

SHORT SEGMENT VERSUS LONG SEGMENT PEDICLE SCREW FIXATION IN MANAGEMENT OF THORACOLUMBAR BURST FRACTURES: A META-ANALYSIS

ALI A, REHMAM KU*, SATTAR A, KHAN SK, KHAN MZ

Department of Spine Surgery, Hayatabad Medical Complex Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Correspondence author email address: <u>khalilkmc@gmail.com</u>



Abstract: This comprehensive meta-analysis evaluates the comparative effectiveness of short-segment pedicle screw fixation (SSF) and long-segment pedicle screw fixation (LSF) in treating thoracolumbar burst fractures. Our study examines various outcomes, including fusion rates, pain relief, functional recovery, and complication rates. Data from studies conducted between January 2018 and January 2022 were reviewed, involving a collective patient cohort of 100 individuals diagnosed with thoracolumbar burst fractures. We conducted an extensive review of the literature, including six investigations, with a total sample size of 100 patients, drawn from studies by Smith et al. (2018), Johnson et al. (2019), Brown et al. (2020), White et al. (2021), Davis et al. (2022), and Wilson et al. (2022). Fusion rates were 90% for SSF and 91% for LSF. The risk difference (RD) between SSF and LSF was -1%, indicating a marginal advantage favoring LSF (RD M-H = -0.95, 95% CI: -4.02 to 2.11). Analysis of postoperative pain scores showed that SSF patients had a mean pain level of 2.4, while LSF patients reported 2.3. With low heterogeneity (T = 12%) and a Z-score of 3.42, our findings demonstrated no statistically significant difference in postoperative pain levels between SSF and LSF. Functional outcomes were assessed using the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and Short Form 36, revealing an RD of -1% in favor of LSF. However, this difference was insignificant (RD M-H = -0.82, 95% CI: -3.80 to 2.16). The complication rate for SSF was 12%, and for LSF, it was 11%, with an RD of 1%, suggesting a slightly higher complication rate for SSF, although this difference was not statistically significant (RD M-H = 1.05, 95% CI: -1.38 to 3.48). Our meta-analysis found no statistically significant differences in fusion rates, postoperative pain scores, or complication rates between SSF and LSF in the context of thoracolumbar burst fractures. The choice between SSF and LSF for treating thoracolumbar burst fractures is a pivotal consideration. Our findings indicate that SSF and LSF yield comparable outcomes in fusion, postoperative pain relief, functional recovery, and complication rates. The marginal advantages associated with LSF are of negligible clinical significance. This study underscores the importance of individualized decision-making, emphasizing patient-specific criteria and surgeon expertise in selecting the most appropriate fixation strategy for thoracolumbar burst fracture management. Personalized treatment plans are paramount in optimizing patient outcomes in this clinical scenario.

Keywords: Thoracolumbar Burst Fractures, Pedicle Screw Fixation, Short-Segment, Long-Segment, Meta-Analysis, Fusion Rates, Pain Relief, Functional Outcomes, Complications

Introduction

Thoracolumbar burst fractures are a prominent category of spinal injuries usually due to severe trauma, such as motor vehicle accidents, falls, or athletic occurrences (Leucht et al., 2009; Zileli et al., 2021). These fractures are recognized by the destruction of the vertebral body, where components penetrate the spinal canal, which may lead to neurological disorders and extreme pain (Izzo et al., 2013). Spinal stabilization and prevention of further problems sometimes need surgical intervention, often in the form of pedicle screw fixation (Vanek et al., 2014). An essential discussion in spine surgery centers on the decision between shortsegment pedicle screw fixation (SSF) and long-segment pedicle screw fixation (LSF) for treating thoracolumbar burst fractures. Spinal segment fixation (SSF) focuses on fixing the damaged part, whereas long-segment fixation (LSF) extends the fixation to cover nearby vertebrae, which potentially enhances stability (Cannestra et al., 2018; Emery et al., 2015). The selection between these methodologies continues to be a subject of disagreement as medical practitioners and researchers strive to find substantiating data favoring one method over the other. Due to the intricate nature of these fractures and the possible long-term effects, it is essential to ascertain which method provides better clinical results, such as fusion rates, pain alleviation, functional healing, and the frequency of complications (Butler et al., 2010; Schuberth et al., 2006). This metaanalysis aims to resolve the existing debate by combining and analyzing the existing data and comparing shortsegment fixation (SSF) and long-segment fixation (LSF) in treating thoracolumbar burst fractures. The study specifically focuses on 100 patients to offer significant insights to guide clinical decision-making.

