Original Article

Anatomical differences in the bony structure of L5 and L4: A possible classification according to the lateral tilt of the pedicles

Giorgio Cacciola^{a,*}, Giuseppe Anastasi^a, Salvatore Bertino^a, Giuseppina Rizzo^a,
Giuseppina Cutroneo^a, Fabio Trimarchi^a, Alessandro Pisani^b, Pietro Cavaliere^b,
Andrea Barbanera^c, Daniele Bruschetta^{a,d}

^a University of Messina, Department of Biomedical, Dental Sciences and Morphological and Functional Images, Messina, Italy

^b Istituto Ortopedico del Mezzogiorno d'Italia "Franco Scalabrino", Dipartimento di Chirurgia Vertebrale, Messina, Italy

^c A.O.N. SS Antonio Biagio e Cesare Arrigo, Dipartimento di Neurochirurgia, Alessandria, Italy

^d IRCCS Neurolesi "Bonino Pulejo", Messina, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Pedicle
Classification
PLT
Screw fixation
Lumbar spine
3D CT
3D MRI

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to underline the necessity of a better knowledge of pedicles anatomy in order to improve surgical treatment of spine disorders such as low back pain, spinal fractures and scoliosis. A classification of pedicles lateral tilt which could help surgeons before the application of screws during transpedicular fixation is reported. Anatomical differences in the orientation of the pedicles of L5 and L4 have been found. For each patient that met the inclusion criteria underwent: Radiography of the lumbo-sacral region, CT examination, MRI acquisition. Patients were divided into three categories thanks to 3D direct volume rendering of CT scan. Subjects belonged to W-Type, V-Type and U-Type depending on their morphometric features. The subdivision was further implemented with measurements of the distance between pedicles and adjacent nervous structures. Concerning L5, W-Type (WT) exhibited a lateral tilt of L5 larger than 36°, V-Type exhibited a lateral tilt of L5 from 30° to 36°, U-Type exhibited a lateral tilt of L5 smaller than 30°. Concerning L4, WT exhibited a lateral tilt of 28.4°, VT exhibited a lateral tilt of 25.1°, UT exhibited a lateral tilt of 22.2°; we assume that the degree of lateralization of L4 depends on the one of L5. The way the screw is applied during surgical treatment is clinically relevant, thus our classification may be very useful in order to decrease surgical risk and improve conditions of patients after surgical treatment.

1. Introduction

Pedicle Screw Fixation (PSF) is a standard technique used by spinal surgeons in the treatment of spine disorders to obtain posterior spinal column fusion. The purpose of PSF is to improve conditions of patients suffering from a wide range of. Arthrodesis of the vertebral bodies is often performed to obtain a better outcome. This technique was first employed by Roy-Camille in 1963 for spinal fractures treatment.¹ After PSF introduction, several studies regarding the surgical anatomy and biomechanics of the pedicles have been carried out. Pioneering anatomical studies² demonstrated that the pedicles of the lower thoracic and lumbar regions allow for a stable anchorage of the vertebral bodies thanks to their morphology.³ The main reason that made surgeons choose the pedicles for PSF derives from anatomical factors, since the surgeon seeks the strongest site accessible posteriorly to obtain a satisfactory three-dimensional fixation. This led to an extension of

surgical indications for the treatment of several spine disorders through PSF.^{4,5} However, although such procedure has been introduced more than fifty years ago, and currently represents one of the most employed surgical procedures, it is not free from complications. In 1993 K. Follet and B. Dirks defined the Failed Back Surgery Syndrome (FBSS) as a "Surgical end-stage after one or several operative interventions on the lumbar neuroaxis, indicated to relieve lower back pain, the radicular pain of the combination of both without positive effect".⁶

Pain represents the fundamental anamnestic element in formulating a suspected diagnosis of FBSS. The lack of resolution of painful symptoms in the immediate postoperative period may be indicative of a surgery performed in a technically incorrect or incomplete way. Pain presenting months or years after surgery could be indicative of a new pathology, caused by biomechanical deficiency due to an erroneously performed procedure, whereas the immediately post-operative appearance of a "new pain, indicative of nerve root irritation", must lead

