Tore K. Solberg
Øystein P. Nygaard
Kristin Sjaavik
Dag Hofoss
Tor Ingebrigtsen

The risk of “getting worse” after lumbar microdiscectomy

Received: 13 September 2003
Revised: 10 March 2004
Accepted: 15 March 2004
Published online: 6 May 2004
© Springer-Verlag 2004

T. K. Solberg (✉) · T. Ingebrigtsen
Department of Neurosurgery,
University Hospital of North Norway,
9038 Tromsø, Norway
Tel.: +47-77-627050,
Fax: +47-77-627052,
e-mail: tore.solberg@unn.no

Ø. P. Nygaard
Department of Neurosurgery,
University Hospital of St. Olav,
Trondheim, Norway

K. Sjaavik
Faculty of Medicine,
University of Tromsø, Norway

D. Hofoss
Foundation for Health Services Research,
Oslo, Norway

Abstract A frequent concern among patients operated for lumbar disc herniation is the risk of “getting worse”. To give an evidence-based estimate of the risk for worsening has been difficult, since previous studies have been more focused on unfavourable outcome in general, rather than on deterioration in particular. In this prospective study of 180 patients, we report the frequency of and the risk factors for getting worse after first time lumbar microdiscectomy. Follow-up time was 12 months. Primary outcome measure was the Oswestry disability index, assessing functional status and health-related quality of life. Of the patients 4% got worse. Independent risk factors of deterioration were a long duration of sick leave and a better functional

status and quality of life prior to operation. We conclude that the risk of deterioration is small, but larger if the patient has been unable to work despite relatively small health problems. This study also demonstrates that changes in instrument scores should be reported, so that an accurate failure rate can be assessed.

Keywords Lumbar discectomy · Outcome · Failed back · Prognostic factors

Introduction

Lumbar microdiscectomy is the most frequently performed spinal operation. A frequent concern among the patients is the risk of “getting worse” after the operation. It is difficult to give an evidence-based estimate of the risk of deterioration, since previous studies have been more focused on unfavourable outcome in general, rather than on deterioration in particular. Some studies reported on increase in pain after microdiscectomy [17, 26, 29] and one study reported on decrease in health-related quality of life (HRQL) after such operations [30]. Prospective studies focusing on deterioration of functional status after microdiscectomy are lacking.

Several predictors of an unfavourable outcome have been identified [1, 2, 12, 20, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32] and socio-

economic and psychological factors seem to play a major role [7, 9, 15, 21, 24]. Risk factors for deterioration of functional status and HRQL after microdiscectomy have not been reported. Furthermore, patients with a favourable outcome score at follow-up may have deteriorated, but this only becomes evident when a change in score is considered. This implies that risk factors for deterioration and a “poor outcome” might be different.

The aim of this prospective study was to evaluate the frequency and the predictors of “getting worse” in a cohort of 180 consecutive patients operated by microdiscectomy for lumbar disc herniation.

Fig. 1 Details of the patients involved in the study

Materials and methods

Patient population

This study comprised all patients operated by lumbar microdiscectomy in the Department of Neurosurgery at the University Hospital of North Norway from 1st of January 2000 to 1st of June 2003. Data were collected in a comprehensive registry intended for research and quality control.

Only patients operated for one level disc herniation, affecting one nerve root, and who had been to 12 months follow-up evaluation were included. Patients who had undergone low back surgery previously were excluded. Figure 1 gives details of the study population.

Informed consent was obtained from all participants and the Regional Ethical Committee for Medical Research approved the design of the study. The Data Inspectorate in Norway approved the registration and management of data.

Outcome measurement

We used the Oswestry disability index (ODI) as the measure of main outcome. The change in ODI score between baseline and 12 months after operation was classified as “deterioration” (increased ODI score) or “no deterioration” (decreased or unchanged ODI score). The ODI raw score at 12 months after operation was classified as “poor” (ODI score >39) or “good” (ODI score <40). Secondary outcome measures were employment status, back and leg pain.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires listed below were completed by the patients at admission for surgery and 12 months after the operation.

Functional status was assessed by the Oswestry low back disability questionnaire [10], which contains 10 questions on limitations of activities of daily living. Each variable is rated on a 0–5 point scale, added up and transferred into a percentage score, the ODI [3]. The range of possible values is from 0 (best health state) to 100 (worst health state). The ODI is also used as a disease-specific measure of HRQL [22].

Pain intensity was graded in two separate 100-mm visual analogue scales for back (VAS back) and leg (VAS leg) pain, end-points being no pain and worst conceivable pain.

