Clinical Outcomes after Microdiscectomy for Recurrent Lumbar Disk Herniation: A Single-center Study

Abstract

Objectives: Revision discectomy is the principal procedure for recurrent lumbar disk herniation (RLDH). The clinical outcomes after this procedure are as good as or slightly poorer than those produced by primary discectomy. In this study, the clinical outcomes of patients treated with microsurgical discectomy for RLDH were analyzed.

Methods: We examined 179 patients undergoing lumbar microdiscectomy surgery for RLDH. The visual analogue scale (VAS), Prolo scoring system, and Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) were used for evaluating the improvement of symptoms and functional outcomes.

Results: Among 179 patients, 101 (56%) obtained good and excellent Prolo scores (group 1), while 78 (44%) obtained fair or poor results (group 2). There was no significant difference between the groups regarding age, gender, body mass index, diabetes mellitus, smoking, interval between primary and revision surgeries, and surgical outcomes. However, significant improvements were achieved in VAS scores for back and radicular pain, as well as ODI scores. Based on the

findings, only ODI scores showed a significant inter-group difference in the 12-month follow-up.

Conclusion: Limited microsurgical discectomy could be considered as the main surgical method in patients with RLDH without overt instabilities.

Keyword:

Recurrence, disc herniation, lumbar, outcome assessment, revision surgery

Introduction

Researchers have proposed different definitions for recurrent lumbar disk herniation (RLDH). The usual definition is disk reherniation at the same level after surgery with same or contralateral side pathology , causing radiculopathy after a minimum of 6 months without any complaints of pain (1, 2); however, this period is controversial (3). The incidence of RLDH is estimated to be 5–18% according to the follow-up duration (4-6). Surgical treatment is indicated in patients with continuous and severe pain, resistant to conservative treatment or cases with motor deficiencies (7).

Revision discectomy is the main therapeutic approach for RLDH. The clinical outcomes after this procedure are slightly poorer or as good as

(8) those after primary discectomy (9). In this cohort study, the clinical outcomes of patients treated with microsurgical discectomy for RLDH were retrospectively analyzed, and determinants of the outcomes were evaluated.

Patients and Methods

In this study, the clinical and radiological data of patients undergoing revision microdiscectomy for single-level RLDH were evaluated between March 2006 and August 2015. The consent forms were obtained from the subjects prior to the operation.

Among 208 patients undergoing microsurgical discectomy for RLDH, 179 (86%) were followed-up for at least 1 year. The senior author conducted all the procedures, using a microscopic technique, consisting of interlaminar fenestration extension, as needed and limited herniotomy.

Decision for surgery was made in accordance with the clinical presentation of sphincter dysfunction, significant motor impairment, low back pain and radicular pain with lack of response to medical treatment owing to RLDH at the same level, as indicated in the lumbosacral magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) after a minimum of 6

months (without any complaintsdiagnostic imaging modality for LRDH in all patients; the results ruled out other probable causes such as fibrosis.

All the patients underwent dynamic radiographic evaluations, using posterolateral and lateral lumbosacral views (neutral, flexion, and extension) to exclude any transitional or rotational instability. The exclusion criteria were as follows: 1) age < 18 years; 2) more than one recurrence; 3) early recurrence (less than 6 months); 4) lumbar disk herniation at another level; 5) evidence of lateral stenosis or significant epidural fibrosis; 6) evidence of instability on imaging before revision surgery; and 7) undergoing primary surgery by a surgeon other than the senior author.

To evaluate back and leg pain, the visual analogue scale (VAS) was applied to determine the severity of symptoms before and after primary revision surgeries, Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) (10) and the Prolo scoring system (11) was used to evaluate the perioperative functional outcomes. Improvements in VAS and ODI scores was determined by measuring the difference in scores before and after revision surgery and after the follow-up (12 months). The participants were classified into four categories in the Prolo scoring system: poor (2-4), moderate

(5-6), good (7-8), and excellent (9-10). Excellent and good categories were considered as group 1 (successful), while fair and poor categories were classified as group 2 (failure).

Instability of the lumbosacral region on dynamic radiography was evaluated as described by Mullin et al. (12). Based on the criteria introduced by Grogan and colleagues, the facet joint degeneration was examined on MRI images (13). Chi square and unpaired student *t* test were performed, using SPSS 16(IBM Corp, Armonk, New York, USA). The significance level was 0.05.

