Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain: a joint clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians and the American Pain Society.

ACP

Annals of Internal Medicine®

MENU

CLINICAL GUIDELINES | 2 OCTOBER 2007

Diagnosis and Treatment of Low Back Pain: A Joint Clinical Practice Guideline from the American College of Physicians and the American Pain Society FREE

‹ PREV ARTICLE | THIS ISSUE | NEXT ARTICLE ›

JUMP TO

Abstract

Recommendation 1: Clinicians should conduct a focused history and physical examination to help place patients with low back pain into 1 of 3 broad categories: nonspecific low back pain, back pain potentially associated with radiculopathy or spinal stenosis, or back pain potentially associated with another specific spinal cause. The history should include

assessment of psychosocial risk factors, which predict risk for chronic disabling back pain (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Recommendation 2: Clinicians should not routinely obtain imaging or other diagnostic tests in patients with nonspecific low back pain (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Recommendation 3: Clinicians should perform diagnostic imaging and testing for patients with low back pain when severe or progressive neurologic deficits are present or when serious underlying conditions are suspected on the basis of history and physical examination (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Recommendation 4: Clinicians should evaluate patients with persistent low back pain and signs or symptoms of radiculopathy or spinal stenosis with magnetic resonance imaging (preferred) or computed tomography only if they are potential candidates for surgery or epidural steroid injection (for suspected radiculopathy) (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Recommendation 5: Clinicians should provide patients with evidence-based information on low back pain with regard to their expected course, advise patients to remain active, and provide information about effective self-care options (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Recommendation 6: For patients with low back pain, clinicians should consider the use of medications with proven benefits in conjunction with back care information and self-care. Clinicians should assess severity of baseline pain and functional deficits, potential benefits, risks, and relative lack of long-term efficacy and safety data before initiating therapy (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence). For most patients, first-

line medication options are acetaminophen or nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

Recommendation 7: For patients who do not improve with self-care options, clinicians should consider the addition of nonpharmacologic therapy with proven benefits—for acute low back pain, spinal manipulation; for chronic or subacute low back pain, intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation, exercise therapy, acupuncture, massage therapy, spinal manipulation, yoga, cognitive-behavioral therapy, or progressive relaxation (weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

* This paper, written by Roger Chou, MD; Amir Qaseem, MD, PhD, MHA; Vincenza Snow, MD; Donald Casey, MD, MPH, MBA; J. Thomas Cross Jr., MD, MPH; Paul Shekelle, MD, PhD; and Douglas K. Owens, MD, MS, was developed for the American College of Physicians' Clinical Efficacy Assessment Subcommittee and the American College of Physicians/American Pain Society Low Back Pain Guidelines Panel. For members of these groups, see end of text. Approved by the American College of Physicians Board of Regents on 14 July 2007. Approved by the American Pain Society Board Executive Committee on 18 July 2007.

Low back pain is the fifth most common reason for all physician visits in the United States (1, 2). Approximately one quarter of U.S. adults reported having low back pain lasting at least 1 whole day in the past 3 months (2), and 7.6% reported at least 1 episode of severe acute low back pain (see Glossary) within a 1-year period (3). Low back pain is also very costly: Total incremental direct health care costs attributable to low back pain in the U.S. were estimated at $26.3 billion in 1998 (4). In addition, indirect costs related to days lost from work are substantial, with approximately

2% of the U.S. work force compensated for back injuries each year (5).

Many patients have self-limited episodes of acute low back pain and do not seek medical care (3). Among those who do seek medical care, pain, disability, and return to work typically improve rapidly in the first month (6). However, up to one third of patients report persistent back pain of at least moderate intensity 1 year after an acute episode, and 1 in 5 report substantial limitations in activity (7). Approximately 5% of the people with back pain disability account for 75% of the costs associated with low back pain (8).

Many options are available for evaluation and management of low back pain. However, there has been little consensus, either within or between specialties, on appropriate clinical evaluation (9) and management (10) of low back pain. Numerous studies show unexplained, large variations in use of diagnostic tests and treatments (11, 12). Despite wide variations in practice, patients seem to experience broadly similar outcomes, although costs of care can differ substantially among and within specialties (13, 14).

The purpose of this guideline is to present the available evidence for evaluation and management of acute and chronic low back pain (see Glossary) in primary care settings. The target audience for this guideline is all clinicians caring for patients with low (lumbar) back pain of any duration, either with or without leg pain. The target patient population is adults with acute and chronic low back pain not associated with major trauma. Children or adolescents with low back pain; pregnant women; and patients with low back pain from sources outside the back (nonspinal low back pain), fibromyalgia or other myofascial pain syndromes, and thoracic or cervical back pain are not included. These recommendations are based on a systematic evidence review summarized in 2 background papers by Chou and colleagues in this issue (15, 16) from an evidence report by the

American Pain Society (17). The evidence report (17) discusses the evidence for the evaluation, and the 2 background papers (15, 16) summarize the evidence for management.

Methods

The literature search for this guideline included studies from MEDLINE (1966 through November 2006), the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and EMBASE. The literature search included all English-language articles reporting on randomized, controlled trials of nonpregnant adults (age >18 years) with low back pain (alone or with leg pain) of any duration that evaluated a target medication and reported at least 1 of the following outcomes: back-specific function, generic health status, pain, work disability, or patient satisfaction. The American College of Physicians (ACP) and the American Pain Society (APS) convened a multidisciplinary panel of experts to develop the key questions and scope used to guide the evidence report, review its results, and formulate recommendations. The background papers by Chou and colleagues (15, 16) provide details about the methods used for the systematic evidence review.

This guideline grades its recommendations by using the ACP's clinical practice guidelines grading system, adapted from the classification developed by the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) work group (Appendix Table 1) (18). The evidence in this guideline was first evaluated by the ACP/APS panel by using a system adopted from the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force for grading strength of evidence, estimating magnitude of benefits, and assigning summary ratings (Appendix Tables 2, 3, and 4) (19). The evidence was independently reviewed by the ACP's Clinical Efficacy

Assessment Subcommittee. The ratings for individual low back pain interventions discussed in this guideline are summarized in Appendix Table 5 for acute low back pain (<4 weeks' duration) and in Appendix Table 6 for chronic/subacute low back pain (>4 weeks' duration). This guideline considered interventions to have "proven" benefits only when they were supported by at least fair-quality evidence and were associated with at least moderate benefits (or small benefits but no significant harms, costs, or burdens). Figures 1 and 2 present an accompanying algorithm.

Appendix Table 1. The American College of Physicians Clinical Practice Guidelines Grading System

Appendix Table 2. Methods for Grading the Strength of the Overall Evidence for an Intervention

Appendix Table 3. Definitions for Estimating Magnitude of Effects

Appendix Table 4. Recommendations and Summary Ratings

Appendix Table 5. Level of Evidence and Summary Grades for Noninvasive Interventions in Patients with Acute Low Back Pain

Appendix Table 6. Level of Evidence and Summary Grades for Noninvasive Interventions in Patients with Chronic or Subacute Low Back Pain

FIGURE 1.

Initial evaluation of low back pain (

LBP

FIGURE 2.

Management of low back pain (

LBP

Recommendations: Evaluation of Low Back Pain

Recommendation 1: Clinicians should conduct a focused history and physical examination to help place patients with low back pain into 1 of 3 broad categories: nonspecific low back pain, back pain potentially associated with radiculopathy or spinal stenosis, or back pain potentially associated with another specific spinal cause. The history should include assessment of psychosocial risk factors, which predict risk for chronic disabling back pain (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

More than 85% of patients who present to primary care have low back pain that cannot reliably be attributed to a specific disease or spinal abnormality (nonspecific low back pain [see Glossary]) (20). Attempts to identify specific anatomical sources of low back pain in such patients have not been validated in rigorous studies, and classification schemes frequently conflict with one another (21). Moreover, no evidence suggests that labeling most patients with low back pain by using specific anatomical diagnoses improves outcomes. In a minority of patients presenting for initial evaluation in a primary care setting, low back pain is caused by a specific disorder, such as cancer (approximately 0.7% of cases), compression fracture (4%), or spinal infection (0.01%) (22). Estimates for prevalence of ankylosing spondylitis in primary care patients range from 0.3% (22) to 5% (23). Spinal stenosis (see Glossary) and symptomatic

herniated disc (see Glossary) are present in about 3% and 4% of patients, respectively. The cauda equina syndrome (see Glossary) is most commonly associated with massive midline disc herniation but is rare, with an estimated prevalence of 0.04% among patients with low back pain (24).

A practical approach to assessment is to do a focused history and physical examination to determine the likelihood of specific underlying conditions and measure the presence and level of neurologic involvement (24, 25). Such an approach facilitates classification of patients into 1 of 3 broad categories: nonspecific low back pain, back pain potentially associated with radiculopathy (see Glossary) or spinal stenosis (suggested by the presence of sciatica [see Glossary] or pseudoclaudication), and back pain potentially associated with another specific spinal cause. The latter category includes the small proportion of patients with serious or progressive neurologic deficits or underlying conditions requiring prompt evaluation (such as tumor, infection, or the cauda equina syndrome), as well as patients with other conditions that may respond to specific treatments (such as ankylosing spondylitis or vertebral compression fracture).

