

1 **Research topics and trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis: a**  
2 **bibliometric study with machine-learning based text mining**

3

4 Guoxin Fan, MD<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Jiaqi Qin, BE<sup>3,†</sup>, Yufeng Li<sup>4,†</sup>, Sheng Yang, MD<sup>5,6</sup>, Longfei Huang, MD<sup>7</sup>,  
5 Huaqing Liu, MESC<sup>3</sup>, Shisheng He<sup>5,6,\*</sup>, MD, Xiang Liao, MD<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Pain Medicine, Huazhong University of Science and Technology Union Shenzhen  
8 Hospital, Shenzhen, 518060, China.

9 <sup>2</sup> Guangdong Key Laboratory for Biomedical Measurements and Ultrasound Imaging, School of  
10 Biomedical Engineering, Shenzhen University Health Science Center, Shenzhen 518060, China.

11 <sup>3</sup> Artificial Intelligence Innovation Center, Research Institute of Tsinghua, Pearl River Delta,  
12 Guangzhou, 510735, China.

13 <sup>4</sup> Department of Orthopedics, The Eighth Affiliated Hospital Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen,  
14 518033, China.

15 <sup>5</sup> Department of Orthopedics, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of  
16 Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China

17 <sup>6</sup> Spinal Pain Research Institute, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China.

18 <sup>7</sup> Department of Orthopedics, Nanchang Hongdu Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 1399  
19 Diezihu Road, Donghu District, Nanchang, 330006, China

20

21 <sup>†</sup> these three authors equally contribute to the work.

22 \* Corresponding authors:

23 Shisheng He; Email addresses: [tjhss7418@tongji.edu.cn](mailto:tjhss7418@tongji.edu.cn)

24 Mailing address: Department of Orthopedics, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University  
25 School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

26 Xiang Liao; Email addresses: [digitalxiang@163.com](mailto:digitalxiang@163.com)

27 Mailing address: Department of Pain Medicine, Huazhong University of Science and Technology  
28 Union Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, China

## 29 **Abstract**

30 Objectives: The study aimed to conduct a bibliometric analysis of publications concerning lumbar  
31 spondylolisthesis, as well as explore its research topics and trends with machine-learning based  
32 text mining.

33 Methods: The data were extracted from the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) database  
34 and analyzed in Rstudio1.3.1. Annual publication production and the top 20 productive authors  
35 over time were presented. Additionally, top 20 productive journals and top 20 impact journals  
36 were compared by spine-subspecialty or not. Similarly, top 20 productive countries/regions and  
37 top 20 impact countries/regions were compared by developed countries/regions or not. The  
38 collaborative relationship among countries and the research trends in the past decade were  
39 presented by R package “Bibliometrix”. Latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) analysis was conducted  
40 to classify main topics of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

41 Results: Up to 2021, a total number of 4990 articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis were  
42 finally included for analysis. Spine-subspecialty journals were found to be dominant in  
43 productivity and impact of the field, and SPINE, EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL and JOURNAL  
44 OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE were the top 3 productive and the top 3 impact journals in this  
45 field. USA, China and Japan have contributed to over half of the publication productivity, but  
46 European countries seemed to publish more influential articles. It seemed that developed  
47 countries/regions tended to produce more articles as well as high influential articles, and  
48 international collaborations focused on USA, Europe and eastern Asia. Publications concerning  
49 emerging surgical technique was the major topic, followed by radiographic measurement and  
50 epidemiology for this field. Cortical bone trajectory, oblique lumbar interbody fusion, oblique  
51 lateral lumbar interbody fusion, lateral lumbar interbody fusion, degenerative lumbar  
52 spondylolisthesis, adjacent segment disease, spinal canal stenosis, minimally invasive  
53 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion and percutaneous pedicle screw were the recent hotspots  
54 over the past 5 years.

55 Conclusions: The study successfully summarized the productivity and impact of different  
56 countries/regions and journals, which should benefit the journal selection and pursuit of  
57 international collaboration for researcher who were interested in the field of lumbar  
58 spondylolisthesis. Additionally, the current study may encourage more researchers in the field and  
59 somewhat inform their research direction in the future.

