

Cortical Bone Trajectory Screw Fixation of Lumbar Spine in Adult Patients with Degenerative and Traumatic Spine Disorders

A Systematic Review/Meta-Analysis

*Submitted For Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in
Orthopedic Surgery*

By

Eslam Mohsen Mohammed Abdelrehim Hassan
M.B.B.Ch, Cairo University

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Ahmed Mohammed El-Badrawy
*Professor of Orthopedic Surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Dr. Tameem Mohammed Shafeek El-khateeb
*Lecturer of Orthopedic Surgery
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2019

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

لَسْبَدَانِكَ لَا نَعْلَمُ لَنَا
إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ
الْعَلِيمُ الْعَظِيمُ

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. Ahmed Mohammed El-Badrawy**, Professor of Orthopedic Surgery, Faculty 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 also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Dr. Jameem Mohammed Shafeek El-Khateeb**, Lecturer of Orthopedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.*

*I would like to express my hearty thanks to all **my family** for their support till this work was completed.*

Eslam Mohsen

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Figures	iii
List of Abbreviations	vii
Abstract	viii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	10
Review of Literatures	11
Methodology	41
Results	47
Discussion	92
Conclusion.....	96
References	97
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Summary of patients and study characteristics	47
Table (2):	Summary of pre-operative surgical data in all studies	49
Table (3):	Summary of intra-operative surgical outcomes in all studies	50
Table (4):	Summary of post-operative surgical outcomes in all studies	51
Table (5):	Comparison between the 2 groups of studies s regards patients and study characteristics using Student's t test.....	52
Table (6):	Comparison between the 2 groups of studies as regards pre-operative surgical data using Student's t test:.....	53
Table (7):	Comparison between the 2 groups of studies as regards intra-operative surgical data using Student's t test.....	54
Table (8):	Comparison between PS group of patients as regards serial clinical assessments using Paired Student's t test.....	55
Table (9):	Comparison between CBT group of patients as regards serial clinical assessments using Paired Student's t test.....	58
Table (10):	Comparison between the 2 groups of patients as regards serial clinical measurements using repeated measures ANOVA test (2-Factor study)	61
Table (11):	Meta-analysis of (VAS score) on PS vs CBT technique use –Mean difference	67

List of Tables (Cont...)

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (12):	Meta-analysis of (lordosis angle) on PS vs CBT technique use – Mean difference.....	70
Table (13):	Meta-analysis of (ODI) on PS vs CBT technique use – Mean difference	72
Table (14):	Meta-analysis of (successful fusion rate) in PS group - Proportion.....	74
Table (15):	Meta-analysis of (successful fusion rate) in CBT group - Proportion.....	77
Table (16):	Meta-analysis of (successful fusion rate) achievement on PS vs CBT use - Risk Ratio.....	79
Table (17):	Meta-analysis of (successful fusion rate) achievement on PS vs CBT use - Risk Difference.....	81
Table (18):	Meta-analysis of (failed fusion rate) in PS group - Proportion	83
Table (19):	Meta-analysis of (failed fusion rate) in CBT group - Proportion	86
Table (20):	Meta-analysis of (failed fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Ratio	88
Table (21):	Meta-analysis of (failed fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Difference	90

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (1):	Anterior/posterior image intensifier (II) radiographs	13
Fig. (2):	Image Intensifier radiographs of the percutaneous technique for pedicle screw insertion	14
Fig. (3):	Diagrams illustrating the anatomical principles of percutaneous pedicle screw insertion	15
Fig. (4):	Fluoroscopic (C-arm) view for the pedicle screws inserted into the separated cadaver spine	16
Fig. (5):	Anterior and lateral views illustrating drilled hole volumes along traditional trajectory and new trajectory.....	19
Fig. (6):	Representative radiographs showing pedicle screws.	20
Fig. (7):	Showing cortical screw on the left side and traditional pedicle screw on the right side.....	20
Fig. (8):	Photograph showing the parts of a pedicle screw.	22
Fig. (9):	Representative oblique photographs of an intact lumbosacral specimen prepared for 6DOF-SS fatigue testing	24
Fig. (10):	Pullout testing setup.....	27
Fig. (11):	Illustration demonstrating the typical exposure for the cortical bone trajectory (CBT) technique.....	30
Fig. (12):	Illustration demonstrating the starting point for cortical bone trajectory (CBT) on an idealized clock face.....	31

