

MULTIMODAL REHABILITATION TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH SCIATICA

Dunja Popović^{1,2}, Larisa Vojnović^{1,2}, Tijana Aleksandrić^{1,2}, Maša Rapajić¹, Aleksandar Knežević^{1,2}, Jana Vasin¹

Pain radiating from the lower back to the lower limb below the knee is known as sciatica. The purpose of this research was to ascertain how patients with sciatica responded to multimodal rehabilitation therapy.

Fifty-one patients with persistent sciatica receiving treatment at the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic of the Clinical Center of Vojvodina were included in the study. In addition to demographic information, we also collected scores from the Oswestry Disability Index, Central Sensitization Inventory, Fear Avoidance Component Scale, and Numerical Rating Scale. At the beginning and completion of the treatment, results were acquired.

Thirty-four out of the patients, or 66.7%, were female. The stationary multimodal treatment for chronic pain took place for a period of 20.48 ± 5.89 days. After the treatment, the NRS assessed pain intensity had significantly decreased (6.49 ± 2.22 vs. 5.00 ± 2.22 , $t = 5.629$, $p < 0.001$). Following the treatment, there was a substantial improvement in the average ODI score (48.75 ± 15.16 vs. 42.24 ± 14.13 ($t = 4.246$, $p < 0.001$) and FACS score (66.80 ± 14.13 vs. 62.47 ± 16.49 , $t = 2.086$, $p = 0.042$). After the course of the treatment, the CSI score decreased, although this change was not statistically significant ($t = 1.446$, $p = 0.155$).

Patients receiving stationary comprehensive rehabilitation treatment see improvements in their functional status, a decrease in their level of fear-induced activity avoidance, and a reduction in the severity of their pain.

Acta Medica Medianae 2023; 62(4): 37-43.

Key words: *chronic sciatica, disability, the pain, multidisciplinary treatment*

¹University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Medicine, Novi Sad, Serbia

²Clinical Center of Vojvodina, Medical Rehabilitation Clinic, Novi Sad, Serbia

Contact: Dunja Popović
3 Hajduk Veljkova St., 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia
E-mail: dunjapopovic@uns.ac.rs

Introduction

Sciatica is a pain that spreads from the lower back to one or both lower extremities to below the knee. Usually, sciatica is caused by nerve root compression. Neuroradiological studies confirm that 85% of sciatica cases are related to intervertebral disc disorders (1). The most commonly affected are the L5 and S1 nerve roots, somewhat less often the L4 nerve roots (2).

However, there are other possible causes of sciatica, such as traumatic injury of the sciatic nerve, muscle hematomas, tumors, piriformis syndrome and myofascial pain syndrome (3–6).

Treatment of sciatica presents a major challenge for medical professionals and the health care system in general (7). Current approaches

recognize the value of a multimodal treatment that focuses not only on nociceptive aspects of pain but also on cognitive-evaluative and motivational-affective aspects (8). Evidence-based multimodal treatment of sciatica represents a significant advance in the treatment of this condition (9, 10). Multimodal treatment consists of a combination of pharmacological and non-pharmacological therapy, which includes the use of physical therapy, psychological and cognitive-behavioral therapy. A multimodal approach more adequately and comprehensively manages pain at the molecular, behavioral, cognitive and functional levels (11). These approaches have been shown to lead to superior and long-lasting outcomes, including pain perception, mood, restoration of physical functioning, work status and medication use (8).

Pharmacological therapy begins after an accurate diagnosis. A key component of drug pain management is finding a balance between desired effects and acceptable side effects. Long-term use of painkillers in the treatment of sciatica may be associated with unpredictable efficacy, reduced tolerance to drug effects, and potentially more serious side effects (3, 12).

In the case of non-pharmacological therapy the importance of physical medicine and

rehabilitation, which contributes to the improvement and maintenance of physical functioning and a better quality of life of the patient, is particularly emphasized. Physical therapy mainly focuses on kinesitherapy and electrotherapy modalities. Electrotherapy procedures in sciatica are primarily intended to reduce the intensity of pain, relax muscle spasms, prevent muscle atrophy, increase local blood circulation, as well as maintain and increase range of motion (13).

