Author, Year Title Ackerman, 2008	Study Design	USA Single center Pain clinic	Inclusion Criteria  18 to 55 years of age; nonradicular low back pain, SPECT positive for lumbar facet joint involvement; excluded patients with normal MRI imaging	Facet Joint Block (percent pain relief) Requirements Not required	Imaging Requirements for Patient Selection Required (SPECT, excluded if MRI normal)	Enrollment <6 months (mean 7.6
Carette, 1991	RCT	Pain clinic	18 to 65 years of age; first or recurrent episode of low back pain, buttock pain, or both for ≥6 months; pain present on day of enrollment; normal neurological exam; at least 50% reduction in pain following uncontrolled facet joint block at L4-L5 and/or L5-S1 followed by return of pain by 2 weeks after block (imaging findings not required)	Single intraarticular facet joint block (≥50% pain relief)	Not required	≥6 months (median 18- 24 months)

Author, Year Title	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Subject Age, Sex, Diagnosis, Duration of Pain, Severity of Pain	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)
Ackerman, 2008	Allergy to study drugs, radicular symptoms, pregnant, steroid exposure within 4 weeks, workman's compensation or motor vehicle accident, anticoagulant therapy, lumbar disc herniation, spinal stenosis, lumbar compression fracture, positive bleeding history, pain longer than 6 months, schedule II opioid use	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 46 (23 vs. 23) Analyzed: 46 at 12 w	A vs. B Age (mean): 41 vs. 38 years Male: 52% vs. 61% Duration of pain: Not reported by group, mean 7.6 w overall Baseline pain (0-10 NRS): 7.8 vs. 8.1 Baseline function (0-100 ODI): 31 vs. 34	Treatment prior to intervention: Not reported Treatments following intervention: Not reported Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Carette, 1991	tumor, infection, or spondylitis); previous injections into the facet joints or low back surgery; pregnant; known allergy to local anesthetic or	Approached: Not reported; 190 underwent diagnostic facet joint block Eligible:108 Randomized: 101 (51 vs. 50) Analyzed: 95 (48 vs. 47) at 6 m	Age (mean): 42 vs. 43 years Male: 51% vs. 58% Duration of pain (median, months): 18 versus 24 Baseline pain (0-10 VAS): 6.3 vs. 6.2 Baseline Sickness Impact Profile	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Restricted to acetaminophen Treatments following intervention: Physicians asked to limit concurrent treatments to acetaminophen; 11 vs. 6 patients received other treatments (antidepressant, physical therapy, additional injection) through 6 months Other patient characteristics: Not reported

Author, Year Title Ackerman, 2008	triamcinolone (0.2 ml) and 1% lidocaine (0.5 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Medial branch block with at medial branches of doral rami with 8 mg triamcinolone (0.2 ml) and	Number and Frequency of Injections, Number of Levels, Provider Experience  Number and frequency of injections: Injections appeared to be performed once Number of levels: 5 levels bilaterally Provider experience: Physician fellowship trained and board certified in anesthesiology and pain medicine	Imaging Guidance Fluoroscopic guidance	Type of Comparator Intra-articular versus medial branch corticosteroid injection
Carette, 1991	methylprednisolone acetate (1 ml) plus isotonic saline (1 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance	Number and frequency of injections: Mean 3.6 vs. 3.6 injections, frequency not specified Number of levels: 2 vs. 2 (L4/L5 and L5/S1), bilateral 80% vs. 79%	Fluoroscopic guidance	Intraarticular injection of saline

Author, Year	Results
Title	(acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
Ackerman, 2008	A vs. B Pain (0-10 NRS): 7.8 vs. 8.1 at baseline, 3.2 vs. 5.4 at 12 w (p<0.05) Pain relief ≥50% (0-10 NRS): 61% (14/23) vs. 26% (6/23) at 12 w, RR 2.33 (95% CI 1.09 to 5.00) ODI (0-100): 31 vs. 34 at baseline, 12 vs. 23 at 12 w (p<0.05)
Carette, 1991	A vs. B Pain Pain (0-10 VAS): 4.5 vs. 4.7 at 1 m, 4.0 vs. 5.0 at 6 m (p<0.05) McGill pain questionnaire, pain rating index (scale NR): 19.0 vs. 22.8 at 1 m (p>0.05); 17.1 vs. 21.6 at 6 m (p>0.05) McGill pain questionnaire, present pain intensity (0 to 5): 2.3 vs. 2.6 at 1 m (p>0.05); 2.1 vs. 2.9 at 6 m (p>0.05)  Function Sickness Impact Profile, overall (0-100): 9.3 vs. 9.8 at 1 m (p>0.05), 7.8 vs. 10.8 at 6 m (p>0.05) Sickness Impact Profile, physical dimension (0-100): 5.2 vs. 6.3 at 1 m (p>0.05), 4.3 vs. 7.9 at 6 m (p<0.05) Sickness Impact Profile, psychosocial dimension: 8.2 vs. 9.0 at 1 m (p>0.05); 7.7 vs. 9.0 at 6 m (p>0.05) Bed rest in past 2 weeks (days): 0.3 vs. 0.1 at 1 m (p>0.05), 0.2 vs. 0.4 at 6 m (p>0.05) Complete restriction in main activity in past 2 weeks (days): 3.2 vs. 2.2 at 1 m (p>0.05); 1.3 vs. 2.9 at 6 m (p>0.05)  Global Assessment Overall effect (7 category scale), "very marked" or "marked improvement": 42% (20/48) vs. 33% (16/48) at 1 m (p=0.53), 46% (22/48) vs. 15% (7/47) at 6 m (p=0.002)

