Author, Year Title Lee, 2009	Study Design RCT	Country Setting South Korea Single center Physical medicine clinic	due to herniated intervertebral disc or spinal stenosis	Exclusion Criteria Unilateral or bilateral leg pain, arterial vascular disease, lumbar epidural steroid injection in last 2 months, prior lumbar spine surgery, presence of neurological deficits	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled) Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 202 Analyzed: 192 (116 vs. 76) at 2 weeks to 4 months	Type of Intervention (experimental and control groups, dose, duration of treatment) A: Transforaminal epidural injection with 20 mg triamcinolone acetonide (0.5 ml) with lidocaine 0.5% (4 ml) with fluoroscopic guidance (n=116) B: Interlaminar epidural injection with 40 mg triamcinolone acetonide (1 ml) with lidocaine 0.5% (8 ml) with fluoroscopic guidance (n=76)
Manchikanti, 2012 Also Manchikanti 2011 Manchikanti 2008	RCT	USA Single center Pain clinic	herniation and negative controlled local anesthetic blocks for facet or sacroiliac joint pain; ≥18 years of age; history of chronic function-limiting low back pain for >6 months;	lumbar surgery; uncontrolled or unstable opioid use; uncontrolled psychiatric disorders; uncontrolled medical illness, either acute or	Approached: 147 Eligible: 133 Randomized: 120 (60 vs. 60) Analyzed: 120 (60 vs. 60) at 24 months, including 22 (10 vs. 12) lost to followup	A: Caudal epidural with 6 mg betamethasone or 40 mg methylprednisolone (1 ml) with lidocaine 0.5% (9 ml) with fluoroscopic guidance (n=60) B: Caudal epidural with lidocaine 0.5% (10 ml) with fluoroscopic guidance (n=60)

Author, Year Title Lee, 2009	Age (mean): 42 vs. 42 in herniated disc group, 62 vs. 62 years in spinal stenosis group Male: 61% vs. 50% in herniated disc group, 35% vs. 26% in spinal stenosis	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received) A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Not specified Other patient characteristics: 52% herniated disc, 58% spinal stenosis (analyzed separately)	Number and Frequency of Injections Number of Levels Provider Experience Number of injections: Mean not reported, maximum of three interlaminar injections at minimum 2 week intervals, maximum number of transforaminal injections not reported (injection performed bilaterally) Number of levels: Appears to be single Provider experience: Not reported	Imaging Guidance Fluoroscopy with contrast verification in epidural space
Manchikanti, 2012 Also Manchikanti 2011 Manchikanti 2008	Male: 37% vs. 22% Duration of pain (months): 92 vs. 100 Baseline pain (0 to 10 NRS): 7.9 vs.	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported	Number of injections: Mean 5.5 vs. 4.5 over 2 years, frequency not specified Number of levels: Caudal Provider experience: Not reported	Fluoroscopy with contrast verification in epidural space

Author, Year	Type of	Results
Title Lee, 2009	Comparison Transforaminal	(acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed) Herniated disc group
Lee, 2003	versus interlaminar epidural injection with corticosteroid plus local anesthetic	Roland pain score (0 to 5): 3.34 vs. 3.25 at baseline, 1.55 vs. 1.53 at 2 w, 1.57 vs. 1.59 at 2 m, 1.66 vs. 1.72 at 4 m Patient Satisfaction Index score 1 or 2 (1 to 4 scale): 78% (46/59) vs. 85% (29/34) at 2 w, RR 0.91 (95% CI 0.75 to 1.11); 83% (49/59) vs. 85% (29/34) at 2 m, RR 0.97 (95% CI 0.81 to 1.17); 76% (45/59) vs. 85% (29/34) at 4 m, RR 0.89 (95%
		Spinal stenosis group Roland pain score (0 to 5): 3.39 vs. 3.31 at baseline, 1.6 vs. 2.19 at 2 w, 1.67 vs. 2.12 at 2 m, 1.79 vs. 2.19 at 4 m (p<0.05 at 2 w, 2 m, and 4 m) Patient Satisfaction Index score 1 or 2 (1 to 4 scale): 75% (43/57) vs. 64% (27/42) at 2 w, RR 1.17 (95% CI 0.90 to 1.54); 70% (40/57) vs. 57% (25/42) at 2 m, RR 1.18 (95% CI 0.87 to 1.59); 67% (38/57) vs. 52% (22/42) at 4 m, RR 1.27 (95% CI 0.90 to 1.79) Pain score improved ≥2 points (0-10 pain NRS): 54% (31/57) vs. 36% (15/42) at 2 w, RR 1.52 (95% CI 0.95 to 2.44); 61% (35/57) vs. 36% (15/42) at 2 m, RR 1.72 (95% CI 1.09 to 2.71); 51% (29/57) vs. 31% (13/42) at 4 m, RR 1.64 (95% CI 0.98 to 2.76)
Manchikanti, 2012	Caudal epidural	A vs. B
Also Manchikanti 2011 Manchikanti 2008	injection with local anesthetic	Pain Pain (mean NRS, 0 to 10): 7.9 vs. 8.0 at baseline, 3.6 vs. 4.2 at 3 months, 3.7 vs. 4.1 at 6 months, 3.8 vs. 4.3 at 12 months, 4.0 vs. 4.4 at 24 months (p=0.52 for group difference) Pain relief >=50% from baseline: 80% (48/60) vs. 68% (41/60) at 3 months, 80% (48/60) vs. 68% (41/60) at 6 months, 72% (43/60) vs. 63% (38/60) at 12 months, 65% (39/60) vs. 57% (34/60) at 24 months
		Function         ODI (0 to 50): 28 vs. 28 at baseline, 14 vs. 16 at 3 months, 14 vs. 16 at 6 months, 14 vs. 16 at 12 months, 15 vs. 16 at 24 months (p=0.21 for group difference)         ODI improved >=50% from baseline: 75% (45/60) vs. 60% (36/60) at 3 months, 75% (45/60) vs. 62% (37/60) at 6 months, 72% (43/60) vs. 56% (34/60) at 12 months, 63% (38/60) vs. 56% (34/60) at 24 months         Other Outcomes         Onigid use (mg MED/day): 26 up, 24 at baseline, 20 up, 20 at 2 months, 21 up, 22 at 6 months, 20 up, 23 at 12 months, 20 up, 20 at 2 months, 21 up, 22 at 6 months, 20 up, 23 at 12 months, 20 up, 20 up, 20 at 2 months, 21 up, 22 at 6 months, 21 up, 22 up
		Opioid use (mg MED/day): 36 vs. 34 at baseline, 30 vs. 29 at 3 months, 31 vs. 32 at 6 months, 30 vs. 32 at 12 months, 30 vs. 31 at 24 months (p=0.45 for group difference)

