Cervical laminoforaminotomy for the treatment of cervical degenerative radiculopathy

ROBERT F. HEARY, M.D., TIMOTHY C. RYKEN, M.D., PAUL G. MATZ, M.D.,
PAUL A. ANDERSON, M.D., MICHAEL W. GROFF, M.D., LANGSTON T. HOLLY, M.D.,
MICHAEL G. KAISER, M.D., PRAVEEN V. MUMMANENI, M.D., TANVIR F. CHOUHIDI, M.D.,
EDWARD J. VRESILOVIC, M.D., PH.D., AND DANIEL K. RESNICK, M.D.

1Department of Neurosurgery, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey—New Jersey Medical School, Newark, New Jersey; 2Department of Neurosurgery, University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa; 3Division of Neurological Surgery, University of Alabama, Birmingham, Alabama; Departments of 4Orthopaedic Surgery and 5Neurological Surgery, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin; 6Department of Neurosurgery, Harvard Medical School and Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts; 7Division of Neurosurgery, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California at Los Angeles, California; 8Department of Neurological Surgery, Neurological Institute, Columbia University, New York, New York; 9Department of Neurosurgery, University of California at San Francisco, California; 10Department of Neurosurgery, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, New York; and 11Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Pennsylvania State College of Medicine, Hershey, Pennsylvania

Object. The objective of this systematic review was to use evidence-based medicine to examine the efficacy of posterior laminoforaminotomy in the treatment of cervical radiculopathy.

Methods. The National Library of Medicine and Cochrane Database were queried using MeSH headings and key words relevant to posterior laminoforaminotomy and cervical radiculopathy. Abstracts were reviewed, and studies meeting inclusion criteria were selected. The guidelines group assembled an evidentiary table summarizing the quality of evidence (Classes I–III). Disagreements regarding the level of evidence were resolved through an expert consensus conference. The group formulated recommendations which contained the degree of strength based on the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines network. Validation was done through peer review by the Joint Guidelines Committee of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons/Congress of Neurological Surgeons.

Results. Posterior laminoforaminotomy improves clinical outcome in the treatment of cervical radiculopathy resulting from soft lateral cervical disc displacement or cervical spondylosis with resulting narrowing of the lateral recess. All studies were Class III. The most frequent design flaw involved the lack of utilization of validated outcomes measures. In addition, few historical studies included a detailed preoperative analysis of the patients. As such, the vast majority of studies that included both pre- and postoperative assessments with legitimate outcomes measures have been performed since 1990.

Conclusions. Posterior laminoforaminotomy is an effective treatment for cervical radiculopathy.

(DOI: 10.3171/2009.2.SPINE08722)

Key Words • cervical spine • cervical spondylosis • laminotomy • practice guidelines • radiculopathy • treatment outcome

Recommendations

Posterior laminoforaminotomy is recommended as a surgical treatment option for symptomatic cervical radiculopathy resulting from soft lateral cervical disc displacement or cervical spondylosis with resultant narrowing of the lateral recess (quality of evidence, Class III; strength of recommendation, D).

Posterior laminoforaminotomy is recommended as a surgical method to decompress a compressed cervical nerve root resulting from soft lateral cervical disc displacement or cervical spondylosis with resultant narrowing of the lateral recess (quality of evidence, Class III; strength of recommendation, D).

Timing. There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation regarding timing.

Rationale

Cervical radiculopathy is typically characterized as pain in the anatomic distribution of a single cervical...
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nerve root. Sensorimotor impairment of the same nerve root may or may not be simultaneously present. Not uncommonly, multiple nerve roots may be affected simultaneously, leading to multilevel radiculopathy. Rarely, cervical myelopathy may coexist with clinically significant cervical radiculopathy. Cervical radiculopathy is usually the result of either a soft lateral disc displacement or spondylosis with resultant foraminal compromise caused either by a calcified disc, osteophyte, or both.

Herniated cervical discs causing radiculopathy may be treated from either an anterior or posterior approach. Likewise, spondylosis may be treated from either approach. The first documented description of the surgical treatment of a herniated cervical disc was by Spurling and Scoville,17 who provided a description of a posterior approach to the cervical spine for treatment of a herniated cervical disc via a laminoforaminotomy procedure.

Over the next 40 years, many reports of the surgical treatment of cervical radiculopathy via a posterior approach were published. To assess the efficacy of posterior laminoforaminotomy for decompression of the cervical nerve root(s) in cases of cervical radiculopathy, an evidence-based review of the relevant medical literature was undertaken.

