ISSN: 0975-8585

Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences

Comparative Study Between Functional Outcome Of Lumbar Canal Stenosis Treated With Surgical Decompression By Laminectomy And Unilateral Partial Hemi Laminectomy Approach.

K Ramesh[1], and G Vimalan[2]*.

[1,2]Assistant professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Government Dharmapuri Medical College, Dharmapuri, Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT

Lumbar spinal canal stenosis may eventually cause signs of intermittent neurogenic claudication. The surgical options include procedures such as midline decompression by laminectomy different kinds of unilateral and bilateral fenestrations and partial or full hemi laminectomies. The study aims to unilateral decompressive approach provides sufficient decompression; a less invasive unilateral procedure, which preserves posterior musculoligamentous complex and bony structures and reduces associated morbidity.41 patients underwent preoperative assessment of Japanese orthopedic association score (JOA Score), Neurogenic claudication outcome scores (NCOS), the visual analog scale for back pain and neurogenic claudication. Patients were randomized to undergo either unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy or CMD (CMD) by laminectomy. 20 patients were randomized into unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy group and 21 patients into CMD (CMD) by laminectomy group. The mean JOA recovery rate was 50.61% for the unilateral decompression group and 52.12% for the CMD group. Notably, 62% of the CMD group had a good or excellent outcome while 70% of the unilateral decompression group had a good or excellent outcome. In our study, unilateral decompression by a partial hemi laminectomy provides minimal exposure for decompression in lumbar canal stenosis while preserving musculoligamentous attachments of the posterior elements of the spine and good postoperative results after one year with favorable outcomes of at least 70%.

Keywords: Lumbar canal stenosis, CMD, Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis

https://doi.org/10.33887/rjpbcs/2022.13.1.40

Corresponding author

ISSN: 0975-8585

INTRODUCTION

Lumbar spinal canal stenosis has been known for more than 100 years, but for a long time it was regarded as "the forgotten spinal disease." This neglect occurred because the association between herniated intervertebral discs andsciatica received most of the attention after it was discovered by Mixter and Barr in 1934 [1]. However, the syndrome was not widely understood or diagnosed until Verbiest in 1954 described the classic finding of middle-aged and older adults with back and lower extremity pain precipitated by standing and walking and aggravated by hyperextension. The secondary development of degenerative changes that further narrow the lumbar spinal canal precipitated symptoms [2]. Lumbar spinal canalstenosis now is an accepted clinical entity. The symptomsand signs are due to narrow canal space. The degenerative lumbar spinal canal stenosis is due to the thickening of interspinous dorsal ligament and facet joint hypertrophy. Lumbar spinal canal stenosis may eventually cause signs of intermittent neurogenic claudication, and it can lead to loss of quality of life [3]. Conservative measures provide relief from symptoms for a short period only, but finally, surgical decompression of the neurovascular structures will be needed. At present, different surgical options are available. The surgical options include procedures such as midline decompression by laminectomy different kinds ofunilateral and bilateral fenestrations and partial or full hemilaminectomies [4]. nowadays, it is not very clear which of the techniques is the most favorable and their long-term results are inconclusive. Most of the patients suffering from degenerative lumbar spinal canal stenosis are elderly patients and its incidence increases considerably. Since elderly patients have associated co-morbid conditions compared to younger generations problems regarding various surgical procedures need to be addressed. Such choices are important because greater invasiveness is associated with greater use of health care resources, greater complications, and higher mortality but generally similar clinical benefits [5]. So benefit & high risk must be carefully weighed in choosing the surgical procedure. Standard midline decompression by conventional laminectomy is the commonly performedsurgical treatment for degenerative lumbar canal stenosis [6]. This method involves jeopardizing the integrity of the posterior complex of the spine and elevation of paraspinal muscles from the spinous processes and has been shown to result in paraspinal muscle atrophy, trunk extensor weakness, Iatrogenic instability of the spine, and possibly," Failed back syndrome. Unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy method of decompression isthought to avoid one side of paraspinal muscle damage and extensor weakness by preserving the attachment of paraspinal muscle less and the posterior l, ligamentous attachments of spinous processes [7]. We present the prospective randomized control study comparing the outcome of a unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy and conventional midline decompression (CMD) by laminectomy in 41 patients who underwent surgery for lumbar spinal canal stenosis [8].

