

# **Intervertebral disc decompression following endplate damage: implications for disc degeneration depend on spinal level and age**

Patricia Dolan PhD, Jin Luo PhD\*, Phillip Pollintine PhD, Priyan R. Landham FRCS (Orth),

Manos Stefanakis PhD<sup>+</sup>, Michael A. Adams PhD

Centre for Comparative and Clinical Anatomy, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

\* Dept. of Life Sciences, University of Roehampton, U.K.

<sup>+</sup> Dept. of Health Sciences, European University of Cyprus

## **Corresponding author:**

Dr Patricia Dolan,

Reader in Biomechanics,

Centre for Comparative and Clinical Anatomy,

University of Bristol,

Southwell Street,

Bristol BS2 8EJ, U.K.

Trish.Dolan@bris.ac.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 117 928 8363

Fax: +44 (0) 117 925 4794

**KEY WORDS:** intervertebral disc degeneration, endplate damage, intradiscal pressure, spinal level;

intradiscal pressure.

**Acknowledgements** This work was funded in the U.K. by Action Medical Research, the Royal College of Surgeons of England, the Gloucestershire Arthritis Trust, BackCare, and the Greek Institute of Scholarships (I.K.Y).

**Ethics:** Research approved by the NRes ethics committee, Frenchay Hospital, Bristol, U.K.

## **Abstract**

*Study Design* Mechanical and morphological studies on cadaveric spines.

*Summary of Background Data* Disc degeneration can be initiated by damage to a vertebral body endplate, but it is unclear why endplate lesions, and patterns of disc degeneration, vary so much with spinal level and age.

*Objective* Explain how spinal level and age influence disc degeneration arising from endplate fracture.

*Methods* 174 cadaveric 'motion segments', from T7-8 to L5-S1 and aged 19-96 yrs, were subjected to controlled compressive overload to damage a vertebral body. 'Stress profilometry' was performed before and after damage in order to quantify changes in intradiscal pressure (IDP), and compressive stresses in the annulus. 86 of the undamaged vertebral bodies were then sectioned in the mid-sagittal plane, and the thickness of the central bony endplate was measured from microradiographs. Regression analysis was used to compare the relative influences of spinal level, age, disc degeneration and gender on results obtained.

*Results* Compressive overload caused endplate fracture at an average force of 3.4 kN, and reduced vertebral body height by an average 1.88 mm. Pressure loss in the adjacent nucleus pulposus decreased from 93% at T8-9 to 38% at L4-5 ( $R^2 = 22\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), and increased with age ( $R^2 = 19\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) especially in male specimens. Stress concentrations in the posterior annulus increased following endplate fracture, with the effect being greatest at upper spinal levels ( $R^2 = 7\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Endplate thickness increased by approximately 50% between T11 and L5 ( $R^2 = 21\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

*Conclusion* Endplate fracture creates abnormal stress distributions in the adjacent intervertebral disc, increasing the risk of internal disruption and degeneration. Effects are greatly reduced in the lower lumbar spine, and in young specimens, primarily because of differences in nucleus volume, and materials properties, respectively. Disc degeneration between L4 and S1 may often be unrelated to endplate fracture.

## Key Points

1. Disc degeneration can be initiated by damage to a vertebral endplate, but why should disc and endplate lesions vary so greatly with spinal level and age?
2. Experiments on 174 cadaveric motion segments (aged 19-96 yrs, from T7-8 to L5-S1) showed that compressive overload *always* damaged a vertebral body endplate and decompressed the adjacent intervertebral disc.
3. The severity of disc decompression depended primarily on spinal level, decreasing linearly from 93% at T8-9 to 38% at L4-5 ( $R^2 = 22\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), and was lower in young male specimens. Variations appeared to depend on systematic differences in nucleus volume and endplate thickness.
4. Results suggest that disc degeneration at L4-5 and L5-S1 may often be unrelated to endplate fracture.

### **Précis**

Experiments on cadaveric spines showed that endplate fracture always decompresses the adjacent nucleus pulposus, and concentrates compressive stress in the posterior annulus fibrosus. Effects are much reduced in the lower lumbar spine, and in young specimens, as a result of increased nucleus volume and thicker endplates. Disc degeneration between L4 and S1 may often be unrelated to endplate fracture.

## Introduction

Recent population studies show a strong dose-response relationship between intervertebral disc degeneration and chronic low back pain.<sup>1-3</sup> However, the relationship is weak if degeneration is defined in terms of age-related water loss,<sup>4-5</sup> and strong if ‘degeneration’ involves structural features such as radial fissures,<sup>6-7</sup> posterior herniation,<sup>8</sup> endplate defects,<sup>9</sup> and reinnervation<sup>10-11</sup>.

This disagreement highlights a growing problem: ‘disc degeneration’ encompasses a range of features, each with its own risk factors, and opportunities for intervention. Only when the disc finally collapses can the process be likened to a single disease, and by then it may be too late for effective intervention apart from surgery. Clearly there is a need to distinguish between separate disc degeneration ‘phenotypes’ earlier in the degeneration process, so that distinct pathological processes can be treated or prevented more effectively.

