

Comparison of the efficacy of saline, local anesthetics, and steroids in epidural and facet joint injections for the management of spinal pain: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials

Laxmaiah Manchikanti¹, Devi E. Nampiaparampil¹, Kavita N. Manchikanti², Frank J.E. Falco³, Vijay Singh⁴, Ramsin M. Benyamin⁵, Alan D. Kaye⁶, Nalini Sehgal⁷, Amol Soin⁸, Thomas T. Simopoulos⁹, Sanjay Bakshi¹⁰, Christopher G. Gharibo¹¹, Christopher J. Gilligan¹², Joshua A. Hirsch¹³

Medical Director of the Pain Management Center of Paducah, 2831 Lone Oak Road, Paducah, KY, 42003, and Clinical Professor, Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, ¹Rehabilitation Medicine, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, ²Fourth Year Resident in Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, ³Medical Director of Mid Atlantic Spine and Pain Physicians, Newark, DE, Pain Medicine Fellowship Program, Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, Department of PM and R, Temple University Medical School, Philadelphia, PA, ⁴Medical Director, Spine Pain Diagnostics Associates, Niagara, WI, ⁵Medical Director, Millennium Pain Center, Bloomington, IL, and Clinical Assistant Professor of Surgery, College of Medicine, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL, ⁶Department of Anesthesia, LSU Health Science Center, New Orleans, LA, ⁷Interventional Pain Program, Professor and Director Pain Fellowship, Department of Orthopedics and Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, ⁸Ohio Pain Clinic, Centerville, OH, ⁹Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care, and Pain Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA., ¹⁰President of Manhattan Spine and Pain Medicine, ¹¹Medical Director of Pain Medicine and Associate Professor of Anesthesiology and Orthopedics, Department of Anesthesiology, NYU Langone-Hospital for Joint Diseases, NYU School of Medicine, New York, NY, ¹²Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care, and Pain Medicine at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, and Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology at Harvard Medical School, ¹³Vice Chief of Interventional Care, Chief of Minimally Invasive Spine Surgery, Service Line Chief of Interventional Radiology, Director of Endovascular Neurosurgery and Neuroendovascular Program, Massachusetts General Hospital; and Associate Professor, Department of Radiology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

E-mail: *Laxmaiah Manchikanti - drlm@thepainmd.com; Devi E. Nampiaparampil - devichechi@gmail.com; Kavita N. Manchikanti - kavita.manchikanti@gmail.com; Frank J.E. Falco - csm01@aol.com; Vijay Singh - vj@wmpnet.net; Ramsin M. Benyamin - ramsinbenyamin@yahoo.com; Alan D. Kaye - alankaye44@hotmail.com; Nalini Sehgal - Sehgal@rehab.wisc.edu; Amol Soin - ohiopainclinic@gmail.com; Thomas T. Simopoulos - tsimopou@bidmc.harvard.edu; Sanjay Bakshi - drbakshi58@gmail.com; Christopher G. Gharibo - cgharibo@usa.net; Christopher J. Gilligan - cgilligan@partners.org; Joshua A. Hirsch, MD - HIrsh@snisonline.org

*Corresponding author

Received: 24 July 14 Accepted: 14 December 14 Published: 07 May 15

This article may be cited as:

Manchikanti L, Nampiaparampil DE, Manchikanti KN, Falco FJ, Singh V, Benyamin RM, et al. Comparison of the efficacy of saline, local anesthetics, and steroids in epidural and facet joint injections for the management of spinal pain: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Surg Neurol Int* 2015;6:S194-235.

Available FREE in open access from: <http://www.surgicalneurologyint.com/text.asp?2015/6/5/194/156598>

Copyright: © 2015 Manchikanti L. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Background: The efficacy of epidural and facet joint injections has been assessed utilizing multiple solutions including saline, local anesthetic, steroids, and others. The responses to these various solutions have been variable and have not been systematically assessed with long-term follow-ups.

Methods: Randomized trials utilizing a true active control design were included. The primary outcome measure was pain relief and the secondary outcome measure was functional improvement. The quality of each individual article was assessed by Cochrane review criteria, as well as the criteria developed by the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) for assessing interventional techniques. An evidence analysis was conducted based on the qualitative level of evidence (Level I to IV).

Results: A total of 31 trials met the inclusion criteria. There was Level I evidence that local anesthetic with steroids was effective in managing chronic spinal pain based on multiple high-quality randomized controlled trials. The evidence also showed that local anesthetic with steroids and local anesthetic alone were equally

Access this article
online

Website:

www.surgicalneurologyint.com

DOI:

10.4103/2152-7806.156598

Quick Response Code:



effective except in disc herniation, where the superiority of local anesthetic with steroids was demonstrated over local anesthetic alone.

Conclusion: This systematic review showed equal efficacy for local anesthetic with steroids and local anesthetic alone in multiple spinal conditions except for disc herniation where the superiority of local anesthetic with steroids was seen over local anesthetic alone.

Key Words: Chronic pain, epidural injections, facet joint injections, local anesthetic, spinal pain, steroids, saline

INTRODUCTION

The increasing prevalence of spinal pain and disability, and the explosion of health care costs are major issues for the US and the world.^[11,18,28,46,49,72,73,78,101,150,151,163,195,204] Freburger *et al.*^[46] reported a rapid overall increase in low back pain of 162%, rising from 3.9% in 1992 to 10.2% in 2006. A study of US Burden of Disease Collaborators showed spinal pain occupying three of the first five categories of disability.^[195] Hoy *et al.*^[72,73] reported various prevalences for spinal pain, with an annual prevalence of 39% in the low back, 26% in the neck, and 13% in the midback or thoracic spine. Leboeuf-Yde *et al.*^[100] reported the prevalence of low back pain to be 43%, neck pain to be 32%, and thoracic pain to be 13%. In addition, the prevalence of persistent pain is high, especially in the elderly and it is closely associated with functional limitations.^[14,21,53,201] Overall, chronic persistent low back and neck pain is seen in 25–60% of patients, one year or longer after an initial episode.^[39,45,109,157,193]

Martin *et al.*^[150] estimated that treatments for back and neck pain problems accounted for \$86 billion in health care expenditures in the US in 2005. This represented an increase in expenditures of 65% and a 49% increase in the number of patients seeking spine-related care from 1997 to 2006. Gaskin and Richard^[49] reported annual expenditures of \$100 billion for managing moderate and severe pain. Various diagnostic and treatment modalities have been increasingly utilized including surgery, imaging, physical therapy, drugs, and interventional techniques, and have been increasing rapidly.^[1,33,34,80,97,108,109,128-130,138,149,171,175,186] Consequently, spinal interventional techniques are considered to be one of the major components in the escalation of health care costs among patients with chronic spinal pain, specifically in the US.^[1,33,34,45,80,97,108,128-130,138,149,171,175,186] Manchikanti *et al.*^[138] analyzed utilization trends and Medicare expenditures from 2000 to 2008 regarding the growth of spinal interventional pain management techniques. They reported that Medicare recipients who received spinal interventional techniques increased 107.8% from 2000

to 2008, with an annual increase of 9.6%. The overall number of spinal interventional techniques performed increased by 186.8%, an annual increase of 14.1% per 100,000 beneficiaries. There was a 240% increase in expenditures for these procedures during the same period.

In another manuscript, Manchikanti *et al.*^[128] reported the overall increase of interventional techniques from 2000 to 2011 to be 228%. In the Medicare population during the same period there was an overall increase of 177% – an annual increase of 11.4%. Abbott *et al.*,^[1] in their analysis of utilization patterns between 2003 and 2007, showed a variable number of procedures performed per patient across all categories during a 12-month inclusion period with high variability among specialties. An increase in interventional techniques along with geographic variability and variability among specialties has been demonstrated.^[130] Thus, spinal interventional techniques are increasing exponentially, with their efficacy being scrutinized along with their inappropriate use.^[1,9,24,36,43,44,63,80,107,110,113,123,128,130,138,166,170,189]

Epidural injections are used in managing spinal pain secondary to disc herniation, spinal stenosis, postsurgery syndrome, discogenic pain not from facet or sacroiliac joints, and multiple other conditions.^[9,24,36,45,63,110,113,123,166,172,189] Facet joint injections are used in managing facet joint pain.^[43-45,107] Epidural injections are administered by three approaches: caudal in the sacral region; interlaminar in the lumbar, thoracic, and cervical regions; and transforaminal in the lumbar, thoracic, and cervical regions. Facet joint injections are administered by intraarticular injections or facet joint nerve blocks. The efficacy of epidural injections and facet joint injections has been assessed utilizing multiple solutions including saline, local anesthetics, steroids, and other drugs such as clonidine, ketamine, hypertonic sodium chloride solution, and amitriptyline.^[12,27,109] Local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids, or steroids alone or with saline are the most common combinations and most commonly studied, and normal saline is commonly used as a placebo.

The response to epidural injections is variable for various pathologies including disc herniation and/or radiculitis, discogenic pain without disc herniation, spinal stenosis, and postsurgery syndrome. Manchikanti *et al.*,^[109] based on multiple systematic reviews of epidural injections and facet joint injections,^[9,36,113,123,166] reported variable evidence for disc herniation with or without radiculitis, spinal stenosis, and discogenic pain. This evidence ranged from good to limited based on the pathology and treatment. The evidence from multiple assessments appears to be similar for local anesthetics alone compared with local anesthetic with steroids.^[9,36,43,44,63,107,110,113,123,166] In fact, Bicket *et al.*^[12] performed a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating “control” injections, utilizing 43 randomized controlled trials, which included 3641 patients, and concluded that epidural nonsteroidal injections were more likely than nonepidural injections to achieve positive outcomes and provide a greater pain score reduction.

Steroids and local anesthetics have multiple mechanisms of action when injected into the epidural space; antiinflammatory effects are predominantly seen with steroids and other effects are seen with local anesthetics.^[3,6,19,66,67,99,148,155,158,167,168,181,191] The first reports of caudal epidural injections were with local anesthetics alone.^[20,32,40,169,185] Evans^[40] and Cyriax^[32] published multiple manuscripts indicating the effectiveness of local anesthetic injections without steroid. Bicket *et al.*^[12] combined all control injections rather than separating them into active and inactive solutions, placebo and active control trials, and various solutions such as local anesthetic, amitriptyline, clonidine, hypertonic saline, and normal sodium chloride solution.

This systematic review assesses randomized controlled trials of epidural and facet joint injections utilizing saline, local anesthetic, and/or steroids. The objective of this review is to characterize the role of saline and local anesthetic in these procedures and to compare their effects to those of steroids in the long-term.

METHODS

The methodology for this systematic review was derived from evidence-based systematic reviews and meta-analyses of randomized trials.^[102] Randomized trials with an active control or placebo control were included. Furthermore, included trials had at least 25 patients in each group or described appropriate sample size calculation, enrolled patients with pain duration of at least 3 months, and followed-up for at least 1 month after treatment.

Only randomized trials utilizing a true active control design with injection of either sodium chloride solution or local anesthetic or steroid into the epidural space, on the nerve root, in the joint, or facet joint nerves were

included. True placebo injections, that is, injections of inactive solutions into inactive structures, were not included.

In active control trials, two different procedures or drugs are compared. For this assessment, only the trials comparing sodium chloride solution, local anesthetic, or steroids were utilized. The rationale for assessing only the aforementioned agents is that they are the most clinically relevant medications. Further, trials where a drug was injected outside the epidural space, nerve root, or joint were excluded. This evidence will address the misconception concerning local anesthetic as a placebo or even sodium chloride solution as a pure placebo.

The interventions evaluated were caudal and interlaminar epidural injections in the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar regions; transforaminal epidural injections in the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar regions; and facet joint injections and nerve blocks in the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar regions.

The primary outcome measure was pain relief; the secondary outcome measure was functional improvement. A literature search was performed from various resources including PubMed, the Cochrane Library, the US National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC), previous systematic reviews, and cross references.

The search period covered from 1966 through March 2014.

The search strategy emphasized chronic neck, thoracic, low back, and upper extremity pain; lower extremity pain; and chest wall pain treated with epidural or facet joint interventions. Search terms were:

(Chronic low back pain or chronic back pain or chronic neck pain or disc herniation or discogenic pain or facet joint pain or herniated lumbar discs or nerve root compression or lumbosciatic pain or postlaminectomy or lumbar surgery syndrome or radicular pain or radiculitis or sciatica or spinal fibrosis or spinal stenosis or zygapophyseal) and (epidural injection or epidural steroid or epidural perineural injection or interlaminar epidural or intraarticular corticosteroid or nerve root blocks or intraarticular injection or periradicular infiltration or saline injection or transforaminal injection or corticosteroid or methylprednisolone or facet joint or medial branch block); Sort by: Publication Date; Filters: Clinical Trial, Controlled Clinical Trial, Evaluation Studies, Multicenter Study, Randomized Controlled Trial, Validation Studies, Comparative Study.

The quality of each individual article was assessed for bias using Cochrane review criteria [Appendix 1]^[48] and by the American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) review criteria, titled “Interventional Pain Management Techniques – Quality Appraisal of Reliability and Risk of Bias Assessment (IPM – QRB)” [Appendix 2].^[131]

The literature search, selection of trials, and methodological quality assessment were performed by at least two authors for each task. The allocation of trials for methodological quality assessment was distributed among the authors. Any discrepancies were resolved by consensus and the primary (LM) and senior (JH) authors.

Trials scoring 8–12 on Cochrane review criteria or 32–48 on ASIPP criteria were considered high quality, trials scoring 4–7 on Cochrane review criteria or 20–31 on ASIPP criteria were considered moderate quality, and studies scoring less than 4 on Cochrane review criteria or less than 20 on ASIPP criteria were considered low quality.

A meta-analysis was conducted if there were more than two trials that were condition-specific and homogeneous.

Analysis of the evidence was based on the condition, region, and modality (e.g. lumbar disc herniation, cervical spinal stenosis, or thoracic facet joint arthritis) so as to reduce any clinical heterogeneity.

The summary measure for pain was a 50% or more reduction of pain in at least 50% of the patients, or at least a 3-point decrease in pain scores; for disability scores the summary measure was a 50% or more reduction in disability in at least 40% of the patients or at least a 30-point decrease in disability scores measured on a scale of 0–100.

The analysis of evidence was conducted based on the qualitative level of evidence criteria synthesized by ASIPP^[126] as shown in Table 1, which was developed from multiple previously utilized grading schemata, most importantly Cochrane reviews and the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF).^[15,62,64,189,196]

RESULTS

The literature search and study selection is shown in Figure 1 as recommended by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA).^[102] Overall, there were 40 randomized trials for consideration after eliminating duplicate publications.^[5,8,16,17,25,27,29,35,47,51,52,79,87,88,94,98,114-122,132,133,137,139-144,153,159,161,174,177,178,182,188,192,199] Of these, five trials utilized a true placebo design without the ability to assess the role of the drugs injected into the epidural space, facet joints, and over nerves;^[5,35,153,174,188] one trial utilized intramuscular steroid injections compared with epidural steroid injections;^[199] and another trial^[98] utilized intramuscular local anesthetic injections. In another trial,^[177] forceful injection was assessed. One facet joint nerve block trial compared two different modalities.^[25] Consequently, 31 trials met the inclusion criteria for methodological quality assessment.^[8,16,17,27,29,47,52,79,87,114,116-122,132,133,137,139-144,159,161,178,182,192] Each manuscript was independently, in an unblinded, standardized manner, assessed for methodological quality assessment. The primary authors of manuscripts being

assessed were not involved in the methodological quality assessment. All disagreements between reviewers were resolved by the primary and senior authors (LM and JH). Methodological quality assessment scores are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Meta-analysis

There was no homogeneity among the 31 trials meeting the inclusion criteria for methodological quality assessment when the region, technique, solutions injected, and use of fluoroscopy were considered. Of the 31 trials, 13 trials by Manchikanti *et al.* assessing the role of epidural injections were similar in many aspects;^[114,116-122,132,133,139-141] they were, however, performed for different pathologies, such as cervical or thoracic or lumbar region involvement, or disc herniation, spinal stenosis, postsurgery syndrome, or discogenic pain. Thus, a meta-analysis was not feasible. Furthermore, the trials were all performed by one group of authors in the same setting with similar protocols. Similarly, four facet joint nerve block manuscripts also had similarities;^[137,142-144] they were performed in the same setting, but for different regions, by the same group of authors. Consequently, none of them met the criteria for homogeneity so as to be included in a meta-analysis.

Study characteristics

Study characteristics and outcomes are described in Table 4.

Caudal epidural injections

Among those trials meeting the inclusion criteria, there were six examining the efficacy of caudal epidural injections with multiple solutions.^[79,118,119,139,140,182] Of these, four were of high quality utilizing Cochrane and IPM-QRB criteria,^[118,119,139,140] one was moderate (IPM-QRB) to high (Cochrane review) quality,^[182] and one was of moderate quality utilizing both criteria.^[79]

Four of these studies were conducted by Manchikanti *et al.*^[118,119,139,140] Using the same protocol, active controlled trials were conducted assessing the efficacy of epidural injections in a total of 480 patients, either with local anesthetic or local anesthetic with steroids, during a 2-year follow-up in patients with lumbar disc herniation, lumbar discogenic pain without facet joint or sacroiliac joint pain, lumbar central spinal stenosis, and lumbar postsurgery syndrome. These studies were rated as high quality on Cochrane review criteria, with scores ranging from 10 to 11 out of 12 and IPM-QRB scores of 44 out of 48.

