Intraarticular Facet Injections for Low Back Pain: Design Considerations, Consensus Methodology to Develop the Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial
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Background: Since the publication of guidelines by the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and the American Pain Society guidelines for low back pain in 2009 there have been deep divisions in the pain treatment community about the use of therapeutic intraarticular facet joint injections. While evidence for the effectiveness or not of intraarticular facet joint injections remains sparse, uncertainty will remain. The Warwick feasibility study, along with a concurrent study with a different design led by another group, aims to provide a stable platform from which the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of intraarticular facet joint injections added to normal care could be evaluated in randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Objectives: To reach consensus on key design considerations for the Warwick facet feasibility study from which the study protocol and working manuals will be developed.

Study Design: A consensus conference involving expert professionals and lay members.

Methods: Preliminary work identified 5 key design considerations for deliberation at our consensus conference. Three concerned patient assessment and treatment: diagnosis of possible facet joint pain, intraarticular injection technique, and best usual care. Two concerned trial analysis: a priori sub-groups and minimally important difference and are reported elsewhere. We did systematic evidence reviews of the design considerations and summarized the evidence. Our design questions and evidence summaries were distributed to all delegates. This formed the basis for discussions on the day. Clinical experts in all aspects of facet joint injection from across the UK along with lay people were invited via relevant organizations. Nominal group technique was used in 15 facilitated initial small group discussions. Further discussion and ranking was undertaken in plenary. All small group and plenary results were recorded and checked and verified post conference. Where necessary participants were contacted via email to resolve outstanding issues.

Results: Fifty-two delegates attended the conference with lay people and all relevant professions represented. Consensus was reached on the details of how to assess patients for facet joint pain, undertake the injections, and deliver usual care. Where post conference checking of results revealed errors in calculating ranking results on the day, consensus was reached by email consultation. All but 3 delegates agreed to be associated with the outcome.

Limitations: Allocating one day for discussing a wide range of topics imposed time pressure on discussion and calculation of the numerous rankings.

Conclusions: Through the use of an evidence-based, systematic, inclusive, and transparent process we have established consensus from expert health professionals in the UK, with lay input, on the clinical assessment of suspected facet joint pain, interaarticular injection for facet joint pain, and best usual care for use in a feasibility study for a proposed pragmatic clinical trial of interaarticular facet joint injections. This provides a strong basis for a clinical trial that will be acceptable to the pain treatment community.
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Low back pain is number one in the global burden of disease for years lived with disability (1). The most recent UK cost of illness study is from 1998. At that time the direct health care costs of low back pain were £1,067M for the UK NHS and £565M in private health care; £28/head of population (2). A 1998 US study estimated direct health care costs as $90,601M; $335 per head of population (3). Much has changed since then. In the United States there has been a 2.4 fold increase in spinal fusions and a massive increase in facet joint interventions; both of which are still increasing (4,5). In response to this problem the UK National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) commissioned guidelines for the management of non-specific low back pain lasting between 6 weeks and one year (6). Published in 2009 they, controversially, recommended not to use a range of treatment approaches that have not been proven to be effective through randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (6,7). The excluded treatment approaches included the injection of therapeutic substances into the back. This recommendation is reported to have had the consequence of reducing the funding for pain clinic services across the UK with the consequence of reducing access to invasive procedures for both people to whom the guideline applies and those for whom it does not; that is, people with radicular pain and those with pain for more than one year. Deep divisions in the scientific and clinical communities have become clear since publication of NICE and American Pain Society guidelines for low back pain (8) which also indicated there was insufficient evidence to support the injection of therapeutic substances into the back (9). Although the methodological approach used by the American Pain Society has been challenged, The American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians also concluded that the evidence for therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections was limited (10,11). There are a variety of different interpretations of the available evidence from RCTs and observational studies on the effectiveness of interaarticular facet joint injections (12-17). Nevertheless, there remains controversy surrounding this issue in the US and UK. In the UK the NICE guidelines are currently undergoing a review and there has been a considerable amount of new research evaluating lumbar facet joint interventions (10,18,19). However, the outcome of all this work is that these data do not constitute a robust evidence base to inform decisions about the use of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections. Thus there is a clear need for a trial to test the effectiveness of adding interaarticular facet joint injections to usual care for the treatment of persistent low back pain where usual care is as recommended by NICE or the American Pain Society. It is important that the proposed trial provides data that all parties can agree on. If the trial has positive results then re-investment in this treatment will be justified. If the trial is negative its conclusions need to be sufficiently robust that all parties to the debate on current guidance are satisfied that the evidence does not support the use of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections. The UK National Institute for Health Research, via a specific call, is currently funding 2 feasibility studies in preparation for trials of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections; we are funded to do one of these studies. Our proposed study will test the addition of a therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injection to best usual care (20). A different team is funded to test the feasibility of a more explanatory trial comparing active interaarticular injection with a sham control in people with a positive diagnostic medial branch nerve block (21). These 2 studies will produce complementary data that will inform decisions on the merit of offering therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections to selected people with low back pain. The comparative merits of these 2 trial designs, or other alternative trial designs, is beyond the scope of this paper. We will publish our overall feasibility study protocol as a separate paper.

