Spine Publish Ahead of Print
DOI: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e31829fc56f

BMP-2-Augmented *Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion for the Treatment of Chronic Low Back Pain Secondary to the Homogeneous Diagnosis of Discogenic Pain Syndrome: Two-Year Outcomes*

Donald S. Corenman*, M.D., Douglas M. Gillard^, D.C., Grant Dornan, MS^, Eric Strauch, PA-C*

The manuscript submitted does not contain information about medical device(s)/drug(s). Med-Equip Inc. grant funds were received in support of this work. Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work: grants, consultancy, royalties.

Contact Information:

Donald S. Corenman MD, DC: The Steadman Clinic, 181 W. Meadow Dr., Suite 400, Vail, CO 81658. (Senior author)

Douglas M. Gillard BS, DC: the Steadman Philippon Research Institute, 181 W. Meadow Dr., Suite 1000, Vail, CO 81657. (**Corresponding author**)

Grant Dornan MS: the Steadman Philippon Research Institute, 181 W. Meadow Dr., Suite 1000, Vail, CO 81657. (Biostatistician)

Eric Strauch PA-C: the Steadman clinic, 181 W. Meadow Dr., Suite 400, Vail, CO 81658.

ABSTRACT:

Study Design: A retrospective observational study.

Objective: To assess clinical outcomes; perioperative complications; revision surgery rates; and BMP-2-related osteolysis, heterotopic bone, and unexplained postoperative radiculitis (BMPP) in a group of patients treated with BMP-2-augmented transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (bTLIF) for the homogeneous diagnosis of discogenic pain syndrome (DPS) and to put forth the algorithm used to make the diagnosis.

Summary of Background Data: There is a paucity of literature describing outcomes of TLIF for the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS, an old but controversial member of the lumbar degenerative disease family.

Methods: The registry from a single-surgeon was queried for patients who had undergone bTLIF for the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS, which was made via specific diagnostic algorithm. Clinical outcomes were determined by analyzing point-improvement from typical outcome questionnaires (OQs) and the data from Patient Satisfaction and Return to Work (RTW) questionnaires. Independent record review was employed to assess all outcomes.

Results: 80% of the cohort (36/45) completed pre-op and post-op OQs at an average follow-up of 41.9 ± 11.9 months, which demonstrated significant clinical improvement: ODI= 16.4 ($p<0.0001$), SF12-PCS= 10.0 ($p<0.0001$), and a Numeric Rating Scale for back pain = 2.3 ($p<0.0001$). The median patient satisfaction score was 9.0 (10= complete satisfaction), and 84.4% (27/32) of the cohort were able to return to their pre-op job, with or without modification. There were 3 perioperative complications; 4 revision surgeries; and 11 cases of benign BMPP. There were no incidents of the intraoperative dural tears or nerve root injury, and neither

litigation involvement (11/36, P>0.17), preoperative depression (15/36, P >0.19), nor prior discectomy/decompression (14/36, P<0.37) were predictors of outcomes.

Conclusions: Although limited by retrospective design and small cohort, the results of this investigation suggest that bTLIF is a reasonable treatment option for patients who suffer DPS and affords high patient satisfaction. A larger study is needed to confirm these findings.

Key Words: transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion, recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2, clinical outcomes, discogenic pain syndrome, internal disc disruption, isolated disc resorption, chronic low back pain, BMP phenomena, Perioperative complications, revision surgery, pseudoarthrosis

Level of Evidence: 4

MINI ABSTRACT

Forty-five patients from a single-surgeon practice, all of whom underwent TLIF for discogenic pain syndrome, were followed for a minimum of two years and standard outcome questionnaire data gathered. Analysis revealed significant point-improvement on all questionnaire data. Perioperative complication rates were low and there were no significant BMP-related complications.

Key Points:

#1) the medical literature concerning clinical outcomes for BMP-2-augmented transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF) as a treatment intervention for the specific diagnosis of discogenic pain syndrome (DPS) is scarce and uncertain.

#2) to our knowledge, this is the first investigation into this subject matter which achieved a minimal two-year follow-up with 80% of the cohort successfully completing both preoperative and postoperative outcome assessment tools and assessed the prevalence of BMP phenomena.

#3) data analysis revealed statistically significant clinical outcomes as measured by standard outcome assessment tools, as well as high patient satisfaction scores and return to work. Although over 30% of the cohort experienced BMP phenomena (i.e., osteolysis or ectopic bone formation), it was not associated with clinical outcome, revision surgery, unexplained radiculopathy, or, to the best of our knowledge, the development of cancer.

#4) a larger randomized controlled trial is needed to confirm these results.