60

61 **Keywords:** Bibliometrics, Lumbar Spondylolisthesis, Machine Learning, Latent Dirichlet  
62 allocation, Text Mining

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

## 70 **Introduction:**

71 Lumbar spondylolisthesis, especially in the elderly, is one of the most common causes of low  
72 back pain(1). Lumbar spondylolisthesis is defined as a slip of one vertebra over the other beneath,  
73 causing instability of the segment and compression of the cauda equina(2). The incidence of  
74 lumbar spondylolisthesis is 4-6% in the general population(3), which typically occurs in the  
75 occurs at the fourth and fifth lumbar vertebrae(4). In the United States, approximately 11.5% of  
76 the population suffers from this disease(5). Based on its etiology, lumbar spondylolisthesis can be  
77 divided into isthmic or degenerative spondylolisthesis. The former could be post-traumatic  
78 fractures in the pars interarticularis or congenital defects, while the latter is a result of disorders of  
79 the disc space or degenerative arthritis(6). Currently, the risk factors for spondylolisthesis are  
80 considered to be older age, female gender, larger body mass index and sagittal facet orientation(7).

81 According to the current agreement, the treatment of lumbar spondylolisthesis essentially  
82 incorporates conservative treatment or surgical treatment. The nonsurgical treatment options may  
83 include physical therapy, exercise, epidural steroid injections for pain, and medications. If  
84 conservative therapy fails, a surgical intervention was usually recommended(8). Surgical options  
85 include either decompression alone or decompression with fixation and fusion, with the essential  
86 objectives of neural decompression and stability reconstructions as well as restoration of sagittal  
87 alignment(9). Recently, minimally invasive spine surgery has been widely adopted in surgical  
88 management of lumbar spondylolisthesis(10-12). Therefore, probing and summarizing the  
89 research topics or trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis may benefit potential doctors and researchers  
90 who were interested in this field.

91 Bibliometric analysis is a powerful tool to depict the research activities of a certain field in  
92 details(13). For example, bibliometrics analysis can quantify the contribution of a research field  
93 (including different countries, institutions, journals, or authors), and to identify the research trends  
94 or topics in a particular field(14). Nowadays, bibliometric analysis has been widely adopted in  
95 summarizing medical fields, like emerging techniques(15-17) and common disease(18-20). In  
96 spine field, bibliometric studies about cervical myelopathy(21), spinal stenosis(22), spinal cord  
97 injury(23), scoliosis(24) are thriving. However, no bibliometric study concerning lumbar  
98 spondylolisthesis was available. Meanwhile, latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) is a popular  
99 machine learning algorithm that has been accepted as a bibliometric tool to obtain research topics  
100 for a specific field(25-27). Thus, the purpose of this work is to explore the research topics and  
101 trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis via bibliometric analysis.

102

## 103 **Methods:**

### 104 **Data Acquisition**

105 Relevant literatures were collected from the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) database.  
106 The search terms are “spondylolisthesis”. The time interval was set to 1975 to 2021. Only articles  
107 were included, and no language restrictions were applied. To avoid bias incurred by frequent  
108 database renewal, all literature retrieval and data downloads were completed in a single day, Jan  
109 18, 2022. Considering that data were directly downloaded from the data set, ethical approval was  
110 not required. WoSCC data of full record and references (including titles, countries of origin,

111 institutions, journals, authors, etc.) were extracted in bib format and then imported into the  
112 Rstudio1.3.1. for bibliometric analysis.

### 113 **Quantitative analysis**

114 Annual publication production and the top 20 productive authors over time were presented.  
115 Additionally, top 20 productive journals and top 20 impact journals were compared by  
116 spine-subspecialty or not. Similarly, top 20 productive countries/regions and top 20 impact  
117 countries/regions were compared by developed countries/regions or not. The productivity of  
118 journals and countries/regions was measured by the total number of publications, whereas the  
119 impact of journals and countries/regions was assessed by H-index or average article citations (15).  
120 H-index was characterized as the extent that an entity has published at least h papers that have  
121 been each cited at least h times (28). All the data were analyzed by Rstudio1.3.1 and R package  
122 “Bibliometrix” was used to conduct quantitative analysis of different entity’s contributions.

### 123 **Research topics and trends**

124 LDA can create a vocabulary of terms and then classify the included publications into different  
125 topics(18). We used the package “lda” in R language to conduct LDA analysis of included  
126 abstracts. The collaborative relationship among countries and the research trend in the past decade  
127 were presented by R package “Bibliometrix”.

