

1 **Title:** Longitudinal Study to Better Understand Neuropathic Back Pain as a Means of Improving Patient

2 Selection for 10 kHz Spinal Cord Stimulation

3 **Running Title:** Understanding Neuropathic Back Pain

4 **Authors:** Shreya Mandloi, BS<sup>1</sup>, Christian V Tran, BS<sup>1</sup>, Sara Thalheimer, BS<sup>1</sup>, Samantha Jaffe, BS<sup>1</sup>, Leonard

5 Braitman PhD<sup>2</sup>, Kevin Hines MD<sup>1</sup>, Ashwini Sharan, MD<sup>1</sup>, Chengyuan Wu, MD<sup>1</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Neurological Surgery, Thomas Jefferson University Hospitals, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

7 <sup>2</sup>Division of Biostatistics, Thomas Jefferson University Hospitals, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

8 **Corresponding Author:**

9 Shreya S. Mandloi, BS

10 Department of Neurological Surgery, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, 901 Walnut Street 3rd Floor,

11 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107.

12 **Telephone number:** 609-578-0944

13 **E-mail:** [shreya.mandloi@jefferson.edu](mailto:shreya.mandloi@jefferson.edu)

14

15

16 **Abstract:**

17 **Objective:** To create a questionnaire that can identify patients who will respond well to high-frequency  
18 spinal cord stimulation.

19 **Materials and Methods:** Thirty-three patients who received permanent implantation of a high-  
20 frequency spinal cord stimulator were followed for up to one year. Preoperative patient data in the form  
21 of a packet containing pain metrics, the Douleur Neuropathique 4 (DN4) questionnaire, and a  
22 questionnaire thought to contain clinically useful questions were collected. Visual analog scale (VAS),  
23 Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), and subjective overall percent pain reduction were collected at time  
24 points of 6 weeks, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months.

25 **Results:** Patients who revealed that they could walk before a long period of time before their pain  
26 worsened, whose pain was consistent throughout the day, whose pain wakes them up from sleep and  
27 whose pain is worse when leaning side to side had a significant increase in ODI following SCS.  
28 Additionally, patients who reported only being able to sit or lie down for less than thirty minutes before  
29 having to move experienced significantly decreased ODI. **Conclusions:** While literature has shown that  
30 patients with neuropathic pain respond to SCS, identifying which patients clinically would have an  
31 optimal response remains a challenge. Future studies on a greater number of patients are needed to  
32 further develop a questionnaire to better identify clinical signs consistent with low back pain that will  
33 respond to spinal cord stimulation.

34 **Key words:** neuropathic pain, nociceptive pain, spinal cord stimulation, low back pain, high-frequency  
35 SCS

36 **Statements and Declarations**

37 **Sources of Financial Support:** Financial support for this project was provided by Nevro

38 **Conflict of Interests:** Dr. Ashwini Sharan reports personal fees from Neuspera, personal fees from  
39 Medtronic, grants and personal fees from Dixi, personal fees and other from Cerebral Therapeutics,  
40 outside the submitted work. Dr. Chengyuan Wu reports grants from Nevro, during the conduct of the  
41 study; personal fees from Nevro, personal fees from Abbott, personal fees from Medtronic, personal  
42 fees from Boston Scientific, personal fees from MicroSystems Engineering, outside the submitted work.

43

44 **Introduction:**

45 Low back pain (LBP) is one of the most extensive and widespread medical problems, affecting  
46 15-20% of the U.S. population per year.[ 1 ] Due to the multifactorial nature of LBP, it is often difficult to  
47 treat. It has been proposed that axial lower back pain may consist of three different types of pain:  
48 neuropathic (lesion to the somatosensory system itself), nociceptive (lesion to non-neural tissue that  
49 activates nociceptors), and nociplastic (gap of patients that don't have neuropathic or nociceptive pain)  
50 pain.[ 2 ] However, it is difficult to accurately diagnose and characterize LBP, thus therapeutic responses  
51 are often inconsistent. The ability to categorize patients based on what type of axial LBP they have can  
52 help clinicians provide more tailored and accurate treatment plans for patients.