All four trials showed similar results for the efficacy of caudal epidural injections with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids in 50–80% of the patients. In these trials, success was defined as at least 3 weeks of significant improvement (50% improvement) in pain and function after the first two injections. All patients were




Figure 1: The flow diagram illustrating published literature evaluating various solutions in epidural and facet joint injections

Table 1: Grading of evidence modified by ASIPP

Level I	Evidence obtained from multiple relevant high-quality randomized controlled trials
Level II	Evidence obtained from at least one relevant high-quality randomized controlled trial or multiple relevant moderate- or low-quality randomized controlled trials
Level III	Evidence obtained from at least one relevant moderate- or low-quality randomized controlled trial with multiple relevant observational studies or evidence obtained from at least one relevant high-quality nonrandomized trial or observational study with multiple moderate- or low-quality observational studies
Level IV	Evidence obtained from multiple moderate- or low-quality relevant observational studies
Level V	Opinion or consensus of large group of clinicians and/or scientists

Adapted and Modified from: Manchikanti L, Falco FJE, Benyamin RM, Kaye AD, Boswell MV, Hirsch JA. A modified approach to grading of evidence. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E319-25.^[126]
 ASIPP: American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians

grouped into successful (responsive) or nonresponsive categories accordingly. We then calculated the number of patients with disc herniation, discogenic pain, spinal stenosis, or postsurgery syndrome who were nonresponsive to local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroid. We observed no significant differences in the patients who did not respond to either injection for any of the spinal conditions. This suggests that none of the spinal conditions influenced the response to either type of injection.

Table 4 shows the results were superior in the responsive groups in all four diagnostic categories. A limitation of these trials was that none of them included placebo controls. The authors discussed potential pathophysiologic mechanisms for the efficacy of local anesthetic with steroids. Long-term improvement seen with both

Table 2: Methodological quality assessment of randomized trials utilizing Cochrane review criteria

	Manchikanti et al. ^[139]	Manchikanti et al. ^[119]	Manchikanti et al. ^[140]	Manchikanti et al. ^[118]	Iversen et al. ^[79]	Sayegh et al. ^[182]	Cohen et al. ^[27]	Ghahreman et al. ^[52]	Karppinen et al. ^[87]	Nam and Park ^[199]	Manchikanti et al. ^[120]
Randomization adequate	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concealed treatment allocation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Patient blinded	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Care provider blinded	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Outcome assessor blinded	N	N	N	N	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Drop-out rate described	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
All randomized participants analyzed in the group	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Reports of the study free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Groups similar at baseline regarding most important prognostic indicators	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Co-interventions avoided or similar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Compliance acceptable in all groups	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Time of outcome assessment in all groups similar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Score	10/12	10/12	11/12	11/12	7/12	10/12	8/12	11/12	12/12	8/12	10/12
	Riew et al.^[178]	Ng et al.^[161]	Tafazal et al.^[192]	Manchikanti et al.^[141]	Manchikanti et al.^[116]	Manchikanti et al.^[114]	Fukusaki et al.^[97]	Cuckler et al.^[29]	Carette et al.^[16]	Manchikanti et al.^[122]	Manchikanti et al.^[133]
Randomization adequate	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	U	Y	Y	Y
Concealed treatment allocation	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	U	Y	Y	Y
Patient blinded	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Care provider blinded	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Outcome assessor blinded	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	U	N	Y	N	N
Drop-out rate described	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
All randomized participants analyzed in the group	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Reports of the study free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Groups similar at baseline regarding most important prognostic indicators	U	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Co-interventions avoided or similar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Compliance acceptable in all groups	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Time of outcome assessment in all groups similar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Score	8/12	11/12	10/12	10/12	10/12	10/12	5/12	6/12	11/12	11/12	10/12

Contd...

Table 2: Contd

	Manchikanti et al. ^[121]	Manchikanti et al. ^[132]	Manchikanti et al. ^[117]	Manchikanti et al. ^[144]	Manchikanti et al. ^[137]	Manchikanti et al. ^[142]	Manchikanti et al. ^[143]	Carette et al. ^[17]	Barnsley et al. ^[8]
Randomization adequate	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Concealed treatment allocation	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Patient blinded	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Care provider blinded	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Outcome assessor blinded	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Drop-out rate described	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
All randomized participants analyzed in the group	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reports of the study free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Groups similar at baseline regarding most important prognostic indicators	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Co-interventions avoided or similar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Compliance acceptable in all group	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Time of outcome assessment in all groups similar	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Score	10/12	10/12	11/12	11/12	8/12	11/12	10/12	11/12	12/12

Y: Yes; N: No; U: Unclear. Source: Furlan AD, Pennick V, Bombardier C, van Tulder M; Editorial Board, Cochrane Back Review Group. 2009 updated method guidelines for systematic reviews in the Cochrane Back Review Group. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2009;34:1929-41.^[16]

Table 3: Methodological quality assessment of randomized trials utilizing ASIPP IPM-QRB

	Manchikanti et al. ^[139]	Manchikanti et al. ^[119]	Manchikanti et al. ^[140]	Manchikanti et al. ^[118]	Iversen et al. ^[79]	Sayegh et al. ^[102]	Cohen et al. ^[27]	Ghahreman et al. ^[52]	Karpinen et al. ^[87]	Nam and Park ^[159]
Trial design guidance and reporting										
CONSORT or SPIRIT	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	0
Design factors										
Type and design of trial	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Setting/physician	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
Imaging	3	3	3	3	1	0	3	3	3	3
Sample size	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	0
Statistical methodology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Patient factors										
Inclusiveness of population										
For epidural procedures	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
For facet or sacroiliac joint interventions										
Duration of pain	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	1
Previous treatments	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
Duration of follow-up with appropriate interventions	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	0	1	0
Outcomes										
Outcomes assessment criteria for significant improvement	4	4	4	4	0	2	2	4	2	2
Analysis of all randomized participants in the groups	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2
Description of drop-out rate	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	1
Similarity of groups at baseline for important prognostic indicators	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	2
Role of co-interventions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
Randomization										
Method of randomization	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Allocation concealment										
Concealed treatment allocation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Blinding										
Patient blinding	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Care provider blinding	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
Outcome assessor blinding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Conflicts of interest										
Funding and sponsorship	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
Conflicts of interest	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	44	44	44	44	28	28	43	37	34	26

Contd...

Table 3: Contd...

	Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> ^[120]	Riew <i>et al.</i> ^[178]	Ng <i>et al.</i> ^[165]	Tafazal <i>et al.</i> ^[192]	Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> ^[141]	Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> ^[116]	Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> ^[114]	Fukusaki <i>et al.</i> ^[47]	Cuckler <i>et al.</i> ^[28]	Carette <i>et al.</i> ^[16]
Trial design guidance and reporting										
CONSORT or SPIRIT	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	0	2	1
Design factors										
Type and design of trial	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
Setting/physician	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2
Imaging	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0
Sample size	3	2	2	1	3	3	3	0	1	3
Statistical methodology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Patient factors										
Inclusiveness of population										
For epidural procedures	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
For facet or sacroiliac joint interventions										
Duration of pain	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	0	0
Previous treatments	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0
Duration of follow-up with appropriate interventions	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	0
Outcomes										
Outcomes assessment criteria for significant improvement	4	1	1	2	4	4	4	1	2	0
Analysis of all randomized participants in the groups	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	2
Description of drop-out rate	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
Similarity of groups at baseline for important prognostic indicators	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
Role of co-interventions	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Randomization										
Method of randomization	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2
Allocation concealment										
Concealed treatment allocation	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	2
Blinding										
Patient blinding	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Care provider blinding	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
Outcome assessor blinding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Conflicts of interest										
Funding and sponsorship	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Conflicts of interest	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	44	32	37	32	44	44	43	18	25	27

Contd...

Table 3: Contd...

	Manchikanti et al. ^[122]	Manchikanti et al. ^[133]	Manchikanti et al. ^[121]	Manchikanti et al. ^[132]	Manchikanti et al. ^[117]	Manchikanti et al. ^[144]	Manchikanti et al. ^[137]	Manchikanti et al. ^[142]	Manchikanti et al. ^[143]	Carette et al. ^[17]	Barnsley et al. ^[8]
Trial design guidance and reporting											
CONSORT or SPIRIT	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	2
Design factors											
Type and design of trial	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
Setting/physician	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Imaging	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sample size	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	1
Statistical methodology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Patient factors											
Inclusiveness of population											
For epidural procedures	2	2	2	2	1			2	2	1	2
For facet or sacroiliac joint interventions											
Duration of pain	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Previous treatments	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0
Duration of follow-up with appropriate interventions	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	1
Outcomes											
Outcomes assessment criteria for significant improvement	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2
Analysis of all randomized participants in the Groups	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
Description of drop-out rate	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1
Similarity of groups at baseline for important prognostic indicators	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Role of co-interventions	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	0
Randomization											
Method of randomization	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2
Allocation concealment											
Concealed treatment allocation	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2
Blinding											
Patient blinding	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Care provider blinding	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Outcome assessor blinding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Conflicts of interest											
Funding and sponsorship	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
Conflicts of interest	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	43	42	44	42	43	46	34	46	46	38	36

Source: Manchikanti L, Hirsch JA, Cohen SP, Heavner JE, Falco FJE, Diwan S, et al. Assessment of methodologic quality of randomized trials of interventional techniques: Development of an interventional pain management specific instrument. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E263-90.^[131]

types of injections and may be attributed to previously described mechanisms of action.^[3,6,19,30,58,66-68,89,95,96,99,118,119,139,140,148,155,158,167,168,181,185,190,191] In addition, the efficacy of sodium chloride solution injected into joint spaces or the epidural space has also been described.^[10,16,17,60,200] All the studies demonstrated the efficacy of local anesthetic with steroids; although the disc herniation group showed higher quality with pain relief improvement at 6 and 12 months. One of the major advantages of these trials was that only patients with chronic pain were enrolled and patient homogeneity was observed by recruiting those with similar diagnoses/conditions instead of lumping all diagnostic groups together and/or including those with acute and subacute pain.

The study by Sayegh *et al.*^[182] is also a moderate (IPM-QRB) to high-quality (Cochrane) randomized controlled trial on the efficacy of local anesthetic alone versus local anesthetic with steroids. This trial showed significant improvement for both local anesthetic, and local anesthetic plus steroids; however, steroids were shown to be superior, in that they provided faster, higher quality, and longer-lasting relief compared with local anesthetic alone. This study included patients with acute and subacute sciatica.

Iversen *et al.*,^[79] in ultrasound-guided caudal epidural injections utilizing either epidural saline or epidural saline plus steroids, showed no significant improvement in either group. The trial was criticized for flaws in its design and conduct.^[61,109,111,180,203] The authors did not utilize a local anesthetic, recruited a large proportion of patients with acute pain, and many of the patients had improved before randomization.

In conclusion, there was Level I evidence supported by multiple, relevant high-quality randomized controlled trials^[118,119,139,140] and one moderate to high-quality trial^[182] reporting the efficacy of local anesthetics with steroids in managing chronic low back and lower extremity pain with a caudal approach.

There was also Level I evidence, based on multiple, relevant high-quality randomized controlled trials,^[118,119,140] showing equal effectiveness for local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids, with one high-quality trial showing that local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids are equally effective^[139] and one moderate to high-quality trial^[182] reporting the superiority of local anesthetic with steroids.

Lumbar transforaminal epidural injections

There were eight randomized controlled trials assessing the efficacy of multiple solutions used in lumbar transforaminal administration.^[27,52,87,120,159,161,178,192] All of these trials were rated as high-quality, scoring 8–11 out of 12 based on Cochrane review criteria. Utilizing IPM-QRB criteria, however, one trial by Nam and Park^[159] was shown

to be of moderate-quality with a score of 26 out of 48. The characteristics of these studies were considerably different with varying protocols, multiple injections of solutions, and follow-up periods ranging from 1 month to 2 years.

Cohen *et al.*,^[27] in a 3-month follow-up study, reported that local anesthetic alone and local anesthetic with steroids injections were equally effective, even though they concluded that local anesthetic with steroids may be superior. The study included patients with acute and subacute disc herniations and was rather small, with just 30 patients in the local anesthetic alone group and 28 patients in the local anesthetic with steroids group. This was a high-quality trial based on both Cochrane review criteria (8/12) and IPM-QRB criteria (43/48).

Ghahreman *et al.*,^[52] utilizing multiple groups, assessed the efficacy of bupivacaine alone in 27 patients and in 28 patients who also received steroids. However, the follow-up period was just one month. This trial showed transforaminal epidurals of local anesthetic with steroids to be superior to local anesthetic alone, with a 54% versus 7% improvement. This trial also showed a lack of effectiveness for sodium chloride solution when it was utilized as a true placebo injected away from the nerve root, and a significant effect when sodium chloride solution was injected transforaminally, even though this was still much inferior to local anesthetic with steroids. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (11/12) as well as IPM-QRB criteria (37/48).

In a large trial, Karppinen *et al.*^[87] studied the efficacy of a single transforaminal injection of sodium chloride solution or methylprednisolone with bupivacaine in patients followed-up at one year. This trial showed rather surprising effects in favor of sodium chloride solution at 3 and 6 months, with no significant difference noted at one year. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (12/12) as well as IPM-QRB criteria (34/48). In a subgroup analysis, the authors reported the efficacy of transforaminal steroids with local anesthetic compared with sodium chloride solution in disc protrusions.^[87,88] These manuscripts also faced significant criticism.^[111,145,146,170]

Nam and Park^[159] conducted a small study assessing the role of transforaminal epidural injections in lumbar spinal stenosis in 36 patients, with 19 receiving lidocaine and 17 receiving lidocaine with steroids with a short-term follow-up of 3 months. This study showed positive results for local anesthetic with steroids and local anesthetic alone but a superiority for local anesthetic with steroids. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (8/12) and moderate quality based on IPM-QRB criteria (26/48).

Manchikanti *et al.*,^[120] in an active-controlled trial with a large number of patients and long-term follow-up,

Table 4: Study characteristics and outcomes of randomized epidural and facet joint injection trials

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function		Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years				
Caudal epidural									
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[139]	Total = 120 Lidocaine = 60 Lidocaine with steroids = 60	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful category was defined as at least 3 weeks of significant improvement with the first 3 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 62% vs LA with steroid 72% Successful LA 77% vs LA with steroid 80%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroid 73% Successful LA 87% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 67% vs LA with steroid 72% Successful LA 85% vs LA with steroid 84%	Overall LA 60% vs LA with steroid 65% Successful LA 77% vs LA with steroid 76%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the responsive group of participants. Nonresponsive patients: were also similar with Local anesthetic = 13, steroids = 10. The average relief per procedure was higher for steroid groups	Positive double-blind randomized trial with superiority of steroids with average pain relief for steroids. Overall improvement with local anesthetic alone or with steroids was similar. Nonresponsive subjects were also similar with 13 and 10 in local anesthetic only and with steroids group	
Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane = 10/12 IPM-QRB = 44/48	Lidocaine vs lidocaine mixed with steroid Average number of injections = 5-6 for 2 years								
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[119]	Total = 120 Lidocaine = 60 Lidocaine with steroids = 60	NRS pain scale, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful category was defined as at least 3 weeks of significant improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 60% vs LA with steroid 72% Successful LA 87% vs LA with steroid 88%	Overall LA 62% vs LA with steroid 72% Successful LA 89% vs LA with steroid 93%	Overall LA 56% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 84% vs LA with steroid 85%	Overall LA 54% vs LA with steroid 60% Successful LA 84% vs LA with steroid 73%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group of participants. Nonresponsive patients: groups, 23 in local anesthetic = 23, steroids = 19	Positive randomized double-blind trial with similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids. There were inordinately high proportions of patients failing to respond initially in both groups, 23 in local anesthetic group, and 19 in steroid group	

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[140] RA, AC, F Lumbar post surgery syndrome Quality scores Cochrane = 11/12 IPM-QRB = 44/48	Total = 140 Lidocaine = 70 Lidocaine + steroid = 70 Lidocaine vs lidocaine mixed with nonparticulate betamethasone	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful category was defined as at least 3 weeks of significant improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 56% vs LA with steroid 61% Successful LA 74% vs LA with steroid 78%	Overall LA 53% vs LA with steroid 59% Successful LA 70% vs LA with steroid 75%	Overall LA 47% vs LA with steroid 58% Successful LA 62% vs LA with steroid 63%	A significant number of patients with no improvement with 32 of 140 patients. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic or with steroids = 15. The average relief per procedure was higher for steroid groups. Thus steroids may provide some superiority	Positive results with local anesthetics with or without steroids. Similar results with local anesthetic or with steroids. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic = 17, steroids = 15			
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[118] RA, AC, F Lumbar central spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane = 11/12 IPM-QRB = 44/48	Total = 100 Lidocaine = 50 Lidocaine + steroid = 50 Lidocaine 0.5% vs lidocaine mixed with steroid.	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful category was defined as at least 3 weeks of significant improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 54% vs LA with steroid 50% Successful LA 73% vs LA with steroid 68%	Overall LA 44% vs LA with steroid 46% Successful LA 54% vs LA with steroid 62%	Overall LA 38% vs LA with steroid 44% Successful LA 51% vs LA with steroid 57%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic = 13, steroids = 13. Nonresponsive patients were equal in both groups with a total of 26%	Double-blind design in a practical setting. Similar results with local anesthetic or with steroids. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic = 13, steroids = 13			