128

## 129 **Results**

### 130 **General information**

131 Up to 2021, a total number of 4990 articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis were finally  
132 included for analysis. Average citations per documents reached 24.43, and average citations per  
133 year per documents reached 1.829. A total of 623 sources were identified while most sources were  
134 academic journals, as only a few articles were book chapters. Annual published articles  
135 concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis kept rising over time (**Figure 1**), and the publications of the  
136 latest 10 years contributed to 56.9% (2841/4990) productivity of this field. Similarly, almost all  
137 the top 20 productive authors published most of their articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis  
138 in years between 2010 and 2020.

### 139 **Quantitative analysis**

140 The top 20 productive journals and the top 20 impact journals publishing articles concerning  
141 lumbar spondylolisthesis were listed in **Table 1**. Articles in the top 20 journals (2789) were equal  
142 to 55.89% of all 4990 article publications. “SPINE” was the most productive journal (750 articles)  
143 and the most influential journal (H-index: 102) in the field. Similarly, “EUROPEAN SPINE  
144 JOURNAL” was the second productive (361 articles) and the second influential journal (H-index:  
145 49), while “JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE” was the third productive (255 articles)  
146 and the third influential journal (H-index: 47). Most articles (1952/2789) were published by  
147 spine-subspecialty journals among the top 20 productive journals, even though only 9  
148 spine-subspecialty journals were in the top 20 productive lists. The top 3 influential journals all  
149 belonged to spine-subspecialty journals, although only one third of the top 20 influential journals

150 were spine-subspecialty journals (7/20).

151 The top 20 productive and top 20 impact countries/regions publishing articles concerning  
152 lumbar spondylolisthesis were listed in **Table 2**. Articles in the top 20 countries/regions (4468)  
153 were equal to 89.54% of all 4990 article publications. USA was the most productive country (1570  
154 articles) in this field, followed by China (536 articles) and Japan (531 articles). It was noted that  
155 Taiwan, as one of the most developed regions in China, accounted for nearly 20% of China's  
156 productive contributions. However, only three non-developed countries were in the top 20  
157 productive list, while developed countries/regions published 86.01% (3843/4468) articles among  
158 the top 20 productive lists. As we ranked the top impact countries/regions by average article  
159 citations, USA only ranked top 7 and Japan ranked top 16, while China was even not in the top 20  
160 influential list. Among this list, only one country belonged to non-developed economic entity.

161 Collaborations among countries/regions and institutions in lumbar spondylolisthesis field  
162 were presented in **Figure 2**. Countries or region connected with red lines indicated there were  
163 some collaborations among them and the thickness of the red line was proportional to the number  
164 of collaborations. It seemed that USA was the hub country of publications, because there are lots  
165 of red lines radiated from USA to European countries, China, Korea, Japan and even Australia.  
166 Although India, Brazil, China, Japan and some middle eastern countries were also productive,  
167 there were little collaborations among them. As for institution collaboration, University of  
168 California-San Francisco was the most active institution in this field. It seemed that most active  
169 institutions in collaborations were from USA, followed by South Korea, and Canada. Although  
170 China was one of the most productive country, only two intuitions from Taiwan Province were  
171 recognized as the most active institutions in collaborations.

## 172 **Research topics and trends**

173 After removing articles without abstracts, a total of 4581 articles were finally included for LDA  
174 analysis. We found three major topics in this field, and named them as “Topic 1: surgery”, “Topic  
175 2: radiology” and “Topic 3: epidemiology” (**Figure 3**). The publication proportion of these three  
176 topics were 37.2%, 34.3% and 28.5%, respectively. Additionally, we presented how the  
177 productivity of these three topics evolved over time. It seemed that one third of publications were  
178 concerned about the radiographic measurement of lumbar spondylolisthesis (Topic 2: radiology),  
179 and it kept as the most productive topic for two decades (1990 to 2010). After 2010, publications  
180 concerning all kinds of surgical management (Topic 1: surgery) became the dominant topic, and  
181 publications concerning prevalence, risk factors, quality of life and conservative treatment of  
182 lumbar spondylolisthesis (Topic 3: epidemiology) joined as another mainstream topic after 2015.

183 Using term frequency, we obtained the research trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis over the  
184 past one decade (**Figure 4**). Cortical bone trajectory (CBT), oblique lumbar interbody fusion  
185 (OLIF), oblique lateral lumbar interbody fusion (OLLIF), lateral lumbar interbody fusion (LLIF),  
186 degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, adjacent segment disease (ASD), spinal canal stenosis,  
187 minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (MIS-TLIF) and percutaneous pedicle  
188 screw were the recent hotspots over the past 5 years.