53 The pharmacologic management of neuropathic pain is varied amongst first-line drugs including  
54 gabapentin, pregabalin, serotonin-noradrenaline receptor uptakes and tricyclic antidepressants with  
55 modest efficacy.[ 3 ] Other forms of management for neuropathic pain include physical therapy,  
56 psychological therapy, surgery, transcranial magnetic stimulation, and spinal cord stimulation (SCS).[ 4  
57 ]Traditional SCS was born out of gate-control theory which predicted improved nociceptive pain as a

58 result of SCS therapy. However, literature has shown that SCS does not adequately impact nociceptive  
59 pain and has a stronger impact on neuropathic pain providing relief in greater than 50% of medically  
60 refractory neuropathic LBP. [5,6] High frequency (10kHz) SCS is more effective than traditional SCS when  
61 used for chronic neuropathic LBP. [ 7 ]

62 Although the specific mechanism of action of high-frequency SCS is not completely known,  
63 current theories hypothesize the involvement of both segmental and supraspinal pathways of pain and  
64 that SCS may also activate opioid receptors. [ 8,9 ] As high frequency SCS has improved and more  
65 consistent clinical outcomes in the treatment of neuropathic LBP there is an opportunity to better  
66 characterize which patients have neuropathic back and will have optimal response to SCS. There  
67 remains a need to identify patients with neuropathic back pain, as no gold standard currently exists and  
68 current questionnaires in use have proven insufficient. The Douleur Neuropathique 4 (DN4)  
69 questionnaire that is often used was developed for leg pain and is thus not an optimal screening tool for  
70 neuropathic back pain. [ 10-12] As it is difficult to accurately diagnose the type of LBP patients  
71 experience, this pilot study aims to assess the utility of screening questions using a physician generated  
72 questionnaire to identify patients with neuropathic LBP that respond to high frequency SCS.

### 73 **Materials and Methods:**

#### 74 *Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria*

75 The study protocol and informed consent were approved by the institutional review board  
76 (Study #17C.539) as a prospective before-after clinical trial. Inclusion criteria consisted of patients over  
77 18 years of age who were appropriate candidates for a trial of 10 kHz NEVRO SCS per standard of care.  
78 Patients were deemed appropriate candidates if they had failed all conservative measures of pain  
79 management including medical management, interventional pain management and physical therapy for

80 at least 6 months. Additionally, patients were deemed appropriate if they had failed prior lumbar spine  
81 surgery or as not an appropriate candidate for spine surgery by a board-certified spine surgeon. Patients  
82 received either percutaneous or paddle implants at clinical preference of either the patient or the  
83 surgeon. Patients younger than 18 years of age or who were unwilling to fill out questionnaires and  
84 allow other clinical data to be collected were excluded.

#### 85 *Questionnaire and Data Collection*

86 A questionnaire was generated based on the implanting physicians' prior experience as an  
87 explicit attempt to differentiate between nociceptive and neuropathic pain. The questionnaire can be  
88 visualized in Table I. Participants completed the physician generated questionnaire, Douleur  
89 Neuropathique 4 (DN4)[ 13 ], Visual Analogue pain scale (VAS)[ 14 ], and Oswestry Disability Index (ODI)[  
90 15 ]preoperatively via paper and returned by mail, in-person at appointments, digitally, or by phone  
91 call., Flexibility in the way in which patients were allowed to complete the questionnaire was provided  
92 in an attempt to increase compliance and retention throughout the study.

93 (VAS), subjective overall percent pain reduction, and (ODI) scores were collected from patients  
94 postoperatively at time points of 6 weeks, 3 months, 6 months, and 1 year. Data was recorded at patient  
95 follow-up visits; however, in some patients, data was collected via a phone call due to the COVID-19  
96 pandemic.

#### 97 *Implantation of Spinal Cord Stimulator*

98 After patients were determined to be candidates for NEVRO SCS therapy and consent was  
99 obtained in person in the hospital/clinic, they first underwent a trial with percutaneous electrodes  
100 implanted over the T9-T10 interspace for seven to ten days. Patients were considered eligible for

101 permanent implantation if they reported at least a 50% improvement in their pain during their trials,  
102 and they underwent permanent implantation one to two weeks after the end of their trials.