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures			Pain relief and function	Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.			
Iversen <i>et al.</i> , 2011 ^[79] RA, PC, UL Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=7/12 IPM-QRB=28/48	Total=116 Epidural saline vs epidural saline with steroids Number of injections=2 for 1 year	ODI, EQLS, VAS	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference	The results were similar in both groups with epidural saline or epidural steroid without local anesthetic. Both were ineffective	Negative results for both epidural saline and epidural steroids in a study with numerous deficiencies with a flawed design with and without local anesthetic. There were no significant differences between epidural saline and epidural saline with steroids
Sayegh <i>et al.</i> , 2009 ^[82] DB, AC, B Lumbar disc herniation=108 Lumbar disc degeneration=75 Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=28/48	Total=183 Local anesthetic=90 Local anesthetic with steroid=93 Caudal administered blindly Number of injections=1-3 over a period of 1 year	ODI, straight leg raising	Mean ODI: LA=23.5 LA with steroid=8.7 Negative straight leg raising: LA vs LA with steroids 73%	Mean ODI: LA=13.6 LA with steroid=5.8 Negative straight leg raising: LA 68% vs LA with steroids 84%	Mean ODI: LA=13.0 LA with steroid=4.91 Negative straight leg raising: LA 71% vs LA with steroids 85%	There was significant improvement in ODI with steroids at 1 month, 6 months, and 1 year after the treatment with initial injections. There was significant improvement with negative straight leg raising only at one month follow-up with 51% in the local anesthetic group and 73% in the steroid group; however, at 6 months and one year, there was no significant difference between the groups with negative SLR of 68% and 71% with local anesthetic and 84% and 85% with steroids	Caudal epidural injections containing local anesthetic and steroids were more effective with faster action and greater relief from symptoms while local anesthetic actions were more progressive and likely less notable improvement. Overall steroids were superior to local anesthetic with the initial injection with one year follow-up in subacute sciatica patients. Both local anesthetic and local anesthetic and steroid group showed significant improvement from baseline with mean ODI and straight leg raising, even though steroid group results were superior with significant difference when comparing both groups

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics/ Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Lumbar transforaminal epidurals										
Cohen <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[27]	Total=84 Local anesthetic with saline=30	Pain relief, ODI, global perceived effect	LA=43% LA+ steroids=50%	NA	NA	NA	NA	Leg pain measured one month after the second injection was reduced more with steroids than with local anesthetic with saline. The differences were modest and not statistically significant. Differences in back pain and function associated with steroids versus local anesthetic with saline also were not statistically significant. This trial seems to show equal effectiveness of steroids and local anesthetic	Although this was a well conducted study, it was not a true placebo study. Even though there was no significant difference, authors concluded that epidural steroid injections may provide short-term pain relief for some. They included patients with subacute sciatica. Significant improvement was seen with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids at 3- and 6-month follow-up. Local anesthetic and steroids are equally effective	
RA, PC, F Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=8/12 IPM-QRB=43/48	Local anesthetic with corticosteroid=28 Bupivacaine + saline vs bupivacaine + 60 mg of methylprednisolone Number of injections: 1-2		LA+ steroids=29% Only the successful patients maintained blinding for 6 months							
Ghahreman <i>et al.</i> , 2010 ^[52]	Total=150 Transforaminal LA=27	At least 50% pain relief	At one month follow-up	NA	NA	NA	NA	Local anesthetic with steroid was superior to local anesthetic alone at one month follow-up. Steroids were rather high dose with 70 mg of triamcinolone	In this short-term assessment in a small number of patients, high-dose steroids (70 mg of triamcinolone) were superior to local anesthetic and saline	
RA, PC, F Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPM-QRB=37/48	Transforaminal steroid=28 Transforaminal injection of 2 mL of 0.5% bupivacaine in the local anesthetic group Transforaminal local anesthetic with steroid, 40 mg per mL or 70 mg of triamcinolone Number of injections=1 to 3 for 12 months		Transforaminal local anesthetic = 7% Transforaminal epidural with steroids = 54%							

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Karppinen <i>et al.</i> , 2001 ^[87] RA, PC, F Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=12/12 IPM-QRB=34/48	Total=160 Saline=80 Methylprednisolone- bupivacaine=80 Sodium chloride solution, or methylprednisolone (40 mg) and bupivacaine (5 mg) Number of injections=1	VAS, ODI, Nottingham Health Profile, cost, physical examination	The treatment effects in both leg pain and back pain favored the saline treatment	There were no treatment effects in favor of either treatment	NA	Improvement during the follow-up period was found in both the methylprednisolone and saline groups. At 3-month follow-up assessment and 6-month follow-up assessment saline was favored; whereas at one year follow-up assessment there were no treatment effects in favor of either treatment. Leg pain had decreased on the average by 65% in both groups.	An ineffective or inappropriate placebo design, without applicable results. Overall saline appears to have been superior at 3 and 6 months, but no significant difference at one year between both groups. Leg pain decreased on average by 65% in both groups. Surgery was avoided in the majority of the patients with 18 patients in the steroid group and 15 in the saline group undergoing surgery			
Nam and Park, 2011 ^[159] RA, AC, F Lumbar spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane=8/12 IPM-QRB=26/48	Total=36 Lidocaine=19 Lidocaine with steroid=17 Local anesthetic 0.5% Lidocaine 2 mL or 1.5 mL of 0.5% lidocaine and 20 mg of 0.5 mL of triamcinolone Either lidocaine 0.5% 2 mL or 1.5 mL of 0.5% lidocaine with 20 mg of 0.5 mL of triamcinolone Number of injections=1-3	VAS, ODI	Mean VAS lidocaine group 4.732 vs 3.829 for steroid group Mean ODI lidocaine group 48.626 and steroid group 37.182 Baseline VAS 7.4 lidocaine group and 7.3 steroid group Baseline ODI 62.9 lidocaine group and 63.0 for steroid group	NA	NA	Local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids were both effective. Local anesthetic with steroids showed significantly greater improvement	Positive results with local anesthetic and steroids or local anesthetic alone at 3 months. Very small study. Steroids superior to local anesthetic			

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics	Participants/interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Methodological quality scoring										
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁽¹⁷²⁰⁾	Total=120 Lidocaine=60 Lidocaine with steroids=60 Lidocaine vs lidocaine mixed with steroid	NRS pain scale, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful LA 90% vs LA with steroid 82% at least 3 weeks of significant improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 67% Successful LA 88% vs LA with steroid 87%	Overall LA 75% vs LA with steroid 57% Successful LA 92% vs LA with steroid 73%	Overall LA 65% vs LA with steroid 57% Successful LA 80% vs LA with steroid 73%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and steroids. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=11, steroids=15. Local anesthetics were somewhat superior, though not statistically significant	Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=11, steroids=15. Local anesthetics were somewhat superior, though not statistically significant			
Riew <i>et al.</i> , 2000 ⁽¹⁷⁸⁾	Total=55 Bupivacaine=27 Bupivacaine + steroid=28 Bupivacaine 0.25% or bupivacaine with 6 mg of betamethasone	North American Spine Society Outcome Instrument and operative treatment considered as failure of injection treatment. Success was defined as avoidance of surgical intervention	NA	33% vs 71% (avoided surgery)	81% of patients without surgery avoided surgery after 5 years	Local anesthetic with steroids was superior in avoiding surgery. Local anesthetic alone was also effective. The assessment was based on avoidance of surgery. Steroids with local anesthetic were superior to local anesthetic alone. Local anesthetic with steroids were superior to local anesthetic alone	Positive results in avoiding surgery in 33% of bupivacaine group and 71% in the steroid group. The assessment was based on avoidance of surgery. Steroids with local anesthetic were superior to local anesthetic alone. Local anesthetic with steroids were superior to local anesthetic alone			
Ng <i>et al.</i> , 2005 ⁽¹⁶¹⁾	Total=86 Bupivacaine=43 Bupivacaine + steroid=43 Bupivacaine only, or bupivacaine with methylprednisolone	VAS, ODI, change in walking distance, claudication, satisfaction of the outcome	Bupivacaine=47.5% Bupivacaine + steroid=41.5%	NA	NA	A sustained reduction in radicular pain and improvement in back-related disability at 3-month follow-up with bupivacaine alone or bupivacaine with steroids. Corticosteroids did not produce additional benefit in the periradicular infiltration of local anesthetic agents for the treatment of chronic radicular pain	Positive results in a small study with short-term follow-up. Both groups showed similar improvement when administered with bupivacaine alone or bupivacaine with steroids. Local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids were equally effective			

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Tafazal <i>et al.</i> , 2009 ^[192] RA, AC, F Lumbar disc herniation, lumbar spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane = 10/12 IPM-QRB = 32/48	Total: 150 patients Lumbar disc herniation: 76 Foraminal stenosis: 48 Local anesthetic group: Injection of 2 mL of 0.25% bupivacaine Local anesthetic with steroid group: Injection of 2 mL of 0.25% bupivacaine and 40 mg of methylprednisolone. Bupivacaine only: Lumbar disc herniation: 34 Foraminal stenosis: 25 Bupivacaine with steroids Lumbar disc herniation: 42 Foraminal stenosis: 23	VAS, ODI, LBOS Clinically significant outcome	Disc herniation 54% Spinal stenosis 42% ODI Disc herniation LA 13.8±3.7 vs LA with steroids 13.6±3.1 Stenosis 6.5±3.4 vs 1.5±2.6 VAS leg pain Disc herniation LA 24.3±5.5 vs LA with steroids 27.4.6±4.7 Stenosis 20.4±6.1 vs 19.1±5.4	NA NA	At the end of one year, 23 of 129 patients or 18% of the patients required surgery with no significant difference in local anesthetic and steroids. The surgery was avoided in 82% of the patients. Disc herniation group showed greater reduction in the ODI with a mean change of 15 points from baseline of 46.6 in the bupivacaine only group and 43.4 in bupivacaine and steroid group. There was a mean change in the VAS of 26 mm in the disc prolapse group	There was no difference between local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids. A total of 82% of the patients avoided surgery with equal results with local anesthetic alone or with steroids. The authors concluded that periradicular infiltration of corticosteroids for sciatica does not provide any additional benefit when compared with bupivacaine alone. Patients in disc herniation group responded better than stenosis group	There was no significant difference between both groups. Surgery was avoided in both groups. Corticosteroid addition to local anesthetic failed to provide any additional benefit when compared with local anesthetic injection alone. Better effectiveness in disc herniation compared to stenosis			

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Lumbar interlaminar epidural Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁽¹⁴⁾ RA, AC, F Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=44/48	Total=120 Local anesthetic and steroids=60 Xylocaine or Xylocaine with non-particulate Celestone Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake, significant improvement 50% or greater of NRS scores and ODI scores Successful category was defined as at least 3 weeks of significant improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroids 82% Successful LA 86% vs LA with steroid 83% LA 76% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 63% vs LA with steroids 85% Successful LA 80% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 67% vs LA with steroids 85% Successful LA 80% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 60% vs LA with steroid 70% Successful LA 72% vs LA with steroid 71%	Results were somewhat superior for pain relief at 6 months and functional status at 12 months in the steroid group. There were 11 patients in nonresponsive category with 10 patients in the local anesthetic group and 1 patient in the steroid group	Positive randomized trial with long-term follow-up. Overall, similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids with significant improvement. Steroids were superior at 6 months with pain relief and 12 months with functional status A significantly higher proportion of patients non-responsive to the first 2 injections in the local anesthetic group 10 vs 1		

Contd...

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years	3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.		
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2013 ^[16] RA, AC, F Discogenic pain Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=44/48	Total=120 Local anesthetics=60 Local anesthetics and steroids=60 Lidocaine alone or with Celestone Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful was defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 83% vs LA with steroids 77% Successful LA 90% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroids 75% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83%	Overall LA 77% vs LA with steroids 67% Successful LA 84% vs LA with steroid 71%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroids 67% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 70%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=5, steroids=6. The average relief per procedure was higher for steroid groups. Thus steroids may provide some superiority	Positive results in a large active control trial. Both local anesthetic alone or with steroids were effective with no significant difference between the groups		
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ^[14] RA, AC, F Central spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=43/48	Total=120 Local anesthetic=60 Local anesthetic and steroids=60 Local anesthetic or non-particulate Celestone. Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Successful was defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures. Significant improvement: 50% improvement in pain and function	Overall LA 75% vs LA with steroids 77% Successful LA 88% vs LA with steroid 85%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroids 77% Successful LA 84% vs LA with steroid 87%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroids 73% Successful LA 86% vs LA with steroid 83%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroid 73% Successful LA 84% vs LA with steroid 85%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=9, steroids=7	Positive results in a large active control trial. Both were effective in a similar proportion of patients with significant improvement either with local anesthetic or local anesthetic with steroids were effective		

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		Walking distance Excellent: >100 m Good: 20-100 m	3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years				
Fukusaki <i>et al.</i> , 1998 ⁽⁴⁷⁾ RA, B, AC, PC Spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane = 5/12 IPM-QRB = 18/48	Total = 53 Epidural saline = 16 Mepivacaine = 18 Mepivacaine and methylprednisolone = 19 Saline or mepivacaine or a combination of mepivacaine and methylprednisolone Number of injections = 1-3	Walking distance Excellent: >100 m Good: 20-100 m	Saline 6.3% LA = 5.6% LA with steroid 5.3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	The steroid group showed significantly superior results after one week compared with epidural saline or epidural mepivacaine. At 3 months, there was no significant difference and the effect dissipated in all patients to less than 10% effectiveness level. There was no significant difference between epidural saline, local anesthetic, or steroids	In this assessment steroid patients showed better improvement after one week; however, this dissipated at the end of 3 months. All 3 groups provided lack of significant improvement. There was no difference between saline and local anesthetic and steroids with lack of effectiveness with all 3 solutions	
Cuckler <i>et al.</i> , 1985 ⁽²⁹⁾ RA, AC, B Disc herniation and spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane = 6/12 IPM-QRB = 25/48	Total = 73 Acute herniated nucleus = 36 Spinal stenosis = 37 Local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids Number of injections = 1-2	75% or more improvement	NA	NA	LA 17% vs LA with steroids 31%	NA	NA	Either local anesthetic or local anesthetic with steroids were ineffective on a long-term basis; however, with one to two injections and a follow-up of one year, local anesthetic with steroids appears to be somewhat superior to local anesthetic alone with 31% vs 17% improvement	This is a small randomized double-blind controlled trial describing local anesthetic injection into the epidural space as placebo. Seventeen percent of the patients in the local anesthetic group and 31% of the patients in the local anesthetic with steroid group at one year showed significant improvement	

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures			Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years				
Carette <i>et al.</i> , 1997 ^[16] RA, B, PC Disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPM-QRB=27/48	Total=158 Methylprednisolone=78 Placebo=80 Normal saline vs depo methylprednisolone and normal saline Number of injections=1-3	NSI	NA	NA	NA	NA	Epidural injection of methylprednisolone with normal saline may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with sciatica. There was no significant functional benefit and there was no reduction in need for surgery. Initially, there was improvement in the steroid group; however, at 6 weeks and 3 months there was no significant difference in the epidural saline or epidural saline with steroids group	Methylprednisolone with epidural saline was superior in the short-term. Overall, there was no significant difference between sodium chloride solution alone or sodium chloride solution with steroids. Methylprednisolone with saline or saline alone were equally ineffective except in short-term	
Cervical interlaminar epidurals Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2013 ^[17,22] RA, AC, F Cervical disc herniation Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPM-QRB=43/48	Total=120 Local anesthetic=60 Local anesthetic with steroids=60 Local anesthetic or with Celestone Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, NDI, employment status, opioid intake Significant improvement >50% pain relief and >50% functional status improvement Successful was defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures	Overall LA 83% vs LA with steroid 70% Successful LA 91% vs LA with steroid 84% LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 82% vs LA with steroid 73% Successful LA 91% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 77% vs with steroid 82% LA with steroid 80%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 77% vs LA with steroid 80%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=7, steroids=10	Positive results in a randomized large trial performed under fluoroscopy with long-term follow-up. Similar results with local anesthetic or with steroids	

