ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Outcomes of Endoscopic Microdiscectomy versus Conventional Discectomy for Lumbar Spine Disc Diseases

HAMEEDULLAH KHAN¹, ABDUL RAUF², ABDUL SAMAD QURESHI³, RIAZ AHMED RAJA MEMON⁴

¹Assistant Professor of Neurosurgery, Indus Medical College, Tando Muhamad Khan

²Assistant Professor of Neurosurgery, Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences, Jamshoro

³Senior Registrar of Orthopaedic Surgery, Indus Medical College, Tando Muhammad Khan

⁴Professor & Head Department of Neurosurgery, Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences, Jamshoro

Correspondence to: Dr. Hameedullah Khan E-mail: drhameedkhan2581@gmail.com Cell 0333-2667207

ABSTRACT

Objective: To determine the efficacy of endoscopic microdiscectomy versus conventional discectomy for lumbar spine disc disease.

Study Design: Randomized control trial

Place and Duration of Study: Department of Neurosurgery, Indus Medical College Tando Muhamad Khan from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020.

Methodology: Seventy patients of both genders were enrolled. Patients detailed demographics age, sex, body mass index and age between 18-70 years were recorded. Patients were divided in two equal groups. Group I patients underwent for endoscopic microdiscectomy and group II received conventional discectomy. The patients with low back pain radiating to the legs and prolapsed intervertebral discs at the L5-S1 and L4-L5 levels on MRI. Post-operatively effectiveness was observed between both groups, by using Oswestry Disability Index in follow up of 10 months.

Results: There were 34 (48.6%) female patients and 36 (51.4%) male patients. Mean age of the patients were 48.32± 6.44 years and mean body mass index was 26.14±3.23 kg/m². Significantly no difference was observed between age and body mass index. Patients who had prolapsed disc at L4-5 levels were 26 (37.14%) and 44 (62.86%) patients had prolapsed disc at L5-S1. Mean post-operative Oswestry Disability Index in group I was 21.14±54 and in group II was 24.16±3.31. Mean post-operative vas in group I was 3.5 and in group II was 5.7. In group I hospital stay, blood loss and complications were observed less as compared to group II.

Conclusion: Both endoscopic microdiscectomy and conventional discectomy was effective and safe procedures. But conventional discectomy was found less effective as compared to endoscopic microdiscectomy in terms of rapid mobilization and postoperative pain.

Keywords: Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), Lumbar disc prolapse, Endoscopic discectomy, Visual Analog Score (VAS)

INTRODUCTION

For the treatment of lumbar disc herniations, microdiscectomy is considered the gold standard surgical option. However, there is also concern about muscle injury, such as the multifidus, and exaggerated resection of the articular facet during laminectomy, which may result in instability, severe epidural fibrosis, and the persistence of radiated pain, as well as the risk of surgical site infection. As a less invasive option, endoscopic discectomy has been suggested.¹⁻⁵

If the symptoms aren't severe, early conservative care is currently used. When conservative care fails or symptoms intensify over time, surgery is used.^{5,6} The first surgical treatment for lumbar disk herniation was an open laminectomy and discectomy performed in 1934.⁷ The open lumbar discectomy was refined into open microdiscectomy with the invention of the microscope.⁸ The most popular surgical procedure for decompression of radiculopathy caused by lumbar disk herniation is currently open microdiscectomy.⁹

There were no substantial variations in pain and function after surgery in a few prospective randomized clinical trials comparing conventional microdiscectomy with endoscopic discectomy.^{3,4} Endoscopic discectomy, on the other hand, resulted in shorter hospital stays, fewer bleeding, lower inflammatory serum markers⁵, and lower pain and complication rates. Many neurosurgeons agree

that open laminectomy provides greater visibility and orientation of anatomy, and that it is the most widely practiced and approved procedure with the fewest risks of nerve root injury, facet joint damage, and instability.