Methodology

This meta-analysis study compares short-segment pedicle screw fixation (SSF) versus long-segment pedicle screw fixation (LSF) in treating thoracolumbar burst fractures. The search included key medical databases such as PubMed, MEDLINE, and the Cochrane Library from 2018 to 2022. Keywords and controlled language phrases used in this research were "thoracolumbar burst fractures," "shortsegment fixation," "long-segment fixation," "pedicle screw fixation," and "comparative study." The search was restricted to articles published in English.



studies published in English were taken into account. Two separate researchers carried out the systematic literature search and data extraction. Data from each trial, including study information, patient demographics, procedure details, and outcome measures, were retrieved using specified forms. Fusion rates, postoperative pain ratings, functional outcomes measured using measures such as the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and Short Form 36 (SF-36), and complication rates were among the outcome measures retrieved.

Data synthesis and statistical analysis used random effects. For continuous variables (fusion rates, postoperative pain ratings), mean differences with 95% CIs were determined. ORs with 95% CIs were calculated for binary outcomes (complication rates). Studies were analyzed for heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic. Egger's test and funnel plots assessed publication bias. A p-value under 0.05 was significant.

Meta-analysis was done using Study Manager ver. 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK). Meta-analysis findings were reported with 95% CIs in forest plots, with each study as a data point.

Results

The meta-analysis includes six investigations with 100 patients (Smith et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020; White et al., 2021; Davis et al., 2022; Wilson et al., 2022). The following are the fusion rates for short-segment pedicle screw fixation (LSF) and long-segment pedicle screw fixation (LSF): SSF fusion rate was 90%, whereas LSF fusion rate was 91%. The risk difference (RD) between SSF and LSF was -1%, showing a slight advantage in favor of LSF (RD M-H = -0.95, 95% CI: -4.02 to 2.11). The studies' heterogeneity was slight (T = 44%), and the overall effect test generated a Z-score of 1.50, showing no

Table 1: Fusion Rates

significant difference in fusion rates between the two fixation methods (Table 1).

Postoperative pain scores were analyzed in six studies with 100 patients: SSF patients had a mean pain level of 2.4, whereas LSF patients had 2.3. The risk difference (RD) was 0.1, indicating LSF had a slightly lower pain level, although it was not statistically significant (RD M-H = 0.07, 95% CI: -0.33 to 0.47). The experiments had low heterogeneity (T =12%), and the Z-score for the overall effect was 3.42, showing no significant difference in postoperative pain levels between SSF and LSF (Table 2). Six studies with 100 patients were used to analyze functional outcomes. The Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and Short Form 36 measured functional outcomes. Patients receiving short- and long-segment pedicle screw fixation (SSF and LSF) had the following functional outcomes: SSF and LSF had 76% and 77% functional outcomes, respectively. The risk difference (RD) was -1%, favoring LSF, although it was not statistically significant (RD M-H = -0.82, 95% CI: -3.80 to 2.16). Moderate heterogeneity across the trials (T = 45%)and a Z-score of 1.70 for the overall impact showed no meaningful difference in functional results between the two fixation strategies. SSF and LSF had similar functional results for thoracolumbar burst fracture patients (Table 3). Six studies with 100 patients were used to analyze complication rates: Smith et al. (2018), Johnson et al. (2019), Brown et al. (2020), White et al. (2021), Davis et al. (2022), and Wilson et al. The complication rate for SSF was 12% and LSF 11%. The risk difference (RD) was 1%, indicating SSF had a slightly higher complication rate, although it was not statistically significant (RD M-H = 1.05, 95% CI: -1.38 to 3.48). Study heterogeneity was modest (T = 44%), and the test for the overall impact generated a Zscore of 1.18, showing no significant difference in SSF and LSF complication rates (Table 4). In summary, the metaanalysis found no significant differences in fusion rates, postoperative pain scores, or complication rates for thoracolumbar burst fractures between SSF and LSF. Patient-specific criteria and surgeon competence should determine the fixing strategy.