With this in mind, we recently contrasted ‘endplate-driven’ and ‘annulus-driven’ disc degeneration.<sup>12</sup> The former is characterised by an endplate fracture, inwards collapse of the annulus, high heritability, and a distribution predominantly in the upper lumbar and thoracic spine. In contrast, ‘annulus-driven’ degeneration is characterised by a radial fissure and/or disc prolapse, low heritability, and a distribution predominantly in the lower lumbar spine (L4-S1). The distinction is simplistic (endplates *can be* damaged at L4 and L5, and upper lumbar discs *can* herniate) but it is consistent with a diverse range of evidence, and it suggests why spinal level should exert such a strong influence on spinal pathology.<sup>13-15</sup> One experimental finding in particular supports this ‘two-phenotypes’ concept: severe mechanical loading is more likely to create radial fissures and herniation in lower lumbar discs than in upper lumbar discs.<sup>16-17</sup> However, there is no corresponding evidence that upper lumbar and

1 thoracic discs are more vulnerable to endplate fracture, and its sequellae, than are lower  
2 lumbar discs.  
3

4  
5 We hypothesise that endplate damage arising from excessive spinal compression causes  
6  
7 major decompression of thoracic and upper lumbar discs, but only minor decompression of  
8  
9 lower lumbar discs. Nucleus decompression following endplate fracture has been shown to  
10  
11 cause progressive internal disruption in cadaveric discs,<sup>18</sup> leading to realistic disc  
12  
13 degeneration in an animal model.<sup>19</sup>  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **Materials and Methods**

19  
20  
21 *Cadaveric material* Thoracolumbar spines from donated cadavers were stored at -20<sup>0</sup> C  
22  
23 before being dissected into ‘motion segments’ comprising one or two discs and their adjacent  
24  
25 vertebrae.<sup>20-23</sup> Details of the 174 tested discs are summarised in **Table 1**.  
26  
27

28  
29 *Stress profilometry* Each motion segment was mounted in plaster (**Figure 1**) and loaded on a  
30  
31 materials testing machine.<sup>20</sup> During testing, specimens were wrapped in plastic film to  
32  
33 minimise water loss. A moderate compressive force (typically 1 kN) was applied for 1-2  
34  
35 hours in order to dehydrate the disc by an amount similar to that seen in-vivo during a day’s  
36  
37 activity,<sup>24</sup> hence ensuring that disc hydration was well within the normal physiological  
38  
39 range. After the creep loading period, a pressure transducer (side-mounted in a 1.3 mm-  
40  
41 diameter needle) was inserted into the disc and pulled across its mid-sagittal diameter to  
42  
43 measure the distribution of compressive “stress”.<sup>25</sup> These “stress profiles” were usually  
44  
45 obtained at a compressive load of 1kN with the specimen positioned either in the neutral  
46  
47 position (0°) or in 2° of extension, to simulate typical erect postures in life. Vertical and  
48  
49 horizontal stress was measured in successive tests by rotating the transducer needle about its  
50  
51 axis. Intradiscal pressure (IDP) in the nucleus, and peak compressive stresses in the annulus  
52  
53 (over and above nucleus pressure), were then measured from the ‘profiles’.<sup>22</sup> For some  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 specimens, the compressive force during creep loading and stress profilometry was changed  
2 to 0.5 kN or 2 kN, depending on specimen size and age, but all intradiscal measurements  
3 were subsequently scaled to an applied load of 1 kN for comparison. Stress profilometry has  
4 been validated<sup>26-28</sup> and linearity between measured ‘stress’ and applied load has been  
5 demonstrated.<sup>29</sup>

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 *Compressive overload* With the specimen positioned in moderate flexion (to simulate the flat  
13 back of a weight-lifter<sup>30</sup>) the compressive force was increased by moving the ram of the  
14 testing machine upwards at 3mm/s. Loading was removed at a pre-determined maximum  
15 displacement which depended on specimen size and age, and the force-deformation graph  
16 was inspected for evidence that the yield point had been exceeded.<sup>20</sup> If not, the specimen was  
17 loaded to a higher maximum displacement. Eventually, the first sign of injury was revealed  
18 by a reduction in gradient of the force-deformation graph. Endplate damage was confirmed  
19 by radiographs,<sup>31</sup> and quantified by repeating the loading cycle up to the failure load, and  
20 noting the extent to which it was shifted along the X (displacement) axis.<sup>20</sup> The X-shift (in  
21 mm), recorded at a load of 1 kN, indicated motion segment height loss.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 *Optical measurements of vertebral body deformation* To help interpret the Dartec-based  
38 measurements of motion segment height loss, a single-camera MacReflex system was used to  
39 measure deformation of the damaged vertebral body independently of deformation of the  
40 disc, the non-damaged vertebral body, and the apparatus<sup>23</sup>. This technique can be subject to  
41 large errors if vertebral damage disturbs the reflective markers, which is more likely to occur  
42 in smaller thoracic vertebrae. Therefore, these measurements were obtained in 15 specimens  
43 from T11-12 to L4-5. In these specimens, three pairs of reflective markers were attached to  
44 the lateral cortex of each vertebral body tested (Figure 1) so that anterior, middle and  
45 posterior vertebral body heights could be measured,<sup>23</sup> to an accuracy of 10µm.<sup>32</sup> Height  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 measurements were compared before and after compressive damage in order to calculate  
2 cortical height loss in mm.<sup>23</sup>  
3  
4

5 *Specimen morphology* After testing, each specimen was dissected and photographed to  
6  
7 confirm the site(s) of fracture. The macroscopic appearance of each disc, and its height on  
8  
9 pre-fracture radiographs, were used to grade disc degeneration from 1 to 4, using the first  
10  
11 four points on a scale described previously.<sup>33</sup>  
12  
13