Clinical guidelines recommend the provision of 'encouragement to stay physically active'. Moreover, bed rest is not recommended (14). Physical activity is a key element in the treatment of chronic pain conditions. Various types of exercise have been proven to reduce pain, improve physical functioning and quality of life in patients with chronic pain. The use of aerobic exercises has positive effects on pain modulation, nutrition of the intervertebral disc and the mechanics of the spinal column itself (15). Great attention is paid to hydrokinesitherapy, because water, with its mechanical and thermal properties, has a beneficial effect on the musculoskeletal system (16).

In addition to reducing the perception of pain, exercise has an impact on mental health, improves mood, and reduces stress and depression that are often associated with chronic pain conditions (17, 18).

The aim of this study was to determine the effect of multimodal rehabilitation treatment on patients with sciatica.

Material and methods

The research was designed as a prospective case study, conducted at the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic of the University Clinical Centre of Vojvodina and included patients who were treated between September 1st and December 1st, 2018 for chronic sciatica.

Chronic sciatica is defined as pain in the lower back that spreads to one or both lower extremities below the knee level for more than six months.

Inpatient multimodal treatment consisted of drug treatment and physical therapy. Drug therapy was prescribed by the physician in charge of the patient's treatment. Physical treatment consisted of therapeutic exercises that were routinely carried out at the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic (exercises to increase muscle strength, improve balance and coordination, increase flexibility and muscle tone), therapeutic modalities (interfering currents, magnetotherapy, laser therapy, sonophoresis, etc.), hydrotherapy and ergonomic education of patients.

In the present study, 51 patients were included in the research. The criteria for inclusion in the research were the presence of sciatica, and the age of the subjects (18 years and older). Criteria for exclusion from the study: subjects

under 18 years of age, presence of malignant disease, pain that lasted less than 3 months, patients who had spine surgery in the last 6 months, and patients who did not understand the Serbian language. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University Clinical Center of Vojvodina (No 00-28/864).

We obtained data on age, gender, level of education, duration of pain, and duration of inpatient multimodal treatment. In addition to these data, patients filled out a set of questionnaires given hereinafter.

The Serbian version of the Central Sensitization Inventory (CSI-Serb) designed by the patient were related to the central sensitization syndrome. It consists of two parts. Section A provided 25 items related to central sensitization syndrome with a score from 0 to 100. Each item carried a 5-point Likert scale from 0 (never) to 4 (always). Based on section B through 7 questions (not numbered), we learnt about the patient's previous diagnoses (restless legs syndrome, chronic fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, temporomandibular dysfunction, migraines, irritable bowel syndrome, neck injuries, anxiety and depression) (19–21).

The Serbian version of the Fear Avoidance Component Scale (FACS-Serb), consisted of 20 items to which the respondent answered on a six-point Likert scale from 0 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). The FACS-Serb score can range from 0 to 100, where a higher score indicates a greater degree of activity avoidance (22).

The Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) was used to assess the functional status of patients with the lumbar syndrome. There were 10 items to which the respondents answered on a six-point Likert scale from 0 to 5, where 5 indicates the greatest level of activity limitation. The index is expressed in percentages, and a higher value of this index represents a greater degree of limitation in activities of daily life (12, 13).

Pain intensity values were collected according to the Numerical Rating Scale (NRS). We examined current pain (at the time of the survey), maximum pain in the past 4 weeks, and average pain intensity in the past 4 weeks. The scale consisted of 11 items ranging from 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst possible pain) (23).

The data were processed with the statistical program SPSS 23 for Windows. Descriptive and inferential statistics methods were used during the statistical data processing. Comparison of numerical data from different groups was performed using parametric and non-parametric methods. Student's t-test of paired samples was used, and categorical data were analyzed using Chi-square. A value of $p \leq 0.05$ was taken as significant.