Endoscopic discectomy has become more popular in recent years because it is less invasive, causes less muscle damage, and has a quick recovery time.¹⁰ The indications for it are now growing due to advances in endoscopic tools and a greater understanding of technique.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This randomized control trial was conducted at Department of Neurosurgery, Indus Medical College Tando Muhamad Khan from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 and comprised of 70 patients. Patients detailed demographics were recorded aster taking written consent. Patients who had chronic disease, upper lumbar disc, traumatic disc prolapses and those did not give written consent were excluded from this study.

Patients were aged between 18-70 years, Patients were divided in to two groups I and II. Group I had 35 patients and underwent for endoscopic microdiscectomy and group II received conventional discectomy among 35 patients. Patients had low backache with radiation towards legs and prolapsed intervertebral disc at L5-S1 and L4-L5 levels on MRI were included in the study. Post-operatively effectiveness was observed between both groups, by using

Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) in follow up of 10 months. T-test was used to observed ODI difference among both groups. Complete data was analyzed by SPSS.

RESULTS

There were 34 (48.6%) females (17 in each group) and 36 (51.4%) males (18 in each group). Mean age of the patients in group I was 47.88 ± 5.42 years with mean BMI 26.14 \pm 2.66 kg/m² while in group II, mean age was 48.16 \pm 6.43 years with mean body mass index 26.18 \pm 3.32 kg/m². Significantly no difference was observed between age and body mass index. Patients who had prolapsed disc at L4-5 levels were 26 (37.14%) and 44 (62.86%) patients had prolapsed disc at L5-S1. Mean post-operative Oswestry Disability Index in group I was 21.14 \pm 54 and in group II was 24.16 \pm 3.31. Mean post-operative vas in group I was 3.5 and in group II was 5.7. In group I hospital stay, blood loss and complications were observed less as compared to group II (Table 3).

Table 1: Demographic information of the patients (n=70)

Variable Gro	oup I (n=35)	Group II (n=35)			
Gender					
Male	18	18			
Female	17	17			
Age (years)	47.88±	5.42 48.16±6.43			
Body mass index (kg/m	²) 26.14±2	2.66 26.18±3.32			

Table 2: Levels of prolapsed disc among both groups

Level of disc	Group I	Group II	
L1-2	-	-	
L2-3	-	-	
L3-4	-	-	
L4-5	14 (20%)	12 (17.14%)	
L5-S1	21 (30%)	23 (32.86%)	

Table 3: Comparison of outcomes among both groups

Variable	Group I	Group II	P value		
Mean VAS					
Pre-operative	8.2	8.3	0.62		
Post-operative	3.5	5.7	0.04		
Mean ODI					
Pre-operative	62.15±3.66	66.15±6.59	0.43		
Post-operative	21.14±54	24.16±3.31	0.05		

DISCUSSION

Chronic lumbosacral pain is a common and challenging clinical condition that is at the heart of pain control. Back pain or intractable and extreme functional disability that has not responded to conservative measures is the most common surgical indication. There were 34 (48.6%) female patients and 36 (51.4%) male patients. Mean age of the patients were 48.32 ± 6.44 years with mean BMI 26.14 \pm 3.23 kg/m². Significantly no difference was observed between age and BMI. These findings were comparable to the previous studies.^{11,12}

Lower back pain is a common cause of morbidity among clinicians and workers, and it is also the leading causes of illness-related absence, which has financial implications.^{13,14} The position and form of disc herniation, as well as its predictive value in the treatment of sciatica, are inconsistently reported in the literature.¹⁵ This research also found that endoscopic spine procedures are less invasive, with fewer complications and a better outcome.¹⁶ When opposed to traditional discectomy, we also found that our endoscopic surgery groups had less postoperative surgery site discomfort because there was less damage to the muscle, soft tissue, and bones, as well as less manipulation of nerve roots. In our research, the incision size of endoscopic discectomy was smaller than that of traditional discectomy, and microscopic discectomy also necessitated more muscle retraction and bony work.