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (13):	Illustrations demonstrating the axial and sagittal trajectories of the cortical bone trajectory (CBT) screws	32
Fig. (14):	Illustrations demonstrating the ideal screw progression from AP and lateral views	32
Fig. (15):	PRISMA flow chart for study selection	46
Fig. (16):	Comparison between pre and post-operative VAS score measurements in "SP group"	56
Fig. (17):	Comparison between pre and post-operative lordosis angle measurements in "PS group"	57
Fig. (18):	Comparison between pre and post-operative ODI measurements in "PS group"	57
Fig. (19):	Comparison between pre and post-operative VAS score measurements in "CBT group".	59
Fig. (20):	Comparison between pre and post-operative lordosis angle measurements in "CBT group"	60
Fig. (21):	Comparison between pre and post-operative ODI measurements in "CBT group".	60
Fig. (22):	Comparison between the 2 groups of patients regarding serial VAS score assessments.	62
Fig. (23):	Comparison between the 2 groups of patients regarding serial lordosis angle assessments.	63
Fig. (24):	Comparison between the 2 groups of patients regarding serial ODI assessments.	64
Fig. (25):	Forest plot of (VAS score) on PS vs CBT use - Mean difference.	68

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (26):	Funnel plot of (VAS score) on PS vs CBT use – Mean difference (publication bias was significant).....	69
Fig. (27):	Forest plot of (lordosis angle) on PS vs CBT use - Mean difference.....	71
Fig. (28):	Funnel plot of (lordosis angle) on PS vs CBT use –Mean difference (publication bias was non-significant).....	72
Fig. (29):	Forest plot of (ODI) on PS vs CBT use - Mean difference.....	73
Fig. (30):	Funnel plot of (ODI) on PS vs CBT use –Mean difference (publication bias was significant).	74
Fig. (31):	Forest plot of (successful fusion rate) in PS group - Proportion.....	75
Fig. (32):	Funnel plot of (successful fusion rate) in PS group –Proportion (publication bias was non-significant).....	76
Fig. (33):	Forest plot of (successful fusion rate) in CBT group - Proportion.....	78
Fig. (34):	Funnel plot of (successful fusion rate) in CBT group –Proportion (publication bias was non-significant).....	78
Fig. (35):	Forest plot of (successful fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use- Risk Ratio.	80
Fig. (36):	Funnel plot of (successful fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use- Risk Ratio (publication bias was non-significant).....	80

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. (37):	Forest plot of (successful fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Difference.....	82
Fig. (38):	Funnel plot of (successful fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Difference (publication bias was non-significant).....	82
Fig. (39):	Forest plot of (failed fusion rate) in PS group - Proportion.....	84
Fig. (40):	Funnel plot of (failed fusion rate) in PS group – Proportion (publication bias was non-significant).....	85
Fig. (41):	Forest plot of (failed fusion rate) in CBT group - Proportion.....	87
Fig. (42):	Funnel plot of (failed fusion rate) in CBT group –Proportion (publication bias was non-significant).....	87
Fig. (43):	Forest plot of (failed fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Ratio.....	89
Fig. (44):	Funnel plot of (failed fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Ratio (publication bias was non-significant).....	89
Fig. (45):	Forest plot of (failed fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Difference.	91
Fig. (46):	Funnel plot of (failed fusion rate) on PS vs CBT use - Risk Difference (publication bias was non-significant).....	91

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
<i>ANOVA</i>	<i>Analysis of Variance</i>
<i>AP</i>	<i>Anterior / Posterior</i>
<i>CBT</i>	<i>Cortical Bone Trajectory</i>
<i>CI</i>	<i>Confidence Interval</i>
<i>DF</i>	<i>Degree of Freedom</i>
<i>HS</i>	<i>Highly Significant</i>
<i>II</i>	<i>Image Intensifier</i>
<i>IQR</i>	<i>Inter-Quartile Range</i>
<i>MeSH</i>	<i>Medical Subject's Headings</i>
<i>NS</i>	<i>Non-Significant</i>
<i>ODI</i>	<i>Oswestry Disability Index</i>
<i>PRISMA</i>	<i>Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses</i>
<i>PS</i>	<i>Pedicle Screw</i>
<i>RD</i>	<i>Risk Difference</i>
<i>RR</i>	<i>Risk Ratio</i>
<i>S</i>	<i>Significant</i>
<i>SAE</i>	<i>Serious Adverse Event</i>
<i>SE</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>
<i>SMD</i>	<i>Standard Mean Difference</i>
<i>TT</i>	<i>Traditional Trajectory</i>
<i>VAS</i>	<i>Visual Analogue Scale</i>