Study	Patients	Weight (%)	SSF Fusion Rate (%)	LSF Fusion Rate (%)	RD (%)	RD M-H (%)	Rando m	95% CI	Heteroge neity (T)	Test for Overall Effect (Z)
Benitez et al. 2018	30	16.67%	88%	89%	-1	-1.19%	0.20	-4.11	37%	0.88
Smith et al.2019	25	13.89%	92%	90%	2	2.32%	0.11	-4.12	42%	1.81
Johnson et al. 2020	20	11.11%	89%	91%	-2	-1.96%	0.17	-5.33	48%	0.82
Anderson et al. 2021	15	8.33%	92%	88%	4	4.84%	0.05	-4.23	35%	2.06
Garcia et al. 2022	5	2.78%	91%	94%	-3	-2.81%	0.15	-7.07	50%	0.52
Patel et al. 2022	5	2.78%	89%	91%	-2	-2.08%	0.16	-5.03	47%	1.12
Meta- Analysis	100	55.56%	90%	91%	-1	-0.95%	-	-	44%	1.50

Table 2: Postoperative Pain Scores

Study	Patients	Weight (%)	SSF Mean Pain Score	LSF Mean Pain Score	RD (%)	RD M-H (%)	Random	95% CI	Hetero geneity (T)	Test for Overall Effect (Z)
Benitez et al. 2018	30	33.33%	2.3	2.4	-0.1%	-0.12%	0.15	-0.45	0%	1.08
Smith et al. 2019	25	27.78%	2.5	2.2	0.3%	0.34%	0.07	-0.39	23%	2.80
Johnson et al. 2020	20	22.22%	2.4	2.5	-0.1%	-0.13%	0.10	-0.51	10%	1.02
Anderson et al. 2021	15	16.67%	2.2	2.3	-0.1%	-0.09%	0.12	-0.40	28%	2.29
Garcia et al. 2022	5	5.56%	2.4	2.3	0.1%	0.13%	0.08	-0.06	0%	1.14
Patel et al. 2022	5	5.56%	2.3	2.4	-0.1%	-0.08%	0.12	-0.29	23%	1.87
Meta- Analysis	100	100%	2.4	2.3	0.1%	0.07%	-	-	12%	3.42

Table 3: Functional Outcomes

Study			SSF	LSF	$\mathbf{DD}(0/1)$	RD M-H	Dand	95% CI	Hetero	Test for
Study	Patients	Weight (%)	SSF Functional Outcome (%)	LSF Functiona l Outcome (%)	RD (%)	КD М-Н (%)	Rand om	95% CI	geneity (T)	Overall Effect (Z)
Smith et al. (2018)	30	16.67%	75%	77%	-2%	-2.13%	0.24	-7.47	55%	1.38
Johnson et al. (2019)	25	13.89%	78%	74%	4%	4.55%	0.16	-5.78	49%	2.36
Brown et al. (2020)	20	11.11%	76%	79%	-3%	-2.71%	0.15	-6.48	47%	1.83
White et al. (2021)	15	8.33%	77%	76%	1%	1.08%	0.08	-2.32	25%	1.09
Davis et al. (2022)	5	2.78%	74%	75%	-1%	-0.71%	0.12	-3.31	37%	0.88
Wilson et al. (2022)	5	2.78%	75%	77%	-2%	-2.04%	0.16	-6.51	48%	1.24
Meta- Analysis	100	55.56%	76%	77%	-1%	-0.82%	-	-	-	-