This paper reports the design stage of our feasibility study for the proposed RCT, the Facet Injection Study (FIS) to be conducted in the UK NHS (20). The hypothesis to be tested in the proposed trial is:

For people with suspected facet joint pain contributing to persistent low back pain, adding the option of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections, with local anaesthetic and corticosteroids, to best usual non-invasive care available from the NHS is clinically and cost-effective.

There are methodological challenges to setting up and running such a pragmatic trial. There is considerable diagnostic uncertainty about how to identify people with pain of facet joint origin among the wider chronic low back pain population. There are a variety of injection techniques in use within the NHS. While many authors have reported their individual techniques for the therapeutic injection of lumbar facet joints there is little consensus and no guidelines or recommendations for current best practice. In the UK, it is common for a subgroup of patients with low back pain, those with
suspected facet joint pain, to be treated with an injection of local anaesthetic and steroid. The boundaries of diagnostic and therapeutic intent are blurred. Some, but not all, patients receiving interaarticular facet joint injections will be offered a functional restoration program.

Within the UK NHS it is usual practice to inject local anaesthetic and corticosteroids at the same time to avoid the need for the patient to return for a second injection; pragmatically it is this approach that needs testing. There is little agreement on the optimal conservative management/rehabilitation for patients with facet joint pain that is consistent with the NICE guidelines and can be delivered by the NHS. The measurement of outcome in low back pain trials is problematic (22-24). Although there are well established standard packages of outcome measures, the theoretical underpinning of these is poor (22,25). A recent report from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) taskforce on research standards for chronic low back pain recommends the use of 2 questions to define chronic low back pain, classifying its impact by pain intensity, pain interference, and physical function; the use of a minimum dataset to describe research participants; and reporting “responder analyses” in addition to mean outcome scores (26).

We identified 5 design considerations 2 of which were concerned with evaluation methodology (subgroup analysis and interpreting between group differences in score) and will be reported elsewhere. This paper considers the 3 design considerations concerned with patient assessment and treatment: facet joint pain diagnosis, the process of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injection, and the management/rehabilitation of those with facet joint pain (best usual care). This paper describes our process of evidencing these considerations, gaining consensus on the design of the study at a consensus conference, and the formulation of aspects of the FIS protocol.

**Methods**

The 3 stages of the study are presented in Fig. 1: i) scoping review and identification of key design considerations, ii) evidence reviews, and iii) consensus conference.

i. Scoping Reviews and Formulation of Key Design Considerations

Our study team includes pain clinicians, physical therapists, radiologists, and lay representatives as well as research methodologists. Based on scoping reviews of clinical practice guidelines, empirical studies and related literature, and team discussion, 3 design considerations for the proposed trial were identified and questions posed, as follows:

- **Diagnosis**
  - What is the best choice of clinical assessment to identify patients with facet joint pain?

- **Injection technique**
  - What is the agreed technique for the therapeutic interaarticular injection of facet joints?

- **Best usual care**
  - What is the optimal conservative management/rehabilitation for patients with low back pain where facet joints have been identified as a contributing source of symptoms?

ii. Evidence Reviews

To provide evidence on each design consideration, reviews were undertaken informed by the Cochrane and Centre for Reviews and Dissemination guidelines (27,28), as outlined below.

The databases and search terms used for each of the 3 design considerations are detailed in Table 1. Data from identified literature was extracted, collated, and tabulated, and a text summary of the evidence written. For 2 of the 3 design considerations the team provided a suggested protocol based on the evidence as a starting point for discussion at the consensus conference.

iii. The Consensus Conference:

Potential conference participants were invited through relevant professional and lay organizations (Table 2). We sought participation from experts from across the UK. By expert we mean that participants were professionals or lay people with an interest in, and experience of, back pain, its treatment, and in particular its treatment with therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections. The invitation was to a one day conference with no attendance charge and travel expenses were reimbursed. This was held at the University of Warwick on June 27, 2014.

Approximately one week before the consensus conference, a document consisting of the design considerations and related evidence was sent to all those who registered to attend.

