## Comparative Study between Decompressive Laminectomy and Bilateral Foraminotomy in Surgical Treatment of Lumbar Canal Stenosis

#### Thesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of M.D Degree in Neurosurgery

#### By

Tarek Ismail Osman AbdelHafiz *M.B*, *B Ch.*, *M.Sc*.

#### Supervised By

#### Professor Doctor/ Mohammad Alaa Fakhr

Professor of Neurosurgery
Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

#### **Professor Doctor/ Hisham Abdel Salam Simry**

Professor of Neurosurgery
Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

#### **Doctor/ Ahmad Gamal Hamad**

Associate Professor of Neurosurgery Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

#### **Professor Doctor/ Ciaran Bolger**

Professor of Neurosurgery
Beaumont Teaching Hospital
Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland -- Dublin - Ireland

Faculty of Medicine AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY 2009

#### Acknowledgement

To **Allah**, goes all my deepest gratitude and thanks for achieving any work in my life.

I wish to express my cordial appreciation and utmost gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Mohammad Alaa Fakhr,** Professor of Neurosurgery, Ain Shams University and **Prof.Dr. Ciaran Bolger,** Consultant Neurosurgeon, Beaumont Teaching Hospital, The Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland for their sincere guidance, supervision and kind encouragement throughout the whole thesis. Professors Bolger and Fakhr were the body and core of this study by their energetic and scientific way of dealing with every task. Their perseverance and noble way of teaching were and still are unmatched, to them, I owe a lot.

My sincere thanks to **Dr. Ahmad Hamad**, Associate Professor of Neurosurgery, Ain Shams University, **and Prof. Dr.** Hisham Simry, Professor of Neurosurgery, Ain Shams University, for their relentless support, splendid efforts, and creative thoughts as well as providing an invaluable criticism and direction.

Last but not least, my deep appreciation is expressed to all the staff of Neurosurgery Department, Ain Shams University and Beaumont hospital as well as to all members of my family for their cooperation and encouragement.

#### **CONTENTS**

	Page
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	5
Review of Literature	
> Anatomy of Lumbar Spine	6
> Biomechanics of Lumbar Spine	25
> Pathogenesis of Lumbar Spinal Stenosis	28
> Clinical presentation and examination of	
Lumbar Spinal Stenosis	50
> Imaging and Electrodiagnostic studies of	
Lumbar Stenosis	58
> Treatment of Lumbar Stenosis	74
Materials and Methods	92
Results	122
Discussion	140
Summary & Conclusion	148
References	151
Arabic Summary	

#### LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	Page
1	Classification of Lumbar Spondylosis	30
2	Conditions Associated with Developmental Spinal Stenosis	31
3	Comparison of Vascular and Neurogenic Claudication	54
4	Prevalence of Neurological Signs in Lumbar Spinal Stenosis	57
5	Reoperation after Lumbar Spinal Stenosis surgery	91

#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CSF	Cerebrospinal fluid
CT	Computed tomography
<b>EMG</b>	Electromyography
LOS	Length of stay
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
MRM	Magnetic resonance myelography
ODI	Oswestry disability index
<b>SEPs</b>	Somatosensory evoked potentials
TENS	Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation
VAS	Visual analogue score

#### **LIST OF FIGURES**


No.	Title	Page
1	Anatomy of lumbar vertebra.	8
2	Posterior longitudinal ligament.	12
3	Spinal ligaments.	12
4	Ligamentum flavum (anterior aspect in the lumbar region).	14
5	Showing interspinous and supraspinous ligaments.	15
6	Paramedian sagittal section of the caudal portion of the lumbar spine.	18
7	A: Transverse section of human lumbar disc. B: Coronal section of human lumbar disc.	19
8	Showing vertebral foraminae morphology of $L_{3,4,5}$ respectively.	21
9	Showing neural foramin and spinal nerve.	22
10	showing the pathoanatomical changes of LSS a)Coronal, b)dorsal and c) lateral views of LSS. In a) distinct stenosis areas are depicted in red. b) Dorsal view of lateral stenosis (red dots) caused by hypertrophic facet joints and narrowing of the neuroforamen. c) Corresponding lateral perspective of narrowed neuroforamen causing a lateral stenosis.	35
11	The processes involved in neurogenic claudication development in lumbar spinal stenosis.	52
12	Abnormal course of nerve roots on magnetic resonance myelography. The course in the foramen was defined as abnormal if the nerve shifted upward and ran transversely, with the angle of offset more cephalad than horizontal (straight white line). Indentation (arrow) was included in abnormal courses.	60

