

### A Comparative Study of Lumbar Spine Stabilization Devices

Borja Martinez Yllera Marcelo Simões Carlos Rodrigo de Mello Roesler Ari Digiacomo Ocampo Moré Eduardo Alberto Fancello







Hospital Universitário Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina Florianópolis – SC, Brasil Departamento de Engenharia Mecânica – CTC Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina Florianópolis – SC, Brasil



### LEBm - Laboratory of Biomechanical Engineering

University Hospital Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina Florianópolis – SC, Brasil



### LEBm - permanent staff

- Ari Digiacomo Ocampo Moré, Surgeon, Surgery Dep. (Director)
- Carlos Rodrigo de Mello Roesler, Mech. Eng. Mech. Dep.
- Edison da Rosa, Mech. Eng. Mech. Dep.
- Eduardo Alberto Fancello, Mech. Eng. Mech. Dep.
- Gean Vitor Salmoria, Chem. Eng. Mech. Dep.

### LEBm activities

- Implant testing
- Orthopedic Biomechanics
  - Evaluation of orthopedic surgical techniques
  - Support for development of orthopedic implants
  - Constitutive Modeling





### Content

- 1. Context; clinical motivation of the present work
- 2. Model description
- 3. Hypotheses, results and discussion
- 4. Conclusions

- The spine is a very complex structure:
  - flexibility for movement
  - support for weight bearing
  - protection of spinal cord and nerves
  - mobile column divided in 24 segments







#### Background

- The spine is a very complex structure:
- The segment is the Spinal Functional Unit (FSU): the minor part capable of movement





 Each typical segment is composed of 2 vertebras articulated by a triarticular complex composed of 2 facet joints and the intervertebral disc



- The spine is a very complex structure:
- The intervertebral disc is a unique kind of joint:
  - complete viscoelastic cushion
  - act as a shock absorber







- The spine is a very complex structure:
- The intervertebral disc is a unique kind of joint:
  - complete viscoelastic cushion
  - act as a shock absorber
  - high grade of anisotropy







- The spine is a very complex structure:
- The intervertebral disc is a unique kind of joint:
  - complete viscoelastic cushion
  - act as a shock absorber
  - high grade of anisotropy
  - allows limited movement
  - unconstrained center of rotation







#### Background

- The spine is a very complex structure:
- Provides flexibility for movement, support for weight bearing and protection of the spinal cord and nerve roots.
- The dynamic and supportive properties of the normal spine are provided by 25 moveable vertebrae, over 100 elaborate joints, 24 intervertebral discs, more than 220 specialized ligaments, an intricate network of blood vessels and countless specialized nerve endings.

In this scenario, it is very difficult to anticipate the actual impact of any intervention



#### Background

 Most spine surgeons do not have any kind of training or even knowledge on biomechanics



What's the true importance of biomechanics on the practice of the spine surgeon?

'not so important'



Grupo de Análise e Proieto Mecânico

### **Spine Biomechanics**

Background

- Traditional surgical interventions:
  - logic rationale
  - clinical experimentation
  - clinical results



Clinical outcome will always be the ultimate quality control, but the context of spine surgery suffered a number of changes...



#### Background

- Before the 90's:
- serious pathologies- fractures, deformities, tumors, infection, etc.
- armamentarium- rods, hooks, wires → levers acting on a number of segments



The goal was to keep people alive and walking!



#### Background

Implants that act on an isolated segment (segmental instrumentation)



#### effects imposed to a restricted area of pathology

#### Laboratório de Engenharia BioMecânica GRANTE Grupo de Análise e Projeto Mecânico

### **Spine Biomechanics**

#### Background

Segmental implants were the cornerstone to surgery for pain or spine degeneration

SPINE Volume 22, Number 6, pp 667–680 ©1997, Lippincott–Raven Publishers

#### Threaded Titanium Cages for Lumbar Interbody Fusions

Charles Dean Ray, MD, FACS, FRSH (Lond.)

- 2001-2010 was 'The Decade of the Spine'
  - appearance of many new techniques
  - popularization of spine surgery





#### Background

Segmental implants were the cornerstone to surgery for pain or spine degeneration

development of surgical tools

#### $\mathbf{\Psi}$

development of surgical techniques

#### $\mathbf{\Psi}$

industry driven medical practice...



