

Stand-Alone Open Disectomy versus Fixation in Management of Recurrent Lumbar Disc Prolapse

Systematic Review

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree
of Neurosurgery*

By

Karim Mohamed Mohamed Shafie
MB.B.B.ch

Under Supervision of

Prof. Ismail Sabry

*Professor of Neurosurgery Surgery
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

Prof. Mohamed Kabil

*Professor of Neurosurgery
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

Dr. Hamdi Nabawy Mostafa

*Lecturer of Neurosurgery Surgery
Faculty of Medicine
Misr University for Science and Technology University*

Dr. Omar Farouk Ahmed

*Lecturer of Neurosurgery Surgery
Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University*

Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2018

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سبحانك لا علم لنا
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢



Acknowledgement

*First, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude and gratefulness to **Allah** who continues to bless and fill me with hope, faith and patience that enable me to carry out all my daily work.*

*I am greatly honored to express my thanks and gratitude to **Prof. Ismail Sabry**, Professor of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for guidance, great help encouragement and his creative support throughout the whole work up of this thesis.*

*I would like to express thanks and gratitude to **Prof. Mohamed Kabil**, Professor of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his valuable help and advice for me to accomplish this work.*

*I am very much indebted to **Dr. Hamdy Nabawy Mostafa**, Lecturer of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Misr University of Science and Technology and **Dr. Omar Elfarok**, for their kind supervision, valuable advices, constructive criticism and indispensable help throughout this work. Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for their great help and support and every person who helped me during this work especially my dear colleagues in Neurosurgery Department, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University and Misr University of Science and Technology for their great help in this work.* **Karim Mohamed Mohamed Elshafei**

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables.....	خطأ! الإشارة المرجعية غير معروفة.
List of Figures.....	خطأ! الإشارة المرجعية غير معروفة.
List of Abbreviations	خطأ! الإشارة المرجعية غير معروفة.
Abstract	خطأ! الإشارة المرجعية غير معروفة.
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	5
Review of Literature	
▪ Clinical Anatomy.....	6
▪ Pathophysiology of Lumbar Disc Disease.....	37
▪ Clinical Picture	53
▪ Investigations.....	72
▪ Differential Diagnosis	86
▪ Treatment	95
Methodology	122
Results	132
Discussion	157
Conclusion.....	163
References	167
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Symptoms and signs of patient with lumbar radiculopathy.....	57
Table (2):	MacNab outcome assessment of patient satisfaction.....	126
Table (3):	Summary of study characteristics.....	133
Table (4):	Summary of patient demographics	135
Table (5):	Meta-analysis for estimated blood loss	135
Table (6):	Meta-analysis for dural tear	137
Table (7):	Meta-analysis for achieving good-to-excellent MacNab score.....	139
Table (8):	Meta-analysis for the hospital length of stay	141
Table (9):	Meta-analysis for JOA score.....	143
Table (10):	Meta-analysis for ODI.....	145
Table (11):	Meta-analysis for the operative time.....	147
Table (12):	Meta-analysis for reoperation	149
Table (13):	Meta-analysis for VAS score of back pain	151
Table (14):	Meta-analysis for VAS score of lower limb pain.....	153
Table (15):	Summary of operative variables and surgical outcomes.....	156

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Lumbar Vertebrae, superior view	9
Figure (2):	Cauda equina and meninges at lumbar level	11
Figure (3):	Facet joint synovial folds. A, Posterior view. B, a coronal section shows the facet joint synovial folds	14
Figure (4):	Vertebral ligaments of the lumbar region	15
Figure (5):	Lumbar intervertebral foramen.....	19
Figure (6):	The intervertebral disc.....	23
Figure (7):	Pathways of nutrient supply in a normal intervertebral disc	24
Figure (8):	The axial pressure dissipated by the disk is transmitted to the annulus fibrosus and to the vertebral endplates	26
Figure (9):	Compression load in a normal nondegenerated disk.....	27
Figure (10):	Compression load in a degenerated disk.	27
Figure (11):	Tensile and compressive stresses in the disk during bending.....	29
Figure (12):	Annulus fibers.....	30
Figure (13):	Locations of shear strains in the anulus under combined moments	31
Figure (14):	Disk pressure in the third lumbar disk during the following postures; supine, side lying, standing, forward bending 20 degrees, forward bending 20 degrees with a 20-kg weight, unsupported sitting, sitting bent forward 20 degrees, and sitting bent forward 20 degrees with a 20-kg weigh.....	33
Figure (15):	The effect of backrest inclination and lumbar support on intradiskal pressur	33