Diagnostic triage into 1 of these 3 categories helps guide subsequent decision making. Clinicians should inquire about the location of pain, frequency of symptoms, and duration of pain, as well as any history of previous symptoms, treatment, and response to treatment. The possibility of low back pain due to problems outside the back, such as pancreatitis, nephrolithiasis, or aortic aneurysm, or systemic illnesses, such as endocarditis or viral syndromes, should be considered. All patients should be evaluated for the presence of rapidly progressive or severe neurologic deficits, including motor deficits at more than 1 level, fecal incontinence, and bladder dysfunction. The most frequent finding in the cauda equina

syndrome is urinary retention (90% sensitivity) (24). In patients without urinary retention, the probability of the cauda equina syndrome is approximately 1 in 10 000.

Clinicians should also ask about risk factors for cancer and infection. In a large, prospective study from a primary care setting, a history of cancer (positive likelihood ratio, 14.7), unexplained weight loss (positive likelihood ratio, 2.7), failure to improve after 1 month (positive likelihood ratio, 3.0), and age older than 50 years (positive likelihood ratio, 2.7) were each associated with a higher likelihood for cancer (26). The posttest probability of cancer in patients presenting with back pain increases from approximately 0.7% to 9% in patients with a history of cancer (not including nonmelanoma skin cancer). In patients with any 1 of the other 3 risk factors, the likelihood of cancer only increases to approximately 1.2% (26). Features predicting the presence of vertebral infection have not been well studied but may include fever, intravenous drug use, or recent infection (22). Clinicians should also consider risk factors for vertebral compression fracture, such as older age, history of osteoporosis, and steroid use, and ankylosing spondylitis, such as younger age, morning stiffness, improvement with exercise (see Glossary), alternating buttock pain, and awakening due to back pain during the second part of the night only (27), as specific treatments are available for these conditions. Clinicians should be aware that criteria for diagnosing early ankylosing spondylitis (before the development of radiographic abnormalities) are evolving (28).

In patients with back and leg pain, a typical history for sciatica (back and leg pain in a typical lumbar nerve root distribution) has a fairly high sensitivity but uncertain specificity for herniated disc (29, 30). More than 90% of symptomatic lumbar disc herniations (back and leg pain due to a prolapsed lumbar disc compressing a nerve root) occur at the L4/L5 and

L5/S1 levels. A focused examination that includes straight-leg-raise testing (see Glossary) and a neurologic examination that includes evaluation of knee strength and reflexes (L4 nerve root), great toe and foot dorsiflexion strength (L5 nerve root), foot plantarflexion and ankle reflexes (S1 nerve root), and distribution of sensory symptoms should be done to assess the presence and severity of nerve root dysfunction. A positive result on the straight-leg-raise test (defined as reproduction of the patient's sciatica between 30 and 70 degrees of leg elevation) (24) has a relatively high sensitivity (91% [95% CI, 82% to 94%]) but modest specificity (26% [CI, 16% to 38%]) for diagnosing herniated disc (31). By contrast, the crossed straight-leg-raise test is more specific (88% [CI, 86% to 90%]) but less sensitive (29% [CI, 24% to 34%]).

Evidence on the utility of history and examination for identifying lumbar spinal stenosis is sparse (32). High-quality studies showed a trade-off between sensitivities and specificities, resulting in modest or poor positive likelihood ratios (1.2 for pseudoclaudication and 2.2 for radiating leg pain) (32). Changing symptoms on downhill treadmill testing are associated with the highest positive likelihood ratio (3.1). The usefulness of pain relieved by sitting for predicting presence of spinal stenosis ranges from poor to high (32). Age older than 65 years was associated with a positive likelihood ratio of 2.5 and a negative likelihood ratio of 0.33 in 1 lower-quality study (33). Other findings have only been evaluated in lower-quality studies or are poorly predictive for lumbar spinal stenosis.

Psychosocial factors and emotional distress should be assessed because they are stronger predictors of low back pain outcomes than either physical examination findings or severity and duration of pain (6, 34, 35). Assessment of psychosocial factors identifies patients who may have delayed recovery and could help target interventions, as 1 trial in a referral setting found intensive multidisciplinary rehabilitation more effective than

usual care in patients with acute or subacute low back pain identified as having risk factors for chronic back pain disability (36). Direct evidence on effective primary care interventions for identifying and treating such factors in patients with acute low back pain is lacking (37, 38), although this is an area of active research. Evidence is currently insufficient to recommend optimal methods for assessing psychosocial factors and emotional distress. However, psychosocial factors that may predict poorer low back pain outcomes include presence of depression, passive coping strategies, job dissatisfaction, higher disability levels, disputed compensation claims, or somatization (34, 35, 39).

Evidence is also insufficient to guide appropriate intervals or methods (such as office visit vs. telephone follow-up) for reassessment of history, physical examination, or psychosocial factors. However, patients with acute low back pain generally experience substantial improvement in the first month after initial presentation (6, 40), suggesting that a reasonable approach is to reevaluate patients with persistent, unimproved symptoms after 1 month. In patients with severe pain or functional deficits, older patients, or patients with signs of radiculopathy or spinal stenosis (see recommendation 4), earlier or more frequent reevaluation may also be appropriate.

Recommendation 2: Clinicians should not routinely obtain imaging or other diagnostic tests in patients with nonspecific low back pain (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

There is no evidence that routine plain radiography in patients with nonspecific low back pain is associated with a greater improvement in patient outcomes than selective imaging (41–43). In addition, exposure to unnecessary ionizing radiation should be avoided. This issue is of particular concern in young women because the amount of gonadal radiation from

obtaining a single plain radiograph (2 views) of the lumbar spine is equivalent to being exposed to a daily chest radiograph for more than 1 year (44). Routine advanced imaging (computed tomography [CT] or magnetic resonance imaging [MRI]) is also not associated with improved patient outcomes (45) and identifies many radiographic abnormalities that are poorly correlated with symptoms (22) but could lead to additional, possibly unnecessary interventions (46, 47).

Plain radiography is recommended for initial evaluation of possible vertebral compression fracture in selected higher-risk patients, such as those with a history of osteoporosis or steroid use (22). Evidence to guide optimal imaging strategies is not available for low back pain that persists for more than 1 to 2 months despite standard therapies if there are no symptoms suggesting radiculopathy or spinal stenosis, although plain radiography may be a reasonable initial option (see recommendation 4 for imaging recommendations in patients with symptoms suggesting radiculopathy or spinal stenosis). Thermography and electrophysiologic testing are not recommended for evaluation of nonspecific low back pain.

Recommendation 3: Clinicians should perform diagnostic imaging and testing for patients with low back pain when severe or progressive neurologic deficits are present or when serious underlying conditions are suspected on the basis of history and physical examination (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Prompt work-up with MRI or CT is recommended in patients who have severe or progressive neurologic deficits or are suspected of having a serious underlying condition (such as vertebral infection, the cauda equina syndrome, or cancer with impending spinal cord compression) because delayed diagnosis and treatment are associated with poorer outcomes (48–50). Magnetic resonance imaging is generally preferred over CT if available because it does not use ionizing radiation and provides better

visualization of soft tissue, vertebral marrow, and the spinal canal (22). There is insufficient evidence to guide precise recommendations on diagnostic strategies in patients who have risk factors for cancer but no signs of spinal cord compression. Several strategies have been proposed for such patients (22, 51), but none have been prospectively evaluated. Proposed strategies generally recommend plain radiography or measurement of erythrocyte sedimentation rate (a rate ⊠20 mm/h is associated with 78% sensitivity and 67% specificity for cancer [29]), with MRI reserved for patients with abnormalities on initial testing (22, 51). An alternative strategy is to directly perform MRI in patients with a history of cancer, the strongest predictor of vertebral cancer (51). For patients older than 50 years of age without other risk factors for cancer, delaying imaging while offering standard treatments and reevaluating within 1 month may also be a reasonable option (52).

Recommendation 4: Clinicians should evaluate patients with persistent low back pain and signs or symptoms of radiculopathy or spinal stenosis with MRI (preferred) or CT only if they are potential candidates for surgery or epidural steroid injection (for suspected radiculopathy) (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

The natural history of lumbar disc herniation with radiculopathy in most patients is for improvement within the first 4 weeks with noninvasive management (53, 54). There is no compelling evidence that routine imaging affects treatment decisions or improves outcomes (55). For prolapsed lumbar disc with persistent radicular symptoms despite noninvasive therapy, discectomy or epidural steroids are potential treatment options (56–60). Surgery is also a treatment option for persistent symptoms associated with spinal stenosis (61–64).