Grupo de Análise e Proieto Mecânico

### **Spine Biomechanics**

#### Background

• New kinds of treatments are being introduced



- same clinical outcomes when compared to traditional techniques
- introduction of new complications
- justified by pure biomechanical rationalizations



### **Spine Biomechanics**

- Spinal Fusion:
  - eliminates movement and load transmission





- Dynamic Fixation:
  - introduces in the segment an implant to restore balance between spine components, aiming to bring movement and load transmission back to normal





- Disc Arthroplasty:
  - substitutes the damaged component of the segment for an implant, trying to bring movement and load transmission back to normal





#### Background

 Today we consider surgery for young people with minor problems that causes only pain – <u>healthy people / goal of enhancing life quality</u>



- Today we consider surgery for young people with minor problems that causes only pain – <u>healthy people / goal of enhancing life quality</u>
- much bigger responsibility / precision much more important



- Today we consider surgery for young people with minor problems that causes only pain – <u>healthy people / goal of enhancing life quality</u>
- much bigger responsibility / precision much more important
- The spine surgeon have to consider some questions:
  - Is the effect of the procedure really restricted to the disease? NO.



- Today we consider surgery for young people with minor problems that causes only pain – <u>healthy people / goal of enhancing life quality</u>
- much bigger responsibility / precision much more important
- The spine surgeon have to consider some questions:
  - Is the effect of the procedure really restricted to the disease? NO.
  - What happens in the rest of spine?
  - Am I doing something that can result in more damage in the future?
  - Is there any technical detail that can make my procedure better?



#### Background

- Today we consider surgery for young people with minor problems that causes only pain – <u>healthy people / goal of enhancing life quality</u>
- much bigger responsibility / precision much more important
- The spine surgeon have to consider some questions:
  - Is the effect of the procedure really restricted to the disease? NO.
  - What happens in the rest of spine?
  - Am I doing something that can result in more damage in the future?
  - Is there any technical detail that can make my procedure better?

Those questions can't be solved with observation of short term clinical outcomes.



#### Background

- Today we consider surgery for young people with minor problems that causes only pain – <u>healthy people / goal of enhancing life quality</u>
- much bigger responsibility / precision much more important
- The spine surgeon have to consider some questions:
  - Is the effect of the procedure really restricted to the disease? NO.
  - What happens in the rest of spine?
  - Am I doing something that can result in more damage in the future?
  - Is there any technical detail that can make my procedure better?

Those questions can't be solved with observation of short term clinical outcomes. Biomechanical research started being of immediate significance to the surgeon.



### **Spine Biomechanics**







### **Spine Biomechanics**







**Spine Biomechanics** 











### **Spine Biomechanics**



### **Specific Topics**



- 1. Better understanding of mechanical response of the healthy lumbosacral spine at different flexion-extension amplitudes
- 2. Mechanical response of a healthy spine compared with that stabilized with fusion device.
- 3. Impact of segment stabilization on adjacent segments
- 4. Does the stiffness of the stabilization system produce significant differences on the post-operatory scenario?

Simulation by Finite Elements

### The FE Model



#### LS spine geometry:

Geometry obtained form Zygote Media Group company



After comparison with anthropometric studies, the angle of lordosis of the vertebrae and discs were changed



### The FE Model



#### Vertebrae geometry:

Geometry modified in order to follow anthropometric study of **Zhou et al**: computerized **tomography measurements of the L3-L5 vertebrae of 126 patients** 





### The FE Model

Intervertebral disk Geometry:

- ✓ Modified to follow statistical lordosis angle and heights
- ✓ The relative positions of vertebrae was modified
- ✓ Lower and upper surface shapes follow that of vertebrae









### Intervertebral disk

#### **Characteristics:**

> Nucleus Pulposus: gelatinous incompressible material. Distribution of pressure on the Fibrosus annulus when compressed.

> Annulus Fibrosus: highly anisotropic fiber reinforced tissue around the nucleus. Fibers oriented along an helicoidally distribution.







### Intervertebral disk



#### Modeling

- Ground substance: hyperelastic incompressible (Mooney Rivlin / Ogden)
- $\succ$  Orientation of fibers with horizontal plane: from 25° at anterior region to 50° at posterior region.