Anxiety and depression were measured on a three level scale where patients could indicate if they had no, moderate or severe problems.

Clinical data

At admission for surgery, a doctor collected the clinical data. Follow-up data were recorded by an independent observer (trained nurse) at an outpatient clinic. Data on employment status were obtained from the patients (interview).

Clinical examination included a straight leg raising (SLR) test and three indicators of neurological deficits (muscle atrophy, muscle strength and sensory impairment to pinprick). The result of each evaluation was rated on a three-step scale including no, moderate and severe impairment.

Surgical procedure

A standard microdiscectomy was performed using Caspar self-retaining retractors and an operating microscope.

Statistical analyses

Overall mean differences of repeated measures were evaluated by Student's *t*-test. Differences in means between subgroups of patients were analysed by the Mann-Whitney *U*-test because of non-normal distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). To assess risk factors for deterioration, we used linear and logistic regression analyses. In linear regression we used the average of the sum of the pre-treatment and post-treatment ODI scores as explanatory variables for change in ODI score between baseline and 12 months of follow-up. In this way we controlled for the dependence between the preoperative ODI score and the ODI score change in the same individual, when evaluating how the pre-treatment score was associated to improvement in ODI score. In multivariate analyses, we identified statistically significant risk factors by stepwise logistic regression. All statistical analyses were calculated in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS for Windows, version 11.0, Chicago IL).

Effect size (ES) was estimated according to the method of Kazis et al. [16]. ES is the difference between pre-treatment and post-treatment scores divided by the standard deviation of the pre-treatment score, and indicates the relative size of the effect in comparison to underlying “noise” of the data [4]. An ES of 0.8 or more is considered to be large [5].

Results

Characteristics of the study population

Mean (SD) age was 41 (11) years, 66 (36.7%) of the patients were females, 49% were smokers, mean (SD) body mass index, BMI, was 26.2 (9.0). The mean (SD) duration of sick leave prior to operation was 19.4 (25.4) weeks. Minimal level of primary school had been completed by 25%, high school or vocational school by 47% and university or college by 28% of the patients.

A positive straight leg raising (SLR) test below 60° elevation was found in 72%, motor weakness in 42% and

Table 1 Employment status of the patients

Employment status	Number of patients (%)	
	Baseline N=180	12 months N=179 ^a
On sick leave	124 (69)	18 (10)
On partly sick leave	11 (6)	6 (3)
Working full time	16 (10)	108 (61)
Homemaker, student, unemployed or retired pensioner	49 (9)	20 (12)
On rehabilitation ^b	9 (5)	21 (11)
Disability pensioner	2 (1)	6 (3)

^aOne missing value.

^bPatients who have received workers compensation more than 12 months with prospect of either returning back to work or permanent disability status.

sensory deficits in 77% of the cases. Of the patients 53% were operated at the L5/S1 level, 41% at L4/L5 and 6% at the L3/L4 level.

Seven patients (3.9%) had complications after the operation. There were two cases of postoperative discitis and two cases of superficial wound infection. One postoperative muscle hernia was closed surgically several weeks after the microdiscectomy. One dural tear was repaired during the primary operation. One subcutaneous postoperative hematoma was treated non-surgically. The ODI score had increased in only one of these cases (superficial wound infection) at 12 months. There was no mortality.

Outcome assessments

Characteristics about employment status are listed in Table 1. Out of 135 sick-listed patients at baseline, 88 (65.7%) had returned to full employment, 6 (4.5%) were on partly sick leave and 15 (11.2%) were still on full sick leave 12 months after the operation (missing data: one). Among the remaining 25, 16 (11.9%) were undergoing rehabilitation, 3 (2.2%) were disability pensioners and 6 (4.5%) were homemakers, retired pensioners or students.

Mean (SD) percent improvement of preoperative ODI score was 68.5% (34.2.) ES was large (Table 2), 7 patients

(3.9%) had a worsening of functional status as measured by an increase in ODI score. Their characteristics are listed in Table 3. A change of 10% in the ODI score is considered to be clinically relevant [2, 13, 27]. Of these patients 6 were evaluated with postoperative contrast-enhanced MRI scans. One patient (male 39 years) refused. Only normal postoperative changes were found. There were no signs of recurrent disc herniation, spondylodiscitis, spinal stenosis or spondylolisthesis. All of them were regarded as failure cases according to the medical records and were evaluated by a neurosurgeon. Two patients had neuropathic nerve root pain, the others were considered to have unspecific back pain. Additional muscular involvement and referred pain is described as myofascial back pain in Table 3. None had been offered further surgery when this study was closed.

