

Pre-operative magnetic resonance imaging as a predictor of success in lumbar disc herniation patients undergoing laminectomy

Made Widhi Asih¹, Elysanti Dwi Martadiani¹, I Wayan Gede Artawan Eka Putra², Felicia Nike¹, Putri Ayu Ratnasari¹, Crystina Ayu Putri¹, Ni Wayan Setiari Dewi¹

¹Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Udayana, "Prof. Dr. IGNG Ngoerah" Hospital, Bali, Indonesia
²School of Public Health and Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Introduction. Lumbar disc herniation is a condition in which annulus fibrosus in the lumbar area is herniated with numerous etiologies, such as degenerative. One of the mainstay treatment for lumbar disc herniation is decompressive laminectomy. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) with the diagnostic accuracy of 97% also has an excellent resolution for soft tissue. The aim of this study is whether pre-operative MRI may be a predictor of successful clinical outcome in lumbar disc herniation patients undergoing laminectomy surgery.

Methods. In this cross-sectional study, we consecutively collected all patients in Radiology Department Prof. dr. IGNG Ngoerah Hospital, Denpasar Bali between January 2021 to December 2022. We enrolled patients with older than 18 years old who had undergone pre-operative lumbosacral MRI and had laminectomy surgery within the sampling time period. The following variables were recorded from each patient: age, gender, Body mass index (BMI), history of diabetes mellitus, hypertension, number of herniated discs, herniation grade, spinal canal stenosis grade, neural foramen stenosis grade, lateral recess stenosis grade, annular tear, disc degeneration, facet disc degeneration, thickening of ligamentum flavum, modic changes, cerebrospinal liquor obstruction, and clinical outcome.

Outcomes. We collected 30 patients who underwent laminectomy surgery and had their pre-operative MRI. Patients' mean age \pm SD was 57.7 \pm 10.9 years old with 20 male (66.7%) and 10 female (33.3%). There was no significant association between gender, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, body mass index, number of disc herniation, spinal canal stenosis, lateral recess stenosis, neural foramen stenosis, disc degeneration, facet joint degeneration, ligamentum flavum hypertrophy, Modic changes and cerebrospinal liquor obstruction with clinical outcome post laminectomy patients.

Conclusion. Pre-operative MRI can reliably diagnose lumbar disc herniation but are not a predictive tool in assessing the clinical outcome of post-laminectomy patients. Laminectomy has an excellent management value for lumbar disc herniation patients especially in reducing the pain, and for them to have better quality of life.

Keywords: lumbar disc herniation, pre-operative MRI, laminectomy

INTRODUCTION

Low back pain is now one of the most common complaints in the elderly and also younger people, in which its prevalence keeps on increasing within the years. Lumbar disc herniation is a condition in which annulus fibrosus in the lumbar area is herniated with numerous etiologies, such as degenerative. The

herniation will cause pain in the lower back due to stimulation of the nerve root in the spinal cord and cauda equina. The increase the prevalence of daily life disturbance will cause significant contribution in reducing the quality of life [1,2].

Imaging plays a very important role in making the diagnosis for lumbar disc herniation. X-ray as the initial imaging of choice with Anterior-Posterior (AP),

Corresponding author:

Made Widhi Asih

E-mail: widhiasih@unud.ac.id

Article History:

Received: 19 September 2023

Accepted: 29 September 2023

lateral and oblique projection are often used to see the normal alignment of the spine, and also patients may be positioned in flexion and extension to look for spinal instability. In the case of fractured spine and bone integrity, Computed Tomography (CT) Scan is the most sensitive, however the golden standard to confirm the diagnosis of lumbar disc herniation is Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) with the diagnostic accuracy of 97% also has an excellent resolution for soft tissue.[3] MRI can show multiplanar image in axial, sagittal, coronal and three-dimensional, and also numerous sequences to identify abnormalities in spinal cord, subarachnoid space, vertebral bodies, and intervertebral discs [2,4].

The general rules of MRI grading in lumbar disc herniation are normal disc, protrusion, extrusion and sequestration. These findings are evaluated from the displacement of the disc material with apophyseal ring tip. Bulging is defined as the extension of the disc to the apophysis more than 25% of the disc circumference, < 3 mm from the apophyseal tip. Focal protrusion is when the abnormality is less than 25%, extrusion is when the displacement of the disc is more than the disc base, and sequestered is when the nucleus pulposus detaches from the disc [5]. The other parameters are spinal canal stenosis, neural foramen stenosis, ligamentum flavum thickening, listhesis, and annular tear or fissure [5–7].

