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Study Design. Eighteen patients with lumbar instability from fractures, post laminectomy syndrome, or infection were treated prospectively with minimally invasive retroperitoneal lumbar fusions.

Objectives. To determine if interbody Baggby and Kuslich fusion cages and femoral allograft bone dowels can be inserted in a transverse direction via a lateral endoscopic retroperitoneal approach to achieve spinal stability.

Summary of Background Data. Endoscopic spinal approaches have been used to achieve lower lumbar fusion when instrumentation is placed through a laparoscopic, transperitoneal route. However, complications of using this approach include postoperative intra-abdominal adhesions, retrograde ejaculation, great vessel injury, and implant migration. This study is the first clinical series investigating the use of the lateral retroperitoneal, minimally invasive approach for lumbar fusions from L1 to L5.

Methods. Eighteen patients underwent anterior interbody decompression and/or stabilization via endoscopic retroperitoneal approaches. In most cases, three 12-mm portals were used. Two parallel transverse interbody cages restored the neuroforaminal height and the desired amount of lumbar lordosis was achieved by inserting a larger anterior cage, distraction plug, or bone dowel.

Results. The overall morbidity of the procedure was lower than that associated with traditional "open" retroperitoneal or laparotomy techniques, with a mean length of hospital stay of 2.8 days (range, outpatient procedure to 8 days). The mean estimated intraoperative blood loss was 208 cc (range, 25–1000 cc). There were no cases of implant migration, significant subsidence, or pseudoarthrosis at mean follow-up examination of 24.3 months (range, 12–40 months) after surgery.

Conclusions. This preliminary study of 18 patients illustrates that endoscopic techniques can be applied effectively through a retroperitoneal approach with the patient in the lateral position. Unlike the patients who had undergone transperitoneal procedures described in previous reports, in these preliminary 18 patients, there were no cases of retrograde ejaculation, injury to the great vessels, or implant migration. [Key words: endoscopic retroperitoneal, minimally invasive retroperitoneal lumbar fusions, transverse axis BAK] Spine 1998; 23:1476–1484

The use of minimally invasive and endoscopic approaches has been described for multiple abdominal procedures, including cholecystectomy,‡§ appendixectomy,‡⁵ colon resection,‡⁷ and Nisson fundoplication.‡⁸ Recently, increased attention has been paid to the use of these approaches with lumbar disectomy‡⁹,‡¹ and lumbar anterior interbody arthrodesis.‡¹,‡² Most endoscopic approaches described thus far have been transperitoneal and have depended on CO₂ insufflation to provide working space and to retract the small bowel out of the surgical field. Gaur and McDougall et al were the first to describe retroperitoneoscopy, an endoscopic retroperitoneal approach for urologic procedures. The current report describes the natural transition toward retroperitoneal minimally invasive endoscopic spinal surgery, which does not require CO₂ insufflation, Trendelenburg position, entrance into the peritoneum, or anterior dissection near the great vessels to provide safe exposure for spinal surgery.

Materials and Methods

Twelve minimally invasive retroperitoneal lumbar procedures were performed at St. Joseph's Hospital in Baltimore, Maryland, and six were performed at Presbyterian Hospital of Plano, Texas, between March 1994 and September 1996. There were 6 female and 12 male patients, with a mean age of 53.4 years (range, 31–76 years).

The indications for surgery included 13 cases of degenerative conditions, three cases of infections, one unstable burst fracture, and one case of a retroperitoneal neurofibroma in-
Figure 1. This 75-year-old man had back pain and right anterior thigh pain 2 years after he had undergone laminectomies from L3 to S1 with a posterolateral fusion from L4 to S1. The lateral (A) and anteroposterior (B) radiographs show "vacuum disk" sign at L3–L4 with lateral translation of the L3 vertebral body on L4. His characteristic pain was reproduced by an L3–L4 discogram performed by an independent radiologist. Lateral (C) and anteroposterior (D) radiographs were obtained after the procedure using the endoscopic retroperitoneal approach was performed and a transversely oriented BAK fusion cage was inserted (15 mm in diameter and 24 mm length). The patient's back and right leg pain resolved after surgery.

