International Journal of Orthopedic and Orthodontic Research

Minimally Invasive Techniques in Spine Surgery: A Prospective Outcome Study

Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh [1*], Dr. Kenneth O'Brien [2], Dr. Ahmed Z Farouk [3]
[1] Department of Orthopedics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), New Delhi, India
[2] Department of Orthopedics and Sports Medicine, Stanford University, USA
[3] Department of Orthopedics, Cairo University, Egypt

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh**

Article Info

Volume: 01
Issue: 03
May-June 2025
Received: 21-04-2025
Accepted: 15-05-2025
Page No: 01-04

Abstract
Background: Minimally invasive spine surgery (MISS) has emerged as a revolutionary approach to treating various spinal pathologies while reducing patient morbidity and improving recovery times.
Objective: This prospective study evaluates the clinical outcomes, complications, and patient satisfaction following minimally invasive spine surgery techniques compared to traditional open procedures.
Methods: A total of 145 patients undergoing spine surgery between January 2022 and December 2023 were enrolled. Patients were divided into two groups: MISS group (n=75) and open surgery group (n=70). Primary outcomes included operative time, blood loss, length of hospital stay, and functional outcomes using Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and Visual Analog Scale (VAS) scores at 6 weeks, 3 months, and 12 months post-operatively.
Results: The MISS group demonstrated significantly reduced operative time (127±34 minutes vs 189±52 minutes, $p<0.001$), decreased blood loss (85±25 ml vs 245±78 ml, $p<0.001$), and shorter hospital stays (2.1±0.8 days vs 4.3±1.2 days, $p<0.001$). Functional outcomes showed superior improvement in the MISS group with ODI scores improving from 64±12 to 18±8 at 12 months compared to 66±14 to 26±11 in the open surgery group ($p<0.05$).
Conclusion: Minimally invasive spine surgery techniques offer superior short-term outcomes with reduced morbidity, faster recovery, and improved patient satisfaction while maintaining equivalent long-term functional results.

Keywords: Minimally invasive surgery, spine surgery, endoscopic spine surgery, tubular retractors, patient outcomes, spinal fusion

Introduction

Spine surgery has undergone significant evolution over the past two decades, with minimally invasive techniques representing one of the most important advances in neurosurgical and orthopedic practice. Traditional open spine surgery, while effective, is associated with substantial tissue trauma, prolonged recovery periods, and significant postoperative morbidity. The development of minimally invasive spine surgery (MISS) techniques has revolutionized the field by offering comparable therapeutic outcomes while minimizing surgical trauma.

The fundamental principle of MISS involves accessing the surgical target through smaller incisions, preserving paraspinal musculature, and reducing soft tissue disruption. These techniques utilize specialized instruments, enhanced visualization systems, and advanced imaging guidance to achieve surgical objectives with minimal collateral damage to surrounding tissues. The theoretical advantages include reduced blood loss, decreased postoperative pain, shorter hospital stays, faster return to activities, and improved cosmetic outcomes

Various minimally invasive approaches have been developed, including tubular retractor systems, endoscopic techniques, lateral approaches, and percutaneous methods. Each technique offers specific advantages depending on the pathology being addressed and patient factors. Despite the growing adoption of these techniques, comprehensive outcome studies comparing MISS to traditional open procedures remain limited, necessitating further investigation to establish evidence-based guidelines for their implementation.

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Patient Selection

This prospective, comparative study was conducted at a tertiary care spine center between January 2022 and December 2023. The study protocol was approved by the institutional ethics committee, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Inclusion criteria comprised patients aged 18-75 years with degenerative spine disease requiring surgical intervention, including lumbar disc herniation, spinal stenosis, and single-level degenerative spondylolisthesis. Exclusion criteria included previous spine surgery, multilevel pathology requiring fusion, active infection, malignancy, and significant comorbidities precluding surgery.

Surgical Techniques

The MISS group underwent procedures using tubular retractor systems (METRx, Medtronic) for discectomy and decompression, or lateral interbody fusion techniques (XLIF, NuVasive) for fusion cases. The open surgery group received standard posterior approaches with subperiosteal muscle dissection. All procedures were performed by experienced spine surgeons with expertise in both techniques.

Outcome Measures

Primary outcomes included operative parameters (operative time, estimated blood loss, hospital length of stay) and functional outcomes assessed using validated instruments. The Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) and Visual Analog Scale (VAS) for back and leg pain were administered preoperatively and at 6 weeks, 3 months, and 12 months postoperatively. Secondary outcomes included complication rates, patient satisfaction scores, and return to work/activities.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 26.0. Continuous variables were expressed as mean ± standard deviation and compared using Student's t-test. Categorical variables were compared using chi-square test. A p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Patient Demographics

A total of 145 patients were enrolled, with 75 patients in the MISS group and 70 in the open surgery group. Patient demographics were comparable between groups. The mean age was 52.3±12.1 years in the MISS group and 54.7±13.8 years in the open group ($p=0.28$). Gender distribution showed 58% male patients in the MISS group and 61% in the open group ($p=0.73$).