Search Criteria

The group undertook a search of the National Library of Medicine (PubMed) literature and Cochrane database. Using the MeSH subject headings of “cervical” and “spine” and “surgery”, and limiting the search to human studies and the English language, we searched the period from 1966 through 2007. This review generated a broad base of studies (9589 references). We reviewed the titles and abstracts with attention to those addressing clinical management, and performed secondary searches cross-indexing radiculopathy with surgery and cervical and radiculopathy. We then reviewed the bibliographies of selected papers for additional references of relevance.

We selected articles if they addressed issues related to the surgical management of cervical radiculopathy. Articles containing data on anterior approaches were included if they contained comparative data for posterior surgical approaches. We formulated an evidentiary table from the resulting list of articles most relevant to the topic of surgical management of cervical radiculopathy via laminoforaminotomy (Table 1).

Scientific Foundation

Laminoforaminotomy was described ~ 10 years after the initial report of the treatment of a herniated lumbar disc by Mixter and Barr11 in 1934. This description of laminoforaminotomy predated the initial reports of anterior cervical discectomy by Cloward23 and Smith and Robinson16 by 10 years.

Despite its long-term use and widespread general acceptance as a surgical technique, a paucity of peer-reviewed literature was found on the use of laminoforaminotomy for cervical radiculopathy. Radhakrishnan et al.13 reported on their experience with a cohort of 561 patients with cervical radiculopathy over a 14-year period, among whom 141 (26%) underwent surgery. Laminoforaminotomy was the most common approach used, and 94% of these operations were performed within 3 months of the diagnosis. These investigators found that patients with radicular pain, dermatomal sensory loss, and motor deficits were at least 8 times more likely than patients without any of these factors to undergo surgical intervention. Additional information regarding the outcomes in patients who underwent surgery were not available in this review. This study was graded Class II with respect to determining which patients were likely to undergo surgery, but did not provide useful data with respect to the results of surgical treatment.

Although numerous articles were written in the time period from 1944 until the past decade, the majority of these were severely flawed in study design. There were no Class I or II studies written which specifically addressed the use of laminoforaminotomy in the treatment of cervical radiculopathy. The most frequent design flaw involved the lack of validated outcomes measures. In addition, few historical studies included a detailed preoperative analysis of the patients. As such, the vast majority of studies that included both pre- and postoperative assessments with legitimate outcomes measures have been performed since 1990. Due to a variety of reasons, all of these have been classified as providing Class III scientific evidence.

In 1983, Henderson et al.7 published a comprehensive review of 846 surgical cases performed in 736 consecutively treated patients with cervical radiculopathy using the laminoforaminotomy technique. These authors demonstrated a 96% improvement in arm pain and paresthesia, and a 98% resolution of preoperative motor deficits. Most patients (91.5%) rated their outcomes as good or excellent, and there was no statistically significant difference between the outcomes for patients with hard or soft disc herniation or cervical spondylosis. This case series provided Class III medical evidence, and is marred by nonvalidated outcome measure and nonblinded assessments.

Herkowitz et al.8 performed a comparison of laminoforaminotomy with anterior cervical discectomy and fusion to treat of cervical herniated discs causing radiculopathy. These authors alternated the treatment in 33 patients and had a mean follow-up of 4.2 years. Good and excellent results were obtained in 94% of patients who underwent anterior cervical discectomy and fusion, and 75% of those who underwent laminoforaminotomy; however, this difference was not statistically significant. This cohort study was graded Class III due to its small size, nonvalidated outcome measures, and nonblinded assessments.

Zeidman and Ducker20 retrospectively reported on 172 patients who had undergone laminoforaminotomy for cervical radiculopathy. With a mean follow-up period of > 2 years in 77% of the patients and > 1 year in the remaining 23%, overall pain relief was reported in 97% of patients. For similar reasons as above, this study was graded Class III.

