

Comparative Study Between Mini-Open and Open Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion as a Treatment in Patients with Degenerative Lumbar Spine

A Thesis

*Submitted For Partial Fulfillment of M.D. Degree of
Orthopaedic Surgery*

By

Samer Samir Mohammed Moussa

M.B.B.Ch

M.Sc. of Orthopaedic Surgery- Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Abdel Mohsen Arafa Ali

Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery

Facutl of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Jean Marc Vital

Professor of Spine Surgery

University of Bordeaux

France

Dr. Fady Michael Fahmy

Lecturer of Orthopaedic Surgery

Facutl of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2017

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سبحانك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgment

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **ALLAH**, the Most Kind and Most Merciful.*

*I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Abdel Mohsen Arafa Ali**, Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery Facutl of Medicine - Ain Shams University for his keen guidance, kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Dr. Fady Michael Fahmy**, Lecturer of Orthopaedic Surgery Facutl of Medicine - Ain Shams University, for her great help, active participation and guidance.*

Samer Samir Mohammed Moussa

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	5
List of Figures	6
List of Abbreviations	12
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	16
Review of Literature	
▪ Anatomy of Lumbar Spine	17
▪ Pathogenesis of Spinal Canal Stenosis	23
▪ Diagnosis	28
▪ Surgical Treatment.....	42
Patients and Methods	49
Results	76
Case Presentation	91
Discussion	121
Summary & Conclusion	127
References	130
Arabic Summary	—

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Differentiation of symptoms of vascular claudication from those of neurogenic claudication	31
Table (2):	Values of spinopelvic parameters in asymptomatic adults (* PI=PT+SS).....	34
Table (3):	Comparison between groups according to level.	53
Table (4):	Shows highly significant statistical difference between pre and postoperative VAS in each group.	76
Table (5):	Comparison between groups according to operative time (hrs).	79
Table (6):	Comparison between groups according to blood transfusion and blood loss.....	81
Table (7):	Comparison between groups according to radiation exposure in (mGym2).....	82
Table (8):	Shows statistically significant difference between groups according to VAS of back pain postoperatively.	83
Table (9):	Comparison between groups according to early complications.	84
Table (10):	Comparison between groups according to long-term complications.	88
Table (11):	Comparison pre and other categories according to oswestry in group I.....	88
Table (12):	Comparison pre and other category according to oswestry in group II.....	89
Table (13):	Comparison between groups according to oswestry.....	90

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (1):	Functional Spinal Unit (FSU) ⁽¹³⁾	17
Fig. (2):	The Shape and boundaries of the Intervertebral Foramen. ⁽¹⁶⁾	19
Fig. (3):	Illustration demonstrating changes in IVF dimensions with increasing age, height, and weight. ⁽¹⁷⁾	20
Fig. (4):	Schema of facet orientation measurement. Reference plane was defined by posterior aspect of vertebral body	22
Fig. (5):	Diagram showing the three zones of nerve root canal according to Lee classification. ⁽²⁶⁾	25
Fig. (6):	Normal foramen dimension	26
Fig. (7):	Anteroposterior and lateral plain radiographic views showing narrowing of the disc space in L4-L5 level	32
Fig. (8):	Dynamic views showing reversal of L4-L5 normal trapezoidal disc geometry with spondylolisthesis	33
Fig. (9):	Pelvic parameters: PT pelvic tilt, SS sacral slope, PI pelvic incidence. ⁽⁴⁷⁾	34
Fig. (10):	Spine segmentation and lumbar lordosis. Inflection points are the points of change in curvature and do not necessarily correspond to anatomical structures.....	35
Fig. (11):	T2 weighted image of MRI, sagittal cuts showing central stenosis.....	36
Fig. (12):	An absence of normal fat around the root indicates foraminal stenosis on sagittal T1-weighted images (arrows). ⁽²⁵⁾	37
Fig. (13):	MRI Axial T2 – weighted image shows right foraminal stenosis	37

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (14):	Extraforaminal stenosis is identified on axial T1-weighted images by obliteration of the normal interval of fat between the disc and nerve root (arrow) at the lumbar 3–4 disc level ⁽²⁵⁾	38
Fig. (15):	CT identifies posterior vertebral arch joint structures responsible for the stenosis and allows you to determine their amount	39
Fig. (16):	Calculation of the quotient of Jones-Thompson.....	41
Fig. (17):	Patient position for lumbar surgery ⁽⁶⁷⁾	44
Fig. (18):	Exposure of surgical field ⁽⁶⁷⁾	44
Fig. (19):	A diagram to identify the entry points for pedicle screws ⁽⁶⁸⁾	45
Fig. (20):	Facetectomy and fenestration to expose the right L5 foramen. ⁽⁶⁷⁾	46
Fig. (21):	Dilation of the interbody space is achieved with interbody distractors that can be rotated to achieve endplate elevation. ⁽⁶⁸⁾	46
Fig. (22):	A diagram shows the bone graft and interbody cage in the disc space. ⁽⁶⁸⁾	47
Fig. (23):	Bar chart between groups according to age (years).	50
Fig. (24):	Bar chart between groups according to sex.	50
Fig. (25):	Preoperative diagnosis.....	52
Fig. (26):	Bar chart between groups according to level.....	53
Fig. (27):	Plain X-ray AP and lateral views showing degenerative spondylolisthesis at the level L4-L5 (Case 21, G1).	57
Fig. (28):	Plain X-ray lateral views with flexion and extension (Dynamic views) showing dynamic instability at the level L4-L5 (Case 21, G1)	57

