



Management of Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Retrospective Analysis of the Contribution of Minimally Invasive Surgery Toto Lumbar Spondylolisthesis

**M.A. Daraabou ^{a*}, A.Regragui ^a, M.Jaafar ^a, M.Hemama ^a,
N.El Fatemi ^a and M.R. El Maaqili ^a**

^a Neurosurgery Department, CHU IBN SINA Rabat, Mohammed V University of Rabat, Morocco.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/119969>

Original Research Article

Received: 17/05/2024

Accepted: 20/07/2024

Published: 17/10/2024

ABSTRACT

Objective: The objective of our study consists of studying the contribution of minimally invasive surgery for lumbar spondylolisthesis in patients treated in the neurosurgery department of the Ibn Sina University Hospital in the city of Rabat during a period of 8 years.
Summary of Background Data. The past two decades have witnessed a surge in minimally invasive spine surgery, mirroring advancements in other surgical disciplines. These techniques prioritize minimizing muscle damage compared to traditional approaches, thereby aiming to reduce

*Corresponding author: E-mail: docmehdiakka@gmail.com;

Cite as: Daraabou, M.A., A.Regragui, M.Jaafar, M.Hemama, N.El Fatemi, and M.R. El Maaqili. 2024. "Management of Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Retrospective Analysis of the Contribution of Minimally Invasive Surgery Toto Lumbar Spondylolisthesis". *Asian Journal of Research in Surgery* 7 (2):368-74. <https://journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/article/view/232>.

complications associated with surgery. This study reviews the value of these approaches in the treatment of spondylolisthesis.

Study Design: Retrospective cohort study, January 2016 to January 2024.

Methodology: A retrospective analysis of 29 patients who underwent interbody fusion for lumbar stenosis using minimally invasive (MI) TLIF was performed. Patients were monitored by the Visual Analog Score (VAS), Meyrding score, and average percentage gain. The results of recently published series are reported.

Results: The average age of patients is 54 years, with extremes of 34 and 70 years. sex ratio of 6.25.

The clinical picture was dominated by low back pain in 61% as well as radiculalgia reported in 81.7%, intermittent claudication in 26.8%, deficit in 15.4%, and sphincter disorder in 3.4%.

In our series, the predominant location of spondylolisthesis was at the level of L4-L5 in 46% of patients and L5-S-SS1 in 42%. All patients benefited from prior medical treatment for failure. In 61.5% of patients, the failure of medical and orthopedic treatment was the indication for surgery. Surgical treatment was required in all patients in our study, using the minimally invasive transforaminal interbody fusion method. Clinically, 62% of our patients have very good progress, 26% have good progress, and 4% have average progress. Neurological recovery was required in all our patients who had previously presented a neurological deficit. The average percentage of gains in the patients included in our study is 65%, ranging from 6.6% to 100%.

Conclusion: Our study has shown the significant benefit of minimally invasive spondylolisthesis surgery carried out by well-trained practitioners. The treatment always begins with medical and orthopedic treatment, but depending on the evolution of the disease, we often resort to surgical treatment.

Minimally invasive surgery concretely meets the required objectives, in particular the reduction of the risk of hemorrhage and infection, rapid postoperative recovery, and the preservation of the muscles.

Keywords: Lumbar stenosis; minimally invasive spine surgery; transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion; spondylolisthesis; transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion.

1. INTRODUCTION

Degenerative spondylolisthesis (DS) is a disorder that causes the slip of one vertebral body over the one below due to degenerative changes [1,2]. It differs from spondylolytic thesis by the absence of a pars interarticularis defect (spondylolysis), i.e., in DS, the whole upper vertebra (vertebral body and posterior part of the vertebra, including neural arch and processes) slips relative to the lower vertebra [3,4]. Both DS and spondylolytic thesis are commonly seen as incidental findings in asymptomatic patients [5].