Results

The present study included 51 participants; the majority were women (34; 66.7%). The average age of the subjects was 54.55 ± 14.74 years. The youngest patient was 21 years old, while the oldest patient was 80 years old.

The largest number of respondents had a secondary level of education (33; 64.7%), and the smallest number of them had a tertiary education (3; 5.9%).

Patients reported that the pain lasted an average of 55.65 months, while the duration of inpatient multimodal chronic pain treatment at the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic lasted an average of 20.47 days (Table 1).

Table 2 shows the scores of the Central Sensitization Inventory (CSI-Serb), the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), the Fear-Avoidance Scale (FACS-Serb), as well as pain intensity before and after multimodal treatment. Functional status determined on the basis of ODI ($t = 4.246$, $p < 0.001$), FACS-Serb scores ($t = 2.086$, $p = 0.042$), as well as pain intensity ($t = 5.629$, $p = < 0.001$) significantly improved after multimodal treatment at the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic.

The degree of central sensitization symptoms determined on the basis of the CSI-Serb improved after the treatment, but this difference did not reach statistical significance ($t = 1.446$, $p = 0.155$).

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	Mean	SD
Age (years)	54.55	± 14.74
Sex (female %)	34 (66.7%)	
Duration of pain (months)	55.65	± 92.85
Duration of the treatment (days)	20.47	± 5.89

Table 2. Comparison of questionnaire results before and after treatment

	BEFORE TREATMENT		AFTER TREATMENT		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
CSI-Serb ¹	38.39	11.97	35.84	15.05	1.446	0155
ODI ²	48.75	15.16	42.24	14.13	4.246	< 0.001
FACS-Serb ³	66.80	14.13	62.47	16.94	2.086	0.042
NRS ⁴	6.49	2.22	5.00	2.22	5.629	< 0.001

¹ Central Sensitization Inventory

² Oswestry Disability Index

³ Fear Avoidance Component Scale

⁴ Numerical Rating Scale

Discussion

Chronic sciatica is one of the most common pain syndromes in developed countries (15).

Multimodal treatment is defined as the simultaneous use of two or more different therapeutic treatments with different mechanisms of action with a common goal (24). At the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic, multimodal treatment consists of therapeutic exercises, therapeutic modalities, hydrotherapy, and patients also receive drug therapy. Unlike most similar treatments in developed countries, the treatment does not include psychotherapy, so the interpretation of the results is particularly interesting from this aspect.

The Central Sensitization Inventory is a reliable, valid scale for examining the presence of symptoms of central sensitization (25–30). In our study, an improvement in the CSI score after treatment was shown, but the difference we obtained was not statistically significant. Although there was some indication that the CSI could be used as a tool to monitor the effect of treatment (16), we failed to show that it was significantly different at the beginning and the end of the treatment. There are probably more reasons for these results. First, it is possible that the CSI is not a suitable instrument for monitoring the effect of multimodal treatment, which in our case was without psychotherapy. Another potential reason could be that CSI is not sensitive enough to detect changes occurring in such a short time interval. In any case, it is necessary to further examine changes in the CSI score in relation to potential treatments, as well as in follow-up studies to determine whether this scale has the potential to be used as a tool to assess the effectiveness of chronic pain treatment (31, 32).

The Oswestry index is often used to assess the functionality of patients with lumbar syndrome (33, 34). Inpatient multimodal treatment resulted in a significant improvement in the functionality of patients determined on the basis of the ODI. Other authors also found similar improvements after multimodal treatment (35, 36). Some authors find that there is a significant improvement, in up to 73% of examined patients with chronic sciatica, after physiotherapeutic treatment (27). Although there are significant differences in the content of multimodal treatments, most include psychotherapy (37–39). There are also those who examined the influence of therapeutic exercises (40–42), which was the most similar to our study, so we can assume that in patients with chronic sciatica, therapeutic exercises are very important for functional improvement.