INTRODUCTION:

Spinal arthrodesis (fusion) is one option for the management of debilitating degenerative disorders of the lumbar spine, which were refractory to nonoperative care.[1-3] Over the past decade, one particular fusion technique, transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF), has gained popularity within the surgical community [4-6] secondary to purported lower rates of perioperative patient morbidity [7-11] with the equivalent clinical outcomes as compared to the other techniques for lumbar fusion.[12-14]

First described by Harms in 1998,[4] TLIF has been advocated as a less invasive technique which allows for fusion of the anterior and posterior columns from a unilateral, extracanalar approach, which in turn affords less destruction of the posterior arch, allows for better access to the neuroforamina, and reduces retraction of the dural sac and nerve roots.

Of the lumbar diagnoses along the degenerative cascade, discogenic pain syndrome (DPS) has been found particularly resistant to all forms of treatment,[2,15-23] and has an estimated prevalence between 26%-42% of chronic low back pain patients.[24-26] Originally described 1970s,[27] DPS, which has also been called symptomatic disc degeneration,[12,28] symptomatic degenerative disc disease,[29] degenerative disc disease,[30] disc degeneration,[31] isolated disc resorption,[27] spondylosis,[32] internal disc disruption,[33] and/or disc pathology,[15] remains poorly understood and even controversial. Although not active in every disease disc (for reasons yet to be elucidated), DPS occurs when nociceptors within the periphery of the disc and/or vertebral endplates[27] become chronically activated secondary to pathological biomechanical[34, 35] and/or biochemical [36, 37] mechanisms.

Although investigational treatments exist,[38,39] the gold standard remains interbody fusion, where much of the pain-generating disc/endplates are removed, and the anterior and posterior columns of the affected motion segment(s) are fused into one unit, thereby eliminating pain-generated micromotion.[28,20]

Perhaps secondary to its controversial nature, there remains a paucity of literature regarding the clinical outcomes of TLIF for the treatment of patients with the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS. In fact, results of a literature review discovered only one limited TLIF investigation on the subject,[16] as the majority employed cohorts with heterogeneous diagnoses.[6,28,40-46] Therefore, the purpose of our investigation was to assess, via independent review, clinical outcomes; perioperative complications; revision surgery rates; and the prevalence of BMP-2-related heterotopic bone, osteolysis, and unexplained postoperative radiculitis, collectively called BMP phenomena (BMPP), from a group of patients who had undergone BMP-2-augmented TLIF

(bTLIF) for the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS. A secondary purpose was to put forth our specific algorithm for making the diagnosis of DPS.

METHODS & MATERIALS:

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

With institutional review board approval, the registry from a single-surgeon spine clinic was queried for patients who had undergone open TLIF for the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS between January, 2005 and August, 2010. Further inclusion criteria were patient age between 18 and 72 years; complaints of lower back pain greater than lower extremity pain; and failure of at least 6 months of conservative care. Exclusion criteria included greater than two levels of involvement; lumbar scoliosis greater than 10°; significant stenosis; spondylolysis or spondylolisthesis; instability; and disc herniation that resulted in lower extremity pain greater than low back pain.

Making the Diagnosis:

In order to make the diagnosis of DPS, there must have been a history of chronic debilitating low back pain which failed at least six months of conservative care. In addition, at least two of the following criteria must have been met: (1) severe patient-intolerance to loading of the lumbar spine (especially the combination of sitting and vibration), with dramatic relief following unloading; (2) positive discography (see next paragraph); (3) failed diagnostic blocks of the facet and/or sacroiliac joints; and/or (4) imaging findings of severe disc space collapse, endplate sclerosis, or Modic changes (IDR).

In the majority of the cases (30/36), standard provocative discography with CT follow-up was employed and deemed positive if the following criteria were satisfied: (1) the intended surgical level(s) demonstrate at least 6/10 concordant pain upon pressurization, (2) an adjacent disc was found to be nonpainful, and (3) CT follow-up demonstrated the presence of a full thickness annular tear.

Data Gathering:

After independent review of pertinent medical and imaging records by a doctor not associated with patient care (DMG), the rate of perioperative complications (complications occurring during or up to 6 weeks status-post), revision surgeries and BMPP were gathered. Perioperative complications were defined as dural tear; nerve root injury; iatrogenic fracture; infection; seroma; hematoma; deep vein thrombosis; pulmonary embolism; and cage subsidence/extrusion.

The success of early fusion was assessed via postoperative CT scans as interpreted by the senior author, which, as part of our standard of care, were completed on all patients between 4-7 months status-post. Patients who failed to demonstrate cortical struts spanning the disc space or solid fusion of at least one the facet regions and intertransverse fusion beds were declared non-fused and followed to see whether or not solid fusion ever occurred.