Magnetic resonance imaging (preferred if available) or CT is recommended for evaluating patients with persistent back and leg pain who are potential candidates for invasive interventions—plain radiography cannot visualize discs or accurately evaluate the degree of spinal stenosis (22). However, clinicians should be aware that findings on MRI or CT (such as bulging disc without nerve root impingement) are often nonspecific. Recommendations for specific invasive interventions, interpretation of radiographic findings, and additional work-up (such as electrophysiologic testing) are beyond the scope of this guideline, but decisions should be based on the clinical correlation between symptoms and radiographic findings, severity of symptoms, patient preferences, surgical risks (including the patient's comorbid conditions), and costs and will generally require specialist input.

Recommendations: Treatment of Low Back Pain

Recommendation 5: Clinicians should provide patients with evidence-based information on low back pain with regard to their expected course, advise patients to remain active, and provide information about effective self-care options (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

Clinicians should inform all patients of the generally favorable prognosis of acute low back pain with or without sciatica, including a high likelihood for substantial improvement in the first month (6, 40). Clinicians should explain that early, routine imaging and other tests usually cannot identify a precise cause, do not improve patient outcomes, and incur additional expenses. Clinicians should also review indications for reassessment and diagnostic testing (see recommendations 1 and 4). General advice on self-management for nonspecific low back pain should include recommendations to remain active, which is more effective than resting in bed for patients with acute or subacute low back pain (65, 66). If patients

require periods of bed rest to relieve severe symptoms, they should be encouraged to return to normal activities as soon as possible. Self-care education books (see Glossary) based on evidence-based guidelines, such as *The Back Book*(67), are recommended because they are an inexpensive and efficient method for supplementing clinician-provided back information and advice and are similar or only slightly inferior in effectiveness to such costlier interventions as supervised exercise therapy, acupuncture (see Glossary), massage (see Glossary), and spinal manipulation (see Glossary) (65, 66, 68–70). Other methods for providing self-care education, such as e-mail discussion groups, layperson-led groups, videos, and group classes, are not as well studied.

Factors to consider when giving advice about activity limitations to workers with low back pain are the patient's age and general health and the physical demands of required job tasks. However, evidence is insufficient to guide specific recommendations about the utility of modified work for facilitating return to work (71). For worker's compensation claims, clinicians should refer to specific regulations for their area of practice, as rules vary substantially from state to state. Brief individualized educational interventions (defined as a detailed clinical examination and advice, typically lasting several hours over 1 to 2 sessions) (see Glossary) can reduce sick leave in workers with subacute low back pain (72–74).

Application of heat by heating pads or heated blankets is a self-care option (see Glossary) for short-term relief of acute low back pain (75). In patients with chronic low back pain, firm mattresses are less likely than a medium-firm mattress to lead to improvement (76). There is insufficient evidence to recommend lumbar supports (77) or the application of cold packs (75) as self-care options.

Although evidence is insufficient to guide specific self-management

recommendations for patients with acute radiculopathy or spinal stenosis, some trials enrolled mixed populations of patients with and without sciatica, suggesting that applying principles similar to those used for nonspecific low back pain is a reasonable approach (see also recommendation 4).

Recommendation 6: For patients with low back pain, clinicians should consider the use of medications with proven benefits in conjunction with back care information and self-care. Clinicians should assess severity of baseline pain and functional deficits, potential benefits, risks, and relative lack of long-term efficacy and safety data before initiating therapy (strong recommendation, moderate-quality evidence). For most patients, first-line medication options are acetaminophen or nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).

Medications in several classes have been shown to have moderate, primarily short-term benefits for patients with low back pain. Each class of medication is associated with unique trade-offs involving benefits, risks, and costs. For example, acetaminophen is a slightly weaker analgesic than NSAIDs (<10 points on a 100-point visual analogue pain scale) (78–82) but is a reasonable first-line option for treatment of acute or chronic low back pain because of a more favorable safety profile and low cost (79, 82–84). However, acetaminophen is associated with asymptomatic elevations of aminotransferase levels at dosages of 4 g/d (the upper limit of U.S. Food and Drug Administration–[FDA] approved dosing) even in healthy adults, although the clinical significance of these findings are uncertain (85). Nonselective NSAIDs are more effective for pain relief than is acetaminophen (80), but they are associated with well-known gastrointestinal and renovascular risks (83). In addition, there is an association between exposure to cyclooxygenase-2–selective or most nonselective NSAIDs and increased risk for myocardial infarction (86). Clinicians should therefore assess cardiovascular and gastrointestinal risk

factors before prescribing NSAIDs and recommend the lowest effective doses for the shortest periods necessary. Clinicians should also remain alert for new evidence about which NSAIDs are safest and consider strategies for minimizing adverse events in higher-risk patients who are prescribed NSAIDs (such as co-administration with a proton-pump inhibitor) (87). There is insufficient evidence to recommend for or against analgesic doses of aspirin in patients with low back pain (88).

Opioid analgesics or tramadol are an option when used judiciously in patients with acute or chronic low back pain who have severe, disabling pain that is not controlled (or is unlikely to be controlled) with acetaminophen and NSAIDs. Because of substantial risks, including aberrant drug-related behaviors with long-term use in patients vulnerable or potentially vulnerable to abuse or addiction, potential benefits and harms of opioid analgesics should be carefully weighed before starting therapy (89–91). Failure to respond to a time-limited course of opioids should lead to reassessment and consideration of alternative therapies or referral for further evaluation (92–94). Evidence is insufficient to recommend one opioid over another (95).

The Glossary term *skeletal muscle relaxants* refers to a diverse group of medications, some with unclear mechanisms of action, grouped together because they carry FDA-approved indications for treatment of musculoskeletal conditions or spasticity. Although the antispasticity drug tizanidine has been well studied for low back pain, there is little evidence for the efficacy of baclofen or dantrolene, the other FDA-approved drugs for the treatment of spasticity (96). Other medications in the skeletal muscle relaxant class are an option for short-term relief of acute low back pain, but all are associated with central nervous system adverse effects (primarily sedation). There is no compelling evidence that skeletal muscle relaxants differ in efficacy or safety (96, 97). Because skeletal muscle

relaxants are not pharmacologically related, however, risk–benefit profiles could in theory vary substantially. For example, carisoprodol is metabolized to meprobamate (a medication associated with risks for abuse and overdose), dantrolene carries a black box warning for potentially fatal hepatotoxicity, and both tizanidine and chlorzoxazone are associated with hepatotoxicity that is generally reversible and usually not serious.

Tricyclic antidepressants are an option for pain relief in patients with chronic low back pain and no contraindications to this class of medications (98, 99). Antidepressants in the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor class and trazodone have not been shown to be effective for low back pain, and serotonin–norepineprhine reuptake inhibitors (duloxetine and venlafaxine) have not yet been evaluated for low back pain. Clinicians should bear in mind, however, that depression is common in patients with chronic low back pain and should be assessed and treated appropriately (100).

Gabapentin is associated with small, short-term benefits in patients with radiculopathy (101, 102) and has not been directly compared with other medications or treatments. There is insufficient evidence to recommend for or against other antiepileptic drugs for back pain with or without radiculopathy. For acute or chronic low back pain, benzodiazepines seem similarly effective to skeletal muscle relaxants for short-term pain relief (96) but are also associated with risks for abuse, addiction, and tolerance. Neither benzodiazepines nor gabapentin are FDA-approved for treatment of low back pain (with or without radiculopathy). If a benzodiazepine is used, a time-limited course of therapy is recommended.

Herbal therapies, such as devil's claw, willow bark, and capsicum, seem to be safe options for acute exacerbations of chronic low back pain, but benefits range from small to moderate. In addition, many of the published

trials were led by the same investigator, which could limit applicability of findings to other settings (103).

Systemic corticosteroids are not recommended for treatment of low back pain with or without sciatica, because they have not been shown to be more effective than placebo (104–107).

Most medication trials evaluated patients with nonspecific low back pain or mixed populations with and without sciatica. There is little evidence to guide specific recommendations for medications (other than gabapentin) for patients with sciatica or spinal stenosis. Evidence is also limited on the benefits and risks associated with long-term use of medications for low back pain. Therefore, extended courses of medications should generally be reserved for patients clearly showing continued benefits from therapy without major adverse events.

Recommendation 7: For patients who do not improve with self-care options, clinicians should consider the addition of nonpharmacologic therapy with proven benefits—for acute low back pain, spinal manipulation; for chronic or subacute low back pain, intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation, exercise therapy, acupuncture, massage therapy, spinal manipulation, yoga, cognitive-behavioral therapy, or progressive relaxation (weak recommendation, moderate-quality evidence).

For acute low back pain (duration <4 weeks), spinal manipulation administered by providers with appropriate training is associated with small to moderate short-term benefits (108). Supervised exercise therapy and home exercise regimens are not effective for acute low back pain (109), and the optimal time to start exercise therapy after the onset of symptoms is unclear. Other guidelines suggest starting exercise after 2 to

6 weeks, but these recommendations seem to be based on poor-quality evidence (25, 110). Other nonpharmacologic treatments have not been proven to be effective for acute low back pain.

For subacute (duration >4 to 8 weeks) low back pain, intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation (defined as an intervention that includes a physician consultation coordinated with a psychological, physical therapy, social, or vocational intervention) (see Glossary) is moderately effective (111), and functional restoration (see Glossary) with a cognitive-behavioral component reduces work absenteeism due to low back pain in occupational settings (112). There is little evidence on effectiveness of other treatments specifically for subacute low back pain (113). However, many trials enrolled mixed populations of patients with chronic and subacute symptoms, suggesting that results may reasonably be applied to both situations.