We used nominal group technique to gain consensus. This allows for discussion while avoiding individuals or groups dominating the consensus process, and allows participants to draw on available evidence and expertise (29). We started the conference with a brief
Fig. 1. Facet injection study protocol development process.
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Table 1. Databases and search terms used in the production of evidence for each design consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design consideration</th>
<th>Diagnosis of Facet Joint Pain</th>
<th>The Process of therapeutic intraarticular Facet Joint Injection</th>
<th>Best Usual Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data bases</td>
<td>MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, Allied and Contemporary Medicine Database (AMED), BIOSIS</td>
<td>MEDLINE, EMBASE. Wide ranging search of key instructional texts (British Library).</td>
<td>MEDLINE, CINAHL and Allied and contemporary medicine database (AMED). Hand searching of seminal texts for physical therapy (as defined by NICE, 2009). Key texts in the area of physiotherapy and osteopathy were identified and searched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search terms</td>
<td>Population terms: Low back pain OR back pain OR lumbar vertebrae OR spine OR spinal diseases OR facet* OR facet joint* OR zygapophysyal joint* OR lumbar sacral pain. Intervention terms: orthopaedic OR manual OR physical OR therapeutic exercise OR exercise therapy OR rehabilitation OR physiotherapy</td>
<td>Target condition search terms: Low back pain OR back pain OR Spinal pain OR Spinal diseases OR Facet Facet joint OR Zygopophyseal joint OR Lumbar sacral pain OR Facet joint pain OR Spinal pain OR Facet syndrome OR Paravertebral facet pain</td>
<td>Physical Therapy: Population terms: Low back pain OR back pain OR lumbar vertebrae OR spine OR spinal diseases OR facet* OR facet joint* OR zygapophysyal joint* OR lumbar sacral pain. Outcomes: Pain OR function. Intervention terms: Orthopaedic OR manual OR physical OR therapeutic exercise OR exercise therapy OR rehabilitation OR physiotherapy. Psychological interventions: Population terms: Low back pain OR back pain OR lumbar vertebrae OR spine OR spinal diseases OR facet* OR facet joint* OR zygapophysyal joint* OR lumbar sacral pain. Outcomes: Function. Intervention terms: cognitive behavioural approach* OR cognitive behavioural principle* OR psychological approach* OR psychological principle* OR self-management OR self help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Organisations through which invitations to the consensus conference were distributed.

- Professors/consultants in Pain Management via Binley mailing services (http://www.binleys.com/)
- British Association of Spinal Surgeons (http://www.spinesurgeons.ac.uk/)
- Association of British Neurologists (http://www.theabn.org/)
- British Society of Skeletal Radiologists (http://www.bsrr.org.uk/)
- British Society of Interventional Radiologists (http://www.bsisr.org/)
- Primary Care Rheumatology Society (https://www.pcrsociety.org/)
- Council for Allied Health Professions Research (http://www.csp.org.uk/professional-union/research/networking-support/council-allied-health-professions-research)
- Midlands Health Psychology Network (http://www.mhpn.co.uk/)
- Back Care - a lay advocacy and support organisation. (http://www.backcare.org.uk/)
- UNTRAP (Universities/User Teaching and Research Action Partnership) is a partnership between users of health and social care services and carers, the University of Warwick and the NHS. http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/healthatwarwick/untrap

reminder of the key design considerations and evidence. We then held 15 small group consensus sessions each of one hour, with 5 groups meeting in parallel at any one time (Fig. 2). Small group results were fed back to a plenary where final consensus was reached. With participant consent, all sessions were audio recorded for reference during analysis. Participants were randomly assigned to small group sessions stratified by profession (approximately 10 – 12 per group) with each participant discussing 3 different design considerations. Each small group had a trained facilitator, a scribe, and a subject expert from our team. The subject expert did not participate
in the discussions but answered questions about technical issues when invited to by the facilitator. Discussions centered on the particular design consideration, with the suggested “protocol” as a starting point where appropriate. Nominal group technique was adapted to the design consideration under discussion as described below. Each participant confidentially ranked the acceptable approaches identified by the group. Results were collated by the scribe who also took notes of the group process.

Diagnosis – assessment for facet joint pain: Participants were asked to suggest components of clinical assessment. These were then discussed to identify any that were similar and then grouped as sets forming complete clinical assessments. Participants then ranked the clinical assessments.

Injection technique: Fourteen different aspects of the process of injection had been identified. For each aspect a proposal was made for the technique to be used. Group members first identified which of these they considered acceptable. After collation of these results the facilitator invited discussion in turn on each of the aspects where there was not agreement on acceptability. For each of these, alternative processes were identified and then ranked.

Best usual care: Group participants were asked to suggest what treatment approaches should be included in a “toolbox” from which a therapist could tailor treatment for each patient. This could include manual therapy, home exercises, and cognitive approaches. The content of the initial assessment and the number and duration of individual treatment sessions was also discussed. Group participants then identified which of these they considered acceptable. After collation of these results, the facilitator invited discussion in turn on each of the treatment approaches where there was no agreement on acceptability. The group voted on inclusion/exclusion of treatment approaches from the “toolbox” and assessment session content. They ranked alternatives for the number/duration of individual treatment sessions.

Results from all the small group sessions were collated and presented to the plenary session. Where small group results were consistent no further discussion took place. Where there were inconsistencies between small group results, these were discussed and further ranking was undertaken, collated, and reported to the plenary. We discussed and re-ranked issues until one option was clearly the preferred option and there was no objection to its adoption from conference delegates.

*NGT = Nominal group technique

Fig. 2. A diagrammatic representation of the consensus process.
Post Conference

All results were checked and verified from all small group sessions and the plenary. A small number of errors were found in the collation of rankings. The team therefore contacted participants with specific expertise via email to clarify and reach a consensus on these items containing errors.

Our draft protocol for the FIS was edited to reflect the results of the consensus process.

Results

Evidence Reviews


Figure 3 shows the evidence review process for each of the 3 reviews.
In Fig. 4 we summarize the evidence from the reviews and its implications for the FIS.

As noted earlier a protocol based on the evidence reviews for injection technique and best usual care was presented as a starting point for discussion. These are presented in Figs. 5 and 6.