189

## 190 Discussion

191 Text mining and bibliometric analysis have been adopted widely in depicting a certain  
192 academic field in details. The current study quantified different entities' academic contributions to  
193 lumbar spondylolisthesis, as well as provided an in-depth and visualized analysis of its topics and  
194 trends. To the best of our knowledge, this was the first bibliometric analysis of lumbar  
195 spondylolisthesis, which might help researchers gain a basic understanding, develop areas of focus  
196 and pursue further practice in this field.

197 Academic contributions of one field could be quantified by publication productivity and  
198 citation activity. The current study mainly quantified the contributions of different journals and  
199 countries in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis. It seemed that SPINE, EUROPEAN SPINE  
200 JOURNAL and JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE were the prior journals for researchers  
201 to follow or submit their own works, as these three journals were the top 3 productive and the top  
202 3 impact journals in this field. Additionally, other spine-subspecialty journals like SPINE  
203 JOURNAL could be the second-line options, as spine-subspecialty journals were found to be  
204 dominant in productivity and impact of the field. For country/region contributions, USA, China  
205 and Japan have contributed to over half of the publication productivity. However, European  
206 countries seemed to publish more influential articles, as their average article citations were much  
207 higher. It seemed that developed countries/regions tended to produce more articles as well as high  
208 influential articles, as there were only a few non-developed countries/regions among the top 20  
209 productive and the top 20 influential lists. Additionally, researchers may need to focus on USA,  
210 Europe and eastern Asia, if they need collaborations in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

211 Natural language processing (NLP) is a popular research field where human language could  
212 be decoded by machine learning, which has been adopted to analyze academic publications  
213 recently(29). LDA is one of the most widely used machine learning algorithms in NLP(18, 25, 26),  
214 as it is scalable, computationally fast and close to what the human mind assigns while decoding  
215 text words. In the study, publications of Topic 2 remained as the dominant topic from 1990 to  
216 2010, when all kinds of radiographic equipment spread over the world gradually. We assumed that  
217 the widespread of radiographic equipment enabled researchers to pay more attention to lumbar  
218 instability and thus identify key parameters of sagittal balance. These publications (Topic 2) did  
219 improve the knowledge of lumbar spondylolisthesis like classification(30) or sagittal balance(31),  
220 which was of great significance of guiding the management of lumbar spondylolisthesis(32-34).  
221 Publications of Topic 1 kept as the most productive topic after 2010, which could be explained by  
222 the emerging minimally invasive surgical technique and the lack of agreement on the best surgical  
223 approaches(35), as well as the controversy of the addition of fusion to decompression(36).  
224 Publications of Topic 3 gradually became the mainstream topic after 2015, which indicated the  
225 importance of systematic management of lumbar spondylolisthesis. As most spondylolisthesis  
226 patients were asymptomatic and only a few patients seeking treatment will have surgery, doctors  
227 from different subspecialties might hold different viewpoints about best options of nonoperative  
228 treatments, as well as their dosage and progression of physical therapy procedures(6). Failed  
229 conservative treatment would lead to more than double medical costs than those in the  
230 successfully treated cohort(37).

231 While major topics with historical perspective quickly informed potential researchers about  
232 the macroscopic picture of one academic field and how it evolved, recent hotspots might guide the

233 future researches. The current study identified CBT, OLIF, OLLIF, LLIF, MIS-TLIF, percutaneous  
234 pedicle screw, degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal canal stenosis and ASD were the  
235 research hotspots over the past 5 years. Interestingly, most of these hotspots (the first six) belong  
236 to minimally invasive surgical techniques, and all of them were derivatives of internal fixation or  
237 fusion technique instead of decompression. It was not a surprise as decompression technique has  
238 developed for decades, but internal fixation and fusion technique could be easily modified with  
239 different approaches and novel devices. Unlike the novel concept of the first six hotspots, spine  
240 physicians or surgeons might not be unfamiliar with degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal  
241 canal stenosis and ASD. Degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis became a hotspot instead of  
242 isthmic spondylolisthesis might be explained by growing aging population and higher prevalence  
243 of lumbar degeneration. Lumbar spondylolisthesis often accompanied by spinal canal stenosis and  
244 ASD is a common complication of spinal fusion, which indicated continuous attentions have been  
245 paid to these traditional problems.