Author, Year Title Ackerman, 2008	Duration of Followup 12 weeks	Loss to Followup 0% at 12 w	Compliance to Treatment Appears complete	Adverse Events and Withdrawals due to Adverse Events  Not reported	Quality Rating	Sponsor Not reported
Carette, 1991	6 months	5.9% (3/51) vs. 6.0%		"No adverse events reported, other than transient local pain at the injection sites."	Fair	Not reported

Author, Year Title	Study Design		Inclusion Criteria	Facet Joint Block (percent pain relief) Requirements	Imaging Requirements for Patient Selection	Duration of Symptoms at Enrollment
Civelek, 2012	RCT	not reported Neurosurgery clinic	Chronic and debilitating low back pain thought due to lumbar facet syndrome, not responding to conservative treatment for up to 6 weeks (mean duration 19 months), pain relief after facet joint injection for radiofrequency denervation patients (methods of facet joint block not reported, facet joint block not reported as required for facet joint injection patients, imaging findings of facet joint arthritis described but not clearly required)	group: Not required  Facet denervation group: Facet joint block, methods not reported (%	Unclear	19 months (mean)
Fuchs, 2005	RCT		Low back pain for at least 3 months; radiologic evidence of facet joint osteoarthritis with osteophyte formation (Kellgreen grade 2/3); facet joint block not required	Not required	Required (CT)	>3 months
Galiano, 2007	RCT	Germany Single center Neurosurgery and radiology clinic	Chronic low back pain > 6 months; CT or MRI imaging of lumbar spine (findings not specified); >18 years of age	Not required	Required (CT or MRI)	>6 months

Author, Year Title	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Subject Age, Sex, Diagnosis, Duration of Pain, Severity of Pain	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)
Civelek, 2012	Radicular pain; neurogenic claudication; neurologic deficits; acute or uncontrolled medical illness; history of adverse reaction to local anesthetics; pregnant or lactating	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 100 (50 vs. 50) Analyzed: 100 at 1 y	A vs. B: Age (mean): 56 vs. 52 years Male: 29% vs. 30% Duration of symptoms (mean months): 19 vs. 19 Baseline pain score (0-10 NRS): 8.5 vs. 82 Baseline EQ-5D (5-15): 14 vs. 15	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Spine rehabilitation program for 4-6 weeks in patients who responded favorably to procedure at 1 week, surgery or physical therapy offered to patients who did not respond at 1 week Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Fuchs, 2005	Hypersensitivity or contraindication to study medications; contraindication to intraarticular treatment; anticoagulation, radicular pain, or other specific conditions on clinical examination or CT scan	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 60 (30 vs. 30) Analyzed: 59 (30 vs. 29)	A vs. B: Age (mean): 66 vs. 65 years Male: 20% vs. 40% Duration of symptoms: Not reported (minimum 3 mos.) Baseline pain score (0-100 VAS): 69 vs. 69 Baseline RDQ (0-24): 12 vs. 12	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Galiano, 2007	Local or systemic infection; allergy to steroids or anesthetics; uncorrectable coagulopathy; pregnancy	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 40 (20 vs. 20) Analyzed: Not reported	A vs. B: Age (mean): 49 vs. 49 years Male: 35% vs. 70% Duration of symptoms: Not reported (minimum 6 m) Baseline pain score (0-10 VAS): 71 vs.73 Baseline function: Not reported	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Lumbar surgery (35% vs. 35%) Treatments following intervention: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported

Author, Year Title	Type of Intervention (experimental & control groups, dose, duration of treatment)	Number and Frequency of Injections, Number of Levels, Provider Experience	Imaging Guidance	Type of Comparator
Civelek, 2012	A: Extra-articular facet joint injection to site of medial branch of the dorsal spinal ramus with 40 mg methylprednisolone (1 ml) and 1% lidocaine (8 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Radiofrequency facet denervation at medial branch of the dorsal spinal ramus performed at 80° C for 120 s, with fluoroscopic guidance and electrostimulation confirmation	Number and frequency of injections: Appears to be one Number of levels 1-level: 54% vs. 52% 2-level: 26% vs. 28% 3-level: 16% vs. 16% 4-level: 4% vs. 4% Provider experience: 2 providers with 5+ years experience	A: Fluoroscopic guidance B: Fluoroscopic guidance with electrostimulation confirmation	Radiofrequency denervation
Fuchs, 2005	A: Intraarticular facet joint injection with 10 mg triamcinolone acetonide (1 ml), with CT fluoroscopic guidance  B: Intraarticular facet joint injection with 10 mg sodium hyaluronate (1 ml), with CT fluoroscopic guidance	Number and frequency of injections: 3 injections performed at different levels at weekly intervals Number of levels: 3 over 3 weeks (bilateral) Provider experience: Not reported	CT fluoroscopic guidance	Intraarticular facet join injection of hyaluronic acid
Galiano, 2007	A: CT-guided intraarticular facet joint injection with 4 mg betamethasone (1 ml), 1% lidocaine (1 ml), and 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride (1 ml)  B: Ultrasound-guided intraarticular facet joint injection with 4 mg betamethasone (1 ml), 1% lidocaine (1 ml), and 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride (1 ml)	Number and frequency of injections: Single injection Number of levels: Single level Provider experience: Not reported	A: CT guidance (contrast verification not reported)  B: Ultrasound guidance (contrast verification not reported)	Type of guidance (CT vs. ultrasound)