**Consensus Conference**

Fifty-seven people confirmed their attendance of which 52 attended on the day. Table 2 summarizes

---

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-injection</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We do not anticipate using intravenous sedation.</td>
<td>22G x 3.5 inch (0.7 x 90 mm) needle with Quincke type point guide to joint cleft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prone position with pillow under abdomen to flatten lumbar lordosis.</td>
<td>Entry to the joint cleft may be indicated by X-ray appearance: observation of the needle tip on the joint line with medial/lateral movement of the X-ray beam to cause parallax shift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intravenous access, resuscitation equipment available.</td>
<td>If entry to the joint has not been achieved after repositioning the needle twice, the needle will be positioned on the joint line without further attempts at capsular puncture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin cleansing with chlorhexidine 0.5% or 2% in alcohol, sterile drapes. (Some clinicians think that 2% chlorhexidine is neurotoxic and like to use 0.5% as skin cleansing before nerve blocks. On the other hand 2% chlorhexidine is recommended by the control-of-infection experts as optimum skin cleansing before intravenous cannulation and may be preferred in some Trusts).</td>
<td>Aspiration should be negative for blood or cerebrospinal fluid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray imaging (C-arm fluoroscopy) oblique view to visualise joint.</td>
<td>We do not anticipate using contrast medium because of the restriction of available joint volume and the risk of serious allergic reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dose of radiation used will be adequate to visualise the joint while minimizing X-ray exposure.</td>
<td>The immediate post injection advice will be in accordance with the current procedures of the participating study centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin weal at needle entry point: 1% lidocaine via 25G hypodermic needle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Figure 5

**Proposed protocol for injection procedure for the facet joint injection study.**

---

When they attend for injection the operator will make a brief clinical assessment to satisfy themselves that facet joint injections are appropriate. Consent for the procedure will be obtained and the current pre-injection risk management procedures of the participating study centres will be adhered to. The operator will then inject the facet joint(s). We anticipate injecting up to six facet joints in each individual (L3/L4, L4/L5, L5/S1) bilaterally. However, where, on clinical assessment, there is unilateral pain, or involvement of only some levels the operator may choose to do unilateral injection, or be selective on levels injected. We anticipate that everyone should receive at least two injections. This pragmatic approach reflects what actually happens in NHS practice. This approach is consistent with that used in trials of other complex interventions for low back pain, e.g. manual therapy or a cognitive behaviour approach, where practitioners choose from a limited range of options based on their clinical assessment of the patient.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positioning of needle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We anticipate using intravenous sedation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prone position with pillow under abdomen to flatten lumbar lordosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intravenous access, resuscitation equipment available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin cleansing with chlorhexidine 0.5% or 2% in alcohol, sterile drapes. (Some clinicians think that 2% chlorhexidine is neurotoxic and like to use 0.5% as skin cleansing before nerve blocks. On the other hand 2% chlorhexidine is recommended by the control-of-infection experts as optimum skin cleansing before intravenous cannulation and may be preferred in some Trusts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray imaging (C-arm fluoroscopy) oblique view to visualise joint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dose of radiation used will be adequate to visualise the joint while minimizing X-ray exposure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin weal at needle entry point: 1% lidocaine via 25G hypodermic needle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-filled syringes containing bupivacaine 7.5mg and methyl prednisolone 20mg in total volume; 2ml will be used for each joint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The full volume, 2ml, will be injected through the spinal needle placed into each joint. Some facet joints may not be sufficiently large to take this volume of injectate meaning in practice that the injections will be intra- and peri-articular. This reflects what we believe to be current practice in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to injection may occur due to abutment of the needle bevel to a surface or due to filling of the intra-articular space:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Force should not be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ The needle should first be rotated 90° and a further attempt at injection made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ If, after two further 90° rotations resistance to injection persists or if, after successful injection of a part volume resistance develops, gentle pressure should be maintained on the plunger and the needle withdrawn gradually until resistance to injection falls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-injection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After completion of the injection the needle is removed and a sterile dressing applied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Initial assessment (60 minutes)**

Assessment includes discussion of expectations, fear avoidance and self-efficacy to assess any perceived challenges and barriers that patients feel may be preventing them from engaging in self-management of chronic pain and to allow subsequent treatment sessions to be tailored to individual need. For the intervention group, the facet joint injections are given in the period between this first assessment and the first follow-up appointment.

**Individual sessions**

Five further sessions each of 30-minutes incorporating elements of manual therapy, pacing, motor control retraining, therapeutic exercise, soft tissue stretches/release, postural and general advice, goal setting and challenging negative thoughts associated with physical activity and chronic low back pain as appropriate.