METHODS

This prospective randomized control study was approved by the medical ethics committee of the institutional review board of our hospital. The study was conducted at Tirunelveli Medical College Hospital, Tirunelveli, from 2011 to 2013. Patients meeting the following inclusion criteria were enrolled for the study after obtaining written informed consent. Inclusion criteria: Inclusion criteria were degenerative lumbar canal stenosis affecting 1 or 2 levels with central and lateral recess stenosis only, with neurogenic claudication symptoms with or without radicular component, progressive neurological weakness, or cauda equine syndrome. preoperative MRI with axial cuts at right angles to the affected anatomic segment demonstrating good clinic radiological correlation with significant canal stenosis (<8 mm) failure of conservative methods of treatment with a progressive decrease in walking distance, patients with the following factors were excluded. Exclusion criteria: Primary stenosis, traumatic lumbar canal stenosis, stenosis due to tumors and infections, spondylolisthesis/ far lateral stenosis, foraminal stenosis. Instability at the involved level as defined by >3 mm anterior translation or >10-degree angular change in flexion and extension lateral radiographs. The patient has undergone previous lumbar spine surgery, concomitant symptomatic cervical or thoracic stenosisco morbidities like cardiopulmonary insufficiency, peripheral neuropathy, peripheral vascular disease, and every hip or knee disease. 41 patients met the inclusion criteria and were willing to participate in the study. Enrolled patients underwent preoperativeassessment of the Japanese orthopedic association score (JOA score), neurogenic claudication outcome score (NCOs), visual analog scale for back pain, and neurogenic claudication. Patients were randomized to undergo either unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy or CMD by laminectomy. 20 patients were randomized into unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy group and 21 patients in the CMD by laminectomy group, for either procedure, under general anesthesia, the patient was placed in the prone knee-chest position and the surgical level was

confirmed by the fluoroscopic image before incision. Appropriate tables and graphical representations were used to display the data. The chi-square test was used. A"p" value <0.05 was taken as significant.

RESULTS

In the unilateral decompression group, the JOA score improved from a preop mean of 4.35 to 10.20 at the last follow-up. In the CMD, the last follow-up. The mean JOA recovery rate was 50.61% for the unilateral decompression group and 52.12% for the CMD group. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Notably, 62% of the CMD group had a good or excellent outcome while 70% of the unilateral decompression group had a good or excellent outcome. NCOS score improved from a mean preoperative score of 26.90 to 61.15 at the last follow-up in the unilateral decompression group, and from 27.57 to 62.43 in the CMD group. Statistical analysis did not reveal any significant difference between groups. At the last follow up the mean BPVAS score for the unilateral decompression group was 2.95 and for the CMD group, it was 3.61.

Table 1: Japanese Orthopedic Association score (JOA score).

Parameter	Unilateral decompression (UD)	Conventional (CMD)	Significance
Preop JOA score	4.35	3.95	p<0.05
JOA score, at last, follow up	10.20	9.52	p<0.05
Change in JOA score	5.85	5.57	p<0.05
JOA recovery rate (%)	50.61	52.12	p<0.05
N=	20	21	

Table 2: Outcome of JOA score.

Outcome (JOA score recovery rate) at final follow-up	Unilateral decompression (UD)	Conventional midline decompression (CMD)
Excellent (≥75%)	4	4
Good (50-74%)	10	9
Fair (25-49%)	5	6
Poor (≤24%)	1	2
N=	20	21

Table 3: Neurogenic claudication outcome score (NCOS).

	UD	Conventional (CMD)	Significance
Preop NCOS score	26.90	27.57	(p<0.05)
NCOS score at last follow-up	61.15	62.43	(p<0.05)
Change in NCOS score	34.25	34.86	(p<0.05)
N=	20	21	(p<0.05)

Table 4: Visual analog scales for back pain (BPVAS).

Parameter	UD	Conventional (CMD)	Significance
Preop BPVAS	7.6	8.1	(p<0.05)
BPVAS score, at last, follow up	2.95	3.67	(p<0.05)
Change in BPVAS	4.65	4.43	(p<0.05)
N=	20	21	(p<0.05)

DISCUSSION

The average intraoperative blood loss incurred in the unilateral decompression group (66.25 ml) is less than that in the CMD by laminectomy group (91.67 mol). Moreover, CMD by laminectomy is expected to have more bleeding, but with wider exposure an advantage. In our study, the complications were few and were comparable between groups. Postoperative radiological evaluation to assess the instability was not routinely performed and when the clinical symptoms and signs of back pain and claudication persist, X-rays of a lateral view, flexion, and extension view were taken to rule out