2. For2. For grading SL, Meyerding's classification of slippage is most commonly used (I: 25%, II: 26%–50%, III: 51%–75%, IV: 76%–100%, V: >100% SL). While Grade I patients with Grade II SL are treated conservatively, Grade III and above are candidates for surgery. This necessity is apparent in patients with instability. There is yet again a conundrum about the treatment modality similar to lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) [6-8]. However, unstable lumbar spondylolisthesis (ULS) usually

requires decompression and fusion. This approach has been further strengthened by combining posterior fusion with interbody fusion, which resulted in higher fusion rates, higher correction rates of deformity, stability of the correction, and improved clinical outcomes [9-12].

TLIF. The most widely used techniques for lumbar interbody fusion due to their excellent clinical results and fusion rates are PLIF and TLIF [13]. In this paper, we have retrospectively analyzed the results of patients treated by MI-TLIF. 2

4. Posterior lumbar interbody fusion (PLIF), (PLIF), first described by Cloward in the 1940s using autologous bone grafts, was the staple diet for spondylolisthesis of all kinds; this was followed by the introduction of the TLIF technique, described initially by Harms. 4 A well-functioning Bovie, Cobb's elevators, and self-retaining retractors have been the foundation for gratifying exposure since the inception of spine surgery [14,15]. Advancing technology and

the tireless enthusiasm of spine surgeons have replaced this armamentarium with new, less invasive and highly sophisticated tools. tools. 4

2. METHODOLOGY

A retrospective analysis of 29 patients who underwent interbody fusion for lumbar stenosis using minimally invasive (MI) TLIF was performed. Patients were monitored by the by the Visual Analog Score (VAS), Meyrding score, and average percentage gain. The results of recently published series are reported.

3. RESULTS

The average age of patients is 54 years, with extremes of 34 and 70 years. years. sex ratio of 6.25.

The clinical picture was dominated by low back pain in 61% as well as radiculalgia reported in 81.7%, intermittent claudication in 26.8%, in 26.8%, deficit indeficit in 15.4%, and 15.4%, and sphincter disorder in disorder in 3.4%.

Based on the Meyerding classification, we note that 57.7% of the population studied had an SPL grade I, 23.1% had a grade II,II, and 3.8% had a grade III.

No patient presented with grade IV or V SPL.

In our series, we note a predominance of ante-lis thesis with a rate of 57.9%; on the other hand, retrolisthesis is found in 42.1%.

69% of patients (20 patients) had isthmic lysis, and 31% of 31% of patients (9 patients) had degenerative spondylolisthesis.

In our series, the predominant location of spondylolisthesis was at the level of L4-L5 in 46% of patients and L5-S-SS1 in 42%.

All patients benefited from prior medical treatment with failure.

In 61.5% of patients, the failure of medical and orthopedic treatment was the indication for surgery.

Surgical treatment was required in all patients in our study, using the minimally invasive transforaminal interbody fusion method.

In the 5 post-operative days, the intensity of the pain was: zero for 61% of patients estimated at 1

in 33.5% of patients. patients. -Infection: No infectious complications were noted.

Bleeding: Our study did not note any significant intra- and post-operative bleeding.

Medium-term development: Clinically, 62% of our patients have made very good progress with the disappearance of symptoms and functional impotence., and 26% have made good progress (no functional impotence with low intermittent pain). and 4% is average progress.

Neurological recovery was required in all our patients who had previously presented a neurological deficit.

The average percentage of gains in the patients included in our study is 65%, ranging from 6.6% to 100%.

The majority (65.4%) have a recovery of 5 to 19 mm.

Patients aged between 30 and 39 years old were able to have a recovery of 15 to 19 mm, while the majority of patients between 40 and 69 years old, as well as those between 70 and 79 years old, had a recovery of 5 to 9 mm.

For patients with a slip of 5 to 9 mm, the majority gained between 0 and 4 mm.

Whereas for patients with a slip of 10 to 14 mm, the gain was mainly between 5 and 9 mm.

For patients with a slip of 15 to 19 mm, the majority recovered between 10 and 14 mm.