We should not lose sight of the fact that a significant number of patients with sciatica have a pronounced neuropathic pain component for which they received specific therapy during inpatient treatment, which could also significantly contribute to the functional improvement of these patients (43, 44).

Avoidance of activity due to fear is very common in patients with chronic pain (45). The Fear avoidance component scale (FACS) developed by Neblet et al. (2016) has been shown to be a potentially useful tool for assessing this phenomenon (25). Our results showed that there was a significant improvement in the FACS score, and thus a reduction in the severity of this phenomenon after multimodal treatment at the Medical Rehabilitation Clinic. Other authors also observed after treatment a reduction in the level of fear of activity in patients with sciatica that lasted up to 6 months (46). The observed improvement can be attributed to the fact that during the multimodal treatment, there was communication with healthcare workers (doctors, physiotherapists, nurses, psychologists), and even patients, which certainly had a "psychotherapeutic" effect. This kind of interaction certainly helped to reduce the fears and doubts they had, which significantly contributed to the phenomenon of avoiding activities due to fear. In a certain sense, this type of communication can be seen as a form of patient education and as such has positive effects in patients with a high level of activity avoidance due to fear (47).

In the work of Childs et al., 82% sciatica patients experienced a decrease in pain intensity after a four-week treatment, as measured by the Numerical Pain Scale (48). In our study, positive treatment effects were also observed. This scale showed the best results compared to the other scales, supporting the conclusion that the multimodal treatment according to these criteria was successful (49). It could be said that, in addition to the previously mentioned improvements, it was expected that there would also be a decrease in the intensity of pain on the NRS as the most obvious result in the treatment of pain.

The possibility that patients may feel a certain "pressure" from healthcare workers, when assessing the intensity of pain after treatment, should not be excluded. They may state that the treatment had a more favorable outcome and that the intensity of the pain was reduced more than it was, in order to justify the "effort" that went into their treatment. In our study, although some patients were interested in the values of the first measurement taken, they did not have the opportunity to know the intensity of the pain they had reported at the beginning. We must not ignore the fact that the relationship between the healthcare professional and the patient can influence the obtained values and potentially represent a source of error.

Conclusion

Inpatient multimodal rehabilitation treatment for sciatica patients leads to an improvement in functional status, a reduction in the level of activity avoidance due to fear and a reduction in pain intensity.

