

**Role of MRI in acute lower back pain**

Najat Adel Hashim, Raad Jawad Kadhim

**Abstract**

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) exhibits the best sensitivity (96%) and specificity (92%) for infection. MRI may be helpful for further evaluation of an acute neurologic deficit, suspected cauda equina syndrome, suspected active sacroiliitis, and worsening low back pain not responding to 4 or more weeks of conservative therapy. A group of 501 patient who referred unit from orthopedic were subjected to MRI examination and the MRI results were evaluated. All patients with radicular pain, neurological signs or traumatic patients were excluded from this study. 501 patients complain from acute lower back pain, mean age 33.49+8.38 range (20-70), 229(46%) male and 272(54%) female, in combined MRI finding with age of patients, we found large number of patient have disk prolapsed (191), with mean age 36.50, while patient with normal MRI or just muscles spasm were mean age (31.79), so the MRI not effect in outcome of young patient ( below 31 years old ) with a lower back pain. In conclusion, lumbo-sacral MRI exam have minimal effect in outcome of young patient with acute lower back pain (less than 3wks).

**Keywords:** Acute low back pain, Magnetic resonance imaging

\* Correspondence author: najatadel73@gmial.com

University of Al-Qadissiyah/ College of Medicine/Department of surgery

Received 06 August 2017, Accepted 09 November 2017, Available online 11 November 2017.

This is an article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited. Copyright © 2017 NA

**Introduction**

Low back pain refers to spinal and paraspinal symptoms in the lumbosacral region. "Acute" typically means a duration of less than 2 to 4 weeks [1]. The differential diagnosis of low back pain is broad and includes mechanical and non-mechanical causes [2]. Acute low back pain is one of the most common conditions encountered in primary care [3]. In majority of the cases, acute back pain is self-limited and benign with no cause identified in 95% of the patients. In such patients the cause is either a muscular or ligamentous injury [4, 5].

A focused history and physical examinations are the first step to determine the specific underlying conditions and to look for evidence of neurologic involvement [6, 7]. The evaluation for low back pain should include a complete, focused medical history looking for red flags, which include, but are not limited to: severe or progressive neurologic deficits

(e.g., bowel or bladder function), fever, sudden back pain with spinal tenderness, trauma, and indications of a serious underlying condition (e.g., osteomyelitis, malignancy). It is also important to rule out non spinal causes of back pain, such as pyelonephritis, pancreatitis, penetrating ulcer disease or other gastrointestinal causes, and pelvic disease [8]. Although imaging is commonly used for further evaluation, it should not be considered as a replacement of clinical suspicion based on an accurate history and physical exam. It is important to keep in mind the limitations of the diagnostic studies and to consider how the management will be influenced by the information obtained from these studies [9]. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the preferred investigation for most spinal diseases and is increasingly requested for people with low back pain (LBP). However, determining the cause of back pain is complicated as it is often multifactorial and anatomical abnormalities are common in the spine and may not necessarily translate into clinical symptoms [10]. Thus, national guidelines discourage the use of MRI in non-specific LBP and recommend reserving it for the investigation of severe or progressive neurological deficits or for those cases in which serious underlying pathology is suspected. It also has an acknowledged role in planning surgical management in cases of radiculopathy and spinal stenosis. This review summarizes the indications for MRI in LBP and calls for improved education of patients and health professionals in the limitations of this investigation [11]. MRI has a high sensitivity and specificity in the detection of cancer or infection, but it is not particularly specific when evaluating lumbar radiculopathy. Poor specificity can lead to finding clinically irrelevant abnormalities. The overall evidence for the appropriate use of MRI in low back pain is limited and weak [12].