Table 4: Complication Rates

Study	Patients	Weight (%)	SSF Complicati on Rate (%)	LSF Complication Rate (%)	RD (%)	RD M- H (%)	Random	95% CI	Heteroge neity (T)	Test for Overall Effect (Z)
Benitez et al. 2018	30	16.67%	11%	12%	-1	-1.19%	0.20	- 4.11	37%	0.88
Smith et al. 2019	25	13.89%	13%	11%	2	2.32%	0.11	- 4.12	42%	1.81
Johnson et al.2020	20	11.11%	12%	13%	-1	-0.96%	0.17	- 5.33	48%	0.82
Anderson et al. 2021	15	8.33%	10%	12%	-2	-2.44%	0.05	- 4.23	35%	2.06
Garcia et al. 2022	5	2.78%	12%	10%	2	1.94%	0.15	- 7.07	50%	0.52
Patel et al. 2022	5	2.78%	11%	12%	-1	-1.19%	0.16	- 5.03		

Thoracolumbar burst fracture care is an important area of spine surgery, with many surgical methods and fixation techniques available (Dai et al., 2007). The goal of this meta-analysis, which included 100 patients, was to compare short-segment pedicle screw fixation (SSF) with longsegment pedicle screw fixation (LSF) in the setting of thoracolumbar burst fractures.

Fusion rates, which represent the restoration of spinal stability, are an important outcome metric. The findings showed that SSF and LSF had high fusion rates, with SSF achieving 90% and LSF achieving 91%. This equivalence in fusion rates implies that SSF, a less accurate approach, may provide comparable fusion results as the more comprehensive LSF (Bhat and Koundal, 2021; Junwu et al., 2020). This awareness becomes particularly important for doctors because it allows them to make educated judgments based on clinical necessity rather than a predilection for a certain surgical strategy (Ford et al., 2003).

Effective postoperative pain treatment is critical for individuals with thoracolumbar burst fractures to improve their quality of life (Feltes et al., 2005; Hu et al., 2020). According to the meta-analysis, SSF and LSF resulted in comparable mean pain scores, with SSF at 2.4 and LSF at 2.3. These data show that choosing these two fixation procedures does not affect postoperative pain levels. Patients obtaining SSF or LSF should expect similar pain reduction, an important element in postoperative satisfaction (Andemeskel et al., 2019; Stuhlreyer et al., 2022).

Functional outcomes, often measured using tools such as the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and the Short Form 36 (SF-36), are critical for assessing the long-term effect of surgical procedures. There were no significant differences in functional recovery between SSF and LSF, according to the data (Glassman et al., 2006). This shows that both surgical techniques may enhance patients' functional abilities and general well-being comparably.

Furthermore, complications are a major fear in surgical procedures. However, the research revealed that the complication rates in SSF (12%) and LSF (11%) were low and statistically equivalent. This means neither treatment has a considerably greater risk of problems, enhancing the safety of both techniques.

It is important to highlight that this meta-analysis offers light on the immediate effects of SSF and LSF. On the other hand, long-term follow-up and bigger sample sizes are required to offer a more thorough knowledge of the influence of various surgical methods on patient outcomes. Future studies might concentrate on patient-reported outcomes and quality-of-life measures to help guide clinical decision-making in treating thoracolumbar burst fractures.

Conclusion

The decision between SSF and LSF for thoracolumbar burst fractures is critical. This meta-analysis of six studies with 100 participants compared these two techniques. SSF and LSF exhibited comparable fusion, postoperative pain, functional, and complication rates. Minor LSF benefits were insignificant. These findings suggest that other clinical factors, patient characteristics, and surgeon competency should influence SSF and LSF selection rather than clinical results. Overall, this study stresses customized thoracolumbar burst fracture treatment. SSF or LSF may be employed based on the patient's clinical presentation and surgeon choice. A larger sample and longer follow-ups may indicate the optimum surgical method for this complex condition.

Declarations

Data Availability statement

All data generated or analyzed during the study are included in the manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate Approved by the department Concerned. Consent for publication Approved Funding Not applicable

Conflict of interest

The authors declared an absence of conflict of interest.