References

1. Porchet F, Wietlisbach V, Burnand B, Daepfen K, Villemure JG, Vader JP, et al. Relationship between severity of lumbar disc disease and disability scores in sciatica patients. *Neurosurgery* 2002; 50(6):1253–60. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
2. Ropper AH, Zafonte RD. *Sciatica*. Longo DL, editor. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372(13):1240–8. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
3. Jensen RK, Kongsted A, Kjaer P, Koes B. Diagnosis and treatment of sciatica. *BMJ* 2019; 367. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
4. Galasso A, Urits I, An D, Nguyen D, Borchart M, Yazdi C, et al. A Comprehensive Review of the Treatment and Management of Myofascial Pain Syndrome. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 2020;24(8): 43. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
5. Zale EL, Ditte JW. Pain-Related Fear, Disability, and the Fear-Avoidance Model of Chronic Pain. *Curr Opin Psychol* 2015; 5:24–30. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
6. Bevers K, Watts L, Kishino ND, Gatchel RJ. The Biopsychosocial model of the assessment, prevention, and treatment of chronic pain. *US Neurol* 2016; 12(2):98–104. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
7. Mcgee SJ, Kaylor BD, Emmott H, Christopher MJ. Defining chronic pain ethics. *Pain Med* 2011;12(9):1376–84. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
8. Roditi D, Robinson ME. The role of psychological interventions in the management of patients with chronic pain. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2011; 4:41-9. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
9. Scascighini L, Toma V, Dober-Spielmann S, Sprott H. Multidisciplinary treatment for chronic pain: a systematic review of interventions and outcomes. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2008;47(5):670–8. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
10. Busch H, Bodin L, Bergström G, Jensen IB. Patterns of sickness absence a decade after pain-related multidisciplinary rehabilitation. *Pain* 2011; 152(8):1727–33. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
11. Steinmetz A, Psczolla M, Seidel W, Niemier K, Derlien S, Nisser J. Effect of subgroup-specific multimodal therapy on chronic spinal back pain and function-a prospective inpatient multicentre clinical trial in Germany. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2019;98(1):E13825. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
12. Salduker S, Allers E, Bechan S, Hodgson RE, Meyer F, Meyer H, et al. Practical approach to a patient with chronic pain of uncertain etiology in primary care. *J Pain Res* 2019;12:2651-62. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
13. Tiktinsky R, Chen L, Narayan P. Electrotherapy: yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Haemophilia* 2010;16(SUPPL. 5):126–31. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
14. Ostelo RW. Physiotherapy management of sciatica. *J Physiother* 2020;66(2):83–8. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
15. Frymoyer JW. Back pain and sciatica. *N Engl J Med* 1988;318(5):291–300. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
16. Booth J, Moseley GL, Schiltenswolf M, Cashin A, Davies M, Hübscher M. Exercise for chronic musculoskeletal pain: A biopsychosocial approach. *Musculoskeletal Care* 2017;15(4):413–21. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
17. Casey MB, Smart K, Segurado R, Hearty C, Gopal H, Lowry D, et al. Exercise combined with Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ExACT) compared to a supervised exercise programme for adults with chronic pain: Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials* 2018;19(1):1–14. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
18. Brooks JM, Iwanaga K, Chiu CY, Cotton BP, Deiches J, Morrison B, et al. Relationships between self-determination theory and theory of planned behavior applied to physical activity and exercise behavior in chronic pain. *Psychol Health Med* 2017;22(7):814-22. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
19. Knezevic A, Neblett R, Jeremic-Knezevic M, Tomasevic-Todorovic S, Boskovic K, Colovic P, et al. Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Psychometric Validation of the Serbian Version of the Central Sensitization Inventory. *Pain Pract* 2018;18(4):463–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
20. Tanaka K, Nishigami T, Mibu A, Manfuku M, Yono S, Shinohara Y, et al. Validation of the Japanese version of the Central Sensitization Inventory in patients with musculoskeletal disorders. *PLoS One* 2017;12(12):e0188719. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
21. Neblett R, Cohen H, Choi Y, Hartzell MM, Williams M, Mayer TG, et al. The Central Sensitization Inventory (CSI): establishing clinically significant values for identifying central sensitivity syndromes in an outpatient chronic pain sample. *J Pain*;14(5):438–45. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
22. Knezevic A, Neblett R, Gatchel RJ, Jeremic-Knezevic M, Bugarski-Ignjatovic V, Tomasevic-Todorovic S, et al. Psychometric validation of the Serbian version of the Fear Avoidance Component Scale (FACS). *PLoS One* 2018;13(9):e0204311. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
23. Jensen MP, Turner JA, Romano JM. What is the maximum number of levels needed in pain intensity measurement? *Pain* 1994;58(3):387–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
24. Terminology | International Association for the Study of Pain [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 12]. Available from: <https://www.iasp-pain.org/resources/terminology/>
25. Scerbo T, Colasurdo J, Dunn S, Unger J, Nijs J, Cook C. Measurement Properties of the Central Sensitization Inventory: A Systematic Review. *Pain Pract* 2018;18(4):544–54. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
26. Kregel J, Vuijk PJ, Descheemaeker F, Keizer D, van der Noord R, Nijs J, et al. The Dutch Central Sensitization Inventory (CSI): Factor Analysis, Discriminative Power, and Test-Retest Reliability. *Clin J Pain* 2016;32(7):624–30. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
27. Cuesta-Vargas AI, Roldan-Jimenez C, Neblett R, Gatchel RJ. Cross-cultural adaptation and validity of the Spanish central sensitization inventory. *Springerplus* 2016;5(1):1837. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
28. Pitance L, Piraux E, Lannoy B, Meus M, Berquin A, Eeckhout C, et al. CROSS CULTURAL ADAPTATION, RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE FRENCH VERSION OF THE CENTRAL