Author, Year Title Lee, 2009	Duration of Followup 4 months	Loss to Followup 10/192 at 2 weeks to 4 months		Adverse Events and Withdrawal due to Adverse Events Not reported	<b>Sponsor</b> Wooridul Spine Foundation	Quality Rating Fair	Comments
Manchikanti, 2012 Also Manchikanti 2011 Manchikanti 2008	24 months	A vs. B: 17% (10/60) vs. 20% (12/60) at 24 months	Appears complete	"None of the patients reported significant adverse events"	None reported	Fair	Primary ITT analysis based on baseline data or last followup for patients lost to followup

Author, Year Title	Study Design	Country Setting	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Type of Intervention (experimental and control groups, dose, duration of treatment)
Manchikanti, 2013 Also Manchikanti 2012	RCT	USA Single center		Lumbar facet joint or sacroiliac joint pain based on controlled,	•	A: Interlaminar epidural injection with 6 mg betamethasone (1 ml) and lidocaine 0.5% (5 ml) with
Manchikanti 2010		Pain clinic	low back pain for >6 months; failure to improve with conservative management; imaging findings not specified	comparative local anesthetic blocks;	Analyzed: 120 (60 vs. 60) at 24 months, including 13 (9 vs.	fluoroscopic guidance (n=60) B: Interlaminar epidural injection with lidocaine 0.5% (6 ml) with fluoroscopic guidance (n=60)

Author, Year Title	Subject Characteristics	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)	Number and Frequency of Injections Number of Levels Provider Experience	Imaging Guidance
	A vs. B:	A vs. B:	Number of injections: Mean 3.8	Fluoroscopy with contrast
Also Manchikanti 2012	Age (mean): 43 vs. 41 years Male: 40% vs. 23% Race: Not reported	Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatment following intervention: Not	vs. 3.7 per year, frequency not specified Number of levels: Caudal	verification in epidural space
	Duration of pain (months): 129 vs. 104 Baseline pain (NRS 0 to 10): 7.7 vs. 8.0 Baseline ODI (0 to 50): 29 vs. 31	specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported	Provider experience: Not reported	

Author, Year Title	Type of Comparison	Results (acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
Manchikanti, 2013	Interlaminar epidural	A vs. B
Also Manchikanti 2012 Manchikanti 2010	steroid injection with local anesthetic	Pain Pain (mean NRS, 0 to 10): 7.7 vs. 8.0 at baseline, 3.5 vs. 3.6 at 3 months, 3.6 vs. 3.9 at 6 months, 3.7 vs. 3.7 at 12 months, 3.6 vs. 3.9 at 24 months (p=0.38 for group difference) Pain relief >=50% from baseline: 80% (48/60) vs. 68% (41/60) at 3 months, 80% (48/60) vs. 68% (41/60) at 6 months, 72% (43/60) vs. 63% (38/60) at 12 months, 65% (39/60) vs. 57% (34/60) at 24 months
		Function         ODI (0 to 50): 29 vs. 31 at baseline, 15 vs. 15 at 3 months, 14 vs. 15 at 6 months, 15 vs. 15 at 12 months, 15 vs. 15 at 24 months (p=0.29 for group difference)         ODI improved >=50% from baseline: 75% (45/60) vs. 60% (36/60) at 3 months, 75% (45/60) vs. 62% (37/60) at 6 months, 72% (43/60) vs. 56% (34/60) at 12 months, 63% (38/60) vs. 56% (34/60) at 24 months
		Other Outcomes Opioid use (mg MED/day): 53 vs. 57 at baseline, 40 vs. 36 at 3 months, 42 vs. 36 at 6 months, 42 vs. 36 at 12 months, 42 vs. 36 at 24 months (p=0.45 for group difference)

Author, Year Title	Duration of Followup	Loss to Followup	Compliance to Treatment	Adverse Events and Withdrawal due to Adverse Events	Sponsor	Quality Rating	Comments
Manchikanti, 2013 Also Manchikanti 2012	24 months	A vs. B: 27% (16/60) vs. 17% (10/60) at 24 months	Appears complete	4 subarachnoid punctures without headache and one case of nerve root irritation,	None reported	Fair	Primary ITT analysis based on baseline data or last followup for patients lost to
Manchikanti 2010				not reported by group			followup

E=electronic; ITT=intention-to-treat; m=month; MED=minimal effective dose; n=number; NCS=Nerve Conduction Study; NRS=Numerical Rating Scale; ODI=Oswestry Disability Index; p=p value; RCT=randomized controlled trial; SI=sacroiliac

### Please see Appendix C. Included Studies for full study references.