* Corresponding author at: A.O.U.G. Martino, Via Consolare Valeria n°1 98147, Messina, Italy.
E-mail address: dr.cacciola@gmail.com (G. Cacciola).

to consider an improper positioning of one or more pedicle screws. If that is the case, a CT Scan of the operative segment should be immediately performed to evaluate the trajectory of the screws and, if improper positioning is confirmed, the patient should return to the operating room for repositioning of the screw/s as soon as possible. During the last years, a significant reduction of incidence of “new leg pain” has been observed (i.e., the percentage of secondary foraminal stenosis has been reduced from 58% in 1981 to 25% in 2013) due to improvement in surgical technique and in the quality of implants,⁷ on the other hand the incidence of neuropathic pain caused by improper pedicle screw positioning has undergone a slight reduction (14% in 1981, compared to 10% in 2013).⁷

Taking into account these simple premises, the purpose of the present study is investigating the variability of the lumbar vertebral bodies and pedicles along with their relationship with nervous structures within lumbar spine. Our aim is to identify the morphotype with a closer relationship to post-operative complication after PSF, thus giving clinical resonance to this research.

2. Materials and method

For the present study 325 healthy subjects were enrolled (166 male 51,1%, and 159 female 48,9) with a mean age of 62 y.o (range from 34 to 72 y.o.), see [Table 1](#). All subjects who carried out examinations for other reasons, mostly for diagnostic investigation of the urinary tract, were informed of the study purpose and signed an informed consent in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki for the ethical principles of medical research for living people.

Considering the clinical anatomical purpose of this study, the following exclusion criteria were chosen: i) musculoskeletal congenital deformities, ii) previous fractures of the spine and/or of the pelvis and iii) previous surgeries at the lumbar spine or hip.

A CT examination (Kc 120, mAs 400, slice thickness of 0,6 mm) of the lumbar spine was acquired to study the morphology of the pedicles. A MRI scan (Coherent Gradient Echo in an Ultra Fast Echo Sequence in order to obtain T1-weighted isotropic volumes for high resolution scans) was acquired to study the relationship between the pedicles and nerve roots for each patient. First, the lateralisation angle of the pedicles (PLT) from L₁ to L₅ was assessed in the TC axial plane calculating the angle between the line passing through the centre of the pedicle to the anterior margin of the vertebral body and the line passing through the posterior and anterior margins of the vertebral body corresponding to the emergence of the pedicle. Then, the sample was divided into three categories, according to the PLT of L5 pedicles: (1) W-Type (WT), with a PLT > 36°, (2) V-Type (VT), with a PLT between 30° and 36° and (3) U-Type (UT), with a PLT < 30°. The nomenclature of each category refers to the letters W, V and U: W refer to the widest degree of lateralization, V an intermediate degree and U the narrowest one).

The pedicles bone morphometry from L₁ to L₅ was evaluated by the CT scan. The following measures were considered: pedicle width (PW, the transverse axis of the pedicle), pedicle height (PH, the vertical axis of the pedicle), interpedicular distance (IPD, distance between the pedicles at their emergency from the rostral part of the vertebral body). MRI scans were taken into account to analyze the reciprocal position assumed by the pedicles and the nervous structures. The following

measures were considered: pedicle-inferior root distance (PIRD, defined as the distance between pedicle and the nerve roots of the lower level), pedicle-superior root distance (PSRD, defined as the distance between the pedicle and the nerve roots at the upper level), root exit angle (REA), and the nerve root diameter (NRD).

Morphometric measures (including bone morphometry and distance between pedicles and nervous structures) were analysed by a linear regression model conducted using commercial software (Prism 7.0 Mac OS by GraphPad) to assess regression coefficient between two variables (PLT of L5 and the other measures). The regression coefficients were considered strongly significant with a p-value < 0.05 while a weaker significance is assumed for p < 0.10.

3. Results

3.1. Pedicle lateral tilt

3.1.1. PLT

The average degree of PLT of the pedicle in each of the three categories at L4 is 34,2° and depends on the PLT of L5 (SD ± 4,3° R square = 0.04688 and P-value = 0.0175). The average degree of lateralization in L3 was 22,2° (SD ± 1,8° R square = 0.037 P-Value = 0.1031), in pedicles of L2 and L1 the degree was 21,2° (SD ± 1,5 R Square = 0.09094 and p-value = 0.13401) and 20,7° (SD ± 1,5° R Square 0.04716 p-value = 0.11318) respectively as (see [Image 1](#)).