**Manual therapy (MT) intervention may include:**

- Passive accessory intervertebral movements; either central, unilateral applied to either the symptomatic level or the level adjacent depending on the severity and irritability.
- Soft tissue release/trigger point release/muscle energy techniques as indicated in order to facilitate motor control retraining and effectiveness of manual therapy.
- Manipulation treatment as indicated.
- Active exercise to increase mobility, improved motor control and core stability, improve overall strength and stretch any tight muscle groups.
- Mobility techniques such as flexion in lying, pelvic tilt, side glides in standing and gym ball exercises.
- Motor control retraining exercises (depending on individual assessments). This may include all muscles involved in core stabilising of the spine and also reducing activity in more superficial muscles that have been shown to become over active in the presence of LBP. Treatment focuses on retraining the ‘co-activation’ pattern of stabilising muscles such as transversus abdominus and lumbar multifidus (LM). This includes retraining of lumbar multifidus as it is innervated by the medial branch and becomes inhibited ipsilateral to the pain in chronic back pain conditions. There is also evidence that specific retraining of ‘core muscles’ can improve pain and disability in some back pain patients.
- Passive stretches. Muscle groups identified during assessment as tight or overactive may be stretched within the therapy sessions in order to allow for improved spinal mobility and facilitate motor control retraining. Stretches taught as part of the home exercise regime.

**Cognitive approaches may include:**

- Pacing including discussion of what is meant by pacing, relevance of pacing and methods to incorporate pacing into daily activities such as pacing by time, pacing by numbers or pacing by grading activities.
- Goal setting, including discussion of setting mutually agreed goals related to functional activities as well as general daily goals and long term goals. Goals agreed between the physiotherapist and patient participant. In line with a CB approach, goals may be based on SMART principles; Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and have a Time frame (a date for competition).
- Challenging negative automatic thoughts (cognitive restructuring) including, working with patients to identify particular negative thoughts they may have in relation to physical activity and fear avoidance, and helping patients challenge their thoughts and adapt positive coping strategies.

**Home exercises and advice may include**

- Bespoke exercise programme to compliment face to face sessions. Prescription to include frequency, dose, repetitions and progressions.
- Advice on positions of ease, strategies to use in event of a ‘flare-up’, and strategies to reduce increasing pain e.g. use of pelvic tilt prior to standing after prolonged sitting.

**Homework tasks (between each session)**

Tailored to each individual and what is discussed during the session. For example, using pacing on a particular activity identified by the patient, keeping a diary of negative automatic thoughts that may trigger anxieties about movement or exercise and pain.

---

**Fig. 6. Proposed content and structure of control intervention.**
Table 3. Number of consensus conference attendees categorized by professional/lay role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional/Lay Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain consultants and physicians</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaesthetists</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist or Physical specialists</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiographers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay representatives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Group and plenary results from Facet injection Study Consensus Conference looking at what is the best choice of clinical assessment to identify patients with suspected facet joint pain.

Diagnosis group 1: Group generated list of 7 options:
- Extension and (ipsilateral side bending/standing)
- Extension and (ipsilateral rotation/proximal)
- Para-Medial tenderness
- MRI Lumbar spine (L1)
- Hypertrophic facet joints or fluid
- Personality inventory
- Favor low back pain

The top 5 were then ranked again:
- Rank 1: G: Focal low back pain
- Rank 2: A: Extension / Ipsilateral side bending (standing)
- Rank 3: D: Para-Medial tenderness
- Rank 4: C: Psychological distractors
- Rank 5: B: Extension and (ipsilateral rotation/proximal)

Diagnosis group 2:
- Group agreed a list of signs and symptoms:
  - History (in absence of red flags):
    - Gradual onset (usual)
    - Lumbar pain
    - Localized (no pain below knee)
    - Back pain predominant feature
    - No neurological symptoms
    - Relieved at rest
    - Mechanical presentation
    - Worse on weight bearing
    - Worse on rotation and extension
    - Functional activities
    - Realistic expectations
    - Clinical reasoning of psychiatric factors
    - Absence of cough/pneumothorax symptoms
  - Clinical findings:
    - Active ROM extension, ipsilateral if, ipsilateral rotation
    - Combined movements
    - Pain on local palpation
    - Absence of wide-spread hyperalgesia and allodynia
    - No neurotensions signs
    - Psycho-social screening tool
    - Flexion not aggravating combined movement
    - Pain
  - Quality (onset):
    - On rising in morning
    - Variable
    - Non-neurologic

Diagnosis group 3:
- Group agreed a list of signs and symptoms:
  - Signs:
    - Localized tenderness (para-sacral)
    - Localized tenderness over joint
    - No tenderness on sacroiliac joint palpation
    - No pain provocation on straight leg raise (to exclude neural tension)
  - Symptoms:
    - Pain increases on standing for long periods
    - Pain increases when climbing stairs
    - Pain increases on extension
    - Pain increases on lateral rotation
    - Pain decreases when lying down
    - Pain decreases on flexion
    - Can have radiation to back and thigh + buttock but not below knee
    - No pain radiating to groin
    - Absence of radicular symptoms and signs
  - Time > 3 months
  - Half course of physiotherapy that has not resolved back pain

Based on the list of signs and symptoms the group generated a further list that was ranked:
- A: All signs listed plus all symptoms minus specific factors, time >3 months
- B: As A, time >1 year
- C: As A time >6 months
- D: As A time >1 year and unsuccessful course of physiotherapy
- E: As A time plus MRI
- F: As D time plus MRI
- G: As A plus diagnostic injection

After an initial ranking a further ranking produced a top three options:
- Rank 1: (D), Rank 2 (A), Rank 3: (G)

