Journal Pre-proof

Letter to editor regarding: "Vertebral bone quality score independently predicts cage subsidence following transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion."

Daniele Armocida M.D. PhD student , Luca Proietti Associate Professor , Alessandro Frati Associate Professor

 PII:
 S1529-9430(23)00172-9

 DOI:
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2023.04.019

 Reference:
 SPINEE 58926



Received date:6 April 2023Revised date:20 April 2023Accepted date:21 April 2023

Please cite this article as: Daniele Armocida M.D. PhD student, Luca Proietti Associate Professor, Alessandro Frati Associate Professor, Letter to editor regarding: "Vertebral bone quality score independently predicts cage subsidence following transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion.", *The Spine Journal* (2023), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2023.04.019

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

(c) 2023 Published by Elsevier Inc.



Letter to editor regarding: "Vertebral bone quality score independently predicts cage subsidence following transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion."

Daniele Armocida ^{1,2}, M.D. PhD student Luca Proietti ^{3,4}, Associate Professor Alessandro Frati ², Associate Professor

1 Human Neurosciences Department Neurosurgery Division "Sapienza" University, Rome (RM), Italy

2 IRCCS "Neuromed" Pozzilli (IS), Italy

3 Division of Spinal Surgery IRCCS Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli, Rome, Italy

4 Institute of Orthopaedic, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy

The authors certify that they have NO affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript. The authors confirm their adherence to ethical standards and have NO financial disclosures that would be a potential conflict of interest with this publication.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Daniele Armocida danielearmocida@yahoo.it

AOU "Policlinico Umberto I", Roma, Italy Viale del Policlinico 155–00161, Roma – Italy Phone number: +393932874496.

LETTER

In 2022, Soliman et al. [1] published an interesting retrospective study regarding the relationship between poor bone quality, measured by the vertebral bone quality (VBQ) score using magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and the risk of cage subsidence in transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF). The study is intriguing and well-structured, demonstrating how the VBQ score can

Journal Pre-proof

independently predict postoperative cage subsidence in patients undergoing TLIF surgery with a simple and well-quantifiable tool. However, we realized that some variables in the study's conceptualization need to be considered in view of the limitations given by a retrospective collection with many missing data (importantly preoperative laboratory values such as parathyroid hormone and vitamin D 25(OH)D). We would like to know the views of the authors. One aspect that we would like to understand concerns the cage material. In a recent clinical study published in 2020 by Campbell et al. [2], a significant difference between the use of titanium cages versus polyetheretherketone (PEEK) cages was found. The investigation showed titanium cages have lower subsidence rates than PEEK cages in a long follow-up period.

Other authors, on the other hand, report the importance of cage placement relative to the vertebral body [3]. Placement in the posterior third of the body could lead to more pressure on bone with poorer quality), which is also related to the morphology of the end plate [4] and the cage size [5]. Another factor that may come into play in the short-term risk of subsidence concerns the use of expandable cages. Despite its design, debate persists regarding the value of the expandable cage compared with the static cage. Data suggest that using the expandable cage in TLIF significantly increases a patient's risk of postoperative subsidence [6]. We wonder, based on these results before the study in question, if also the fact that the minimally invasive MIS technique could be a confounding factor according to the authors, given that it was used for only 31.3% and 21.4%, respectively, for the groups without and with subsidence.

Subsidence in TLIF is likely a response to a myriad of factors that include but are certainly not limited to vertebral bone quality. The study is well done and easy to reproduce; therefore, we believe it can be widely integrated considering the numerous variables concerning the type of prosthesis, the implant technique, and the materials. In fact, the study took much more into consideration than the patient's clinical parameters and pre-operative medical history. We therefore ask the authors whether, in their opinion, it is possible that the MRI-VBQ and the related study could also potentially be able to predict not only the radiological event of subsidence but also the symptomatic subsidence phenomena, considering that it was demonstrated that subsidence is not directly related to the clinical deterioration even in osteoporotic patients [7].

Conflict of Interest None.

References

1) Soliman MAR, Aguirre AO, Kuo CC, Ruggiero N, Azmy S, Khan A, Ghannam MM, Almeida ND, Jowdy PK, Mullin JP, Pollina J. Vertebral bone quality score independently predicts cage

Journal Pre-proof

subsidence following transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. Spine J. 2022 Dec;22(12):2017-2023. doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2022.08.002. Epub 2022 Aug 10. PMID: 35961523.

2) Campbell PG, Cavanaugh DA, Nunley P, Utter PA, Kerr E, Wadhwa R, Stone M. PEEK versus titanium cages in lateral lumbar interbody fusion: a comparative analysis of subsidence. Neurosurg Focus. 2020 Sep;49(3):E10. doi: 10.3171/2020.6.FOCUS20367. PMID: 32871573.

3) Amorim-Barbosa T, Pereira C, Catelas D, Rodrigues C, Costa P, Rodrigues-Pinto R, Neves P. Risk factors for cage subsidence and clinical outcomes after transforaminal and posterior lumbar interbody fusion. Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol. 2022 Oct;32(7):1291-1299. doi: 10.1007/s00590-021-03103-z. Epub 2021 Aug 31. PMID: 34462820.

4) Zhou QS, Chen X, Xu L, Li S, Du CZ, Sun X, Wang B, Zhu ZZ, Qiu Y. Does Vertebral End Plate Morphology Affect Cage Subsidence After Transforan inal Lumbar Interbody Fusion? World Neurosurg. 2019 Oct;130:e694-e701. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2019.06.195. Epub 2019 Jul 4. PMID: 31279113.

5) Yuan W, Kaliya-Perumal AK, Chou SM, Oh JY. Does Lumbar Interbody Cage Size Influence Subsidence? A Biomechanical Study. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2020 Jan 15;45(2):88-95. doi: 10.1097/BRS.000000000003194. PMID: 31415458.

6) Armocida D, Pesce A, Cimatti M, Proietti L, Santoro A, Frati A. Minimally Invasive
Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion Using Expandable Cages: Increased Risk of Late
Postoperative Subsidence Without a Real Improvement of Perioperative Outcomes: A Clinical
Monocentric Study. World Neurosurg. 2021 Dec;156:e57-e63. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2021.08.127.
Epub 2021 Sep 4. PMID: 34492389.

7) Oh KW, Lee JH, Lee JH, Lee DY, Shim HJ. The Correlation Between Cage Subsidence, Bone Mineral Density, and Clinical Results in Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion. Clin Spine Surg. 2017 Jul;30(6):E683-E689. doi: 10.1097/BSD.00000000000315. PMID: 28632554.