Of the patients 12 (6.7%) had a “poor” outcome as measured by an ODI raw score >39 at 12 months follow-up. The median preoperative ODI score and duration of sick leave/rehabilitation in this group was 56 points and 16 weeks.

Only three (43%) out of the seven patients who had a deterioration in ODI score also had a “poor” ODI score at follow-up.

Risk factor analyses

The linear regression analyses showed that a longer duration of sick leave (weeks) ($\beta=0.261$, $P<0.001$) and a lower ODI score ($\beta=-0.442$, $P<0.001$) prior to operation are strong predictors of less improvement in ODI score among all 180 cases ($R^2=0.27$). When using the change in ODI score as a dichotomous variable (no deterioration or deterioration) in age-adjusted regression analyses, we found possible predictors of an increase in ODI score. Only a low ODI score and a longer duration of sick leave prior to operation were independent risk factors for deterioration. (Table 4). Other cofactors evaluated in the model (expectations, anxiety and depression and clinical parameters) were not significant.

We also used the ODI raw score at 12 months as a dichotomous variable (“good” or “poor outcome”) in multivariate analyses as described above. The only independent risk factor for a “poor” outcome (ODI score>39) was long

Table 2 Overall effects of lumbar microdiscectomy (180 cases)

Effect	Baseline Mean (SD, 95% CI)	12 months follow up Mean (SD, 95% CI)	Improvement Mean (SD, 95% CI)	P-value	Effect Size
ODI	49.5 (21.2, 46.4–52.6)	13.4 (13.0, 11.4–15.3)	36.2 (23.6, 32.7–39.6)	<0.001	1.7
VAS back pain	51.7 (29.3, 47.4–56.0)	21.3 (22.6, 18.0–24.6)	30.4 (35.6, 25.2–35.6)	<0.001	1.0
VAS leg pain	63.4 (27.5, 59.3–67.4)	16.8 (21.1, 13.7–20.0)	46.5 (33.4, 41.6–51.4)	<0.001	1.7

Table 3 Characteristics of the seven patients who had an increase in ODI score 12 months after microdiscectomy

Gender (age)	ODI score at 12 months (change)	Percent deterioration of preoperative ODI score	Preoperative work status	Postoperative work status, 12 months	Back pain (Δ VAS)	Leg pain (Δ VAS)	Surgeons diagnosis at 12 months	Complications
M (47)	40 (8)	25	Working 50%	Sick-leave	Better (34)	Better (2)	Neuropathic leg pain	None
F (33)	40 (12)	42	Sick leave	Working 50%	Better (11)	Better (25)	Unspecific back pain	None
M (39)	38 (4)	12	Working 25%	Working 30%	Better (16)	Better (33)	Unspecific back pain	None
M (51)	28 (4)	17	Working 75%	Working full time	Better (28)	Better (8)	Myofacial back pain	Superficial wound infection
M (44)	28 (16)	133	Sick leave	Rehabilitation	Worse (2)	Worse (29)	Myofacial back pain	None
F (42)	48 (6)	14	Sick leave	Sick-leave	Better (5)	Worse (5)	Neuropathic leg pain	None
M (56)	22 (4)	22	Sick leave	Working full time	Worse (21)	Better (13)	Unspecific back pain	None

Table 4 Significance of deterioration in ODI score and multivariate analyses of risk factors

Factors	Group (N)		Significance of median differences between group I and II P-value	Risk factor analyses. Binary stepwise logistic regression			
	I (173) Not deteriorated Improved (172) Unchanged (1)	II (7) Deteriorated		β^a	P-value	β^b	P-value
Weeks of sick leave/ rehabilitation Median (IQR ^c)	10 (28)	54 (119)	0.043	0.032	0.001	0.058	0.010
Preoperative ODI score Median (IQR)	50 (34)	28 (16)	0.003	-0.087	0.011	-0.216	0.013
Duration of leg pain Median (IQR)	24 (40)	58 (142)	0.039	0.008	0.006	0.005	0.572
Duration of back pain Median (IQR)	26 (63)	110 (246)	0.061	0.001	0.304		
Preoperative VAS leg pain Median (IQR)	69 (43)	65 (45)	0.311	-0.009	0.481		
Preoperative VAS back pain Median (IQR)	51 (45)	64 (46)	0.801	0.003	0.800		
Age Median (IQR)	40 (15)	44 (12)	0.290				

^aAge adjusted.

^bAdjusted for the two other factors (duration of sick leave/rehabilitation, preoperative ODI score or duration of leg pain) and BMI, anxiety/depression, gender, smoking, age and education.

^cInterquartile range.

duration of sick leave ($\beta=0.20$, $P=0.026$) prior to operation.