### 103 *Data Analysis*

104 Longitudinal bivariate mixed effects linear regression models of each ODI, VAS and subjective  
105 percent pain reduction as functions of each question were developed separately at each time point  
106 (preoperatively, and postoperatively at 1, 3, 6 and 12 months). For each of the bivariate models,  
107 variables with  $p < 0.05$  were included as potential independent predictors into multivariate mixed  
108 models. The questions with  $p < 0.05$  were identified as the substantive questions that were  
109 independent predictors of ODI, VAS and subjective % pain reduction.

### 110 **Results:**

#### 111 *Demographics*

112 A total of 58 patients were enrolled in this study. Of which 25 patients did not fully complete all  
113 preoperative baseline measurements and were removed from the overall dataset. Demographic  
114 information for the remaining 33 patients (57% compliance) is shown in Table II.

#### 115 *Questions associated with Changes in ODI*

116 Bivariate analysis was conducted on each question and ODI to find predictors. Through bivariate  
117 analysis, question numbers 1-7, 9, 10, and 15 were all significantly associated with changes in ODI and  
118 can be seen in Table III. All question numbers with  $p < 0.05$  were included in the multivariate analysis  
119 except for question 1 which was excluded due to collinearity. Multivariate analysis revealed that  
120 patients who could walk for a long period of time before their pain worsened (question 2,  $p = 0.024$ ),  
121 whose pain was consistent throughout the day (question 9,  $p = 0.049$ ), whose pain wakes them up from

122 sleep (question 10,  $p = 0.007$ ), and whose pain is worse when leaning side to side (question 15,  $p =$   
123  $0.006$ ) had a statistically significantly worsening in ODI following SCS. Additionally, patients that  
124 indicated they could stand (question 5,  $p = 0.006$ ) or sit (question 6,  $p = 0.002$ ) for a long time in one  
125 position before having to move were significantly associated with an improvement in ODI following SCS.  
126 All coefficients, confidence intervals and p-values can be seen in Table IV.

#### 127 *Questions associated with Changes in Subjective Percent Pain Reduction*

128 Bivariate analysis was conducted on each question and the change in percent pain reduction to find  
129 predictors. Question 8 was omitted from bivariate analysis due to collinearity. In bivariate analysis,  
130 question numbers 3, 11 and 15 were significantly associated with percent pain reduction and can be  
131 seen in Table V. Multivariate analysis revealed that patients who indicated that patients who indicated  
132 that their pain is worse when leaning side to side (question 15,  $p = 0.032$ ) had a significant decrease in  
133 subjective percent pain reduction, thus an increase in pain levels following SCS. Coefficients, confidence  
134 intervals and p-values for the multivariate analysis can be seen in Table VI.

#### 135 *Questions associated with Changes in VAS*

136 Bivariate analysis was conducted on each question and VAS to find predictors. Through bivariate  
137 analysis, question numbers 5, 9 and 17 were all significantly associated with changes in VAS and can be  
138 seen in Table VII. All significant question numbers were included in the multivariate analysis. However,  
139 multivariate analysis revealed that no questions were significant independent predictors of changes in  
140 VAS and all coefficients, confidence intervals and p-values can be seen in Table VIII.

141

#### 142 **Discussion:**

143           There is a clinical need to identify patients with neuropathic back pain as no gold standard exists  
144 and current questionnaires are often insufficient.[ 8-12 ] Separating neuropathic pain from non-  
145 neuropathic pain is essential for proper treatment as interventions based on pain mechanisms leads to  
146 increased ability to tailor specific therapies.[ 16 ]No single sign or physical exam finding is diagnostic of  
147 neuropathic pain; thus, it is essential to identify which patients through clinical questionnaires are more  
148 likely to have neuropathic pain and respond to SCS.[ 17 ]This study aims to lay the groundwork patient  
149 clinical characteristics that can classify pain type and predict SCS outcomes.