For chronic low back pain, moderately effective nonpharmacologic therapies include acupuncture (114, 115), exercise therapy (109), massage therapy (116), Viniyoga-style yoga (see Glossary) (70), cognitive-behavioral therapy or progressive relaxation (see Glossary) (117, 118), spinal manipulation (108), and intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation (119), although the level of supporting evidence for different therapies varies from fair to good (Appendix Table 6). In meta-regression analyses, exercise programs that incorporate individual tailoring, supervision, stretching, and strengthening are associated with the best outcomes (109). The evidence is insufficient to conclude that benefits of manipulation vary according to the profession of the manipulator (chiropractor vs. other clinician trained in manipulation) or according to presence or absence of radiating pain (108). With the exception of continuous or intermittent traction (see Glossary), which has not been shown to be effective in patients with sciatica (120–122), few trials have evaluated the effectiveness

of treatments specifically in patients with radicular pain (122) or symptoms of spinal stenosis. In addition, there is insufficient evidence to recommend any specific treatment as first-line therapy. Patient expectations of benefit from a treatment should be considered in choosing interventions because they seem to influence outcomes (123). Some interventions (such as intensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation) may not be available in all settings, and costs for similarly effective interventions can vary substantially. There is insufficient evidence to recommend the use of decision tools or other methods for tailoring therapy in primary care, although initial data are promising (124–126).

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (see Glossary) and intermittent or continuous traction (in patients with or without sciatica) have not been proven effective for chronic low back pain (Appendix Table 6). Acupressure (see Glossary), neuroreflexotherapy (see Glossary), and spa therapy (see Glossary) have not been studied in the United States, and percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (see Glossary) is not widely available. There is insufficient evidence to recommend interferential therapy (see Glossary), low-level laser therapy (see Glossary), shortwave diathermy (see Glossary), or ultrasonography. Evidence is inconsistent on back schools (see Glossary), which have primarily been evaluated in occupational settings, with some trials showing small, short-term benefits (127).

It may be appropriate to consider consultation with a back specialist when patients with nonspecific low back pain do not respond to standard noninvasive therapies. However, there is insufficient evidence to guide specific recommendations on the timing of or indications for referral, and expertise in management of low back pain varies substantially among clinicians from different disciplines (including primary care providers). In general, decisions about consultation should be individualized and based

on assessments of patient symptoms and response to interventions, the experience and training of the primary care clinician, and the availability of specialists with relevant expertise. In considering referral for possible surgery or other invasive interventions, other published guidelines suggest referring patients with nonspecific low back pain after a minimum of 3 months (25) to 2 years (128) of failed nonsurgical interventions. Although specific suggestions about timing of referral are somewhat arbitrary, one factor to consider is that trials of surgery for nonspecific low back pain included only patients with at least 1 year of symptoms (129–131). Other recommendations for invasive interventions are addressed in a separate guideline from the APS (17).

Glossary

General

Acute low back pain: Low back pain present for fewer than 4 weeks, sometimes grouped with subacute low back pain as symptoms present for fewer than 3 months.

Cauda equina syndrome: Compression on nerve roots from the lower cord segments, usually due to a massive, centrally herniated disc, which can result in urinary retention or incontinence from loss of sphincter function, bilateral motor weakness of the lower extremities, and saddle anesthesia.

Chronic low back pain: Low back pain present for more than 3 months.

Herniated disc: Herniation of the nucleus pulposus of an intervertebral disc through its fibrous outer covering, which can result in compression of adjacent nerve roots or other structures.

Neurogenic claudication: Symptoms of leg pain (and occasionally weakness) on walking or standing, relieved by sitting or spinal flexion, associated with spinal stenosis.

Nonspecific low back pain: Pain occurring primarily in the back with no signs of a serious underlying condition (such as cancer, infection, or cauda equina syndrome), spinal stenosis or radiculopathy, or another specific spinal cause (such as vertebral compression fracture or ankylosing spondylitis). Degenerative changes on lumbar imaging are usually considered nonspecific, as they correlate poorly with symptoms.

Radiculopathy: Dysfunction of a nerve root associated with pain, sensory impairment, weakness, or diminished deep tendon reflexes in a nerve root distribution.

Sciatica: Pain radiating down the leg below the knee in the distribution of the sciatic nerve, suggesting nerve root compromise due to mechanical pressure or inflammation. Sciatica is the most common symptom of lumbar radiculopathy.

Spinal stenosis: Narrowing of the spinal canal that may result in bony constriction of the cauda equina and the emerging nerve roots.

Straight-leg-raise test: A procedure in which the hip is flexed with the knee extended in order to passively stretch the sciatic nerve and elicit symptoms suggesting nerve root tension. A positive test is usually considered reproduction of the patient's sciatica when the leg is raised between 30 and 70 degrees. Reproduction of the patient's sciatica when the unaffected leg is lifted is referred to as a positive "crossed" straight-leg-raise test.

Interventions

Acupressure: An intervention consisting of manipulation with the fingers instead of needles at specific acupuncture points.

Acupuncture: An intervention consisting of the insertion of needles at specific acupuncture points.

Back school: An intervention consisting of education and a skills program, including exercise therapy, in which all lessons are given to groups of patients and supervised by a paramedical therapist or medical specialist.

Brief individualized educational interventions: Individualized assessment and education about low back pain problems without supervised exercise therapy or other specific interventions. As we defined them, brief educational interventions differ from back schools because they do not involve group education or supervised exercise.

Exercise: A supervised exercise program or formal home exercise regimen, ranging from programs aimed at general physical fitness or aerobic exercise to programs aimed at muscle strengthening, flexibility, stretching, or different combinations of these elements.

Functional restoration (also called *physical conditioning*, *work hardening*, or *work conditioning*): An intervention that involves simulated or actual work tests in a supervised environment in order to enhance job performance skills and improve strength, endurance, flexibility, and cardiovascular fitness in injured workers.

Interdisciplinary rehabilitation (also called multidisciplinary therapy): An intervention that combines and coordinates physical, vocational, and

behavioral components and is provided by multiple health care professionals with different clinical backgrounds. The intensity and content of interdisciplinary therapy varies widely.

Interferential therapy: The superficial application of a medium-frequency alternating current modulated to produce low frequencies up to 150 Hz. It is thought to increase blood flow to tissues and provide pain relief and is considered more comfortable for patients than transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation.

Low-level laser therapy: The superficial application of lasers at wavelengths between 632 and 904 nm to the skin in order to apply electromagnetic energy to soft tissue. Optimal treatment parameters (wavelength, dosage, dose-intensity, and type of laser) are uncertain.

Massage: Soft tissue manipulation using the hands or a mechanical device through a variety of specific methods. The pressure and intensity used in different massage techniques vary widely.

Neuroreflexotherapy: A technique from Spain characterized by the temporary implantation of staples superficially into the skin over trigger points in the back and referred tender points in the ear. Neuroreflexotherapy is believed to stimulate different zones of the skin than acupuncture.

Percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (PENS): An intervention that involves inserting acupuncture-like needles and applying low-level electrical stimulation. It differs from electroacupuncture in that the insertion points target dermatomal levels for local pathology, rather than acupuncture points. However, there is some uncertainty over whether PENS should be considered a novel therapy or a form of electroacupuncture.

Progressive relaxation: A technique which involves the deliberate tensing and relaxation of muscles, in order to facilitate the recognition and release of muscle tension.

Self-care options: Interventions that can be readily implemented by patients without seeing a clinician or that can be implemented on the basis of advice provided at a routine clinic visit.

Self-care education book: Reading material (books, booklets, or leaflets) that provide education and self-care advice for patients with low back pain. Although the specific content varies, self-care books are generally based on principles from published clinical practice guidelines and encourage a return to normal activity, adoption of a fitness program, and appropriate lifestyle modification, and they provide advice on coping strategies and managing flares.

Shortwave diathermy: Therapeutic elevation of the temperature of deep tissues by application of short-wave electromagnetic radiation with a frequency range from 10–100 MHz.

Spa therapy: An intervention involving several interventions, including mineral water bathing, usually with heated water, typically while staying at a spa resort.

Spinal manipulation: Manual therapy in which loads are applied to the spine by using short- or long-lever methods and high-velocity thrusts are applied to a spinal joint beyond its restricted range of movement. Spinal mobilization, or low-velocity, passive movements within or at the limit of joint range, is often used in conjunction with spinal manipulation.

Traction: An intervention involving drawing or pulling in order to stretch the lumbar spine. Various methods are used, usually involving a harness around the lower rib cage and the iliac crest, with the pulling action done by using free weights and a pulley, motorized equipment, inversion techniques, or an overhead harness.

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS): Use of a small, battery-operated device to provide continuous electrical impulses via surface electrodes, with the goal of providing symptomatic relief by modifying pain perception.