14  
15 *Endplate thickness* 86 of the non-damaged vertebral bodies, sampled so that all age groups  
16  
17 and spinal levels were represented, were sectioned in the sagittal plane. Subsequent  
18  
19 microradiographs of 2mm-thick slices were analysed to measure the thickness of the cranial  
20  
21 and caudal bony endplates at 10 equidistant sites along the mid-sagittal section. Because  
22  
23 fracture primarily affects the central endplate, thickness was averaged across sites 4, 5, 6 and  
24  
25 7, which lie adjacent to the inner annulus and nucleus.<sup>34</sup>  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 *Statistical analyses* Linear regression was used to determine which variable factors had the  
31  
32 greatest influence on disc decompression and vertebral damage (height loss).  
33  
34  
35

## 36 **Results**

37  
38 Initial measurements on 174 undamaged specimens showed that IDP averaged 0.88 MPa (for  
39  
40 a reference compressive force of 1kN) and decreased from 0.98 MPa in ‘grade 1’ discs to  
41  
42 0.47 MPa in severely degenerated ‘grade 4’ discs (**Table 2**, column 4). IDP also decreased  
43  
44 with spinal level, from 1.56 MPa at T7-8, to 0.73 MPa at L5-S1.  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Compressive overload always damaged a bony endplate, although some specimens showed  
50  
51 additional vertebral damage to the anterior cortex and/or trabeculae. The compressive force  
52  
53 at the initiation of damage averaged 3.4 kN (range 0.9 - 11.6 kN). Motion segment height  
54  
55 loss averaged 1.88 mm and was greatest in old female specimens and in those with  
56  
57 degenerated discs (Table 2, column 5). Height loss averaged 2.27 mm at T7-8, but was less  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

in the lumbar spine, falling to 0.46 mm at L5-S1. Optical measurements showed that height loss averaged 17%, 11% and 4% in the anterior, middle and posterior regions of the lateral vertebral body cortex of the damaged vertebra, indicating slight anterior wedging.

Vertebral damage reduced IDP in the adjacent disc, by an average 0.54 MPa, which is equivalent to a 62% loss. In contrast, maximum compressive stress in the posterior annulus (over and above nucleus pressure) increased by 0.74 MPa. Nucleus decompression varied greatly with spinal level, from 1.28 MPa at T7-8 to 0.24 MPa at L4-5 (Table 2, column 7). The influence of spinal level did not depend much on whether the discs were degenerated (grades 3 and 4) or not (grades 1 and 2), as shown in **Figure 2**, or on whether decompression was measured in absolute (MPa) or relative (%) terms (Table 2). Nucleus decompression also increased linearly with age in male specimens, whereas nearly all female specimens over the age of 40 yrs were substantially decompressed (**Figure 3**). Similar age-related trends were present if decompression was quantified in absolute or relative terms.

Univariate regression analysis (**Table 3**) showed that the greatest influence on the extent of vertebral damage was spinal level, which explained 20% of variance in all specimens, and 34% in specimens with non-degenerated discs (Table 3, row 3). Vertebral damage also increased with age (Table 3, row 1) and with female gender (Table 2, column 5). Damage was in turn a major influence in disc decompression, explaining 20% of the fall in IDP in all specimens, and 47% in specimens with non-degenerated discs (Table 3, row 14). Age explained 19% of the variance in % disc decompression. However, absolute changes in intradiscal stresses (MPa) following vertebral damage depended less on age than on initial IDP (Table 3, rows 13 & 18) which itself decreased with age and disc degeneration (Table 2, column 4). Peak compressive stress in the posterior annulus (relative to IDP) increased in proportion to the fall in IDP (Table 3, row 20), and increased most when initial IDP was high

(Table 3, row 18). Changes in peak compressive stresses in the *anterior* annulus (not shown) were variable, and unrelated to other variables in Table 3.

Multiple linear regression revealed the greatest influences on disc decompression. If the three independent variables (age, gender and spinal level) were forced into the analysis, they explained 38% of the variance in 'Fall in IDP (MPa)'. However, adding 'Initial IDP (MPa)', 'Damage (mm)', and 'disc degeneration (graded 1-4)' to the model enabled it to explain 71% of the variance in disc decompression (**Table 4**). Additional multivariate analyses revealed that 'Initial IDP (MPa)' itself depended on spinal level, age, and gender (in decreasing order of importance) but the influence of disc degeneration was marginal.

Thickness of the bony endplate is compared at various spinal levels (**Figure 4**). Values in Figure 4 represent the average thickness (of both endplates of each vertebral body) in the central region, adjacent to the nucleus and inner annulus, because this is where fracture generally occurs<sup>34</sup>. Thickness increased by approximately 50% between T11 and L5 ( $R^2 = 21\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Endplate thickness was measured on 86 *undamaged* vertebrae, and so was not compared directly with failure characteristics such as specimen strength.

## **Discussion**

*Summary of findings* Compressive overload always damaged a vertebral body endplate and decompressed the adjacent nucleus pulposus. Decompression was greatest in old specimens, in those with degenerated discs, and in the upper lumbar and thoracic spine. Thickness of the bony endplates increased between T11 and L5.