Discussion

This study shows that 4% of the patients had a worsening of the functional status and HRQL after lumbar microdiscectomy. The deterioration is significant, and it occurs within a larger cohort of patients with a favourable overall outcome, demonstrated by large effect sizes on all outcome measures. Similar results have been published elsewhere [2, 9, 17, 21, 25, 26]. Patients who had been sick-listed for a longer period of time or had a better ODI score prior to operation were at a higher risk of “getting worse”.

Thus, this study confirms what most surgeons would suspect, namely that the potential for deterioration is greater among patients with less severe health problems. Operative complications do not seem to play an important role for deterioration.

Evaluation of risk factors linked to such a small proportion of the study population should be done with caution. However, the linear regression analyses showed that predictors for deterioration also had a strong negative impact on the outcome of all the patients, regardless of whether they got worse or not. On the other hand, a 10-point difference in ODI score between the preoperative and postoperative scores may have different effects in terms of clinical success, depending on where on the ODI score the patient started at baseline. This problem is not

taken into account in linear regression analyses and represents a weakness in our study.

Assessment of pain, work status and functional score are regarded as the most dependable instruments in outcome research, but they are not interchangeable [8]. They represent different aspects of outcome, measure different failure rates [14], and identify different prognostic factors [6, 30]. This study shows that patients may deteriorate in physical function and HRQL despite improvements in pain score. There is also a shift of patients between different outcome groups during the postoperative observation period. A patient with a good outcome after 3 months may have a poor result after 1 year. As a consequence, prognostic factors may change during the follow-up period [32], even though the overall outcome seems to be stable over the course of time [11].

We chose improvement or deterioration in ODI score as the main outcome variable, since the ODI is a well validated, reliable and a responsive measure of functional score and HROL [7, 22]. Moreover, functional well being and better quality of life would be optimal therapeutic goals for the patients [18, 33].

It is reasonable to regard a final ODI score >39 as a "poor result" since the surgery has failed to relieve a severe functional status. If we add the patients who got worse despite a raw score <40, the failure rate increases from 12 (6.7%) to 16 (8.9%). Patients who have to be re-operated can also be classified as failures. If we add the

seven cases that were excluded because of recurrent disc herniation, the failure rate is 23 (12.3%).

Hence, to avoid underestimation of the failure rate, a prospective study should identify patients who deteriorate by evaluating score changes [23]. This is not possible in retrospective studies and studies that despite a prospective design, only report follow-up data, i.e. outcome scores. Furthermore, one should clarify how the terminology "failure" and "poor outcome" are used. This would facilitate comparisons across studies. Still, these terms are often treated as similar concepts in the literature.

Because most of the patients who get worse after microdiscectomy have a favourable ODI score at follow-up, and specific risk factors for deterioration are present, one could consider patients who got worse as a special clinical entity among the "failures". At least they should be accounted for in outcome studies.

Conclusions

Few patients get worse after microdiscectomy. Patients who have been unable to work for a longer period of time, despite a fairly good functional level, should be informed that they run a higher risk of deterioration. In prospective studies, the change in functional score should be reported, so that a more accurate failure rate can be assessed.

