

The Usefulness of Selective Spinal Nerve Root Block

Dae Moo Shim, M.D., Tae Kyun Kim, M.D., Ha Heon Song, M.D.,
Son Soo You, M.D., Jae Duck Cho, M.D.

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, School of Medicine, Wonkwang University, Iksan, Korea

– Abstract –

Purpose: A retrospective study on the usefulness of selective spinal nerve root block among lumbar herniated intervertebral disc (HIVD), spinal stenosis and postoperative syndrome over 10 years.

Material and Method: From a total 1195 patients, whose symptoms were not improved by conservative treatment, 505 treated by selective nerve root block were divided into 3 groups; 150 (29.7%) with HIVD, 313 (62.0%) with spinal stenosis and 42 with postoperative syndrome, and were followed up from Oct. 1992 to Dec 2001. The degree of pain and activity were evaluated by a visual analogue scale method at the out-patient department or through telephone interviews.

Results: The end- results of selective spinal nerve root block, with more than 50% reduction in pain occurred in 380 (75.3%) of the 505 patients. The effectiveness was greater in young patients with HIVD than elderly patients with spinal stenosis. After discharge, 160 patients (31.7%) needed no other treatment: 14 (31.0%) with an extrusion type HIVD and 17 (20.0%) with spondylolisthesis. The only 98 patients (19.4%) needed a surgical procedure after selective spinal nerve root block.

Conclusion: Selective spinal nerve root block in patients with lower back and radiating pain is a valuable conservative treatment to quickly improved symptoms and avoid surgical procedures and the continuous administration of drugs.

Key Words: HIVD, spinal stenosis, postoperative syndrome, spinal nerve root block

가 .

1-5).

Address reprint requests to

Dae Moo Shim, M.D.

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, School of Medicine, Wonkwang University Hospital

#344-2 Sinyoung-dong, Iksan, Chunbuk, 570-711, Korea

Tel: 82-63-850-1255, Fax: 82-63-850-1257, E-mail: osshim@wonkwang.ac.kr

鴫

313

(62.0%) 가

150 (29.7%), 42 (8.3%)

6

1. 232 (74.1%), 84 (56.0%), 1

23 (54.8%)

33 (22.0%) (Table 3).

1992 10 2001 12 10

4.

1195

1

가

505 () 3.8

1947 2

가 110 (21.8%), 3

가 165 (32.7%), 4

2. 가 55 (10.9%), 5 가 72 (14.3%), 6

가 50 (10.0%), 7 46 (9.1%)

가 160 (31.7%). (Table 4).

가 345 (68.3%) (Table 1), 786 가 L4 599 , S1

56.3 (20~83) , 60 212 (42.0%) 가 442 , L3 84 , L2 36

50 109 (21.6%) . 40

67 (13.3%), 30 68 (13.4%), 20 49 (9.6%)

(Table 2).

5.

3.

Table 1. Disease and sex distribution of the patients

	Male	Female	Total
HIVD	73	77	150
Spinal stenosis	79	234	313
Postoperative syndrome	8	34	42
Total	160	345	505

Table 2. Disease and age distribution of the patients

	20 ~ 29	30 ~ 39	40 ~ 49	50 ~ 59	over 60	Total
HIVD	45	56	28	16	5	150
Spinal stenosis	3	11	34	86	179	313
Postoperative syndrome	1	1	5	7	28	42
Total	49	68	67	109	212	505

6.

3

visual analogue scale 100 mm 4 cm 30 45 22 guage

가 , 50 mm 가 1 1 10

가 15 1

SPSS 1

(Ver. 10.0)

Chi-Square test Fisher's Exact test 0.05 0.5 ml (telebrix) 0.5 ml dexamethasone 0.5 ml lidocaine

7.