Author, Year Title	Results (acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
Civelek, 2012	A vs. B
,	<u>Pain</u>
	Pain (0-10 VNS): 8.5 vs. 8.2 at baseline, 3.4 vs. 2.2 at 1 m, 4.4 VS. 2.5 at 6 m, 4.9 vs. 2.6 at 12 m (p<0.01 at all time points except baseline) Pain improved >50%: 80% vs. 100% at 1 m, 68% vs. 90% at 6 m, 62% vs. 88% at 12 m
	Other Outcomes
	NASS patient satisfaction questionnaire (1-4): 1.3 vs. 1.3 at 1 m (p>0.05), 1.7 vs. 1.4 at 6 m (p>0.05), 2.0 vs. 1.5 at 12 m (p=0.04)
	NASS score 1 or 2: 88% vs. 100% at 1 m, 75% vs. 90% at 6 m, 66% vs. 88% at 12 m EQ-5D (scale, 5-15): 15 vs. 14 at baseline, 6.0 vs. 5.6 at 1 m, 7.2 vs. 6.5 at 6 m, 8.0 vs. 6.7 at 12 m (p>0.05 at all time points)
	EQ-5D <9: 89% vs. 98% at 1 m, 75% vs. 92% at 6 m, 69% vs. 90% at 12 m
Fuchs, 2005	A vs. B
	<u>Pain</u>
	Pain (0-100 VAS): 69 vs. 69 at baseline, 30 vs. 41 at 1 m, 33 vs 38 at 6 m (p>0.05)
	<u>Function</u>
	Roland Morris (0-24): 12 vs. 12 at baseline, 7.2 vs. 8.4 at 1 m, 8.3 vs. 7.1 at 6 m (p>0.05)
	ODI (0-50): 18 vs. 21 at baseline, 12 vs. 14 at 1 m, 13 vs. 13 at 6 m (p>0.05) Low Back Outcome Score (0-75): 33 vs. 32 at baseline, 44 vs. 43 at 1 m, 44 vs. 46 at 6 m (p>0.05)
	LOW Back Outcome Score (0-75). 33 vs. 32 at baseline, 44 vs. 43 at 1 m, 44 vs. 46 at 6 m (p>0.05)
	Other Outcomes
	SF-36: "Similar improvement" between groups on all subscales
Galiano, 2007	A vs. B
	Pain (0-100 VAS, data estimated from graph): 46 vs. 38 at 6 w (p<0.01)
	and the vite, data commuted from graphiji. To verify

Author, Year Title	Duration of Followup	Loss to Followup	Compliance to Treatment	Adverse Events and Withdrawals due to Adverse Events	Quality Rating	Sponsor
Civelek, 2012	12 months	0% at 12 m	Appears complete	A vs. B Infection: 0% vs. 0% New motor deficit: 0% vs. 0% New sensory deficit: 0% vs. 0% Increase in severity of low back pain: 0% vs. 4% (resolved within 6- 8 weeks)	Fair	Not reported
Fuchs, 2005	6 months	A vs. B 0% (0/30) vs. 3.3% (1/29) at 6 m	Appears complete	"No significant adverse events"	Fair	Not reported
Galiano, 2007	6 weeks	Not reported	Appears complete (4 ultrasound patients received CT guidance after ultrasound could not provide adequate resolution)	Fluid retention with edema: 1 (group not reported)	Fair	Not reported

Author, Year Title Lakemeier, 2013	Germany Single center Orthopedic clinic	Inclusion Criteria  Lumbar facet joint-related low back pain for at least 24 months; ≥18 years of age; pain reduction ≥50% with uncontrolled intraarticular facet joint block; lumbar facet joint osteoarthritis and hypertrophy in the L3/L4-L5/S1 segments on MRI	Facet Joint Block (percent pain relief) Requirements Single intraarticular facet joint block (≥50% pain relief)	Imaging Requirements for Patient Selection Required (MRI)	Duration of Symptoms at Enrollment >24 months
Lilius, 1989	Single center Clinic setting unclear	Back pain >3 months, localized to one side with tenderness and local muscle spasm over the facet joints; negative straight leg raise (response to facet joint block and imaging findings not required)	Not required	Not required	>3 months