No.	Title	Page
13	Lumbar CT myelogram scan demonstrating a normal central canal diameter.	63
14	Axial lumbar CT scan demonstrating marked right sided spinal canal stenosis (black arrow) resulting from advanced right sided facet hypertrophy. Note the vacuum disk sign within the intervertebral disc (yellow double arrow). The vacuum disk sign is further indication of degenerative changes and spinal instability.	64
15	a) A sagittal reformatted CT myelograph revealing a multisegmental severe disc degeneration, with disc space height reduction, vacuum phenomenon and end-plate sclerosis of the lower lumbar spine, as well as thecal sac compressions at the L3–4 and L4–5 levels (arrows). b–d) Axial reformatted images show a circumscribed severe stenosis of L3–4, with a typical hourglass constriction of the thecal sac (arrow) adjacent to relatively normal areas.	66
16	The midline sagittal T2-weighted MRI shows bunched and wavy cauda equina above the L3-L4 stenosis, and straight cauda equina below it. There are disc herniations at L3-L4, L4-L5 and L5-S1.	68
17	Axial T2 MRI scan (L4-L5) in the same patient as in the above image, confirming central canal stenosis.	68
18	Lateral and axial MRI scan demonstrating right L4 lateral recess stenosis secondary to combination of far lateral disc protrusion and zygapophysial joint hypertrophy.	70
19	Axial MRI scan demonstrating central canal stenosis due to a combination of zygapophysial joint and ligamentum flavum hypertrophy.	70

No.	Title	Page
20	Classification of foraminal stenosis on sagittal	71
	magnetic resonance images: anteroposterior (A),	
	cephalocaudal (B), and circumferential (C).	
21	showing the proposed treatment algorithm for	79
	symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis.	
22	showing the length of the skin incision.	103
23	showing the operating microscope.	104
24	showing the laminae and the joint.	105
25	showing removal of the ligamentum flavum and	106
	exposure of the dura on the ipsilateral side.	
26	showing exposure of dura and nerve root on the	106
	ipsilateral side, and the view trajectory of the	
	operating microscope on MRI.	
27	showing the contralateral dura.	108
28	showing exposure of the contralateral nerve root and	108
	the view trajectory of the operating microscope on	
	MRI.	
29	showing the nerve root on the ipsilateral side after	110
	decompression.	
30	showing the contralateral nerve root after	110
	decompression.	
31	showing skin closure in subcuticular fashion with	111
	steristrips.	
32	showing MRI T2W image of one of the cases	112
	demonstratings spinal stenosis and the red arrows	
	indicate direction of microscope for decompression.	
33	showing Sagittal MRI T2W image of the same	112
	patient showing the direction of the decompression.	
34	showing the skin incision and the two center cross	114
	lines reperesent the spinous process of L4 in this	
	patient.	
35	showing a Kocher clamp placed on the L4 spinous	115

No.	Title	Page
	process, and a probe on the adjacent exposed lamina	
	used as markers.	
36	showing the spine and laminae of L4 exposed.	116
37	showing the spinous process excised with a Horsley	116
	bone cutter.	
38	showing Kerrison rongeur used for finer control in	117
	removing the central portion of the lamina out to the	
	facet joint capsule on each side.	
39	showing the dura exposed centrally.	117
40	showing wide exposure of the dura as the central	118
	part of the lamina was removed.	
41	showing the Kerrison rongeur working from	119
	cephalad to caudad.	
42	showing complete unroofing of the L4 level.	119
43	showing the paraspinous muscles and midline fascia	120
	closed with absorbable 0 braided suture.	
44	showing the surgical procedure between both	122
	groups.	
45	showing gender distribution in group A.	123
46	showing gender distribution in group B.	124
47	showing the follow-up period postoperatively for	125
	both groups.	
48	showing comparison of presenting symptoms in	126
	both groups.	
49	showing comparison of clinical signs between both	127
	groups.	4.50
50	showing the radiographic findings for both groups	128
<b>-</b> 4	in CT and MRI.	100
51	showing the percentage of patients and the levels of	129
	decompression in group A.	4.5.0
52	showing the percentage of patients and the levels of	130
	decompression in group B.	

No.	Title	Page
53	showing the percentage of redo surgeries between both groups.	131
54	showing the percentage of dural tears between both groups.	132
55	showing the percentage of CSF leak between both groups.	133
56	showing the percentage of superficial wound infection between both groups.	133
57	showing the average pain scores between both groups pre and postoperatively.	134
58	showing the over-all back pain improvement between the two groups.	135
59	showing the over-all improvement in leg pain between both groups.	135
60	showing the average Oswestry Score pre and post- Operatively.	136
61	showing the over-all Oswestry score improvements between both groups.	137
62	showing the average walking distance pre and post- Operatively.	138
63	showing the improvements in walking distance in yards for both groups.	138
64	showing the length of stay in days postoperatively for both groups.	139



# Aim of The Work

# Review of Literature

### Materials & Methods

# Results