*Strengths and weaknesses of the investigation.* Many specimens were tested so that influences such as age and spinal level might be distinguished. All techniques have been validated, as discussed above. Vertebral endplate fractures were obtained by compressing them via the adjacent disc, and their radiographic appearance (which included some anterior

wedging) was similar to fractures seen clinically.<sup>31</sup> The use of cadaveric tissues introduces little artefact,<sup>35</sup> and measurements of intradiscal pressure (IDP) are similar to those made in-vivo,<sup>36-38</sup> showing similar variation with degeneration.<sup>39</sup>

Working with dead tissues ensures that long-term consequences of endplate damage can only be estimated. Also, specimens were not distributed evenly between spinal levels and age groups, with relatively few specimens from L5-S1, and few young specimens from thoracic levels (Table 1). Measurements of vertebral damage would have been influenced by the loading protocol, but their dependence on age and gender (Table 3) accurately reflects the fact that, in life, vertebral collapse is greatest in old female vertebrae.

*Relationship to previous studies.* Compressive overload has been shown primarily to damage the vertebral endplate<sup>40-42</sup> and its supporting trabeculae.<sup>43</sup> Spinal flexion and endplate fracture both transfer load-bearing to the anterior vertebral cortex,<sup>23,44</sup> explaining why anterior cortical damage was substantial in the present experiments. Endplate damage decompresses the adjacent disc,<sup>45-46</sup> leading to internal collapse of the inner annulus,<sup>18</sup> and increased radial bulging of the outer annulus,<sup>43</sup> both of which are common features of disc degeneration in-vivo.<sup>47-48</sup> The novelty of the present experiment is to show how disc decompression varies with factors such as spinal level and age.

*Explanation of findings* Damaged endplates bulge more into the vertebral body<sup>43</sup> allowing more space for the disc nucleus. This reduces nucleus pressure, which is sensitive to small % changes in volume.<sup>49</sup> Greater damage causes greater nucleus decompression, and correspondingly greater peak stresses in the annulus, as load-bearing is shifted from nucleus to annulus, and to the neural arch.<sup>22</sup> The following discussion suggests why this mechanism depends primarily on spinal level, age/degeneration and gender, and secondarily on factors such as 'Damage (mm)' which themselves depend on the primary variables.

1 The influence of spinal level has several likely causes, the most important of which is  
2 probably the greater *height* of lower lumbar discs. Disc height increases substantially in the  
3 lower thoracic spine<sup>50</sup> and by 100-150% between T7-8 and L5-S1,<sup>51</sup> so nucleus volume will  
4 increase by at least this amount. Decompression following endplate damage is proportional  
5 to nucleus volume, and so will be reduced at lower lumbar levels. The greater height of  
6 lower lumbar discs leads to greater vertical deformations and radial bulging under load,<sup>51</sup>  
7 enhancing the disc's ability to equalise compressive stress and reducing nucleus  
8 decompression. Increasing disc cross-sectional area at lower spinal levels<sup>40</sup> may also exert an  
9 influence, because it will cause the 1 kN load to give rise to a lower 'initial IDP', which in  
10 turn may cause a smaller pressure drop following endplate damage. However, endplate area  
11 increases by only 17% between L1 and L5<sup>52</sup>, whereas disc decompression across these same  
12 levels decreased by 59% (calculated from Table 2 column 7) so the influence of endplate area  
13 is not paramount. Finally, thicker vertebral endplates in the lower lumbar spine (**Figure 4**)  
14 may minimise endplate deformations and disc pressure changes following endplate damage.

15 The influence of age (Figure 3) is also complex. Nucleus pressure decreases with age and  
16 disc degeneration<sup>39,25</sup> and a lower 'Initial IDP' will naturally cause a greater % fall in IDP  
17 following endplate damage for the same absolute pressure drop. Age also makes vertebrae  
18 more brittle, so that they lose more height when damaged and cause greater disc  
19 decompression. Hence, the marked gender differences shown in Figure 3 could be explained  
20 in terms of increasing bone fragility in women after the menopause. Annulus tissue also  
21 stiffens with age as a result of non-enzymatic glycation,<sup>53</sup> so an old stiff annulus may be  
22 better able to stress-shield the nucleus than the soft hydrated annulus of a young non-  
23 degenerated disc, which can deform and equalise stress.

24 The influence of age and spinal level on nucleus decompression can be compared as follows:  
25 age probably exerts its influence by increasing annulus stiffness and bone fragility, whereas

1 spinal level probably exerts its influence via annulus height and nucleus volume. Although  
2 both influences are large, it is evident from Table 2 that only spinal level has a major  
3 influence on *absolute* pressure loss in the nucleus (in MPa) and on absolute stress increases in  
4 the posterior annulus. Absolute changes in intradiscal stress may be more important than %  
5 changes when it comes to driving disc disruption and degeneration.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 The influence of gender can be explained in terms of increased bone fragility in women, and  
13 also on the reduced size and endplate area in female spines, which would increase initial disc  
14 pressure and lead to greater damage and subsequent pressure changes in the disc (Table 2).  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 *Clinical implications.* Disc decompression and ‘internal disc disruption’ is common in the  
21 thoracolumbar spine.<sup>47</sup> From a biological point of view, low pressure in the nucleus and  
22 increased stresses in the annulus will inhibit disc cell metabolism<sup>54</sup> and increase synthesis of  
23 matrix-degrading enzymes.<sup>55-56</sup> In this way, endplate failure would initiate biological  
24 degenerative changes in the disc. This mechanism of disc degeneration has been  
25 demonstrated in animals,<sup>19, 57</sup> explained by organ culture<sup>56</sup> and mathematical models,<sup>58</sup> and  
26 confirmed in humans.<sup>59</sup>  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Decompression, and loss of disc height, following endplate fracture are associated with an  
39 increase in neutral zone and hence with instability.<sup>20</sup> Greater decompression of thoracic and  
40 upper lumbar discs therefore explains why degenerative disc narrowing and osteophytes,  
41 which are typical in this region of the spine,<sup>50, 60</sup> are so closely associated with large  
42 centrally-located Schmorl’s nodes.<sup>14</sup> Some nodes may be congenital,<sup>41</sup> but others are related  
43 to loading<sup>15</sup> and represent calcification around a vertical herniation of nucleus pulposus.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1 The situation is very different between L4 and S1, where Schmorl's nodes are relatively  
2 uncommon<sup>15,62</sup> and less associated with disc degeneration.<sup>14</sup> This can be explained by the  
3  
4 present results: thicker endplates between L4 and S1 reduce the risk and size of vertical disc  
5  
6 herniations, and the hence the tendency for the disc to degenerate via this mechanism. Most  
7  
8 lower lumbar endplate lesions are characterised as 'erosions/calcification' rather than  
9  
10 'Schmorl's nodes/fractures',<sup>15</sup> and are associated with inflammation in the vertebral body.<sup>63-</sup>  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

