Minimally invasive options for treatment of low back pain

Rajiv Saigal, MD, PhD Medical Director, Spinal Deformity and Spinal Tumors





Part of Washington Hospital Healthcare System

36M resident physician with low back pain. Worsening over several months. No leg pain or weakness.

36M resident physician with low back pain. Worsening over several months. No leg pain or weakness.

Trial of conservative therapy:

- Rest
- Anti-inflammatory meds
- Inversion table



36M resident physician with low back pain. Worsening over several months. No leg pain or weakness.

1 month later, pain resolves.

36M resident physician with low back pain. Worsening over several months. No leg pain or weakness.

1 month later, pain resolves.



Lesson

- Most cases of low back pain do NOT need surgery
- Most common cause: Musculoskeletal strain



Non-medical therapies

- Rest
- Avoiding triggers
- Ergonomics –
- Acupuncture
- Physical therapy
- Inversion table



• TENS

Joom.com

healthyback.com

Medical therapies

- Oral anti-inflammatory meds
- Topical gels/creams
- Local injections
- Neuropathic pain meds

When is back pain surgical?

- Nerve or spinal cord compression
- Trauma
- Tumors
- Spinal deformity



What is MIS?

- > Same surgical goals:
 - decompress
 - stabilize
 - re-align
- > Minimally invasive = less collateral damage

Case: spondylolisthesis

65F with back and right leg pain. Back pain 5/10, Leg pain 5/10, Disability 39/100





Case: spondylolisthesis

65F with back and right leg pain. Back pain 5/10, Leg pain 5/10, Disability 39/100





Case: spondylolisthesis





100

Case: minimally invasive fusion



LOS: 2 days



Case – minimally invasive fusion



NEUROSURGICAL FOCUS

Minimally invasive versus open fusion for Grade I degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: analysis of the Quality Outcomes Database

Praveen V. Mummaneni, MD,¹ Erica F. Bisson, MD, MPH,² Panagiotis Kerezoudis, MD,³ Steven Glassman, MD,⁴ Kevin Foley, MD,⁵ Jonathan R. Slotkin, MD,⁶ Eric Potts, MD,⁷ Mark Shaffrey, MD,⁸ Christopher I. Shaffrey, MD,⁸ Domagoj Coric, MD,⁹ John Knightly, MD,¹⁰ Paul Park, MD,¹¹ Kai-Ming Fu, MD, PhD,¹² Clinton J. Devin, MD,¹³ Silky Chotai, MD,¹³ Andrew K. Chan, MD,¹ Michael Virk, MD, PhD,¹ Anthony L. Asher, MD,⁹ and Mohamad Bydon, MD³

TABLE 4. Summary of postoperative outcomes

		1-Level Fusion				
Variable	All (n = 345)	Open (n = 181)	MIS (n = 76)	p Value		
LOS in days, mean (SD)	3.46 (1.66)	3.36 (1.55)	3.21 (1.74)	0.53		
Discharge destination, n (%)				0.76		
Home routine	283 (82.3)	151 (83.9)	67 (88.2)			
Home w/ home health care services	18 (5.23)	11 (6.11)	3 (3.95)			
Postacute or nonacute care setting	41 (11.9)	18 (10.0)	6 (7.89)			
Transferred to another acute care facility	2 (0.58)					
90-day readmission, n (%)	5 (1.47)	1 (0.56)	2 (2.67)	0.21		
90-day return to work, n (%)	87 (66.4)	42 (60.9)	26 (76.5)	0.18		
Return to the op room w/in 1 yr, n (%)*	20 (5.81)	9 (5.00)	4 (5.26)	>0.99		
12-mo functional outcomes				\wedge		
NASS satisfaction, n (%)				0.16		
1	199 (68.2)	111 (74.0)	44 (68.8)			
2	47 (16.1)	17 (11.3)	14 (21.9)			
3	26 (8.90)	13 (8.67)	5 (7.81)			
4	20 (6.85)	9 (6.00)	1 (1.56)			
Change in ODI, mean (SD)	-24.17 (17.4)	-25.54 (16.9)	-27.61 (16.4)	0.40		
Change in EQ-5D, mean (SD)	0.24 (0.22)	0.25 (0.22)	0.26 (0.21)	0.84		
Change in NRS-BP, mean (SD)	-3.79 (3.11)	-4.22 (2.96)	-3.80 (3.12)	0.35		
Change in NRS-LP, mean (SD)	-4.00 (3.48)	-4.15 (3.57)	-4.47 (3.11)	0.51		
Quality-adjusted life days w/in the 1st yr	266 (46.3)	268 (46.3)	270 (46.3)	0.84		



* Related to the index procedure

Case – chronic low back pain

33M Hx early onset scoliosis surgery s/p T10-L4 PSF,
BMI 41.9, work-related injury and mid-low back pain.
No pain until work-related injury while moving
packages. Constant mid-low back pain, up to 9/10,
worse with flexion. Stopped working after this injury.
2 rounds of PT, tried Norco and Tylenol, lumbar ESI
and facet block with no significant pain relief.

