A Prospective Study of Thoracolumbar Pott’s Spine Treated at a Tertiary Care Centre by Posterior Decompression Alone
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**Abstract**

In order to extract current trends in diagnosis and medical or surgical treatment of spinal TB we performed a review with patients admitted to our hospital between 2016 and 2017. Although the development of more accurate imaging modalities such as magnetic resonance imaging and advanced surgical techniques have made the early diagnosis and management of spinal TB much easier, these are still very challenging topics. In this review we aim to discuss the diagnosis and management of spinal TB based on studies with acceptable design, clearly explained results and justifiable conclusions.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Tuberculosis is a common disease in developing countries affecting a large proportion of population. It is a major cause of mortality and morbidity in India. There is large number of cases having extra-pulmonary tuberculosis. Vertebral column is a common site for extra-pulmonary tuberculosis. The entity is called as Pott’s spine. Pott’s disease, described by Sir Percival Pott, is one of the oldest demonstrated diseases affecting humans [1, 2]. The thoracolumbar spine is the most commonly affected, with less frequent involvement of the cervical and sacral spine [4]. Tuberculous spondylitis is diagnosed in the second, third, or fourth decade of life in developing nations, with a male to female ratio ranging from 1.3 : 1 to 1.7 : 1 [2,3,4-6]. Neurologic deficits with or without kyphotic deformities are a frequent sequelae of serious disease [7].

**METHODS**

The study was conducted in the Department of Neurosurgery, G. R. Medical College and Jay Arogya Hospital, Gwalior, M.P. India, over a period of one year. Of all patients with thoracolumbar otts spine admitted in the hospital during the study period were included. Patients of all age groups and both sexes were included in the study. These cases were analyzed for age, sex incidence, location and histopathological diagnosis. Statistical analysis was done by calculating the numbers and percentage for computing the incidence in various age groups, in sexes, location.

**Study design**

A meta-analysis

**Ethical approval**

The study was undertaken after consent and clearance by the ethical committee of G.R. Medical College Gwalior

**Inclusion criteria**

Of all patients admitted with thoracolumbar potts spine during the period 2016 – 2017 were included.

**Exclusion criteria**

Cervical potts were excluded.

**Sample size**

Twenty five patients

**Methodology**

Age, Sex, Location, presenting complaints were studied.
RESULT

At the end after evaluation of the results of decompression with a minimum follow-up of 6 months, inference made based on the data obtained from study.

In following points
- Operative duration.
- Neurological outcome
- Mobility
- Deformity
- Back pain
- Control of infection
- Complication

OBSERVATION

The present study comprises of 25 patients of thoracolumbar Pott’s spine admitted in the department of Neurosurgery, G.R. Medical College & J.A. Group of Hospitals, Gwalior from Feb 2016 to Aug 2017 who were treated by decompression alone.

| Table-1: Age distribution | Age in Years | No. of patients | Percentage |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| <10                       | 3            | 12%             |
| 10-20                     | 1            | 4%              |
| 21-40                     | 11           | 44%             |
| 41-60                     | 8            | 32%             |
| >60                       | 2            | 8%              |

Mean age was 37.2 years

| Table-2: Sex distribution | Sex | Number of patients | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-----|--------------------|------------|
|                           | Male | 13                 | 52%        |
|                           | Female | 12               | 48%        |

| Table-3: Distribution according to location of disease | Location of disease | Number of patients | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------|
|                                                        | Upper Dorsal spine D1-4 | 2                 | 8%         |
|                                                        | Mid Dorsal spine D4-8 | 6                 | 24%        |
|                                                        | Lower Dorsal spine D8-12 | 13               | 52%        |
|                                                        | Lumbar spine L1-5 | 4                 | 16%        |

| Table-4: Assessment of effect of Decompression alone after 1 month | Sign & Symptoms | Present | Improvement | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|------------|
| Pain relief                                                     | 25              | 20      | 80%         |
| improvement in power                                            | 22              | 15      | 68%         |
| improvement in sensation                                        | 21              | 10      | 47.6%       |
| improvement in Autonomic system                                 | 8               | 2       | 25%         |
| Mobility                                                        | 22              | 4       | 18%         |
| improvement in Cobb’s angle                                     | 25              | 6       | 24%         |