The Surgical Procedure:

All patients underwent a single or double-level TLIF by the senior author, which was augmented by posterolateral fusion, Texas Scottish Rite Hospital (TSRH™) posterior pedicle screw-rod instrumentation (Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Memphis, TN), and a Boomerang™ polyetheretherketone (PEEK) interbody device (Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Memphis, TN). The generalities of this surgical procedure have been described previously [4,47] and will not be

presented in this paper. Additionally, all procedures were augmented, in an off-labeled manner, with the osteobiologic recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 (BMP-2) (Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Memphis, TN), in order to reduce the time for solid fusion and obviate chances of pseudoarthrosis.

BMP-2 Preparation and Distribution:

At each level of fusion, a large kit II of BMP-2 was employed and prepared in accord with the manufacturer's instructions by soaking the BMP-2 solution into the type I absorbable collagen sponge (InFUSE™, Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Memphis, TN) for 30 minutes. The BMP-soaked sponge was then morselized with locally harvested bone which created an easy to work with BMP paste. The dosage of BMP-2 within the paste was 12 mg per motion segment, at a standard concentration of 1.5 mg/ml. No allograft or autologous iliac crest bone were utilized, and the typical distribution of BMP paste per level was 6 mg in the interbody space, which was placed anterior to the cage, against the annulus fibrosis and not in the cage itself; 4 mg in the contralateral decorticated facet and intertransverse fusion bed; and 2 mg ipsilaterally in the intertransverse fusion bed and facetectomy region.

Outcome Assessment Tools:

Pre-op and post-op patient-completed outcome questionnaires (PCOQs) included the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), an 0-10 point numeric rating scale for back pain (bNRS) (10= worst imaginable pain), and the physical component of the Short Form-12 Health Survey (SF12-PCS). Two other questionnaires were also employed: a 0-10 point patient satisfaction instrument (10 = complete satisfaction), and a 0-4 point return to work instrument designed to assess the patient's ability to return to their pre-op job (0= unable to return at all, 4= return without limitations). The

patients were also divided into a light work group and a heavy work group based upon the physicality of their pre-op employment. Clinical outcomes were assessed by comparing pre-op vs. post-op point-improvement on the PCOQs, as well as analyzing patient satisfaction and return to work data.

Statistical Analysis:

Statistical analysis was performed with IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 20 (Armonk, NY). All continuous variables were found to be normally distributed, which allowed for parametric testing. Possible predictors of clinical outcomes included demographics as well as pre-op variables, while post-op improvement in PCOQs was used as response variables. Independent samples t-tests (two-tailed) were used to test associations between binary predictors and continuous outcomes. Pearson Correlations were used to investigate the relationship between continuous predictors and clinical outcomes.

RESULTS:

Demographic Data Analysis:

Analysis of typical demographic variables and pre-op job classification (Tables I, II and III) demonstrated that being female ($p= 0.03$) or young in age ($p=0.02$; $r= -0.40$) were predictors of clinical outcome. None of the other variables were predictive of clinical outcomes. (Table IV)

Procedural Data Analysis:

All patients underwent either a single (24/36) or double (12/36) level TLIF with the following frequency distributions: L2/L3 (1/36), L3/L4 (3/36), L4/L5 (13/36), and L5/S1 (31/36), for a total of 48 lumbar levels fused.

Perioperative Complications, Revision Surgery, BMPP, and Fusion Status:

Perioperative complications were experienced in 8.3% (3/36) of the cohort and included two cases of pedicle screw placement failure (secondary to osteoporosis) and one case of post-op peridiscal hematoma with associated cage extrusion (this ultimately went on to revision surgery); however, there were no cases of infection, nerve root injury, or dural tear. Revision surgery (Table V) was necessitated in 11.1% (4/36) of the cohort; however, statistical analysis revealed no difference in clinical outcomes between the revision surgery group and rest of the cohort ($P > 0.13$). BMPP (ectopic bone, n=3; osteolysis, n=8; and radiculitis, n=0) were observed collectively in 30.6% (11/36) of the cohort; however, they were not associated with any known adverse effects, such as the need for revision surgery, or change in health status, and as a group demonstrated an equivalent clinical outcome on all PCOQs ($P > 0.48$).

As demonstrated on CT, delayed early fusion occurred in 8.3% of the cohort (4/36) secondary to the appearance of only woven bone in the disc space. However, all of these patients eventually went on to solid fusion as demonstrated on x-ray (n=2) and CT (n=2), at an average time point of 14.9 months (Range, 12.4—18.4).