4. DISCUSSION

This study showed that the average age of our patients at the time of the intervention was 54.3 years. We noted through the analysis of our results that they agree with the literature data illustrated in Table 1.

After 50 years of age, both women and men begin to develop DS, with women having a faster rate of development than men. For elderly Chinese (65 years, mean age: 72.5 years).

The male/female ratio was 1/5. This is consistent with the majority of studies [5].

The existing data also suggest that menopause may be a contributing factor to the accelerated development of spondylolisthesis in post-menopausal women.

Table 1. Average age of patients at the time of the intervention

Etude	Age moyen
Yasuchika Aoki 2020 [16]	64.4
Michael Karsy 2020 [17]	50.3
Zoher Ghogawala 2016 [18]	67
(David H. Ge 2018)	56.5
(Yang2015)	44.6
Baoshan Xu 2020 [19]	66
Ivar M. Austevoll 2021 [20]	66
(Bounnit 2018)	60
Notre série	54.3

Low back pain is the most common initial sign and constitutes the main reason for consultation (HENSIGER, 2007).

Radiculalgia was reported by 81.7% of our patients. Ivar M. Austevoll 2021: 75% This could be explained by the absence of early conservative treatment due to the delay in consultation.

Based on the Meyerding classification, we note that 57.7% of the population studied had an SPL grade I, 23.1% had a grade II, and 3.8% had a grade III. It should be noted that the results of the different radiological examinations may differ depending on the cooperation of the patient and the good control of the examiner.

According to Daniel Son et al. [21], a slight variation in the positioning of the patient or in the inclination of the gantry can lead to a variation of

10 to 15% in the amplitude of the vertebral movement. Patient positioning and the direction of the X-ray beam must be precise to enable optimal measurement [13].

We note that the L4-L5 location is the most frequent in almost all studies, which supports our results [21,22].

Therapeutic management of spondylolisthesis includes a medical, orthopedic, and surgical component [23].

Some studies have shown that glucocorticoid infiltrations only offer short-term effectiveness in relieving symptoms, with long-term failure, which is consistent with Kraiwattanapong et al. [24].

Bell et al. [25] studied a group of symptomatic patients who wore an orthosis for almost two years, coupled with physical therapy. During this study, an improvement in symptoms and the absence of progression of slippage in all patients were noted.

The study by Steiner and Micheli [26], which focused on the installation of a splint for 6 months, showed that 78% of patients had an excellent result.

Surgical treatment was required in all patients in our study, using the minimally invasive transforaminal interbody fusion method. The aim was, above all, to eliminate the painful symptoms and the neurological deficit.

Table 2. Comparative table of complications linked to SPL surgical techniques

Étude	Technique	Complications			
		Douleurs	Infections	Transfusion	Autres
(Kirby 2018)	PLF	10.4%	6%		Fuite de LCR (1.4%) Pseudarthrose (0.7%)
(Oikonomidis 2019)	PLIF/TLIF		9.6%	4.8%	Chirurgie de révision pour déplacement de vis (1.6%)
(Turcotte 2018)		9.5%	1.5%	8.9%	Embolie pulmonaire (0.7%) TVP (1.2%)
(Pui Yin Cheung 2016)		29,8%			Instabilité radiologique (7.8%)
(P. Ver 2018)		20%			Déficit neurologique (24.8%)
(Urquhart 2018)		15.9%	10.3%		Fuite de LCR (4.6%)
(Tamburrelli 2018)	Mini-TLIF	14.22%	0%	0%	0%
Notre étude	Mini-TLIF	30%	0%	0%	

Comparative studies between minimally invasive surgery (Mis TLIF) and conventional surgery have been carried out by Wang et al. [27] in 2010, whose results raised advantages for the minimally invasive technique with regard to postoperative pain and hospital stay; and Goldstein et al. [28]. The minimally invasive technique presents less postoperative pain, less blood loss, as well as a reduction in the length of hospitalization and the risk of postoperative infection, while the rate of intraoperative complications was close, as were the functional results.