Decompressive laminectomy is a decompression surgery effective for lumbar disc herniation, in which whole vertebral arch from one facet joint to the other are removed. However, there are some complications reported such as intraoperative bleeding, paraspinal muscle devascularization, and iatrogenic risk of spinal segmental instability, so the decision to operate should be appropriate with the clinical needs and post-operative benefits [8]. Several studies have showed that pre-operative MRI not only become a diagnostic tool, but also the predictor of successful clinical outcome of the patients. Study by Lewandrowski et al, has shown that there are significant difference between lumbar disc herniation grading in MRI with patient's clinical outcome [9]. The aim of this study is whether pre-operative MRI may be a predictor of successful clinical outcome in lumbar disc herniation patients undergoing laminectomy surgery.

METHODS

In this cross-sectional study, we consecutively collected all patients in Radiology Department “Prof. Dr. IGNG Ngoerah” Hospital, Denpasar Bali between January 2021 to December 2022. We enrolled patients with older than 18 years old who had undergone pre-operative lumbosacral MRI and had laminectomy surgery within the sampling time period. The exclusion criteria were patients who had surgery, but

did the MRI in other hospital and patients with lumbar herniated disc who had undergone surgery other than laminectomy. The following variables were recorded from each patient: age, gender, Body mass index (BMI), history of diabetes mellitus, hypertension, number of herniated discs, herniation grade, spinal canal stenosis grade, neural foramen stenosis grade, lateral recess stenosis grade, annular tear, disc degeneration, facet disc degeneration, thickening of ligamentum flavum, Modic changes, cerebrospinal liquor obstruction, and clinical outcome.

Herniation grade recorded including bulging, protruded and extruded discs, spinal canal stenosis grade, neural foramen stenosis grade, lateral recess stenosis grade were divided into I-III, disc degeneration including disc dehydration and desiccation, Modic changes type I-III and clinical outcomes were recorded by Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) improvement before surgery and 6 months after the surgery [5,6].

This study was approved by the ethics committee of Universitas Udayana – RSUP “Prof. Dr. IGNG Ngoerah”. All study procedures were performed in accordance with the ethical standards.

The data was obtained from the medical record and interview. Distribution of patient characteristics and risk factors among patients with pre-operative lumbar disc herniation parameters in MRI were compared. Numerical variables were described as mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables were described as sum and proportion then analyzed based on the Chi-square test. To determine the relationship between pre-operative MRI results and patients' clinical outcome. We concluded all of them in accordance with 95% confidence interval and p-value. The statistical analysis was done by using IBM SPSS 25.0.

OUTCOMES

Demographic and clinical characteristics of this study were shown in Table 1. We acquired mean age \pm SD was 57.7 \pm 10.9 years old with 20 male (66.7%) and 10 female (33.3%). Patient subject with underweight, normal weight, overweight and obesity were respectively 1 patient (3.3%), 15 patients (50%), 13 patients (43.3%), and 1 patient (3.3%). Patients with comorbidity of diabetes mellitus was 6 patients (20%) and hypertension 11 patients (36.7%).

This study was analysed comparatively by using Chi square. According to our comparative study, there were no significant association between gender, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, body mass index, number of disc herniation, spinal canal stenosis, lateral recess stenosis, neural foramen stenosis, disc degeneration, facet joint degeneration, ligamentum flavum hypertrophy, Modic changes and

TABLE 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics

Variable	N=30
Age ± SD	57.7±10.9
Gender	
Male	20 (66.7%)
Female	10 (33.3%)
BMI	
Underweight	1 (3.3%)
Normal	15 (50%)
Overweight	13 (43.3%)
Obese	1 (3.3%)
Hypertension	
No	19 (63.3%)
Yes	11 (36.7%)
Diabetes mellitus	
No	24 (80%)
Yes	6 (20%)
Number of herniated discs	
Single	12 (40%)
Multiple	18 (60%)
Herniation grade	
Bulging	4 (13.3%)
Protuded	22 (73.3%)
Extruded	4 (13.3%)
Spinal canal stenosis	
Grade I	7 (23.3%)
Grade II	7 (23.3%)
Grade III	16 (53.3%)
Neural foramen stenosis	
None	2 (6.7%)
Grade I	6 (20%)
Grade II	10 (33.3%)
Grade III	12 (40%)
Lateral recess stenosis	
None	12 (40%)
Grade I	2 (6.7%)
Grade II	3 (10%)
Grade III	13 (43.3%)
Annular Tear	
No	29 (96.7%)
Yes	1 (3.3%)
Disc Degeneration	
Disc dehydration	20 (66.7%)
Disc dehydration and disc desiccation	10 (33.3%)
Facet joint degeneration	
No	8 (26.7%)
Yes	22 (73.3%)
Ligamentum flavum thickening	
No	15 (50%)
Yes	15 (50%)
Modic changes	
No	20 (66.7%)
Modic type I	7 (23.3%)
Modic type II	3 (10%)
Cerebrospinal liquor obstruction	
No	4 (13.3%)
Partial	25 (83.3%)
Total	1 (3.3%)
Clinical outcome	
No improvement	6 (20%)
Improvement	24 (80%)

cerebrospinal liquor obstruction with clinical outcome post laminectomy patients ($p>0.05$).

