



# **تقييم الزرع العنقي الأمامي الديناميكي في جراحات انتكاس القرص الغضروفي العنقي**

توطئة للحصول على درجة الدكتوراه في جراحة المخ والأعصاب

مقدمه من الطبيب

**عبد الرحمن هشام الجيار**  
بكالوريوس الطب والجراحة- ماجستير الجراحة العامة  
مدرس مساعد جراحة المخ والأعصاب  
كلية الطب - جامعة عين شمس

**تحت إشراف**

**الأستاذ الدكتور/ عصام عبد الرحمن عمارة**

أستاذ جراحة المخ والأعصاب  
كلية الطب- جامعة عين شمس

**الأستاذ الدكتور/ أحمد جمال الدين حمد**

أستاذ م. جراحة المخ والأعصاب  
كلية الطب- جامعة عين شمس

**الأستاذ الدكتور/ محمد علاء الدين حبيب**

أستاذ م. جراحة المخ والأعصاب  
كلية الطب- جامعة عين شمس



# **Assessment of Anterior Dynamic Cervical Implant in Surgery of Cervical Disc Degeneration**

## **Thesis**

Submitted for partial fulfillment of M.D.in Neurosurgery

By

**Abdelrhman Hesham El-Gayar**  
(M.B,B.Ch.,MSc.)

*Supervised by*

**Prof. Dr.essam Abdelrhman Emara**

Professor of Neurosurgery  
Faculty of medicine  
Ain Shams University

**Prof.Dr.Ahmed Gamal El-Din Hamad**

Assist Professor of Neurosurgery  
Faculty of medicine  
Ain Shams University

**Prof.Dr.Mohamed Alaa El-Din Habib**

Assist.Professor of Neurosurgery  
Faculty of medicine  
Ain Shams University

**2015**

# *Acknowledgment*

*First and foremost, thanks to God, the most beneficent and most merciful.*

*I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor **Dr.essam Abdelrhman Emara** Professor of Neurosurgery - Ain Shams University, who gave me all his generous support to help me to accomplish this work .Many thanks to Professor **Dr.Ahmed Gamal El-Din Hamad** Assistant Professor of Neurosurgery - Ain Shams University, whose appreciated efforts made this work more valuable. I would also like to thank , Assistant Professor **Dr.Mohamed Alaa El-Din Habib** , Assist.Prof. of Neurosurgery - Ain Shams University, for supervising this work and giving me his very valuable support.*

*Last, but not least, my thanks to all my colleagues for their cooperative spirit and help.*

*Abdelrhman Hesham El-Gayar*

# Contents

List of tables.....	2
List of figures.....	4
List of abbreviations.....	8
Introduction.....	10
Review:	
– I Anatomy of the subaxial cervical spine and its effect on function.....	13
– II Cervical Spine Biomechanics.....	38
– III Degenerative cervical disc disease (pathology).....	43
– IV Clinical picture.....	55
– V Imaging studies.....	74
– VI Standard treatment of the degenerative cervical spine...83	
– VII Cervical spine arthroplasty, the new concept in management of degenerative cervical disc disease.....	107
– VIII Dynamic Cervical implant between the solid fusion and the hyper mobile arthroplasty.....	159
Patients and methods.....	168
Results.....	185
Illustrative cases.....	203
Discussion .....	224
Conclusion.....	233
Summary.....	237
References.....	240
Arabic summary.....	253

## List of Tables

No.	content
1	The degenerative cascade.
2	Clinical Examination for Cervical Radiculopathy.
3	Japanese Orthopedic Association classification of myelopathy
4	Nurick grades of disability.
5	Normal range of motion (ROM) of the cervical spine.
6	Characteristics desirable in an ‘ideal’ cervical disc.
7	FDA approved cervical disc prophesies.
8	Articulation and kinematics In different disc prophesies.
9	Inclusion criteria for cervical disc replacement.
10	Neck disability index.
11	Distribution of the studied group as regard general data.
12	Distribution of the studied group as regard segments affected , number of segments and implants.
13	Distribution of the studied group as regard operative time.
14	Relation between operative time versus level.
15	Changes of studied VAS pre and one month postoperative.
16	Changes of studied VAS pre and after twelve months follow up
17	Changes of studied NDI pre and one month postoperative.
18	Changes of studied NDI pre and after twelve months follow up.