246 Since most hotspots belonged to publications of Topic 1 (surgery), it was necessary to depict  
247 these surgical hotspots in details. CBT, as a caudal-to-rostral and medial-to-lateral pedicle screw  
248 insertion method, has merits of great fixation and pull-out strength even in osteoporosis patients  
249 due to its trajectory goes through cortical bone(38). Thus, CBT became popular in all kinds of  
250 spinal fusion including lumbar spondylolisthesis(39-41). Percutaneous pedicle screw is another  
251 widespread fixation technique with traditional trajectory, but its merits of minimally invasiveness  
252 popularized its utility in OLIF, OLLIF, LLIF and MIS-TLIF etc. OLIF takes an anterior  
253 retroperitoneal approach surgery through a small incision(42). Within the retroperitoneal space,  
254 surgeons will drag the psoas muscle backward, expose the intervertebral space between the psoas  
255 muscle and the abdominal aorta, and then perform decompression plus fusion, which is usually  
256 followed by posterior fixation of percutaneous pedicle screw. OLLIF is another minimally  
257 invasive fusion surgery described by AbbasiH in details in 2015(43). OLLIF uses the classic  
258 YESS endoscopy trajectory technology to establish a working channel, and then enters the  
259 intervertebral disc through Kambin's triangle to complete discectomy and intervertebral fusion  
260 under full-endoscopy(44). LLIF or extreme lateral interbody fusion (XLIF) is another minimally  
261 invasive surgery by bluntly separate the psoas muscle to the lateral side of the intervertebral  
262 space(45, 46). It should be noted that muscle separation may damage the lumbar plexus, so  
263 intraoperative neuromonitoring is required for LLIF/XLIF. MIS-TLIF takes a small paramedial  
264 incision, and the ipsilateral articular process will be excised to expose the intervertebral foraminal  
265 window, through which decompression and fusion are performed(47). It is reported that MIS-TLIF  
266 has become one of the most widespread fusion surgeries(48).

267 The current study may have some limitations. First, we only analyzed articles from the  
268 WoSCC database, so publications not indexed in the WoSCC database were not considered and  
269 citation counts might be underestimated. Second, the study mainly analyzed some useful  
270 information (e.g. abstracts, titles, etc.) of the included publications instead of reviewing full texts.  
271 Last but may not least, as the WoSCC database kept updating and records of 2022 were not  
272 complete, we only analyzed the data by 2021, which might not reflect the most recent trends of  
273 2022.

274

## 275 **Conclusions**

276 The study successfully summarized the productivity and impact of different countries/regions and  
277 journals, which should benefit the journal selection and pursuit of international collaboration for  
278 researcher who were interested in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis. Publications concerning  
279 emerging surgical technique was the major topic, followed by radiographic measurement and  
280 epidemiology for this field. CBT, OLIF, OLLIF, LLIF, MIS-TLIF, percutaneous pedicle screw,  
281 degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal canal stenosis and ASD were the research hotspots  
282 of lumbar spondylolisthesis over the past 5 years. With macroscopic plus detailed analysis of  
283 publications concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis, the current study may encourage more  
284 researchers in the field and somewhat inform their research direction in the future.  
285