The retroperitoneal approach proved to be very versatile in the range of vertebral levels addressed throughout the 18 cases. Four patients underwent procedures at L1–L2, seven patients at L3–L4, and two patients at L4–L5. There were four endoscopic decompressions and fusions at L2–L3. One patient with vertebral osteomyelitis underwent a decompressive procedure from L2 to L4.

Surgical Technique. The approach is a combination of video-assisted thoracoscopic and laparoscopic methods. The patient is put under general endotracheal anesthesia, then turned in the...
vertebral bodies are exposed, and the lumbar segmental vessels. Alternatively, carbon dioxide insufflation can be forced into the retroperitoneal space. Notice the "winged keel cutting edges," which will penetrate a fascial layer, such as the peritoneum, if the trochar is forcibly twisted backwards and forwards.

Usually, the genitofemoral nerve is visualized on the surface of the preperitoneal fat is encountered. The trochar is used to create a section, balloon insufflation, or the use of an optical, transparent, dissecting trochar, called an Optiview (Ethicon Endosurgery, Cincinnati, OH) that was used in dissecting the retroperitoneal space. Notice the "winged keel cutting edges," that will not penetrate a fascial layer such as the peritoneum unless the trochar is twisted. Therefore, the three abdominal muscular layers overlying the peritoneum are penetrated in sequence under direct visualization until the preperitoneal fat is encountered. The trochar is used to create a potential space that is superficial to the peritoneum until the laterally oriented fibers of the psoas major muscle are viewed. Usually, the genitofemoral nerve is visualized on the surface of the psoas muscle. At this juncture, a dissection balloon, such as the Zimmer (Wausau, IN) Ultra-power or Anspach with heavy-duty rongeurs or a high-powered, 5-mm burr, such as the Zimmer (Wausau, IN) Ultra-power or Anspach with long extensions, can be used to hollow out the vertebral body to allow collateral circulation to the neuroforamen and spinal cord to occur to its maximum potential. If the lesion is a tumor or infection, then a culture and frozen section are obtained at this time in the procedure. A 45-degree, 4-mm—wide endoscopic Kerrison rongeur is used to resect the pedicle. Starting cephalad, the instrument is pointed caudad to protect the exit site. Optimally, two vascular clips or an endoloop on the high-pressure side are ligated and divided.

Occasionally, a fourth 10-mm portal is used for suctioning in highly vascular cases requiring corpectomies for tumors or infections. Occasionally, for longer strut grafts or instrumentation, the 10-mm working portal is extended in size as much as 5 cm, and an endoscopically assisted, mini-laparotomy type of retroperitoneal exposure facilitates the corpectomy or spinal instrumentation. If the size of the working portal is extended, of course, the CO₂ insufflation is lost, and the working space in the retroperitoneum has to be maintained by using retractors. This technique is advantageous because the spinal decompression can be accomplished without airtight seals, and because standard thoracoscopic instruments can be used on the lumbar spine. In other words, throughout the remainder of the procedure, spine instruments of heterogeneous shaft diameters can be used, and airtight seals around trocars are not required.

Once the vertebral level is confirmed fluoroscopically, the transversalis fascia, perinephric fascia, and retroperitoneal contents are retracted anteriorily (Figure 3). Electrocautery is used to mark the intervertebral discs adjacent to the involved lesion. For example, for an L1 corpectomy, the L1-L2 and the T12-L1 intervertebral disc spaces are marked. A left-sided approach to the surgery is preferred to a right-sided approach, because it is easier to dissect the aorta off the spine than to dissect around the more friable inferior vena cava; this is particularly true in cases of pyogenic vertebral osteomyelitis or cases of neoplasm that occur after radiation therapy with retroperitoneal fibrosis. The psoas muscle is retracted posteriorly, and the ureter is retracted anteriorly.