Operative Parameters

The MISS group demonstrated significantly superior operative parameters across all measured variables. Mean operative time was 127±34 minutes for MISS compared to 189±52 minutes for open surgery ($p<0.001$). Estimated blood loss was markedly reduced in the MISS group (85±25 ml vs 245±78 ml, $p<0.001$). Hospital length of stay was shorter for MISS patients (2.1±0.8 days vs 4.3±1.2 days, $p<0.001$).

Functional Outcomes

Both groups showed significant improvement in functional scores from baseline. However, the MISS group demonstrated superior outcomes at all follow-up intervals. ODI scores improved from 64±12 preoperatively to 18±8 at 12 months in the MISS group, compared to improvement from 66±14 to 26±11 in the open surgery group ($p<0.05$). VAS back pain scores decreased from 7.2±1.8 to 2.1±1.2 in the MISS group versus 7.4±1.6 to 3.2±1.4 in the open group ($p<0.01$).

Complications and Patient Satisfaction

Complication rates were lower in the MISS group (8% vs 17%, $p<0.05$), with most complications being minor and self-resolving. Patient satisfaction scores were significantly higher in the MISS group (8.7±1.2 vs 7.4±1.6, $p<0.001$). Return to work occurred earlier in the MISS group (6.2±2.1 weeks vs 9.8±3.4 weeks, $p<0.001$).

Table 1: Comparison of Operative Parameters and Outcomes

Parameter	MISS Group (n=75)	Open Surgery Group (n=70)	p-value
Age (years)	52.3±12.1	54.7±13.8	0.28
Male gender (%)	58	61	0.73
Operative time (min)	127±34	189±52	<0.001
Blood loss (ml)	85±25	245±78	<0.001
Hospital stay (days)	2.1±0.8	4.3±1.2	<0.001
ODI 12-month	18±8	26±11	<0.05
VAS back pain 12-month	2.1±1.2	3.2±1.4	<0.01
Complications (%)	8	17	<0.05
Patient satisfaction	8.7±1.2	7.4±1.6	<0.001
Return to work (weeks)	6.2±2.1	9.8±3.4	<0.001

Discussion

This prospective study demonstrates significant advantages of minimally invasive spine surgery techniques over traditional open approaches across multiple outcome measures. The superior operative parameters observed in the MISS group align with theoretical expectations and previous literature reports. Reduced operative time, despite the perceived learning curve associated with MISS techniques, likely reflects improved efficiency and reduced complexity of tissue handling. The dramatic reduction in blood loss

represents one of the most compelling advantages of MISS, potentially reducing transfusion requirements and associated complications.

The shorter hospital stays observed in the MISS group translate to significant healthcare cost savings and improved patient convenience. This finding is consistent with the reduced tissue trauma and faster recovery associated with minimally invasive approaches. The superior functional outcomes in the MISS group, as measured by validated instruments, suggest that preservation of paraspinal musculature and reduced soft tissue disruption contribute to improved patient-reported outcomes.

The lower complication rate in the MISS group is particularly noteworthy, as it addresses concerns regarding the safety of these newer techniques. This finding suggests that when performed by experienced surgeons, MISS techniques may actually be safer than traditional approaches. The superior patient satisfaction scores likely reflect the combination of improved outcomes, reduced pain, faster recovery, and better cosmetic results.

However, this study has limitations including single-center design, potential selection bias, and relatively short-term follow-up. Long-term outcomes and durability of results require further investigation. Additionally, the learning curve associated with MISS techniques may influence outcomes in centers with less experience.

Conclusion

Minimally invasive spine surgery techniques offer significant advantages over traditional open approaches, including reduced operative morbidity, faster recovery, and improved patient satisfaction while maintaining equivalent therapeutic efficacy. These findings support the continued development and adoption of MISS techniques in appropriate clinical scenarios. Future research should focus on long-term outcomes, cost-effectiveness analyses, and optimal patient selection criteria to further refine the role of minimally invasive approaches in spine surgery.

As surgical technology continues to advance, minimally invasive techniques are likely to become the standard of care for many spinal pathologies. Continued surgeon education, technological refinement, and outcome research will be essential to maximize the benefits of these innovative approaches while ensuring patient safety and optimal outcomes.