19	Changes in weakness pre and one month postoperative on the right side.
20	Changes in weakness pre and twelve months follow up on the right side .
21	Changes in weakness pre and one month postoperative on the left side.
22	Changes in weakness pre and twelve months follow up on the left side.
23	Distribution of the studied group as regard myelopathy .
24	Distribution of the studied group as regard related complications.
25	Distribution of the studied group as regard unrelated complications.
26	Distribution of the studied group as regard fusion after twelve months .
27	Relation between complications versus level and implant size.

## List of figures

No.	Figure
1	The anatomic subdivisions of the uncovertebral joint.
2	Lower cervical vertebrae.
3	Sketches of structures forming a cervical intervertebral disc.
4	Musculature of the cervical spine.
5	Microsurgical anatomy of the PLL.
6	Intertransverse space.
7	Microsurgical anatomy of superior laryngeal nerve.
8	Anterior view of the right RLN.
9	Anterior view of the complete course of the left RLN.
10	Lateral cervical spine radiograph depicting spondylosis.
11	An illustration of dermatomal patterns.
12	A diagram of Spurling's sign.
13	Peripheral nerves and dermatomal distribution.
14	Plane radiography findings in cervical DDD.
15	Axial cervical CT scan.
16	Cervical MRI depicting right paracentral herniation extending into the neuroforamen..
17	Foraminal imaging.
18	The localizing needle.
19	Possible mechanism of injury during anterior cervical discectomy.
20	Water hammer effect during placement of bone graft.
21	Recommended position of the bone tamp during the final positioning of the bone graft.
22	Cummins-Bristol disc.
23	Different cervical disc prosthesis.

24	The Bryan Cervical Disc prosthesis.
25	Prestige II. Disc.
26	Prestige LP disc.
27	The ProDisc-C.
28	Cervicore device.
29	PCM device
30	Cervidisc device
31	Secure c device
32	M6 C cervical disc prosthesis
33	Mobi-C device
34	Kineflex device
35	Dynamic cervical implant
36	Experimental biomechanical study of DCI
37	Dynamic cervical implant
38	Different sizes of DCI and trials
39	Palpable landmarks in anterolateral approach.
40	Axial view of the plane of dissection and exposure of the prevertebral space.
41	Anterior cervical discectomy.
42	Anterior cervical discectomy.
43	Trial implant.
44	Fluoroscopic guidance during trial implant insertion.
45	DCI insertion under fluoroscopic guidance.
46	Intraoperative photo after DCI insertion.
47	Graph describing percentage of implant size used
48	Graph showing change of VAS between preoperative and postoperative
49	Graph showing change in neck disability index between preoperative and postoperative
50	Graph showing change of right side weakness between preoperative and postoperative.



51	Graph showing change of left side weakness between preoperative and postoperative
52	Graph showing percentage of related complications
53	Graph showing percentage of implant unrelated complications
54	Graph showing percentage of fusion within the first year among the studied group
55	Case 1 pre operative MRI sagittal T2W
56	Case 1 postoperative dynamic cervical PXR.
57	Case 1 one year postoperative dynamic cervical PXR.
58	Case 1 one year postoperative A-P and lat cervical PXR.
59	Case 1 one year postoperative MRI
60	Case 2 pre operative MRI sagittal T2W
61	Case 2 pre operative MRI axial T2W
62	Case 2 direct postoperative dynamic cervical PXR.
63	Case 2 one month postoperative lateral cervical PXR
64	Case 2 one year postoperative dynamic cervical PXR.
65	Case 3 pre operative MRI axial T2W.
66	Case 3 pre operative MRI sagittal T2W.
67	Case 3 intraoperative lateral cervical PXR after insertion.
68	Case 3 direct postoperative A-P and lateral cervical PXR.
69	Case 3 six weeks postoperative lateral cervical PXR.
70	Case 3 postoperative lateral cervical PXR after fixation and fusion.
71	Case 4 one month postoperative A-P and lateral cervical PXR.
72	Case 4 three months postoperative A-P and lateral and dynamic cervical PXR.

---

73	Case 4 three months postoperative lateral cervical PXR.
74	Case 4 three months postoperative MRI.
75	Case 4, nine months postoperative dynamic cervical PXR.
76	Case 4, nine months postoperative lateral cervical PXR.
77	Case 4 postoperative A-P and lateral cervical PXR after fixation and fusion.