### Intervertebral disk

Modeling

Stiffness of fibers obtained from in vitro study [Holzapfel],



Geometry divided in 8 regions in radial direction and 5 regions in circumferential directions. The 4 curves were combined and conveniently adapted to each region.





### Ligaments



 Highly oriented structures with zero stiffness to compressive strains

Spine stability and movements constraints.

Model: Nonlinear uniaxial elements









#### **Anterior Longitudinal & Posterior Longitudinal**



### Ligaments

![](_page_41_Picture_1.jpeg)

Grupo de Análise e Projeto Mecânico

#### **Inter Transverse & Capsular**

![](_page_41_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Yellow (Flavum) & Inter Spinous

![](_page_42_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Supra Spinous & Ileo Lumbar

![](_page_43_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Facet Joints**

![](_page_44_Picture_1.jpeg)

- Stability function
- Movement constraints
- Nonlinear frictionless contact model [5]

![](_page_44_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Material Properties**

![](_page_45_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_3.jpeg)

Material	E (MPa) Possion's ratio		Element Type	
Cancellous bone	Exx=140 Eyy=200 Ezz=140 Gxy=48.3 Gyz=48.3 Gxz=48.3	γxy=0.315 γyz=0.315 γxz=0.450	Hexaedrals	
Cortical bone	12000	γ=0.2	Hexahedral	
Bony posterior elements	3500 γ=0.25		Hexahedrals and Tetrahedrals	
Nucleus	Mooney-Rivlin c Incomp	Hexahedrals		
Annulus ground substance	Hyper-ela incomp	Hexahedrals		
Annulus fibers	Stress-str	No-compression uniaxial connectors		
Outer Bony Endplate	12000 γ=0.3		Hexahedral	
Intermediate Bony Endplate	6000	γ=0.3	Hexahedral	
Inner Bony Endplate	2000	γ=0.3	Hexahedral	
Ligaments	Stress-strain cu	No-compression uniaxial connectors		

### **Calibration of segment L4-L5**

![](_page_46_Picture_1.jpeg)

Grupo de Análise e Projeto Mecânico

 ✓ Heuer measured the movements of segment L4-L5 in flexion, extension, lateral bending and torsion.

✓ Measurements were performed with an intact segment and after removing several structures, sequentially: SSL, ISL, YL, CL, facet joints, PLL, ALL, Nucleous Pulposus

 ✓ Soft tissues behavior was adjusted to obtain a difference of less than 5%, in comparison to the experimental curves obtained by Heuer

![](_page_46_Picture_6.jpeg)

### **Calibration of segment L4-L5**

![](_page_47_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Comparative rotation results after calibration of Annulus Fibrosus

![](_page_47_Figure_3.jpeg)

48

### **Calibration of segment L4-L5**

![](_page_48_Picture_1.jpeg)

Comparative rotation results after **calibration of ISL** on flexion, extension, lateral bending and torsion

![](_page_48_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Calibration of complete Lombosacral Segment (L1-S1)

![](_page_49_Picture_1.jpeg)

GRANTE Grupo de Análise e Projeto Mecânico

✓ Parametric extrapolation of L4-L5 soft tissues properties to the other segments

 ✓ Calibration of extrapolated material properties in order to compare with in vitro rotation measurements of Panjabi [29],
Yamamoto [51], Guan [14] and Rohlmann [38]

![](_page_49_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Loads: Weight + Muscular Forces

#### **MUSCLES**

#### Local Muscles:

- ✓ Connect adjacent vertebrae
- ✓ Provide compressive loads that stabilize the column

#### **Global Muscles**

✓ Control the spine movement: flexion, extension, lateral bending and torsion

#### MODEL

- ✓ Erector Spinae: Applied at 40mm dorsal from L1 superior endplate.
- ✓ Rectus Abdominus: Applied 153mm ventral from L1 superior endplate.
- ✓ Weigh: Applied at 200 mm cranial and 30 mm anterior from the L1 superior endplate.
- ✓ Follower Load : Simulate Local Muscles; 200N compressive load at each pair of vertebrae

![](_page_51_Picture_0.jpeg)

GRANTE

### Loads: Weight + Muscular Forces

#### Global muscular force calculation: 6 load cases

- 50 Flexion (30 Hip / 20 Spine)
- 30 Flexion (20 Hip / 10 Spine)
- 15 Flexion (10 Hip / 5 Spine)
- Neutral Position
- -15 Extension (- 5 Hip / -10 Spine)
- 25 Extension (-10 Hip / -15 Spine)