Author, Year Title	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Subject Age, Sex, Diagnosis, Duration of Pain, Severity of Pain	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)
Lakemeier, 2013	History of osteoporosis or malignancies; allergies to local anesthetics; pregnant or lactating; lumbar spinal stenosis or spinal instability; vertebral fractures; symptomatic radiculopathies; uncontrolled psychiatric disorders, uncontrolled medical illness; history of adverse reactions to corticosteroids.	Approached: 89 Eligible: 69 Randomized: 56 (29 vs. 27) Analyzed: 52 (26 vs. 26) at 6 m	A vs. B: Age (mean): 56 vs. 58 years Male: 62% vs. 65% Duration of symptoms: Not reported (≥24 months required for inclusion) Baseline pain score (0-10 VAS): 7.0 vs. 6.6 Baseline ODI (0-100): 39 vs. 41	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Lilius, 1989	Not described	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 109 (28 vs. 39 vs. 42) Analyzed: 104 at 3 m	A vs. B vs. C: Age (mean): 44 years overall Male: 44% overall Duration of symptoms: Not reported Baseline pain (0 to 100 VAS): 49 overall Baseline function: Not reported "No important differences between groups for age, sex, duration of symptoms, previous operations"; data not reported by group	A vs. B vs. C: Treatments prior to intervention: Not reported Treatments following intervention: Not reported Other patient characteristics: Not reported

Author, Year Title Lakemeier, 2013	Type of Intervention (experimental & control groups, dose, duration of treatment)  A: Intraarticular facet injection with betamethasone 3 mg (1 ml) plus 0.5% bupivacaine (0.5 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance; sham denervation (electrodes not connected to generator)  B: Radiofrequency denervation of facet joint: 0.5% bupivacaine (1ml), radiofrequency applied to site of the dorsal ramus medial branch of the target facet joint at 80°C for 90 seconds, with fluoroscopic guidance and electrostimulation confirmation	Unclear Number of levels: Unclear Provider experience: "Experienced spinal surgeon"	Type of Comparator Radiofrequency denervation
Lilius, 1989	A: Intraarticular facet joint injection with 80 mg methylprednisolone acetate (2 ml) plus 30 mg bupivacaine (6 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Extra-articular (pericapsular) facet joint injection	Appears to be single injection Number of levels: Unilateral, 2 levels per patient (L3/4 and L4/5 in15 patients and L4/5	Pericapsular injection of steroid + local anesthetic Intraarticular injection of saline

Author, Year	Results
Title	(acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
Lakemeier, 2013	A vs. B
	Pain
	Pain (0-10 VAS): 7.0 vs. 6.6 at baseline, 5.4 vs. 4.7 at 6 m; improvement 1.6 vs. 1.9 (p=0.35)
	Function
	Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (0-24): 1.32 vs. 12.8 at baseline, 9.0 vs. 9.1 at 6 m; improvement 4.2 vs. 3.7 (p=0.51)
	ODI (0-100): 39 vs. 41 at baseline, 33 vs. 28 at 6 m, improvement 5.7 vs. 13 (p=0.46)
	Other Outcomes
	Analgesic intake: "No measurable differences," data not provided
Lilius, 1989	A vs. B vs. C
	Pain The Control of t
	Pain (VAS, 0-100, estimated from graph): 45 vs. 52 vs. 52 at baseline, 31 vs. 35 vs. 41 at 2 w, 40 vs. 42 at 6 w, 44 vs. 42 vs. 43 at 3 m
	(p=0.33 vs. A vs. B, p=0.72 for A + B vs. C)
	Function
	Disability score: Data not reported (p=0.99 for A vs. B, p=0.89 for A + B vs. C)
	Return to work: No difference between groups (data not reported)

Author, Year Title Lakemeier, 2013	Duration of Followup 6 months		Compliance to Treatment 10% (3/29) vs. 3.7%	Adverse Events and Withdrawals due to Adverse Events "No major adverse events reported"	Quality Rating Good	Sponsor No funding
			(1/27) did not undergo allocated procedure or underwent additional procedure (nucleotomy)			
Lilius, 1989		A vs. B 3.6% (1/28) vs. 0% (0/39) vs. 4.8% (2/42)		Not reported by intervention group; unspecified "side effects" reported in 7/106 overall	Poor	None

	Study Design		Inclusion Criteria	Requirements	Imaging Requirements for Patient Selection	Enrollment
Manchikanti, 2010  Manchikanti, 2008	RCT	Pain clinic	History of chronic function-limiting low back pain for >6 months; >18 years of age; positive results on controlled diagnostic lumbar facet joint nerve blocks (≥80% concordant pain relief and ability to perform previously painful movements); Imaging findings not required	Two medial branch blocks (≥80% pain relief)	Not required	>6 months (mean 108 months)
Manchikanti, 2001	RCT	Single center Pain clinic	Low back pain for >6 months with or without lower extremity pain; positive response to comparative facet joint blocks (criteria for positive response not reported); imaging findings not required	Two facet joint blocks (% pain relief NR)	Not required	> 6 months (mean 21 months)

Author, Year Title	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Subject Age, Sex, Diagnosis, Duration of Pain, Severity of Pain	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)
Manchikanti, 2010  Manchikanti, 2008	Radicular pain, lumbar spine surgery within 3 months, uncontrolled major depression or psychiatric disorders, heavy opioid usage (300 mg MED/day), acute or uncontrolled medical illness, pregnant or lactating, unable to be positioned in the prone position, history of adverse reactions to study medications	Approached: 144 (152 in 2008 report) Eligible: 128 Randomized: 120 (60 vs. 60) Analyzed: 120 (including 24 patients with missing data) at 24 m	A vs. B: Age (mean): 46 vs. 48 years Male: 45% vs. 35% Duration of symptoms (months): 108 vs. 108 Baseline pain (0-10 NRS): 7.9 vs. 8.2 Baseline ODI (0-50): 26 vs. 27	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Not specified Prior lumbar surgery: 13% vs. 20% Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Manchikanti, 2001	<18 or >90 years, neurological deficits, response to conservative treatment, previous nerve block	Approached: 212 Eligible: 84 Randomized: 84 (42 vs. 42) Analyzed: 73 (41 vs. 32) at 2.5 y	1.7 vs. 1.8	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Prior laminectomy 17% vs. 31% Treatments following intervention: Not reported Occupational: 12% vs. 16% Depression: 73% vs. 81% Generalized anxiety disorder: 76% vs. 72% Somatization disorder: 56% vs. 41% Disabled: 47% vs. 34%