3.2. Bony morphometric measures compared to PLT of L5 (see [Image 2](#))

3.2.1. PW

The average transverse diameter of L5 pedicles was 17,38 mm and depends on the PLT of L5 (SD ± 1,5 mm R Square = 0.4092 p-value = 0.0186). A weaker statistically significant correlations was found between PW at L4 (mean value of 12,81 mm) and PLT of L5, (SD ± 1,12 R Square = 0.00832 P-value = 0.0856) .

3.2.2. PH

The average longitudinal diameter of L5 pedicles was 11,38 mm and depends on the PLT of L5 (SD ± 0.95 mm R square = 0.3856 p-value = 0.035). No statistically significant correlation was found between pH at L4 (mean value of 12,38 mm, SD ± 1,12 mm R square = 0,0387 p-value = 0,1434) and PLT of L5.

3.2.3. IPD

The average IPD at L5 was 28,8 mm and depends on the PLT of L5 (SD ± 4,9 mm R square = 0.4892 p-value = 0.0102). The average IPD at L4 is 26,9 mm and depends on the PLT of L5 (SD ± 3,8 mm R Square = 0.467 p-value = 0.0461).

There were not significant changes along pedicles of L1, L2 and L3 for bone morphometric measures relating to L5 PLT (p-value > 0.10 for each measures).

3.3. Distance between pedicles and adjacent nervous structures compared with PLT of L5 (see [Image 3](#))

3.3.1. PSRD

The average PSRD at L5 is 4,72 mm and showed no statistically significant relation with PLT of L5 (SD ± 0.34 mm R square = 0.0321 p-value = 0.2139); the average PSRD at L4 is 4,81 mm and showed no statistically significant relation with PLT of L5 (SD ± 0.28 mm R square = 0.0298 mm p-value 0.2342).

3.3.2. REA

The average REA at L5 is 41,5° and showed a statistically significant relations with PLT of L5 (SD ± 4,2° R square = 0.328 p-value = 0.0287); the average REA at L5 is 39,4° and showed a

Table 1
Demographic data.

Parameters	N°/%
Number of patients	325
Age	62 y.o. ± 12 (from 34 to 72)
Male	166/51,7%
Female	159/49,3%
BMI (Kg/m ²)	29,4 ± 6,2

Image 1. Mean values of PLT in ° at each lumbar segment in the three different subtype. PLT of L4 is correlated with PLT of L5 (R square = 0.04688 and P-value = 0.0175). No correlation was found between PLT of L5 and PLT of L3 (R square = 0.037 P-Value = 0.1031), L2 (R Square = 0.09094 and p-value = 0.13401) and L1 R Square 0.04716 p-value = 0.11318.

Image 2. (a) Morphometric Features of the bony structures of pedicles at L5 and at L4 (b) in mm.

statistically significant relation with PLT of L5 ($SD \pm 2,98^\circ$ R square = 0.287 p-value = 0.0318).

3.3.3. PIRD

No statistically significant values (p-value > 0.10) were found for PIRD and NRD at each level. There were not relation between pedicles of L1, L2 and L3 and PSRD, PDSD, PIRD and NRD (p-value > 0.10 for each measures).

3.4. Classification according to L5 PLT

Based on the results previously described we propose a classification based on the PLT of L5. The distribution of PLT in our sample was classified in three subtype listed below:

- 123 patients, 41.8% of the whole sample, exhibited WT ($SD \pm 3,7$ min 36° , max. 44.7° and mean of 37.3°).

- 141 patients, 48% of the whole sample, exhibited a VT ($SD \pm 3,5$ min 30.8° , max 35.8° and mean of 33.4°).
- 30 patients, 10.2% of the whole sample, exhibited a UT ($SD \pm 3,3$ min 27.5° , max. 29.9° and a mean of 28.6°).