150           This study indicates that questions related to a mix of mechanical pain and neuropathic pain  
151 were predictive of ODI following SCS. Currently, there is a lack of consensus on the effects of SCS on  
152 mechanical pain. Prior studies have demonstrated that SCS can increase pain threshold and decrease  
153 mechanical pain sensitivity.[ 18 ]Other studies found no difference in mechanical pain following SCS.[ 19  
154 ] Our study population demonstrated that patients with mechanical pain – those that responded that  
155 their pain worsens when leaning side to side – had a significant worsening in ODI and less pain reduction  
156 compared to before SCS. ODI can be used as both a functional measure and to demonstrate pain  
157 severity.[ 20 ]The functional limitations experienced by patients may be a result of mixed pain. Thus,  
158 while SCS has a promising effect on neuropathic pain, ODI can still increase if mechanical pain is a  
159 primary issue. Literature demonstrates that pain response is multidimensional and that composite  
160 endpoints from multiple pain scales may give more insight into SCS outcome.[ 21 ]We additionally found  
161 that patients who could sit or stand for a long period of time had improvements in ODI with SCS. These  
162 results indicate that patients that can tolerate one position for an increased length of time may be  
163 better respondents to SCS than those that must move frequently to relieve their pain. Additionally,  
164 patients that could walk for a long time before their pain worsened had significant worsening in ODI  
165 with SCS. This highlights that patients that tend to be “better” preoperatively have varying responses to



166 SCS in terms of ODI. Prior literature has demonstrated that the duration of pain does not predict SCS  
167 outcome.[ 22 ]However, to our knowledge this study emphasizes a clinical gap that preoperative pain  
168 level and functionality may influence SCS outcome.

169 While literature has shown that patients with neuropathic pain respond to SCS, identifying  
170 which patients clinically would have an optimal response remains a challenge. Given the significant  
171 correlations between specific questions and changes in ODI and subjective pain reduction, this pilot  
172 study lays the groundwork for the development of a diagnostic questionnaire to identify appropriate  
173 candidates for SCS.

#### 174 *Limitations*

175 The major limitation of this study is its sample size; as a pilot study, a small number of  
176 participants were recruited and so it is possible that different results would be obtained from using a  
177 larger dataset. Another limitation is the magnitude of study attrition -- because of the frequency of data  
178 collection, low compliance was observed with regards to the questionnaire packets that subjects  
179 received at each time point. Additionally, because not all subjects were supervised when filling out the  
180 packets, some skipped portions of the packet, resulting in missing data at various time points.

181 The questionnaire used in this study was also developed solely based on the clinical experience  
182 of two authors (CW and ADS). As such, it is unlikely to serve as a comprehensive tool for the  
183 identification of subtypes of LBP. At the same time, as this work was developed as a pilot study, the  
184 intent of this preliminary questionnaire was to obtain objective feedback on the utility of questions  
185 focused on the identification of symptoms consistent with mechanical LBP.

186 Another limitation is that due to the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic, some VAS scores at  
187 the latest time point were collected over the phone. As VAS is meant to allow patients to visually

188 represent their perceptions of pain, it is possible that our findings for VAS at that time point are  
189 inaccurate.

#### 190 *Future Studies*

191 Future studies should further assess existing neuropathic pain questionnaires to the one  
192 presented in this study with a greater number of participants. Additionally, the results of this study can  
193 be used to further develop questions to be presented to participants in future studies, with greater  
194 emphasis on questions associated with improved outcomes and the removal of questions that were not  
195 predictive. Lastly, further studies are needed to determine the generalizability of these findings to other  
196 stimulation paradigms.

#### 197 **Conclusion:**

198 This pilot study attempts to generate clinically relevant questions that can be used to identify  
199 patients who experience neuropathic pain in the lower back and are therefore good candidates for high-  
200 frequency spinal cord stimulation. Results indicate that questions revealing patients who have a lack of  
201 mechanical characteristics are correlated with better outcomes at time points ranging up to one year.  
202 Future studies on a greater number of patients are needed to further develop a questionnaire to better  
203 identify clinical signs consistent with low back pain that will respond to spinal cord stimulation.

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218 **References:**

219 1. Andersson GB. Epidemiology of low back pain. *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl.* 1998;281:28-31. Accessed  
220 Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1080/17453674.1998.11744790.