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (16):	70-kg standing man, the pressure on the L3 disk is on the order of 70 kg.....	35
Figure (17):	The role of aggrecan and collagen in the ability of disc to resist compression	39
Figure (18):	Cadaveric lumbar intervertebral discs sectioned in the midsagittal plane	40
Figure (19):	Alcian blue/Picrosirius red staining of degenerated IVD.....	42
Figure (20):	A healthy IVD with an intensely blue stained proteoglycan-rich NP	43
Figure (21):	Carragee classification of disc herniations	49
Figure (22):	Grading of disc degeneration on T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging	51
Figure (23):	Low midline sill sign of a patient with lumbar spondylolisthesis.....	68
Figure (24):	Interspinous gap change during lumbar flexion-extension motion for the detection of lumbar instability.....	69
Figure (25):	Textiloma	73
Figure (26):	Postoperative 'aseptic' spondylodiscitis: sagittal T1-WI and sagittal T2-WI.....	75
Figure (27):	Expected postoperative finding: normal epidural and intervertebral fibrosis	81
Figure (28):	Recurrent disc herniation.....	82
Figure (29):	Postoperative axial T1W, post-contrast T1W, T2W MRI.....	82
Figure (30):	Old recurrent disc herniation.....	83
Figure (31):	Massive recurrent disc herniation.	84
Figure (32):	Old recurrent disc herniation.....	85
Figure (33):	Sagittal T2W MRI of the lumbar spine after laminectomy for arachnoiditis showing thickened, clumped nerve roots	90
Figure (34):	Facet joint osteoarthritis on CT scan	92

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (35):	Open Discectomy.....	99
Figure (36):	Intraoperative photograph.....	100
Figure (37):	Open Posterolateral Lumbar Fusion	105
Figure (38):	Diagram illustrating the pedicle width.....	105
Figure (39):	Steps involved in lumbar instrumented fusion.....	107
Figure (40):	Sagittal view of the exposure.....	114
Figure (41):	Two posterior lumbar interbody fusion spacers within the disc space	114
Figure (42):	Sagittal view using Brantigan carbon fiber fusion	114
Figure (43):	Anterior lumbar interbody fusion.....	118
Figure (44):	A 52-year-old man with L5-S1 recurrent disc with, grade 1, i spondylolisthesis causing back and leg pain that was treated with a TLIF procedure.....	120
Figure (45):	Flow diagram of identified, excluded, and included studies used in the systemic review.....	124
Figure (46):	Forest plot for estimated blood loss. There is evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.0002, I ² = 81.8%). Random effects estimate favors discectomy over fusion (SMD = -1.892, 95% CI = -2.677 to -1.107, p-value <0.001).	136
Figure (47):	Funnel plot for estimated blood loss. There is no evidence of publication bias.	136
Figure (48):	Forest plot for the incidence of dural tear. There is evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.053, I ² = 54.811%). Random effects estimate shows no difference between discectomy and fusion (OR = 0.981, 95% CI = -0.281 to 3.427, p-value = 0.976).	138