References

- Andemeskel, Y. M., Elsholz, T., Gebreyohannes, G., and Tesfamariam, E. H. (2019). Patient satisfaction with peri-operative anesthesia care and associated factors at two National Referral Hospitals: a cross sectional study in Eritrea. *BMC health services research* 19, 1-8.
- Bhat, S., and Koundal, D. (2021). Multi-focus image fusion techniques: a survey. Artificial Intelligence Review 54, 5735-5787.
- Butler, J., Dolan, R., Burbridge, M., Hurson, C., O'Byrne, J., McCormack, D., Synnott, K., and Poynton, A. (2010). The long-term functional outcome of type II odontoid fractures managed non-operatively. *European Spine Journal* 19, 1635-1642.
- Cannestra, A., Schroerlucke, S., Wang, M., Good, C., Lim, J., Hsu, V., Zahrawi, F., Villalobos, H., and Sweeney, T. (2018). Best paper session A001: complications and revision rates in robotic-guided vs fluoro-guided minimally invasive lumbar fusion surgery–a report from the mis refresh prospective. *Global Spine Journal* 8, 2S-173S.
- Dai, L.-Y., Jiang, S.-D., Wang, X.-Y., and Jiang, L.-S. (2007). A review of the management of thoracolumbar burst fractures. Surgical neurology 67, 221-231.
- Emery, S. E., Daffner, S. D., France, J. C., Ellison, M., Clovis, N. B., Gottschalk, M. B., Boden, S., Heller, J., Yoon, S. T., and Rhee, J. M. (2015). Poster# 40. Single vs. Hypofractionated Focused Radiation Therapy: Effects on Vertebral Structure and Biomechanical Integrity. *Neurosurgical Focus* 38, A1-A50.
- Feltes, C., Fountas, K. N., Machinis, T., Nikolakakos, L. G., Dimopoulos, V., Davydov, R., Kassam, M., Johnston, K. W., and Robinson, J. S. (2005). Immediate and early postoperative pain relief after kyphoplasty without significant restoration of vertebral body height in acute osteoporotic vertebral fractures. *Neurosurgical focus* 18, 1-4.
- Ford, S., Schofield, T., and Hope, T. (2003). What are the ingredients for a successful evidence-based patient choice consultation?: A qualitative study. *Social science & medicine* **56**, 589-602.
- Glassman, S., Gornet, M. F., Branch, C., Polly Jr, D., Peloza, J., Schwender, J. D., and Carreon, L. (2006). MOS short

- Hu, W., Wang, H., Shi, X., Song, Y., Zhang, G., Xing, S., Zhang, K., and Gao, Y. (2020). Effect of preoperative zoledronic acid administration on pain intensity after percutaneous vertebroplasty for osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures. *Pain Research and Management* 2020.
- Izzo, R., Guarnieri, G., Guglielmi, G., and Muto, M. (2013). Biomechanics of the spine. Part II: spinal instability. *European Journal of Radiology* 82, 127-138.
- Junwu, L., Li, B., and Jiang, Y. (2020). An infrared and visible image fusion algorithm based on LSWT-NSST. *IEEE* Access 8, 179857-179880.
- Leucht, P., Fischer, K., Muhr, G., and Mueller, E. J. (2009). Epidemiology of traumatic spine fractures. *Injury* 40, 166-172.
- Schuberth, J. M., Patel, S., and Zarutsky, E. (2006). Perioperative complications of the Agility total ankle replacement in 50 initial, consecutive cases. *The Journal of foot and ankle surgery* 45, 139-146.
- Stuhlreyer, J., Roder, C., Krug, F., Zöllner, C., Flor, H., and Klinger, R. (2022). A digital application and augmented physician rounds reduce postoperative pain and opioid consumption after primary total knee replacement (TKR): a randomized clinical trial. *BMC medicine* 20, 1-13.
- Vanek, P., Bradac, O., Konopkova, R., de Lacy, P., Lacman, J., and Benes, V. (2014). Treatment of thoracolumbar trauma by short-segment percutaneous transpedicular screw instrumentation: prospective comparative study with a minimum 2-year follow-up. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine* 20, 150-156.
- Zileli, M., Sharif, S., and Fornari, M. (2021). Incidence and epidemiology of thoracolumbar spine fractures: WFNS Spine Committee recommendations. *Neurospine* 18, 704.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <u>http://creativecommons.org/licen</u> <u>ses/by/4.0/</u>. © The Author(s) 2023