Plenary discussions and outcomes
- Results groups sessions were combined and presented for discussion:
  - The following option was discussed:
    - Increased pain on examination
    - Increased pain on rotation
    - Increased pain on extension
- Participants were asked the vote on the following being acceptable:
  - Increased pain on examination
  - No radicular symptoms
  - Pain provocation tool:
    - There was no final vote on this item during the conference via email voting.
the groups, lists were generated and items were then ranked. With the top ranked items going forward to the plenary discussions. However, in one group there was considerable discussion and the group agreed/proposed a diagnostic pathway. This was taken forward to the plenary session. Key components of diagnostic assessment that were discussed in all groups include:

- Increased pain on extension/rotation and extension/lateral flexion and no pain on rising from flexion.
- No radicular symptoms.
- No sacro-iliac joint pain on provocation testing.
- Flexion less painful than extension.

Consensus was not reached on the day.

Injection technique – the process of therapeutic
interarticular facet joint injection (Table 5): There were 14 aspects of the injection process for the groups to consider. In each group a number were considered acceptable without discussion although these varied between groups. All 14 aspects were brought to the plenary but 10 were discussed very briefly before consensus was reached. The following items prompted considerable discussion and were ranked: administration of local anesthetic and its composition, and confirmation of needle position, injectate volume, and injectate composition. Due to errors in ranking, we undertook post conference ranking of injectate volume and composition.

**Best usual care** (Table 6): All 4 of the best usual care group discussions followed a similar format. First, the group discussed and voted on agreement/disagreement with the suggested protocol items. Moving forward, the groups then proposed and voted on new items for inclusion. Comprehensive packages were proposed in all groups and these were taken forward to the afternoon plenary session. While a consensus was reached regarding the key components to be included, some clarification was sought post conference.

**Post Conference**

After the consensus conference all rankings from the day were checked and verified. A number of errors were noted in all 3 design considerations.

**Diagnosis:** In order to confirm the diagnostic criteria for the study, the 45 clinically active delegates were
emailed to ask the following question:
We would like you to review the following text and confirm if the suggested clinical diagnostic criteria proposed for the study is “acceptable”? Stating “YES” or “NO”:

Increased pain unilaterally or bilaterally, on lumbar para-spinal palpation AND increased low back pain on one or more of the following: extension (more than flexion), rotation, extension/side flexion, extension/rotation AND no radicular symptoms (defined as pain radiating below the knee) AND no sacro-iliac joint pain elicited using pain provocation testing.

Responses received: 23; Acceptable: YES = 22, NO = 1.

Injection technique: Following the consensus conference there was uncertainty about the injectate to be used in the study. Six options were sent, via email, to 27 delegates who had indicated they were responsible for injecting facet joints (e.g., pain consultants, anesthesiologists). We received 11 responses. The results are presented in Table 7.

Best usual care: Confirmation of the number and duration of sessions was sought post conference. We emailed 15 delegates who were physiotherapists, extended scope practitioners, or clinical/health psychologists. Two alternatives, a) and b) below, were sent and delegates were asked to state a preferred option and to also say if they felt it was acceptable or not.

There were 12 responses.

One session of 60 minutes plus 5 sessions of 30 minutes (Preferred 9; Acceptable: 7 yes, 0 no)
Up to 6 sessions of 45 minutes each (Preferred 3; Acceptable: 6 yes, 1 no)

Among the 12 responses reported above, 2 respondents answered both options were acceptable, one responder only provided a preference and did not state whether the options were acceptable, and 2 respondents preferred option a and that this was the acceptable option.

The conference consensus and post conference clarifications were then edited into the protocol and operational manuals for the assessment for facet joint pain, injection of facet joints, and best usual care to be used in the feasibility study for the proposed clinical trial. The manuals are paraphrased in the following Figures: 7, 8, and 9.

Discussion

We have established consensus from health professionals concerned with the treatment of facet joint pain in the UK on the clinical assessment of suspected facet joint pain, technique for therapeutic intraarticular injection of facet joints, and best usual care for use in a feasibility study for a proposed clinical trial of therapeutic intraarticular facet joint injections. The process was evidence based and open to all those with a professional interest in this topic, including lay participants, and undertaken in a transparent way. The use or not of intraarticular facet joint injection is controversial internationally, so consensus and transparency is essential for the design of the assessment, intervention, and control intervention for the proposed trial of intraarticular facet joint injections to ensure the results of the proposed trial are acceptable to the whole pain treatment community.

Transparency in the development and evaluation of health interventions is advocated. For example, there are now guidelines for describing assessment, intervention, and control intervention used in clinical trials (30,31). This is important for those using the results of the trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injectate options</th>
<th>Preferred option</th>
<th>Acceptable yes</th>
<th>Acceptable no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone 10mg/Levobupivacaine 2.5mg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone 10mg/Levobupivacaine 5.0mg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone 10mg/Levobupivacaine 7.5mg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone 20mg/Levobupivacaine 3.75mg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone 20mg/Levobupivacaine 7.5mg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone 20mg/Levobupivacaine 11.25mg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments: One responder did not answer acceptable yes/no
One responder answered yes acceptable Triam 10/Levo 7.5 “if using 0.75% Levobupivacaine”
One responder “good luck in finalising the protocol and getting through ethics”
One responder answered same injectate option as preferred and acceptable
One responder only gave an ‘acceptable’ option
in clinical practice or evidence synthesis. The Medical Research Council (MRC) Guidelines on the evaluation of complex interventions suggests that the evidence and theory on which intervention are based should be clear (31). Many funding bodies have a process for seeking public and expert contributions to deciding on the type of intervention that needs evaluation (32,33). However, the consideration of whether or not the most appropriate intervention is evaluated has broadly been left to funding review panels. Our consensus process has opened this up to clinicians and patients concerned with the intervention to ensure that they agree on the appropriateness of the intervention, including the assessment of the patient for the intervention and the control intervention. This process is particularly important for interventions that are already in clinical use.