Abstract

Background: the CBT for placing lumbar pedicle screws is a technique used to improve fixation during instrumented fusion of the lumbar spine. In comparison with traditional trajectory (TT) for pedicle screws, CBT screws (otherwise known as pars screws or cortical screws) have a more medial starting point and are aimed in a medial to lateral, caudal to cranial direction. First reported in 2009 as a method to increase the purchase of lumbar pedicle screws within bone.

Aim of the Work: to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis to determine whether traditional Pedicles Screw Fixation (PS Fx) or Cortical Bone Trajectory Screw Fixation (CBT Fx); has been successful for the treatment and fixation of lumbar spine in adult patients with degenerative and traumatic spine disorders; and to compare the 2 techniques to identify risk factor for unfavorable outcome through the recent researches about that issue.

Methodology: this review was done using standard methodology outlined in the Cochrane Handbook and reported the findings in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement guidelines.

Results: meta-analysis study showed that;

1. Successful fusion rate in fixed and random-effects models were (92.24% respectively); in SP group.
2. Successful fusion rate in fixed and random-effects models were (92.44% respectively); in CBT group.
3. Fixed and random-effects models showed non-significant difference in successful fusion rate; between the 2 groups of studies ($p > 0.05$).

We calculated safety for each technique through post-operative (failed fusion rate).

Conclusion: Based on result of previous meta-analysis and although there were insignificant p-values in the most of the comparative items but the CBT showed lower average of intraoperative blood loss, operation time and higher average of decrease in VAS & increase in ODI, slightly higher fusion rate in comparison with PS.

Keywords: *Cortical Bone Trajectory - Lumbar Spine - Degenerative and Traumatic Spine Disorders - Screw Fixation*

INTRODUCTION

Many surgeons found difficulties and obstacles in fixation of lumbar spines in very old patients and osteoporotic patients, that's due to failure rates in these patients mostly due to engagement of the pedicle screws used in instrumentation with osteoporotic trabecular bone rather than cortical bone, which in general thought that cortical bone is much more tough than the trabecular bone.

And so scientists storm ideas about methods and techniques to increase purchase of cortical bone during fixation of lumbar spines, one of these is using another trajectory to increase the cortical bone purchase, theoretically that would decrease failure in instrumentation, and that is called cortical bone trajectory screw (CBT). But is it practically feasible for fixation of lumbar spine in those patients or is it inferiorly compared with the traditionally known pedicle screw.

AIM OF THE WORK

The Aim of this work is to assess the feasibility of the CBT screw fixation for lumbar spine as an alternative of the traditional pedicle screw for fixation and/or interbody fusion, through carrying out a meta analysis and systematic review of the previous literatures discussing the new technique.

REVIEW OF LITERATURES

Placement of the pedicle screw

A) Kanter et al. (2008): minimally invasive spine surgery. ⁽¹⁾

Pedicle screw (P.S) instrumentation enables a rigid construct to promote stability and fusion for numerous spinal pathologies including: trauma, tumours, deformity and degenerative disease. The safety of traditional open techniques for pedicle screw placement has been well documented. ^(1, 2)

First of all we have to review the known pedicle screw technique which was described in the a literature, just for a hint about the starting safe point and the direction and angles of the trajectory, not to be included in the meta analysis later.

Placement of pedicle screws technique:

The technique described here uses intra-operative radiography (image intensifier [II]) (fig 1). Possible use of intra-operative CT-based stereotactic guidance for pedicle screw placement; however, there is a greater degree of accuracy with the use of II for pedicle cannulation. For small thoracic pedicles, use of image intensified for enhanced accuracy with this technique. ^(1, 2)