, Kathol MH, et al. Correct placement of epidural steroid injections: Fluoroscopic guidance and contrastadministration. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 1991;12:1003–7.
- [73] Stitz M, Sommer H. Accuracy of blind versus fluoroscopically guided caudal epidural injections. *Spine* 1999;24:1371–6.
- [74] White AH, Derby R, Wynne G. Epidural injections for the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. *Spine* 1980;5:78–86.
- [75] Fukusaki M, Kobayashi I, Hara T, Sumikawa K. Symptoms of spinal stenosis do not improve after epidural steroid injection. *Clin J Pain* 1998;14:148–51.
- [76] Cuckler JM, Bernini PA, Wiesel SW, et al. The use of epiduralsteroids in the treatment of lumbar radicular pain: a prospective randomized, double-blind study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1985;67:63–6.

- [77] Papagelopoulos PJ, Petrou HG, Triantafyllidis PG, et al. Treatment of lumbosacral radicular pain with epidural steroid injections. *Orthopedics* 2001;24:145–9.
- [78] Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, et al. Preliminary results of a randomized, equivalence trial of fluoroscopic caudal epidural injections in managing chronic low back pain: Part 4—Spinal stenosis. *Pain Physician* 2008;11:833–48.
- [79] Botwin KP, Gruber RD, Bouchlas CG, et al. Fluoroscopically guided lumbar transformational epidural steroid injections in degenerative lumbar stenosis: an outcome study. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2002;81:898–905.
- [80] Ciocon JO, Galindo-Ciocon D, Amaranath L, Galindo D. Caudal epidural blocks for elderly patients with lumbar canal stenosis. *J Am Geriatric Soc* 1994;42:593–6.
- [81] Delpont EG, Cucuzzella AR, Marley JK, et al. Treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis with epidural steroid injections: a retrospective outcome study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2004;85:479–84.
- [82] Hoogmartens M. Morelle Epidural injection in the treatment of spinal stenosis. *Acta Orthop Belg* 1987;53:409–11.
- [83] Levendoglu F, Oguz H, Polat E, Bodur S. The effect of Corset on Walking time in Lumbar spinal stenosis. *Turkiye Klinikleri Tip Bilimleri Dergisi* 2009;29:1172–7.
- [84] Prateepavanich P, Thanapipatsiri S, Santisatisakul P, et al. The effectiveness of lumbosacral corsetin symptomatic degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2001;84:572–6.
- [85] Willner S. Effect of a rigid brace on back pain. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1985;56:40–2.
- [86] Inoue M, Kitakoji H, Yano T, et al. Acupuncture treatment for low back pain and Lower Limb symptoms—the relation between Acupuncture or Electroacupuncture stimulation and Sciatic nerve Blood Flow. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med* 2008;5:133–43.
- [87] Amundsen T, Weber H, Nordal HJ, et al. Lumbar spinal stenosis: conservative or surgical management?: a prospective 10-year study. *Spine* 2000;25:1424–35; discussion 1435–1426.
- [88] Simotas AC. Nonoperative treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2001;384:153–61.
- [89] Zucherman JF, Hsu KY, Hartjen CA, et al. A multicenter, prospective, randomized trial evaluating the X STOP interspinous process decompression system for the treatment of neurogenic intermittent claudication: two-year follow-up results. *Spine* 2005;30:1351–8.
- [90] Athviraham A, Yen D. Is spinal stenosis better treated surgically or nonsurgically? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2007;458:90–3.
- [91] Malmivaara A, Slätis P, Heliövaara M, et al. Surgical or nonoperative treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis? A randomized controlled trial. *Spine* 2007;32:1–8.
- [92] Weinstein JN, Tosteson TD, Lurie JD, et al. Surgical versus nonoperative treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis four-year results of the spine patient outcomes research trial. *Spine* 2010;35:1329–38.
- [93] Weinstein JN, Tosteson TD, Lurie JD, et al. Surgical versus non-surgical therapy for lumbar spinal stenosis. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:794–810.
- [94] Park DK, An HS, Lurie JD, et al. Does multilevel lumbar stenosis lead to poorer outcomes?: a subanalysis of the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) lumbar stenosis study. *Spine* 2010;35:439–46.
- [95] Mariconda M, Fava R, Gatto A, et al. Unilateral laminectomy for bilateral decompression of lumbar spinal stenosis: a prospective comparative study with conservatively treated patients. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2002;15:39–46.
- [96] Arinzon Z, Adunsky A, Fidelman Z, Gepstein R. Outcomes of decompression surgery for lumbar spinal stenosis in elderly diabetic patients. *Eur Spine J* 2004;13:32–7.
- [97] Arinzon ZH, Fredman B, Zohar E, et al. Surgical management of spinal stenosis: a comparison of immediate and long term outcome in two geriatric patient populations. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2003;36:273–9.
- [98] Johnsson KE, Uden A, Rosen I. The effect of decompression on the natural course of spinal stenosis. A comparison of surgically treated and untreated patients. *Spine* 1991;16:615–9.