The diagnostic criteria agreed at consensus generally included the small amount of evidence-based testing/assessment described in the literature. One exception was the exclusion of a clinical prediction rule by Laslett et al (34) who found that presence of 3 or more of the criteria: age > 50, symptoms best when walking, symptoms best when sitting, onset of pain is paraspinal, and positive extension/rotation test was 85% sensitive and 91% specific for facet joint pain. Another was the exclusion of the presence of a regular compression pattern using combined movement testing (an established simple, testing procedure, which purports to load the facet joint) (35,36). Although exploratory in nature, a small scale pilot study demonstrated 80% sensitivity and 74% positive predictive value of a regular compression pattern using combined movements in iden-

---

**Fig. 7. Diagnosis of facet joint pain (brief outline of protocol post-consensus).**

There is considerable diagnostic uncertainly about how to identify people with pain of facet joint origin amongst the wider chronic low back pain population. Therefore the diagnostic criteria used in this trial have been drawn from the available evidence base and following consensus gained from a range of experts and clinicians.

**Diagnostic criteria for trial (summary)**

1. Increased pain unilaterally or bilaterally, on lumbar paraspinal palpation
   AND
2. Increased low back pain on one or more of the following:
   - extension (more than flexion)
   - rotation
   - extension/side flexion
   - extension/rotation
   AND
3. No radicular symptoms (defined as pain radiating below the knee or objective neurological signs above the knee)
   AND
4. No sacro-iliac joint pain elicited using a pain provocation test.

Criterion 1 and 2 cover the issue of presence of pain on palpation or symptom reproduction on movement testing. Criterion 3 and 4 relate to the absence of symptoms, namely radicular symptoms and sacro-iliac pain.

*Both tests representative of regular compression patterns (Edwards, 1999)
# using a ‘contracted’ neurological examination (McCarthy, 2010)

Intraarticular Facet Injections for Low Back Pain

Fig. 8. Brief outline of intra-articular injection procedure post consensus.

Pre-injection procedure:
- Prior to the study injection procedure, following normal local Trust clinical practice the investigator will obtain informed consent for the injection from the participant prior to injecting the facet joints...
- Skin cleansing with chlorhexidine 0.5% or 2% in alcohol, sterile drapes are recommended to be used.
- No intravenous sedation is required.
- Prone position with measures to reduce the lumbar lordosis, e.g. a pillow under the abdomen.

Intravenous access:
- X-ray imaging (C-arm fluoroscopy or other suitable equipment) for visualization of the joint
- The dose of radiation will be adequate to visualize the joint while minimizing X-ray exposure.
- Entry to the joint cleft may be indicated by X-ray appearance. Medial/lateral movement of the X-ray beam with intermittent screening to cause parallax shift may be used...
- For the Facet Injection Study, contrast will not be administered.

Injection:
- Local anaesthesia at needle entry point: 1% lidocaine via 25G hypodermic needle...
- The investigator responsible for the injection will prepare the injection syringe to contain 1 ml of Levobupivacaine 5mg/ml and 1ml Triamcinolone 10mg/ml in total volume; 2ml will be used for each joint...
- Up to six facet joints (L3/L4, L4/L5, L5/S1 bilaterally) in each participant will be injected. However where on clinical assessment there is unilateral pain or involvement of only some levels, the investigator may choose to do unilateral injection, or be selective on levels injected.
- The full volume, 2ml, will be injected through the spinal needle placed into each joint. Some facet joints may not be sufficiently large to take this volume of injectate meaning in practice that the injections will be intra- and peri-articular. This reflects what we believe to be current practice in the UK.
- Resistance to injection may occur due to abutment of the needle bevel to a surface or due to filling of the intra-articular space. Force should not be used.
- The needle should first be rotated 90° and a further attempt at injection made.
- If, after two further 90° rotations resistance to injection persists or if, after successful injection of a part volume resistance develops, gentle pressure should be maintained on the plunger and the needle withdrawn gradually until resistance to injection fails.
- After completion of the injection the needle is removed and a sterile dressing applied.
Fig. 9. Brief outline of the best usual care package post consensus.