Clinical Outcome Data Analysis:

Post-Op PCOQs, which were successfully completed by 80% of the cohort (36/45) at an average time point of 41.9 ± 11.9 months, demonstrated significant point-improvement from baseline. (Table VI) Patient satisfaction data demonstrated a median score of 9 (10= complete satisfaction), and 83.3% of the patients (30/36) were considered to be satisfied with the results of their procedure (i.e., scores >5). Analysis of return to work scores, which were applicable in 88.9% (32/36) of the cohort, demonstrated that 84.4% (27/32) of the cohort were able to return to

their pre-op job, either with or without limitations. All patients (7/7) in the heavy work group and 80% (20/25) in the light work group were able to return to their pre-op job with or without limitations (Table VII), and neither group demonstrated superior clinical outcome ($p>0.50$), mean return to work scores ($p>0.95$), or the ability to return to pre-op job without any limitations ($p=1.0$).

Being involved in litigation (via the Worker's Compensation or Personal Injury system) (11/36); suffering preoperative depression (15/36); or undergoing prior microdiscectomy/decompressive surgery (14/36) were not predictors of clinical outcomes ($p>0.15$).

DISCUSSION:

Despite the increasing popularity of TLIF, its efficacy for the treatment of DPS has not been fully elucidated, secondary to a paucity of investigations on the subject. A thorough search of the PubMed database in the English language for TLIF outcome studies which employed only cohorts heterogeneously diagnosed with DPS produced only one qualifying paper,[16] as most semi-qualifying investigations were eliminated secondary to the inclusion of cohorts with mixed diagnoses (especially spondylolisthesis).[6,28,40-46]

In a small retrospective study with one-year minimum follow-up, Takahashi et al.[16] reported the clinical outcomes of 21 patients who had undergone TLIF for the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS. Clinical outcomes, which were assessed with the ODI, a 0-10 visual analog scale, and the Japanese Orthopedic Association Score, revealed significant improvement between pre-op and post-op scores on all outcome assessment tools. The perioperative complication rate was 23.8% and there was one reported revision surgery (1/21; 4.8%). Although limited by its retrospective design, small cohort and unknown percent participation at follow-up, the authors concluded that

TLIF was a "safe and effective technique for lumbar interbody fusion in patients with chronic lumbar discogenic pain." [16]

We studied clinical outcomes, perioperative complications, revision surgery rates and BMPP prevalence in patients that had underwent open bTLIF for the homogeneous diagnosis of DPS, which was made via a very specific algorithm. At an average follow-up of 41.9 months, 80% of the patients had successfully completed post-op PCOQs, which all demonstrated significant point-improvement ($p<0.01$) from baseline. Patient satisfaction data revealed a median value of 9 (10= complete satisfaction) and RTW data demonstrated that 84.4% of the participating patients were able to return to their Pre-Op job, in at least some capacity. Statistical analysis of the heavy vs. light job groups revealed no significant difference between the groups with regard to clinical outcomes, mean RTW scores, or their ability to RTW without any limitations. Perioperative complications were experienced in 8.3% of the cohort, one of which resulted in revision surgery secondary to cage extrusion. Three additional revision surgeries were necessitated; (Table V) however, as a group, revision surgery was not a predictor of clinical outcome ($p>0.13$). BMPP were observed in 30.6% of the patients, but its presence had no effect upon clinical outcomes, need for revision surgery, or postoperative health status. As demonstrated on CT, delayed early-fusion was discovered in 8.3% of the cohort; however, all of these patients eventually achieved solid fusion at an average time point of 14.9 months.

The demographic variables of being female ($p<0.03$) and young in age ($p<0.02$) were predictors of superior clinical outcome as measured solely by the SF12-PCS; the significance of these findings is unknown. Also difficult to explain was the failure of litigation (11/36; $p>0.17$), preoperative depression (15/36; $p>0.19$), and prior decompressive surgery (20/36; $p>0.37$) to

predict clinical outcomes, for all of these factors have been previously demonstrated to be negative predictors of clinical outcome following surgery.[48-56]

The significant magnitude of point-improvement achieved by our cohort on all clinical outcome measures is not that extraordinary and has been reported previously.[15] However, the 90% median patient satisfaction score perhaps needs further explanation. We believe that this high level of satisfaction stems from both the strict diagnostic algorithm employed to make the diagnosis of DPS, as well as an extensive patient education effort, during which we make the patient understand that TLIF does not typically afford 100% pain relief, there is a need for lifetime postoperative restrictions, and there is a chance for future adjacent level fusion surgery. In fact, patients with unrealistic expectations are often referred out of the practice.

The notion of the disc as a pain generator is not new and was first described by Crock more than 40 years ago;[27] however, the diagnosis never gained full acceptance within the medical community, secondary perhaps to unanswered questions regarding its pathogenicity. For example, we still do not completely understand why some discs exhibit findings of DPS on imaging (i.e. diminish disc height, endplate sclerosis/erosion or annular tears), yet fail to be symptomatic. There is possibly some yet to be elucidated mechanism and/or agent that, when coupled with the patient's unique biochemistry and/or immune system, ignites the nociceptors within the disc and/or endplates into a chronic inflammatory process, which in turn results in the chronic intractable low back pain of DPS.