If a corpectomy is being performed after the two adjacent discectomies, the surgeon must have access to three methods of hemostasis: 1) Endo-Avitene Microfibrillar Collagen (Alcon, Inc., Humacao, Puerto Rico), 2) Gelfoam (Upjohn Corp., Kalamazoo, MI) soaked in Thrombin (GenTrac Corp., Middleton, WI), and 3) bipolar endoscopic electrocautery. At this point, the segmental vessels are dissected from the underlying bone and elevated with a right-angled clamp. It is important to use two vascular clips or an endoloop on the high-pressure side of the vessels; the vessels are divided with endoscissors. As a general rule, with any spine procedure the segmental vessels are ligated and divided in the anterior half of the vertebral body to allow collateral circulation to the neuroforamen and spinal cord to occur to its maximum potential. If the lesion is a tumor or infection, then a culture and frozen section are obtained at this time in the procedure. A 45-degree, 4-mm—wide endoscopic Kerrison rongeur is used to resect the pedicle. Starting cephalad, the instrument is pointed caudad to protect the exiting spinal roots. Either Kandera (Acromed Corp., Cleveland, OH) heavy-duty rongeurs or a high-powered, 5-mm burr, such as the Zimmer (Wausau, IN) Ultra-power or Anspach with long extensions, can be used to hollow out the vertebral body. Curettes and small 2—3-mm Kerrison rongeurs are used to complete the corpectomy. It is important to decompress the spinal canal all the way across to the base of the opposite pedicle. Decompression is accomplished only when the opposite pedicle is palpated or visualized. An autogenous iliac strut graft is tamped into place, filling the anterior portion of the corpectomy defect.

Alternatively, if the patient only requires a discectomy or one-level fusion, an anterior interbody fusion can be accomplished endoscopically. The disc space height is restored by using a distraction plug placed from the side. Optimally, two
distraction plugs are tamped into the disc space: one anteriorly and one posteriorly. At this point, either a single-barrel or double-barrel drill tube is placed over the distraction plugs. The position of the distraction plugs is monitored with anteroposterior and lateral fluoroscopy. The center of the distraction plugs will correspond with the center of the BAK interbody fusion cages or endoscopic bone dowels. Four patients underwent the cages were packed with autogenous iliac bone graft. The morselized iliac autograft can be harvested with minimally invasive techniques through a 12-mm incision by using a disposable T-shaped awl.

After surgery, the patient is placed in a warm and form corset (interbody fusion) or a thoracolumbar sacral orthosis (after a corpectomy), until radiographic fusion is accomplished. Intraoperatively, it is important to countersink the BAK fusion cages or laparoscopic bone dowel. The authors advocate packing additional bone graft superficial to the cage. At 3–6 months after surgery, arthrodesis can be confirmed if solid trabecular bone is observed to bridge one vertebrae to the adjacent level; this is the most reliable radiographic sign of a solid arthrodesis. Three-dimensional, computed-tomography reconstruction images of the bone within the cages and flexion-extension lateral radiographs also can provide useful information.

**Results**

The mean length of the postoperative follow-up period was 24.3 months (range, 12–40 months). Fourteen patients underwent left-sided retroperitoneal approaches, and, in four patients, the pathology was addressed more easily on the right side. There were four patients who in whom a single incision was made of 5 centimeters or less. Fourteen patients had either three or four portals measuring approximately 12 mm in length. These fourteen patients had CO2 insufflation to assist the retrotransverse dissection. The patients with one incision of 5 centimeters or less had lesions compatible with infection or tumor, and the use of CO2 insufflation was avoided to prevent pressurizing the tumor cells or bacteria systemically into the patient's bloodstream.

Fusions were performed in 15 of 18 cases by using structural bone graft and/or interbody fusion cages. A 38-year-old radiologist’s wife with a neurofibroma arising from the lumbar sacral plexus adjacent to the left common iliac vein did not demonstrate preoperative or intraoperative instability; therefore, a fusion procedure was not indicated.

Ten patients underwent fusion surgery with custom BAK interbody fusion cages. The long axes of the cages were in the transverse direction (Figure 4). In each case, the cages were packed with autogenous iliac bone graft harvested using a minimally invasive, T-shaped trochar, that was 10 mm in diameter. Four patients underwent placement of laparoscopic bone dowels fashioned from femoral allograft. The long axes of the implants were positioned in a transverse direction.