64 They may reflect posterior disc herniations in which displaced annulus strips cartilage  
from the bony endplate,<sup>65-66</sup> allowing inflammatory reactions to occur. Many disc herniations  
involve disruption of cartilage and bone on the postero-lateral margins of the vertebral  
body.<sup>67</sup>

These interpretations support the concept of two disc degeneration phenotypes<sup>12</sup>: 'endplate-  
driven' degeneration in the upper lumbar and thoracic spine which is initiated by endplate  
damage as simulated in the present experiment; and 'annulus driven' degeneration at L4-5  
and L5-S1 which is initiated by nucleus tissue herniating through the annulus. Both of the  
initiating lesions decompress the nucleus, making it less likely that the other type of lesion  
could occur in the same disc.

*Unanswered questions and future research.* Longitudinal clinical studies are required to  
prove that different mechanisms lead to disc degeneration at L4-S1 compared to higher spinal  
levels.

*Conclusions* Even minor damage to a vertebral body endplate can decompresses the adjacent  
disc, allowing the annulus to collapse inwards. The effect is small in young and lower  
lumbar discs, possibly because they have a larger nucleus volume, and thicker endplates. In  
life, degeneration of L4-S1 discs may often be unrelated to endplate fracture.

## References

1. Cheung KM, Karppinen J, Chan D, et al. Prevalence and pattern of lumbar magnetic resonance imaging changes in a population study of one thousand forty-three individuals. *Spine* 2009;34:934-40.
2. de Schepper EI, Damen J, van Meurs JB, et al. The association between lumbar disc degeneration and low back pain: the influence of age, gender, and individual radiographic features. *Spine* 2010;35:531-6.
3. Bendix T, Kjaer P, Korsholm L. Burned-out discs stop hurting: fact or fiction? *Spine* 2008;33:E962-7.
4. Videman T, Battie MC, Gibbons LE, Maravilla K, Manninen H, Kaprio J. Associations between back pain history and lumbar MRI findings. *Spine* 2003;28:582-8.
5. Boos N, Rieder R, Schade V, Spratt KF, Semmer N, Aebi M. 1995 Volvo Award in clinical sciences. The diagnostic accuracy of magnetic resonance imaging, work perception, and psychosocial factors in identifying symptomatic disc herniations. *Spine* 1995;20:2613-25.
6. Videman T, Nurminen M. The occurrence of anular tears and their relation to lifetime back pain history: a cadaveric study using barium sulfate discography. *Spine* 2004;29:2668-76.
7. Peng B, Hou S, Wu W, Zhang C, Yang Y. The pathogenesis and clinical significance of a high-intensity zone (HIZ) of lumbar intervertebral disc on MR imaging in the patient with discogenic low back pain. *Eur Spine J* 2006;15:583-7.
8. Jensen MC, Brant-Zawadzki MN, Obuchowski N, Modic MT, Malkasian D, Ross JS. Magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine in people without back pain. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331:69-73.



9. Hamanishi C, Kawabata T, Yosii T, Tanaka S. Schmorl's nodes on magnetic resonance imaging. Their incidence and clinical relevance. *Spine* 1994;19:450-3.
10. Freemont AJ, Peacock TE, Goupille P, Hoyland JA, O'Brien J, Jayson MI. Nerve ingrowth into diseased intervertebral disc in chronic back pain. *Lancet* 1997;350:178-81.
11. Coppes MH, Marani E, Thomeer RT, Groen GJ. Innervation of "painful" lumbar discs. *Spine* 1997;22:2342-9; discussion 9-50.
12. Adams MA, Dolan P. Intervertebral disc degeneration: evidence for two distinct phenotypes. *Journal of Anatomy* 2012;221:497-506.
13. Battie MC, Videman T, Levalahti E, Gill K, Kaprio J. Genetic and environmental effects on disc degeneration by phenotype and spinal level: a multivariate twin study. *Spine* 2008;33:2801-8.
14. Mok FP, Samartzis D, Karppinen J, Luk KD, Fong DY, Cheung KM. ISSLS prize winner: Prevalence, determinants, and association of Schmorl nodes of the lumbar spine with disc degeneration: a population-based study of 2449 individuals. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2010;35:1944-52.
15. Wang Y, Videman T, Battie MC. ISSLS Prize Winner: Lumbar Vertebral Endplate Lesions: Associations With Disc Degeneration and Back Pain History. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2012;37:1490-6.
16. Adams MA, Hutton WC. Prolapsed intervertebral disc. A hyperflexion injury 1981 Volvo Award in Basic Science. *Spine* 1982;7:184-91.
17. Adams MA, Hutton WC. Gradual disc prolapse. *Spine* 1985;10:524-31.
18. Adams MA, Freeman BJ, Morrison HP, Nelson IW, Dolan P. Mechanical initiation of intervertebral disc degeneration. *Spine* 2000;25:1625-36.
19. Holm S, Holm AK, Ekstrom L, Karladani A, Hansson T. Experimental disc degeneration due to endplate injury. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2004;17:64-71.