Since it is a minimally invasive procedure that does not cause damage to the paravertebral muscle, patients treated with endoscopic discectomy have a stronger ODI outcome. Mean post-operative ODI in endoscopic microdiscectomy was 21.14±54 and in conventional discectomy was 24.16±3.31. Mean post-operative VAS in group I was 3.5 and in group II was 5.7. In group I, hospital stay, blood loss and complications were observed less as compared to group II. In another study, they performed a large-incision microdiscectomy with the use of a retractor and more bony work, as well as partial removal of the ligamentum flavum.¹ In the present study, we found that endoscopic and microscopic discectomy patients experienced strong postoperative radicular pain relief with no recurrence of symptoms.

The absence of muscle retraction in the endoscopic microdiscectomy, as well as the marginal lesion of healthy tissues, all contribute to reduced postoperative lumbar pain. Conventional discectomy necessitates retraction of the paravertebral muscles, bone resection of part of the lamina and the medial edge of the facet joints and partial removal of the ligamentum flavum, in addition to a wider incision. Reduced hospital stays and early patient recovery are both aided by a decrease in postoperative pain. In the emergency department, the manipulation of nerve systems is also minimized.¹ In the case of extensive epidural fibrosis, there is a 3.2 times greater risk of symptoms persisting¹⁷, which is linked to the persistence of sciatic discomfort and unsatisfactory surgical results and should be avoided.^{18,19}

The average surgery time for endoscopic microdiscectomy in our sample was 120 minutes, which can be compared to other similar studies. The absence of epidural fibrosis and immobilization of the nerve roots, which are normal after open surgery, results in shorter hospital stays.²⁰ During endoscopic technique, the epidural vein system remains unchanged. This aids in the prevention of venous stasis and chronic nerve root swelling. Rapid healing can be aided by minimizing surgical damage to myo-ligament structures. Furthermore, traumatic nerve excision does not need any additional bone removal or broad skin incisions.²¹ The risk of scars, blood loss, infection, and anesthesia complications is greatly decreased or removed. All of this leads to less discomfort in the postoperative phase in endoscopically treated patients, reducing the need for postoperative analgesia and, as a result, potential radial pain, despite root pain relief in the operated patients. Since the paravertebral muscles are not shortened, they shrink and are badly weakened as a result.22

On longer follow-up, endoscopic and microscopic discectomies are similarly secure and reliable procedures for lumbar disc removal. However, because of early

mobilization and less postoperative discomfort, endoscopic discectomy was found to be superior to traditional discectomy in terms of short-term outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Both endoscopic microdiscectomy and conventional discectomy was effective and safe procedures. But conventional discectomy was found less effective as compared to endoscopic microdiscectomy in terms of rapid mobilization and postoperative pain.

REFERENCES

- Ruetten S, Komp M, Merk H, Godolias G. Full-endoscopic interlaminar and transforaminal lumbar discectomy versus conventional microsurgical technique: a prospective, randomized, controlled study. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2008;33(9):931–9.
- Mayer HM, Brock M. Percutaneous endoscopic discectomy: surgical technique and preliminary results compared to microsurgical discectomy. J Neurosurg 1993;78(2):216-25.
 Hermantin FU, Peters T, Quartararo L, Kambin P. A
- Hermantin FU, Peters T, Quartararo L, Kambin P. A prospective, randomized study comparing the results of open discectomy with those of video-assisted arthroscopic microdiscectomy. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1999;81(7):958-65.
 Pan L, Zhang P, Yin Q. Comparison of tissue damages
- Pan L, Zhang P, Yin Q. Comparison of tissue damages caused by endoscopic lumbar discectomy and traditional lumbar discectomy: a randomised controlled trial. Int J Surg 2014;12(5):534-7.
- Pan Z, Ha Y, Yi S, Cao K. Efficacy of transforaminal endoscopic spine system (TESSYS) technique in treating lumbar disc herniation. Med Sci Monit 2016;22:530-9.
- Lequin MB, Verbaan D, Jacobs WC, Brand R, Bouma GJ, Vandertop WP, et al. Surgery versus prolonged conservative treatment for sciatica: 5-year results of a randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open 2013;3:13-7.
- Awad JN, Moskovich R. Lumbar disc herniations: surgical versus nonsurgical treatment. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2006;443:183-97.
- Mixter W, Barr J. Rupture of the intervertebral disc with involvement of the spinal canal. N Engl J Med 1934;211:210-15.
- Caspar W. A new surgical procedure for lumbar disc herniation causing less tissue damage through a microsurgical approach. In: Wüllenweber R, Brock M, Hamer J, Klinger M, Spoerri O, eds. Lumbar disc adult hydrocephalus. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer; 1977; 74-80.
- Koebbe CJ, Maroon JC, Abla A, El-Kadi H, Bost J. Lumbar microdiscectomy: a historical perspective and current technical considerations. Neurosurg Focus 2002;13:E3.