References

1. Abramovitz JN, Neff SR (1991) Lumbar disc surgery: results of the Prospective Lumbar Discectomy Study of the Joint Section on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons and the Congress of Neurological Surgeons. *Neurosurgery* 29:301–307
2. Asch HL, Lewis PJ, Moreland DB, Egnatchik JG, Yu YJ, Clabeaux DE, Hyland AH (2002) Prospective multiple outcomes study of outpatient lumbar microdiscectomy: should 75 to 80% success rates be the norm? *J Neurosurg* 96:34–44
3. Baker DJP, Pynsent PB, Fairbank CT (1990) The Oswestry disability index revisited: its reliability, repeatability and validity, and a comparison with the St Thomas's disability index. In: Roland M, Jenner JR (eds) *Back pain. New approaches to rehabilitation and education*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp 174–186
4. Brazier J, Deverill M, Green C, Harper R, Booth A (1999) A review of the use of health status measures in economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess* 3: 1–164
5. Carmines EG, Zeller RA (1979) *Reliability and validity assessment. Quantitative applications in the social sciences #17*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA
6. Dauch WA, Fasse A, Brucher K, Bauer BL (1994) Predictors of treatment success after microsurgical operation of lumbar intervertebral disk displacement. *Zentralbl Neurochir* 55:144–155
7. Deyo RA (1988) Measuring the functional status of patients with low back pain. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 69:1044–1053
8. Dionne CE, Von Korff M, Koepsell TD, Deyo RA, Barlow WE, Checkoway H (1999) A comparison of pain, functional limitations, and work status indices as outcome measures in back pain research. *Spine* 24:2339–2345
9. Dvorak J, Gauchat MH, Valach L (1988) The outcome of surgery for lumbar disc herniation. I. A 4–17 years follow-up with emphasis on somatic aspects. *Spine* 13:1418–1422
10. Fairbank JC, Couper J, Davies JB, O'Brien JP (1980) The Oswestry low back pain disability questionnaire. *Physiotherapy* 66:271–273
11. Findlay GF, Hall BI, Musa BS, Oliveira MD, Fear SC (1998) A 10-year follow-up of the outcome of lumbar microdiscectomy. *Spine* 23:1168–1171
12. Greenough CG (1993) Results of treatment of lumbar spine disorders. Effects of assessment techniques and confounding factors. *Acta Orthop Scand Suppl* 251:126–129
13. Hagg O, Fritzell P, Nordwall A (2003) The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after treatment for chronic low back pain. *Eur Spine J* 12:12–20
14. Howe J, Frymoyer JW (1985) The effects of questionnaire design on the determination of end results in lumbar spinal surgery. *Spine* 10:804–805
15. Hurme M, Alaranta H (1987) Factors predicting the result of surgery for lumbar intervertebral disc herniation. *Spine* 12:933–938
16. Kazis LE, Anderson JJ, Meenan RF (1989) Effect sizes for interpreting changes in health status. *Med Care* 27:S178–S189

17. Lewis PJ, Weir BK, Broad RW, Grace MG (1987) Long-term prospective study of lumbosacral discectomy. *J Neurosurg* 67:49–53
18. McGregor AH, Hughes SP (2002) The evaluation of the surgical management of nerve root compression in patients with low back pain: part 1: the assessment of outcome. *Spine* 27:1465–1470
19. McGregor AH, Hughes SP (2002) The evaluation of the surgical management of nerve root compression in patients with low back pain: part 2: patient expectations and satisfaction. *Spine* 27:1471–1476
20. Nygaard OP, Kloster R, Solberg T (2000) Duration of leg pain as a predictor of outcome after surgery for lumbar disc herniation: a prospective cohort study with 1-year follow up. *J Neurosurg* 92:131–134
21. Pappas CT, Harrington T, Sonntag VK (1992) Outcome analysis in 654 surgically treated lumbar disc herniations. *Neurosurgery* 30:862–866
22. Patrick DL, Deyo RA (1989) Generic and disease-specific measures in assessing health status and quality of life. *Med Care* 27:S217–S232
23. Patrick DL, Deyo RA, Atlas SJ, Singer DE, Chapin A, Keller RB (1995) Assessing health-related quality of life in patients with sciatica. *Spine* 20:1899–1908
24. Pearce JM (2000) Aspects of the failed back syndrome: role of litigation. *Spinal Cord* 38:63–70
25. Sorensen LV, Mors O (1989) A two-year prospective follow-up study of the outcome after surgery in patients with slipped lumbar disk operated upon for the first time. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 96:94–99
26. Stromqvist B, Jonsson B, Fritzell P, Hagg O, Larsson BE, Lind B (2001) The Swedish National Register for lumbar spine surgery: Swedish Society for Spinal Surgery. *Acta Orthop Scand* 72:99–106
27. Tandon V, Campbell F, Ross ER (1999) Posterior lumbar interbody fusion. Association between disability and psychological disturbance in non-compensation patients. *Spine* 24:1833–1838
28. Weber H (1983) Lumbar disc herniation. A controlled, prospective study with ten years of observation. *Spine* 8:131–140
29. Weir BK (1979) Prospective study of 100 lumbosacral discectomies. *J Neurosurg* 50:283–289
30. Woertgen C, Holzschuh M, Rothoerl RD, Brawanski A (1997) Does the choice of outcome scale influence prognostic factors for lumbar disc surgery? A prospective, consecutive study of 121 patients. *Eur Spine J* 6:173–180
31. Woertgen C, Rothoerl RD, Holzschuh M, Breme K, Brawanski A (1998) Are prognostic factors still what they are expected to be after long-term follow-up? *J Spinal Disord* 11:395–399
32. Woertgen C, Rothoerl RD, Breme K, Altmeyen J, Holzschuh M, Brawanski A (1999) Variability of outcome after lumbar disc surgery. *Spine* 24:807–811
33. Wood-Dauphinee SL (2001) Assessment of back-related quality of life: the continuing challenge. *Spine* 26:857–861