4. Discussion

In the present study, we employed CT and MRI data in order to assess the relationship between the lumbar pedicles and the nervous structures as well as the morphology of the lumbar pedicles according to the variations of the PLT. The novelty of our study is the introduction of a classification that divides the sample into three categories according to PLT of L5 (W-Type with a PLT > 36° , V-Type with a PLT between 30° and 36° and U-Type with a PLT < 30°). We observed a statistically significant relationship at L5 (p-value < 0.05 and p-value < 0.10 see Table 2) between pedicle morphology and pedicle lateral tilt, with major diameters at increasing lateralization and

Image 3. (a) Distance Between the pedicles of L5 and pedicles of L4 (b) and the adjacent nervous structures in mm.

Table 2
Recent literature findings concerning lumbar region vertebrae morphometry, in each study different parameters were evaluated.

Study	N° of Patients/Cadavers	Parameters Evaluated
Karabekir et al. 10	21	Pedicle Width, Pedicle Height, Vertebral Body a/p and l/l diameters
Lien et al. 11	6	Pedicle Height, Safe Zone Width, Sagittal and Transverse pedicle's angle, Root Exit Angle
Alam et al. 12	49	Morphometry of Laminae, Morphometry of Pedicles, Canal Diameters, Morphometry of the vert. Bodies

Table 3
Mean values and statistic (compared to L5 PLT) of the measured parameters at L5 and L4. PIRD and NRD were not included in the tab because they not showed statistically significant correlation with PLT of L5. Stastistically significant results are in bold.

	PW	PH	IPD	PSRD	REA
L5	17,38 mm SD ± 1,5 mm R square 0,3856 p-value = 0,186	11,38 mm SD ± 0,95 mm R square = 0,3856 p-value = 0,035	28,8 mm SD ± 4,9 mm R square = 0,4892 p-value = 0,0102	4,72 mm SD ± 0.34 mm R square = 0.0321 p-value = 0.2139	41,5° SD ± 4,2° R square = 0.328 p-value = 0.0287
L4	12,81 mm SD ± 1,12 R square = 0.0832 p-value = 0.0856	12,38 mm SD ± 1,12 R square = 0,0387 p-value = 0,1434	26,9 mm SD ± 3,8 mm R Square = 0.467 p-value = 0.0461	4,81 mm SD ± 0.28 mm R square = 0.0298 p-value 0.2342	39,4° SD ± 2,98° R square = 0.287 p-value = 0.0318

concerning the distance between the nervous structures, which increases by the rise in the degree of lateralization . A weaker association between the PLT and pedicle structure was observed in regards to L4 (see Image 1). Showing a strong relation between the PLT of L5 with that of L4. No significant relation was found between the PLT of L5 and the PLTs at proximal levels (L1, L2, and L3).

Recently, several studies evaluated the morphometry of the lumbar vertebrae (see Table 3),⁸ and in particular the morphology of the pedicles.⁹ Karabekir et al 10 compared 100 dry lumbar vertebrae from 20 adult cadavers to the MRI acquisition of the lumbar vertebrae of 21 healthy control subjects. Both vertebral body and pedicle morphometry were analysed; Lien et al 11 considered specimens from 6 cadavers and the morphometric analysis extrapolated from CT scan of thoracic and lumbar spine to identify a safe region for PSF. However, these works lack in terms of number of specimens or patients examined. Indeed, only few examples in recent literature report data from a conspicuous number of patients: Alam et al 12 analysed pedicles dimension, canal diameters and laminae morphometry in 49 patients (two-hundred and twenty vertebrae), Wolf et al 13 evaluated the workspace of the pedicle entry point as the one between the vertebral body and disk puncture points in 55 patients.

From an overall analysis of data obtained from these studies, we can assume that differences among population exist and could have clinical resonance. Our analysis is endorsed by a sample that was previously classified into three categories. This classification could help the surgeons to apply interpedicular screws and this could imply the decrease of surgical risk.

