

Long-term follow-up radiologic and clinical evaluation of cylindrical cage for anterior interbody fusion in degenerative cervical disc disease

Hyoung-Joon Chun MD; Hyeong-Joong Yi MD PhD; Hyun Cho

Department of Neurosurgery, Hanyang University Medical Center/ College of Medicine, Hanynag University

Introduction

Various procedures have been introduced for anterior interbody fusion in degenerative cervical disc disease including plate systems with autologous iliac bone, carbon cages, and cylindrical cages. However, except for plate systems, the long-term results of other methods have not been established. In the present study, we evaluated radiologic findings for cylindrical cervical cages over long-term follow up periods.

Methods

Patient selection From 2003 to 2006, anterior interbody fusion with a cylindrical cage (AMSLUTM cage, Eurosurgical, Amsterdam, The Netherlands) was performed in 138 patients (Figure 1). Among these patients, a total of 99 were followed-up for more than 36 months and were retrospectively enrolled in the present study through reviews of medical charts, operative notes, and radiologic images.

Radiologic assessment Plain radiographs including anterior-posterior views and lateral views including neutral, flexion, and extension were obtained during the preoperative period, immediately after surgery, 6 months, 12 months, 24 months, and at least 36 months after surgery. At each follow-up, we evaluated radiographs for bony fusion, subsidence, kyphotic angle from cage direction change, osteophyte formation of anterior and posterior portion, and surgical complications.For the evaluation of cage subsidence, intervertebral disc height was measured by dividing of the sum of the three points including the anterior, posterior, and midpoint interbody distance by 3. Subsidence was defined as any settlement in disc height of at least 3 mm on lateral radiographs. We defined bony fusion as occurring when segmental motion was not noted in dynamic radiographs and there was no radiolucency around the cage.

Results

Cylindrical titanium cage



Osteophyte grade

| uue- | Development |
|------------|--|
| 0 | Osteophyte formation (-)- |
| I - | Osteophyte formation (+), did not reach the disc space- |
| Π, | $\underline{Osteophyte}\ formation\ (+), reached\ the\ disc\ space\ (upper\ or\ lower\ level).$ |
| I . | $\underline{Osteophyte}$ formation (+), reached the disc space (upper and lower levels) without bridge formation . |
| V- | Osteophyte formation (+), with bridge formation- |
| | |

Demographics of enrolled patients

| ¢ | Number | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Study period. | Jan. 2003 - Dec. | | |
| Study period- | 2006. | | |
| Total patients (levels). | 96 (112) _° | | |
| Mean age (range). | 48.4 years (29-72). | | |
| Male : Female. | 51:450 | | |
| Maan fallow up pariod | 38.61 months | | |
| Mean follow-up perioda | (range, 36-68). | | |
| Level | ø | | |
| Single level. | 80 patients | | |
| C34. | 2.0 | | |
| C45. | 9. | | |
| C56. | 50 _° | | |
| C67. | 19. | | |
| Two level. | 16 patients | | |
| C34/C45+ | 1.0 | | |
| C45/C56+ | 5.0 | | |
| C56/C67. | 10. | | |
| Bone fusion rate. | 100‰ | | |

Statistical analysis of subsidence related sex and

| | | leve | ^ | | |
|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| o | | Absence | Presence | | |
| | | Number (%). | Number (%)- | _ p value | |
| Sex | Male | 9 (50). | 42 (53.8). | 0.769 | |
| | Female. | 9 (50)- | 36 (46.2)- | 0.7680 | |
| Level | C34- | 1 (5.6). | 2 (2.6). | | |
| | C45. | 2 (11.1)- | 12 (15.4)- | 0.2(1 | |
| | C56. | 9 (50)- | 51 (65.4)- | 0.5612 | |
| | C67. | 6 (33.3). | 13 (16.7)- | | |

 Statistical analysis by Spearman's coefficient correlation and phi correlation in all enrolled patients