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years	3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.		
Methodological quality scoring Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[1,33] RA, AC, F Cervical spinal stenosis Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=42/48	Total=60 Local anesthetic only=30 Local anesthetic with steroids=30 Local anesthetic or with Celestone Average number of injections=3-4 for 2 years	NRS, NDI, employment status, opioid intake Significant improvement >50% pain relief and >50% functional status improvement Successful as defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures	Overall LA 77% vs LA with steroid 87% Successful LA 79% vs LA with steroid 82% LA with steroid 92%	Overall LA 87% vs LA with steroid 80% Successful LA 79% vs LA with steroid 92%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 70% Successful LA 90% vs LA with steroid 89%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83% LA with steroid 79%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 70% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83% LA with steroid 75%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83% LA with steroid 79%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=1, steroids=4	Preliminary results of a large randomized trial performed under fluoroscopy with positive results. Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ^[121] R, AC, F Cervical discogenic pain Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=44/48	Total=120 Local anesthetic only=60 Local anesthetic with steroids=60 Local anesthetic or with Celestone Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, NDI, opioid intake, employment, changes in weight Significant improvement >50% pain relief and >50% functional status improvement Successful as defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures	Overall LA 68% vs LA with steroid 77% Successful LA 75% vs LA with steroid 82%	Overall LA 67% vs LA with steroid 73% Successful LA 73% vs LA with steroid 79%	Overall LA 72% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83% LA with steroid 79%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83% LA with steroid 75%	Overall LA 73% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 83% LA with steroid 75%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=5, steroids=4	Positive results of a large randomized controlled trial performed under fluoroscopy. Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids	

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years	3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.		
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ⁽¹³²⁾ R, AC, F Cervical post surgery syndrome Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPM-QRB=42/48	Total=56 Local anesthetic only=28 Local anesthetic with steroids=28 Local anesthetic or with Celestone Average number of injections=3-4 for 1 year	NRS, NDI, employment status, opioid intake Significant improvement >50% pain relief and >50% functional status improvement Successful was defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures	Overall LA 68% vs LA with steroid 68% Successful LA 83% vs LA with steroid 72%	Overall LA 64% vs LA with steroid 71% Successful LA 78% vs LA with steroid 80%	Overall LA 71% vs LA with steroid 64% Successful LA 87% vs LA with steroid 72%	NA	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=5, steroids=3	An active-control trial conducted with fluoroscopy with positive results. Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids		
Thoracic interlaminar epidurals Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁽¹⁷⁾ RA, AC, F Chronic mid and/ or upper back pain Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPM-QRB=43/48	Total=110 Local anesthetic only=55 Local anesthetic with steroids=55 6 mL of local anesthetic only or 6 mL of local anesthetic with 6 mg of nonparticulate betamethasone Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, ODI, employment status, opioid intake Significant improvement >50% pain relief and >50% functional status improvement Successful was defined as those patients responding with at least 3 weeks of improvement with the first 2 procedures	Overall LA 78% vs LA with steroid 82% Successful LA 88% vs LA with steroid 86%	Overall LA 74% vs LA with steroid 84% Successful LA 84% vs LA with steroid 90%	Overall LA 71% vs LA with steroid 84% Successful LA 80% vs LA with steroid 90% LA with steroid 85%	Overall LA 71% vs LA with steroid 84% Successful LA 80% vs LA with steroid 90% LA with steroid 85%	No significant difference between local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids with significant improvement with overall assessment or in the successful group participants. Nonresponsive patients: Local anesthetic=4, steroids=6	First large randomized trial with active control design and long-term follow-up. Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids		

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Results	Comment (s)	
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years			
Facet joint injections and nerve blocks								
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2010 ^[1-44]	Total=120 Local anesthetic with steroid=60 Local anesthetic=60 Lumbar facet joint pain Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPW-QRB=46/48	NRS, ODI, employment status, and opioid intake. Significant improvement was defined as patients with significant pain relief of $\geq 50\%$ and functional improvement of $\geq 40\%$	LA 82% vs LA with steroid 83%	LA 93% vs LA with steroid 83%	LA 85% vs LA with steroid 84%	LA 85% vs LA with steroid 90%	There is no difference between local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroid. Similar results with lumbar facet joint nerve blocks with therapeutic lumbar facet joint nerve blocks	Positive with local anesthetic with or without steroids. Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2001 ^[137]	Total=73 Local anesthetic with steroid=41 Local anesthetic=32 Lumbar facet joint pain Quality scores Cochrane=8/12 IPW-QRB=34/48	NRS, functional status, opioid intake, employment status	SI	SI	SI	NA	Positive results both with local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids No difference between local anesthetic alone compared with steroids. 24 months: No data available	Positive short- and long-term results Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures				Pain relief and function			Results	Comment (s)
		3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.	2 years					
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2010 ^[1-42] RA, DB, AC, F Cervical facet joint pain Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPW-QRB=46/48	Total=120 Group I - no steroid=60 Group II - steroid=60 Cervical facet joint nerve blocks were performed either with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroid. Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, NDI, opioid intake, and employment status at baseline Significant improvement was defined as at least 50% improvement in pain relief and/ or functional status improvement	LA 83% vs LA with steroid 85%	LA 87% vs LA with steroid 95%	LA 85% vs LA with steroid 92%	LA 70% vs LA with steroid 75%	Positive results both with local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids There was no difference between local anesthetic alone or with local anesthetic with steroids	A large randomized double-blind controlled trial performed under fluoroscopy with or without steroids showed positive long-term results. Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids		
Manchikanti <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ^[1-43] RA, DB, F Thoracic facet joint pain Quality scores Cochrane=10/12 IPW-QRB=46/48	Total=100 Group I - no steroid=50 Group II - steroid=50 Thoracic facet joint nerve blocks were performed either with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroid. Average number of injections=5-6 for 2 years	NRS, ODI, opioid intake, and return to work status. Significant improvement was defined as significant pain relief and functional status improvement of 50% or more	LA 79% vs LA with steroid 83%	LA 79% vs LA with steroid 81%	LA 80% vs LA with steroid 83%	LA 80% vs 84% LA with steroid	Positive results both with local anesthetic and local anesthetic with steroids There was no difference between local anesthetic alone or with local anesthetic with steroids	The randomized controlled trial showed positive results with long-term follow-up Similar results with local anesthetic or with local anesthetic and steroids		
Carette <i>et al.</i> , 1991 ^[17] RA, DB, PC or AC Lumbar facet joint pain Quality scores Cochrane=11/12 IPW-QRB=38/48	Total=97 Methylprednisolone acetate=49 Isotonic saline=48 patients Patients received lumbar intraarticular injections under fluoroscopic guidance injections of either isotonic saline or methylprednisolone acetate. Number of injections=1	VAS, McGill pain questionnaire, mean sickness impact profile	33% vs 42%	22% vs 10%	NA	NA	The results were somewhat superior with steroids initially and at 6 months; however, both injection of sodium chloride solution and methylprednisolone produced similar results when concurrent interventions were taken into account. The conclusion was intraarticular sodium chloride injection or methylprednisolone were equally effective	In comparison of intraarticular sodium chloride solution and methylprednisolone, the results were superior initially up to 6 months; however, after 6 months both intraarticular sodium chloride solution and intraarticular methylprednisolone were judged to be equally ineffective. Intraarticular sodium chloride solution injection or methylprednisolone were equally effective		

Contd....

Table 4: Contd...

Study characteristics/ Methodological quality scoring	Participants/ interventions	Outcome measures			Results	Comment (s)		
		Pain relief and function	3 mos.	6 mos.			12 mos.	2 years
Barnsley <i>et al.</i> , 1994 ^[8] RA, DB, AC, F Cervical facet joint pain Quality scores Cochrane = 12/12 IPM-QRB = 36/48	Total = 39 Corticosteroid group = 21 Local anesthetic group = 20 Randomized patients were treated with either 1 mL of cervical intraarticular injection of either bupivacaine 0.5% or betamethasone 5.7 mg. Number of injections = 1	VAS, McGill pain questionnaire, return to 50% pain level	20%	20%	20%	NA	Less than 50% of patients reported relief of pain for more than one week and less than 20% reported relief for more than one month, irrespective of their treatment, either with intraarticular local anesthetic or intraarticular betamethasone alone without local anesthetic. Both were equally ineffective	A small randomized double-blind controlled trial showing overall negative results, but similar results with local anesthetic and steroids. Both local anesthetic and steroids were equally ineffective

RA: Randomized; AC: Active control; B: Blind; F: Fluoroscopy; PC: Placebo control; UL: Ultrasound; DB: Double blind; VAS: Visual analog scale; NRS: Numeric rating scale; ODI: Oswestry disability index; NDI: Neck disability index; LA: Local anesthetic; P: Positive; N: Negative; NA: Not applicable; NRS: Numeric rating scale; SI: Significant improvement; LBOS: Low back outcome score; IPM-QRB: Interventional pain management techniques-Quality appraisal of reliability and risk of bias assessment; EQLS: European quality of life scale

showed the efficacy of the local anesthetic lidocaine, as well as lidocaine with steroids. There was significant improvement at the end of 2 years in all parameters in 65% of patients who received local anesthetic alone and 57% of patients who received local anesthetic with steroid. Furthermore, when patients were separated into nonresponsive and responsive categories based on initial relief of at least 3 weeks with two procedures, significant improvement (at least 50% improvement in pain and function) was seen in 80% in the responsive local anesthetic group and 73% in the responsive local anesthetic with steroid group. These patients with disc herniation had improvement in all parameters: Pain intensity, function, and medication reduction. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (10/12) as well as IPM-QRB criteria (44/48).

Riew *et al.*,^[178] in a study of patients with disc herniation, treated 27 patients with transforaminal epidural injections of bupivacaine alone and 28 patients with bupivacaine with steroids. They reported that 33% of the patients in the local anesthetic group and 71% in the local anesthetic with steroid group avoided surgery. Overall this trial showed both local anesthetic alone and local anesthetic with steroid were effective; however, local anesthetic with steroid was superior. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (8/12) and IPM-QRB criteria (32/48).

Ng *et al.*^[161] in a trial of 86 patients, with 43 receiving bupivacaine and 43 receiving bupivacaine with steroids, reported efficacy for both treatments at 3 months in 47.5% of the patients in the bupivacaine group and 41.5% in the bupivacaine with steroids group. Consequently, this trial showed equal effectiveness for both, even though it was less than 50% in both groups. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (11/12) as well as IPM-QRB criteria (37/48).

Tafazal *et al.*^[192] reported the effectiveness of transforaminal local anesthetic with or without steroids in disc herniation and spinal stenosis. They reported superior results for sciatica with similar efficacy for local anesthetic alone or with steroids. This was a high-quality trial based on Cochrane review criteria (10/12) as well as IPM-QRB criteria (32/48).

There was Level I evidence, based on multiple, relevant high-quality randomized controlled trials,^[27,120,161,192] that local anesthetic with steroids provides significant improvement in transforaminal epidural injections, and that local anesthetic alone and local anesthetic with steroids are equally effective.

There was Level II evidence, based on one high-quality trial, that local anesthetics with steroids are superior to local anesthetic alone in avoiding surgery (33% vs 71%),^[178] with another high-quality trial^[192] showing

avoidance of surgery in a similar proportion of patients in both the local anesthetic only and local anesthetic with steroids groups, with 82% of the patients able to avoid surgery. There was also Level III evidence that local anesthetic with steroids was superior to local anesthetic alone based on one high-quality randomized trial^[52] with short-term follow-up and one moderate- to high-quality randomized trial.^[159] There was Level IV evidence that transforaminal injections of sodium chloride solution were equally effective as transforaminal injections of steroids based on one high-quality randomized trial^[87] with contradictory results from one high-quality randomized trial.^[52]

Lumbar interlaminar epidural injections

There were six randomized controlled trials assessing the efficacy of multiple solutions used in lumbar interlaminar epidurals.^[16,29,47,114,116,141] Three of these trials were rated as high quality based on Cochrane review criteria and IPM-QRB criteria.^[114,116,141] One trial was high quality based on Cochrane review criteria. Two trials were rated as moderate-quality based on Cochrane review criteria;^[29,47] however, utilizing IPM-QRB criteria, Cuckler *et al.*^[29] and Carrette *et al.*^[16] were considered moderate-quality and Fukusaki *et al.*^[47] was considered low-quality.

Three of these studies were conducted by Manchikanti *et al.*^[114,116,141] with the same active control design protocol. The studies included a total of 360 patients to assess the efficacy of local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids in lumbar disc herniation, lumbar discogenic pain without facet joint or sacroiliac joint pain, and lumbar central spinal stenosis. The study period for each was 2 years. These studies were rated as high quality based on Cochrane review criteria, with all of them scoring 10 out of 12. The IPM-QRB for all of them was either 43 or 44 of 48. Similar efficacious results for epidural injections of local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids were seen in 60–84% of the patients in these studies.

In these manuscripts, the study subcategories were identified as responsive and nonresponsive groups. The responsive groups consisted of patients who received at least 3 weeks of significant improvement (50% improvement) in pain and function with the first two procedures. The number of patients in the nonresponsive category who received interlaminar epidural injections of local anesthetic only included 10 who had disc herniation, five who had discogenic pain, and nine patients who had central stenosis. In the corresponding nonresponsive local anesthetic with steroids category, the number of patients were: One who had disc herniation, six who had discogenic pain, and seven who had central stenosis. Thus, there was a high proportion of patients in the disc herniation group who were nonresponsive to lumbar interlaminar injections of local anesthetic, while there

were no differences noted in the central stenosis or the discogenic pain groups compared with the corresponding responsive patients. In addition, in disc herniation, lumbar interlaminar epidural injections have somewhat superior results for pain relief at 6 months, and functional status at 12 months as observed in the local anesthetic with steroid group.^[141] Thus, the results indicate that a patient who failed to respond to local anesthetic alone may be treated with the addition of steroids. The results were superior in the successful groups in all four categories. The disadvantage of all four trials has been that there was no inclusion of a placebo group.

Among the other trials, Fukusaki *et al.*^[47] studied a small number of patients (53) divided into three groups. The patients were blindly injected with epidural saline (16), bupivacaine (18), or bupivacaine and methylprednisolone (19). There was a lack of effectiveness for any of the solutions at 3 months. Cuckler *et al.*^[29] studied disc herniation and spinal stenosis in 73 patients: 36 with an acute herniated nucleus pulposus and 37 with spinal stenosis. Two injections and a 1-year follow-up showed the superiority of local anesthetic with steroids, however, only 17% in the local anesthetic only group and 31% in the local anesthetic with steroids group responded. This study showed a lack of effectiveness for either local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids based on the setting of this trial; however, it also showed low level evidence that local anesthetic with steroids may be superior.

Carette *et al.*,^[16] in a widely publicized trial, showed a lack of effectiveness at 3 month follow-up for either normal saline or depomethylprednisolone with normal saline injected epidurally in the lumbar spine. This trial showed initial improvement with steroids; however, subsequent analysis showed no significant improvement. There was significant criticism of this manuscript based on the methodology used and the conclusions reached.^[54,147,164,176]

Based on multiple high-quality randomized trials^[114,116,141] showing efficacy, with one high-quality randomized trial showing a lack of efficacy for steroids without local anesthetic,^[16] and two moderate-quality trials,^[29,47] there was Level I evidence for lumbar interlaminar epidural injections in managing low back and/or lower extremity pain with or without local anesthetic with similar efficacy. There was no evidence for the superiority of steroids over local anesthetic with an interlaminar epidural approach, except with local anesthetic with steroids in disc herniation.^[141]

Cervical interlaminar epidural injections

Among the trials meeting inclusion criteria, there were four high-quality trials^[121,122,132,133] assessing the efficacy of cervical interlaminar epidural injections with multiple solutions.

All studies were conducted by Manchikanti *et al.*^[121,122,132,133] as active control trials, assessing the efficacy of cervical interlaminar epidural injections, either with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids, in cervical disc herniation, cervical discogenic pain without facet joint pain, cervical central spinal stenosis, and cervical postsurgery syndrome. Three hundred and fifty-six patients participated. There was a minimum 1-year follow-up for two of the trials and a 2-year follow-up for two of the trials. These studies were rated as high-quality, based on Cochrane review criteria of scores ranging from 10 to 11 of 12 and IPM-QRB criteria, with all of them scoring 42–44 of 48. All four trials showed similar results for the efficacy of epidural injections with local anesthetic alone or with steroids in 64–90% of the patients. In these manuscripts, the study categories were identified as nonresponsive and responsive groups. The responsive group consisted of patients who had at least 3 weeks of significant improvement (50% improvement) in pain and function with the first two procedures. For cervical interlaminar epidural injections in the nonresponsive category with local anesthetic alone, there were seven patients with disc herniation, five patients with discogenic pain, five patients with postsurgery syndrome, and one patient with central stenosis. In the corresponding nonresponsive category of local anesthetic with steroids there were 10, 4, 3, and 4 patients with these pathologies. Thus, there was no significant difference for various conditions in reference to nonresponsive or responsive patient groups. As shown in Table 4, when separate analyses of responsive patients and all patients are conducted, the results were superior in the responsive groups in all four categories. The disadvantage of all four trials was that there was no inclusion of a placebo group.

Based on multiple, high-quality relevant randomized trials,^[121,122,132,133] the Level I evidence is equal for the efficacy of cervical epidural injections with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids in managing neck and/or upper extremity pain.

Thoracic interlaminar epidural injections

There was only one trial assessing thoracic interlaminar epidural injections. It was conducted by Manchikanti *et al.*,^[117] and of high quality based on Cochrane review criteria and IPM-QRB criteria.