Results

Among 179 patients, 103 (57.5%) were male and 76 (42.5%) were female (mean age, 51.39 years; range, 34-69 years). The mean interval between the primary and revision surgeries was 28.45±17.80 months (range, 74 months). Fifty-four (30%) patients were smokers, and 25 (14%) had diabetes mellitus (DM). Fifteen (8.3%) patients underwent accidental durotomy without any major complications after revision surgery (such as cerebrospinal fluid leak or infection). The RLDH level was L4–L5 in 105 (58.7%), L5–S1 in 59 (33.0%), and L3–L4 in 15 (8.4%) patients.

According to VAS and ODI scores, none of the subjects showed any signs of deterioration after revision surgery. According to the Prolo scoring system, 101 (56%) patients attained excellent or good results (group 1), while 78 (44%) attained fair or poor results (group 2). Additionally, we investigated age, gender, smoking, body mass index (BMI), diabetes mellitus (DM), and interval between primary and revision surgeries. These variables showed no significant difference in the outcomes (Table 1). Based on the VAS scores, back pain and radicular pain significantly decreased to 5.25±1.70 and 5.25±1.12 after revision surgery, respectively; also, ODI scores decreased to 45.04±19.97 in all patients (Table 2). In the follow-up, the groups were significantly different regarding ODI scores (P=0.038).

The association of radiological characteristics and functional outcomes is presented in Table 3.There were no significant difference between functional outcomes of two groups in respect to the facet hypertrophy and modic changes (P>0.05).

Discussion

This study assessed patients who underwent microsurgical discectomy for RLDH at the same level. We aimed to evaluate the clinical results

and the probable determinants with respect to Prolo scores and changes in ODI and VAS scores. Although open standard discectomy, microsurgical or endoscopic discectomy, and discectomy with fusion are the accepted treatment methods for RLDH after failure of medical treatment or significant neurological deficits, the optimal management strategy remains controversial (14).

In recent years, researchers have introduced less invasive strategies for the surgical treatment of RLDH (15-17). In patients without overt clinical and radiological evidence of instability, microsurgical discectomy can be considered as an acceptable technique for RLDH. In this study, 56% of patients obtained excellent or good results, while 44% had fair or poor outcomes. Compared with the outcomes of those who had undergone revision surgery for the first time, the outcomes of our patients were compatible with those reported by Buchmann et al. (good and excellent outcomes, 55%) (7), Ibramin et al. (18), and Baba et al. (good and excellent outcomes, 64%) (15). However, Gue et al. (19) and Ozgen et al. (20) reported more successful results (70% and 80%, respectively) than the present study.

In our study, improvement in back and leg VAS scores was significant, with postoperative scores of 1.9 and 1.69, respectively. A few studies

have reported changes in VAS or ODI scores after revision surgery. In our review, the improvement in VAS scores was better than the results of other open revision surgeries (7, 21, 22). However, it was similar to that of endoscopic or microsurgical lumbar discectomy (as a surgical method for revision surgery with limited discectomy) (3, 22).

This study demonstrated that limited microscopic discectomy without aggressive curettage of disk space showed greater improvement in postoperative pain. As some researchers have shown, radical discectomy can augment the severity of postoperative back pain by inducing hypermobility at the involved level (2, 7, 23).

In clinical practice, fixation of the involved level is mostly considered in the treatment of second or third RLDH, while some scholars believe that stabilization is an acceptable method after first-time RLDH to reduce the severity of back pain after revision surgery (23).Nevertheless, Guan et al. demonstrated that pain reduction and functional outcomes were similar in patients with first-time RLDH, who underwent repeated discectomy or instrumentation with discectomy (17). These findings are similar to those reported in some previous studies, especially for back pain improvement (3, 24). Our review showed that microsurgical discectomy produced favorable

outcomes in most patients with first-time RLDH, who had no overt instability in the preoperative evaluation. Therefore, we do not recommend instrumentation for the first revision surgery.

One of the limitations of the present study was the retrospective design, with no consideration of other outcome rating systems (such as SF-36 or Japanese Orthopedic Association scoring system). Also, patients' occupation, workers' compensation claims, and psychosocial status might have negatively affected the functional outcomes after surgery.

Conclusion

This retrospective study demonstrated that limited microsurgical discectomy could be considered as the main surgical method in patients with RLDH without overt instability. Although satisfactory outcomes could be achieved in most patients, the outcomes are less favorable than primary discectomy.

References

1. Suk K-S, Lee H-M, Moon S-H, Kim N-H. Recurrent lumbar disc herniation: results of operative management. Spine. 2001;26(6):672-6.

2. Dai LY, Zhou Q, Yao WF, Shen L. Recurrent lumbar disc herniation after discectomy: outcome of repeat discectomy. Surg Neurol. 2005;64(3):226-31; discussion 31.

3. Dower A, Chatterji R, Swart A, Winder MJ. Surgical management of recurrent lumbar disc herniation and the role of fusion. Journal of Clinical Neuroscience. 2016;23:44-50.