| Table-5: Assessment of effect of Decompression alone after 3 month | Sign & Symptoms | Present | Improvement | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|------------|
| Pain relief                                                     | 25              | 23      | 92%         |
| improvement in power                                            | 22              | 17      | 77%         |
| improvement in sensation                                        | 21              | 13      | 62%         |
| improvement in Autonomic system                                 | 8               | 2       | 25%         |
| Mobility                                                        | 22              | 15      | 68%         |
| improvement in Cobb’s angle                                     | 25              | 6       | 24%         |

| Table-6: Assessment of effect of Decompression alone after 6 month | Sign & Symptoms | Present | Improvement | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|------------|
| Pain relief                                                     | 25              | 24      | 96%         |
| improvement in power                                            | 22              | 17      | 77%         |
| improvement in sensation                                        | 21              | 15      | 71.5%       |
| improvement in Autonomic system                                 | 8               | 3       | 25%         |
| Mobility                                                        | 22              | 17      | 77%         |
| improvement in Cobb’s angle                                     | 25              | 7       | 28%         |

| Table-7: Post-operative Complications | complications | Number of patients |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Wound infection                      | 2              |
| Persistent pain                      | 1              |
| Paraplegia                           | 3              |
| Implant Failure                      |                |
| Fusion failure                       | 5              |
| vascular injury                      | 0              |
| Perioperative bleeding                | 0              |
| Revision of surgery                  |                |
| Death                                | 0              |
Table-8: Comparison of effectiveness between decompressions alone versus decompression with instrumentation procedure after 6 months-

| Sign & Symptoms                  | Patients got relieved by Decompression alone % | Patients got relieved by Decompression with instrumentation % | P- Value |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Pain relief                      | 96                                            | 88                                                          | 0.8314   |
| improvement in power             | 77                                            | 78                                                          | 0.977    |
| improvement in sensation         | 71.5                                          | 91                                                          | 0.598    |
| improvement in Autonomic system  | 25                                            | 50                                                          | 0.466    |
| Mobility                         | 77                                            | 91                                                          | 0.716    |
| improvement in Cobb’s angle      | 28                                            | 84                                                          | 0.0312   |

**DISCUSSION**

The present study has been carried out in the department of neurosurgery, G.R. Medical College, Gwalior on the patients of the thoracolumbar Pott’s spine during February 2016 to August 2017. Total 25 cases of thoracolumbar Pott’s spine were chosen for decompression alone procedure, choice of the operative procedure was decided according to feasibility, affordability and general medical condition of the patients.

Table-9: Age and sex wise distribution of the patients

| s.n  | Study                  | Age group (years) | Mean age (years) | Sex ratio (M:F) |
|------|------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1    | Present Study          | 4-68              | 38.24            | 50:50           |
| 2    | M. Ehsaei et al. [8]   | 5-80              | 42.5             | 48:52           |
| 3    | Park et al. [9]        | 10-76             | 44               | 50:50           |
| 4    | Kenyon et al. [10]     | 14-65             | 29               | 47:53           |
| 5    | Su et al. [11]         | 10-88             | 44.5             | 50:50           |
| 6    | Barriere et al. [12]   | 20-76             | 42               | 56:44           |
| 7    | Alothman et al. [13]   | 15-80             | 53               | 53:47           |
| 8    | Solagberu et al. [14]  | 2-70              | 27               | 48:52           |

Table-10: Location wise distribution

| S.N. | Study                  | Thoracic (%) | Thoraco lumbar (%) | Lumbar (%) |
|------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1    | Present study          | 68           | 16                 | 16         |
| 2    | M. Ehsaei et al. [8]   | 46           | 10                 | 33         |
| 3    | Park et al. [9]        | 78           | 11                 | 20         |
| 4    | Kenyon et al. [10]     | 65           | -                  | 41         |
| 5    | Su et al. [11]         | 33           | 17                 | 42         |
| 6    | Barriere et al. [12]   | 48           | 0                  | 21         |
| 7    | Alothman et al. [13]   | 55           | -                  | 36         |
| 8    | Solagberu et al. [14]  | 24           | 24                 | 44         |

Results of the decompression alone was observed after one month of follow up there was improvement in back pain was more in decompression alone group patients as compared to decompression with instrumentation group, improvement in power and sensation and bowel bladder function was more or less similar in both the groups and no significant difference in either group while there was significant improvement in mobility and Cobb’s angle improvement in decompression with instrumentation group as compared to decompression alone group patients.

After three months of follow up improvement in back pain, power, sensation, bowel bladder function and mobility was more or less similar in both the groups and no significant difference in either group while there was significant improvement of Cobb’s angle in decompression with instrumentation group as compared to decompression alone group patients.