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (49):	Funnel plot for the incidence of dural tear. There is no evidence of publication bias.	138
Figure (50):	Forest plot for achieving good-to-excellent MacNab score. There is no evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.526, I^2 = 0.00%). Fixed effects estimate shows no difference between discectomy and fusion (OR = 0.602, 95% CI = 0.268 to 1.351, p-value = 0.218).	140
Figure (51):	Funnel plot for achieving good-to-excellent MacNab score. There is no evidence of publication bias.	140
Figure (52):	Forest plot for the hospital length of stay. There is evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value <0.0001, I^2 = 92.63%). Random effects estimate favors discectomy over fusion (SMD = -1.919, 95% CI = -3.156, p-value = 0.002).	142
Figure (53):	Funnel plot for the hospital length of stay. There is no evidence of publication bias.	142
Figure (54):	Forest plot for the JOA score. There is no evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.485, I^2 = 0.00%). Fixed effects estimate shows no statistically significant difference between discectomy and fusion (SMD = -0.164, 95% CI = -0.524 to 0.196, p-value = 0.369).	144
Figure (55):	Funnel plot for the JOA. There is no evidence of publication bias.	144

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (56):	Forest plot for the ODI. There is possible heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.146, I^2 = 52.78%). Random effects estimate shows no statistically significant difference between discectomy and fusion (SMD = -0.089, 95% CI = -0.906 to 0.728, p-value = 0.828).	146
Figure (57):	Funnel plot for the ODI. There is no evidence of publication bias.	146
Figure (58):	Forest plot for the operative time. There is evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.0009, I^2 = 78.74%). Random effects estimate favors discectomy over fusion (SMD = -2.779, 95% CI = -3.589 to -1.970, p-value <0.001).	148
Figure (59):	Funnel plot for the operative time. There is no evidence of publication bias.	148
Figure (60):	Forest plot for reoperation. There is no evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.298, I^2 = 18.48%). Fixed effects estimate shows no statistically significant difference between discectomy and fusion (OR = 1.667, 95% CI = 0.494 to 5.624, p-value = 0.410).	150
Figure (61):	Funnel plot for reoperation. There is no evidence of publication bias.	150
Figure (62):	Forest plot for the VAS score of back pain. There is no evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.629, I^2 = 0.00%). Fixed effects estimate shows no statistically significant difference between discectomy and fusion (SMD = -0.005, 95% CI = -0.548 to 0.538, p-value = 0.986).....	152

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (63):	Funnel plot for the VAS score of back pain. There is no evidence of publication bias.	152
Figure (64):	Forest plot for the VAS score of lower limb pain. There is no evidence of heterogeneity (Cochran Q p-value = 0.490, I^2 = 0.00%). Fixed effects estimate shows no statistically significant difference between discectomy and fusion (SMD = -0.035, 95% CI = -0.579 to 0.509, p-value = 0.898).....	154
Figure (65):	Funnel plot for the VAS score of lower limb pain. There is no evidence of publication bias.....	154

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
<i>ADAMs</i>	<i>A Disintegrin and Metalloproteinase</i>
<i>AF</i>	<i>Anulus fibrosus</i>
<i>ALIF</i>	<i>Anterior lumbar interbody fusion</i>
<i>ALL</i>	<i>Anterior Longitudinal Ligament</i>
<i>ANOVA</i>	<i>ANalysis Of VAriance</i>
<i>AP</i>	<i>Antero-Posterior</i>
<i>CBC</i>	<i>Complete Blood Count</i>
<i>CEP</i>	<i>Cartilaginous End Plates</i>
<i>CES</i>	<i>Cauda Equina Syndrome</i>
<i>CILP</i>	<i>Cartilage Intermediate Layer Protein</i>
<i>CPC</i>	<i>Calcium phosphate cement</i>
<i>CSF</i>	<i>Cerebrospinal Fluid</i>
<i>CT</i>	<i>Computed Tomography</i>
<i>ESR</i>	<i>Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate</i>
<i>fMRI</i>	<i>Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging</i>
<i>GAG</i>	<i>Glycosaminoglycan</i>
<i>HS</i>	<i>Hounsfield Scale</i>
<i>IDP</i>	<i>Intradiscal Pressure</i>
<i>IFN- γ</i>	<i>Interferon Gamma</i>
<i>IL</i>	<i>Interleukin</i>
<i>IV</i>	<i>Intravenous</i>
<i>IVD</i>	<i>Intervertebral Disc</i>
<i>IVF</i>	<i>Intervertebral Foramen</i>
<i>LBP</i>	<i>Low Back Pain</i>
<i>LF</i>	<i>Ligamentum Flavum</i>
<i>LI</i>	<i>Lumbar Instability</i>
<i>LS</i>	<i>Lumbar spondylolisthesis</i>
<i>MED</i>	<i>Microendoscopic Discectomy</i>
<i>MEPS</i>	<i>Multi-axial expandable pedicle screws</i>

List of Abbreviations (Cont...)