Literature data have shown that the development of interventional radiology, specialized instrumentation, and minimally invasive fusion techniques has theoretically allowed surgeons to perform fusions with a reduction in iatrogenic injury, hemorrhage, and duration. hospitalization [29,30].

The comparative state of the different complications according to the different techniques with Mini TLIF carried out in our patients and those of Tamburrelli show that there is a clear reduction in the aforementioned complications compared to other techniques, which justifies the interest of Mini TLIF in the management of spondylolisthesis. This data is shown in Table 2.

Clinically, 62% of our patients have very good progress, 26% have good progress, and 4% have average progress.

Neurological recovery was required in all our patients who had previously presented a neurological deficit.

In view of the functional results observed in comparison with the data in the literature, we deduce that the complete reduction of slippage should not constitute the main objective of the treatment but that the main objective must be the restoration of the adapted segmental lordosis to the morphotype [31,32,33].

5. CONCLUSION

Our study has highlighted the significant interest in minimally invasive spondylolisthesis surgery performed by well-trained practitioners.

Treatment always begins with medical and orthopedic treatment, but depending on the progression of the disease, surgical treatment is often used. The determining factor in determining the indication for surgery is the failure of medical

and orthopedic treatment and the persistence or even worsening of the symptoms.

Minimally invasive surgery concretely meets the required objectives, in particular the reduction of the risk of hemorrhage and infection, rapid postoperative recovery, and the preservation of the muscles.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

CONSENT

As per international standards or university standards, patient(s) written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

ETHICAL APPROVAL

As per international standards or university standards written ethical approval has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Minimally invasive arthrodesis in the surgical treatment of degenerative spinal pathologies; A. Lubansu Department of Neurosurgery, Erasm Hospital; 2009. DOI:10.1016/j.neuchi.12.002
2. Daniel Encarnacion-Santos, Renat Nurmukhametov, Medet Donasov, Alexander Volovich. Management of lumbar spondylolisthesis: A retrospective analysis of posterior lumbar interbody fusion versus transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion; 2024. DOI: 10.4103/jcvjs.jcvjs_74_23
3. Paul G Matz, RJ Meagher. Guideline summary review: An evidence-based clinical guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis; 2015. DOI:http://dx.doi.org/doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.11.055
4. Arvind Gopalrao Kulkarni, Shrikant S. Management of spondylolisthesis using MIS techniques: Recent advances; 2020.