After six month of follow up it was observed that improvement in back pain, power and mobility more or less similar in both the groups and no significant difference in either group while there was more improvement in sensation and bowel bladder function, in decompression with instrumentation group but improvement was not statistically significant. While significant improvement was found in Cobb’s angle in decompression with instrumentation group as compared to decompression alone group patients.

Moreover the in decompression alone there was only decompression of cord was done and the pressure over the cord was removed but the spine became unstable so it hampers the mobility and
therefore increased deformity was found in the decompression alone group while in other group decompression with instrumentation spine was stable so there was improvement in Cobb’s angle and minimal deformity of spine and improved mobility as spine was stabilised patients were mobilised early in compare to decompression alone group.

However there is another extreme of the spectrum in developing countries where many poor patients are left untreated due to lack of adequate infrastructure (number of beds/hospitals), human resource (medical and paramedical staff), literacy awareness and capacity to afford cost of implants at public healthcare facility or cost of treatment at private healthcare facility. Medical practice in this era is expected to be ethical; evidence based and should adhere to various protocols established over the years for quality and safety. Therefore, if a paraplegic patient with tuberculosis of dorsal spine with kyphosis is to be treated, he has to be operated at a centre where at least radiographic localisation equipment, high speed drill, and surgeons are available. Tuberculosis is prevalent in developing countries and burden of spinal tuberculosis patients, who are extremely poor, is much more than what public sector hospitals in developing countries can handle/treat.

If a poor patient is admitted to a public sector hospital, cost of prosthetic implants is beyond his reach. Average cost of available implants required for a patient of dorsal spinal tuberculosis of 1-2 levels is approximately USD 1000, which is more than or equal to annual income of most of these patients. Unfortunately, the end result is to choose ATT alone (without surgery) or effective decompressive surgeries without fixation through minimum surgical trauma and prolonged bed rest for bony fusion to occur.

Furthermore in the present study we found that in decompression alone patients have good relief in backache, less time consuming procedure, easy with less intraoperative blood loss but as spine was unstable patient have to bed ridden for long time and there was increased deformity of spine as compared to the decompression with instrumentation group patients.

It is thus clear that the decompression with instrumentation group is the surgical procedure of choice for thoracolumbar Pott’s spine as this is simple, safe procedure with improved stability of spine and improved and early mobility on long term follow up.

After comparison of the results of the decompression alone and decompression with instrumentation, it was observed that after one month of follow up there was improvement in back pain was more in decompression alone group patients as compared to decompression with instrumentation group, improvement in power and sensation and bowel bladder function was more or less similar in both the groups and no significant difference in either group while there was significant improvement in mobility and Cobb’s angle improvement in decompression with instrumentation group as compared to decompression alone group patients.

After three months of follow up improvement in back pain, power, sensation, bowel bladder function and mobility was more or less similar in both the groups and no significant difference in either group while there was significant improvement of Cobb’s angle in decompression with instrumentation group as compared to decompression alone group patients.

After six month of follow up it was observed that improvement in back pain, power and mobility more or less similar in both the groups and no significant difference in either group while there was more improvement in sensation and bowel bladder function, in decompression with instrumentation group but improvement was not statistically significant. While significant improvement was found in Cobb’s angle in decompression with instrumentation group as compared to decompression alone group patients.

Moreover in decompression alone there was only decompression of cord was done and the pressure over the cord was removed but the spine became unstable so it hampers the mobility and therefore increased deformity was found in the decompression alone group while in other group decompression with instrumentation spine was stable so there was improvement in Cobb’s angle and minimal deformity of spine and improved mobility as spine was stabilised patients were mobilised early in compare to decompression alone group.

However there is another extreme of the spectrum in developing countries where many poor patients are left untreated due to lack of adequate infrastructure (number of beds/hospitals), human resource (medical and paramedical staff), literacy awareness and capacity to afford cost of implants at public healthcare facility or cost of treatment at private healthcare facility. Medical practice in this era is expected to be ethical; evidence based and should adhere to various protocols established over the years for quality and safety. Therefore, if a paraplegic patient with tuberculosis of dorsal spine with kyphosis is to be treated, he has to be operated at a centre where at least radiographic localisation equipment, high speed drill, and surgeons are available. Tuberculosis is prevalent in developing countries and burden of spinal tuberculosis patients, who are extremely poor, is much more than what public sector hospitals in developing countries can handle/treat.
If a poor patient is admitted to a public sector hospital, cost of prosthetic implants is beyond his reach. Average cost of available implants required for a patient of dorsal spinal tuberculosis of 1-2 levels is approximately USD 1000, which is more than or equal to annual income of most of these patients. Unfortunately, the end result is to choose ATT alone (without surgery) or effective decompressive surgeries without fixation through minimum surgical trauma and prolonged bed rest for bony fusion to occur. Furthermore in the present study we found that in decompression alone patients have good relief in backache, less time consuming procedure, easy with less intraoperative blood loss but as spine was unstable patient have to bed ridden for long time and there was increased deformity of spine as compared to the decompression with instrumentation group patients.