20. Zhao F, Pollintine P, Hole BD, Dolan P, Adams MA. Discogenic origins of spinal instability. *Spine* 2005;30:2621-30.
21. Pollintine P, Dolan P, Tobias JH, Adams MA. Intervertebral disc degeneration can lead to "stress-shielding" of the anterior vertebral body: a cause of osteoporotic vertebral fracture? *Spine* 2004;29:774-82.
22. Luo J, Skrzypiec DM, Pollintine P, Adams MA, Annesley-Williams DJ, Dolan P. Mechanical efficacy of vertebroplasty: Influence of cement type, BMD, fracture severity, and disc degeneration. *Bone* 2007;40:1110-9.
23. Pollintine P, van Tunen MS, Luo J, Brown MD, Dolan P, Adams MA. Time-dependent compressive deformation of the ageing spine: relevance to spinal stenosis. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2010;35:386-94.
24. McMillan DW, Garbutt G, Adams MA. Effect of sustained loading on the water content of intervertebral discs: implications for disc metabolism. *Ann Rheum Dis* 1996;55:880-7.
25. Adams MA, McNally DS, Dolan P. 'Stress' distributions inside intervertebral discs. The effects of age and degeneration. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1996;78:965-72.
26. McMillan DW, McNally DS, Garbutt G, Adams MA. Stress distributions inside intervertebral discs: the validity of experimental "stress profilometry". *Proc Inst Mech Eng [H]* 1996;210:81-7.
27. McNally DS, Adams MA, Goodship AE. Development and validation of a new transducer for intradiscal pressure measurement. *J Biomed Eng* 1992;14:495-8.
28. Chu JY, Skrzypiec D, Pollintine P, Adams MA. Can compressive stress be measured experimentally within the annulus fibrosus of degenerated intervertebral discs? *Proc Inst Mech Eng [H]* 2008;222:161-70.

29. Pollintine P, Przybyla AS, Dolan P, Adams MA. Neural arch load-bearing in old and degenerated spines. *J Biomech* 2004;37:197-204.
30. Dolan P, Earley M, Adams MA. Bending and compressive stresses acting on the lumbar spine during lifting activities. *J Biomech* 1994;27:1237-48.
31. Jiang G, Luo J, Pollintine P, Dolan P, Adams MA, Eastell R. Vertebral fractures in the elderly may not always be "osteoporotic". *Bone* 2010;47:111-6.
32. Green TP, Allvey JC, Adams MA. Spondylolysis. Bending of the inferior articular processes of lumbar vertebrae during simulated spinal movements. *Spine* 1994;19:2683-91.
33. Adams MA, Dolan P, Hutton WC. The stages of disc degeneration as revealed by discograms. *J Bone Joint Surg [Br]* 1986;68:36-41.
34. Zhao FD, Pollintine P, Hole BD, Adams MA, Dolan P. Vertebral fractures usually affect the cranial endplate because it is thinner and supported by less-dense trabecular bone. *Bone* 2009;44:372-9.
35. Adams MA. Mechanical testing of the spine. An appraisal of methodology, results, and conclusions. *Spine* 1995;20:2151-6.
36. Nachemson AL. Disc pressure measurements. *Spine* 1981;6:93-7.
37. Wilke HJ, Neef P, Caimi M, Hoogland T, Claes LE. New in vivo measurements of pressures in the intervertebral disc in daily life. *Spine* 1999;24:755-62.
38. McNally DS, Shackelford IM, Goodship AE, Mulholland RC. In vivo stress measurement can predict pain on discography. *Spine* 1996;21:2580-7.
39. Sato K, Kikuchi S, Yonezawa T. In vivo intradiscal pressure measurement in healthy individuals and in patients with ongoing back problems. *Spine* 1999;24:2468-74.
40. Brinckmann P, Biggemann M, Hilweg D. Prediction of the compressive strength of human lumbar vertebrae. *Spine* 1989;14:606-10.