Author, Year Title	Type of Intervention (experimental & control groups, dose, duration of treatment)	Number and Frequency of Injections, Number of Levels, Provider Experience	Imaging Guidance	Type of Comparator
	A: Extra-articular facet joint injection with 0.5-1.5 ml solution of 0.15 mg/ml betamethasone and 0.25% bupivacaine or bupivacaine plus Sarapin in equal amounts, with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Extra-articular facet joint injection with 0.5-1.5 ml solution of 0.25% bupivacaine or bupivacaine and Sarapin in equal amounts, with fluoroscopic guidance	Number and frequency of injections: 6.1 vs. 5.6 over 2 years (allowed for patients with initial >50% pain relief with subsequent deterioration in pain relief to <50%, timing not reported) Number of levels: Unclear (blocks performed on minimum of 2 nerves) Provider experience: Not reported	Fluoroscopic guidance	Facet joint nerve block with local anesthetic and Sarapin
	1 mg/ml methylprednisolone and 0.5% lidocaine or 0.25% bupivacaine plus equal volume of Sarapin, with fluoroscopic guidance	Mean 7.3 vs. 6.6 over 2.5 years,	Fluoroscopic guidance	Extra-articular facet joint injection with local anesthetic and Sarapin

Author, Year	Results
Title	(acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
Manchikanti, 2010	A vs. B
	<u>Pain</u>
Manchikanti, 2008	Pain (mean NRS, 0 to 10): 7.9 vs. 8.2 at baseline, 3.5 vs. 3.8 at 3 m, 3.3 vs. 3.6 at 6 m, 3.5 vs. 3.7 at 12 m, 3.2 vs. 3.5 at 24 m (p>0.05 at all
	time points)  Pain relief >= F00/ from bosoline: 939/ (40/60) vs. 939/ (F0/60) et 3 m. 039/ (F6/60) vs. 939/ (F0/60) et 6 m. 959/ (F1/60) vs. 939/ (40/60) et 13
	Pain relief >=50% from baseline: 82% (49/60) vs. 83% (50/60) at 3 m, 93% (56/60) vs. 83% (50/60) at 6 m, 85% (51/60) vs. 82% (49/60) at 12 m, 90% (54/60) vs. 85% (51/60) at 24 m
	III, 90% (34/00) vs. 63% (31/00) at 24 III
	Function
	ODI (0 to 50): 26 vs. 27 at baseline, 14 vs. 13 at 3 m, 12 vs. 13 at 6 m, 12 vs. 12 at 12 m, 11 vs. 12 at 24 m (p>0.05 at all time points)
	ODI improved >=40% from baseline: 72% (43/60) vs. 82% (49/60) at 3 m, 78% (47/60) vs. 83% (50/60) at 6 m, 78% (47/60) vs. 85% (51/60)
	at 12 m, 88% (53/60) vs. 87% (52/60) at 24 m
	Other Outcomes
	Opioid use (mg MED/day): 37 vs. 31 at baseline (p=0.29), 33 vs. 29 at 12 m (p=0.41), 30 vs. 27 at 24 m (p=0.55)
Manchikanti, 2001	A vs. B
	<u>Pain</u>
	Pain (0-10 NRS): 7.7 vs. 7.6 at baseline, 3.3 vs. 3.5 post-treatment (duration unclear) (p>0.05)
	Pain relief >50%: 100% (41/41) vs. 100\$ (32/32) at 3 m, 88% (36/41) vs. 75% (24/32) at 6 m, 17% (7/41) vs. 25% (8/32) at 1 y, 5% (2/41) vs.
	16% (5/32) at >12 m
	Function
	Functional status: (scale not reported) 3.7 vs. 3.6 at baseline, 5.7 vs. 5.3 post-treatment (duration unclear) (P>0.05)
	Tariotional status. (Social het reported) 5.7 vs. 5.5 at baseline, 5.7 vs. 5.5 post treatment (adiation ansisar) (1 v 5.55)
	Other Outcomes
	Use of schedule II opioids: 15% (6/41) vs. 19% (6/32) post-treatment (duration unclear)
	Physical health (scale not reported): 5.1 vs. 4.7 at baseline, 7.1 vs. 6.7 post-treatment (duration unclear) (p>0.05)
	Mental health (scale not reported): 4.7 vs. 4.2 at baseline; 6.7 vs. 6.3 post-treatment (duration unclear) (p>0.05)
	Depression (criteria not reported): 73% (30/41) vs. 81% (26/32) (baseline); 58% (24/41) vs. 72% (23/32) (follow-up unclear) (p>0.05)
	Generalized anxiety disorder (criteria not reported): 76% (31/41) vs. 72% (23/32) (baseline); 61% (25/41) vs. 63% (20/32) (follow-up unclear)
	(p>0.05) Sometization disorder (criteria net reported): E60/ (22/44) vs. 440/ (42/23) (beceline): 220/ (42/44) vs. 490/ (9/23) (p.c. 0.5)
	Somatization disorder (criteria not reported): 56% (23/41) vs. 41% (13/32) (baseline); 32% (13/41) vs. 18% (9/32) (p<0.05) Symptom magnification (criteria not reported): 34% (14/41) vs. 28% (9/32) (baseline); 22% (9/41) vs. 19% (6/32) (p>0.05)
	39mptom magnification (criteria not reported). 34% (14/41) vs. 20% (9/32) (baseline), 22% (9/41) vs. 13% (0/32) (p>0.05)
L	