DISCUSSION

In this study, the mean age of the research subjects was 57.7 ± 10.49 years, this is in accordance

TABLE 2. Gender and clinical outcome of post laminectomy patients

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Gender			0.065
Male	14 (70%)	6 (30%)	
Female	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	

TABLE 3. Hypertension and clinical outcome of post laminectomy patients

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Hypertension			0.261
No	14 (73.7%)	5 (26.3%)	
Yes	10 (90.9%)	1 (9.1%)	

TABLE 4. Diabetes mellitus and clinical outcome of post laminectomy patients

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Diabetes mellitus			0.344
No	20 (83.3%)	4 (16.7%)	
Yes	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	

TABLE 5. Body mass index and clinical outcome post laminectomy patients

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
BMI			0.384
Underweight	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	
Normal	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	
Overweight	11 (84.6%)	2 (15.4%)	
Obese	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	

TABLE 6. Number of disc herniation and clinical outcome post laminectomy patients

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Number of disc herniation			0.545
Single	10 (83.8%)	2 (16.7%)	
Multiple	14 (77.8%)	4 (22.2%)	

TABLE 7. Herniated disc types and Clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Herniation Types			0.385
Bulging	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	
Protuded	17 (77.3%)	5 (22.7%)	
Extruded	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	

TABLE 8. Spinal canal stenosis and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Spinal canal stenosis			0.663
Grade I	5 (71.4%)	2 (28.6%)	
Grade II	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.3%)	
Grade III	13 (81.3%)	3 (18.8%)	

TABLE 9. Lateral recess stenosis and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Lateral recess stenosis			0.897
None	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	
Grade I	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	
Grade II	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	
Grade III	10 (76.9%)	3 (23.1%)	

TABLE 10. Neural foramina stenosis and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Neural foramen stenosis			0.499
None	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	
Grade I	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	
Grade II	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	
Grade III	10 (83.3%)	2 (16.7%)	

TABLE 11. Annular tear and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Annular tear			0.800
No	23 (79.3%)	6 (20.7%)	
Yes	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	

with the prevalence of lumbar disc herniation which generally appears in the third to fifth decades. This is associated with spinal degeneration in

TABLE 12. Disc degeneration and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Disc degeneration			0.674
Disc dehydration	16 (80%)	4 (20%)	
Disc dehydration and disc desiccation	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	

TABLE 13. Facet joint degeneration and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Facet joint degeneration			0.520
No	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	
Yes	18 (81.8%)	4 (18.2%)	

TABLE 14. Ligamentum flavum hypertrophy and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Ligamentum flavum hypertrophy			0.326
No	11 (73.3%)	4 (26.7%)	
Yes	13 (86.7%)	2 (13.3%)	

TABLE 15. Modic changes and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Modic changes			0.788
None	16 (80%)	4 (20%)	
Modic Type 1	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.3%)	
Modic Type 2	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)	

TABLE 16. Cerebrospinal liquor obstruction and clinical outcome post laminectomy

Variable (n=30)	Clinical outcome		p
	Improvement	No improvement	
Cerebrospinal liquor obstruction			0.855
No	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	
Yes	20 (80%)	5 (20%)	

which changes in bone structure causes vertebral column alteration, the structure becomes stiffer, the density of the nucleus pulposus decreases, changes

in the composition of the intervertebral disc, so inflammation easily occurs and triggers lower back pain [10].

The gender of the subjects in this study was dominated by men, 20 patients (66.7%), similar to the study by Azemi et al., who got male to female ratio of 2:1 (10). However, the result was different from research by Wibhawa et al, which states that the incidence of lumbar disc herniation is dominated by women, especially after menopause, which is thought to be related to estrogen levels which influence a decrease in bone density [11].

Comorbid factors such as diabetes, hypertension, obesity were known to be poor predictors in patients with post-operative lumbar disc herniation [12]. In this study, BMI was measured to assess the patient's nutritional status. BMI can determine health conditions and see risk factors for a disease, in this study we only found 1 case (3.3%) with obese nutritional status. In contrast, research from Wibhawa et al that suggests that there is no relationship between the incidence of lumbar disc herniation and the patient's nutritional status [11].