Manchikanti *et al.*,^[117] in a trial with a total of 110 patients, assessed the efficacy of thoracic interlaminar epidural injections with either local anesthetic or local anesthetic with steroids. This was an active control trial with appropriate sample size and a follow-up of 2 years. This trial showed similar efficacy for epidural injections, with improvement in 71% of patients who received local anesthetic alone and in 80% of patients who received local anesthetic with steroids. In this manuscript, the

study categories were identified as nonresponsive and responsive groups. The responsive group consisted of at least 3 weeks of significant improvement (50% improvement) in pain and function with the first two procedures. In the nonresponsive category with local anesthetic only, there were four patients, and for local anesthetic with steroids, there were six patients. This study includes not only patients with disc herniation but also those with discogenic pain, central spinal stenosis, and postsurgery syndrome. This is the only study available in the literature studying the efficacy of thoracic interlaminar epidural injections.

There was Level II evidence based on one high-quality randomized trial^[117] with positive results and no negative studies for the equal effectiveness of local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids.

Facet joint interventions

Lumbar, cervical, and thoracic facet joint nerve blocks and cervical and lumbar intraarticular injections have been studied with saline, local anesthetic, and steroids. There were six randomized controlled trials assessing the efficacy of facet joint interventions with multiple solutions.^[8,17,137,142-144] All of these trials were rated as high-quality based on Cochrane review criteria and IPM-QRB criteria. Among these, four trials assessed the role of facet joint nerve blocks in the cervical, lumbar, and thoracic regions utilizing either local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids.^[137,142-144] Two trials studied the role of facet joint intraarticular injections, Carette *et al.*^[17] in the lumbar spine and Barnsley *et al.*^[8] in the cervical spine. The trial by Carette *et al.*^[17] faced significant criticism.^[31,57]

Facet joint nerve blocks

Among the trials assessing facet joint nerve blocks, three of them included a 2-year follow-up, active control design, and appropriate outcome parameters.^[142-144] The fourth one had a 1-year follow-up and was of lesser quality than the other three performed by the same group of authors.^[137] All four studies were conducted by Manchikanti *et al.*^[137,142-144] Three of them had identical protocols^[142-144] assessing 330 patients in the cervical, lumbar, and thoracic regions. All three randomized active control trials showed similar results, with improvement sustained after 2 years in 70–92% of the patients. At 1-year follow-up, improvement was seen in 80–92% of the patients. All the studies showed similar results with significant improvement with either local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids. Thus, there was no significant difference for various regions in reference to the outcomes. The performance of all three studies by one group of authors finding positive results in each study may be considered an advantage or a deficiency. All the trials utilized appropriate outcome parameters and inclusion criteria and followed strict controlled diagnostic blocks with 80% concordant pain

relief. The fourth study was performed by the same group of authors;^[137] however, the quality parameters were much lower and the improvement was also inferior to the other randomized trials.

Based on the results of this assessment, these four trials, considered to be high-quality based on Cochrane review criteria and IPM-QRB criteria,^[137,142-144] reported efficacy for facet joint nerve blocks in managing cervical, lumbar, or thoracic facet joint pain. All four trials showed equal effectiveness for local anesthetic with or without steroids, resulting in Level I evidence.

Facet joint injections

There was one randomized controlled trial by Carette *et al.*^[17] assessing intraarticular injections either with isotonic saline or methylprednisolone acetate. Pain improvement was seen in both groups up to 6 months; however, after 6 months, both intraarticular sodium chloride solution and intraarticular methylprednisolone injections were judged to be equally ineffective. The authors concluded that intraarticular sodium chloride injection and methylprednisolone were equally effective after eliminating the confounding variables. Barnsley *et al.*^[8] assessed the role of either local anesthetic intraarticular injection or betamethasone intraarticular injection in cervical facet joint pain and showed a lack of effectiveness for both injections.

Thus, there was Level I evidence for the lack of effectiveness for intraarticular injections based on two high-quality randomized controlled trials.^[8,17] There was also Level II evidence based on one high-quality randomized trial that intraarticular steroids or sodium chloride solutions are equally ineffective and local anesthetic or steroids are equally ineffective.^[8]

Efficacy of epidural injections in specific spinal conditions

Disc herniation

Disc herniation has been treated with caudal, lumbar interlaminar, lumbar transforaminal, thoracic interlaminar, and cervical interlaminar epidural injections. There was no identifiable evidence from randomized controlled trials for either cervical transforaminal epidural injections or thoracic transforaminal epidural injections in treating disc herniation.

There were 15 trials assessing the role of epidural injections in disc herniation,^[16,27,29,52,79,87,117,120,122,139,141,161,178,182,192] 3 caudal epidural injection trials,^[79,139,182] 7 lumbar transforaminal epidural injection trials,^[27,52,87,120,161,178,192] 3 lumbar interlaminar epidural trials,^[16,29,141] 1 cervical interlaminar epidural trial,^[122] and 1 thoracic interlaminar epidural trial.^[117]

Of the three caudal epidural injection trials, one trial^[139] was of high-quality based on Cochrane review criteria

and IPM-QRB criteria; a second trial was high-quality^[182] based on Cochrane review criteria and moderate based on IPM-QRB criteria; and a third trial was of moderate-quality.^[79]

All seven randomized controlled trials^[27,52,87,120,161,178,192] on the efficacy of transforaminal epidural injections of various drugs in disc herniation were rated as high-quality, scoring above 8 out of 12 on Cochrane review criteria.

Of the three lumbar interlaminar epidural trials,^[16,29,141] one trial^[141] was rated as high-quality on Cochrane review criteria and IPM-QRB criteria; one trial^[16] was rated as high-quality on Cochrane review criteria and moderate-quality on IPM-QRB; and one trial^[29] was rated as moderate-quality based on Cochrane review criteria and IPM-QRB criteria. One trial evaluated cervical interlaminar epidural injections^[122] and one trial evaluated thoracic interlaminar epidural injections,^[117] both of which were high-quality on Cochrane review criteria, as well as IPM-QRB criteria.

There was Level I evidence, based on multiple, relevant high-quality randomized trials,^[27,117,122,139,141,161,192] for the efficacy of local anesthetic with steroids and equal efficacy for local anesthetic with or without steroids in managing disc herniation. Two trials of caudal epidural injections, one high-quality^[139] and one moderate- to high-quality,^[182] and one high-quality trial of lumbar interlaminar epidurals of local anesthetic with steroids compared to local anesthetic alone,^[141] showed superiority for local anesthetic with steroids with Level II evidence. There was also Level III evidence, based on one high-quality trial, that local anesthetic with steroids is superior to local anesthetic alone in avoiding surgery.^[178] Another high-quality trial^[192] reported avoidance of surgery in a similar proportion of patients in both groups, with 82% of the patients avoiding surgery.

In addition to the above, the level of evidence for each vertebral region was variable. There was Level I evidence for caudal, lumbar interlaminar, and lumbar transforaminal injections in managing lumbar disc herniation, with multiple high quality randomized controlled trials. There was also superiority for steroids in managing disc herniation in the lumbosacral region compared with local anesthetic alone in assessments up to one year with caudal and interlaminar epidural injections.

However, there was Level II evidence for managing cervical disc herniation and thoracic disc herniation based on at least one high-quality randomized controlled trial in each category.

Spinal stenosis

Caudal, lumbar interlaminar, lumbar transforaminal, thoracic interlaminar, and cervical interlaminar epidural injections have been utilized in treating pain from central spinal stenosis. There are no randomized

controlled trials assessing the role of cervical or thoracic transforaminal epidural injections in managing pain of central spinal stenosis. There were seven trials assessing the role of epidural injections in central spinal stenosis,^[29,47,114,118,133,159,192] one caudal epidural trial,^[118] two lumbar transforaminal trials,^[159,192] three lumbar interlaminar trials,^[29,47,114] and one cervical interlaminar epidural trial.^[133]

The caudal epidural injection trial was high quality.^[118] Of the two lumbar transforaminal epidural trials, one was high quality based on Cochrane and IPM-QRB criteria^[192] and the second one^[159] was high quality based on Cochrane review criteria and moderate quality based on IPM-QRB criteria. Among the lumbar interlaminar epidural trials, one was high quality^[114] and the other two were moderate quality^[29,47] based on Cochrane review criteria, with one being moderate quality^[29] and one being low-quality^[47] on IPM-QRB criteria. Among cervical interlaminar epidurals, there was only one study which was of high quality.^[133] Thus, of the seven trials assessing the role of epidural injections in central spinal stenosis, five were high quality,^[114,118,133,159,192] and two were moderate quality^[29,47] based on Cochrane review criteria and four were high quality,^[87,114,118,133] two were moderate quality,^[29,159] and one was low quality^[47] based on IPM-QRB criteria.

There was Level I evidence, based on relevant high-quality trials,^[114,118,133,192] showing positive results, for the equal effectiveness of local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids. There was Level IV evidence from one moderate-quality trial for the superiority of steroids,^[159] and negative evidence from one moderate-quality randomized controlled trial^[29] and one low-quality randomized controlled trial^[47] with short-term follow-up.

There was Level II evidence in managing lumbar central spinal stenosis based on caudal and lumbar interlaminar trials, whereas there was also Level I evidence in managing cervical central spinal stenosis based on one randomized controlled trial, whereas there was no evidence available in managing thoracic spinal stenosis.

Discogenic pain

Discogenic pain has been treated with caudal, lumbar interlaminar, thoracic interlaminar, and cervical interlaminar epidural injections. There are no studies assessing the role of transforaminal epidural injections for discogenic pain.

There were three trials assessing the role of epidural injections in discogenic pain without disc herniation, radiculitis, or facet joint pain;^[116,119,121] one caudal epidural injection trial,^[119] one trial of lumbar interlaminar epidural injections;^[116] and one trial of cervical interlaminar epidural injections.^[121] All the trials were of high-quality and showed positive results with equal effectiveness for local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids.

There was Level I evidence, based on multiple high-quality relevant randomized controlled trials,^[116,119,121] for the equal efficacy of local anesthetic or local anesthetic with steroids in managing discogenic pain.

There was Level II evidence based on two randomized controlled trials in managing discogenic pain with caudal and lumbar interlaminar epidural injections, with Level II evidence in managing cervical and thoracic discogenic pain, with one high-quality randomized controlled trial in each category.

Postsurgery syndrome

Postsurgery syndrome has been treated with caudal, lumbar transforaminal, thoracic interlaminar, and cervical interlaminar epidural injections. There were no studies assessing the role of lumbar interlaminar or transforaminal epidural injections.

There was only one randomized caudal epidural injection trial^[140] and one cervical interlaminar epidural injection trial^[132] assessing the role of epidural injections in postsurgery syndrome.

There was Level II evidence, based on the two high-quality, relevant randomized controlled trials,^[132,140] for the equal efficacy of caudal and cervical interlaminar epidural injections in managing postsurgery syndrome with local anesthetic alone or local anesthetic with steroids.

There was Level II evidence in managing lumbar postsurgery syndrome with caudal epidural injections and cervical postsurgery syndrome with cervical interlaminar epidural injections, with no evidence available for thoracic postsurgery syndrome.

DISCUSSION

In this assessment of the efficacy of various solutions injected into the spinal epidural space and over the facet joint nerves, there was Level I evidence that local anesthetics with steroids and local anesthetics or steroids administered in combination or separately were equally effective based on multiple, relevant, high-quality randomized controlled trials of spinal pain from various origins. However, for intraarticular injection, the evidence of lack of effectiveness was Level I for injections of sodium chloride solution, local anesthetic, or local anesthetic with steroids. There was also Level II evidence for the superiority of local anesthetic with steroids compared with steroids alone in managing disc herniation and Level IV evidence in spinal stenosis.

In recent years, there has been much debate in reference to interventional techniques in general, and epidural injections of steroids in particular, with catastrophic complications related to transforaminal epidural steroid injections, specifically in the cervical and thoracic spine.^{[2,7,13,23,42,55,56,69,75,76,81,86,90,91,104-106,112,124,}

^{125,134-136,154,156,183,184,187,194]} In fact, recently the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a warning about the risk of serious, though rare, complications, and the lack of effectiveness of epidurally administered steroid injections.^[194] However, this advice was issued based on cervical transforaminal epidural particulate steroid injections that resulted in catastrophic complications; only 3% of total epidural injections even involve cervical and thoracic transforaminal epidural injections.^[128,130,138] This assessment clearly shows the efficacy of epidural injections of local anesthetic with or without steroids administered caudally, with interlaminar approaches, and with a lumbar transforaminal approach. Facet joint nerve blocks have also been shown to be efficacious. Further, this assessment also determined there was Level II evidence for the superiority of local anesthetic with steroids over local anesthetic alone in managing disc herniation and radiculitis.

The findings of this systematic review, showing the equal effectiveness of local anesthetics alone and local anesthetics with steroid administered into the epidural space, facet joints, or over facet joint nerves, is in contrast to a long-held philosophy and belief in the medical community concerning the effectiveness of steroids in treating spinal pain based on the theory of spinal pain having an inflammatory component. The results of this study are valid as only high-quality, randomized controlled trials were utilized. Further, the grading of the evidence was based on a best-evidence synthesis utilizing a strict approach for methodological quality assessment. The long-term follow-up of one year or longer was utilized in arriving at the conclusions rather than short-term follow-up of 1, 3, 6, or even 12 weeks, etc., In fact, the results are similar to the Bicket *et al.*^[12] study results, which included not only epidural injections, but also nonspinal epidural injections. Even though the Bicket *et al.*^[12] review had some deficiencies,^[26,38,127] they concluded that epidural nonsteroid injections may provide greater benefit for spinal pain than nonepidural injections based on the significant but small difference found between the two treatments when examining the positive response outcome. These differences were greater compared with the differences between epidural steroid injections and epidural nonsteroid injections, suggesting that, at least in the short-term, most of the benefit of epidural injections may derive from the solution itself, rather than the steroid.^[12] Epidural nonsteroid injections also showed an insignificant trend in Bicket *et al.*'s^[12] evaluation toward greater relief when examining pain score reductions with indirect comparisons. In contrast, in our assessment we utilized long-term assessments with stringent methodological quality criteria; however, we were unable to perform a meta-analysis, which may have not been very accurate by Bicket *et al.*^[12,26,38,127]

The findings of this systematic review may be explained by various mechanisms of steroids and local anesthetics, including the suppression of ectopic discharges from inflamed nerves, enhancing blood flow to ischemic nerve roots, the lysing of iatrogenic and inflammatory adhesions, a washout of proinflammatory cytokines, and reversal of peripheral and central sensitization.^[10,30,47,58,60,68,77,89,95,96,179,190,198,200] Bicket *et al.*^[12] hypothesized a placebo effect with epidural injections, especially those administered via the transforaminal approach, often with reproduction of radicular symptoms, which is not observed with soft tissue injections, resulting in high levels of placebo effect and undermining the effectiveness of blinding.^[37,85,173] However, Karppinen *et al.*^[87,88] utilized this approach and showed equal results. In contrast, Ghahreman *et al.*^[51,52] essentially showed a better response for an intramuscular injection than a transforaminal sodium chloride solution. The resultant numbness and weakness also may influence blinding as well as the patient's response. However, widespread complex mechanisms and variations in placebo and nocebo response have been well described.^[65,70,71,74,84,85,103] And thus far, appropriately designed placebo studies (injecting inactive solutions into inactive structures) have not resulted in a significant placebo effect.^[50-52]

Noteworthy as well is that investigators may be missing the role of the nocebo effect. The implications of these results may be significant in not only designing clinical trials, but also in managing patients. Further, it is essential to understand the differences between chronic and subacute pain. Many of the studies included subacute or acute patients, leading to erroneous conclusions. In this evaluation, we also included some trials that included subacute patients; however, they were followed long-term.^[27,79,182]

Based on this evaluation as well as the Bicket *et al.*^[12] evaluation, it appears that local anesthetic alone epidural injections or facet joint nerve blocks may be a viable option. Using local anesthetic alone may reduce the risk of rare, but potentially fatal, complications such as meningitis^[23,81,124,187] and rare, but real, catastrophic consequences, such as paralysis and death, reported from cervical and thoracic transforaminal epidural injections. Further, patients who have undergone previous surgery may also be considered as high risk. The literature shows a lack of superiority for local anesthetic with epidural steroids over local anesthetic alone, even though lumbar interlaminar epidural injections and any type of transforaminal epidural injection have not been studied with appropriate evidence in postsurgery syndrome. In addition, the dose of steroids may be significantly reduced from the traditional doses of 120 mg or higher. In fact, multiple policies have been mandating the use of lower doses of

steroids.^[22,160,162] There is also support in the literature for a lack of difference in efficacy between high- and low-dose epidural steroid injections and reduction of adverse events with low-dose steroids.^[4,41,82,83,92,93,152,165,202] High-risk patients may include not only postsurgery patients, but also the techniques involving transforaminal approaches and patients with diabetes with a risk of hyperglycemia,^[41,93,109] plus those at a high risk of osteopenia and osteoporosis,^[4,82,92,202] those at risk for avascular necrosis,^[59] those with a risk for adverse effects with suppression of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenocortical axis scheduled for major surgery,^[197] and those with poor wound healing and immunosuppression.