3

Lasegue (bowstring)

Table 3. Symptom distribution

	less than 1 month	1 ~ 3 mos	3 ~ 6 mos	6 ~ 12 mos	over 12 mos	Total
HIVD	33	22	11	16	68	150
Spinal stenosis	29	29	23	78	154	313
Postoperative syndrome	11	4	4	4	19	42
Total	73	55	38	98	241	505

mos: months

Table 4. Number of nerve block according to disease

	1 ~ 2	3 ~ 4	5 ~ 6	7 ~ 8	over 9	Total
HIVD	49	62	33	6	0	150
Spinal stenosis	55	139	82	30	7	313
Postoperative syndrome	13	19	7	3	0	42
Total	117	220	122	39	7	505

Table 5. Reduction of pain after nerve block (Visual analogue scale)

	0 ~ 25%	25 ~ 50%	50 ~ 75%	75 ~ 100%	Total
HIVD	14	30	75	31	150
Spinal stenosis	31	36	171	75	313
Postoperative syndrome	7	7	21	7	42
Total	52	73	267	113	505

50%

6

19, 6 23 50%

1. 가 (65.2%) 13 (68.4%), 15 가

Visual analogue scale 가

50% 380 (75.3%) 2. 106 (70.7%), 28 1) 246 (78.6%), (66.7%) (Table 5).

1) 364 (72.1%), 202 (40%) 172 (34.1%) 3.8 3 96 67 (69.8%) 50% 339 (67.1%) 가 6 , 4 54 39 (72.2%) 50% 151 50% 131 (80.9%), 115 (76.2%) 2) 3 160 (31.7%) , 98 (19.4%), 146 (28.1%), 101 (20.0%) 가 50-60 265 (84.7%) 가 196 (74.0%), 20~30 가 101 (67.3%) 86 (85.1%) 3) 가 150 23 (15.3%), 69 (46.0%), 45 (30.0%), 13 (8.7%) 26 (17.3%) , 가 6 66 , 6 21 (91.3%), 42 84 50% (60.9%), 14 (31.1%), 2 (15.4%) 55 (83.3%), 51 (60.7%) , 31.1% 가 6 가 81 , 6 232 71 (87.7%), 175 (75.4%) 가 75 (24.0%)

59 (18.8%) . , . Krempen ²³⁾ 가 17 (20%), 가 21 (24.7%) 가 . , 가 6 (14.3%) , 가 13 (30.9%) . , 가 iodine 가 . Dooley ⁸⁾ 1944 Kelman²⁾ CT , 116 , 81% . Haueisen ²⁴⁾ 1971 Macnab⁶⁾ 가 5,7-15) . Beaman ¹⁶⁾ 93% phospholipase A ²⁵⁾ 19 12 . Steroid (63.2%) 4 (21.1%) , 3 (15.8%) 1,3,17-20) . 가 가 150 106 (70.7%) 50% 3,18,21,22) . Yabuki ⁵⁾ , 26 (17.3%) 가 . Riew ²⁶⁾ 55 29 . Tajima 106 bupivacaine steroid 29 148 가 4) 20 가 29 lidocaine 75.3% 66.7%, 78.6% 50% dexamethasone 50% 70.7%, 89 (59.3%), 6 (14.3%) . 가 가 White ²⁷⁾ 2 73% 87%

2	가	25%
, Pfirrmann ²⁸⁾	가 86%	
, 2		
	75.3%	50%
1992 10	2001 12	10
가 가	505	1
1. 20~30	50~60	가
6	6	가
2.	380 (75.3%)	50%
	, 160 (31.7%)	
		가