Exam: BLE 4/5, pain ltd No imbalance No hyperreflexia

Pre-op imaging



Pre-op MRI











Case – 6 wks s/p BVN ablation

- "80% better" post op.
- Able to walk into appt where before he would have had to stop 2x.
- Can do home ADLs like washing dishes.
- Can walk stairs much better than pre-op.
- Back pain pre op 9/10 -> now 4/10.
- Doing pool therapy at home.
- Lost 20lbs.
- Exam: BLE 4+ to 5/5

European Spine Journal (2020) 29:1925–1934 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-020-06448-x

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Long-term outcomes following intraosseous basivertebral nerve ablation for the treatment of chronic low back pain: 5-year treatment arm results from a prospective randomized double-blind sham-controlled multi-center study

Jeffrey S. Fischgrund¹[©] · Alfred Rhyne² · Kevin Macadaeg³ · Gregory Moore⁴ · Evish Kamrava⁵ · Christopher Yeung⁶ · Eeric Truumees⁷ · Michael Schaufele⁸ · Philip Yuan⁹ · Michael DePalma¹⁰ · David Greg Anderson¹¹ · Douglas Buxton¹² · James Reynolds¹³ · Michael Sikorsky¹⁴



Fig. 2 Bar graph with confidence intervals for the primary endpoint, mean ODI at baseline, and a minimum of 5 years in BVN-treated US PP patients. The mean reduction in ODI of 25.95 points was statistically significant (p < 0.001)

Data

Check for updates

Data

European Spine Journal (2020) 29:1925–1934 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-020-06448-x

ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Long-term outcomes following intraosseous basivertebral nerve ablation for the treatment of chronic low back pain: 5-year treatment arm results from a prospective randomized double-blind sham-controlled multi-center study

Jeffrey S. Fischgrund¹[©] · Alfred Rhyne² · Kevin Macadaeg³ · Gregory Moore⁴ · Evish Kamrava⁵ · Christopher Yeung⁶ · Eeric Truumees⁷ · Michael Schaufele⁸ · Philip Yuan⁹ · Michael DePalma¹⁰ · David Greg Anderson¹¹ · Douglas Buxton¹² · James Reynolds¹³ · Michael Sikorsky¹⁴



Fig. 3 Proportion of patients by percent mean improvement in VAS from baseline to a minimum of 5 years of follow-up. Sixty-six percent (66%) of patients reported a > 50% reduction in VAS (p < 0.04), 47% reported a > 75% reduction in VAS, and 34% of patients reported complete pain resolution

Case: trauma

65F Hx ankylosing spondylitis, afib on warfarin, AVR, pacemaker, CKD, s/p MVA with T8-T9 hyperextension fracture. BLE 5/5



Treatment options:

- 1) TLSO Brace
- 2) Open T6-T11 PSF
- 3) MIS T6-T11 PSF
- 4) Open T7-T0 PSF
- 5) MIS T7-T10 PSF

Case: trauma

65F Hx ankylosing spondylitis, afib on warfarin, AVR, pacemaker, CKD, s/p MVA with T8-T9 hyperextension fracture. BLE 5/5





Case: trauma

65F Hx ankylosing spondylitis, afib on warfarin, AVR, pacemaker, CKD, s/p MVA with T8-T9 hyperextension fracture. BLE 5/5





Case – spine tumor

63M with metastatic melanoma first diagnosed and treated in the 1990s, calf melanoma resection 2017. Upper thoracic pain for several months. Difficulty walking.

Exam: BLE 4/5 Decreased sensation right leg Patellar DTR 3+









Post op imaging





Case – spine tumor treated MIS

77F Hx chronic hep B. On a hepatic MRI for a liver nodule discovered 2 years ago, she was found to have a thoracic lesion. Intermittent low thoracic pain, onset 1 year ago.

Family Hx father – hepatocellular ca.