Author, Year Title	Duration of Followup	Loss to Followup	Treatment	Adverse Events and Withdrawals due to Adverse Events	Quality Rating	Sponsor
Manchikanti, 2010  Manchikanti, 2008	24 months		4/60 vs. 5/60 unblinded prematurely due to lack of treatment response		Fair	No funding
Manchikanti, 2001		A vs B 2.3% (1/42) vs. 23.8% (10/42) at 2.5y	Appears complete	"None of the various types of complicationswere observed"	Poor	Not reported

Author, Year Title	Study Design		Inclusion Criteria	Facet Joint Block (percent pain relief) Requirements	Imaging Requirements for Patient Selection	Duration of Symptoms at Enrollment
Marks, 1992	RCT		Lumbar or lumbarsacral pain and referred pain in an extra-spinal region; pain present most of the time for >6 months; unresponsive to nonnarcotic analgesics and physical therapy; pain aggravated by sustained postures; imaging not specified	Not required	Not required	>6 months (median 8.5 years)
Nash, 1990	RCT	Single center Pain clinic	Primary low back pain; diffuse lesser intensity pain over the buttocks and posterolateral thigh and occasional radiation to the calf aggravated by sustained positions such as sitting, lying, or standing (diagnostic blocks not performed and no imaging findings required)	Not required	Not required	Not reported
Pneumaticos, 2006	RCT	Single center Orthopedic and radiology clinic	Presumed facet joint pain with nonradicular low back pain; symptoms present >6 months; low back pain with extension of lumbar spine; imaging evidence of facet joint abnormalities; response to facet joint block not required	Not required	Required (imaging method not specified)	>6 months

Author, Year Title	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Subject Age, Sex, Diagnosis, Duration of Pain, Severity of Pain	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)
Marks, 1992	Precise radicular pattern of motor or sensory changes in either lower limb (ignoring changes in tendon reflexes); straight leg raising limited to less than 60 degrees by lower limb pain; evidence of progressive spinal disorder of nondegenerative origin; gross psychological distress	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 86 (42 vs. 44) Analyzed: 86 at 3 m, including 3 (1 vs. 2) with missing data	A vs. B: Age: Not reported Male: Not reported Duration of symptoms: Not reported Baseline pain "severe" or "very severe": 61% vs. 59% Baseline function: Not reported	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Spinal surgery 11.9% vs. 11.3% Treatments following interventions: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Nash, 1990	Not specified	Approached: Not reported Eligible: Not reported Randomized: 67 (33 vs. 34) Analyzed: 56 (30 vs. 26) at 1 m	A vs. B: Age: Not reported Male: Not reported Duration of symptoms: Not reported Baseline pain "severe" or "very severe": 61% vs. 59% Baseline function: Not reported	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following interventions: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported
Pneumaticos, 2006	injection, other spinal abnormalities,	Approached: Not reported Eligible: 47 Randomized: 47 (31 vs. 16) Analyzed: 46 (31 vs. 15) at 6 m	A vs. B: Age (mean): 43 vs. 44 years Male: 48% vs. 50% Duration of symptoms: Not reported (minimum 6 months) Baseline AAOS pain score (0 to 100): 46 across groups (NS for between-group difference, data not reported) Baseline function: Not reported	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Not specified Other patient characteristics: Not reported

Author, Year Title Marks, 1992	Type of Intervention (experimental & control groups, dose, duration of treatment)  A: Intraarticular facet joint injection with 20 mg methylprednisolone acetate (0.5 ml) and 1% lignocaine (1.0 to 1.5 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Extra-articular facet joint injection at medial articular branch of posterior primary ramus with 20 mg methylprednisolone acetate (0.5 ml) and 1% lignocaine (1.0 to 1.5 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance	Number and Frequency of Injections, Number of Levels, Provider Experience  Number and frequency of injections: Not reported Number of levels: Not reported Provider experience: Not reported	Imaging Guidance Fluoroscopic guidance, contrast verification not reported	Type of Comparator Extra-articular facet joint injection with corticosteroid and local anesthetic
Nash, 1990	A: Intraarticular facet join injection with 20 mg methylprednisolone and 2% lignocaine (1 ml) and 0.5% bupivacaine (1 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Extra-articular facet joint injection at medial branch of posterior ramus with 2% lignocaine (1 ml) and 0.5% bupivacaine (1 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance	Not reported Number of levels: Not reported (extra- articular injections performed at target level and level above) Provider experience: Not reported	A: Fluoroscopic guidance with intraarticular contrast confirmation  B: Fluoroscopic guidance with contrast confirmation at site	Extra-articular facet joint injection with local anesthetic
Pneumaticos, 2006	A: Intra-articular and extra-articular facet joint injection with 3 mg betamethasone (0.5 ml) and 0.5% bupivacaine (2.5 ml) (half within joint and half around posterior facet capsule), guided by single photon electronic computed tomography (at positive sites when present or at levels specified by referring physician if no positive sites on SPECT), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Intra-articular and extra-articular facet joint injection with 3 mg betamethasone (0.5 ml) and 0.5% bupivacaine (2.5 ml) (half within joint and half around posterior facet capsule), at levels specified by referring physician, with fluoroscopic guidance	Number and frequency of injections: Not reported Number of levels: Mean 4 joints/patient (not reported by treatment group) Provider experience: 2 providers with 7 and 10 years of experience	Fluoroscopic guidance	Comparison of SPECT vs. no SPECT to guide site of facet joint injections