While provocative CT discography continues to be the gold standard for making the diagnosis of DPS,[57] the test remains controversial secondary to evidence demonstrating low specificity[58] and the association with long-term patient morbidity.[59] We suggest that discography, although still an

important diagnostic tool, should not be used exclusively to make the diagnosis of DPS. In addition to a history of chronic intractable low back pain, which was refractory to conservative care, at least two additional factors must be met in order to make the diagnosis of DPS: (1) severe intolerance to loading of the spine (especially sitting with vibration), with dramatic relief following offloading; (2) positive discography; (3) failed diagnostic blocks of the facet and/or sacroiliac joints; and/or (4) imaging findings of IDR.

While it is possible that other lumbar fusion techniques may afford results similar to those from our bTLIF investigation,[15] we have been unable to find studies that utilized a homogeneous cohort of DPS patients and the diagnostic algorithm that we employed to support that hypothesis. Perhaps this paper will be the impetus for further investigations from surgeons who employ fusion techniques other than open TLIF.

In addition to the controversy surrounding the diagnosis of DPS, other weaknesses of this investigation included its retrospective design and small cohort (n=36). However, notwithstanding these limitations, we believe that our results make a significant contribution to DPS database and demonstrate that open bTLIF is a reasonable treatment option for DPS and affords high rates of patient satisfaction.

REFERENCES:

1) Fritzell P, Hagg O, Wessberg P, Nordwall A. 2001 Volvo award winner in clinical studies: lumbar fusion versus nonsurgical treatment for chronic low back pain. Spine 2001;26:2521-2534.

2) Carreon LY, Glassman SD, Howard J. Fusion and nonsurgical treatment for symptomatic lumbar degenerative disease: a systematic review of Oswestry Disability Index and MOS Short Form-36 outcomes. Spine J 2008;8:747-755.

3) Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, et al. Surgical compared with nonoperative treatment for lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis: four-your results in the spine patient outcomes research trial (SPORT) randomized and observational cohorts. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2009;91: 1295-1304.

4) Harms JG, Jeszenszky D. The posterior, lumbar, interbody fusion in unilateral transforaminal technique. Oper Orthop Traumatol 1998;10:90-102.

5) Lowe TG, Tahernia AD, O'Brien MF, Smith DA. Unilateral transforaminal posterior lumbar interbody fusion: indications, technique and two years results. J Spineal Disord Tech 2002;15:31-38.

6) Hackenburg L, Halm H, Bullmann V, et al. Transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: a safe technique with satisfactory 3 to 5 year results. Eur Spine J 2005;14:551-558.

7) Humphreys CS, Hodges SD, Patwardhan AG, et al. Comparison of posterior and transforaminal approaches to lumbar interbody fusion. Spine 2001; 26 (5): 567-571.

8) Whitecloud TS 3rd, Roesch WW, Ricciardi JE. Eransforaminal interbody fusion versus anterior-posterior interbody fusion of the lumbar spine: a financial analysis. J Spinal Disord 2001;14:100-103.

9) Lauber S, Schulte TL, Liljenqvist U, Harm H, Hackenberg L. Clinical and radiologic 2-4 year results of transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion in degenerative and isthmic spondylolisthesis grades 1 and 2. Spine 2006;31:1693-1698.

10) Hee HT, Castro FP, Majd ME et al. Anterior/posterior lumbar fusion versus transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: analysis of complications and predictive factors. J Spinal Disord 2001;14: 533-540.

11) Cole CD, McCall TD, Schmidt MH, Dailey AT. Comparison of low back fusion techniques: transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF) or posterior lumbar interbody fusion (PLIF) approaches. Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med 2009;2:118-126.

12) Faundez AA, Schwender JD, Safriel Y, et al. Clinical and radiological outcome of anterior-posterior fusion versus transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for symptomatic disc degeneration: a retrospective comparative study of 133 patients. Eur Spine J 2009;18:203-211.

13) Audat Z, Moutasem O, Yousef K, Mohammad B. Comparison of clinical and radiological results of posterolateral fusion, posterior lumbar interbody fusion, and transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion techniques in the treatment of degenerative lumbar spine. Singapore Med J 2012;53:183-187.

14) Jiang SD, Chen JW, Jiang LS. Which procedure is better for lumbar interbody fusion: anterior lumbar interbody fusion or transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion? Arch Orthoop Trauma Surg 2012;132:1259-1266.

15) Glassman SD, Carreon LY, Djurasovic M, et al. Lumbar fusion outcomes stratified by specific diagnostic indication: 2008 outstanding paper award runner-up. Spine J 2009;9:13-21.