## Materials and Methods

Between July 2014 to July 2016, 501 patients with acute lower back pain were referred from orthopedic outpatient to the MRI unit at AL-Diwaniya teaching hospital. The mean age  $33.49 \pm 8.38$  range (20-70), 229 male & 272 female. The history was taken from every one of them, the data collected include, age, sex & duration of pain (all had pain for 1 to 2 wks. only). We exclude all patients with history of trauma, patients with previous attack of back pain, patients with lumbo-sacral spine diseases and patients with neurological diseases. The MRI exam was done by using Siemens Avanto (1.5 tesla) apparatus putting the patient on supine position, the time of examination (10 minute), an ordinary sequences was done, T1 & T2 weighted image sagittal views, T2 weighted image axial view (4mm slice thickness) & MRI myelography.

The following criteria were evaluated in MRI examination:

- 1- Loss of normal lumbar lordosis, for severe muscles spasm.

- 2- Signal intensity of disk & its position, to diagnose disk dehydration & prolapsed.
- 3- Intervertebral foramina, for nerve root compression stenosis foramina.

We divided MRI findings into three groups:

- A- Negative: normal LSS MRI.
- B- Muscles spasm only, without disk prolapsed.
- C- Disk prolapsed in all types: central, postero-lateral & lateral.

Patients divided into 5 age groups this finding applied to patients according to their age.

The total patients classified into 5 groups with interval of 10 years 1<sup>st</sup> group (20-29y), 2<sup>nd</sup> group (30-39 y), 3<sup>rd</sup> group (40-49 y), 4<sup>th</sup> group (50-59y) & 5<sup>th</sup> group  $\geq 60$  y.

We Correlated the MRI findings with patients age group, for comparison between age groups as appropriate ( $P < \text{or} = 0.05$ ) was considerable statistically significant.


## Result and Discussion

Total number of patients was 501, with mean age  $33.49 \pm 8.38$  range (20-70), 229(46%) male & 272 (54%) female. We divided the patients in to 5 age groups with 10 years interval for each group, 1<sup>st</sup> group (20-29 years), 2<sup>nd</sup> group (30-39 years), 3<sup>rd</sup> group (40-49 years), 4<sup>th</sup> group (50-59 years) and 5<sup>th</sup> group.

**Table 1.**


The distribution of patients according to the age group was 177(35.3%) in the 1<sup>st</sup> group, 194(38.7%) in 2<sup>nd</sup> age group, 119(23.8%) in 3<sup>rd</sup> age group, 10(2%) in 4<sup>th</sup> group, and small number in 5<sup>th</sup> group 1 (0.2%).

Age Group	Age intervals	Frequency	Percent
1 <sup>st</sup>	20-29 years	177	35.3
2 <sup>nd</sup>	30-39 years	194	38.7
3 <sup>rd</sup>	40-49 years	119	23.8
4 <sup>th</sup>	50-59 years	10	2
5 <sup>th</sup>	$\geq 60$ years	1	0.2
	Total	501	100



**Figure 1.**

Number of patients related to age largest number are seen in 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> age group ( 194 & 177), then 3<sup>rd</sup> ( 119), while the less number are seen in 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> group (10 & 1).



**Figure 2.**

Showing number of female in this simple little more than male, 272(54%) female, 229 (46%) male

The distribution of patients according to MRI finding was as follow:


Group A: 38 patients had negative results.

Group B: 272patients had only muscle spasm

Group C: 191 patients had disc prolapse with or without nerve root compression or spinal stenosis.

Table 2: in compared group A with B showing (P1 0.9) not significant both have same age group (mean age 31 young patients) , while comparison between group A with C we have ( P2 0.001) significant that s mean these signs are seen in different age groups, & comparison between group C with B showing (P3 < 0.001) highly significant , means these signs also seen in different age groups, both groups A & B are seen in young patients, while group C are seen in old age patients (mean age 36.50).

Groups	Finding	N	Mean age ± SD	P1	P2	P3
A	Negative	38	31.79±3.21	0.9	0.001	<0.001
B	Muscle spasm	272	31.61±8.78			
C	Disc prolapse	191	36.50±7.63			



**Figure 3.**

Relation between the ages of patients & MRI finding, showing negative & muscles spasm are seen in younger patients (below 35-year-old), while disc prolapsed are seen in older age about 40 years old.