221 2. Trouvin A, Perrot S. New concepts of pain. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol.* 2019;33(3):101415.  
222 Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.berh.2019.04.007.

- 223 3. Finnerup NB, Attal N, Haroutounian S, et al. Pharmacotherapy for neuropathic pain in adults: A  
224 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Neurol*. 2015;14(2):162-173. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi:  
225 10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70251-0.
- 226 4. St John Smith E. Advances in understanding nociception and neuropathic pain. *J Neurol*.  
227 2018;265(2):231-238. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1007/s00415-017-8641-6.
- 228 5. Plazier M, Raymaekers V, Bruyneel L, et al. A 15-year follow-up retrospective study on 959 spine  
229 surgeries: What can we learn from real-world data? *Clin Spine Surg*. 2021;34(5):E282-E288. Accessed  
230 Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1097/BSD.0000000000001134.
- 231 6. Kumar K, Taylor RS, Jacques L, et al. The effects of spinal cord stimulation in neuropathic pain are  
232 sustained: A 24-month follow-up of the prospective randomized controlled multicenter trial of the  
233 effectiveness of spinal cord stimulation. *Neurosurgery*. 2008;63(4):762-770; discussion 770. Accessed  
234 Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1227/01.NEU.0000325731.46702.D9.
- 235 7. Kapural L, Yu C, Doust MW, et al. Novel 10-kHz high-frequency therapy (HF10 therapy) is superior to  
236 traditional low-frequency spinal cord stimulation for the treatment of chronic back and leg pain: The  
237 SENZA-RCT randomized controlled trial. *Anesthesiology*. 2015;123(4):851-860. Accessed Dec 18, 2023.  
238 doi: 10.1097/ALN.0000000000000774.
- 239 8. Barchini J, Tchachaghian S, Shamaa F, et al. Spinal segmental and supraspinal mechanisms underlying  
240 the pain-relieving effects of spinal cord stimulation: An experimental study in a rat model of neuropathy.  
241 *Neuroscience*. 2012;215:196-208. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2012.04.057.

- 242 9. Sato KL, King EW, Johaneck LM, Sluka KA. Spinal cord stimulation reduces hypersensitivity through  
243 activation of opioid receptors in a frequency-dependent manner. *Eur J Pain*. 2013;17(4):551-561.  
244 Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1002/j.1532-2149.2012.00220.x.
- 245 10. Gudala K, Ghai B, Bansal D. Usefulness of four commonly used neuropathic pain screening  
246 questionnaires in patients with chronic low back pain: A cross-sectional study. *Korean J Pain*.  
247 2017;30(1):51-58. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.3344/kjp.2017.30.1.51.
- 248 11. Ramasamy A, Martin ML, Blum SI, et al. Assessment of patient-reported outcome instruments to  
249 assess chronic low back pain. *Pain Med*. 2017;18(6):1098-1110. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi:  
250 10.1093/pm/pnw357.
- 251 12. Lacasse A, Cauvier Charest E, Dault R, et al. Validity of algorithms for identification of individuals  
252 suffering from chronic noncancer pain in administrative databases: A systematic review. *Pain Med*.  
253 2020;21(9):1825-1839. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7553015/>. Accessed Dec 18,  
254 2023. doi: 10.1093/pm/pnaa004.
- 255 13. Bouhassira D, Attal N, Alchaar H, et al. Comparison of pain syndromes associated with nervous or  
256 somatic lesions and development of a new neuropathic pain diagnostic questionnaire (DN4). *Pain*.  
257 2005;114(1-2):29-36. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2004.12.010.
- 258 14. Huskisson EC. Measurement of pain. *Lancet*. 1974;2(7889):1127-1131. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi:  
259 10.1016/s0140-6736(74)90884-8.
- 260 15. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry disability index. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2000;25(22):2940-  
261 2952; discussion 2952. Accessed Dec 18, 2023. doi: 10.1097/00007632-200011150-00017.