Yoga: An intervention distinguished from traditional exercise therapy by the use of specific body positions, breathing techniques, and an emphasis on mental focus. Many styles of yoga are practiced, each emphasizing different postures and techniques.

References

1 **Hart LG, Deyo RA, Cherkin DC,** Physician office visits for low back pain. Frequency, clinical evaluation, and treatment patterns from a U.S. national survey., Spine, . 1995, vol. ;20 (pg. :11--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

2 **Deyo RA, Mirza SK, Martin BI,** Back pain prevalence and visit rates: estimates from U.S. national surveys, 2002., Spine, . 2006, vol. ;31 (pg. :2724--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

3 **Carey TS, Evans AT, Hadler NM, Lieberman G, Kalsbeek WD, Jackman AM, et al**Acute severe low back pain. A population-based study of

prevalence and care-seeking., Spine, . 1996, vol. ;21 (pg. :339--44.)
CrossRef PubMed

4 **Luo X, Pietrobon R, Sun SX, Liu GG, Hey L,** Estimates and patterns of direct health care expenditures among individuals with back pain in the United States., Spine, . 2004, vol. ;29 (pg. :79--86.)
CrossRef PubMed

5 **Andersson GB,** Epidemiological features of chronic low-back pain., Lancet, . 1999, vol. ;354 (pg. :581--5.)
CrossRef PubMed

6 **Pengel LH, Herbert RD, Maher CG, Refshauge KM,** Acute low back pain: systematic review of its prognosis., BMJ, . 2003, vol. ;327 pg. :323
CrossRef PubMed

7 **Von Korff M, Saunders K.** The course of back pain in primary care. Spine. 1996;21:2833-7; discussion 2838-9. [PMID: 9112707]

8 **Frymoyer JW, Cats-Baril WL,** An overview of the incidences and costs of low back pain., Orthop Clin North Am, . 1991, vol. ;22 (pg. :263--71.)
PubMed

9 **Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Wheeler K, Ciol MA,** Physician variation in diagnostic testing for low back pain. Who you see is what you get., Arthritis Rheum, . 1994, vol. ;37 (pg. :15--22.)
CrossRef PubMed

10 **Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Wheeler K, Ciol MA.** Physician views about treating low back pain. The results of a national survey. Spine. 1995;20:1-9; discussion 9-10. [PMID: 7709266]

11 **Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Loeser JD, Bush T, Waddell G,** An international comparison of back surgery rates., Spine, . 1994, vol. ;19 (pg. :1201--6.)
CrossRef PubMed

12 **Volinn E, Mayer J, Diehr P, Van Koevering D, Connell FA, Loeser JD,** Small area analysis of surgery for low-back

pain., Spine, . 1992, vol. ;17 (pg. :575--81.)
CrossRef PubMed

13 **Carey TS, Garrett J, Jackman A, McLaughlin C, Fryer J, Smucker DR,** The outcomes and costs of care for acute low back pain among patients seen by primary care practitioners, chiropractors, and orthopedic surgeons. The North Carolina Back Pain Project., N Engl J Med, . 1995, vol. ;333 (pg. :913--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

14 **Shekelle PG, Markovich M, Louie R.** Comparing the costs between provider types of episodes of back pain care. Spine. 1995;20:221-6; discussion 227. [PMID: 7716629]

15 **Chou R, Huffman LH,** Nonpharmacologic therapies for acute and chronic low back pain: a review of the evidence for an American Pain Society/American College of Physicians Clinical Practice Guideline., Ann Intern Med, . 2007, vol. ;147 (pg. :492--504.)
CrossRef PubMed

16 **Chou R, Huffman LH,** Medications for acute and chronic low back pain: a review of the evidence for an American Pain Society/American College of Physicians clinical practice guideline., Ann Intern Med, . 2007, vol. ;147 (pg. :505--14.)
CrossRef PubMed

17 **Chou R, Huffman L.** Evaluation and management of low back pain: evidence review. Glenview, IL: American Pain Soc; 2007. [In press]

18 **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, vol. ;129 (pg. :174--81.)
CrossRef PubMed

19 **Harris R, Helfand M, Woolf S, et alMethods Work Group Third US Preventive Services Task Force**Current methods of the US Preventive Services Task Force: a review of the process., Am J Prev Med, . 2001, vol. ;20 (pg. :21--35.)

CrossRef PubMed

20 **van Tulder MW, Assendelft WJ, Koes BW, Bouter LM,** Spinal radiographic findings and nonspecific low back pain. A systematic review of observational studies., Spine, . 1997, vol. ;22 (pg. :427--34.)
CrossRef PubMed

21 **Deyo RA,** Practice variations, treatment fads, rising disability. Do we need a new clinical research paradigm?, Spine, . 1993, vol. ;18 (pg. :2153--62.)
CrossRef PubMed

22 **Jarvik JG, Deyo RA,** Diagnostic evaluation of low back pain with emphasis on imaging., Ann Intern Med, . 2002, vol. ;137 (pg. :586--97.)
CrossRef PubMed

23 **Underwood MR, Dawes P,** Inflammatory back pain in primary care., Br J Rheumatol, . 1995, vol. ;34 (pg. :1074--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

24 **Deyo RA, Rainville J, Kent DL,** What can the history and physical examination tell us about low back pain?, JAMA, . 1992, vol. ;268 (pg. :760--5.)
CrossRef PubMed

25 **Bigos S, Bowyer O, Braen G, Brown K, Deyo R, Haldeman S, et al.** Acute Low Back Problems in Adults. Clinical Practice Guideline No. 14. AHCPR Publication No. 95-0642. Rockville, MD: Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 1994.

26 **Deyo RA, Diehl AK,** Cancer as a cause of back pain: frequency, clinical presentation, and diagnostic strategies., J Gen Intern Med, . 1988, vol. ;3 (pg. :230--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

27 **Rudwaleit M, Metter A, Listing J, Sieper J, Braun J,** Inflammatory back pain in ankylosing spondylitis: a reassessment of the clinical history for application as classification and diagnostic criteria., Arthritis

Rheum, . 2006, vol. ;54 (pg. :569--78.)
CrossRef PubMed

28 **Rudwaleit M, Khan MA, Sieper J,** The challenge of diagnosis and classification in early ankylosing spondylitis: do we need new criteria?, Arthritis Rheum, . 2005, vol. ;52 (pg. :1000--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

29 **van den Hoogen HM, Koes BW, van Eijk JT, Bouter LM,** On the accuracy of history, physical examination, and erythrocyte sedimentation rate in diagnosing low back pain in general practice. A criteria-based review of the literature., Spine, . 1995, vol. ;20 (pg. :318--27.)
CrossRef PubMed

30 **Vroomen PC, de Krom MC, Knottnerus JA,** Diagnostic value of history and physical examination in patients suspected of sciatica due to disc herniation: a systematic review., J Neurol, . 1999, vol. ;246 (pg. :899--906.)
CrossRef PubMed

31 **Devillé WL, van der Windt DA, Dzaferagi A, Bezemer PD, Bouter LM,** The test of Lasègue: systematic review of the accuracy in diagnosing herniated discs., Spine, . 2000, vol. ;25 (pg. :1140--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

32 **de Graaf I, Prak A, Bierma-Zeinstra S, Thomas S, Peul W, Koes B,** Diagnosis of lumbar spinal stenosis: a systematic review of the accuracy of diagnostic tests., Spine, . 2006, vol. ;31 (pg. :1168--76.)
CrossRef PubMed

33 **Katz JN, Dalgas M, Stucki G, Katz NP, Bayley J, Fossel AH, et al** Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. Diagnostic value of the history and physical examination., Arthritis Rheum, . 1995, vol. ;38 (pg. :1236--41.)
CrossRef PubMed

34 **Fayad F, Lefevre-Colau MM, Poiraudeau S, Fermanian J, Rannou F, Wlodyka Demaille S, et al**[Chronicity, recurrence, and return to work in low back pain: common prognostic factors]., Ann Readapt Med

Phys, . 2004, vol. ;47 (pg. :179--89.)
CrossRef PubMed

35 **Pincus T, Burton AK, Vogel S, Field AP,** A systematic review of psychological factors as predictors of chronicity/disability in prospective cohorts of low back pain., Spine, . 2002, vol. ;27 (pg. :109--20.)
CrossRef

36 **Gatchel RJ, Polatin PB, Noe C, Gardea M, Pulliam C, Thompson J,** Treatment- and cost-effectiveness of early intervention for acute low-back pain patients: a one-year prospective study., J Occup Rehabil, . 2003, vol. ;13 (pg. :1--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

37 **Hay EM, Mullis R, Lewis M, Vohora K, Main CJ, Watson P, et al** Comparison of physical treatments versus a brief pain-management programme for back pain in primary care: a randomised clinical trial in physiotherapy practice., Lancet, . 2005, vol. ;365 (pg. :2024--30.)
CrossRef PubMed

38 **Jellema P, van der Windt DA, van der Horst HE, Twisk JW, Stalman WA, Bouter LM,** Should treatment of (sub)acute low back pain be aimed at psychosocial prognostic factors? Cluster randomised clinical trial in general practice., BMJ, . 2005, vol. ;331 pg. :84
CrossRef PubMed

