

## References

S-191

1. Richter A, Halm HF, Hauck M, et al. 2-year follow-up after decompressive surgery with and without implantation of an interspinous device for lumbar spinal stenosis: A prospective controlled study. *J Spinal Disord Tech.* 2012. [Epub ahead of print]
2. Celik H, Derincek A, Koksai I. Surgical treatment of the spinal stenosis with an interspinous distraction device: do we really restore the foraminal height? *Turk Neurosurg.* 2012; 22(1): 50-54.
3. Ploumis A, Christodoulou P, Gelalis I, et al. Surgical treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis with microdecompression and interspinous distraction device insertion: a case series. *J Orthop Surg Res.* 2012; 7: 35. [ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc](http://ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc). Accessed March 26, 2013.
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Devices and Radiological Health. New device approval letter. October 17, 2012. Coflex Interlaminar Technology. P110008. [accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh](http://accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh). Accessed 04/23/2014.
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Center for Devices and Radiological Health. Summary of safety, effectiveness and labeling: X STOP® Interspinous Process Decompression System. [accessdata.fda.gov](http://accessdata.fda.gov). Accessed 04/23/2014.
6. Epstein NE. A review of interspinous fusion devices: High complication, reoperation rates, and costs with poor outcomes. *Surg Neurol Int.* 2012; 3: 7.
7. Moojen WA, Arts MP, Jacobs WC, et al. Interspinous process device versus standard conventional surgical decompression for lumbar spinal stenosis: randomized controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2013; 347: f6415.
8. Levin, K. Lumbar spinal stenosis: Treatment and prognosis. *UpToDate*. Literature review current through March 2014. Accessed 04/24/2014.
9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of safety and effectiveness data: coflex Interlaminar Technology. 2012. [accessdata.fda.gov](http://accessdata.fda.gov) . Accessed on 3/16/2015.
10. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Incidence of device-related failures following X-Stop interspinous spacer implant in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. FDA. [fda.gov](http://fda.gov). Accessed on 3/15/2015.
11. Davis R, Auerbach J, Bae H, et al. Can low-grade spondylolisthesis be effectively treated by either coflex interlaminar stabilization or laminectomy and posterior spinal fusion? Two-year clinical and radiographic results from the randomized, prospective, multicenter US investigational device exemption trial. *J Neurosurg Spine.* 2013; 19(2):174–184.
12. Moojen WA, Arts MP, Jacobs WCH, et al. Interspinous process device versus standard conventional surgical decompression for lumbar spinal stenosis: randomized controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2013; 347: f6415.
13. Eldin MM. Coflex dynamic distraction stabilization device for lumbar degenerative disease. *Cureus.* 2014; 6(1):e152. [www.cureus.com](http://www.cureus.com).
14. Gazzeri R, Galarza M, Alfieri A. Controversies about Interspinous process devices in the treatment of degenerative lumbar spine diseases: Past, present, and future. *BioMed Research International.* 2014: Article ID 975052. [hindawi.com/journals/bmri](http://hindawi.com/journals/bmri). Accessed 3/16/2015.

15. Grasso G, Giambartino F, and Iacopino DG. Clinical analysis following lumbar interspinous devices implant: Where we are and where we go. *Spinal Cord*. 2014; 52: 740-743.
16. North American Spine Society. Interspinous device without fusion. 2014. spine.org. Accessed on 3/11/2015.
17. Davis RJ, Errico TJ, Bae H, et al. Decompression and coflex interlaminar stabilization compared with decompression and instrumented spinal fusion for spinal stenosis and low-grade degenerative spondylolisthesis: Two-year results from the prospective, randomized, multicenter, food and drug administration investigational device exemption trial. Abstract. *Spine*. 2013a; 38(18): 1529-1539.
18. Kumar N, Shah SM, Ng YH, et al. Role of coflex as an adjunct to decompression for symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis. *Asian Spine J*. 2014; 8(2): 161-169.
19. Richter A, Halm HFH, Hauck M, et al. Two-year follow-up after decompressive surgery with and without implantation of an interspinous device for lumbar spinal stenosis: A prospective controlled study. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2014; 27(6):336-341. Abstract.
20. Bae HW, Lauryssen C, Maislin G, et al. Therapeutic sustainability and durability of coflex interlaminar stabilization after decompression for lumbar spinal stenosis: A four year assessment. *Int J Spine Surg*. 2015; 9: 15. ijssurgery.com. Accessed on 6/24/2015.
21. Moojen WA, Arts MP, Jacobs WC, et al. IPD without bony decompression versus conventional surgical decompression for lumbar spinal stenosis: 2-year results of a double-blind randomized controlled trial. Abstract. *Eur Spine J*. 2015. [Epub ahead of print].
22. Hong P, Liu Y, Li H. Comparison of the efficacy and safety between interspinous process distraction device and open decompression surgery in treating lumbar spinal stenosis: A meta-analysis. *J Invest Surg*. 2015; 28(1):40-49. Abstract.
23. Marsh GD, Mahir S, Leyte A. A prospective randomised controlled trial to assess the efficacy of dynamic stabilisation of the lumbar spine with the Wallis ligament. *Eur Spine J*. Oct 2014; 23(10): 2156-2160.
24. Puzilli F, Gazzeri R, Galarza M, et al. Interspinous spacer decompression (X-STOP) for lumbar spinal stenosis and degenerative disk disease: A multicenter study with a minimum 3-year follow-up. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. 2014; 124: 166–174.
25. Richter A, Halm HFH, Hauck M, Quante M. Two-year follow-up after decompressive surgery with and without implantation of an interspinous device for lumbar spinal stenosis: A prospective controlled study. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2014; 27(6):336-341. Abstract.
26. Machado GC, Ferreira PH, Harris IA, et al. Surgical options for lumbar spinal stenosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. November 2016.
27. Guyer R. ISASS recommendations/coverage criteria for decompression with interlaminar stabilization – coverage indications, limitations, and/or medical necessity. *International Journal of Spine Surgery*. 2016; 10(41):1-20.
28. Gazzeri R. Controversies about interspinous process devices in the treatment of degenerative lumbar spine diseases: Past, present, and future. *BioMed Research International*. 2014:1-15.
29. Cai Y. Interspinous spacers versus posterior lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative lumbar spinal diseases: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *International Orthopaedics*. 2016;40:1135-1142.

30. Chen X. Interspinous dynamic stabilization adjacent to fusion versus double-segment fusion for treatment of lumbar degenerative disease with a minimum follow-up of three years. *International Orthopaedics*. 2016;40:1275-1283.
31. Matz P. North American Spine Society. Evidence-based clinical guidelines for multidisciplinary spine care. 2014.