#### Technique used by Wilke

- 1) Apply the desired flexion angle at L1 superior endplate
- 2) Apply weight force
- Modify iteratively the muscular forces in order to obtain zero value of momentum reaction at the L1 superior endplate

#### Local muscular forces

200 N at each pair of vertebrae

![](_page_51_Figure_15.jpeg)

### Loads: Weight + Muscular Forces

Example: 30 degrees flexion (20 degrees hip, 10 degrees spine)

Hip flexion angle L1 flexion angle Unloaded Final loaded case

![](_page_53_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Loads: Weight + Muscular Forces

RESULTS

#### 50° Flexion (30° hip; 20° spine)

![](_page_53_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Cargas aplicadas al modelo

![](_page_53_Figure_6.jpeg)

	Rotación	Fuerzas de Contacto FJ (N)		Fuerzas en los Ligamentos (N)			
	(grados)	lzq.	Der.	ALL	PLL	CL Izq.	CL Der.
L1L2	4.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.38	0.17	0.82
L2L3	4.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	-3.11	8.41	8.29
L3L4	4.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	-4.81	0.00	0.00
L4L5	1.24	19.84	16.82	0.00	-3.98	0.00	0.00
L5S1	4.62	42.83	43.12	0.00	-1.35	0.00	0.00

	Fuerzas en los Ligamentos (N)						
	FL	ISL	SSL	ITL Izq.	ITL Der.	ILL Ant.	ILL Post.
L1L2	18.14	2.38	48.28	7.27	9.14		
L2L3	10.61	2.85	24.26	3.88	3.42		
L3L4	9.77	0.15	13.72	0.33	0.51	19.32	285.79
L4L5	1.84	-3.76	-3.08	0.00	0.00		
L5S1	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		

![](_page_54_Picture_0.jpeg)

**GRANTE** 

### Loads: Weight + Muscular Forces

Grupo de Análise e Projeto Mecânico Cargas aplicadas al modelo

![](_page_54_Figure_3.jpeg)

### **Evaluation of pedicular fusion implants**

- Insertion of pedicular fusion device in L4-L5 segment consisting in 4 pedicle screws, two rods and intervertebral cage
- Elimination of Nucleous Pulposus and postero-lateral sector of the Annulus Fibrosus
- ✓ Screws: solid elements
- ✓ Rod: beam elements

![](_page_55_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Figure_6.jpeg)

### **Evaluation of pedicular fusion implants**

- Insertion of pedicular fusion device in L4-L5 segment consisting in 4 pedicle screws, two rods and intervertebral cage
- Elimination of Nucleous Pulposus and postero-lateral sector of the Annulus Fibrosus
- ✓ Screws: solid elements
- ✓ Rod: beam elements

![](_page_56_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Hypotheses

- The fusion stabilization device implanted at specified segment increases the relative flexion/extension movement mainly at adjacent segments (flexion-extension angle and anterior-posterior displacement);
- 2. Fusion stabilization devices induce higher facet joint contact forces in adjacent segments;
- 3. Compliant rods (Peek) cause lower impact than rigid rods (Ti) on at adjacent segments;
- 4. The load transferred to the intervertebral cage increases with Peek rods (in comparison to Titanium Rods);

# Conclusions

- The load transferred to the intervertebral cage increases with Peek rods (in comparison to Titanium Rods); Verified. Nevertheless, differences are around 10% in most cases
- 2. The fusion stabilization device implanted at specified segment increases the relative flexion/extension movement at adjacent segments (flexion-extension angle and anterior-posterior displacement); small differences were found. Only slight alteration on flexion/extension angles were found at inferior adjacent level
- 3. Fusion stabilization devices induce higher facet joint contact forces in adjacent segments; Verified at the superior adjacent segment only
- 4. Compliant rods (Peek) cause lower impact than rigid rods (Ti) on at adjacent segments; Not verified. TI and Peek devices caused similar mechanical behavior.

#### **Clinical Final Conclusions**

- Clinical reported facet joint arthrosis may be a consequence of the identified increment of facet contact forces in adjacent segments
- No clear advantages of Peek rods instead of conventional Ti rods (from a mechanical point of view)

## Thank you for your attention