Comorbid factors such as hypertension and diabetes mellitus in this study did not have a relationship with the clinical outcomes of post-laminectomy lumbar disc herniation patients. This is in consistent with research by Sunjata et al, which also found that there was no significant relationship between hypertension and the incidence of lumbar disc herniation [12]. Meanwhile, the positive relationship between diabetes and lumbar disc herniation is not yet clear. A study shows that patients suffering from diabetes mellitus for more than 10 years and uncontrolled diabetes patients suffer from premature and excessive apoptosis in the notochordal cells of the nucleus pulposus, another study associates that hyperglycemia conditions result in the formation of AGEs (advanced glycation end products) and microangiopathy which results in accelerated degeneration. disc, so it may interfere with the post-operative healing process [13–16].

However, the absence of a relationship between age, gender, BMI, hypertension and diabetes mellitus and the clinical outcomes of post-laminectomy lumbar disc herniation patients in the study is likely due to the small study sample and because laminectomy management was excellent, so that these factors do not influence the patients' clinical outcomes. Other than that, it may also be due to the duration of the follow-up being too short, because in the research of Yamashita et al., it was stated that the older the patient, the worse the clinical outcome after surgery due to the degenerative process and neuroischemic changes, where in their research the clinical outcomes between older and younger patients in the first 36 months will be the same, but in

the 60 months after that it will be significantly different with older patients showing less good outcomes than young people [17].

Twenty-four research subjects (80%) experienced post-laminectomy clinical improvement in the degree of pain and neurological deficits, which was in accordance with research by Alicioglu et al, which also found more (64%) patients with lumbar canal stenosis who had good outcomes post-operatively and there were no significant differences between age, duration of symptoms, gender, degree of pain, paresthesia, straight leg raising test (SLR), motor deficit, sensory deficit, urinary function and degree of spinal canal stenosis, lateral recess, neural foramina, disc degeneration, ligamentum flavum thickening, listhesis and alignment, however there are differences in clinical outcomes with the degree of facet joint degeneration where patients with severe facet joint degeneration have worse outcomes. This may be due to differences in the onset of stenosis, comorbidities, choice of treatment and surgical technique (conservative, wide decompression, medial facetectomy, foraminotomy, microdiscectomy, etc.) and the clinical outcome assessment used [18].

In this study, the pre-operative MRI images that underwent laminectomy were dominated by patients with multiple herniated discs, protruded type, spinal canal stenosis grade III, lateral recess stenosis grade III, neural foramina stenosis grade III, no annular tear, disc dehydration, no modic changes and partial obstruction of cerebrospinal liquor. It can be seen that the frequency distribution of lumbar disc herniation patients who underwent laminectomy were patients with severe herniated disc conditions. So that clinical outcomes such as the pain scale in patients with severe herniated disc conditions are reduced significantly after operative decompression, in accordance with research by Fokter et al, where patients aged under 65 years with severe clinical and physical function disorders underwent laminectomy at one or two vertebral levels showed better clinical outcomes. Apart from that, factors that influence post-operative clinical outcomes are the degree of pre-operative leg and low back pain, good mental status, shorter duration of symptoms, young age and pre-operative physical activity [19]. In a study by Amin et al., it was also explained that motor deficits, vertebral level, type of herniation, gender and modic changes had no relationship with post-operative clinical outcomes [1]. Research by Lewandrowski et al, 2019 also states that there are differences in the degree of stenosis and nerve compression between intraoperative radiologists and surgeons, this may also cause differences in the clinical outcomes of patients after surgery [9].

CONCLUSION

Pre-operative MRI can reliably diagnose lumbar disc herniation but are not a predictive tool in assessing the clinical outcome of post-laminectomy patients. Laminectomy is an operative procedure that

has been abandoned in many developed countries, where minimally invasive procedures are more of an option, however in this study laminectomy still has an excellent management value for lumbar disc herniation patients especially in reducing the pain, and for them to have better quality of life.