- Available:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcot.2020.07.015>
5. Yi Xiang J. Wang, Zolt'an K'apl. Lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis epidemiology: A systematic review with a focus on gender-specific and age-specific prevalence; 2016. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jot.11.001>
 6. Bell DF, Ehrlich MG, Zaleske DJ. Brace treatment for symptomatic spondylolisthesis. *s.l. : Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1988;236:192–8.
 7. Demir-Deviren S, Ozcan-Eksi EE, Sencan S, Cil H, Berven S. Comprehensive non-surgical treatment decreased the need for spine surgery in patients with spondylolisthesis: Three-year results. *Journal of Back and Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation.* 2019;1–6. DOI:10.3233/bmr-181185.
 8. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, Hanscom B, Tosteson AN et al. Surgical versus nonsurgical treatment for lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. *New Engl J Med.* 2007;356(22):2257-70. PMID: 17538085.
 9. Spiker WR, Goz V, Brodke DS. Lumbar interbody fusions for degenerative spondylolisthesis: review of techniques, indications, and outcomes. *Global Spine J.* 2019;9:77-84.
 10. Vidal J, TH Marnay. Morphology and antero-posterior body balance in L5/S1 spondylolisthesis. *Rev. Chir. orthop.* 1983; (69):17–29.
 11. Roland M, Fairbank J. The Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire and the Oswestry Disability Questionnaire. *Spine.* 2000, Dec 15;25(24):3115-24.
 12. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB, The oswestry disability index. *Spine* 2000;25(22):2940-2952.
 13. Aladine A. Elsamadicy, Isaac G. Freedman, Andrew B. Koo, Wyatt David, Astrid C. Hengartner, John Havlik, Benjam. Patient- and hospital-related risk factors for non-routine discharge after lumbar decompression and fusion for spondylolisthesis.; 2021.
 14. Denard PJ, Holton KF, Miller J, Fink HA, Kado DM. The oswestry disability index. *Spine* 2000; 25(22):2940-2952.
 15. Marshall LM, et al. Osteoporotic Fractures in Men (MrOS);2005.
 16. Yasuchika Aoki, Hiroshi takahashi, Arata nakajima, Go Kubota, Atsuya Watanabe, takayuki nakajima, Yawara eguchi, Sumihisa orita, Hiroy. prevalence of lumbar spondylolysis and spondylolisthesis in patients with degenerative spinal disease; 2020.
 17. Michael Karsy, Andrew K Chan, Praveen V Mummaneni. Outcomes and complications with age in spondylolisthesis an evaluation of the elderly from the quality outcomes database; 2020.
 18. Zoher Ghogawala, James Dziura, William E. Butler. Aminectomy plus Fusion versus Laminectomy Alone for Lumbar Spondylolisthesis; 2016.
 19. Baoshan Xu, MD, PhD, Haiwei Xu, MD, Hao Zhang. Interbody fusion and percutaneous reduction for lumbar spondylolisthesis with mobile microendoscopic discectomy technique; 2020.
 20. Ivar M Austevoll, Erland Hermansen. Decompression with or without Fusion in Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis; 2021.
 21. Adult spondylolisthesis. Duquesnoy Bernard, *sl Rheumatological Reflections.*1999;19.
 22. Beija I, Najet A, Mohamed Y. Pelvic morphology and Spondylolisthesis, comparative radiological study, collective of authors. *Tunisia Medical year.* 2005;3:341-343.
 23. Omidi-Kashani F, Hassankhani EG, Shiravani R, Mirkazemi M. Surgical outcome of reduction and instrumented fusion in lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. *Iran J Med Sci.* 2016, January;41(1).
 24. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, Hanscom B, Tosteson AN, et al. Surgical versus nonsurgical treatment for lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. *New Engl J Med;* 2007.
 25. *The Lumbar Spine Auteur, Harry N Herkowitz, Jiri Dvorak, Gordon R Bell, Margareta Nordin, Dieter Grob et al; Tous les auteurs Éditeur: Philadelphia : Lippincott Williams & Wilkins;* 2004.
 26. Pedra M, Dupuy R, Vital JM. Degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, EMC. 15-835-B-10.
 27. Kraiwattanapong C, Wechmongkolgorn S, Chatriyanuyok B, Woratanarat P, Udomsubpayakul U, Chanplakorn P et al. Outcomes of fluoroscopically guided lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injections in degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis patients. *Asian Spine J.* 2014;8(2):119–28.

28. Wong LC. Rehabilitation of a patient with a rare multi-level isthmic spondylolisthesis: A case report. *J Can Chiropr Assoc.* 2004;48(2):142–51. PMID: 17549226.
29. Mardjetko S, Connolly P, Shott S. Degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: A meta-analysis of literature, 1970–1993. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1994;19(20 Suppl):2256Se65S [comments: *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1995;20(17):1957e8.
30. Ezekial Koslosky BA, David Gendelberg MD. Classification in Brief: The Meyerding Classification System of Spondylolisthesis; 2020.
31. Mobbs RJ, Loganathan A, Yeung V et al., Indications for anterior lumbar interbody fusion. *Orthop Surg.* 2013;5: 153–163
32. Study Group. Back pain, neurogenic symptoms, and physical 104 function in relation to spondylolisthesis among elderly men. 105 *Spine J* 2010; 10(10):865e73.
33. He LC, Wang YX, Gong JS, Griffith JF, Zeng XJ, Kwok AW, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of lumbar spondylolisthesis in elderly Chinese men and women. *Eur Radiol* 2014;24(2):121s441e8.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/119969>