- SENSITIZATION INVENTORY. *Man Ther* 2016;25:83. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. D BD, C SN, V RP, Ramalingam AT. Content Validity and Test-Retest Reliability of the Gujarati Version of the Central Sensitization Inventory. *Natl J Integr Res Med* 2016; 7(5):18–24.
 30. Caumo W, Antunes LC, Elkfury JL, Herbstrith EG, Sipmann RB, Souza A, et al. The Central Sensitization Inventory validated and adapted for a Brazilian population: psychometric properties and its relationship with brain-derived neurotrophic factor. *J Pain Res [Internet]*. 2017 Sep 1 [cited 2023 Jan 12];10:2109. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 31. Popović D, Ninić N, Vojnović L, Panić DS, Knežević A. CENTRAL SENSITIZATION INVENTORY SCORES IN PATIENTS WITH NEUROPATHIC PAIN COMPARED TO HEALTHY SUBJECTS. *Acta medica medianae*. In press 2023.
 32. Vojnović L, Popović D, Vidić J, Panić DS, Aleksandrić T, Knežević A. GENERALIZED PAIN HYPERSENSITIVITY IN FIBROMYALGIA PATIENTS. *Acta medica medianae*. In press 2023.
 33. Fairbank JCT. Letter to the Editor: Oswestry Disability Index. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2014;20(2):239–42. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 34. Beattie P, Maher C. The role of functional status questionnaires for low back pain. *Aust J Physiother* 1997;43(1):29–38. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 35. Fisher K, Johnston M. Validation of the Oswestry low back pain disability questionnaire: Its sensitivity as a measure of change following treatment and its relationship with other aspects of the pain experience. *Physiother Theory Pract* 1997;13(1):67–80. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
 36. Harper B, Steinbeck L, Aron A. Fascial manipulation vs. standard physical therapy practice for low back pain diagnoses: A pragmatic study. *J Bodyw Mov Ther* 2019;23(1):115–21. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 37. Coen LJ, Sarno JE. Psychosomatic avoidance of conflict in back pain. *J Am Acad Psychoanal* 1989;17(3):359–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 38. Pflingsten M, Hildebrandt J, Leibing E, Franz C, Saur P. Effectiveness of a multimodal treatment program for chronic low-back pain. *Pain* 1997;73(1):77–85. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 39. Hildebrandt J, Pflingsten M, Saur P, Jansen J. Prediction of success from a multidisciplinary treatment program for chronic low back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1997;22(9):990–1001. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 40. Hayden JA, van Tulder MW, Tomlinson G. Systematic review: strategies for using exercise therapy to improve outcomes in chronic low back pain. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;142(9):776–85. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 41. Rainville J, Hartigan C, Martinez E, Limke J, Jouve C, Finno M. Exercise as a treatment for chronic low back pain. *Spine Journal* 2004;4(1):106–15. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 42. Sherman KJ, Cherkin DC, Erro J, Miglioretti DL, Deyo RA. Comparing yoga, exercise, and a self-care book for chronic low back pain: a randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;143(12):849–56. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 43. O'Connor AB, Dworkin RH. Treatment of neuropathic pain: an overview of recent guidelines. *Am J Med* 2009;122(10 Suppl):s22–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 44. Dworkin RH, O'Connor AB, Audette J, Baron R, Gourlay GK, Haanpää ML, et al. Recommendations for the pharmacological management of neuropathic pain: an overview and literature update. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2010;85(3 Suppl):s3–14. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 45. Vlaeyen JWS, Linton SJ. Fear-avoidance and its consequences in chronic musculoskeletal pain: a state of the art. *Pain* 2000;85(3):317–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 46. Wertli MM, Rasmussen-Barr E, Held U, Weiser S, Bachmann LM, Brunner F. Fear-avoidance beliefs—a moderator of treatment efficacy in patients with low back pain: a systematic review. *Spine J* 2014;14(11):2658–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 47. Rainville J, Smeets RJE, Bendix T, Tveito TH, Poiraudreau S, Indahl AJ. Fear-avoidance beliefs and pain avoidance in low back pain—translating research into clinical practice. *Spine J* 2011;11(9):895–903. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 48. Lundberg M, Grimby-Ekman A, Verbunt J, Simmonds MJ. Pain-related fear: a critical review of the related measures. *Pain Res Treat* 2011;2011:494196.. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
 49. Childs JD, Piva SR, Fritz JM. Responsiveness of the numeric pain rating scale in patients with low back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2005;30(11):1331–4. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)