## List of abbreviations

A	Artery.
ACD	Anterior cervical discectomy.
ACDF	Anterior cervical discectomy and fusion
ACF	Anterior cervical corpectomy and fusion.
ALD	Adjacent level degeneration.
ALL	Anterior longitudinal ligament.
A-P	Antero posterior view.
ASD	Adjacent segment degeneration.
c-b ratio	Canal to body ratio.
CoR	Center of rotation.
CSM	Cervical spondylotic myelopathy
CT	Computed tomography.
C-TDR	Cervical total disc replacement.
DCI	Dynamic cervical implant
ECE	External carotid artery.
EMG	Electomyeography.
FEA	Finite elemental analysis
FXA	Functional X ray analysis
ICA	Internal carotid artery.
JOA	Japanese orthopedic association.
lat	Lateral view.
M	Muscle
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging.
N	Nerve.
NDI	Neck disability index.
OPLL	Ossifiedt Posterior longitudinal ligament.
PEEK	Polyether ether keton.
PLL	Posterior longitudinal ligament.
PXR	Plain X-ray.
RLN	Recurrent laryngeal nerve.
ROM	Range of motion.
SLN(eb)	Superior laryngeal nerve (external branch)

SLN(ib)	Superior laryngeal nerve (internal branch)
TDR	Total disc replacement.
TE	Trachea esophageal.
TiCaP	Titanium Calcium-Phosphate.
TiO <sub>2</sub>	Titanium oxide.
UHMWPE	Ultra high molecular weight polyethelene.
UJ	Uncovertrbral joint.
V	Vein.
VA	Vertebral artery.
VAS	Visual analogue score.
VB	Vertebral body.

# **Assessment of Anterior Dynamic Cervical Implant in Surgery of Cervical Disc Degeneration**

## **Introduction:**

Cervical spondylosis causing radiculopathy or myelopathy is one of the most common problems seen by the spine surgeon and is often treated with anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF). This procedure, although it is highly effective at decompressing neural elements and stabilizing the spine, is associated with significant long-term morbidity, including postoperative dysphagia, promoted adjacent-level degeneration (Michael A. et al., 2009)

Although ACDF has been the mainstay treatment for cervical disc disease since the 1950s (Smith GW, 1958 ), interest in motion preservation in spinal surgery is almost as old. The first attempt at cervical arthroplasty reported by Fernstrom in 1966 involved the placement of metallic ball bearings into the disk space of the treated segments. Clinical results were, however, disappointing because of a high incidence of segmental hyper mobility, endplate subsidence, and clinical failure. Interest in cervical arthroplasty waned until the 1990s when a renewal of efforts was spurred by progress in lumbar arthroplasty (Buttner-Janz K, 1989 ) and with increased recognition of long-term complications of cervical fusion surgery, specifically with regard to adjacent segment degeneration.

Adjacent segment degeneration, reported to become clinically symptomatic in up to 25% of patients by 10 years of follow-up )(Katsuura A et al., 2001 ) ,and is believed to be promoted by increased stress and motion at these levels. These factors have been demonstrated to occur biomechanically and clinically (Dmitriev AE, 2005 ) and likely promote the degeneration by disrupting delicate nutrient pathways to the avascular nucleus pulposus ,it was found that degeneration of adjacent levels was significantly associated with loss of physiological cervical lordosis. (Katsuura A, 2001 )

This points to emergence of cervical arthroplasty as an alternatives to arthrodesis that offers the promise of restoring normal spinal movement and reduce a kinematic strain on adjacent segments.

The goal of cervical arthroplasty is to restore normal biomechanics of the treated segment, thereby normalizing motion and stress in adjacent levels and reducing the incidence of long-term failure in the form of adjacent segment degeneration. Cervical arthroplasty might also have the added benefits of reducing incidence of postoperative dysphagia and complications associated with the treatment of multilevel disease (McAfee, 2003 )

The first modern cervical disk replacement to be tested clinically was the Cummins–Bristol artificial joint (Cummins et al., 1998) Although there were significant complications, including screw breakage and pullout, in this initial experience, 16 of 18 patients had continued motion at the treated joint and no patient had adjacent-level

degeneration in up to 65 months of follow-up providing some initial optimism for the concept (Wigfield C, 2002 )

## **Aim of The Work**

To evaluate efficacy and safety of cervical arthroplasty (using dynamic cervical implant) in cervical degenerative disc diseases as regard preservation of cervical biomechanics to prevent adjacent segment degeneration.