The incidence of disease was equal in both males and females

- Mean age was 38.24 years and ranging from 4 years to 68 years.
- Dorsal spine especially lower dorsal segment was most commonly involved.
- Backache was the most common presenting symptom (100%) and 90% came to the hospital with motor weakness.
- Decompression alone shows more improvement in back pain in early post-operative period.
- Mean operative duration was less in decompression alone procedure.
- Decompression procedure is easy, less time consuming with less learning curve with less intraoperative blood loss.
- Decompression with instrumentation shows significant improvement in early mobility of the patients as spine is more stable.

REFERENCES

1. Taylor GM, Murphy E, Hopkins R, Rutland P, Chistov Y. First report of Mycobacterium bovis DNA in human remains from the Iron Age. Microbiology 2007; 153:1243–1249.
2. Lifeso RM, Weaver P, Harder EH. Tuberculous spondylitis in adults. Am J Bone Joint Surg. 1985; 67:1405–141.
3. Gorse GJ, Pais MJ, Kusske JA, Cesario TC. Tuberculous spondylitis: a report of six cases and review of the literature. Medicine (Baltimore) 1983; 62:178–193.
4. Five-year assessments of controlled trials of ambulatory treatment, debridement and anterior spinal fusion in the management of tuberculosis of the spine. Studies in Bulawayo (Rhodesia) and in Hong Kong. Sixth report of the Medical Research Council Working Party on Tuberculosis of the Spine. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 1978; 60:163–177.
5. A 10-year assessment of a controlled trial comparing debridement and anterior spinal fusion in the management of tuberculosis of the spine in patients on standard chemotherapy in Hong Kong. Eighth Report of the Medical Research Council Working Party on Tuberculosis of the Spine. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 1982; 64:393–398.
6. A 10-year assessment of controlled trials of inpatient and outpatient treatment of plaster-of-Paris jackets for tuberculosis of the spine in children on standard chemotherapy. Studies in Masan and Pusan, Korea. Ninth report of the Medical Research Council Working Party on Tuberculosis of the Spine. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 1985; 67:103–110.
7. Jain AK, Kumar S, Tuli SM. Tuberculosis of spine [C1–D4]. Spinal Cord. 1999; 37:362–369.
8. Gupta AK, Srivastava A, Sengar RL. Epidemiological Study of Thoracolumbar Pott’s Spine at a Tertiary Care Hospital in North India. Romanian Neurosurgery. 2018 Jun 1;32(2):340-6.
9. Park DW, Outcome and management of spinal tuberculosis according to the severity of disease: a retrospective study of 137 adult patients at Korean teaching hospitals. Spine (Phil Pa 1976). 2007; 32:E130–E135.
10. Kenyon PC, Chapman AL. Tuberculous vertebral osteomyelitis: findings of a 10-year review of experience in a UK centre. J Infect. 2009;59:372–373.
11. Su SH, Tsai WC, Lin CY, Lin WR, Chen TC, Lu PL, Huang PM, Tsai JR, Wang YL, Feng MC, Wang TP. Clinical features and outcomes of spinal tuberculosis in southern Taiwan. Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection. 2010 Aug 1;43(4):291-300.
12. Barriere V, Gepner P, Bricaire F, Bletry O, Caumes E. Current aspects of spinal tuberculosis: apropos of 16 case reports. Ann Med Interne (Paris). 1999;150:363–369.
13. Naik R, Minj AM, Panda R, Satpathi S, Behera PK, Panda KM. Cytohistological correlation and accuracy of the pap smear test in diagnosis of cervical lesions: a hospital based cross-sectional study from Odisha, India. Med Sci. 2015;3:242-9.
14. Solagberu BA, Ayorinde RO. Tuberculosis of the spine in Ilorin, Nigeria. East Afr Med J. 2001; 78:197–199.