Author, Year	Results
Title	(acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
·	A vs. B <u>Pain</u> Pain response excellent (none, slight, good, excellent): 7.1% (3/42) vs. 0% (0/44) at 1 m, 4.8% (2/42) vs. 0% (0/44) at 3 m  Pain response good or excellent: 36% (15/42) vs. 20% (9/44) at 1 m; 22% (9/42) vs. 14% (6/44) at 3 m
Nash, 1990	A vs. B Pain Pain moderate to very severe (nil to very severe): 83% (25/30) vs. 85% (22/26) at 1 m
	<u>Function</u> Functional status full (nil, limited, full): 57% (17/30) vs. 58% (15/26) at 1 m
	Other Outcomes Drug intake decreased: 30% (9/30) vs. 38% (10/26) at 1 m
	A vs. B Pain AAOS pain score, change from baseline (0-100, estimated from graph): 20 vs. 12 at 1 m, 23 vs. 15 at 3 m, 16 vs. 11 at 6 m AAOS pain score improved >17 points: 48% (15/31) vs. 45% (5/16) at 1 m, 45% (14/31) vs. 45% (5/16) at 3 m, 39% (12/31) vs. 36% (5/14) at 6 m

Author, Year Title Marks, 1992	Duration of Followup 3 months	Loss to Followup 2.4% (1/42) vs. 4.8% (2/44) at 3 m	Compliance to Treatment Appears complete	Adverse Events and Withdrawals due to Adverse Events  A vs, B: "Serious complications": 0% (0/42) vs. 0% (0/44) Headache: 9.5% (4/42) vs. 6.8% (3/44) Paraesthesia of one leg below knee without motor signs: 2.4% (1/42) vs. 2.3% (1/44) Nausea: 2.4% (1/42) vs. 2.3% (1/44) Worsening of pain (1 month): 21.4% (9/42) vs. 29.5% (13/44)	Quality Rating Fair	Sponsor Not reported
Nash, 1990	1 month	A vs. B 9.1% (3/33) vs. 24% (8/34) at 1 m	Not reported	A vs. B Dermatomal analgesia (periprocedural): 0% vs. 0% Motor weakness (periprocedural): 0% vs. 0%	Poor	Not reported
Pneumaticos, 2006	6 months	A vs. B 0% (0/31) vs. 2/15 (13%) at 6 months	Appears complete	Not reported	Fair	Roderick Duncan MacDonald Research Fund of St Luke's Episcopal Hospital and Institute of Orthopedic Research and Education

Author, Year Title	Study Design	Country Setting	Inclusion Criteria	Facet Joint Block (percent pain relief) Requirements	Imaging Requirements for Patient Selection	Duration of Symptoms at Enrollment
	RCT	Brazil Single center University outpatient clinic		Not required		4.3 years (mean, minimum 3 months)

Author, Year Title	Exclusion Criteria	Number of Treatment and Control Subjects (number approached, number eligible, number enrolled)	Subject Age, Sex, Diagnosis, Duration of Pain, Severity of Pain	Other Patient Characteristics (expectations of treatment benefit, confidence in clinician, worker's compensation status, ongoing litigation, smoking status, other treatments received)
Ribeiro, 2013	Known diagnosis of low back pain of an origin other than the facet joints; prior spine surgery; uncontrolled diabetes, systemic arterial hypertension, or glaucoma; diabetes with insulin use; fibromyalgia; changes in medications used for low back pain during the previous 2 months; allergy to the contrast medium; pregnancy or suspected pregnancy; current involvement in litigation	Approached: 82 Eligible: 69 Randomized: 60 (31 vs. 29) Analyzed: 60 (31 vs. 29) at 6 m	50 vs. 53 Baseline pain (0-10 VAS): 7.0 vs. 6.8 (p=0.8)	A vs. B: Treatments prior to intervention: Not specified Treatments following intervention: Patients to remain at rest for 48 hours, take acetaminophen as needed (maximum 750 mg 4x daily) or diclofenac tablets as needed (maximum 50 mg 3x daily), no other medications should be taken or nonpharmacological therapy was to be taken for back pain Other patient characteristics: Diabetes: 13% vs. 17%, systemic arterial hypertension: 20% vs. 21%

