Beware the Risks of Instrumentation to the Pelvis in Ambulatory Early Onset Scoliosis Patients Treated with Growth Sparing Surgery

> <u>Burt Yaszay</u>, Nima Kabirian, Jeff Pawelek, John B. Emans, Charles E. Johnston, Suken A. Shah, Greg M. Mundis, Behrooz A. Akbarnia **Growing Spine Study Group**

> > 5<sup>th</sup> Annual International Congress on Early Onset Scoliosis November 18-19, 2011 – Orlando, FL











## Disclosures

Author	Disclosure
Burt Yaszay	(a) DePuy, KCI; (b) KCI, Synthes, K2M; (d) DePuy; (e) DePuy
Nima Kabirian	No relationship
Jeff Pawelek	No relationship
John Emans	(b) Medtronic, Synthes; (e) Synthes
Charles Johnston	(a) Medtronic; (b) Medtronic; (d) Medtronic; (e) Sanders, Mosby- Elsevier
Suken Shah	<ul><li>(a) Axial Biotech, DePuy; (b) DePuy, K Spine; (c) Globus Medical;</li><li>(d) DePuy</li></ul>
Greg Mundis	(a) Nuvasive, DePuy; (b) K2M, Nuvasive; (d) K2M, Nuvasive
Behrooz Akbarnia	(a) K2M, DePuy, Nuvasive, Ellipse; (b) Nuvasive, K2M, Ellipse, Kspine, DePuy; (c) Nuvasive, Ellipse, K Spine, Nocimed



a. Grants/Research Support

- b. Consultant
- c. Stock/Shareholder
- d. Speakers' Bureau
- e. Other Financial Support

## Introduction

- Pelvic instrumentation (PI) is the most commonly used technique in non-ambulatory patients with neuromuscular scoliosis to control pelvic obliquity and improve sitting posture.
- The utility of PI in ambulatory scoliosis patients has not been well studied, particularly when used with growth sparing surgical techniques.
- The purpose of this study was to characterize the use of PI in distraction-based growth sparing surgery.



## Methods

- Retrospective, multi-center review of an EOS database
- Patients were selected based on the following criteria:
  - Distraction-based growth sparing surgery
  - Instrumentation to sacrum and/or ilium
  - Minimum 6 month follow up
- 10 patients qualified for inclusion



### Results

- 10 ambulatory patients: female=5; male=5
- Mean age = 6.3 yrs (range 3.2–11.5)
- Growing rods: n=6; VEPTR: n=4
- Mean follow up = 2.5 years (range 0.5-5.2)
- Diagnoses:
  - Congenital = 4
  - Syndromic = 4
  - Idiopathic = 2
- Radiographic data:

	Pre index	Post index	Latest follow up
Primary Coronal Deformity	80°	53°	58°
	(range 57°-106°)	(range 39°–67°)	(range 47°–71°)
Sagittal Imbalance	46 mm	54 mm	65 mm
	(range 12 to 128)	(range 1.5–105)	(range 1–115)

### Results

- Distribution of pelvic instrumentation
  - NOTE: One patient was instrumented to L2 initially and later revised to bilateral iliac fixation.



#### **Number of Patients**

## Complications

• Instrumentation failure was the most common complication.

Surgical Procedures	Revision Surgery	Complications
VEPTR (16)	3/16 (19%)	Anchor pull-out (2); medical (2); neuromonitoring changes (2)
GR (34)	11/34 (32%)	Coronal and sagittal decompensation (2); suture abscess (1); rod fracture (9); medical (1)
Total (50)	14/50 (28%)	



# **EOS in Beals Syndrome**





6 yr old boy Pre-op Assessment 05-27-2009

## **EOS in Beals Syndrome**

#### POST INITIAL SURGERY PATIENT IS SAGITALLY AND CORONALLY DECOMPENSATED

#### BILATERAL DISTAL ROD FRACTURES; ROD AND ANCHOR REVISIONS





12-21-2009

03-02-2010

## **EOS in Beals Syndrome**

ABNORMAL POSITIVE SAGITTAL IMBALANCE WHICH WAS NOT CLEARLY EXPLAINED. MRI = NORMAL



ROD FRACTURE; ROD EXCHANGE THROUGH REVISION SURGERY



## Conclusion

• Instrumentation to the pelvis should be carefully considered in ambulatory EOS patients.

 Complications, especially implant failure, are frequent likely due to increased stress on the instrumentation that span the mobile lumbar spine in ambulatory patients.



## Conclusion

 Extra attention should also be paid to sagittal and coronal alignment as these patients do not have mobile levels to compensate for their imbalance.