There were no cases of implant migration or pseudoarthrosis. There were no cases of a radiolucent interface between the implant and the vertebral body. There were no cases of subsidence more than 1 mm, and there was trabecular bony bridging across the adjacent vertebrae laterally by 6 months after surgery.

One additional patient did not undergo an endoscopic stabilization procedure. He was a 47-year-old man with an unstable burst fracture who had undergone left anterior Kaneda instrumentation at the referring institution 3 months earlier. He had had an incomplete neurologic deficit; a preoperative computed tomography scan had demonstrated continued right-sided cauda equina compression. A right-sided endoscopic decompression was performed at the authors’ institution, and additional stabilization was not required.

For all 18 cases, the mean duration of the surgical procedure, including the harvesting of iliac crest bone autograft, was 115.2 minutes (range, 60–260 minutes). The mean estimated blood loss, which, at the authors’ institutions, is determined by the attending anesthesiologist, was 205 cc (range, 25–1000 cc). The mean length of hospital stay was 2.9 days (range, outpatient procedure to 5 days).

**Complications**

There were three patients with postoperative complications. Case 2 was a 71-year-old man on renal dialysis who presented with sepsis. Endoscopic, retroperitoneal, L3–L4 discectomy; debridement; and fusion were performed to culture and manage an L3–L4 pyogenic osteomyelitis. Six weeks after surgery, after treatment with intravenous antibiotics, the patient underwent posterior, segmental stabilization with Texas Scottish Rite Hospital implants from L1–L5 for more definitive stabilization and fusion. The single-level, anterior, interbody, endoscopic fusion was not believed to be adequate to prevent long-term lumbar kyphosis and instability.

The second complication occurred intraoperatively in Case 3, when a laparoscopic bone dowel partially fractured at the point of attachment of the driver into the central drilling peg in the femoral cortical allograft. The fractured piece of allograft was extremely small (approximately 0.5 cm × 0.5 cm × 0.5 cm), and the patient’s spinal stability was not jeopardized. There were no long-term sequelae, and the patient had a solid arthrodesis, which was facilitated by morselized iliac autograft placed in the central chamber of all laparoscopic bone dowels.

The third complication occurred in a 69-year-old man who underwent transverse BAK cage insertion for posterolateral instability at L3–L4. The patient developed a hematoma in the psoas muscle at L3–L4 after surgery. This resulted in a temporary genitofemoral nerve palsy, which resolved spontaneously within 3 months.
Discussion

Retroperitoneal lumbar fusion and stabilization offers several advantages over conventional anterior transperitoneal laparoscopic approaches of the lumbar spine. Retroperitoneal approaches obviate the risk of small bowel obstruction or postoperative intraperitoneal adhesions. Additionally, there should be a reduced risk of retrograde ejaculation, because the autonomic plexus is not dissected, in contrast to preliminary reports of transperitoneal laparoscopic approaches. The patient is in the lateral decubitus position, which facilitates exposure of the lumbar spine, as gravity helps retract the abdominal contents anteriorly. With the straight, lateral position, as opposed to the supine Trendelenburg position required for transperitoneal laparoscopy, it is easier to get orthogonal to the disc space and spine with laterally directed placement of interbody threaded fusion cages. The surgeon can use two longer cages in the transverse axis, with a larger-diameter cage anterior and a smaller-diameter cage posterior, thus “customizing” or “dialing in” the optimal degree of intervertebral lordosis (Figure 5). The same effect of altering the sagittal plane alignment was achieved in the majority of patients in this study by using distraction plugs of different diameters to adjust the degree of lordosis even before reaming the cage diameter. Two longer cages placed laterally via the retroperitoneal approach should be biomechanically more stable, because the surface area of the vertebral body cage contact area is greater than that achieved when using a transperitoneal approach. In addition, the anterior longitudinal ligament and posterior longitudinal ligament are not violated with the lateral retroperitoneal approach. With the transperitoneal approach, if the surgeon reams, taps, or drills too deeply, the spinal canal contents are at risk. With the lateral retroperitoneal approach, however, the orthopedic drilling, reaming, tapping, and cage insertion are directed toward the contralateral psoas muscle instead of the neurologic structures.