REFERENCES

- 1) **Hasue M**: Pain and the nerve root. An interdisciplinary approach. *Spine* 1993;18:2053-2058.
- 2) **Kelman H**: Epidural injection therapy for sciatic pain. *Am. J Surg* 1944;64:183-189.
- 3) **Pelz DM**: Percutaneous lumbar nerve root blocks. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1992;158:1412-1413.
- 4) **Tajima T, Furukawa K, Kuramochi E**: Selective lumbar sacral radiculography and block. *Spine* 1980;5:68-77.
- 5) **Yabuki S, Kikuchi S**: Nerve root infiltration and sympathetic block. An experimental study of intradiscal blood flow. *Spine* 1995;20:901-906.
- 6) **Macnab I**: Negative disc exploration. An analysis of the causes of nerve-root involvement in sixty-eight patients. *J Bone Joint surg* 1971;53A:891-902.
- 7) **Bundens DA, Reichtine GR**: Lumbar nerve root injection as an adjunct to sciatica diagnosis. *Orthop Rev* 1985;14:64-69.
- 8) **Dooley JF, McBroom RJ, Taguchi T, Macnab I**: Nerve root infiltration in the diagnosis of radicular pain. *Spine* 1988;13:79-83.
- 9) **Fairbank J**: The use and interpretation of diagnostic nerve root blocks. *Spine* 1999;24:1388.
- 10) **Fairbank JC, Park WM, McCall IW, O'Brien JP**: Apophyseal injection of local anesthetic as a diagnostic aid in primary low-back pain syndromes. *Spine* 1981;6:598-605.
- 11) **Kinard RE**: Diagnostic spinal injection procedures. *Neurosurg Clin N Am* 1996;7:151-165.
- 12) **North RB, Kidd DH, Zahurak M, Piantadosi S**: Specificity of diagnostic nerve blocks: a prospective, randomized study of sciatica due to lumbosacral spine disease. *Pain* 1996;65:77-85.
- 13) **Saal JS**: General principles of diagnostic testing as related to painful lumbar spine disorders: a critical appraisal of current diagnostic techniques. *Spine* 2002;27:2538-2545.
- 14) **Wilppula E, Jussila P**: Spinal nerve block: a diagnostic test in sciatica. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1977;48:458-460.
- 15) **Wolff AP, Groen GJ, Crul BJ**: Diagnostic lumbosacral segmental nerve blocks with local anesthetics: a prospective double-blind study on the variability and interpretation of segmental effects. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2001;26:147-155.
- 16) **Beaman DN, Graziano GP, Glover RA, Wojtys EM, Chang V**: Substance P innervation of lumbar spine facet joints. *Spine* 1993;18:1044-1049.
- 17) **Bogduk N, Long DM**: The anatomy of the so-called "articular nerves" and their relationship to facet denervation in the treatment of low back pain. *J Neurosurg* 1979;51:172-177.
- 18) **Paris SV**: Anatomy as related to function and pain. *Orthop Clin North Am* 1983;14:475-489.
- 19) **Weinstein SM, Herring SA, Derby R**: Contemporary concepts in spine care: epidural steroid injections. *Spine* 1995;20:1842-1846.
- 20) **Derby R, Kine G, Saal JA, et al.**: Response to steroid and duration of radicular pain as predictors of surgical outcome. *Spine* 1992;17:176-183.

- 21) **Schneiderman GA, McLain RF, Hambly MF, Nielsen SL:** *The pars defect as a pain source: a histologic study.* Spine 1995;20:1761-1764.
- 22) **Slipman CW, Lipetz JS, Jackson HB, Rogers DP, Vresilovic EJ:** *Therapeutic selective nerve root block in the nonsurgical treatment of atraumatic cervical spondylotic radicular pain: a retrospective analysis with independent clinical review.* Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2000;81:741-746.
- 23) **Krempen JF, Smith BS, DeFreest LJ:** *Selective nerve root infiltration for the evaluation of sciatica.* Orthop Clin North Am 1975;6:311-315.
- 24) **Haueisen DC, Smith BS, Myers SR, Pryce ML:** *The diagnostic accuracy of spinal nerve injection studies. Their role in the evaluation of recurrent sciatica.* Clin Orthop 1985;198:179-183.
- 25) **Hong YG, Sa SJ, Kim JD:** *Selective spinal nerve root block for treatment of sciatica.* J Kor Spine Surg 1997;4:1056-1062.
- 26) **Riew KD, Yin Y, Gilula L, et al.:** *The effect of Nerve-root injections on the need for operative treatment of lumbar radicular pain: A prospective, randomized, controlled, double-blind study.* J Bone Joint Surg 2000;82A:1589-1593.
- 27) **White AH:** *Injection techniques for the diagnosis and treatment of low back pain.* Orthop Clin North Am 1983;14:553-567.
- 28) **Pfarrmann CW, Oberholzer PA, Zanetti M, et al.:** *Selective nerve root blocks for the treatment of sciatica: evaluation of injection site and effectiveness a study with patients and cadavers.* Radiology 2001;221:704-711.



10

: 1992 10 2001 12

1195 505 (42%)

가 160 (31.7%), 가 345 (68.3%) 56.3 (20 ~ 83)

150 (29.7%), 313 (62.0%), 42 (8.3%)

visual analogue scale 가

: Visual analogue scale 가 505 380 (75.3%) 50%

가 160 (31.7%)

14 (31.1%), 17 (20.0%)

98 (19.4%)

:

344-2

Tel: 82-63-850-1255, Fax: 82-63-850-1257, E-mail: osshim@wonkwang.ac.kr