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (29):	MRI T2 weighted image, axial cuts showing black disc with severe canal stenosis obliterating the hyperintense signal of the CSF at L4 – L5 (Case 21, G1).....	58
Fig. (30):	Spineart® percutaneous spine system.....	59
Fig. (31):	Determination of entry point for screw insertion.	61
Fig. (32):	Diagrams illustrating the anatomical principles of percutaneous pedicle screw insertion	62
Fig. (33):	The Awl to determine the entry point under fluoroscopic guidance.	63
Fig. (34):	Insertion of guide wire into the pedicle under C-arm control in both AP (a) and Lateral (b) views.	63
Fig. (35):	The guide wire through the largest dilator.....	64
Fig. (36):	Control of screw position under C-arm	64
Fig. (37):	Insertion of the 2 nd screw.	65
Fig. (38):	Both screws on the non-working side are in place.	65
Fig. (39):	Rod application under c-arm.	66
Fig. (40):	M.I.S retractor system. ⁽⁷⁰⁾	67
Fig. (41):	The MIS retractor in place.....	67
Fig. (42):	Facetectomy to expose the disc. ⁽⁶⁸⁾	69
Fig. (43):	Kambin's triangle.....	69
Fig. (44):	Cage insertion under fluoroscopic control in lateral view.....	71
Fig. (45):	The cage positioning under C-arm control AP view.	71
Fig. (46):	Final C-arm control.	72
Fig. (47):	Final clinical photo after wound closure.....	72
Fig. (48):	Line shows the extent of the difference over the periods through back VAS in each group.	77

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (49):	Line shows the extent of the difference over the periods through lower limb VAS in each group.	77
Fig. (50):	Bar chart between groups according to VAS pre and postoperatively.	78
Fig. (51):	Bar chart between groups for operative time (hrs).	79
Fig. (52):	Bar chart between groups according to blood loss (cc).	81
Fig. (53):	Bar chart between groups according to radiation exposure.	82
Fig. (54):	Bar chart between groups according to complications.	84
Fig. (55):	AP PXR showing laterally positioned L5 left screw in "Group 1".	86
Fig. (56):	PXR lumbar region showing L4/L5 posterior cage migration.	87
Fig. (57):	Line shows the extent of the difference over the periods through oswestry in Group 1&2.	89
Fig. (58):	PXR AP (a) – Lateral (b) – Dynamic views (c & d) showing degenerated lumbar spine.	93
Fig. (59):	MRI A) sagittal T2 weighted image shows degenerated L4& L5 with Modic changes, B) axial T2 weighted image shows pervious laminectomy and C) Stenosis of L4& L5 on Lt. side.	94
Fig. (60):	Immediate postoperative PXR , AP and Lateral views.	95
Fig. (61):	PXR 1 month postoperative.	95
Fig. (62):	PXR 3 months postoperative.	96
Fig. (63):	PXR 6 months postoperative.	96
Fig. (64):	PXR 24 months postoperative.	97

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (65):	CT scan sagittal cuts showing complete fusion after 24 months.	97
Fig. (66):	PXR AP, lateral views showing degenerative spondylolisthesis L4-L5.	100
Fig. (67):	MRI sagittal and axial cuts showing spondylolisthesis L4&L5.	101
Fig. (68):	Immediate post-operative plain X ray.	102
Fig. (69):	PXR 1 month postoperative.	102
Fig. (70):	Plain X ray AP and Lateral views after 3 months.	103
Fig. (71):	PXR Lateral view after 6 months.	103
Fig. (72):	PXR after 24 months showing fusion.	104
Fig. (73):	CT scan sagittal and coronal cuts to demonstrate fusion.	104
Fig. (74):	Preoperative PXR AP and lateral view.	107
Fig. (75):	Flexion & extension PXR.	107
Fig. (76):	MRI sagittal cuts showing degenerated L4-L5 & L5-S1 discs.	108
Fig. (77):	MRI Axial cuts showing the stenotic level L4-L5 and foraminal L5-S1 disc prolapse.	108
Fig. (78):	PXR 1month after surgery	109
Fig. (79):	Postoperative PXR AP and Lateral view after 6 months.	109
Fig. (80):	CT scan sagittal cuts after 24 months showing fusion.	110
Fig. (81):	Preoperative MRI sagittal & axial T2 weighted images showing stenosis L4 & L5.	113
Fig. (82):	Last follow up after 24 months with solid fusion.	114
Fig. (83):	PXR AP & Lat views.	117
Fig. (84):	Dynamic views.	117
Fig. (85):	MRI sagittal cuts showing stenosis at L4, L5 and S1.	118