In the report of the laparoscopic BAK study submitted to the Food and Drug Administration, the incidence of iatrogenic intraoperative disc herniation in patients undergoing surgery at one level was 2.8% (6 of 215 patients) and that in patients undergoing transperitoneal, two-level BAK was 12% (3 of 25 patients). Overall, for BAK implants inserted via a straight anterior-to-posterior direction, the incidence of reoperation for iatrogenic penetration or for pushing intervertebral disc material into the spinal canal was 2.3%. Furthermore, lateral retroperitoneal procedures obviate the need to dissect and mobilize the common iliac vein and artery, as is necessary with transperitoneal exposure of the L4–L5 intervertebral disc. The authors have found that it is easier to make the long axis of two retroperitoneal cages or bone dowels parallel via a shotgun or double-barrel trochar than via a transperitoneal independent trochar.

Mayer reported on 20 patients who underwent retroperitoneal, microsurgical, anterior lumbar interbody fusion between January 1, 1995 and January 31, 1996. In this procedure, an extensive quadrilateral retraction frame was used, but anterior stabilization implants were not. All patients had undergone an additional posterior pedicle screw instrumentation procedure 1–2 weeks earlier.

Boden et al described a video-assisted, lateral, intertransverse-process arthrodexis in a rabbit and a nonhuman primate model. This was a posterior approach, which did not involve spinal stabilization.

Ordway et al compared the biomechanical characteristics of a transversely oriented carbon-fiber cage with those of an anteriorly oriented cage in the bovine lumbar spine and found that, in most cases, the differences were not statistically significant. In addition, Ordway et al compared two anteriorly oriented cages with just one transversely oriented cage, which is a biased comparison. However, the carbon fiber cage has been studied extensively at the current authors’ laboratory as well; it is basically an unreamed spacer that is not screwed into place. The BAK system is inherently more stable than the carbon fiber cage because it uses preinsertional distraction via distraction plugs, which results in better ligamentotaxis. The BAK involves a tap that cuts threads into the two adjacent vertebral end plates, and the BAK reduces the strain and micromotion on the bone graft contained within the cage more successfully than does the rectangular carbon-fiber design.

There are several potential disadvantages of the minimally invasive, retroperitoneal approach. Particularly at L4–L5, it may be necessary to remove part of the iliac crest or place the docking portal through the iliac wing to be orthogonal to the L4–L5 disc space. In addition, a large mass of psoas muscle containing lumbosacral

Figure 3. A, Schematic diagram showing the orientation for the retroperitoneal approach. The “X” marks the anterosuperior iliac spine, and the three portals are shown by black dots. B, Initial lateral radiograph of a 76-year-old, dialysis-dependent man with biopsy-confirmed osteomyelitis at L3-L4. Initially, he was treated at another institution with intravenous antibiotics and a thoracolumbosacral orthosis. When he arrived at the authors’ institution, he was in septic shock. C, A sagittal magnetic resonance image revealing vertebral collapse with an associated retropulsed vertebral body fragment and thecal sac compression. D, A schematic diagram depicting the laparoscopic view through the transversalis fascia as the L3-L4 intervertebral disc is exposed. E, A laparoscopic view of the retroperitoneal space. The black arrows demonstrate the interval used to reach the vertebral body. The psoas major (P) is posterior, and the ureter (U) is anterior. Perinephric fat (K) is dissected bluntly to expose the interval. F, A schematic diagram showing debridement of the infected granulomatous tissue with the anterior thecal sac exposed between the L3 and L4 vertebral bodies posterior to the pituitary rongeur. G, A laparoscopic photograph showing a pituitary rongeur debriding the infected L3-L4 intervertebral disc.
Figure 4. Anteroposterior and lateral radiographs of two patients obtained after endoscopic retroperitoneal BAK interbody fusion was performed and instrumentation for postlaminectomy instability was placed. A and B show a one-cage technique. C and D show a two-cage technique.

nerve roots may need to be mobilized laterally. However, the authors of this study still prefer mobilizing the psoas muscle to mobilizing the common iliac vein and artery, as is necessary with transperitoneal approaches. The position of the ureter constantly needs to be considered in transperitoneal and retroperitoneal minimally invasive approaches. One additional advantage of the retroperitoneal approach is that spine surgeons probably will be more comfortable performing the approach without depending on a general surgical "access surgeon."