- 262 16. Freynhagen R, Baron R, Gockel U, Tolle TR. painDETECT: A new screening questionnaire to identify  
263 neuropathic components in patients with back pain. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2006;22(10):1911-1920. doi:  
264 10.1185/030079906X132488.
- 265 17. Bates D, Schultheis BC, Hanes MC, et al. A comprehensive algorithm for management of neuropathic  
266 pain. *Pain Med.* 2019;20(Suppl 1):S2-S12. doi: 10.1093/pm/pnz075.
- 267 18. Meyer-Friessem CH, Wiegand T, Eitner L, et al. Effects of spinal cord and peripheral nerve  
268 stimulation reflected in sensory profiles and endogenous pain modulation. *Clin J Pain.* 2019;35(2):111-  
269 120. doi: 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000661.
- 270 19. Bordeleau M, Carrondo Cottin S, Cantin L, et al. Effects of tonic spinal cord stimulation on external  
271 mechanical and thermal stimuli perception using quantitative sensory testing: A multicenter stimulation  
272 ON-OFF study on chronic pain patients. *Clin J Pain.* 2020;36(3):189-196. doi:  
273 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000791.
- 274 20. Garg A, Pathak H, Churyukanov MV, Uppin RB, Slobodin TM. Low back pain: Critical assessment of  
275 various scales. *Eur Spine J.* 2020;29(3):503-518. doi: 10.1007/s00586-019-06279-5.
- 276 21. Pilitsis JG, Fahey M, Custozzo A, Chakravarthy K, Capobianco R. Composite score is a better reflection  
277 of patient response to chronic pain therapy compared with pain intensity alone. *Neuromodulation.*  
278 2021;24(1):68-75. doi: 10.1111/ner.13212.
- 279 22. De Ridder D, Vancamp T, Lenders MWPM, De Vos CC, Vanneste S. Is preoperative pain duration  
280 important in spinal cord stimulation? A comparison between tonic and burst stimulation.  
281 *Neuromodulation.* 2015;18(1):13-7; discussion 17. doi: 10.1111/ner.12253.

282

283

284

285 Table I. Pre-operative questionnaire given to study subjects.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is your pain worse with walking? *</li> <li>2. How long can you walk before your low back pain worsens? **</li> <li>3. Did your pain begin all of a sudden (related to a specific event)? *</li> <li>4. Did your pain gradually get worse as time went on? *</li> <li>5. How long are you able to stand in one position before having to move? **</li> <li>6. How long are you able to sit in one position before having to move? **</li> <li>7. How long are you able to lay down in one position before having to move? **</li> <li>8. Do you experience pain the entire day? *</li> <li>9. Is your level of low back pain consistent throughout the day? *</li> <li>10. Does your pain wake you up from sleep? *</li> <li>11. After you overexert yourself, does it take more than 1 day to recover? *</li> <li>12. Is your pain worse immediately when you stand up? *</li> <li>13. Is your pain improved when leaning forward? *</li> <li>14. Is your pain worse with bending forward and/or leaning backward? *</li> <li>15. Is your pain worse with leaning side-to-side? *</li> <li>16. Does your pain improve after laying down? *</li> <li>17. How long does it take for the pain to improve after you lay down? **</li> </ol>
Response choices: *(yes, no); ** (0-5 minutes, 5-20 minutes, 20-30 minutes, >30 minutes)

286  
287 Table II. Study Demographics

Sex	n	Range	Mean
M	11	-	-
F	22	-	-
<b>Age at Implant</b>	-	23-84	56
<40	2	-	-
40-49	6	-	-
50-59	16	-	-
60-69	3	-	-
>69	6	-	-
<b>Diagnosis</b>			
Chronic pain syndrome	33	-	-
Lumbago with bilateral sciatica	11	-	-
Lumbago with left-sided sciatica	4	-	-
Lumbago with right-sided sciatica	2	-	-
Lumbosacral radiculopathy	4	-	-
Lumbosacral plexus disorder	3	-	-
CRPS Type I	2	-	-



Failed back surgery syndrome	23	-	-
<b>Implant Type</b>			
Percutaneous	26	-	-
Paddle	7	-	-