Davis4 reported a retrospective study of 170 patients who underwent laminoforaminotomy for compressive
TABLE 1: Evidentiary summary of studies on posterolateral cervical laminoforaminotomy and outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors &amp; Year</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radhakrishnan et al., 1994</td>
<td>561 patients w/ cervical radiculopathy studied over 14 yrs; 141 patients (26%) underwent surgery primarily by laminoforaminotomy w/in 3 mos of diagnosis.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Radiculain, dermatomal sensory loss, &amp; motor deficit were 8x more likely to undergo surgery. Study Class II w/ respect to likelihood to undergo surgery but Class III w/o respect to outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson et al., 1983</td>
<td>Review of 736 consecutive patients (846 surgeries) treated w/ laminoforaminotomy technique, 96% improvement in arm pain &amp; paresthesia w/ 98% resolution of motor deficit; 91.5% satisfied.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Outcomes extremely good w/ posterolateral technique. Class III due to nonvalidated outcomes &amp; nonblinded review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkowitz et al., 1990</td>
<td>33 patients alternating between anterior &amp; posterolateral surgery for radiculopathy. Mean 4.2-yr FU.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Good &amp; excellent results found in 94% anterior surgery &amp; 75% posterolateral surgery (not significant). Class III due to nonvalidated outcomes &amp; nonblinded assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeidman &amp; Ducker, 1993</td>
<td>172 patients underwent posterolateral surgery for cervical radiculopathy. Mean FU &gt;1 yr in 100% &amp; &gt;2 yrs in 77%.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Overall pain relief was 97%; Class III due to nonvalidated outcomes &amp; nonblinded assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, 1996</td>
<td>170 patients underwent posterolateral foraminotomy for cervical radiculopathy. Mean 15-yr FU in 96%.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Good or excellent outcome of 86% using Prolo scores. Recurrence rate of 6%—usually in first 3 yrs. Class III due to nonvalidated outcome measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomaras et al., 1997</td>
<td>183 patients underwent posterolateral foraminotomy for cervical radiculopathy. Mean FU 19 mos.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Outcomes were good or excellent in 93% who were not Worker’s Compensation &amp; 78% who were. This difference was significant (p &lt; 0.01). Class III due to nonvalidated outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar et al., 1998</td>
<td>89 patients treated w/ posterolateral foraminotomy. Mean FU 8.6 mos using Odom’s criteria.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Good or excellent results in 95.5% w/ 6.7% recurrence rate. Class III for nonvalidated outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieve et al., 2000</td>
<td>77 consecutive patients underwent posterolateral foraminotomy for cervical radiculopathy. Mailed questionnaire (80% response).</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>70% of group had significant (&gt;75%) relief of pain, 23% had moderate (&lt;75%) relief, while 7% had the same or worse pain. Deterioration after relief in 27%. Class III due to below average FU &amp; subjective outcome measures that were nonblinded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzmann et al., 2000</td>
<td>67 patients reviewed retrospectively w/ cervical disc displacement &amp; radiculopathy. Outcome using Prolo functional &amp; visual analog scale.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Good &amp; excellent results in 92% by visual analogue scale &amp; 90% excellent result w/ Prolo scale. Class III due to nonvalidated outcome measure &amp; nonblinded assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamson, 2001</td>
<td>Retrospective review of 100 cases of cervical radiculopathy from foraminal stenosis due to soft disc or spondylosis. Tx w/ microendoscopic foramotomy.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Excellent or good results in 97% of patients who returned to baseline activities &amp; employment. Class III due to subjective outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigues et al., 2001</td>
<td>51 patients w/ soft cervical disc displacement &amp; radiculopathy treated w/ posterolateral foraminotomy; mean FU of 46 mos.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Total pain relief in 96% of patients w/ motor improvement in 76% &amp; sensory improvement in 63%. Class III due to no formal outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fessler &amp; Khoo, 2002</td>
<td>51 patients w/ cervical radiculopathy treated w/ open (n = 26) or microendoscopic (n = 25) foraminotomy.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Patients in both groups had 67–92% improvement w/ no differences between groups. Class III due to nonvalidated outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoggl et al., 2002</td>
<td>32 patients w/ posterolateral foraminotomy for cervical radiculopathy, FU 34 mos. Outcomes assessed using Prolo functional economic scale.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Good to excellent outcomes seen in 64% w/ moderate in 18% &amp; poor in 18%. Class III due to nonvalidated nature of Prolo scale &amp; nonblinded assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth et al., 2006</td>
<td>363 patients retrospectively reviewed w/ soft cervical disc disease. Mean 6.1-yr FU in 292 patients (80%). Anterior surgery w/ PMMA spacer compared to posterolateral foraminotomy.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Odom’s criteria: good &amp; excellent in 93.6% anterior &amp; 85.1% posterior (p &lt; 0.05). Better results w/ posterior surgery in terms of operating time &amp; periop complications. Class III due to nonvalidated outcomes &amp; nonblinding of outcome assessors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The criteria for scoring each manuscript into a class are described in Introduction and Methodology: Guidelines for the Surgical Management of Cervical Degenerative Disease, which appears in this issue of the Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine. Abbreviations: FU = follow-up; PMMA = polymethylmethacrylate.

cervical radiculopathy. The mean follow-up period was 15 years in 96% of patients. Good or excellent outcomes were observed in 86% of patients, based on Prolo scores (a nonvalidated outcome measure). The recurrence rate was 6%, with most recurrences occurring within the first 3 years of the index surgical procedure. This case series provides Class III medical evidence.

In 1997, Tomaras and colleagues\* reported their re-
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rospective case series on the use of laminoforaminotomy on 183 patients with cervical radiculopathy. Surgery was performed on an outpatient basis in all cases, and the mean follow-up period was 19 months. There were no immediate readmissions and the outcomes were good or excellent in 93% of patients who were not involved with Worker's Compensation claims, and 78% of those who were. The difference between the outcomes with respect to Worker's Compensation claims was statistically significant (p < 0.01).