**Figure 4.**

A: Sagittal MRI T2 weighted image showing normal disk signal intensity, no signs of prolapsed disk.  
 B: Sagittal MRI t2 weighted image: acute prolapsed L5/S1 disk , with sever muscles spasm.



**Figure 5.**

Axial MRI T2 weighted image showing bilateral nerve root compression by L4/L5 disk prolapsed.

Prolapsed Lumbar disc is regarded as one of the most frequent vertebral column disorders of old people leading to back ache, radicular ache, and then neurological defect due to compression of nerve root [13]. Prolapsed Lumbar disc is a rare condition in children and adolescents. In available published literature, people younger than 18 years generally constitute only 0.5–3% of all patients subjected to surgical intervention [14]. A lot of studies have revised many possible risk factors for lumbar disc herniation (LDH), including BMI, age, gender, diabetes, smoking, type of LDH, occupation, and others. Regarding gender, when analysis of subgroup was dependent up on different study sites, it was found that for male gender it was more possible to have recurrent LDH when they were from Asian ancestors [15]. The higher rate in male patients supports the finding of our study. Most published studies showed that low backache rate and accompanying disc prolapse is significantly rare in young patients and that the rate is more with increasing age and his observation is in accordance with the finding of the current study. For instance, other study observed that about a 3rd of 439 13-year-olds subjected to MRIs for back pain had MRI abnormalities [16]. Other researcher studied 40 children patients reporting lower backache and significant number of subjects who had chronic lower back pain during their 20s however, LDH most frequently affects patients in their early 40s [17, 18].

Only 11% of young adults with low back pain experience acute disc herniation of the lumbar region [19]. Pain has usually acute onset, flexion-related and often accompanied by back muscle spasm, tightness of hamstring muscles and, sometimes, pain in buttock region [20–22]. Radicular symptoms (paresthesias and muscle weakness) are uncommon [23, 24]. Examination frequently demonstrates reduced flexion; positive straight leg raises and sometimes less reflexes/strength of the lower limbs.

The present study showed that Low back pain was more frequent in females in comparison to males. This is in accordance with the several previous studies, that showed that Low back

pain symptoms were usually more common among females. While others showed that the rate of Low back pain is higher among females due to the stress of hormonal changes, problems related gynaecological disorders and also childbirth related events [25-26].

## Conclusion

The findings in this study suggest that smoking might be related in the alteration in lipid profile adversely causing dyslipidemia in smokers. Smoking plays the main role for atherosclerotic process and with coronary artery disease. This study is helpful for future studies in understanding the underlying mechanism causing series of changes influenced by smoking activity. The duration of smoking play an important role in lipid profile change. The results documented a high prevalence of dyslipidemia among Iraqi smokers. The results of this study show that smokers are at much greater risk of developing atherosclerotic plaques and different heart diseases than nonsmokers among Iraqi young.