postoperative instability. Only one patient developed instability in the last follow-up in the CMD group, later posterior fusion and pedicle screw instrumentation were done. The complications are in the expected frequency. No case of new neurological deficit was observed following surgery in the groups. Hence unilateral decompression appears to have a safety profile comparable with CMD. The decompression group was marginally more symptomatic than the unilateral decompression group preoperatively,at the final follow-up, the CMD group fared better in terms of absolute values of JOA score and JOA recovery rate which is statistically insignificant. The CMD group had good or excellent outcomes while the unilateral decompression group fared better with 70% of patients experiencing good or excellent outcomes. Notably, only 5% (1 out of 20 patients) had a poor outcome in the Unilateral Decompression group while 9.5% (2 out of 21 patients) fared poorly at the last follow-up in the unilateral decompression group. These findings demonstrate a marginally better outcome for the unilateral decompression group. Decompression groups in the visual analogy score for neurogenic claudication (NCVAS) at the last follow-up. This signifies that both techniques have a comparable outcome concerning leg pain. There was no statistically significant difference between the 2 different surgical techniques regarding the postoperative results. Kalbarczyk et al from their analysisof complications like a dural tear (two patients 9.5%), and wound dehiscence (two patients 9.5%) also were observed in CMD by laminectomy group, as the postoperative morbidity like UTI, LRI (14.3%) [9]. Katz et al in theirstudy the two (UD and CMD) groups were comparable interms of the preoperative JOA scores (4.25 and 3.95). The postoperative JOA scores, at last, follow-up (10.25 and 9.75 respectively) and change in JOA score (6.0 and 5.8 respectively) did not show any statistically significantdifference [10]. Stucki et al stated that Major improvement was noted regarding the increase in the postoperative walking distance. However long-term follow-up is required to substantiate this assumption [11]. Macnab et al stated that the main advantages of the unilateral surgical decompression by partial hemi laminectomy are the preservation of posterior musculoligamentous complexand bony structure which prevents surgically induced instability. Only the hypertrophied and compressive medial parts of the facet joints are resected. Midline ligamentous structures are completely preserved [12].

CONCLUSION

In our study, unilateral decompression by a partial hemi laminectomy provides minimal exposure for decompression in lumbar canal stenosis while preserving musculoligamentous attachments of the posterior elements of the spine and good postoperative results after one year with favorable outcomes of at least 70% on the Japanese orthopedic association score and Neurogenic claudication outcome score. With both these surgical techniques, a significant improvement in the outcome after surgical decompression could be demonstrated. There was no significant difference between the unilateral decompression by partial hemi laminectomy and Midline decompression by laminectomy techniques regarding the later outcome.

REFERENCES

[1] Arnoldi CC, Brodsky AE, Choix J, Crock HV, Dommisse GF, Edgar MA, et al. Lumbar spinal stenosis and nerve root entrapment Syndromes. Definition and classification. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1976;(115):4-5.
[2] Cirak B, Alptekin M, Palaoglu S, Ozcan OE, Ozgen T. Surgical therapy for lumbar spinal stenosis: evaluation of 300 cases. Neurosurg Rev 2001; 24:80–2.
[3] Barr JS, Mixter WJ. Intervertebral disc ruptures with the involvement of the spinal canal. N Engl J Med. 1934; 211:210–5.
[4] Bolender NF, Schonstrom NR. Role of computed tomography and myelography in the diagnosis of central spinal stenosis. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1985; 67:240-6.
[5] Englund J. Lumbar spinal stenosis. Med Rep 2007;6(1):50-5.
[6] Galiano K. Long term outcome of decompressive laminectomy for lumbar canal stenosis. Spine 2005;30:332-5.
[7] Tuite GF, Stern JD, Doran SE, Papadopoulos SM, McGillicuddy JE, Oyedijo DI, et al. Outcome after laminectomy for lumbar spinal stenosis. Part I: Clinical Correlations. J Neurosurg 1994;81:699-706.
[8] Iguchi T, Kurihara A, Yamasaki K. Functional outcome of decompressive laminectomy for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. Spine 2000;;25(14):1754-9.
[9] Kalbarczyk A, Lukes A, Seiler RW. Surgicaltreatment of lumbar spinal stenosis in the elderly. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 1998;140:637–41.

[10] Katz IN, Lipson SJ, Brick GW, Grobler LJ, Weinstein JN, Fossel AH, et al. Clinical correlates of patient satisfaction after laminectomy for degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. Spine 1995; 20:1155-60.
[11] Stucki G, Dalgar M, Stucki G, Katz NP, Bayley J, Fossel AH, et al. Degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis: Diagnostic value of the history and physical examination 1995;38(9):1236–41.
[12] Macnab I, Cuthbert H. The incidence of denervation of the sacrospinalis muscles following spinal surgery. Spine 1977;69(2):109-13.