Author, Year Title	Type of Intervention (experimental & control groups, dose, duration of treatment)	Number and Frequency of Injections, Number of Levels, Provider Experience	Imaging Guidance	Type of Comparator
Ribeiro, 2013	A: Intra-articular facet joint injection with 20 mg triamcinolone hexacetonide (1 ml) and lidocaine (dose not reported, 1 ml), with fluoroscopic guidance  B: Intramuscular injections in the lumbar paravertebral musculature with 20 mg triamcinolone hexacetonide (1 ml) and lidocaine (dose not reported, 1 ml)	Number and frequency of injections: Appeared to be administered once Number of levels: 6 injections performed bilaterally at L3 to S1, each level injected bilaterally Injections performed by a rheumatologist with experience in minimally invasive procedures	Fluoroscopic guidance	Intramuscular injection

Author, Year	Results
Title	(acute and subacute, or chronic, or mixed)
Ribeiro, 2013	A vs. B
·	<u>Pain</u>
	Pain (0-10 VAS): 7.0 vs. 6.8 at baseline (p=0.54), 4.0 vs. 4.0 at 1 week (p=0.92), 4.0 vs. 3.6 at 1 m (p=0.92), 4.7 vs. 6.1 at 3 m (p=0.06), 5.3
	vs. 5.8 at 6 m (p=0.54)
	Pain on extension (0-10 VAS): 6.8 vs. 6.5 at baseline (p=0.53), 3.6 vs. 4.4 at 1 week (p=0.30), 4.0 vs. 5.1 at 1 m (p=0.17), 5.1 vs. 6.4 at 3 m
	(p=0.10), 5.3 vs. 6.1 at 6 m
	(p=0.32) <u>Function</u>
	RDQ (0-24): 15 vs. 16.4 at baseline (p=0.31), 11.5 vs. 13.4 at 1 week (p=0.24), 10.2 vs. 12.2 at 1 m (p=0.21), 10.6 vs. 14.7 at 3 m (p=0.01), 10.9 vs. 13.4 at 6 m
	(p=0.17) Global
	Improvement (5-point Likert scale, options were "much worse, a little worse, unchanged, a little better, or much better), percentage of patients
	who were "much better": 58% vs. 31% at 1 week (intergroup p=0.029), 55% vs. 52% at 1 m (p=0.4), 55% vs. 45% at 3 m (p=0.82), 48% vs.
	24% at 6 m
	(p=0.26) Quality of
	<u>life</u>
	SF-36 Physical Functioning: p=0.21 between the groups over time (data NR)
	SF-36 Role Physical: p=0.023 between the groups over time (favors group A) (data NR)
	SF-36 Body Pain: p=0.15 between the groups over time (data NR)
	SF-36 General Health: p=0.52 between the groups over time (data NR)
	SF-36 Vitality: p=0.45 between the groups over time (data NR) SF-36 Social Functioning: p=0.16 between the groups over time (data NR)
	SF-36 Role Emotional: p=0.35 between the groups over time (data NR)
	SF-36 Mental Health: p=0.68 between the groups over time (data 1417)
	NR) Medication usage
	Acetaminophen daily intake (unit of measurement not reported): 5.2 vs. 3.7 at 1 week (p=0.34), 6.0 vs. 9.4 at 1 m (p=0.40), 19.5 vs. 19.7 at 3
	m (p=0.98), 26.4 vs. 28.8 at 6 m (p=0.83)
	Diclofenac daily intake (unit of measurement not reported): 1.5 vs. 1.4 at 1 week (p=0.98), 4.3 vs. 5.4 at 1 m (p=0.72), 3.1 vs. 10.4 at 3 m
	(p=0.06), 5.9 vs. 14.9 at 6 m (p=0.04)
	No differences between groups in terms of the number of patients between groups who used other treatments, including pharmacological
	treatments, physical therapy, and spine surgery.
	ı

Author, Year Title	Duration of Followup	Loss to Followup	Compliance to Treatment	Adverse Events and Withdrawals due to Adverse Events	Quality Rating	Sponsor
Ribeiro, 2013	6 months	A vs. B 6.5% (2/31) vs. 6.9% (2/29) at 6 months (but all 60 patients included in the intention to treat analysis)	Appears that all patients received injection as randomized.	Gastrointestinal bleeding (considered serious) and endoscopic surgery: 0% (0/31) vs. 3% (1/29) between 3 and 6 m  Spinal arthrodesis for aggravation of back pain after a fall: 3% (1/31) vs. 0% (0/29) (after 1 m visit)  Death (cause not reported): 3% (1/31) vs. 0% (0/29) between 3 and 6 m  "No significant differences were found between the groups regarding the number of adverse [local and systemic] events." Events included: Postprocedure pain: 9 patients total Cutaneous hypochromia: 1 patient total Increased blood glucose: 5 patients total Vaginal bleeding: 3 patients total Dizziness: 3 patients total Nausea: 3 patients total	Good	Grant funding (from Fundacao de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de Sao Paulo)

AAOS = American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons; CI = confidence interval; CT=computed tomography; EQ-5D = EuroQoL five-level version; MED = minimal effective dose; MRI = magnetic resonance imaging; NASS = North American Spine Society; NR = not reported; NRS = numeric rating scale; ODI = Oswestry Disability Index; RCT = randomized controlled trial; SPECT = single photon electronic computed tomography; VAS = visual analogue scale

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