However, these results should be interpreted in the context of their multiple limitations. Based on the results, an abundant amount of steroids is not advised. As explained, there was no meta-analysis performed. The majority of the high-quality, randomized trials included in this analysis were from one group of investigators. Consequently, further trials are essential. At present, this evidence suggests physicians carefully select patients and take the opportunity to discuss with them shared decision-making concerning the equal efficacy of local anesthetic with or without steroids in multiple conditions. Steroids with local anesthetic appear to have some superiority, even though it is derived from a low level of evidence, over local anesthetics alone in managing disc herniation.

CONCLUSION

This systematic review shows a lack of effectiveness for saline and equal effectiveness for local anesthetic alone and local anesthetic with steroids in multiple, high-quality randomized controlled trials for epidural injections for managing spinal pain in various regions for various pathologies and facet joint nerve blocks in managing facet joint pain. The results also showed the superiority of epidural steroid injections with local anesthetic over local anesthetics alone for disc herniation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Vidyasagar Pampati, MSc, for statistical assistance; Tom Prigge, MA, and Laurie Swick, BS, for manuscript review; and Tonie M. Hatton and Diane E. Neihoff, transcriptionists, for their assistance in preparation of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Abbott ZI, Nair KV, Allen RR, Akuthota VR. Utilization characteristics of spinal interventions. *Spine J* 2012;12:35-43.
2. Akkaya T, Sayin M. Transforaminal epidural steroid injection and its complications. *Agri* 2005;17:27-39.
3. Alimasi W, Sawaji Y, Endo K, Yorifuji M, Suzuki H, Kosaka T, *et al.* Regulation of

- nerve growth factor by anti-inflammatory drugs, a steroid, and a selective cyclooxygenase 2 inhibitor in human intervertebral disc cells stimulated with interleukin-1. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2013;38:1466-72.
4. Al-Shoha A, Rao DS, Schilling J, Peterson E, Mandel S. Effect of epidural steroid injection on bone mineral density and markers of bone turnover in postmenopausal women. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2012;37:E1567-71.
 5. Arden NK, Price C, Reading I, Stubbing J, Hazelgrove J, Dunne C, et al. A multicentre randomized controlled trial of epidural corticosteroid injections for sciatica: The WEST study. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2005;44:1399-406.
 6. Arner S, Lindblom U, Meyerson BA, Molander C. Prolonged relief of neuralgia after regional anesthetic block. A call for further experimental and systematic clinical studies. *Pain* 1990;43:287-97.
 7. Atluri S, Glaser SE, Shah RV, Sudarsha G. Needle position analysis in cases of paralysis from transforaminal epidurals: Consider alternative approaches to traditional techniques. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:321-34.
 8. Barnsley L, Lord SM, Wallis BJ, Bogduk N. Lack of effect of intraarticular corticosteroids for chronic pain in the cervical zygapophyseal joints. *N Engl J Med* 1994;330:1047-50.
 9. Benyamin RM, Manchikanti L, Parr AT, Diwan SA, Singh V, Falco FJE, et al. The effectiveness of lumbar interlaminar epidural injections in managing chronic low back and lower extremity pain. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E363-404.
 10. Bhatia MT, Parikh LCJ. Epidural saline therapy in lumbosciatic syndrome. *J Indian Med Assoc* 1966;47:537-42.
 11. Bhushan A, Leigh JP. National trends in occupational injuries before and after 1992 and predictors of workers' compensation costs. *Public Health Rep* 2011;126:625-34.
 12. Bicket M, Gupta A, Brown CH, Cohen SP. Epidural injections for spinal pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the "control" injections in randomized controlled trials. *Anesthesiology* 2013;119:907-31.
 13. Botwin KP, Gruber RD, Bouchlas CG, Torres-Ramos FM, Freeman TL, Slaten WK. Complications of fluoroscopically guided transforaminal lumbar epidural injections. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2000;81:1045-50.
 14. Bressler HB, Keyes WJ, Rochon PA, Badley E. The prevalence of low back pain in the elderly. A systematic review of the literature. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1999;24:1813-9.
 15. Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care. Procedure Manual. March 2014. Available from: <http://canadiantaskforce.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Procedure-Manual-2014-v2-0FINAL.pdf?1414ed1> [Last accessed on 2015 Jan 27].
 16. Crette S, Leclaire R, Marcoux S, Morin F, Blaise GA, St-Pierre A, et al. Epidural corticosteroid injections for sciatica due to herniated nucleus pulposus. *N Engl J Med* 1997;336:1634-40.
 17. Crette S, Marcoux S, Truchon R, Grondin C, Gagnon J, Allard Y, et al. A controlled trial of corticosteroid injections into facet joints for chronic low back pain. *N Engl J Med* 1991;325:1002-7.
 18. Cassidy JD, Carroll LJ, Côté P. The Saskatchewan Health and Back Pain Survey. The prevalence of low back pain and related disability in Saskatchewan adults. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1998;23:1860-7.
 19. Cassuto J, Sinclair R, Bonderovic M. Anti-inflammatory properties of local anesthetics and their present and potential clinical implications. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2006;50:265-82.
 20. Cathelin MF. Mode d'action de la cocaine injectée dans l'espace epidural par le procede du canal sacre. *Comptes Rendues des Seances de la Societe de Biologie et de ses Filiales (Paris)* 1901;43:487.
 21. Cecchi F, Debolini P, Lova RM, Macchi C, Bandinelli S, Bartali B, et al. Epidemiology of back pain in a representative cohort of Italian persons 65 years of age and older: The InCHIANTI study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2006;31:1149-55.
 22. CGS Administrators, LLC. LCD for Pain Management (L31845). Revision Effective Date: 01/01/2012.
 23. Chiller TM, Roy M, Nguyen D, Guh A, Malani AN, Latham R, et al. Clinical findings for fungal infections caused by methylprednisolone injections. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1610-9.
 24. Chou R, Huffman L. Guideline for the Evaluation and Management of Low Back Pain: Evidence Review. American Pain Society, Glenview, IL, 2009. Available from: <http://www.americanpainsociety.org/uploads/pdfs/LBPEvidRev.pdf> [Last accessed on 2015 Jan 27].
 25. Civelek E, Cansever T, Kabatas S, Kircelli A, Yilmaz C, Musluman M, et al. Comparison of effectiveness of facet joint injection and radiofrequency denervation in chronic low back pain. *Turk Neurosurg* 2012;22:200-6.
 26. Cohen SP, Bicket MC. In Reply. *Anesthesiology* 2014;120:1284-5.
 27. Cohen SP, White RL, Kurihara C, Larkin TM, Chang A, Griffith SR, et al. Epidural steroids, etanercept, or saline in subacute sciatica: A multicenter, randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;156:551-9.
 28. Côté P, Cassidy JD, Carroll L. The Saskatchewan Health and Back Pain Survey. The prevalence of neck pain and related disability in Saskatchewan adults. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1998;23:1689-98.
 29. Cuckler JM, Bernini PA, Wiesel SW, Booth RE Jr, Rothman RH, Pickens GT. The use of epidural steroid in the treatment of radicular pain. *J Bone Joint Surg* 1985;67:63-6.
 30. Cui W, Li Y, Li S, Wang R, Li J. Systemic administration of lidocaine reduces morphine requirements and postoperative pain of patients undergoing thoracic surgery after propofol-remifentanyl based anaesthesia. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2010;27:41-6.
 31. Culling RD, Rice JH. Corticosteroid injections for chronic low back pain. *N Engl J Med* 1992;326:834.
 32. Cyriax JH. Epidural anesthesia and bedrest in sciatica. *Br Med J* 1961;1:20-4.
 33. Deyo RA, Gray DT, Kreuter W, Mirza S, Martin BI. United States trends in lumbar fusion surgery for degenerative conditions. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2005;30:1441-5.
 34. Deyo RA, Mirza SK. Trends and variations in the use of spine surgery. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2006;443:139-46.
 35. Dilke TF, Burry HC, Grahame R. Extradural corticosteroid injection in the management of lumbar nerve root compression. *Br Med J* 1973;2:635-7.
 36. Diwan SA, Manchikanti L, Benyamin RM, Bryce DA, Geffert S, Hameed H, et al. Effectiveness of cervical epidural injections in the management of chronic neck and upper extremity pain. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E405-34.
 37. Dooley JF, McBroom RJ, Taguchi T, Macnab I. Nerve root infiltration in the diagnosis of radicular pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1988;13:79-83.
 38. Engel AJ, Kennedy DJ, Macvicar J, Bogduk N. Not all injections are the same. *Anesthesiology* 2014;120:1282-3.
 39. Eriksen J, Ekholm O, Sjøgren P, Rasmussen NK. Development of and recovery from long-term pain. A 6-year follow-up study of a cross-section of the adult Danish population. *Pain* 2004;108:154-62.
 40. Evans W. Intracanal epidural injection in the treatment of sciatica. *Lancet* 1930;2:1225-9.
 41. Even JL, Crosby CG, Song Y, McGirt MJ, Devin CJ. Effects of epidural steroid injections on blood glucose levels in patients with diabetes mellitus. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2012;37:E46-50.
 42. Everett CR, Baskin MN, Speech D, Novoseletsky D, Patel R. Flushing as a side effect following lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injection. *Pain Physician* 2004;7:427-9.
 43. Falco FJ, Manchikanti L, Datta S, Sehgal N, Geffert S, Onyewu O, et al. An update of the effectiveness of therapeutic lumbar facet joint interventions. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E909-53.
 44. Falco FJ, Manchikanti L, Datta S, Wargo BV, Geffert S, Bryce DA, et al. Systematic review of therapeutic effectiveness of cervical facet joint interventions: An update. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E839-68.
 45. Fernández-de-Las-Peñas C, Alonso-Blanco C, Hernández-Barrera V, Palacios-Ceña D, Jiménez-García R, Carrasco-Garrido P. Has the prevalence of neck pain and low back pain changed over the last 5 years? A population-based national study in Spain. *Spine J* 2013;13:1069-76.
 46. Freburger JK, Holmes GM, Agans RP, Jackman AM, Darter JD, Wallace AS, et al. The rising prevalence of chronic low back pain. *Arch Intern Med* 2009;169:251-8.
 47. 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.
 48. Furlan AD, Pennick V, Bombardier C, van Tulder M; Editorial Board, Cochrane Back Review Group. 2009 updated method guidelines for systematic reviews in the Cochrane Back Review Group. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:1929-41.
 49. Gaskin DJ, Richard P. The economic costs of pain in the United States. *J Pain* 2012;13:715-24.
 50. Gerdesmeyer L, Wagenpfeil S, Birkenmaier C, Veihelmann A, Hauschild M, Wagner K, et al. Percutaneous epidural lysis of adhesions in chronic lumbar radicular pain: A randomized double-blind placebo controlled trial. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:185-96.
 51. Ghahremani A, Bogduk N. Predictors of a favorable response to transforaminal

- injection of steroids in patients with lumbar radicular pain due to disc herniation. *Pain Med* 2011;12:871-9.
52. Ghahreman A, Ferch R, Bogduk N. The efficacy of transforaminal injection of steroids for the treatment of lumbar radicular pain. *Pain Med* 2010;11:149-68.
 53. Ghanei I, Rosengren BE, Hasseri R, Nilsson JÅ, Mellström D, Ohlsson C, et al. The prevalence and severity of low back pain and associated symptoms in 3,009 old men. *Eur Spine J* 2014;23:814-20.
 54. Gillies JH, Ward JH, Griesdale DE. Corticosteroid injections for sciatica. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337:1242.
 55. Glaser SE, Falco FJ. Paraplegia following a thoracolumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injection. *Pain Physician* 2005;8:309-14.
 56. Glaser SE, Shah RV. Root cause analysis of paraplegia following transforaminal epidural steroid injections: The "unsafe" triangle. *Pain Physician* 2010;13:237-44.
 57. Gostine M. Corticosteroid injections for chronic low back pain. *N Engl J Med* 1992;326:834-5.
 58. Grigoras A, Lee P, Sattar F, Shorten G. Perioperative intravenous lidocaine decreases the incidence of persistent pain after breast surgery. *Clin J Pain* 2012;28:567-72.
 59. Gunal I, Karatosun V. Avascular necrosis of the femoral heads after single corticosteroid injection. *CMAJ* 2006;175:31.
 60. Gupta AK, Mital VK, Azmi RU. Observations of the management of lumbosacral syndromes (sciatica) by epidural saline. *J Indian Med Assoc* 1970;54:194-6.
 61. Gupta S, Ward S, Munglani R, Sharma M. Letter to the Editor re: Iversen T, et al. Effect of caudal epidural steroid or saline injection in chronic lumbar radiculopathy: Multicentre, blinded, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5278. Careful patient selection, fluoroscopy and contrast injection are needed for effective spinal injections. Published online 9/26/2011. Author's reply: Published online 9/29/2011.
 62. Guyatt G, Gutterman D, Baumann MH, Addrizzo-Harris D, Hylek EM, Phillips B, et al. Grading strength of recommendations and quality of evidence in clinical guidelines. Report from an American College of Chest Physicians task force. *Chest* 2006;129:174-81.
 63. Hansen H, Manchikanti L, Simopoulos TT, Christo PJ, Gupta S, Smith HS, et al. A systematic evaluation of the therapeutic effectiveness of sacroiliac joint interventions. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E247-78.
 64. Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH, Lohr KN, Mulrow CD, Teutsch SM, et al. Current methods of the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Am J Prevent Med* 2001;20:21-35.
 65. Häuser W, Bartram C, Bartram-Wunn E, Tölle T. Adverse events attributable to placebo in randomized controlled drug trials in fibromyalgia syndrome and painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy: Systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2012;28:437-51.
 66. Hayashi N, Weinstein JN, Meller ST, Lee HM, Spratt KF, Gebhart GF. The effect of epidural injection of betamethasone or bupivacaine in a rat model of lumbar radiculopathy. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1998;23:877-85.
 67. He L, Uçeyler N, Krämer HH, Colaço MN, Lu B, Birklein F, et al. Methylprednisolone prevents nerve injury-induced hyperalgesia in neprilysin knockout mice. *Pain* 2014;155:574-80.
 68. Hollmann MW, Durieux M. Local anesthetics and the inflammatory response. *Anesthesiology* 2000;93:858-75.
 69. Houten JK, Errico TJ. Paraplegia after lumbosacral nerve root block: Report of three cases. *Spine J* 2002;2:70-5.
 70. Howick J, Bishop FL, Heneghan C, Wolstenholme J, Stevens S, Hobbs FD, et al. Placebo use in the United Kingdom: Results from a national survey of primary care practitioners. *PLOS One* 2013;8:e58247.
 71. Howick J, Friedemann C, Tsakok M, Watson R, Tsakok T, Thomas J, et al. Are treatments more effective than placebos? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e62599.
 72. Hoy DG, Bain C, Williams G, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, et al. A systematic review of the global prevalence of low back pain. *Arthritis Rheum* 2012;64:2028-37.
 73. Hoy DG, Protani M, De R, Buchbinder R. The epidemiology of neck pain. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2010;24:783-92.
 74. Hróbjartsson A, Gøtzsche PC. Placebo interventions for all clinical conditions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010;1:CD003974.
 75. Hunttoon MA, Martin DP. Paralysis after transforaminal epidural injection and previous spinal surgery. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2004;29:494-5.
 76. Huston CW, Slipman CW, Garvin C. Complications and side effects of cervical and lumbosacral selective nerve root injections. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2005;86:277-83.
 77. Igarashi T, Kikuchi S, Shubayev V, Myers RR. Exogenous tumor necrosis factor-alpha mimics nucleus pulposus-induced neuropathology. *Spine* 2000;25:2975-80.
 78. Institute of Medicine (IOM). *Relieving Pain in America: A Blueprint for Transforming Prevention, Care, Education, and Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2011.
 79. Iversen T, Solberg TK, Romner B, Wilsgaard T, Twisk J, Anke A, et al. Effect of caudal epidural steroid or saline injection in chronic lumbar radiculopathy: Multicentre, blinded, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5278.
 80. Jacobs WC, van Tulder M, Arts M, Rubinstein SM, van Middelkoop M, Ostelo R, et al. Surgery versus conservative management of sciatica due to a lumbar herniated disc: A systematic review. *Eur Spine J* 2011;20:513-22.
 81. Kainer MA, Reagan DR, Nguyen DB, Wiese AD, Wise ME, Ward J, et al. Fungal infections associated with contaminated methylprednisolone in Tennessee. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:2194-203.
 82. Kang SS, Hwang BM, Son H, Cheong IY, Lee SJ, Chung TY. Changes in bone mineral density in postmenopausal women treated with epidural steroid injections for lower back pain. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:229-36.
 83. Kang SS, Hwang BM, Son HJ, Cheong IY, Lee SJ, Lee SH, et al. The dosages of corticosteroid in transforaminal epidural steroid injections for lumbar radicular pain due to a herniated disc. *Pain Physician* 2011;14:361-70.
 84. Kaptchuk TJ, Friedlander E, Kelley JM, Sanchez MN, Kokkotou E, Singer JP, et al. Placebos without deception: A randomized controlled trial in irritable bowel syndrome. *PLoS ONE* 2010;5:e15591.
 85. Kaptchuk TJ, Stason WB, Davis RB, Legedza AR, Schnyer RN, Kerr CE, et al. Sham device v inert pill: Randomised controlled trial of two placebo treatments. *BMJ* 2006;332:391-7.
 86. Karaman H, Kavak GO, Tüfek A, Yldrm ZB. The complications of transforaminal lumbar epidural steroid injections. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2011;36:E819-24.
 87. Karppinen J, Malmivaara A, Kurunlahti M, Kyllönen E, Pienimäki T, Nieminen P, et al. Periradicular infiltration for sciatica: A randomized controlled trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2001;26:1059-67.
 88. Karppinen J, Ohinmaa A, Malmivaara A, Kurunlahti M, Kyllönen E, Pienimäki T, et al. Cost effectiveness of periradicular infiltration for sciatica: Subgroup analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2001;26:2587-95.
 89. Kawamata M, Takahashi T, Kozuka Y, Nawa Y, Nishikawa K, Narimatsu E, et al. Experimental incision induced pain in human skin: Effects of systemic lidocaine on flare formation and hyperalgesia. *Pain* 2002;100:77-89.
 90. Kennedy DJ, Dreyfuss P, Aprill CN, Bogduk N. Paraplegia following image-guided transforaminal lumbar spine epidural steroid injection: Two case reports. *Pain Med* 2009;10:1389-94.
 91. Khan S, Pioro EP. Cervical epidural injection complicated by syrinx formation: A case report. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2010;35:E614-6.
 92. Kim S, Hwang B. Relationship between bone mineral density and the frequent administration of epidural steroid injections in postmenopausal women with low back pain. *Pain Res Manag* 2014;19:30-4.
 93. Kim WH, Sim WS, Shin BS, Lee CJ, Jin HS, Lee JY, et al. Effects of two different doses of epidural steroid on blood glucose levels and pain control in patients with diabetes mellitus. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:557-68.
 94. Klenerman L, Greenwood R, Davenport HT, White DC, Peskett S. Lumbar epidural injections in the treatment of sciatica. *Br J Rheumatol* 1984;23:35-8.
 95. Koppert W, Ostermaier N, Sittl R, Weidner C, Schmelz M. Low dose lidocaine reduces secondary hyperalgesia by a central mode of action. *Pain* 2000;85:217-24.
 96. Koppert W, Zeck S, Sittl R. Low dose lidocaine suppresses experimentally induced hyperalgesia in humans. *Anesthesiology* 1998;89:1345-53.
 97. Kovacs FM, Urrutia G, Alarcón JD. Surgery versus conservative treatment for symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2011;36:E1335-51.
 98. Kraemer J, Ludwig J, Bickert U, Owczarek V, Traupe M. Lumbar epidural perineural injection: A new technique. *Eur Spine J* 1997;6:357-61.
 99. Lavoie PA, Khazen T, Filion PR. Mechanisms of the inhibition of fast axonal transport by local anesthetics. *Neuropharmacology* 1989;28:175-81.
 100. Leboeuf-Yde C, Nielsen J, Kyvik KO, Fejer R, Hartvigsen J. Pain in the lumbar, thoracic or cervical regions: Do age and gender matter? A population-based