16) Takahashi T, Hanakita J, Minami M, et al. Surgical outcome and postoperative work status of lumbar discogenic pain following transforaminal interbody fusion. Neurol Med Chir (Tokyo) 2011;51:101-107.

17) Carey TS, Garrett JM, Jackman AM. Beyond the good prognosis. Examination of an inception cohort of patients with chronic low back pain. Spine 2000;25:115-120.

18) Rhyne AL, Smith SE, Wood KE, Darden BV. Outcome of unoperated discogram-positive low back pain. Spine 1995;20-1997-2000.

19) Wahlgre DR, Atkinson JH, Epping-Jordan JE, et al. One-year follow-up of first onset low back pain. Pain 1997;73:13-221.

20) Bono CM, Lee CK. The influence of subdiagnosis on radiographic and clinical outcomes after lumbar fusion for degenerative disc disorder: an analysis of the literature from two decades. Spine 2005;30:227-234.

21) Grob D, Humke T. Translaminar screw fixation in the lumbar spine: technique, indications, results. Eur Spine J 1998;7:178-186.

22) Schwab FJ, Nazarian DG, Mahmud F. Effects of spinal instrumentation on fusion of the lumbosacral spine. Spine 1995;20:2023-2028.

23) Flynn JC, Hoque MA. Anterior fusion of the lumbar spine. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1979;61A:1143-1150.

24) Schwarzer AC, Aprill CN, Derby R, Fortin J, Kine G, Bogduk N. The prevalence and clinical features of internal disc disruption in patients with chronic low back pain. Spine 1995;20:1878-1883.

25) De Palma MJ, Ketchum JM, Saullo T. What is the source of chronic low back pain and does age play a role? Pain Med 2011;12:224-233.

26) Manchikanti L, Singh V, Pampati V, et al. Evaluation of the relative contributions of various structures in chronic low back pain. Pain Physician 2001;4:308-316.

27) Crock HV. An appraisal of intervertebral disc lesions. Med J Aust 1970;1:983-989.16 – 17 Mura PP, Costaglioli M, Piredda M, et al. TLIF symptomatic disc degeneration: a retrospective study of 100 patients. Eur Spine J 2011;20:S57-S60.

28) Mura PP, Costaglioli M, Piredda M, et al. TLIF symptomatic disc degeneration: a retrospective study of 100 patients. Eur Spine J 2011;20:S57-S60.

29) Schizas C, Tzinieris N, Tsiridis E, Kosmopoulos V. Minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: evaluating initial experience. Int Orthop 2009;33:1683-1688.

30) Buenaventura RM, Shah RV, Patell V, et al. Systematic review of discography as a diagnostic test for spinal pain: an update. Pain Physician 2007;10:147-164.

31) Wang Y, Videman T, Battie MC. ISSLS prizewinner: lumbar vertebral endplate lesions. Spine 2012;37:1490-1496.

32) Poh SY, Yue WM, Chen LTJ, et al. Two-year outcomes of transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. J Orthop Surg 2011;19:135-140.

33) Zhou Y, Abdi S. Diagnosis and minimally invasive treatment of lumbar discogenic pain: a review of the literature. Clin J Pain 2006;22:468-481.

34) Bogduk N. The lumbar disc in low back pain. Neurosurg Clin N Am 1991;2:791-806.

35) Kuslich SD, Ulstrom CL, Michael CJ. The tissue of origin of low back pain and sciatica. Orthop Clin North Am 1991;22:181-187.

36) Weinstein J, Claverie W, Gibson S. The pain of discography. Spine 1988;13:1344-1348.

37) Peng B, Wu W, Hou S, et al. The pathogenesis of discogenic low back pain. J Bone Joint Surg [Br] 2005;87:62-67.

38) Kapural L, Vrooman B, Sarwar S, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of transdisal radiofrequency, Biacplasty for treatment of discogenic low back pain. Pain Med 2012; [ahead of print].

39) Tsou PM, Yeung AC, Yeung AT. Posterolateral transforaminal selective endoscopic discectomy and thermal annuloplasty for chronic lumbar discogenic pain: a minimal access visualized intradiscal surgical procedure. Spine J 2004;4:564-573.

40) Knox JB, Dai III JM, Orchowski J. Osteolysis in transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion with bone morphogenetic protein-2. Spine 2011;37:672-676.

41) Joseph V, Rampersaud YR. Heterotopic bone formation with the use of rH-BMP-2 in posterior minimal access interbody fusion. Spine 2007;32:2885-2890.

42) Villavicencio AT, Burneikiene S, Nelson L, et al. Safety of transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion and intervertebral recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2. J Neurosurg Spine 2005;3:436-443.

43) Crandall DG, Revella J, Patterson J, et al. Transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion with rH-BMP-2 in spinal deformity, spondylolisthesis, and degenerative disease – Part 1: Large series diagnosis related outcomes and complications with 2-9 year follow-up. Spine 2013; [Epub ahead of print].

