

## References

S-191

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Summary of safety and effectiveness data: Coflex Interlaminar Technology. 2012.
2. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Incidence of device-related failures following X-Stop interspinous spacer implant in patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. FDA. 2015.
3. Machado GC, Ferreira PH, Harris IA, et al. Surgical options for lumbar spinal stenosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016.
4. Guyer R. ISASS recommendations/coverage criteria for decompression with interlaminar stabilization – coverage indications, limitations, and/or medical necessity. *Int J Spine Surgery*. 2016; 10(41):1-20.
5. Cai Y. Interspinous spacers versus posterior lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative lumbar spinal diseases: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Int Orthop*. 2016;40:1135-1142.
6. 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. *Int Orthop*. 2016;40:1275-1283.
7. Hayes, Inc. Hayes Health Technology Brief. *Coflex interlaminar stabilization device (Paradigm Spine LLC) for treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis*. Lansdale, PA: Hayes, Inc. 09/21/2018.
8. Abjornson C, Yoon BJ, Callanan T, et al. Spinal stenosis in the absence of spondylolisthesis: Can interlaminar stabilization at single and multi-levels provide sustainable relief? *Int J Spine Surg*. 2018; 12(1):64-9.
9. Musacchio MJ, Laurysen C, Davis RJ, et al. Evaluation of decompression and interlaminar stabilization compared with decompression and fusion for the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis: 5-year follow-up of a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Int J Spine Surg*. 2016;10.
10. Schmidt S, Franke J, Rauschmann M, et al. Prospective, randomized, multicenter study with 2-year follow-up to compare the performance of decompression with and without interlaminar stabilization. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2018:1-10.
11. Simon RB, Dowe C, Grinberg S, et al. The 2-level experience of interlaminar stabilization: 5-year follow-up of a prospective, randomized clinical experience compared to fusion for the sustainable management of Spinal Stenosis. *Int J Spine Surg*. 2018;12(4):419-27.
12. Fan Y, Zhu L. Decompression alone versus fusion and Coflex in the treatment of lumbar degenerative disease: A network meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2020;99(11):e19457.
13. Li AM, Li X, Yang Z. Decompression and coflex interlaminar stabilisation compared with conventional surgical procedures for lumbar spinal stenosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg*. 2017;40:60-67.
14. Du MR, Wei FL, Zhu KL, Song RM, Huan Y, et al. Coflex interspinous process dynamic stabilization for lumbar spinal stenosis: Long-term follow-up. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2020;81:462-468.
15. Yuan W, Su QJ, Liu T, Yang JC, et al. Evaluation of Coflex interspinous stabilization following decompression compared with decompression and posterior lumbar interbody fusion for the treatment of lumbar degenerative disease: A minimum 5-year follow-up study. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2017;35:24-29.

16. Zhang JX, Jing XW, Cui P, He X, Hao DJ, Li SJ. Effectiveness of dynamic fixation Coflex treatment for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. *Exp Ther Med*. 2018;15(1):667-672.