## References

1. Kumar R, Kumar V, Das NK, Behari S, Mahapatra AK. Adolescent lumbar disc disease: Findings and outcome. *Childs Nerv Syst* 2007; 23:1295–9.
2. Sarma P, Thirupathi RT, Srinivas D, Somanna S. Adolescent prolapsed lumbar intervertebral disc: Management strategies and outcome. *Journal of Pediatric Neurosciences* 2016;11(1):20-24.
3. Huang W, Han Z, Liu J, Yu L, Yu X. Risk Factors for Recurrent Lumbar Disc Herniation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Martin. S, ed. Medicine.* 2016;95(2):e2378
4. Kasliwal MK, Deutsch H. Lumbar disc replacement in adolescents: An initial experience in two cases. *Journal of Pediatric Neurosciences* 2012;7(2):129-132.
5. Kjaer P, Leboeuf-Yde C, Sorensen JS, Bendix T. An epidemiologic study of MRI and low back pain in 13-year-old children. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2005;30:798–806.
6. Strömqvist F, Strömqvist B, Jönsson B, Karlsson MK. The outcome of lumbar disc herniation surgery is worse in old adults than in young adults: A study of 14,090 individuals in the Swedish Spine Surgery Register (SweSpine). *Acta Orthopaedica.* 2016;87(5):516-521.
7. Alhasani S, et al. Critical role of IL-23 signaling in prostatic cancer. *American Journal of BioMedicine* 2013;1(1):4-6.
8. Zetaruk M. Lumbar spine injuries. In: Micheli LJ, Purcell LK, editors. *The Adolescent Athlete.* New York: Springer 2007. pp. 109–40.
9. Trainor TJ, Trainor MA. Etiology of low back pain in athletes. *Curr Sport Med Reports* 2004;3:41–6.
10. d'Hemecourt PA, Gerbino PG, 2nd, Micheli LJ. Back injuries in the young athlete. *Clin Sports Med* 2000;19:663–79.
11. Watkins RG. Lumbar disc injury in the athlete. *Clin Sports Med.* 2002;21:147–65.

12. Schumann C, et al. Differences in the survival rate between premenopausal and postmenopausal women with lung cancer: US SEER database. *American journal of BioMedicine* 2014;2(3):315-322.
13. Kraft DE. Low back pain in the adolescent athlete. *Pediatr Clin N Am.* 2002;49:643–53.
14. Simon LM, Jih W, Buller JC. Back pain and injuries. In: Birrer RB, Griesemer BA, Cataletto MB, editors. *Pediatric Sports Medicine for Primary Care*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2002. pp. 306–25.
15. Al-khirsani H, et al. Relationship of the expression of IL-32 on NF- $\kappa$ B and p-p38 MAP kinase pathways in human esophageal cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2012;30(4\_suppl):59-59.
16. Schneider S, Randoll D, Buchner M. Why do women have back pain more than men? A representative prevalence study in the federal republic of Germany. *Clin J Pain.* 2006;22:738–747.
17. Yousif NG. Fibronectin promotes migration and invasion of ovarian cancer cells through up-regulation of FAK–PI 3 K/A kt pathway. *Cell biology international* 2014;38(1):85-91.
18. Hathorn DC, Carruth AK, Agosta LJ, Pryor SK. Selfreported back pain among farm women in southeast Louisiana. *AAOHN J.* 2009;57:232–238.
19. Bener A, Dafeeah EE, Alnaqbi K. Prevalence and Correlates of Low Back Pain in Primary Care: What Are the Contributing Factors in a Rapidly Developing Country. *Asian Spine Journal.* 2014;8(3):227-236.
20. BRIAN A. CASAZZA, MD, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, North Carolina  
*Am Fam Physician.* 2012 Feb 15;85(4):343-350.
21. Atlas SJ, Deyo RA. Evaluating and managing acute low back pain in the primary care setting. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2001;16:120–31.
22. Kinkade S. Evaluation and treatment of acute low back pain. *Am Fam Physician.* 2007;75(8):1181–8. (Apr 15).
23. Deyo RA, Rainville J, Kent DL. What can the history and physical exam tell us about low back pain? *JAMA.* 1992;268: 760–5.
24. Lee J, Adrienne J, et al. Expression of IL-32 modulates NF- $\kappa$ B and p38 MAP kinase pathways in human esophageal cancer. *Cytokine* 2013;61(1):223-227.
25. Bigos S, Bowyer O, Braen G, et al. Acute low back pain problems in adults. *Clinical Practice Guideline ns 14. AHCPR Publication No. 95-0642.* Rockville, MD. US Department of Health and Human Services; 1994.
26. Amato E, Lizio D, Settineri N, Di Pasquale A, Salamone I, Pandolfo I. A method to evaluate the dose increase in CT with iodinated contrast medium. *Med Phys.* 2010;37:4249-4256.
27. Chou R, Qaseem A, Snow V, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain: a joint clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians and the  
28.