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (86):	MRI axial cuts.....	119
Fig. (87):	Immediate postoperative PXR.	119
Fig. (88):	PXR at 24 months showing fusion.	120

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
AP	<i>Anterior-posterior</i>
CT	<i>Computed tomography</i>
DDD	<i>Degenerative Disc Disease</i>
FSU	<i>Functional Spine Unit</i>
IAP	<i>Inferior antroposterior</i>
IVD	<i>Intervertebral disc</i>
IVF	<i>Intervertebral Foramen</i>
LL	<i>Lumbar lordosis</i>
MRI	<i>Magnetic resonance imaging</i>
NIC	<i>Neurogenic intermittent Claudication</i>
ODI	<i>Oswestry Disability Index</i>
PI	<i>Pelvic incidence</i>
PLIF	<i>Posterior lumbar interbody fusion</i>
PT	<i>Pelvic tilt</i>
RBCs	<i>Red blood cells</i>
SAP	<i>Superior antroposterior dimension</i>
SD	<i>Standard deviation</i>
SI	<i>Superior to Inferior</i>
SPSS	<i>Statistical Program for Social Science</i>
SS	<i>Sacral slope</i>
TK	<i>Thoracic kyphosis</i>
TLIF	<i>Tranforaminal lumbar interbody fusion</i>
VAS	<i>Visual Analogue Score</i>

INTRODUCTION

Spinal canal stenosis is a common degenerative condition of the lumbar spine, which - with aging - is seen with increasing frequency. Spinal stenosis can lead to significant impairment in the quality of life and the ability to perform activities of daily living. Spinal canal stenosis is predominantly a disease of the elderly with the exception of lumbosacral congenital spinal stenosis, which presents with symptoms as early as the second through the fourth decade of life. Although symptoms develop as patients reach their fifties and sixties, the pathognomonic degenerative changes which contribute to lumbar stenosis begin as early as the fourth decade ⁽¹⁾.

Patients with spinal stenosis will usually present with neurogenic claudication, which must be differentiated from vascular claudication. Flexion of the spine will usually partially relieve symptoms; thus, patients will often report needing to sit down or lean over an assistive walking device (e.g, walker, cane, shopping cart). Patients will most commonly present with complaints of limited walking tolerance, “ progressive shortening of walking distance”, and this is often what leads them to seek treatment⁽¹⁾.

Open decompression laminotomy via a posterior approach is the most widely performed surgical procedure for decompression lumbar canal stenosis. ⁽²⁾.

The safety of traditional open techniques for pedicle screw placement for spinal fixation is well documented ⁽³⁾⁽⁴⁾. However, conventional open spine surgery has several disadvantages reported including: extensive blood loss, postoperative muscle pain and infection risk. Paraspinal muscle dissection involved in open spine surgery can cause muscular denervation, increased intramuscular pressure, ischaemia and necrosis resulting in muscle atrophy and scarring which is associated with prolonged postoperative pain and disability ⁽⁵⁾⁽⁶⁾. This approach-related morbidity is then often associated with lengthy hospital stay and significant costs ⁽⁷⁾.

The current trend favors minimally invasive surgery of the spine due to lower complication rates and approach-related morbidity with minimal soft tissue trauma, reduced intra operative blood loss and risk of transfusion, improved cosmesis, decreased postoperative pain and narcotic usage, shorter hospital stays, earlier mobilization with faster return to work and thus reduced overall health care costs ⁽⁸⁾.

In 1968, Wiltse et al first described the paraspinal sacrospinalis muscle-splitting approach to the lumbar spine. The Wiltse approach decreased bleeding and provided a more direct approach to the transverse processes and pedicles. Unlike the traditional midline incision, it was also thought to decrease postoperative pain and avoid disruption of the supraspinous and interspinous ligaments. The Wiltse approach has recently been adapted for tranforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF). The

safety and efficacy of TLIF have been demonstrated previously by several authors⁽⁹⁻¹¹⁾.

Advances in the technique have led to 3 predominant approaches for TLIF: open by using a standard midline approach, mini-open by using a bilateral Wiltse plane approach with expandable tubular retractors, and minimally invasive with a non-expandable or expandable tubular retractor and bilateral percutaneous screw placement⁽¹²⁾.