- study of 34,902 Danish twins 20-71 years of age. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2009;10:39.
101. Leigh JP. Economic burden of occupational injury and illness in the United States. *Milbank Q* 2011;89:728-72.
 102. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:W65-94.
 103. Lyby PS, Forsberg JT, Asli O, Flaten MA. Induced fear reduces the effectiveness of a placebo intervention on pain. *Pain* 2012;153:1114-21.
 104. Lyders EM, Morris PP. A case of spinal cord infarction following lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injection: MR imaging and angiographic findings. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2009;30:1691-3.
 105. MacMahon PJ, Crosbie I, Kavanagh EC. Reducing the risk of spinal cord infarction during transforaminal steroid injections. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2010;31:E32.
 106. Malhotra G, Abbasi A, Rhee M. Complications of transforaminal cervical epidural steroid injections. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:731-9.
 107. Manchikanti KN, Atluri S, Singh V, Geffert S, Sehgal N, Falco FJ. An update of evaluation of therapeutic thoracic facet joint interventions. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E463-81.
 108. Manchikanti L, Abdi S, Atluri S, Balog CC, Benyamin RM, Boswell MV, et al. American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) guidelines for responsible opioid prescribing in chronic non-cancer pain: Part 2 – Guidance. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:S67-116.
 109. Manchikanti L, Abdi S, Atluri S, Benyamin RM, Boswell MV, Buenaventura RM, et al. An update of comprehensive evidence-based guidelines for interventional techniques of chronic spinal pain: Part II: Guidance and recommendations. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:S49-283.
 110. Manchikanti L, Benyamin RM, Falco FJ, Kaye AD, Hirsch JA. Do epidural injections provide short- and long-term relief for lumbar disc herniation? A systematic review. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2014 Feb 11. [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: 10.1007/s11999-014-3490-4.
 111. Manchikanti L, Benyamin RM, Falco FJE, Caraway DL, Datta S, Hirsch JA. Guidelines warfare over interventional techniques: Is there a lack of discourse or straw man? *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E1-26.
 112. Manchikanti L, Benyamin RM, Swicegood JR, Falco FJE, Datta S, Pampati V, et al. Assessment of practice patterns of perioperative management of antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapy in interventional pain management. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E955-68.
 113. Manchikanti L, Buenaventura RM, Manchikanti KN, Ruan X, Gupta S, Smith HS, et al. Effectiveness of therapeutic lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injections in managing lumbar spinal pain. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E199-245.
 114. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, Damron KS, Pampati V, Falco FJ. A randomized, double-blind controlled trial of lumbar interlaminar epidural injections in central spinal stenosis: 2-year follow-up. *Pain Physician* 2015;18:79-92.
 115. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, Damron KS, Pampati V, Falco FJ. Lumbar interlaminar epidural injections in central spinal stenosis: Preliminary results of a randomized, double-blind, active control trial. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:51-63.
 116. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, Pampati V, Benyamin RM. A randomized, double-blind, active-controlled trial of fluoroscopic lumbar interlaminar epidural injections in chronic axial or discogenic low back pain: Results of a 2-year follow-up. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:E491-504.
 117. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, Pampati V, Benyamin RM. Assessment of thoracic interlaminar epidural injections in managing chronic thoracic pain: A randomized, double-blind, controlled trial with a 2-year follow-up. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E327-38.
 118. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, Pampati V, Fellows B. Results of 2-year follow-up of a randomized, double-blind, controlled trial of fluoroscopic caudal epidural injections in central spinal stenosis. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:371-84.
 119. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, McManus CD, Pampati V. Fluoroscopic caudal epidural injections in managing chronic axial low back pain without disc herniation, radiculitis or facet joint pain. *J Pain Res* 2012;5:381-90.
 120. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, Pampati V, Falco FJ. Transforaminal epidural injections in chronic lumbar disc herniation: A randomized, double-blind, active-control trial. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E489-501.
 121. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, Pampati V, Malla Y. Two-year follow-up results of fluoroscopic cervical epidural injections in chronic axial or discogenic neck pain: A randomized, double-blind, controlled trial. *Int J Med Sci* 2014;11:309-20.
 122. Manchikanti L, Cash KA, Pampati V, Wargo BV, Malla Y. A randomized, double-blind, active control trial of fluoroscopic cervical interlaminar epidural injections in chronic pain of cervical disc herniation: Results of a 2-year follow-up. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:465-78.
 123. Manchikanti L, Falco FJ, Diwan S, Hirsch JA, Smith HS. Cervical radicular pain: The role of interlaminar and transforaminal epidural injections. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 2014;18:389.
 124. Manchikanti L, Falco FJE, Benyamin RM, Caraway DL, Helm II S, Wargo BV, et al. Assessment of infection control practices for interventional techniques: A best evidence synthesis of safe injection practices and use of single-dose medication vials. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E573-614.
 125. Manchikanti L, Falco FJ, Benyamin RM, Caraway DL, Kaye AD, Helm II S, et al. Assessment of bleeding risk of interventional techniques: A best evidence synthesis of practice patterns and perioperative management of anticoagulant and antithrombotic therapy. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:SE261-318.
 126. Manchikanti L, Falco FJE, Benyamin RM, Kaye AD, Boswell MV, Hirsch JA. A modified approach to grading of evidence. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E319-25.
 127. Manchikanti L, Falco FJ, Hirsch JA. Letter to the editor RE: Bicket M, Gupta A, Brown CH, Cohen SP. Epidural injections for spinal pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the “control” injections in randomized controlled trials. *Anesthesiology* 2013;119:907-31.
 128. Manchikanti L, Falco FJ, Singh V, Pampati V, Parr AT, Benyamin RM, et al. Utilization of interventional techniques in managing chronic pain in the Medicare population: Analysis of growth patterns from 2000 to 2011. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E969-82.
 129. Manchikanti L, Helm II S, Fellows B, Janata JW, Pampati V, Grider JS, et al. Opioid epidemic in the United States. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:ES9-38.
 130. Manchikanti L, Helm II S, Singh V, Hirsch JA. Accountable interventional pain management: A collaboration among practitioners, patients, payers, and government. *Pain Physician* 2013;16:E635-70.
 131. Manchikanti L, Hirsch JA, Cohen SP, Heavner JE, Falco FJ, Diwan S, et al. Assessment of methodologic quality of randomized trials of interventional techniques: Development of an interventional pain management specific instrument. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E263-90.
 132. Manchikanti L, Malla Y, Cash KA, McManus CD, Pampati V. Fluoroscopic cervical interlaminar epidural injections in managing chronic pain of cervical post-surgery syndrome: Preliminary results of a randomized, double-blind active control trial. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:13-26.
 133. Manchikanti L, Malla Y, Cash KA, McManus CD, Pampati V. Fluoroscopic epidural injections in cervical spinal stenosis: Preliminary results of a randomized, double-blind, active control trial. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E59-70.
 134. Manchikanti L, Malla Y, Wargo BV, Cash KA, McManus CD, Damron KS, et al. A prospective evaluation of bleeding risk of interventional techniques in chronic pain. *Pain Physician* 2011;14:317-29.
 135. Manchikanti L, Malla Y, Wargo BV, Cash KA, Pampati V, Fellows B. A prospective evaluation of complications of 10,000 fluoroscopically directed epidural injections. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:131-40.
 136. Manchikanti L, Malla Y, Wargo BV, Cash KA, Pampati V, Fellows B. Complications of fluoroscopically directed facet joint nerve blocks: A prospective evaluation of 7,500 episodes with 43,000 nerve blocks. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E143-50.
 137. Manchikanti L, Pampati V, Bakht C, Rivera J, Beyer C, Damron K, et al. Effectiveness of lumbar facet joint nerve blocks in chronic low back pain: A randomized clinical trial. *Pain Physician* 2001;4:101-17.
 138. Manchikanti L, Pampati V, Falco FJ, Hirsch JA. Growth of spinal interventional pain management techniques: Analysis of utilization trends and Medicare expenditures 2000 to 2008. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2013;38:157-68.
 139. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Cash KA, Pampati V, Damron KS, Boswell MV. Effect of fluoroscopically guided caudal epidural steroid or local anesthetic injections in the treatment of lumbar disc herniation and radiculitis: A randomized, controlled, double blind trial with a two-year follow-up. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:273-86.
 140. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Cash KA, Pampati V, Datta S. Fluoroscopic caudal epidural injections in managing post lumbar surgery syndrome: Two-year results of a randomized, double-blind, active-control trial. *Int J Med Sci* 2012;9:582-91.
 141. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Cash KA, Pampati V, Falco FJ. A randomized, double-blind, active-control trial of the effectiveness of lumbar interlaminar epidural injections in disc herniation. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E61-74.

142. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, Cash KA, Fellows B. Comparative outcomes of a 2-year follow-up of cervical medial branch blocks in management of chronic neck pain: A randomized, double-blind controlled trial. *Pain Physician* 2010;13:437-50.
143. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJ, Cash KA, Pampati V, Fellows B. The role of thoracic medial branch blocks in managing chronic mid and upper back pain: A randomized, double-blind, active-control trial with a 2-year follow-up. *Anesthesiol Res Pract* 2012;2012:585806.
144. Manchikanti L, Singh V, Falco FJE, Cash KA, Pampati V. Evaluation of lumbar facet joint nerve blocks in managing chronic low back pain: A randomized, double-blind, controlled trial with a 2-year follow-up. *Int J Med Sci* 2010;7:124-35.
145. Manchikanti L, Singh V. Periradicular infiltration for sciatica. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2002;27:215-7.
146. Manchikanti L, Singh V. Periradicular infiltration for sciatica. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2002;27:335-6.
147. Manning DC, Hopwood MB. Corticosteroid injections for sciatica. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337:1242.
148. Mao J, Chen LL. Systemic lidocaine for neuropathic pain relief. *Pain* 2000;87:7-17.
149. Marquez-Lara A, Nandyala SV, Fineberg SJ, Singh K. Current trends in demographics, practice, and in-hospital outcomes in cervical spine surgery: A national database analysis between 2002 and 2011. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2014;39:476-81.
150. Martin BI, Deyo RA, Mirza SK, Turner JA, Comstock BA, Hollingworth W, et al. Expenditures and health status among adults with back and neck problems. *JAMA* 2008;299:656-64.
151. Martin BI, Turner JA, Mirza SK, Lee MJ, Comstock BA, Deyo RA. Trends in health care expenditures, utilization, and health status among US adults with spine problems, 1997-2006. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:2077-84.
152. McCahon RA, Ravenscroft A, Hodgkinson V, Evley R, Hardman J. A pilot study of the dose-response of caudal methylprednisolone with levobupivacaine in chronic lower back pain. *Anaesthesia* 2011;66:595-603.
153. Meadeb J, Rozenberg S, Duquesnoy B, Kuntz JL, Le Loët X, Sebert JL, et al. Forceful sacrococcygeal injections in the treatment of postdiscectomy sciatica. A controlled study versus glucocorticoid injections. *Joint Bone Spine* 2001;68:43-9.
154. Mehta S, Khalil AA, Alshekhlee A. Air myelopathy following a cervical epidural injection. *Pain Med* 2010;11:1678-9.
155. Melzack R,Coderre TJ, Katz J, Vaccarino AL. Central neuroplasticity and pathological pain. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 2001;933:157-74.
156. Mendelson J, Muppidi S, Silberstein S. Multiple intracerebral hemorrhages after cervical epidural injections. *Neurology* 2008;70:2415-6.
157. Miedema HS, Chorus AM, Wevers CW, van der Linden S. Chronicity of back problems during working life. *Spine* 1998;23:2021-8.
158. Minamide A, Tamaki T, Hashizume H, Yoshida M, Kawakami M, Hayashi N. Effects of steroids and lipopolysaccharide on spontaneous resorption of herniated intervertebral discs: An experimental study in the rabbit. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1998;23:870-6.
159. Nam HS, Park YB. Effects of transforaminal injection for degenerative lumbar scoliosis combined with spinal stenosis. *Ann Rehabil Med* 2011;35:154-23.
160. National Government Services, Inc. LCD for Pain Management (L28529). Effective Date 01/01/2009.
161. Ng L, Chaudhary N, Sell P. The efficacy of corticosteroids in periradicular infiltration for chronic radicular pain. A randomized, double-blind, controlled trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2005;30:857-62.
162. Noridian Healthcare Solutions, LLC. Local Coverage Determination (LCD). Lumbar Epidural Injections L33836. Revision effective Date: 2/26/2014.
163. Ohayon MM, Stingsl JC. Prevalence and comorbidity of chronic pain in the German general population. *J Psychiatr Res* 2012;46:444-50.
164. Orlando MP, Sherman MO. Corticosteroid injections for sciatica. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337:1242.
165. Owlia MB, Salimzadeh A, Alishiri G, Haghighi A. Comparison of two doses of corticosteroid in epidural steroid injection for lumbar radicular pain. *Singapore Med J* 2007;48:241-5.
166. Parr AT, Manchikanti L, Hameed H, Conn A, Manchikanti KN, Benyamin RM, et al. Caudal epidural injections in the management of chronic low back pain: A systematic appraisal of the literature. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:E159-98.
167. Pasqualucci A, Varrassi G, Braschi A, Peduto VA, Brunelli A, Marinangeli F, et al. Epidural local anesthetic plus corticosteroid for the treatment of cervical brachial radicular pain: Single injection versus continuous infusion. *Clin J Pain* 2007;23:551-7.
168. Pasqualucci A. Experimental and clinical studies about the preemptive analgesia with local anesthetics. Possible reasons of the failure. *Minerva Anestesiol* 1998;64:445-57.
169. Pasquier MM, Leri D. Injection intra-et extradurales de cocaine a dose minime dans le traitement de la sciaticque. *Bull Gen Ther* 1901;142:196.
170. Patel N. Re: Karppinen J. et al. Periradicular infiltration for sciatica. A randomized controlled trial. *Spine* 26, 1059-1067:2001. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2002;27:1588-9.
171. Patil PG, Turner DA, Pietrobon R. National trends in surgical procedures for degenerative cervical spine disease: 1990-2000. *Neurosurgery* 2005;57:753-8.
172. Pinto RZ, Maher CG, Ferreira ML, Hancock M, Oliveira VC, McLachlan AJ, et al. Epidural corticosteroid injections in the management of sciatica: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:865-77.
173. Plastaras CT, Heller DS, Sorosky BS, Houle TT. Pain reproduction during lumbosacral transforaminal epidural steroid injection does not affect outcome. *J Back Musculoskeletal Rehab* 2006;19:57-60.
174. Price C, Arden N, Coggan L, Rogers P. Cost-effectiveness and safety of epidural steroids in the management of sciatica. *Health Technol Assess* 2005;9:1-58, iii.
175. Rajae SS, Bae HW, Kanim LE, Delamarter RB. Spinal fusion in the United States: Analysis of trends from 1998 to 2008. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2012;37:67-76.
176. Raza K. Corticosteroid injections for sciatica. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337:1241.
177. Revel M, Auleley GR, Alaoui S, Nguyen M, Duruoz T, Eck-Michaud S, et al. Forceful epidural injections for the treatment of lumbosacral pain with post-operative lumbar spinal fibrosis. *Rev Rhum Engl Ed* 1996;63:270-7.
178. Riew KD, Yin Y, Gilula L, Bridwell KH, Lenke LG, Laurusen C, et al. The effect of nerve-root injections on the need for operative treatment of lumbar radicular pain. A prospective, randomized, controlled, double-blind study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2000;82-A: 1589-93.
179. Roberts ST, Willick SE, Rho ME, Rittenberg JD. Efficacy of lumbosacral transforaminal epidural steroid injections: A systematic review. *PM R* 2009;1:657-68.
180. Saripanidis S. Letter to the Editor re: Lversen T, et al. Re: Effect of caudal epidural steroid or saline injection in chronic lumbar radiculopathy: Multicentre, blinded, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5278. Gate control pain modulation theory invalidates the control group used in this research. Published online 10/8/2011.
181. Sato C, Sakai A, Ikeda Y, Suzuki H, Sakamoto A. The prolonged analgesic effect of epidural ropivacaine in a rat model of neuropathic pain. *Anesth Analg* 2008;106:313-20.
182. Sayegh FE, Kenanidis EI, Papavasiliou KA, Potoupnis ME, Kirkos JM, Kapetanios GA. Efficacy of steroid and nonsteroid caudal epidural injections for low back pain and sciatica: A prospective, randomized, double-blind clinical trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:1441-7.
183. Shah RV. Paraplegia following thoracic and lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injections: How relevant are particulate steroids? *Pain Pract* 2014;14:297-300.
184. Shah RV. Paraplegia following thoracic and lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injections: How relevant is physician negligence? *J Neurointerv Surg* 2014;6:166-8.
185. Sicard MA. Les injections medicamenteuse extradurales par voie saracoccygiene. *Comptes Rendus des Seances de la Societe de Biologie et de ses Filiales (Paris)* 1901;53:452-3.
186. Singh K, Nandyala SV, Marquez-Lara A, Fineberg SJ. Epidemiological trends in the utilization of bone morphogenetic protein in spinal fusions from 2002 to 2011. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2014;39:491-6.
187. Smith RM, Schaefer MK, Kainer MA, Wise M, Finks J, Duwve J, et al. Fungal infections associated with contaminated methylprednisolone injections. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1598-609.
188. Snoek W, Weber H, Jørgensen B. Double blind evaluation of extradural methyl prednisolone for herniated lumbar discs. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1977;48:635-41.
189. Staal JB, de Bie RA, de Vet HC, Hildebrandt J, Nelemans P. Injection therapy for subacute and chronic low back pain: An updated Cochrane review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:49-59.
190. Sugimoto M, Uchida I, Mashimoto T. Local anaesthetics have different