Abb.	Full term
<i>MI</i>	<i>Microinstability</i>
<i>MMP-3</i>	<i>Matrix Metalloproteinase 3</i>
<i>MRI</i>	<i>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</i>
<i>NGF</i>	<i>Nerve growth factor</i>
<i>NP</i>	<i>Nucleus Pulposus</i>
<i>PELD</i>	<i>Percutaneous Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy</i>
<i>PLF</i>	<i>Posterolateral Fusion</i>
<i>PLIF</i>	<i>Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion</i>
<i>PLL</i>	<i>Posterior Longitudinal Ligament</i>
<i>PMMA</i>	<i>Polymethyl-methacrylate</i>
<i>SI</i>	<i>Signal intensity</i>
<i>SLR</i>	<i>Straight Leg Raising</i>
<i>T1WI</i>	<i>T1 weighted Image</i>
<i>T2WI</i>	<i>T2 weighted Image</i>
<i>TDR</i>	<i>Total Disc Replacement</i>
<i>TLIF</i>	<i>Transforaminal lumbar Interbody Fusion</i>
<i>TNF-α</i>	<i>Tumor necrosis factor alpha</i>
<i>TSE</i>	<i>T2 weighted spin echo</i>

Abstract

Objectives: Current surgical treatment options for one-time recurrent lumbar disc herniation (RLDH) include repeat discectomy or discectomy supplemented with fusion. Significant contention exists within the surgical spine community with regard to the most effective treatment modality. The objective of this study is to compare reoperation rates and patient reported outcomes following fusion versus repeat discectomy for RLDH.

Patients and Methods: The electronic literature search was performed in Ovid Medline/Pubmed, EMBASE and Cochrane, for human studies directly comparing repeat discectomy with fusion for ipsilateral or contralateral RLDH. Using mean differences (MD) and odds ratios (OR) for continuous and categorical outcomes, respectively.

Results: A total of 798 patients with RLDH (457 fusions and 341 repeat discectomies) from 11 studies (10 observational and 1 randomized controlled trials) were analyzed. Mean time to reherniation was 54.4 ± 30.4 months, while average follow-up time was 40 ± 11.7 months (range: 12–92.6). No difference was found between fusions and repeat discectomies with regards to related reoperations (OR: 0.68; 95% C.I: 0.14–3.2). Changes in PRO scores from baseline to last follow-up were also similar between the two groups, including VAS- back pain (MD, -0.3 ; 95% CI, -1.4 to 0.7), VAS-leg pain (MD, -0.3 ; 95% CI, -1.4 to 0.7), ODI (MD, 0.6 ; 95% CI, -0.2 to 1.4), JOA (MD: 1.0 ; 95% CI: 0.02 to 2.0) and MacNab satisfaction (OR: 1.5 ; 95% CI, 0.9 to 2.3).

Conclusion: Available evidence shows that in treating one-time recurrent disc herniations, repeat discectomy and fusion are associated with comparable reoperation rates, incidence of dural tears, functional outcomes as well as satisfaction with surgical treatment at last follow-up. Future longitudinal, randomized controlled trials should be completed to validate any associations found in this study.

keywords (Discectomy, Fusion, Recurrent, Lumbar disc herniation, Patient reported outcomes, Dural tear, Reoperation, Oswestry disability index, Modified Japanese orthopedic scale, Leg pain, Back pain, Postoperative infections, Operative time, Hospital stay)

Introduction