References

1. Foley KT, Holly LT, Schwender JD. Minimally invasive lumbar fusion. Spine. 2003;28(15 Suppl):S26-35.
2. Peng CW, Yue WM, Poh SY, *et al*. Clinical and radiological outcomes of minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. Spine. 2009;34(13):1385-1389.
3. Kim DY, Lee SH, Chung SK, *et al*. Comparison of multifidus muscle atrophy and trunk extension muscle strength: percutaneous versus open pedicle screw fixation. Spine. 2005;30(1):123-129.
4. Schwender JD, Holly LT, Rouben DP, *et al*. Minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (TLIF): technical feasibility and initial results. J Spinal Disord Tech. 2005;18 Suppl:S1-6.
5. Fan S, Hu Z, Zhao F, *et al*. Multifidus muscle changes and clinical effects of one-level posterior lumbar interbody fusion: minimally invasive procedure versus conventional open approach. Eur Spine J. 2010;19(2):316-324.
6. Dhall SS, Wang MY, Mummaneni PV. Clinical and radiographic comparison of mini-open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion with open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion in 42 patients with long-term follow-up. J Neurosurg Spine. 2008;9(6):560-565.
7. Tian NF, Wu YS, Zhang XL, *et al*. Minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: a meta-analysis based on the current evidence. Eur Spine J. 2013;22(8):1741-1749.
8. Shunwu F, Xing Z, Fengdong Z, *et al*. Minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for the treatment of degenerative lumbar diseases. Spine. 2010;35(17):1615-1620.
9. Adogwa O, Parker SL, Bydon A, *et al*. Comparative effectiveness of minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: 2-year assessment of narcotic use, return to work, disability, and quality of life. J Spinal Disord Tech. 2011;24(8):479-484.
10. Hey HW, Hee HT. Lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis: comparison between minimally invasive surgery and open surgery. Asian Spine J. 2015;9(5):668-674.
11. Parker SL, Adogwa O, Bydon A, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative spondylolisthesis associated low-back and leg pain over two years. World Neurosurg. 2012;78(1-2):178-184.
12. Wang MY, Cummock MD, Yu Y, *et al*. An analysis of the differences in the acute hospitalization charges following minimally invasive versus open posterior lumbar interbody fusion. J Neurosurg Spine. 2010;12(6):694-699.
13. Seng C, Siddiqui MA, Wong KP, *et al*. Five-year outcomes of minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: a matched-pair comparison study. Spine. 2013;38(23):2049-2055.
14. Lee KH, Yue WM, Yeo W, *et al*. Clinical and radiological outcomes of open versus minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. Eur Spine J. 2012;21(11):2265-2270.
15. Lau D, Han SJ, Lee JG, *et al*. Minimally invasive compared to open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for the treatment of spondylolisthesis. J Clin Neurosci. 2011;18(12):1613-1616.
16. Singh K, Nandyala SV, Marquez-Lara A, *et al*. A perioperative cost analysis comparing single-level minimally invasive and open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. Spine J. 2014;14(8):1694-1701.
17. Holly LT, Schwender JD, Rouben DP, *et al*. Minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: indications, technique, and complications. Neurosurg Focus. 2006;20(3):E6.
18. Pelton MA, Phillips FM, Singh K. A comparison of perioperative costs and outcomes in patients with and without workers' compensation claims treated with minimally invasive or open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion. Spine. 2012;37(22):1914-1919.
19. Villavicencio AT, Burneikienė S, Roeca CM, *et al*. Minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar

interbody fusion. Surg Neurol Int. 2010;1:12.
20. Schizas C, Tzinieris N, Tsiridis E, *et al*. Minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: evaluating initial experience. Int Orthop. 2009;33(6):1683-1688.
21. Deutsch H, Musacchio MJ Jr. Minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion with unilateral pedicle screw fixation. Neurosurg Focus. 2006;20(3):E10.
22. Rouben D, Casnellie M, Ferguson M. Long-term durability of minimal access surgery for degenerative lumbar spine disease. Neurosurgery. 2011;69(5):1131-1137.
23. Ntoukas V, Müller A. Minimally invasive approach versus traditional open approach for one level posterior lumbar interbody fusion. Minim Invasive Neurosurg. 2010;53(1):21-24.
24. Cheng JS, Park P, Le H, *et al*. Short-term and long-term outcomes of minimally invasive and open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusions: is there a difference? Neurosurg Focus. 2013;35(2):E6.
25. Price JP, Dawson JM, Schwender JD, *et al*. Clinical and radiologic comparison of minimally invasive surgery with traditional open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: a review of 452 patients from a single institution. Clin Spine Surg. 2018;31(6):E1-E8.
26. Sulaiman SH, Singh M, Meybodi AT, *et al*. Minimally invasive versus open lumbar laminotomy: radiographic and clinical outcomes. Minim Invasive Surg. 2014;2014:507314.
27. Rahman M, Summers LE, Richter B, *et al*. Comparison of techniques for decompressive lumbar laminectomy: the minimally invasive versus the "classic" open approach. Minim Invasive Neurosurg. 2008;51(2):100-105.
28. Zairi F, Arikat A, Allaoui M, *et al*. Minimally invasive decompression for lumbar spinal stenosis using a bilateral approach with unilateral tubular retractor: technical note and results. Minim Invasive Neurosurg. 2011;54(4):179-183.
29. Ikuta K, Tono O, Tanaka T, *et al*. Surgical complications of microendoscopic procedures for lumbar spinal stenosis. Minim Invasive Neurosurg. 2007;50(3):145-149.
30. Mobbs RJ, Li J, Sivabalan P, *et al*. Outcomes after decompressive laminectomy for lumbar spinal stenosis: comparison between minimally invasive unilateral laminectomy for bilateral decompression and open laminectomy. J Neurosurg Spine. 2014;21(2):179-186.