- mechanisms and sites of action at the recombinant NMDA receptors. *Br J Pharmacol* 2003;138:876-82.
191. Tachihara H, Sekiguchi M, Kikuchi S, Konno S. Do corticosteroids produce additional benefit in nerve root infiltration for lumbar disc herniation. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2008;33:743-7.
 192. Tafazal S, Ng L, Chaudhary N, Sell P. Corticosteroids in peri-radicular infiltration for radicular pain: A randomised double blind controlled trial. One year results and subgroup analysis. *Eur Spine J* 2009;18:1220-5.
 193. Thelin A, Holmberg S, Thelin N. Functioning in neck and low back pain from a 12-year perspective: A prospective population-based study. *J Rehabil Med* 2008;40:555-61.
 194. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Drug Safety Communications. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA requires label changes to warn of rare but serious neurologic problems after epidural corticosteroid injections for pain. Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/DrugSafety/UCM394286.pdf> [Last accessed on 2015 Jan 27].
 195. US Burden of Disease Collaborators. The state of US health, 1999-2010: Burden of diseases, injuries, and risk factors. *JAMA* 2013;310:591-608.
 196. van Tulder MW, Suttorp M, Morton S, Bouter LM, Shekelle P. Empirical evidence of an association between internal validity and effect size in randomized controlled trials of low-back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:1685-92.
 197. Ward A, Watson J, Wood P, Dunne C, Kerr D. Glucocorticoid epidural for sciatica: Metabolic and endocrine sequelae. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2002;41:68-71.
 198. Wilkinson IM, Cohen SP. Epidural steroid injections. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 2012;16:50-9.
 199. Wilson-MacDonald J, Burt G, Griffin D, Glynn C. Epidural steroid injection for nerve root compression: A randomized, controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2005;87-B: 352-5.
 200. Wittenberg RH, Greskötter KR, Steffen R, Schoenfeld BL. Is epidural injection treatment with hypertonic saline solution in intervertebral disk displacement useful? (The effect of NaCl solution on intervertebral disk tissue). *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb* 1990;128:223-6.
 201. Yamashita T, Takahashi K, Yonenobu K, Kikuchi S. Prevalence of neuropathic pain in cases with chronic pain related to spinal disorders. *J Orthop Sci* 2014;19:15-21.
 202. Yi Y, Hwang B, Son H, Cheong I. Low bone mineral density, but not epidural steroid injection, is associated with fracture in postmenopausal women with low back pain. *Pain Physician* 2012;15:441-9.
 203. Yland MJ. Letter to the Editor re: Iversen T, *et al.* Re: Effect of caudal epidural steroid or saline injection in chronic lumbar radiculopathy: Multicentre, blinded, randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5278. Published online 11/19/2011. Author's reply: Published online 9/29/2011.
 204. Zhang Y, Baik SH, Fendrick AM, Baicker K. Comparing local and regional variation in health care spending. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:1724-31.

Appendix 1: Randomized controlled trials quality rating system

Was the method of randomization adequate?	A random (unpredictable) assignment sequence. Examples of adequate methods are coin toss (for studies with two groups), rolling a dice (for studies with two or more groups), drawing of balls of different colors, drawing of ballots with the study group labels from a dark bag, computer-generated random sequence, preordered sealed envelopes, sequentially ordered vials, telephone call to a central office, and preordered list of treatment assignments. Examples of inadequate methods are alternation, birth date, social insurance/security number, date in which they are invited to participate in the study, and hospital registration number	Yes/no/unsure
Was the treatment allocation concealed?	Assignment generated by an independent person not responsible for determining the eligibility of the patients. This person has no information about the persons included in the trial and has no influence on the assignment sequence or on the decision about eligibility of the patient	Yes/no/unsure
Was knowledge of the allocated interventions adequately prevented during the study?		
Was the patient blinded to the intervention?	This item should be scored "yes" if the index and control groups are indistinguishable for the patients or if the success of blinding was tested among the patients and it was successful	Yes/no/unsure
Was the care provider blinded to the intervention?	This item should be scored "yes" if the index and control groups are indistinguishable for the care providers or if the success of blinding was tested among the care providers and it was successful	Yes/no/unsure
Was the outcome assessor blinded to the intervention?	Adequacy of blinding should be assessed for the primary outcomes. This item should be scored "yes" if the success of blinding was tested among the outcome assessors and it was successful or For patient-reported outcomes in which the patient is the outcome assessor (e.g., pain, disability): The blinding procedure is adequate for outcome assessors if participant blinding is scored "yes" For outcome criteria assessed during scheduled visit and that supposes a contact between participants and outcome assessors (e.g., clinical examination): The blinding procedure is adequate if patients are blinded, and the treatment or adverse effects of the treatment cannot be noticed during clinical examination For outcome criteria that do not suppose a contact with participants (e.g., radiography, magnetic resonance imaging): The blinding procedure is adequate if the treatment or adverse effects of the treatment cannot be noticed when assessing the main outcome For outcome criteria that are clinical or therapeutic events that will be determined by the interaction between patients and care providers (e.g., co-interventions, hospitalization length, treatment failure), in which the care provider is the outcome assessor: The blinding procedure is adequate for outcome assessors if item "4" (caregivers) is scored "yes" For outcome criteria that are assessed from data of the medical forms: The blinding procedure is adequate if the treatment or adverse effects of the treatment cannot be noticed on the extracted data	Yes/no/unsure
Were incomplete outcome data adequately addressed?		
Was the drop-out rate described and acceptable?	The number of participants who were included in the study but did not complete the observation period or were not included in the analysis must be described and reasons given. If the percentage of withdrawals and drop-outs does not exceed 20% for short-term follow-up and 30% for long-term follow-up and does not lead to substantial bias a "yes" is scored	Yes/no/unsure
Were all randomized participants analyzed in the group to which they were allocated?	All randomized patients are reported/analyzed in the group they were allocated to by randomization for the most important moments of effect measurement (minus missing values) irrespective of noncompliance and co-interventions	Yes/no/unsure
Are reports of the study free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting?	In order to receive a "yes," the review author determines if all the results from all prespecified outcomes have been adequately reported in the published report of the trial. This information is either obtained by comparing the protocol and the report, or in the absence of the protocol, assessing that the published report includes enough information to make this judgment	Yes/no/unsure
Other sources of potential bias		
Were the groups similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators?	In order to receive a "yes," groups have to be similar at baseline regarding demographic factors, duration and severity of complaints, percentage of patients with neurological symptoms, and value of main outcome measure (s)	Yes/no/unsure
Were co-interventions avoided or similar?	This item should be scored "yes" if there were no co-interventions or they were similar between the index and control groups	Yes/no/unsure
Was the compliance acceptable in all groups?	The reviewer determines if the compliance with the interventions is acceptable, based on the reported intensity, duration, number, and frequency of sessions for both the index intervention and control intervention (s). For example, physiotherapy treatment is usually administered over several sessions; therefore, it is necessary to assess how many sessions each patient attended. For single-session interventions (e.g., surgery), this item is irrelevant	Yes/no/unsure

Contd...

Appendix 1: Contd...

Was the timing of the outcome assessment similar in all groups?	Timing of outcome assessment should be identical for all intervention groups and for all important outcome assessments	Yes/no/unsure
---	--	---------------

Adapted from: Furlan AD, Pennick V, Bombardier C, van Tulder M; Editorial Board, Cochrane Back Review Group. 2009 updated method guidelines for systematic reviews in the Cochrane Back Review Group. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2009;34:1929-41^[46]

Appendix 2: Item checklist for assessment of randomized controlled trials of IPM techniques utilizing IPM-QRB

		Scoring
Trial design guidance and reporting		
CONSORT or SPIRIT		
Trial designed and reported without any guidance		0
Trial designed and reported utilizing minimum criteria other than CONSORT or SPIRIT criteria or trial was conducted prior to 2005		1
Trial implies it was based on CONSORT or SPIRIT without clear description with moderately significant criteria for randomized trials or the trial was conducted before 2005		2
Explicit use of CONSORT or SPIRIT with identification of criteria or trial conducted with high level reporting and criteria or conducted before 2005		3
Design factors		
Type and design of trial		
Poorly designed control group (quasi selection, convenient sampling)		0
Proper active-control or sham procedure with injection of active agent		2
Proper placebo control (no active solutions into active structures)		3
Setting/physician		
General setting with no specialty affiliation and general physician		0
Specialty of anesthesia/PMR/neurology/radiology/ortho, etc.		1
Interventional pain management with interventional pain management physician		2
Imaging		
Blind procedures		0
Ultrasound		1
CT		2
Fluoro		3
Sample size		
Less than 50 participants in the study without appropriate sample size determination		0
Sample size calculation with less than 25 patients in each group		1
Appropriate sample size calculation with at least 25 patients in each group		2
Appropriate sample size calculation with 50 patients in each group		3
Statistical methodology		
None or inappropriate		0
Appropriate		1
Patient factors		
Inclusiveness of population		
For epidural procedures		
Poorly identified mixed population		0
Clearly identified mixed population		1
Disorders specific trials (i.e., well defined spinal stenosis and disc herniation, disorder specific, disc herniation or spinal stenosis or post surgery syndrome)		2
For facet or sacroiliac joint interventions		
No diagnostic blocks		0
Selection with single diagnostic blocks		1
Selection with placebo or dual diagnostic blocks		2
Duration of pain		
Less than 3 months		0
3-6 months		1
> 6 months		2
Previous treatments		

Contd...

Appendix 2: Contd...

	Scoring
Conservative management including drug therapy, exercise therapy, physical therapy, etc.,	
Were not utilized	0
Were utilized sporadically in some patients	1
Were utilized in all patients	2
Duration of follow-up with appropriate interventions	
Less than 3 months or 12 weeks for epidural or facet joint procedures, etc., and 6 months for intradiscal procedures and implantables	0
3-6 months for epidural or facet joint procedures, etc., or 1 year for intradiscal procedures or implantables	1
6-17 months for epidurals or facet joint procedures, etc., and 2 years or longer for discal procedures and implantables	2
18 months or longer for epidurals and facet joint procedures, etc., or 5 years or longer for discal procedures and implantables	3
Outcomes	
Outcomes assessment criteria for significant improvement	
No descriptions of outcomes or <20% change in pain rating or functional status	0
Pain rating with a decrease of 2 or more points or more than 20% reduction or functional status improvement of more than 20%	1
Pain rating with decrease of ≥ 2 points and $\geq 20\%$ change or functional status improvement of $\geq 20\%$	2
Pain rating with a decrease of 3 or more points or more than 50% reduction or functional status improvement with a 50% or 40% reduction in disability score	2
Significant improvement with pain and function $\geq 50\%$ or 3 points and 40% reduction in disability scores	4
Analysis of all randomized participants in the groups	
Not performed	0
Performed without intent-to-treat analysis without inclusion of all randomized participants	1
All participants included with or without intent-to-treat analysis	2
Description of drop out rate	
No description of dropouts, despite reporting of incomplete data or $\geq 20\%$ withdrawal	0
Less than 20% withdrawal in one year in any group	1
Less than 30% withdrawal at 2 years in any group	2
Similarity of groups at baseline for important prognostic indicators	
Groups dissimilar with significant influence on outcomes with or without appropriate randomization and allocation	0
Groups dissimilar without influence on outcomes despite appropriate randomization and allocation	1
Groups similar with appropriate randomization and allocation	2
Role of Co-interventions	
Co-interventions were provided but were not similar in the majority of participants	0
No co-interventions or similar co-interventions were provided in the majority of the participants	1
Randomization	
Method of randomization	
Quasi randomized or poorly randomized or not described	0
Adequate randomization (coin toss, drawing of balls of different colors, drawing of ballots)	1
High quality randomization (computer generated random sequence, preordered sealed envelopes, sequentially ordered vials, telephone call, preordered list of treatment assignments, etc.)	2
Allocation concealment	
Concealed treatment allocation	
Poor concealment of allocation (open enrollment) or inadequate description of concealment	0
Concealment of allocation with borderline or good description of the process with probability of failure of concealment	1
High quality concealment with strict controls (independent assignment without influence on the assignment sequence)	2
Blinding	
Patient blinding	
Patients not blinded	0
Patients blinded adequately	1
Care provider blinding	

Contd...

Appendix 2: Contd...

	Scoring
Care provider not blinded	0
Care provider blinded adequately	1
Outcome assessor blinding	
Outcome assessor not blinded or was able to identify the groups	0
Performed by a blinded independent assessor with inability to identify the assignment-based provider intervention (i.e., subcutaneous injection, intramuscular distant injection, difference in preparation or equipment use, numbness and weakness, etc.)	1
Conflicts of interest	
Funding and sponsorship	
Trial included industry employees	-3
Industry employees involved; high levels of funding with remunerations by industry or an organization funded with conflicts	-3
Industry or organizational funding with reimbursement of expenses with some involvement	0
Industry or organization funding of expenses without involvement	1
Funding by internal resources only with supporting entity unrelated to industry	2
Governmental funding without conflict such as NIH, NHS, AHRQ	3
Conflicts of interest	
None disclosed with potential implied conflict	0
Marginally disclosed with potential conflict	1
Well disclosed with minor conflicts	2
Well disclosed with no conflicts	3
Hidden conflicts with poor disclosure	-1
Misleading disclosure with conflicts	-2
Major impact related to conflicts	-3
Total	48

Source: Manchikanti L, Hirsch JA, Cohen SP, Heavner JE, Falco FJE, Diwan S, et al. Assessment of methodologic quality of randomized trials of interventional techniques: Development of an interventional pain management specific instrument. *Pain Physician* 2014;17:E263-90.^[131] NIH: National institutes of health, NHS: National health service, AHRQ: Agency for healthcare research and quality, PMR: Physical medicine and rehabilitation, CT: Computed tomography, IPM: Interventional pain management techniques, QRB: Quality appraisal of reliability and risk of bias assessment