Obviously, it is difficult to prove statistically that the incidence of complications associated with the retroperitoneal approach is lower than that associated with the intraperitoneal endoscopic spinal procedures, because even transperitoneal spinal fusion is only a recently described procedure and is still in its infancy. However, many general surgical, gynecologic, and urologic procedures in which the retroperitoneal approach is used have been reported showing fewer complications than their transperitoneal operative counterparts. Leverant et al\textsuperscript{17} showed that intra-abdominal adhesions do occur with laparoscopy. They found intraperitoneal adhesions in 79 of 124 patients whose only prior surgery was laparoscopy; none of the 91 controls without prior laparoscopies in that study had adhesions. Lajer et al\textsuperscript{16} reported a 1% incidence of hernias in trocar ports after abdominal laparoscopy. Hernias through trocar ports have not been described with retroperitoneal approaches.

The authors of the current study have performed more than 150 endoscopic spinal procedures, and have had a patient with postoperative small bowel obstruction. This obstruction occurred in a patient 2 weeks after he had
undergone anterior transperitoneal laparoscopic L4–L5 fusion, when the greater omentum became adherent to the posterior peritoneum.

Tiusanen et al. reported an incidence of retrograde ejaculation of 5.9% as a complication of anterior interbody fusions and found that it occurred only after transabdominal procedures. In the report of the first series of 240 laparoscopic BAK interbody fusions and stabilizations submitted to the Food and Drug Administration, there were 12 cases (5%) of retrograde ejaculation that occurred as a complication of laparoscopic procedures. Although the numbers are too small to analyze statistically, there probably is a higher incidence of this complication at L5–S1 exposure than at L4–L5 exposure; it has been described to occur after anterior fusions to L4 and with periaortic lymph node dissection. Retroperitoneal exposure, either endoscopic or conventional, is associated with a lower incidence of this postoperative complication.

It is difficult to compare the morbidity of traditional versus minimally invasive, endoscopic, anterior, retroperitoneal approaches in the orthopaedic literature directly, because the length of hospital stay, operative time, and length of time out of work have not been reported. However, there are three studies of traditional, retroperitoneal, anterior decompressions of the spine in which the current authors have participated and reported: those of McAfee et al. with 70 patients, McAfee with 185 patients, and McAfee and Zdeblick with 23 patients. Overall, it is the authors' impression that the incidence of complications and morbidity is much lower for endoscopic procedures; in particular, associated medical perioperative complications are reduced, including urinary tract infections, post-operative atelectasis, and pneumonia. However, further experience is clearly necessary to confirm this impression. The authors currently are participating in a prospective, multicenter trial by the National Institute of Health to investigate further the complication rates of conventional versus minimally invasive techniques.

In summary, in this report of 18 cases of minimally invasive, lateral retroperitoneal, lumbar procedures, the main advantages were:

1) the length of stay was less than that associated with larger muscle-splitting "open approaches."
2) the need for mobilization of the great vessels was reduced compared with that of transperitoneal laparoscopic approaches,
3) the procedure allowed for two larger cages to be inserted parallel to one another in a transverse direction, horizontal, rather than perpendicular, to the spinal canal.
4) by varying the diameter of the retroperitoneally placed interbody fusion cages, interbody allograft bone dowels, or distraction plugs, customization of the amount of lumbar lordosis was possible without increasing the risk of implant dislodgement or pseudoarthrosis.

Eighteen cases is not a large series, but the results are favorable compared with preliminary results of alternative techniques.
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