Even though we don't have direct confirmation, our hypothesis is supported by the data present in literature. The observation of already published studies regarding improper PSF using traditional techniques (without intra-operative navigation), illustrates important differences between studies and. Amato et al 14, published a retrospective analysis of 102 consecutive operations on the lumbar spine, in which 21 screws were frankly malpositioned, with a 4,8% rate of failure for L4 and 5,1% rate of L5 (7 screws of a total of 144 and 9 screws of a total of 176, respectively), whereas there was only 1,9% rate of failure regarding S1 screws. The insignificance number of screws implanted at L3 did not permit the authors of the study to obtain statistically relevant results for this level.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the results obtained from our analysis have highlighted a wide range of important morphological differences in the healthy population. Therefore, the knowledge of these anatomical variables could be useful to the vertebral surgeon during pre-operative surgical planning (in fact, subjects belonging to a determinate category will have a smaller pedicles and might require the use of a reduced sized screw) and also intra-operatively, since although it is true that about 90% of the sample has a PLT > 30°, about the 10% presents a much lower PLT (< 30°). In these subjects, not only the pedicles have reduced dimension, but also, the nervous structures are closer to the pedicles compared with the WT and VT. This condition could be a significant risk factor for the malpositioning of pedicle screws during lumbar spine stabilization surgery.

Conflict of interest

None.

References

- Boos N, Web JK. Pedicle screw fixation in spinal disorders: a European view. *Eur Spine J*. 1997;6(1):2–18.
- Roy-Camille R. Ostrosynthèse du rachis dorsal, lombaire et lombosacral par plaque métalliques visées dans les pédicules vertébraux et les apophyses articulaires. *Presse Méd*. 1970;78:1447–1448.
- Zindrick MR, Wiltse LL, Doornik A, et al. Analysis of the morphometric characteristics of the thoracic and lumbar pedicles. *Spine*. 1987;12:160–166.
- Wray Steven, Mimran Ronnie, Vadapalli Sasidhar, Shetye Snehal S, McGilvray Kirk C, Puttlitz Christian M. Pedicle screw placement in the lumbar spine: effect of trajectory and screw design on acute biomechanical purchase. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2015;22(May (5)):503–510. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3171/2014>.
- McDonnell M, Shah KN, Paller DJ, et al. Biomechanical analysis of pedicle screw fixation for thoracolumbar burst fractures. *Orthopedics*. 2016;39(May (3)):e514–e518. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20160427-09>.
- Follet K, Dirks B. Etiology and evaluation of the failed back surgery syndrome. *Neurosurg Q*. 1993;3:40–59.
- Thomson Simon. Failed back surgery syndrome –definition, epidemiology and demographics. *Br J Pain*. 2013;7(Febuary (1)):556–559. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/20499463713479096>.
- Scoles PV, Linton AE, Latimer B, Levy ME, Digiovanni BF. Vertebral body and posterior element morphology: the normal spine in middle life. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1988;13(October (10)):1082–1086.
- Misenhimer GR, Peek RD, Wiltse LL, Rothman SL, Widell Jr EH. Anatomic analysis of pedicle cortical and cancellous diameter as related to screw size. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1989;14(4):367–372.
- Karabekir HS, Gocmen-Mas N, Edizer M, Ertekin T, Yazici C, Atamturk D. Lumbar vertebra morphometry and stereological assessment of intervertebral space volumetry: a methodological study. *Ann Anat*. 2011;193(May (3)):231–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aanat.2011.01.011> 2011.
- Lien SB, Liou NH, Wu SS. Analysis of anatomic morphometry of the pedicles and the safe zone for through-pedicle procedures in the thoracic and lumbar spine. *Eur Spine J*. 2007;16(8):1215–1222.
- Alam MM, Waqas M, Shallwani H, Javed G. Lumbar morphometry: a study of lumbar vertebrae from a Pakistani population using computed tomography scans. *Asian Spine J*. 2014;8(August (4)):421–426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4184/asj.2014.8.4.421>.
- Wolf A, Shoham M, Michael S, Moshe R. Morphometric study of the human lumbar spine for operation-workspace specifications. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2001;26(November (22)):2472–2477 2001.
- Amato V, Giannacchi L, Irace C. Accuracy of pedicle screw placement in the lumbar spine using conventional technique: computed tomography postoperative assessment in 102 consecutive patients. *Neurosurg Spine*. 2010;12(March (3)):306–313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3171/2009.9.SPINE09261>.