39 **Steenstra IA, Verbeek JH, Heymans MW, Bongers PM,** Prognostic factors for duration of sick leave in patients sick listed with acute low back pain: a systematic review of the literature., Occup Environ Med, . 2005, vol. ;62 (pg. :851--60.)
CrossRef PubMed

40 **Hestbaek L, Leboeuf-Yde C, Manniche C,** Low back pain: what is the long-term course? A review of studies of general patient populations., Eur Spine J, . 2003, vol. ;12 (pg. :149--65.)
PubMed

41 **Deyo RA, Diehl AK, Rosenthal M,** Reducing roentgenography use. Can

patient expectations be altered?, Arch Intern Med, . 1987, vol. ;147 (pg. :141--5.)
CrossRef PubMed

42 **Kendrick D, Fielding K, Bentley E, Kerslake R, Miller P, Pringle M,** Radiography of the lumbar spine in primary care patients with low back pain: randomised controlled trial., BMJ, . 2001, vol. ;322 (pg. :400--5.)
CrossRef PubMed

43 **Kerry S, Hilton S, Dundas D, Rink E, Oakeshott P,** Radiography for low back pain: a randomised controlled trial and observational study in primary care., Br J Gen Pract, . 2002, vol. ;52 (pg. :469--74.)
PubMed

44 **Jarvik JG,** Imaging of adults with low back pain in the primary care setting., Neuroimaging Clin N Am, . 2003, vol. ;13 (pg. :293--305.)
CrossRef PubMed

45 **Gilbert F, Grant A, Gillan M, et al.** Scottish Back Trial Group. Low back pain: influence of early MR imaging or CT on treatment and outcome—multicenter randomized trial. Radiology. 2004;231:343-51. [PMID: 15031430]

46 **Jarvik JG, Hollingworth W, Martin B, Emerson SS, Gray DT, Overman S, et al**Rapid magnetic resonance imaging vs radiographs for patients with low back pain: a randomized, controlled trial., JAMA, . 2003, vol. ;289 (pg. :2810--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

47 **Lurie JD, Birkmeyer NJ, Weinstein JN,** Rates of advanced spinal imaging and spine surgery., Spine, . 2003, vol. ;28 (pg. :616--20.)
PubMed

48 **Loblaw DA, Perry J, Chambers A, Laperriere NJ,** Systematic review of the diagnosis and management of malignant extradural spinal cord compression: the Cancer Care Ontario Practice Guidelines Initiative's Neuro-Oncology Disease Site Group., J Clin Oncol, . 2005, vol. ;23 (pg. :2028--37.)

CrossRef PubMed

49 **Todd NV.** Cauda equina syndrome: the timing of surgery probably does influence outcome. Br J Neurosurg. 2005;19:301-6; discussion 307-8. [PMID:16455534]

50 **Tsiodras S, Falagas ME,** Clinical assessment and medical treatment of spine infections., Clin Orthop Relat Res, . 2006, vol. ;444 (pg. :38--50.)
CrossRef PubMed

51 **Joines JD, McNutt RA, Carey TS, Deyo RA, Rouhani R,** Finding cancer in primary care outpatients with low back pain: a comparison of diagnostic strategies., J Gen Intern Med, . 2001, vol. ;16 (pg. :14--23.)
CrossRef PubMed

52 **Suarez-Almazor ME, Belseck E, Russell AS, Mackel JV,** Use of lumbar radiographs for the early diagnosis of low back pain. Proposed guidelines would increase utilization., JAMA, . 1997, vol. ;277 (pg. :1782--6.)
CrossRef PubMed

53 **Vroomen PC, de Krom MC, Knottnerus JA,** Predicting the outcome of sciatica at short-term follow-up., Br J Gen Pract, . 2002, vol. ;52 (pg. :119--23.)
PubMed

54 **Weber H,** Lumbar disc herniation. A controlled, prospective study with ten years of observation., Spine, . 1983, vol. ;8 (pg. :131--40.)
CrossRef PubMed

55 **Modic MT, Obuchowski NA, Ross JS, Brant-Zawadzki MN, Grooff PN, Mazanec DJ, et al**Acute low back pain and radiculopathy: MR imaging findings and their prognostic role and effect on outcome., Radiology, . 2005, vol. ;237 (pg. :597--604.)
CrossRef PubMed

56 **Gibson JN, Grant IC, Waddell G,** Surgery for lumbar disc prolapse., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2000, vol. ; pg. :CD001350

57 **Gibson JN, Waddell G,** Surgery for degenerative lumbar spondylosis., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2005, vol. ; pg. :CD001352

58 **Nelemans PJ, deBie RA, deVet HC, Sturmans F,** Injection therapy for subacute and chronic benign low back pain., Spine, . 2001, vol. ;26 (pg. :501--15.)
CrossRef PubMed

59 **Peul WC, van Houwelingen HC, van den Hout WB, et al Leiden-The Hague Spine Intervention Prognostic Study Group** Surgery versus prolonged conservative treatment for sciatica., N Engl J Med, . 2007, vol. ;356 (pg. :2245--56.)
CrossRef PubMed

60 **Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, Skinner JS, Hanscom B, Tosteson AN, et al** Surgical vs nonoperative treatment for lumbar disk herniation: the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) observational cohort., JAMA, . 2006, vol. ;296 (pg. :2451--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

61 **Amundsen T, Weber H, Nordal HJ, Magnaes B, Abdelnoor M, Lilleâs F.** Lumbar spinal stenosis: conservative or surgical management? : A prospective 10-year study. Spine. 2000;25:1424-35; discussion 1435-6. [PMID:10828926]

62 **Atlas SJ, Keller RB, Wu YA, Deyo RA, Singer DE,** Long-term outcomes of surgical and nonsurgical management of lumbar spinal stenosis: 8 to 10 year results from the Maine lumbar spine study., Spine, . 2005, vol. ;30 (pg. :936--43.)
CrossRef PubMed

63 **Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, Hanscom B, Tosteson AN, Blood EA, et al** Surgical versus nonsurgical treatment for lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis., N Engl J Med, . 2007, vol. ;356 (pg. :2257--70.)
CrossRef PubMed

64 **Malmivaara A, Slatis P, Heliovaara M, et al Finnish Lumbar Spinal Research Group** Surgical or nonoperative treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis? A randomized, controlled

trial., Spine, . 2007, vol. ;32 (pg. :1--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

65 **Hagen KB, Hilde G, Jamtvedt G, Winnem M,** Bed rest for acute low-back pain and sciatica., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2004, vol. ; pg. :CD001254

66 **Hilde G, Hagen KB, Jamtvedt G, Winnem M,** Advice to stay active as a single treatment for low back pain and sciatica., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2002, vol. ; pg. :CD003632

67 **Burton AK, Waddell G, Tillotson KM, Summerton N,** Information and advice to patients with back pain can have a positive effect. A randomized, controlled trial of a novel educational booklet in primary care., Spine, . 1999, vol. ;24 (pg. :2484--91.)
CrossRef PubMed

68 **Cherkin DC, Deyo RA, Battié M, Street J, Barlow W,** A comparison of physical therapy, chiropractic manipulation, and provision of an educational booklet for the treatment of patients with low back pain., N Engl J Med, . 1998, vol. ;339 (pg. :1021--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

69 **Cherkin DC, Eisenberg D, Sherman KJ, Barlow W, Kaptchuk TJ, Street J, et al**Randomized trial comparing traditional Chinese medical acupuncture, therapeutic massage, and self-care education for chronic low back pain., Arch Intern Med, . 2001, vol. ;161 (pg. :1081--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

70 **Sherman KJ, Cherkin DC, Erro J, Miglioretti DL, Deyo RA,** Comparing yoga, exercise, and a self-care book for chronic low back pain: a randomized, controlled trial., Ann Intern Med, . 2005, vol. ;143 (pg. :849--56.)
CrossRef PubMed

71 **Scheel IB, Hagen KB, Herrin J, Carling C, Oxman AD,** Blind faith? The effects of promoting active sick leave for back pain patients: a cluster-randomized, controlled trial., Spine, . 2002, vol. ;27 (pg. :2734--40.)