41. Hansson T, Roos B. The amount of bone mineral and Schmorl's nodes in lumbar vertebrae. *Spine* 1983;8:266-71.
42. Rolander SD, Blair WE. Deformation and fracture of the lumbar vertebral end plate. *Orthop Clin North Am* 1975;6:75-81.
43. Brinckmann P, Horst M. The influence of vertebral body fracture, intradiscal injection, and partial discectomy on the radial bulge and height of human lumbar discs. *Spine* 1985;10:138-45.
44. Tzermiadianos MN, Renner SM, Phillips FM, et al. Altered disc pressure profile after an osteoporotic vertebral fracture is a risk factor for adjacent vertebral body fracture. *Eur Spine J* 2008;17:1522-30.
45. Adams MA, McNally DS, Wagstaff J, Goodship AE. Abnormal stress concentrations in lumbar intervertebral discs following damage to the vertebral body: a cause of disc failure. *Eur Spine J* 1993;1:214-21.
46. Przybyla A, Pollintine P, Bedzinski R, Adams MA. Outer annulus tears have less effect than endplate fracture on stress distributions inside intervertebral discs: Relevance to disc degeneration. *Clin Biomech* 2006;21:1013-9.
47. Crock HV. Internal disc disruption. A challenge to disc prolapse fifty years on. *Spine* 1986;11:650-3.
48. Gunzburg R, Parkinson R, Moore R, et al. A cadaveric study comparing discography, magnetic resonance imaging, histology, and mechanical behavior of the human lumbar disc. *Spine* 1992;17:417-26.
49. Ranu HS. Multipoint determination of pressure-volume curves in human intervertebral discs. *Ann Rheum Dis* 1993;52:142-6.
50. Niemelainen R, Battie MC, Gill K, Videman T. The prevalence and characteristics of thoracic magnetic resonance imaging findings in men. *Spine* 2008;33:2552-9.

51. Koeller W, Meier W, Hartmann F. Biomechanical properties of human intervertebral discs subjected to axial dynamic compression. A comparison of lumbar and thoracic discs. *Spine* 1984;9:725-33.
52. Panjabi MM, Goel V, Oxland T, et al. Human lumbar vertebrae. Quantitative three-dimensional anatomy. *Spine* 1992;17:299-306.
53. Wagner DR, Reiser KM, Lotz JC. Glycation increases human annulus fibrosus stiffness in both experimental measurements and theoretical predictions. *J Biomech* 2006;39:1021-9.
54. Ishihara H, McNally DS, Urban JP, Hall AC. Effects of hydrostatic pressure on matrix synthesis in different regions of the intervertebral disk. *J Appl Physiol* 1996;80:839-46.
55. Handa T, Ishihara H, Ohshima H, Osada R, Tsuji H, Obata K. Effects of hydrostatic pressure on matrix synthesis and matrix metalloproteinase production in the human lumbar intervertebral disc. *Spine* 1997;22:1085-91.
56. Walter BA, Korecki CL, Purmessur D, Roughley PJ, Michalek AJ, Iatridis JC. Complex loading affects intervertebral disc mechanics and biology. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2011;19:1011-8.
57. Omlor GW, Nerlich AG, Wilke HJ, et al. A new porcine in vivo animal model of disc degeneration: response of anulus fibrosus cells, chondrocyte-like nucleus pulposus cells, and notochordal nucleus pulposus cells to partial nucleotomy. *Spine* 2009;34:2730-9.
58. Shirazi-Adl A. Finite-element simulation of changes in the fluid content of human lumbar discs. Mechanical and clinical implications. *Spine* 1992;17:206-12.
59. Kerttula LI, Serlo WS, Tervonen OA, Paakko EL, Vanharanta HV. Post-traumatic findings of the spine after earlier vertebral fracture in young patients: clinical and MRI study. *Spine* 2000;25:1104-8.

60. Videman T, Battie MC, Gill K, Manninen H, Gibbons LE, Fisher LD. Magnetic resonance imaging findings and their relationships in the thoracic and lumbar spine. Insights into the etiopathogenesis of spinal degeneration. *Spine* 1995;20:928-35.
61. Niemelainen R, Battie MC, Videman T. Risk indicators for severe upper or mid back pain in men. *Spine* 2011;36:E326-33.
62. Williams FM, Manek NJ, Sambrook PN, Spector TD, Macgregor AJ. Schmorl's nodes: common, highly heritable, and related to lumbar disc disease. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007;57:855-60.
63. Luoma K, Vehmas T, Gronblad M, Kerttula L, Kaapa E. MRI follow-up of subchondral signal abnormalities in a selected group of chronic low back pain patients. *Eur Spine J* 2008;17:1300-8.
64. Kerttula L, Luoma K, Vehmas T, Gronblad M, Kaapa E. Modic type I change may predict rapid progressive, deforming disc degeneration: a prospective 1-year follow-up study. *Eur Spine J* 2012;21:1135-42.
65. Kokubun S, Sakurai M, Tanaka Y. Cartilaginous endplate in cervical disc herniation. *Spine* 1996;21:190-5.
66. Veres SP, Robertson PA, Broom ND. The morphology of acute disc herniation: a clinically relevant model defining the role of flexion. *Spine* 2009;34:2288-96.
67. Rajasekeran S, Bajaj N, Tubaki V, Shetty A. An in-vivo study on 'Anatomy of failure' and proposal for a structural classification of Lumbar Disc Herniation. *International Society for the Study of the Lumbar Spine (ISSLS)*. Amsterdam; 2012.

**Table 1:** Details of 174 cadaveric specimens tested. Values refer to the number of specimens in each sub-group.

Number of specimens tested (total =174)									
Spinal Level	n	Grade of disc degeneration				Age (yrs)		Gender	
		1	2	3	4	<=60	>60	Male	Female
T7-8	6		4	2		2	4	2	4
T8-9	4			4		1	3	2	2
T9-10	9		5	3	1	3	6	3	6
T10-11	12		5	7		3	9	6	6
T11-12	17		8	5	4	1	16	10	7
T12-L1	21		11	9	1	4	17	12	9
L1-2	27		11	13	3	4	23	12	15
L2-3	33	2	15	14	2	13	20	20	13
L3-4	23		7	10	6	5	18	13	10
L4-5	20	4	8	7	1	12	8	13	7
L5-S1	2		1	1		2		2	
Sub-totals	174	6	75	75	18	50	124	95	79