4. Law JD, Lehman RA, Kirsch WM. Reoperation after lumbar intervertebral disc surgery. Journal of neurosurgery. 1978;48(2):259-63.

5. Ebeling U, Kalbarcyk H, Reulen H. Microsurgical reoperation following lumbar disc surgery: timing, surgical findings, and outcome in 92 patients. Journal of neurosurgery. 1989;70(3):397-404.

6. Gaston P, Marshall R. Survival analysis is a better estimate of recurrent disc herniation. Bone & Joint Journal. 2003;85(4):535-7.

7. Buchmann N, Preuß A, Gempt J, Ryang Y-M, Vazan M, Stoffel M, et al. Outcome after Surgical Treatment for Late Recurrent Lumbar Disc Herniations in Standard Open Microsurgery. World neurosurgery. 2016;89:382-6.

8. Palma L, Carangelo B, Muzii VF, Mariottini A, Zalaffi A, Capitani S. Microsurgery for recurrent lumbar disk herniation at the same level and side: do patients fare worse? Experience with 95 consecutive cases. Surgical neurology. 2008;70(6):619-21.

9. Patel M, Braybrooke J, Newey M, Sell P. A comparative study of the outcomes of primary and revision lumbar discectomy surgery. Bone Joint J. 2013;95(1):90-4.

10. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry disability index. Spine. 2000;25(22):2940-53.

11. Vanti C, Prosperi D, Boschi M. The Prolo Scale: history, evolution and psychometric properties. Journal of orthopaedics and traumatology. 2013;14(4):235-45.

12. Mullin BB, Rea GL, Irsik R, Catton M, Miner ME. The effect of postlaminectomy spinal instability on the outcome of lumbar spinal

stenosis patients. Journal of Spinal Disorders & Techniques. 1996;9(2):107-16.

13. Grogan J, Nowicki BH, Schmidt TA, Haughton VM. Lumbar facet joint tropism does not accelerate degeneration of the facet joints. American journal of neuroradiology. 1997;18(7):1325-9.

14. Mroz TE, Lubelski D, Williams SK, O'Rourke C, Obuchowski NA, Wang JC, et al. Differences in the surgical treatment of recurrent lumbar disc herniation among spine surgeons in the United States. The Spine Journal. 2014;14(10):2334-43.

15. Baba H, Chen Q, Kamitani K, Imura S, Tomita K. Revision surgery for lumbar disc herniation. International orthopaedics. 1995;19(2):98-102.

16. Fu T-S, Lai P-L, Tsai T-T, Niu C-C, Chen L-H, Chen W-J. Long-term results of disc excision for recurrent lumbar disc herniation with or without posterolateral fusion. Spine. 2005;30(24):2830-4.

17. Guan J, Ravindra VM, Schmidt MH, Dailey AT, Hood RS, Bisson EF. Comparing clinical outcomes of repeat discectomy versus fusion for recurrent disc herniation utilizing the N2QOD. Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine. 2017;26(1):39-44.

18. Ibrahim M, Arockiaraj J, Amritanand R, Venkatesh K, David KS. Recurrent Lumbar Disc Herniation: Results of Revision Surgery and Assessment of Factors that May Affect the Outcome. A Non-Concurrent Prospective Study. Asian spine journal. 2015;9(5):728-36.

19. Guo JJ, Yang H, Tang T. Long-term outcomes of the revision open lumbar discectomy by fenestration: A follow-up study of more than 10 years. International orthopaedics. 2009;33(5):1341-5.

20. Ozgen S, Naderi S, Ozek MM, Pamir MN. Findings and outcome of revision lumbar disc surgery. Clinical Spine Surgery. 1999;12(4):287-92.

21. Wera GD, Marcus RE, Ghanayem AJ, Bohlman HH. Failure within one year following subtotal lumbar discectomy. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2008;90(1):10-5.

22. Lee DY, Shim CS, Ahn Y, Choi Y-G, Kim HJ, Lee S-H. Comparison of percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy and open lumbar microdiscectomy for recurrent disc herniation. Journal of Korean Neurosurgical Society. 2009;46(6):515-21.

23. McGirt MJ, Ambrossi GLG, Datoo G, Sciubba DM, Witham TF, Wolinsky J-P, et al. Recurrent disc herniation and long- term back pain after primary lumbar discectomy: review of outcomes reported for

limited versus aggressive disc removal. Neurosurgery. 2009;64(2):338-45.

24. El Shazly AA, El Wardany MA, Morsi AM. Recurrent lumbar disc herniation: A prospective comparative study of three surgical management procedures. Asian journal of neurosurgery. 2013;8(3):139.