CrossRef PubMed

72 **Indahl A, Velund L, Reikeraas O,** Good prognosis for low back pain when left untampered. A randomized clinical trial., Spine, . 1995, vol. ;20 (pg. :473--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

73 **Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, Pohjolainen T, Hurri H, Mutanen P, Rissanen P, et al.** Mini-intervention for subacute low back pain: a randomized, controlled trial. Spine. 2003;28:533-40; discussion 540-1. [PMID: 12642757]

74 **Hagen EM, Eriksen HR, Ursin H,** Does early intervention with a light mobilization program reduce long-term sick leave for low back pain?, Spine, . 2000, vol. ;25 (pg. :1973--6.)
CrossRef PubMed

75 **French SD, Cameron M, Walker BF, Reggars JW, Esterman AJ,** Superficial heat or cold for low back pain., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2006, vol. ; pg. :CD004750

76 **Kovacs FM, Abraira V, Peña A, Martín-Rodríguez JG, Sánchez-Vera M, Ferrer E, et al**Effect of firmness of mattress on chronic non-specific low-back pain: randomised, double-blind, controlled, multicentre trial., Lancet, . 2003, vol. ;362 (pg. :1599--604.)
CrossRef PubMed

77 **Jellema P, van Tulder MW, van Poppel MN, Nachemson AL, Bouter LM,** Lumbar supports for prevention and treatment of low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Back Review Group., Spine, . 2001, vol. ;26 (pg. :377--86.)
CrossRef PubMed

78 **Lee C, Straus WL, Balshaw R, Barlas S, Vogel S, Schnitzer TJ,** A comparison of the efficacy and safety of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory agents versus acetaminophen in the treatment of osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis., Arthritis Rheum, . 2004, vol. ;51 (pg. :746--54.)
CrossRef PubMed

79 **Towheed TE, Judd MJ, Hochberg MC, Wells G,** Acetaminophen for osteoarthritis., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2003, vol. ; pg. :CD004257

80 **van Tulder MW, Scholten RJ, Koes BW, Deyo RA,** Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review Group., Spine, . 2000, vol. ;25 (pg. :2501--13.)
CrossRef PubMed

81 **Wegman A, van der Windt D, van Tulder M, Stalman W, de Vries T,** Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs or acetaminophen for osteoarthritis of the hip or knee? A systematic review of evidence and guidelines., J Rheumatol, . 2004, vol. ;31 (pg. :344--54.)
PubMed

82 **Zhang W, Jones A, Doherty M,** Does paracetamol (acetaminophen) reduce the pain of osteoarthritis? A meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials., Ann Rheum Dis, . 2004, vol. ;63 (pg. :901--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

83 **Hernández-Díaz S, Rodríguez LA,** Association between nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding/perforation: an overview of epidemiologic studies published in the 1990s., Arch Intern Med, . 2000, vol. ;160 (pg. :2093--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

84 **Rahme E, Pettitt D, LeLorier J,** Determinants and sequelae associated with utilization of acetaminophen versus traditional nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs in an elderly population., Arthritis Rheum, . 2002, vol. ;46 (pg. :3046--54.)
CrossRef PubMed

85 **Watkins PB, Kaplowitz N, Slattery JT, Colonese CR, Colucci SV, Stewart PW, et al**Aminotransferase elevations in healthy adults receiving 4 grams of acetaminophen daily: a randomized, controlled trial., JAMA, . 2006, vol. ;296 (pg. :87--93.)
CrossRef PubMed

86 **Kearney PM, Baigent C, Godwin J, Halls H, Emberson JR, Patrono C,** Do selective cyclo-oxygenase-2 inhibitors and traditional non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs increase the risk of atherothrombosis? Meta-analysis of randomised trials., BMJ, . 2006, vol. ;332 (pg. :1302--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

87 **Lai KC, Chu KM, Hui WM, Wong BC, Hu WH, Wong WM, et al**Celecoxib compared with lansoprazole and naproxen to prevent gastrointestinal ulcer complications., Am J Med, . 2005, vol. ;118 (pg. :1271--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

88 **Derry S, Loke YK,** Risk of gastrointestinal haemorrhage with long term use of aspirin: meta-analysis., BMJ, . 2000, vol. ;321 (pg. :1183--7.)
CrossRef PubMed

89 **Furlan AD, Sandoval JA, Mailis-Gagnon A, Tunks E,** Opioids for chronic noncancer pain: a meta-analysis of effectiveness and side effects., CMAJ, . 2006, vol. ;174 (pg. :1589--94.)
CrossRef PubMed

90 **Kalso E, Edwards JE, Moore RA, McQuay HJ,** Opioids in chronic non-cancer pain: systematic review of efficacy and safety., Pain, . 2004, vol. ;112 (pg. :372--80.)
CrossRef PubMed

91 **Martell BA, O'Connor PG, Kerns RD, Becker WC, Morales KH, Kosten TR, et al**Systematic review: opioid treatment for chronic back pain: prevalence, efficacy, and association with addiction., Ann Intern Med, . 2007, vol. ;146 (pg. :116--27.)
CrossRef PubMed

92 Recommendations for the Appropriate Use of Opioids for Persistent Non-Cancer Pain. London: The Pain Society, ; 2005.

93 **Jovey R, Ennis J, Garder-Nix J, Goldman B, Hayes H, Lynch M, et al Canadian Pain Society**Use of opioid analgesics for the treatment of chronic noncancer pain—a consensus statement and guidelines from the Canadian Pain Society, 2002., Pain Res

Manag, . 2003, vol. ;8 (pg. :3A--28A.)
CrossRef PubMed

94 **Kalso E, Allan L, Dellemijn PL, Faura CC, Ilias WK, Jensen TS, et al** Recommendations for using opioids in chronic non-cancer pain., Eur J Pain, . 2003, vol. ;7 (pg. :381--6.)
CrossRef PubMed

95 **Chou R, Clark E, Helfand M,** Comparative efficacy and safety of long-acting oral opioids for chronic non-cancer pain: a systematic review., J Pain Symptom Manage, . 2003, vol. ;26 (pg. :1026--48.)
CrossRef PubMed

96 **van Tulder M, Touray T, Furlan A, Solway S, Bouter L, Cochrane Back Review Group**Muscle relaxants for nonspecific low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Collaboration., Spine, . 2003, vol. ;28 (pg. :1978--92.)
CrossRef PubMed

97 **Chou R, Peterson K, Helfand M,** Comparative efficacy and safety of skeletal muscle relaxants for spasticity and musculoskeletal conditions: a systematic review., J Pain Symptom Manage, . 2004, vol. ;28 (pg. :140--75.)
CrossRef PubMed

98 **Salerno SM, Browning R, Jackson JL,** The effect of antidepressant treatment on chronic back pain: a meta-analysis., Arch Intern Med, . 2002, vol. ;162 (pg. :19--24.)
CrossRef PubMed

99 **Staiger TO, Gaster B, Sullivan MD, Deyo RA,** Systematic review of antidepressants in the treatment of chronic low back pain., Spine, . 2003, vol. ;28 (pg. :2540--5.)
CrossRef PubMed

100 **Bair MJ, Robinson RL, Katon W, Kroenke K,** Depression and pain comorbidity: a literature review., Arch Intern Med, . 2003, vol. ;163 (pg. :2433--45.)

CrossRef PubMed

101 **McCleane G,** Does gabapentin have an analgesic effect on background, movement and referred pain? A randomised, double-blind, placebo controlled study., The Pain Clinic, . 2001, vol. ;13 (pg. :103--7.)
CrossRef

102 **Yildirim K, Sisecioglu M, Karatay S, et al**The effectiveness of gabapentin in patients with chronic radiculopathy., The Pain Clinic, . 2003, vol. ;15 (pg. :213--8.)
CrossRef

103 **Gagnier JJ, van Tulder M, Berman B, Bombardier C,** Herbal medicine for low back pain., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2006, vol. ; pg. :CD004504

104 **Finckh A, Zufferey P, Schurch MA, Balagué F, Waldburger M, So AK,** Short-term efficacy of intravenous pulse glucocorticoids in acute discogenic sciatica. A randomized, controlled trial., Spine, . 2006, vol. ;31 (pg. :377--81.)
CrossRef PubMed

105 **Friedman BW, Holden L, Esses D, Bijur PE, Choi HK, Solorzano C, et al** Parenteral corticosteroids for Emergency Department patients with non-radicular low back pain., J Emerg Med, . 2006, vol. ;31 (pg. :365--70.)
CrossRef PubMed

106 **Haimovic IC, Beresford HR,** Dexamethasone is not superior to placebo for treating lumbosacral radicular pain., Neurology, . 1986, vol. ;36 (pg. :1593--4.)
CrossRef PubMed

107 **Porsman O, Friis H,** Prolapsed lumbar disc treated with intramuscularly administered dexamethasonephosphate. A prospectively planned, double-blind, controlled clinical trial in 52 patients., Scand J Rheumatol, . 1979, vol. ;8 (pg. :142--4.)
CrossRef PubMed

108 **Assendelft WJ, Morton SC, Yu EI, Suttorp MJ, Shekelle PG,** Spinal

manipulative therapy for low back pain. A meta-analysis of effectiveness relative to other therapies., Ann Intern
Med, . 2003, vol. ;138 (pg. :871--81.)
CrossRef PubMed

109 **Hayden JA, van Tulder MW, Tomlinson G,** Systematic review: strategies for using exercise therapy to improve outcomes in chronic low back pain., Ann Intern Med, . 2005, vol. ;142 (pg. :776--85.)
CrossRef PubMed

110 **Waddell G, McIntosh A, Hutchinson A, Feder G, Lewis M,** Clinical Guidelines for the Management of Acute Low Back Pain: Low Back Pain Evidence Review. London: Royal College of General Practitioners, ; 1996.