Kumar et al.10 reported their results in a series of patients treated with foraminotomy for cervical spondylotic radiculopathy caused by osteophytes. In this retrospective review, patients with disc herniation were not included. A total of 89 patients were treated with a mean follow-up of 8.6 months. Using Odom's criteria, good or excellent results were obtained in 95.5% of patients. Further surgery for recurrent root symptoms was performed on 6.7% of the patients.

Grieve et al.6 reported on the results of cervical foraminotomy for spondylitic radiculopathy in 77 consecutive patients. With an 80% response rate to a mailed questionnaire, 70% of patients had complete or > 75% improvement of their preoperative pain, 23% had improvement of < 75%, and 7% had the same or worsened pain. Sixteen patients (27%) reported an initial improvement in symptoms with subsequent deterioration (the overall follow-up rate was 80%). The most common postoperative complaint was neck pain (reported by 22% of patients).

Witzmann and associates9 performed a retrospective analysis of soft and hard cervical disc herniation causing radiculopathy in 67 patients. Using a laminoforaminotomy technique, they obtained 92% good and excellent results according to visual analog scale testing, and a 90% excellent result on the Prolo Functional Economic Outcome Rating Scale12 at a mean 3-year follow-up evaluation.

Adamson1 reported on the use of a microendoscopic method to perform a laminoforaminotomy in 2001. This retrospective report detailed 100 laminoforaminotomies performed for unilateral cervical radiculopathy resulting from soft lateral disc herniation or spondylotic foraminal stenosis. Adamson reported excellent or good results in 97% of patients who returned to their preoperative employment and baseline level of physical activity. Rodrigues et al.14 reported on 51 patients with soft cervical disc herniation causing radiculopathy. In this retrospective review, the authors reported total pain relief in 96%, motor improvement in 76%, and sensory improvement in 63% of patients. The study used no formal outcome scales in the evaluations which were performed after a mean duration of follow-up of 46 months. Schoggl et al.15 reported retrospectively on the use of posterior microforaminotomy for cervical spondylotic radiculopathy in which 32 patients were followed up for a mean of 34 months. The authors assessed outcomes using the Prolo Functional Economic Outcome Rating Scale, and reported a good to excellent outcome in 64%, moderate outcome in 18%, and a poor outcome in 18%. Because of their retrospective nature, all of these studies provide Class III medical evidence.

In 2002, Fessler and Khoo5 reported on the use of a microendoscopic cervical foraminotomy technique. They compared the results of this newer procedure with those obtained using an open laminoforaminotomy technique. The open surgery group included 26 consecutive patients, and the endoscopic group was composed of the next 25 consecutive patients with either cervical root compression from foraminal stenosis or disc herniation. As such, a sequential series of patients was analyzed. The patients in both groups had between 87 and 92% symptomatic improvement, with no significant differences between the groups. This study was graded Class III because of the lack of any validated outcomes measures in the evaluation process, the lack of a simultaneous control group, and the fact that the outcome assessors were not blinded.

Korinth et al.7 performed a retrospective comparative analysis of 363 cases of cervical soft disc disease causing radiculopathy at a single level. Of these, 292 patients (80%) were available for long-term follow-up at 6.1 years. The authors compared anterior cervical discectomy using a polymethylacrylate spacer with a posterior foraminotomy procedure. Using Odom's criteria, the good and excellent results were found to be statistically different between the anterior (93.6%) and posterior (85.1%) groups in favor of the anterior approach (p < 0.05). Interestingly, statistically significant differences were detected favoring posterior surgery with respect to perioperative complications and mean operating times; however, posterior surgeries also had significantly greater need for repeated surgery to be performed at a later date. The reasons for assigning a patient into a particular group were vaguely described and not randomized in any manner. This study was graded Class III due to 80% follow-up, a nonvalidated outcome measure, and the lack of blinded data.

Summary and Key Issues for Future Investigation

The preponderance of clinical studies we have described support the utility of posterior cervical laminoforaminotomy as an effective treatment for either cervical disc displacement or foraminal spondylotic stenosis causing radiculopathy.

Advantages to posterior laminoforaminotomy include sparing the motion segment. Furthermore, there is the theoretical advantage that adjacent segment disc degeneration, which is becoming increasingly recognized after anterior cervical fusion, is unlikely to occur in patients undergoing laminoforaminotomy.

Future investigation would involve identifying the ideal surgical treatment for soft lateral cervical disc displacement causing radiculopathy. Review of the current, peer-reviewed literature did not resolve whether an anterior or a posterior surgery would have better short- and long-term results. Performance of a well-designed, randomized clinical trial for patients with this clinical scenario would enable resolution of this question.
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