Exam: BLE 5/5 Normal sensation

Pre op MRI





Case – MIS biopsy and kyphoplasty



Data

Balloon kyphoplasty versus non-surgical fracture management for treatment of painful vertebral body compression fractures in patients with cancer: a multicentre, randomised controlled trial

James Berenson, Robert Pflugmacher, Peter Jarzem, Jeffrey Zonder, Kenneth Schechtman, John B Tillman, Leonard Bastian, Talat Ashraf, Frank Vrionis, for the Cancer Patient Fracture Evaluation (CAFE) Investigators*

Summary

 Background Non-randomised trials have reported benefits of kyphoplasty in patients with cancer and vertebral compression fractures (VCFs). We aimed to assess the efficacy and safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the same to be approximately safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-straight and the saf



Figure 2: Disability and quality of life at baseline and after 1 month

€®

Balloon kyphoplasty versus non-surgical fracture management for treatment of painful vertebral body compression fractures in patients with cancer: a multicentre, randomised controlled trial

James Berenson, Robert Pflugmacher, Peter Jarzem, Jeffrey Zonder, Kenneth Schechtman, John B Tillman, Leonard Bastian, Talat Ashraf, Frank Vrionis, for the Cancer Patient Fracture Evaluation (CAFE) Investigators*

Summary

Background Non-randomised trials have reported benefits of kyphoplasty in patients with cancer and vertebral compression fractures (VCFs). We aimed to assess the efficacy and safety of balloon kyphoplasty compared with non-subsidiary of the same of the same



Data

Case – open spinal deformity

67 year old female with scoliosis & low back pain her entire life. Leaning forward for the past 4 years. Sharp shooting leg pain that radiates into bilateral posterior thighs with walking.

Exam:

Stands and walks with stooped forward posture





Normal spinal alignment



Figure 1. Cone of balance or cone of economy. The figure outlines the "stable" zone surrounding the individual that is conical in shape from the feet to the head. Deviation from the center within the zone results in greater muscular effort and energy expenditure to maintain an upright posture. Deviation of the body outside the cone results in falling or requiring support.

Figure 5. Realignment objectives in the sagittal plane. SVA <50 mm, PT <20°, and LL = PI \pm 9° sets the stage for achievement of a successful harmonious spinopelvic realignment.

Less invasive option – Anterior column realignment

- 3CO have traditionally been employed for 20-35° of sagittal correction at a single segment.
- 3CO technically challenging, high morbidity
- ACR was developed as a less invasive procedure for restoring segmental lordosis.
- In contrast to 3CO, ACR is an anterior column lengthening procedure



FIGURE 1. Osteotomy classification: grades 1 to 6 according to the anatomic resection.

Schwab et al Neurosurg 2014



Godzik Turner et al The Spine Journal 2020

Case – ACR

66M Hx prior L1-L3 PSF and L5-S1 ALIF/PSF, presented with disabling back pain, inability to stand up straight.



Case – ACR

Underwent: Stage 1- ROH

Stage 2- L1-2 LLIF, L2-3 ACR, L3-4 LLIF

Stage 3- L1-S1 PSF

No ICU stay, home on POD3



Lumbar lordosis

Anterior Column Realignment (ACR) in Adult Sagittal Deformity Correction

Technique and Review of the Literature

Rajiv Saigal, MD, PhD,* Gregory M. Mundis Jr., MD,* Robert Eastlack, MD,* Juan S. Uribe, MD,[†] Frank M. Phillips, MD,[‡] and Behrooz A. Akbarnia, MD*



PI-LL mismatch

Anterior Column Realignment (ACR) in Adult Sagittal Deformity Correction

Technique and Review of the Literature

Rajiv Saigal, MD, PhD,^{*} Gregory M. Mundis Jr., MD,^{*} Robert Eastlack, MD,^{*} Juan S. Uribe, MD,[†] Frank M. Phillips, MD,[‡] and Behrooz A. Akbarnia, MD^{*}





Cost minimization in treatment of adult degenerative scoliosis

Omar M. Uddin, BA,¹ Raqeeb Haque, MD,¹ Patrick A. Sugrue, MD,¹ Yousef M. Ahmed, MD,¹ Tarek Y. El Ahmadieh, MD,¹ Joel M. Press, MD,² Tyler Koski, MD,¹ and Richard G. Fessler, MD, PhD³



FIG. 3. Total EBL (in milliliters) for patients in the MIS and Open cohorts. Figure is available in color online only.