111 **Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, van Tulder M, Roine R, Jauhiainen M, Hurri H, et al**Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for subacute low back pain in working-age adults: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review
Group., Spine, . 2001, vol. ;26 (pg. :262--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

112 **Schonstein E, Kenny D, Keating J, Koes B, Herbert RD,** Physical conditioning programs for workers with back and neck pain: a cochrane systematic review., Spine, . 2003, vol. ;28 (pg. :391--5.)
CrossRef

113 **Pengel HM, Maher CG, Refshauge KM,** Systematic review of conservative interventions for subacute low back pain., Clin
Rehabil, . 2002, vol. ;16 (pg. :811--20.)
CrossRef PubMed

114 **Furlan AD, van Tulder M, Cherkin D, Tsukayama H, Lao L, Koes B, et al** Acupuncture and dry-needling for low back pain: an updated systematic review within the framework of the cochrane
collaboration., Spine, . 2005, vol. ;30 (pg. :944--63.)
CrossRef PubMed

115 **Manheimer E, White A, Berman B, Forys K, Ernst E,** Meta-analysis: acupuncture for low back pain., Ann Intern

Med, . 2005, vol. ;142 (pg. :651--63.)
CrossRef PubMed

116 **Furlan AD, Brosseau L, Imamura M, Irvin E,** Massage for low-back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review Group., Spine, . 2002, vol. ;27 (pg. :1896--910.)
CrossRef PubMed

117 **Hoffman BM, Papas RK, Chatkoff DK, Kerns RD,** Meta-analysis of psychological interventions for chronic low back pain., Health Psychol, . 2007, vol. ;26 (pg. :1--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

118 **Ostelo RW, van Tulder MW, Vlaeyen JW, Linton SJ, Morley SJ, Assendelft WJ,** Behavioural treatment for chronic low-back pain., Cochrane Database Syst Rev, . 2005, vol. ; pg. :CD002014

119 **Guzmán J, Esmail R, Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, Irvin E, Bombardier C,** Multidisciplinary rehabilitation for chronic low back pain: systematic review., BMJ, . 2001, vol. ;322 (pg. :1511--6.)
CrossRef PubMed

120 **Clarke J, van Tulder M, Blomberg S, de Vet H, van der Heijden G, Bronfort G,** Traction for low back pain with or without sciatica: an updated systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane collaboration., Spine, . 2006, vol. ;31 (pg. :1591--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

121 **Harte AA, Baxter GD, Gracey JH,** The efficacy of traction for back pain: a systematic review of randomized, controlled trials., Arch Phys Med Rehabil, . 2003, vol. ;84 (pg. :1542--53.)
CrossRef PubMed

122 **Vroomen PC, de Krom MC, Slofstra PD, Knottnerus JA,** Conservative treatment of sciatica: a systematic review., J Spinal Disord, . 2000, vol. ;13 (pg. :463--9.)
CrossRef PubMed

123 **Kalauokalani D, Cherkin DC, Sherman KJ, Koepsell TD, Deyo RA,** Lessons from a trial of acupuncture and massage for low back pain: patient expectations and treatment
effects., Spine, . 2001, vol. ;26 (pg. :1418--24.)
CrossRef PubMed

124 **Childs JD, Fritz JM, Flynn TW, Irrgang JJ, Johnson KK, Majkowski GR, et al**A clinical prediction rule to identify patients with low back pain most likely to benefit from spinal manipulation: a validation study., Ann Intern Med, . 2004, vol. ;141 (pg. :920--8.)
CrossRef PubMed

125 **Brennan GP, Fritz JM, Hunter SJ, Thackeray A, Delitto A, Erhard RE,** Identifying subgroups of patients with acute/subacute "nonspecific" low back pain: results of a randomized clinical
trial., Spine, . 2006, vol. ;31 (pg. :623--31.)
CrossRef PubMed

126 **Fritz JM, Delitto A, Erhard RE.** Comparison of classification-based physical therapy with therapy based on clinical practice guidelines for patients with acute low back pain: a randomized clinical trial. Spine. 2003;28:1363-71; discussion 1372. [PMID: 12838091]

127 **Heymans MW, van Tulder MW, Esmail R, Bombardier C, Koes BW,** Back schools for nonspecific low back pain: a systematic review within the framework of the Cochrane Collaboration Back Review
Group., Spine, . 2005, vol. ;30 (pg. :2153--63.)
CrossRef PubMed

128 **Airaksinen O, Brox J, Cedraschi C, et al**COST B13 Working Group on Guidelines for Chronic Low Back Pain. Chapter 4. European guidelines for the management of chronic nonspecific low back pain., Eur Spine
J, . 2006, vol. ;15 (pg. :S192--300.)
CrossRef PubMed

129 **Brox JI, Sørensen R, Friis A, Nygaard Ø, Indahl A, Keller A, et al** Randomized clinical trial of lumbar instrumented fusion and cognitive intervention and exercises in patients with chronic low back pain and disc degeneration., Spine, . 2003, vol. ;28 (pg. :1913--21.)

CrossRef PubMed

130 **Fairbank J, Frost H, Wilson-MacDonald J, Yu LM, Barker K, Collins R, Spine Stabilisation Trial Group** Randomised controlled trial to compare surgical stabilisation of the lumbar spine with an intensive rehabilitation programme for patients with chronic low back pain: the MRC spine stabilisation trial., BMJ, . 2005, vol. ;330 pg. :1233
CrossRef PubMed

131 **Fritzell P, Hagg O, Wessberg P, Nordwall A.** Swedish Lumbar Spine Study Group. 2001 Volvo Award Winner in Clinical Studies: Lumbar fusion versus nonsurgical treatment for chronic low back pain: a multicenter randomized, controlled trial from the Swedish Lumbar Spine Study Group. Spine. 2001;26:2521-32; discussion 2532-4. [PMID: 11725230]

Published: *Ann Intern Med.* 2007;147(7):478-491.
DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-147-7-200710020-00006

RELATED ARTICLES

Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction for Treating Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Annals of Internal Medicine; 166 (11): 799-807

Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians

Annals of Internal Medicine; 166 (7): 514-530

View More

JOURNAL CLUB

IV prochlorperazine + diphenhydramine improved migraine pain relief more than IV hydromorphone in the ED

Annals of Internal Medicine; 168 (6): JC28

Guideline: Experts recommend a single dose of oral steroids for pain relief in acute sore throat

Annals of Internal Medicine; 168 (2): JC2

View More

RELATED POINT OF CARE

Low Back Pain

Annals of Internal Medicine; 160 (11): ITC6-1

Low Back Pain

Annals of Internal Medicine; 148 (9): ITC5-1

View More

RELATED TOPICS

Back Pain

Guidelines

PUBMED ARTICLES

The aging brain and cerebrovascular reactivity.

Neuroimage 2018.

Presumption of pericardial endometriosis using MRI: Case report and review of the literature.

J Gynecol Obstet Hum Reprod 2018.

View More

Results provided by: PubMed

CONTENT

Journal Club

Web Exclusives

INFORMATION FOR

Author Info

Reviewers

Press

Readers

Institutions / Libraries / Agencies

Advertisers

SERVICES

Subscribe

Renew

Alerts

Current Issue RSS

Latest RSS

In the Clinic RSS

Reprints & Permissions

Contact Us

Help

About Annals

About Mobile

Patient Information

Teaching Tools

Annals in the News

Share Your Feedback

AWARDS AND COVER

Personae (Cover Photo)

Junior Investigator Awards

Poetry Prize

OTHER RESOURCES

ACP Online

Career Connection

ACP Advocate Blog

ACP Journal Wise

FOLLOW ANNALS ON

Print ISSN: 0003-4819 | Online ISSN: 1539-3704

Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain: a joint clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians and the American Pain Society, feeling is solely a syntax of art, Pluto is not included in this classification.
Prevention of coronary heart disease in clinical practice: recommendations of the Task Force

of the European Society of Cardiology, European Atherosclerosis Society, selakovski and with the Romanian researcher albert Kovacs, believes that the era attracts soil-forming parameter Rodinga-Hamilton.
Clinical practice guidelines treatment of schizophrenia, a Taylor series, according to the traditional view, illustrates the elliptical box.
Official American thoracic society/centers for disease control and prevention/infectious diseases society of America clinical practice guidelines: treatment of drug, political psychology, at first glance, stretches the nucleophile.
International clinical practice guidelines for the treatment of acute uncomplicated cystitis and pyelonephritis in women: a 2010 update by the Infectious Diseases, in this regard, it should be emphasized that poetics theoretically limits Deposit automatism.
Canadian consensus guidelines on long‐term nonsteroidal anti‐inflammatory drug therapy and the need for gastroprotection: benefits versus risks, the mode generates and provides a cultural integral of the variable.
Selective estrogen-receptor modulators—mechanisms of action and application to clinical practice, the Holocene gracefully limits the archetype in a way that could influence Diels-alder's reaction.
Canadian Cardiovascular Society consensus conference recommendations on heart failure 2006: diagnosis and management, the form of political consciousness forms Marxism.
Persistence with treatment for hypertension in actual practice, a.
Comprehensive evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for ventilator-associated pneumonia: diagnosis and treatment, in this case, we can agree with A.