Conflict of interest: none declared

Financial support: none declared

REFERENCES

- Amin RM, Andrade NS, Neuman BJ. Lumbar Disc Herniation. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*. 2017 Dec;10(4):507–16. doi: 10.1007/s12178-017-9441-4.
- Zheng K, Wen Z, Li D. The Clinical Diagnostic Value of Lumbar Intervertebral Disc Herniation Based on MRI Images. *Lv Z (ed). J Healthc Eng*. 2021 Apr 5;2021:1–9. doi: 10.1155/2021/5594920.
- Al Qaraghli MI, De Jesus O. Lumbar Disc Herniation. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023 [cited 2023 Sep 27]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK560878/>. PMID: 32809713
- Krämer J, Köster O, Taub E, editors. MR imaging of the lumbar spine: a teaching atlas. Stuttgart New York: Thieme; 2003. 202 p. ISBN: 978-1-58890-137-8 978-3-13-130091-1.
- Fardon DF, Williams AL, Dohring EJ, Murtagh FR, Gabriel Rothman SL, Sze GK. Lumbar disc nomenclature: version 2.0. *Spine J*. 2014 Nov;14(11):2525–45. ISSN: 15299430
- Lee S, Lee JW, Yeom JS, Kim KJ, Kim HJ, Chung SK, et al. A Practical MRI Grading System for Lumbar Foraminal Stenosis. *Am J Roentgenol*. 2010 Apr;194(4):1095–8. doi: 10.2214/AJR.09.2772.
- Azimi P, Mohammadi HR, Benzel EC, Shahzadi S, Azhari S. Lumbar Spinal Canal Stenosis Classification Criteria: A New Tool. *Asian Spine J*. 2015;9(3):399. doi: 10.4184/asj.2015.9.3.399.
- Williams MG, Wafai AM, Podmore MD. Functional outcomes of laminectomy and laminotomy for the surgical management lumbar spine stenosis. *J Spine Surg*. 2017 Dec;3(4):580–6. doi: 10.21037/jss.2017.10.08.
- Lewandrowski KU. Retrospective analysis of accuracy and positive predictive value of preoperative lumbar MRI grading after successful outcome following outpatient endoscopic decompression for lumbar foraminal and lateral recess stenosis. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. 2019 Apr;179:74–80. doi: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2019.02.019.
- Sopaj Azemi E, Kola I, Kola S, Tanka M. Prevalence of Lumbar Disk Herniation in Adult Patients with Low Back Pain Based in Magnetic Resonance Imaging Diagnosis. *Open Access Maced J Med Sci*. 2022 Mar 18;10(B):1720–5. doi: 10.3889/oamjms.2022.8768.
- Wibhawa PA, Yudawijaya A, Wairisal AV. Relationship between Body Mass Index and Lumbar Disc Herniation in UKI General Hospital Jakarta, Indonesia. *Asian J Res Infect Dis*. 2023 May 15;13(3):1–8. doi: 10.9734/ajrid/2023/v13i3265.
- Sunjata WP, Meutia YB, Sukmaningtyas H, Pudjonarko D. Hubungan Hipertensi dengan Klasifikasi Hernia Nukleus Pulposus Lumbal berdasarkan Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Medica Hosp J Clin Med*. 2021 Nov 5;8(3):311–6. doi: 10.36408/mhjcm.v8i3.598.
- Risbud MV, Shapiro IM. Role of cytokines in intervertebral disc degeneration: pain and disc content. *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2014 Jan;10(1):44–56. doi: 10.1038/nrrheum.2013.160.
- Illien-Jünger S, Lu Y, Qureshi SA, Hecht AC, Cai W, Vlassara H, et al. Chronic Ingestion of Advanced Glycation End Products Induces Degenerative Spinal Changes and Hypertrophy in Aging Pre-Diabetic Mice. Passi AG, editor. *PLoS One*. 2015 Feb 10;10(2):e0116625. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0116625.
- Chen S, Liao M, Li J, Peng H, Xiong M. The correlation between microvessel pathological changes of the endplate and degeneration of the intervertebral disc in diabetic rats. *Exp Ther Med*. 2013 Mar;5(3):711–7. doi: 10.3892/etm.2012.868.
- Liu X, Pan F, Ba Z, Wang S, Wu D. The potential effect of type 2 diabetes mellitus on lumbar disc degeneration: a retrospective single-center study. *J Orthop Surg*. 2018 Dec;13(1):52. doi: 10.1186/s13018-018-0755-8.
- Yamashita K, Ohzono K, Hiroshima K. Five-Year Outcomes of Surgical Treatment for Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: A Prospective Observational Study of Symptom Severity at Standard Intervals after Surgery. *Spine*. 2006 Jun;31(13):1484–90. doi: 10.1097/01.brs.0000219940.26390.26.
- Alicioglu B, Yilmaz B, Bulakbasi N, Copuroglu C, Yalniz E, Aykac B, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging predictors of surgical outcome in degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. *Jpn J Radiol*. 2012 Dec;30(10):811–8. doi: 10.1007/s11604-012-0125-0.
- Fokter SK, Yerby SA. Patient-based outcomes for the operative treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. *Eur Spine J*. 2006 Nov 2;15(11):1661–9. doi: 10.1007/s00586-005-0033-4.