44) Carter JD, Swearingen AB, Chaput CD, et al. Clinical and radiographic assessment of transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion using HEALOS collagen-hydroxyapatite sponge and autologous bone marrow aspirate. Spine J 2009;9:434-438.

45) Kong CB, Jeon DW, Chang BS, et al. Outcome of spinal fusion for lumbar degenerative disease. Spine 2010;35:1489-1494.

46) Poh SY, Yue WM, Chen LTJ, et al. Two-year outcomes of transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. J Orthop Surg 2011;19:135-140.

47) Wong DA, Kumar A, Jatana S, et al. Neurologic impairment from ectopic bone and the lumbar canal: a potential complication of off-label PLIF/TLIF use of bone morphogenetic protein-2. Spine J 2008;8:1011-1018.

48) DeBerard MS, LaCaille RA, Spielmans G, et al. Outcomes and presurgery correlates of lumbar discectomy in Utah Workers' Compensation patients. Spine J 2009;9:193-203.

49) LaCaille RA, DeBerard MS, LaCaille LJ, et al. Obesity and litigation predict Workers Compensation costs associated with interbody cage lumbar fusion. Spine J 2007;7:266-272.

50) Klekamp J, McCarty E, Spengler DM. Results of elective lumbar discectomy for patients involved in the Workers Compensation system. J Spinal Disord 1998;11:277-282.

51) Adogwa O, Parker SL, Shau DN, et al. Preoperative Zung Depression Scale predicts outcome after revision lumbar surgery for adjacent segment disease, recurrent stenosis, and pseudoarthrosis. Spine J 2012;12:179-185.

52) Chaichana KL, Mukherjee D, Adogwa O, et al. Correlation of preoperative depression and somatic perceptions scales with postoperative disability and quality of life after lumbar discectomy. J Neurosurg Spine 2011;14:261-267.

53) Sinikallio S, Aalto T, Airaksinen O, et al. Depression is associated with a poorer outcome of lumbar spinal stenosis surgery: a two-year prospective follow-up study. J Neurosurg Spine 2011;14:261-267.

54) Derby R, Howard M, Grant, Joseph M, et al. the ability of pressure-controlled discography to predict surgical and nonsurgical outcomes. Spine 1998;24:364-371.

55) Carragee EJ, Lincoln T, Parmar VS, Alarnin T. A gold standard evaluation of the "discogenic pain" diagnosis is determined by provocative discography. Spine 2006;31:2115-2123.

56) Glassman SD, Minkow RE, Dimar JR , et al. Effect of prior lumbar discectomy on outcome of lumbar fusion: a prospective analysis using SF-36 measure. J Spinal Disord 1998;11:383-388.

57) Walsh TR, Weinstein JN, Spratt KF, et al. Lumbar discography in normal subjects: a controlled, prospective study. J Bone Joint Surg [Am] 1990;72:1081-88.

58) Carragee EJ, Tanner CM, Yang B, et al. False-positive findings unnumbered discography. Reliability of subjective concordance assessment during provocative disc injection. Spine 1999;24:2542-2547.

59) Carragee EJ, Don AS, Hurwitz DC, et al. "2009 ISSLS Winner: does discography cause accelerated progression of degeneration changes in the lumbar disc? A 10-year matched cohort study. Spine 2009; 34:2338-2345.

Table I: Patient Demographics		
Demographics:	**Mean**	**Range**
Age	43.9	26.7—66.5
Height	69 ins.	61—79 ins.
Weight	166.7 Lbs.	115—230 Lbs.
BMI	24.6 Kg/m^2	19.1—33.0 Kg/m^2

Table II: Patient Demographics & Preoperative Medical Conditions	
Demographics:	
Males	61.1% (n=22)
Females	38.9% (n=14)
Smoking History	52.8% (n= 19)
Previous Surgery	30.9% (n= 14)
Litigation	30.6% (n= 11)
Low back pain only	13.9% (n=5)
Depression	41.7% (n= 15)

Table III: Job Categorization (n=32)

Heavy Pre-Op Jobs (n=7)	Return to Work Score	Light Pre-Op Jobs (n=25)	Return to Work Score
General contractor (n=1)	4	Physician assistant	4
Mason (n=1)	1	Security guard	0
Ski patrol (n=1)	2	Architect	4
Landscaper (n=2)	4, 4	College professor	4
Labor/construction (n=1)	1	Firefighting management (n=2)	4, 0
Law Enforcement (n=1)	4	Account executive	4
		Light-duty truck driver	1
		Administrative/desk work (n=2)	4, 4
		Construction management	4
		Catering management	4
		Real estate agent/broker	4
		Property management (n=2)	3, 2
		City administrations	4
		Office equipment service tech	0
		Film industry (props)	0
		Golf operations	4
		Interior designer	3
		Computer technician	4
		Medical technologist	2