**Table 2:** Summary of results for various specimen groups. Values indicate the mean. n = number of specimens in each group. DD = grade of disc degeneration. The fall in intradiscal pressure (IDP) following endplate damage is given in absolute units (MPa), and also as a % of the Initial IDP before damage. “PA stress rise” = absolute increase in peak compressive stress (relative to IDP) measured in the posterior annulus, caused by endplate damage.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Specimen groups	n	Age (yrs)	Initial IDP (MPa)	Damage (mm)	% Fall in IDP	Fall in IDP (MPa)	PA stress rise (MPa)
All	174	71	0.88	1.88	62	0.54	0.74
Male	95	70	0.79	1.73	57	0.42	0.64
Female	79	72	0.99	2.06	68	0.69	0.85
Age≤60	50	48	1.09	1.48	46	0.54	0.73
Age > 60	124	80	0.79	2.05	69	0.54	0.74
DD - 1	6	24	0.98	0.81	5	0.05	0.03
DD - 2	75	65	1.00	1.79	56	0.57	0.79
DD - 3	75	77	0.86	1.98	68	0.60	0.71
DD - 4	18	84	0.47	2.21	80	0.34	0.86
T7-8	6	72	1.56	2.27	87	1.28	1.82
T8-9	4	74	1.27	2.16	93	1.19	1.09
T9-10	9	68	1.23	2.71	85	1.01	1.56
T10-11	12	74	0.87	2.44	89	0.79	0.49
T11-12	17	80	0.89	2.38	77	0.66	0.95
T12-L1	21	74	1.00	1.94	63	0.60	0.79
L1-2	27	77	0.85	1.89	71	0.59	0.85
L2-3	33	68	0.83	1.58	49	0.37	0.60
L3-4	23	71	0.64	1.92	48	0.29	0.43
L4-5	20	56	0.74	1.09	38	0.24	0.35
L5-S1	2	47	0.73	0.46	5	0.02	0.25



**Table 3** Summary of univariate linear regression results. A negative sign indicates an inverse relationship. Gender was coded 0 (female) and 1 (male), and spinal levels from T7-8 to L5-S1 were coded from 1 to 11. Dependent (Y) variables represent changes following endplate damage.

Row no.	Dependent (Y) variable	Independent (X) variable	All discs (n=174)		Non-degenerated discs (n=81)	
			Rsqr	P	Rsqr	P
1	Damage (mm)	age	17	<0.001	14	0.001
2		gender	-4	0.011	-15	<0.001
3		spinal level	-20	<0.001	-34	<0.001
4		initial IDP	0	NS	8	0.009
5	% Fall in IDP	age	19	<0.001	19	<0.001
6		gender	-3	0.031	-9	0.006
7		spinal level	-22	<0.001	-32	<0.001
8		initial IDP	0	NS	1	NS
9		damage	37	<0.001	51	<0.001
10	Fall in IDP (MPa)	age	2	NS	1	NS
11		gender	-9	<0.001	-12	0.002
12		spinal level	-33	<0.001	-35	<0.001
13		initial IDP	49	<0.001	44	<0.001
14		damage	20	<0.001	47	<0.001
15	PA stress rise (MPa)	age	0	NS	0	NS
16		gender	-1	NS	-4	NS
17		spinal level	-7	<0.001	-7	0.021
18		initial IDP	25	<0.001	28	<0.001
19		damage	4	0.007	10	0.003
20		fall in IDP	27	<0.001	31	<0.001

**Table 4** The best predictive model for disc decompression, obtained using multiple linear regression, explained 71% of the variance in ‘Fall in IDP (MPa)’. Spinal level was coded from 1 (T7-8) to 11 (L5-S1), gender was coded 0 (female) and 1 (male), and disc degeneration graded from 1-4. Standardised (Std) coefficients indicate the relative importance of each influence. A ‘-ve’ sign indicates an inverse relationship.

All discs (n=174) $R^2 = 71\%$		
	Std coefficients	P
Initial IDP (MPa)	0.662	<0.001
Damage (mm)	0.244	<0.001
Spinal level	(-) 0.179	<0.001
Age (yrs)	0.138	0.016
Gender	(-) 0.066	NS
Disc Degeneration	0.058	NS

## Figure Captions


**Figure 1** Cadaveric thoracolumbar motion segments were secured in cups of dental plaster, and compressed by means of two rollers, which maintained a neutral posture without inhibiting any settling movements in the horizontal plane. Black circles represent reflective markers that were attached to the lateral vertebral body cortex in some specimens: these enabled deformations to be measured optically, independent of deformations of other tissues and apparatus. The distribution of compressive stress was measured within the intervertebral disc by pulling a miniature pressure transducer along its mid-sagittal diameter.

**Figure 2** Disc decompression (Fall in IDP) following endplate damage decreased regularly from T7-8 down to L5-S1, regardless of whether the disc was degenerated or not. 81 of the 174 specimens were non-degenerated (disc grade 1 or 2). Error bars indicate the standard error of the mean (SEM).


**Figure 3** Disc decompression following vertebral endplate damage increased with age, but only in male specimens. In contrast, most female specimens aged over 40 yrs were substantially decompressed. Error bars indicate the SEM.

**Figure 4** Average thickness of the vertebral body endplate was minimal at T11, and increased linearly from T11 to L5 ( $R^2 = 21\%$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Data refer to 80 undamaged vertebrae.

# Figure 1



# Figure 2



# Figure 3




Figure 4