288

289 Table III: Bivariate analysis of Question Number and Changes in ODI

Question Number	Coefficient (CI)	p-value
1	16.95 (1.32, 32.59)	0.034
2	-5.67 (-9.55, -1.78)	0.004
3	0.500 (0.42, 0.58)	<0.001
4	10.36 (-1.95, 22.66)	0.099
5	-6.68 (-10.11, -3.24)	<0.001
6	-7.60 (-10.85, -4.34)	<0.001
7	-4.83 (-8.44, -1.21)	0.009
8	-0.88 (-12.04, 10.28)	0.877
9	8.22 (1.20, 15.24)	0.022
10	20.04 (6.60, 33.48)	0.003
11	2.44 (-5.95, 10.82)	0.057
12	6.22 (-1.83, 14.28)	0.130
13	6.00 (-1.23, 13.24)	0.104
14	1.48 (-7.07, 10.02)	0.735
15	11.08 (3.66, 18.50)	0.003
16	0.68 (-7.69, 7.82)	0.986
17	0.34 (-2.89, 3.57)	0.835

290

291 Table IV: Multivariate Analysis of Question Number and Changes in ODI

Question Number	Coefficient (CI)	p-value
2	11.77 (1.56, 21.98)	0.024
3	-1.27 (-7.82, 5.29)	0.705
4	11.80 (1.30, 22.30)	0.028
5	-14.73 (-25.14, -4.33)	0.006
6	-5.86 (-9.53, -2.19)	0.002
9	7.68 (0.02, 15.32)	0.049
10	22.13 (5.91, 38.34)	0.007
15	9.39 (2.67, 16.13)	0.006

292 Table V: Bivariate Analysis of Question Number and Changes in % Pain Reduction

Question Number	Coefficient (CI)	p-value
1	9.87 (-10.71, 30.44)	0.347
2	7.32 (-0.20, 14.84)	0.056
3	-16.94 (-30.65, -3.23)	0.015
4	7.30 (-20.64, 35.35)	0.608

5	3.93 (-2.60, 10.47)	0.238
6	2.95 (-3.57, 9.46)	0.375
7	2.57 (-4.20, 9.34)	0.457
9	-8.35 (-22.06, 5.36)	0.233
10	-13.81 (-41.96, 14.33)	0.336
11	32.99 (9.86, 56.12)	0.005
12	-0.20 (-14.80, 14.39)	0.978
13	5.28 (-8.0, 18.60)	0.437
14	3.78 (-14.36, 21.92)	0.683
15	-16.86 (-30.79, -2.94)	0.018
16	-11.64 (-24.66, 1.38)	0.080
17	-4.85 (-12.48, 2.77)	0.212

293

294

295 Table VI: Multivariate Analysis of Question Number and Changes in % Pain Reduction

Question Number	Coefficient (CI)	p-value
3	-8.52 (-22.45, 5.41)	0.231
11	20.87 (-23.64, 65.39)	0.358
15	-15.14 (-28.95, -1.33)	0.032

296

297 Table VII: Bivariate Analysis of Question Number and Changes in VAS

Question Number	Coefficient (CI)	p-value
1	0.99 (-1.00, 2.99)	0.330
2	-0.52 (-1.06, 0.19)	0.059
3	0.29 (-0.73, 1.30)	0.581
4	0.01 (-1.76, 1.78)	0.991
5	-0.50 (-0.98, -0.02)	0.042
6	-0.01 (-0.5, 0.48)	0.956
7	0.18 (-0.35, 0.71)	0.509
8	-0.05 (-1.51, 1.41)	0.945
9	1.09 (0.13, 2.04)	0.026
10	1.69 (-0.16, 3.55)	0.074
11	0.19 (-0.92, 1.30)	0.736
12	0.33 (-1.03, 1.10)	0.952
13	-0.68 (-1.65, 0.30)	0.176
14	-0.58 (-1.71, 0.55)	0.318
15	0.36 (-0.64, 1.37)	0.482
16	-0.05 (-1.12, 1.01)	0.926
17	0.51 (0.04, 0.98)	0.035

298

299

300 Table VIII: Multivariate Analysis of Question Number and Changes in VAS

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Coefficient (CI)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
5	0.02 (-0.55, 0.59)	0.939
9	0.67 (-0.41, 1.75)	0.222
17	0.44 (-0.05, 0.93)	0.083

301