		Teacher	4
		Bookkeeper	0
		Flight attendant	4

Table IV: Demographics Effect on Clinical Outcome

Variable	n=	ODI	SF-12 (pcs)	NRS - LBP	Statistical test
		p-value	*p-value*	*p-value*	
Age* (Younger age = better improvement.)	36	0.47	**0.02***	0.86	2-tailed T-test & Pearson Correlation
Sex* (Female=better improvement.)	36	0.16	**0.03***	0.13	2-tailed t-test, 2-tailed t-test, & 2-tailed t-test
Smoking History	19	0.43	0.83	0.73	2-tailed t-test, Welch's test, & 2-tailed t-test
BMI*	36	0.81	0.91	0.88	2-tailed T-test & Pearson Correlation
Compensation	11	0.28	0.17	0.65	2-tailed t-test, 2-tailed t-test, & 2-tailed t-test
Depression	15	0.19	0.44	0.76	2-tailed t-test, 2-tailed t-test, & 2-tailed t-test
Previous Surgery	14	0.37	0.70	0.87	Welch's test, 2-tailed t-test & 2-tailed t-test
Back Pain Only	5	0.55	0.87	0.79	2-tailed t-test, 2-tailed t-test, & 2-tailed t-test

* Statistically significant positive influence on clinical outcome.
▫ $r = -0.402$
Total cohort = 36

Revision Surgeries

Table V	Revision Surgery Data							
Case	Gender (age in years)	BMI (kg/m^2)	Smoking history	Index Procedure	Revision Procedures	Elapsed time (months)	Pt. Improvement on the ODI, SF12-PCS, and the bNRS. (Group Average)	Notes
#1	Male (30.0)	22.53	No	L5/S1 TLIF	Hardware removal	20.9	-9.0 (17.7) -4.9 (9.8) 0.0 (2.4)	*The patient had continued low back pain for which hardware removal was completed.
#2	Female (56.7)	25.01	No	L3/L4 TLIF	(1) Adjacent level Discectomy (2) Same Adjacent level TLIF for collapse & recurrent HNP	3.9 & 9.4	-8.0 (17.7) 6.7 (9.8) 2.0 (2.4)	*4 months after index procedure, HNP occurred in right IVF at the inferior adjacent level. After failed microdiscectomy, TLIF was performed for recurrent herniation and foraminal collapse.
#3)	Female (27.2)	21.7	Yes	L5/S1 TLIF	Hardware removal	16.1	22.0 (17.7) 30.9 (9.8) 3.0 (2.4)	*After one year of pain relief, patient developed low back pain secondary to barometric change; instrumentation removal was completed as a treatment intervention.
#4)	Female (34.2)	26.6	Yes	L5/S1 TLIF	(1) Decompression for cage extrusion (2) 2nd Decompression &	2 & 15.9	20.0 (17.7) 14.0 (9.8) 2.0 (2.4)	*2 months after the index procedure, decompressive revision surgery was necessitated secondary to a cage extrusion and bone spur into the IVF.

					instrumentation removal			15.9 months status post, a second decompressive surgery, with instrumentation removal, was necessitated for scar tissue and bone spur removal secondary to continued complaints of radiculitis.
	Average: 37.0	Average: 24.0				Average: 11.4	Group Averages: 21.0 (17.7) 22.5 (9.8) 2.5 (2.4) P values: 0.78, 0.14, 0.95	

Table VI: Clinical Improvement at Follow-Up

Outcome Instrument	Preop Mean Score	Postop Mean Score	Point Change (improvement)	Percent Change	p-Value
ODI	37.8	21.4	**16.4**	42.1	< 0.01
SF-12 (PCS)	34.9	44.9	**10.0**	33.3	< 0.01
SF-12 (MCS)	45.9	50.5	**4.6**	16.8	0.018
NRS for LBP	4.9	2.6	**2.3**	42.8	< 0.01

Table VII:	**Degree of Return to Work Status-Post TLIF**	
Degree of Return to Pre-Op Job	**N = 32 (32/36)* Heavy Work (H) n=7 Light Work (L) n=25**	**Total Relative Frequency of Both Groups**
Not at All (0)	5 (0H, 5L)	15.6% (5/32)
< Somewhat (1)	3 (2H, 1L)	9.4% (3/32)
Somewhat (2)	3 (1H, 2L)	9.4% (3/32)
< Completely (3)	2 (0H, 3L)	9.4% (3/32)
Completely (4)	19 (4H, 15L)	59.4% (19/32)
* Four (4/36) patients did not participate, for they were either retired (n=1), homemakers (n=1) or failed to complete the questionnaire (n=2).		