- [99] Atlas SJ, Deyo RA, Keller RB, et al. The Maine Lumbar Spine Study, Part II. 1-year outcomes of surgical and nonsurgical management of sciatica. *Spine* 1996;21:1777–86.
- [100] Gibson JN, Waddell G, Grant IC. Surgery for degenerative lumbar spondylosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2000;CD001352.
- [101] Turner JA, Ersek M, Herron L, Deyo R. Surgery for lumbar spinal stenosis. Attempted meta-analysis of the literature. *Spine* 1992;17:1–8.
- [102] Hsu KY, Zucherman JF, Hartjen CA, et al. Quality of life of lumbar stenosis-treated patients in whom the X STOP interspinous device was implanted. *J Neurosurg Spine* 2006;5:500–7.
- [103] Grob D, Humke T, Dvorak J. Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. Decompression with and without arthrodesis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1995;77:1036–41.
- [104] Yone K, Sakou T. Usefulness of Posner's definition of spinal instability for selection of surgical treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis. *J Spinal Disord* 1999;12:40–4.
- [105] Rampersaud YR, Ravi B, Lewis SJ, et al. Assessment of health-related quality of life after surgical treatment of focal symptomatic spinal stenosis compared with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. *Spine J* 2008;8:296–304.
- [106] Airaksinen O, Herno A, Turunen V, et al. Surgical outcome of 438 patients treated surgically for lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 1997;22:2278–82.
- [107] Atlas SJ, Keller RB, Wu YA, et al. Long-term outcomes of surgical and nonsurgical management of lumbar spinal stenosis: 8 to 10 year results from the maine lumbar spine study. *Spine* 2005;30:936–43.
- [108] Cornefjord M, Byröd G, Brisby H, et al. A long-term (4- to 12-year) follow-up study of surgical treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Eur Spine J* 2000;9:563–70.
- [109] Gelalis ID, Stafilas KS, Korompilias AV, et al. Decompressive surgery for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis: long-term results. *Int Orthop* 2006;30:59–63.
- [110] Herno A, Airaksinen O, Saari T. Long-term results of surgical treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 1993;18:1471–4.
- [111] Hurri H, Slätis P, Soini J, et al. Lumbar spinal stenosis: assessment of long-term outcome 12 years after operative and conservative treatment. *J Spinal Disord* 1998;11:110–5.
- [112] Javid MJ, Hadar EJ. Long-term follow-up review of patients who underwent laminectomy for lumbar stenosis: a prospective study. *J Neurosurg* 1998;89:1–7.
- [113] Jolles BM, Porchet F, Theumann N. Surgical treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis. Five-year follow-up. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2001;83:949–53.
- [114] Jonsson B, Annertz M, Sjöberg C, Strömqvist B. A prospective and consecutive study of surgically treated lumbar spinal stenosis. Part II: Five-year follow-up by an independent observer. *Spine* 1997;22:2938–44.
- [115] Katz JN, Lipson SJ, Chang LC, et al. Seven-to 10-year outcome of decompressive surgery for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spine* 1996;21:92–8.
- [116] Kim HJ, Lee HM, Kim HS, et al. Life expectancy after lumbar spine surgery: one-to eleven-year follow-up of 1015 patients. *Spine* 2008;33:2116–21.
- [117] Oertel MF, Ryang YM, Korinath MC, et al. Long-term results of microsurgical treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis by unilateral laminotomy for bilateral decompression. *Neurosurgery* 2006;59:1264–9.
- [118] Tuite GF, Stern JD, Doran SE, et al. Outcome after laminectomy for lumbar spinal stenosis. Part I: clinical correlations. *J Neurosurg* 1994;81:699–706. Erratum in: *J Neurosurg* 1995 May;82:912.
- [119] Caputy AJ, Luessenhop AJ. Long-term evaluation of decompressive surgery for degenerative lumbar stenosis. *J Neurosurg* 1992;77:669–76.

- [120] Hee HT, Wong HK. The long-term results of surgical treatment for spinal stenosis in the elderly. *Singapore Med J* 2003;44:175–80.
- [121] Nakai O, Ookawa A, Yamaura I. Long-term roentgenographic and functional changes in patients who were treated with wide fenestration for central lumbar stenosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1991;73:1184–91.
- [122] Postacchini F, Cinotti G, Gumina S, Perugia D. Long-term results of surgery in lumbar stenosis. 8-year review of 64 patients. *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl* 1993;251:78–80.
- [123] Rompe JD, Eysel P, Zöllner J, et al. Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. Long-term results after undercutting decompression compared with decompressive laminectomy alone or with instrumented fusion. *Neurosurg Rev* 1999;22:102–6.
- [124] Sanderson PL, Getty CJ. Long-term results of partial undercutting facetectomy for lumbar lateral recess stenosis. *Spine* 1996;21:1352–6.
- [125] Scholz M, Firsching R, Lanksch WR. Long-term follow up in lumbar spinal stenosis. *Spinal Cord* 1998;36:200–4.