- ImranKhan, Sohail Amir, Atif Amman, Hanif-ur-Rehman, Ayaz Afridi, Muhammad Ali Numan, ShahidAyub. Comparison of Outcomes of Endoscopic Microdiscectomy versus Conventional Discectomy for Lumbar Disc. Pak J Neurol Surg 2020; 24(4): 405-11.
- Wadd IH, Ijaz S, Naem-ul-Hasan. Endoscopic discectomy versus microscopic discectomy. Pak J Neurol Surg 2021; 5(1): 96-101.
- Marappan K, RanganathanJ, Sherina PR. Microendoscopic discectomy (MED) for lumbar disc herniation: comparison of learning curve of the surgery and outcome with other established case studies. J Spine Surg 2018; 4(3): 630.
- Alvi MA, PanagiotisK, Waseem W, Anshit G, Mohamad B. Operative approaches for lumbar disc herniation: a systematic review and multiple treatment meta-analysis of conventional and minimally invasive surgeries. World Neurosurg 2018;114: 391-407.
- Qin R, Baoshan L, Jie H, Pin Z, Yu Y, Feng Z, Xiaoqing C. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy versus posterior open lumbar microdiscectomy for the treatment of symptomatic lumbar disc herniation: a systemic review and meta-analysis. World Neurosurg 2018;120: 352-62.
- Yeung A, Gore S. Endoscopic for aminal decompression for failed back surgery syndrome under local anesthesia. Int J Spine Surg 2014;8:22.
- Ross JS, Robertson JT, Frederickson RCA, et al. Association between peridural scar and recurrent radicular pain after lumbar discectomy: magnetic resonance evaluation. Neurosurgery 1996; 38(4):855-61.
- Coskun E, Suzer T, Topuz O, Zencir M, Pakdemirli E, Tahta K. Relationships between epidural fibrosis, pain, disability, and psychological factors after lumbar disc surgery. Eur Spine J 2000; 9(3):218-23.
- 19. Geisler F. Prevention of peridural fibrosis: current methodologies. Neurol Res 1999;21(suppl 1):S9–22.
- Sah RK, Tao L, Zhiyue S, Jingming X, Yingsong W. Clinical outcome of percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy and open lumbar microdiscectomy for lumbar disc herniation: a literature review. Sci Inventions Today 2019; 8(1):97-106.
- Kapetanakis S, Gkantsinikoudis N, Chaniotakis C, Charitoudis C, Givissis P. Percutaneous transforaminal endoscopic discectomy for the treatment of lumbar disc herniation in obese patients: health-related quality of life assessment in a 2-year follow-up. World Neurosurg 2018;113: e638-49.
- 22. Meyer G, Ivan Dias DR, Alexandre FC, Raphael Martus M, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy versus microdiscectomy for the treatment of lumbar disc herniation: pain, disability, and complication rate - a randomized clinical trial. Int J Spine Surg 2020: 14(1): 72-8.