Originalni rad

UDC: 615.8:616.833.58-009.7
doi: 10.5633/amm.2023.0405

MULTIMODALNI REHABILITACIONI TRETMAN BOLESNIKA SA LUMBOIŠIJALGIJOM

Dunja Popović^{1,2}, Larisa Vojnović^{1,2}, Tijana Aleksandrić^{1,2}, Maša Rapajić¹,
Aleksandar Knežević^{1,2}, Jana Vasin¹

¹Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Medicinski fakultet, Novi Sad, Srbija

²Klinički centar Vojvodine, Klinika za medicinsku rehabilitaciju, Novi Sad, Srbija

Kontakt: Dunja Popović
Hajduk Veljkova 3, 21000 Novi Sad, Srbija
E-mail: dunjapopovic@uns.ac.rs

Lumboišijalgija se definiše kao bol u donjem delu leđa sa propagacijom u donji ekstremitet ispod nivoa kolena. Podaci o najefikasnijem lečenju ovog stanja su oskudni. Stoga, cilj ovog istraživanja bio da se ispita efikasnost multimodalnog rehabilitacionog tretmana kod bolesnika sa lumboišijalgijom.

Pedeset jedan (51) ispitanik sa hroničnom lumboišijalgijom lečen je na Klinici za medicinsku rehabilitaciju Kliničkog centra Vojvodine. Uz demografske podatke, na početku i na kraju tretmana praćene su vrednosti Numeričke skale bola (engl. *Numerical Rating Scale* – NRS), Osvestrijevog indeksa onesposobljenosti (engl. *The Oswestry Disability Index* – ODI), vrednosti Skale centralne senzitivizacije (engl. *Central Sensitization Inventory* – CSI) i vrednosti Skale izbegavanja aktivnosti usled straha (engl. *Fear Avoidance Component Scale* – FACS).

Veći broj ispitanika činile su žene (34; 66,7%). Stacionarni multimodalni tretman hroničnog bola trajao je $20,48 \pm 5,89$ dana. Rezultati intenziteta bola po NRS-u bili su značajno manji nakon tretmana ($6,49 \pm 2,22$ prema $5,00 \pm 2,22$; $t = 5,629$, $p < 0,001$). Prosečna vrednost ODI ($48,75 \pm 15,16$ prema $42,24 \pm 14,13$; $t = 4,246$, $p < 0,001$) i prosečna vrednost FACS-a ($66,80 \pm 14,13$ prema $62,47 \pm 16,49$; $t = 2,086$, $p = 0,042$) nakon tretmana ukazivale su na značajno poboljšanje. To nije bio slučaj sa CSI skorom – tu nije bilo statistički značajne razlike nakon multimodalnog tretmana ($38,39 \pm 11,97$ prema $35,84 \pm 15,05$; $t = 1,446$, $p = 0,155$).

Primenom multimodalnog stacionarnog rehabilitacionog tretmana postiže se poboljšanje funkcionalnog statusa, smanjenje intenziteta bola, kao i smanjenje stepena izbegavanja aktivnosti usled straha kod bolesnika sa hroničnom lumboišijalgijom.

Acta Medica Medianae 2023; 62(4):37-43.

Ključne reči: lumboišijalgija, onesposobljenost, bol, multimodalni tretman

"This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) Licence".