J Neurosurg Spine 23:798-806, 2015

	MIS				Open			
Type of Charge	Mean	SD	No. of Pts	Mean	SD	No. of Pts	Between MIS & Open	p Value
Inpatient charges								
Length of hospital stay (days)	7.03	3.86	38	14.88	8.20	33	-7.85	<0.01
Blood	\$2539.11	\$3886.10	37	\$14,470.30	\$9496.52	33	-\$11,931.20	<0.01
Cardiac ancillary services	\$2069.44	\$2020.39	25	\$4539.78	\$2627.56	31	-\$2470.34	<0.01
ICU nursing	\$12,757.00	\$14,549.51	20	\$14,539.88	\$11,707.66	33	-\$1782.88	0.64
Imaging	\$9136.92	\$7355.76	38	\$14,031.89	\$8552.72	33	-\$4894.97	0.01
Laboratory tests	\$7173.54	\$6196.78	35	\$18,633.53	\$9573.61	33	-\$11,459.99	<0.01
Operating room	\$202,621.51	\$84,305.64	38	\$253,014.41	\$70,991.72	33	-\$50,392.90	0.01
Pharmacy	\$4324.87	\$3517.43	38	\$12,684.44	\$9934.44	33	-\$8359.57	<0.01
Respiratory services	\$6720.27	\$15,090.07	30	\$12,931.96	\$9571.11	33	-\$6211.69	0.06
Routine nursing	\$10,730.32	\$5323.45	38	\$18,398.85	\$10,293.84	33	-\$7668.53	<0.01
Miscellaneous (nuclear medi- cine, gastrointestinal, other)	\$20,533.07	\$11,416.01	38	\$28,919.16	\$11,385.71	33	-\$8386.09	<0.01
Inpatient total	\$269,807.35	\$116,498.84	38	\$391,889.05	\$121,191.71	33	-\$122,081.71	<0.01
Inpatient total (adjusted for inflation)) \$292,329.91	\$128,590.45	38	\$433,620.37	\$129,553.86	33	-\$141,290.46	<0.01
Outpatient rehabilitation charges								
Length of stay (days)	13.94	7.38	16	16.36	10.62	14	-2.42	0.48
Continuous assessment	\$1583.38	\$1172.66	8	\$1070.01	\$750.01	8	\$513.37	0.31
Microbiology	\$184.20	\$105.88	10	\$654.40	\$621.32	5	-\$470.20	0.12
Psychiatry	\$783.84	\$440.00	11	\$851.06	\$661.09	9	-\$67.23	0.80
Supplies	\$229.18	\$284.58	14	\$224.84	\$191.45	13	\$4.34	0.96
Pharmacy	\$5422.36	\$3254.84	16	\$8691.12	\$8389.71	14	-\$3268.76	0.18
Room and board	\$13,892.50	\$7,684.27	16	\$15,801.64	\$10,255.24	14	-\$1,909.14	0.57
Evaluation and management	\$2808.94	\$1300.56	16	\$3038.86	\$1893.07	14	-\$229.92	0.71
Physical therapy	\$6471.19	\$3509.06	16	\$7182.86	\$5806.83	14	-\$711.67	0.69
Occupational therapy	\$5574.88	\$2991.85	16	\$6603.57	\$5768.45	14	-\$1028.70	0.55
General laboratory	\$2463.63	\$1752.57	16	\$2908.64	\$2406.49	14	-\$445.02	0.57
Laboratory, nonurine	\$110.94	\$83.73	16	\$124.29	\$107.77	14	-\$13.35	0.71
Miscellaneous	\$2681.50	\$3641.11	16	\$3320.22	\$3599.57	14	-\$638.72	0.63
Outpatient rehabilitation total	\$41,072.16	\$22,541.03	16	\$49,272.24	\$36,991.91	14	-\$8200.08	0.48
Grand total	\$353,322.66	\$112,092.08	16	\$493,614,64	\$152,207.65	14	-\$140,291,98	0.01
Grand total (adjusted for inflation)	\$380,732.69	\$124,332.93	16	\$539,331.69	\$165,845.01	14	-\$158,598.99	0.01

TABLE 3. Comparison of inpatient hospital, outpatient rehabilitation, and total charges



- ACR is a less invasive technique for correction of sagittal imbalance
- Less blood loss
- Possible cost reduction

Conclusions

- MIS techniques can be used for a range of spinal disorders
- Degenerative
- Tumor
- Deformity
- Trauma
- Less blood loss
- Lower length of stay
- Lower cost
- Similar long-term outcomes

Thank you

Rajiv Saigal, MD, PhD drsaigal@gmail.com





Part of Washington Hospital Healthcare System

Questions?

Rajiv Saigal, MD, PhD drsaigal@gmail.com





Part of Washington Hospital Healthcare System