 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *
 *

Statistical analysis by Spearman's coefficient correlation and phi correlation in patients with one level

| Surgery | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------|-------------|---------|----------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| | Mean- | Subsidence- | | Osteophyte anterior- | | Osteophyte posterior- | |
| | | r. | p_{i} | r. | <i>p</i> . | T- | <i>p</i> , |
| Age- | 48.43- | 0.12 - | 0.295 | 0.21 | 0.062 - | 0.15 - | 0.193 - |
| Sex- | - | ~0.07 | 0.533 - | +0.07 | 0.520 - | -0.13 - | 0.251 - |
| T-score- | -0.42- | -0.19 - | 0.098 - | +0.20 | 0.071 - | -0.21 - | 0.059 - |
| VAS preop- | 7.9- | 0.20 - | 0.080 - | +0.03 - | 0.780 - | -0.09 - | 0.424 - |
| VAS immed- | 3.36- | 0.11 - | 0.331 - | -0.01 - | 0.937 - | 0.08 - | 0.497 - |
| VAS_6 mo- | 2.07- | 0.10 - | 0.371 - | 0.16 - | 0.161 - | 0.21 - | 0.063 - |
| VAS_12 mo- | 1.52- | 0.10 - | 0.369 | 0.19 - | 0.094 - | 0.32 - | 0.004 - |
| VAS_24 mo- | 1.35- | 0.06 | 0.572 - | 0.13 - | 0.257 - | 0.28 - | 0.013 - |
| VAS final- | 1.33- | 0.07 - | 0.529 | 0.18 - | 0.120 - | 0.32 - | 0.003 - |
| Outcome- | 2 | 0.1- | 0.861- | 0.2- | 0.102- | 0.3- | 0.002- |

Statistical analysis by Spearman's coefficient correlation and phi correlation in patients with two level

| surgery | | | | | | | |
|----------|--------|-------------|--------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| | Mean- | Subsidence- | | Osteophyte_anterior- | | Osteophyte_posterior- | |
| 2 | | Te . | p. | I. | p. | r. | p. |
| | 48.70- | 0.36- | 0.165 | 0.35- | 0.178- | 0.35 | 0.187- |
| , | | 0.26- | 0.302- | 0.23- | 0.381- | 0.00- | 1.000- |
| ore | -0.58- | -0.42- | 0.104- | -0.17- | 0.536- | -0.24- | 0.373- |
| s preop- | 8.23- | -0.14- | 0.597- | 0.03- | 0.901- | -0.12- | 0.653- |
| S_immed- | 3. | 0.24- | 0.367- | 0.19- | 0.491- | 0.32- | 0.229- |
| 8_6 mo- | 1.53- | 0.35- | 0.188- | 0.08- | 0.767- | 0.03- | 0.907- |
| 8_12 mo- | 0.88- | 0.30- | 0.257- | 0.15- | 0.571- | 0.19- | 0.474- |
| 8_24 mo- | 1.05- | 0.00- | 1.000- | 0.35- | 0.183- | 0.15- | 0.578- |
| S_final- | 0.70- | 0.28- | 0.288- | 0.37- | 0.153- | -0.01- | 0.977- |
| come. | | 0.2. | 0.504 | 0.4. | 0.152 | 0.0. | 0.977. |

Statistical analysis of subsidence related factors

| ø | Absence | Presence | p value. | |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Age | 45.4 ± 8.85 | 49.1 ± 9.07. | 0.17. | |
| T-score. | $\textbf{-0.1}\pm0.72\textbf{.}$ | -0.5 ± 0.94 | 0.04 | |
| VAS preop- | 7.4 ± 1.61- | 8.1 ± 1.44 | 0.11- | |
| VAS immed- | 3.0 ± 1.50 | 3.4 ± 1.51 | 0.285- | |
| VAS_6 mo- | 1.7 ± 1.08 | 2.1 ± 1.47 | 0.345- | |
| VAS_12 mo- | 1.2 ± 1.31 | 1.5 ± 1.34 | 0.381- | |
| VAS_24 mo- | 1.1 ± 1.13 | $1.3\pm1.38_{\circ}$ | 0.606 | |
| VAS final- | 1.1 ± 1.21 | $1.3 \pm 1.40_{\circ}$ | 0.548 | |

Conclusions

The present study describes the long term (at least 36 months) follow-up results of cylindrical cage treatment according to radiologic characteristics including subsidence, osteophyte formation, and kyphosis in a large study sample. Cage subsidence and osteophyte formation were present in almost all of the cases in our sample, which is inconsistent with the findings of previous reports. Surgeons should explain the possibility that neurologic outcomes may be aggravated by posterior osteophyte formation in late stages to patients during preoperative preparation. Cylindrical cages are relatively safe when used in patients with normal BMD, with a possibility of subsidence and kyphosis during bone fusion in patients with low T-scores, although there are low risks of severe neurologic aggravation.