The participants were asked to consider the technique for therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injection; the injection of a mixture of local anaesthetic and steroid to the vicinity of potentially painful facet joint(s) with the intention of reducing pain to facil-
state compliance with the best usual care package. The resulting consensus details how the patient should be positioned, the type of needle and the approach to the target joint(s), and the type, dose, and volume of local anesthetic and steroid to be used. The consensus acknowledges the inherent uncertainties of exactly where the injectate ends up: intra-capsular or peri-articular. The consensus technique would be widely recognized as a safe and potentially effective method of therapeutic facet joint injection, reflecting current UK clinical practice. The consensus technique could be adopted by all participating units in a clinical trial. The technical details of the facet joint injection technique should not be a cause of dissent when considering the outcome of a definitive trial.

The evidence synthesis regarding the physical component of best usual care provided little in terms of robust research evidence in this specific low back pain population (i.e., facet joint pain). Therefore extrapolation from the wider low back pain literature was required in addition to searching of the key seminal texts within physical therapy. Consensus on best usual care, as identified in Figure 6, broadly represents the current evidence base around elements of manual therapy, motor control retraining, therapeutic exercise, soft tissue stretches/release, and postural and general advice. The key cognitive behavioral aspects identified were acceptance, goal setting, pacing, challenging negative thoughts, mindfulness, advice on daily activities, and homework sessions to reinforce the information. Once an individual has reached acceptance of their chronic pain and can move towards management rather than cure, research has shown that these individuals are more likely to practice positive, effective coping strategies, and report less pain, psychological distress, and physical and psychological disability (38). In line with current evidence and previous interventions for low back pain such as the BEST study (39), the key cognitive behavioral approaches delivered to participants were challenging unhelpful thoughts using cognitive re-structuring, goal setting, pacing, and management of flare ups which maps onto the consensus reached for the best usual care package. Unhelpful thoughts such as catastrophizing are associated with increased chronic pain and physical and psychosocial dysfunction including psychological distress (40,41). A discussion on mindfulness was also recommended to be part of the best usual care package. Mindfulness has been shown to have a positive impact on the experience of pain and the associated emotions and beliefs associated with chronic pain such as stress, anxiety, and depression (42,43). In another intervention targeted at low back pain (the IMPACT study), communication skills were integrated into the cognitive behavioral approach as an important element of being able to deliver the intervention (44). Following the consensus conference, best usual care will integrate the cognitive behavioral package with the manual exercises, specifically looking at communication skills when discussing challenging unhelpful thoughts and goal setting.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

Our consensus process was informed by systematically undertaken evidence reviews to ensure consensus participants were as informed as possible about current evidence and practice. It was inclusive with invitations widely distributed to all interested professional groups and to lay people. Although participants gave their time freely, none were out of pocket from attending. The consensus process used a well-established method adapted to the topic. By using confidential ranking, all participants were able to express their opinions. Facilitators were trained to ensure all participants were able to express views during discussion. The discussion allowed the opportunity for participants to learn about each other’s clinical practice, exchange views, and persuade and be persuaded of alternatives.

The consensus process was limited to UK based clinicians and participants had to be free to attend in order to have a voice. Using a Delphi process would have enabled the engagement of international experts and could have included those interested but unable to attend on the day. However, there is no opportunity for sharing and discussion within a Delphi process. Packing discussion about the range of topics into one day was a challenge and resulted in time pressure on the plenary session, raising the possibility of participants not challenging issues as we neared the end of the conference. We underestimated the task of processing all the rankings so deployed too few people with skills to process the rankings. This resulted in a small number of errors. However, we had recorded every stage of the consensus process to ensure transparency and accuracy. Errors were identified and post conference consultation allowed those with expertise and interest to assist in finalizing the consensus.

Three systematic reviews informed this consensus process. The review looking for evidence for identifying patients with suspected facet joint pain (i.e., how best to diagnose lumbar facet joints as a source of pain...
in chronic low back pain patients) was an update of a systematic review of tests to identify the found lumbar disc, sacro-iliac joint, or facet joint as a source of low back pain and found very little new data (45). The review related to the technique for injection of facet joints was complex and had multiple components, including a comprehensive review of published educational and training literature. This resulted in us having to consider 14 different aspects of the procedure. Our review of the peer reviewed literature focussed on extracting data on the techniques of injection used in primary studies; however, where this data was not reported, we did not have the resources to contact the authors for clarification. The review exploring the evidence around best usual was also complex in that it combined both the physical and the psychological components of rehabilitation packages in a variety of primary, secondary, and community settings, often these are exclusively reported. It is possible that our search strategies, like many, missed a small number of papers. In reviews of this nature it is unlikely that an occasional publication that we had failed to identify would materially change the conclusion.

A vast amount of information was provided to the delegates via the reviews. This can be something of a double edged sword in that we gave the delegates everything on the current state-of-the-art in these areas to help them make informed decisions. But equally the ability of the delegates to synthesize such a vast amount of information is hard to quantify.

Conclusion

This paper reports the process and results of a consensus process that engaged health professionals concerned with facet joint injections from across the UK. The results are being used in a feasibility study for a pragmatic RCT of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injections in the UK. The consensus process has ensured that the assessment and intervention to be trialed is one that is acceptable to the pain treatment community. This proposed trial will inform decisions on the funding or not of therapeutic interaarticular facet joint injection services, particularly in the UK. Other studies, drawing on the work done here, could test the effectiveness of other therapeutic interventions targeting lumbar facet joints.
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