## 286 **References:**

- 287 1. Bydon M, Alvi MA, Goyal A. Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: Definition, Natural  
288 History, Conservative Management, and Surgical Treatment. *Neurosurg Clin N Am.*  
289 2019;30(3):299-304.
- 290 2. Fan G, Zhang H, Guan X, Gu G, Wu X, Hu A, et al. Patient-reported and radiographic outcomes  
291 of minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative spondylolisthesis with  
292 or without reduction: A comparative study. *J Clin Neurosci.* 2016;33:111-8.
- 293 3. Standaert CJ, Herring SA. Spondylolysis: a critical review. *Br J Sports Med.* 2000;34(6):415-22.
- 294 4. Zhang S, Ye C, Lai Q, Yu X, Liu X, Nie T, et al. Double-level lumbar spondylolysis and  
295 spondylolisthesis: A retrospective study. *J Orthop Surg Res.* 2018;13(1):55.
- 296 5. Kalichman L, Kim DH, Li L, Guermazi A, Berkin V, Hunter DJ. Spondylolysis and  
297 spondylolisthesis: prevalence and association with low back pain in the adult community-based  
298 population. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2009;34(2):199-205.
- 299 6. Vanti C, Ferrari S, Guccione AA, Pillastrini P. Lumbar spondylolisthesis: STATE of the art on  
300 assessment and conservative treatment. *Archives of physiotherapy.* 2021;11(1):19.
- 301 7. Ferrero E, Guigui P. Current trends in the management of degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis.  
302 *EFORT Open Rev.* 2018;3(5):192-9.
- 303 8. Faldini C, Pagkrati S, Acri F, Miscione MT, Francesconi D, Giannini S. Surgical treatment of  
304 symptomatic degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis by decompression and instrumented fusion: *J*  
305 *Orthop Traumatol.* 2007 Sep;8(3):128-33. doi: 10.1007/s10195-007-0079-7. Epub 2007 Sep 17.
- 306 9. Fan G, Gu G, Zhu Y, Guan X, Hu A, Wu X, et al. Minimally Invasive Transforaminal Lumbar  
307 Interbody Fusion for Isthmic Spondylolisthesis: In Situ Versus Reduction. *World Neurosurg.*  
308 2016;90:580-7.e1.
- 309 10. Kwon JW, Park Y, Lee BH, Yoon SR, Ha JW, Kim H, et al. Ten-Year Outcomes of Minimally  
310 Invasive Versus Open Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion in Patients With Single-Level Lumbar  
311 Spondylolisthesis. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2022.
- 312 11. Chang M, Wang L, Yuan S, Tian Y, Zhao Y, Liu X. Percutaneous Endoscopic Robot-Assisted  
313 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion (PE RA-TLIF) for Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Technical  
314 Note and Two Years Clinical Results. *Pain physician.* 2022;25(1):E73-e86.
- 315 12. Haddas R, Lieberman I, Block A, Derman P. The Effect of Surgical Decompression and Fusion on  
316 Functional Balance in Patients With Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).*



- 317 2020;45(14):E878-e84.
- 318 13. Da W, Tao Z, Meng Y, Wen K, Zhou S, Yang K, et al. A 10-year bibliometric analysis of  
319 osteosarcoma and cure from 2010 to 2019. *BMC Cancer*. 2021;21(1):115.
- 320 14. Tao L, Zhou S, Tao Z, Wen K, Da W, Meng Y, et al. The publication trends and hot spots of  
321 scoliosis research from 2009 to 2018: a 10-year bibliometric analysis. *Ann Transl Med*. 2020;8(6):365.
- 322 15. Ding H, Wu C, Liao N, Zhan Q, Sun W, Huang Y, et al. Radiomics in Oncology: A 10-Year  
323 Bibliometric Analysis. *Frontiers in oncology*. 2021;11:689802.
- 324 16. Wang Q, Yang KL, Zhang Z, Wang Z, Li C, Li L, et al. Characterization of Global Research  
325 Trends and Prospects on Single-Cell Sequencing Technology: Bibliometric Analysis. *Journal of*  
326 *medical Internet research*. 2021;23(8):e25789.
- 327 17. Shi J, Gao Y, Ming L, Yang K, Sun Y, Chen J, et al. A bibliometric analysis of global research  
328 output on network meta-analysis. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*. 2021;21(1):144.
- 329 18. Zhang Z, Wang Z, Huang Y. A Bibliometric Analysis of 8,276 Publications During the Past 25  
330 Years on Cholangiocarcinoma by Machine Learning. *Frontiers in oncology*. 2021;11:687904.
- 331 19. Lin H, Wang X, Huang M, Li Z, Shen Z, Feng J, et al. Research hotspots and trends of bone  
332 defects based on Web of Science: a bibliometric analysis. *Journal of orthopaedic surgery and research*.  
333 2020;15(1):463.
- 334 20. Guo Y, Xu ZY, Cai MT, Gong WX, Shen CH. Epilepsy With Suicide: A Bibliometrics Study and  
335 Visualization Analysis via CiteSpace. *Frontiers in neurology*. 2021;12:823474.
- 336 21. Yin M, Xu C, Ma J, Ye J, Mo W. A Bibliometric Analysis and Visualization of Current Research  
337 Trends in the Treatment of Cervical Spondylotic Myelopathy. *Global spine journal*. 2021;11(6):988-98.
- 338 22. Yin M, Wang H, Sun Y, Xu C, Ye J, Ma J, et al. Global Trends of Researches on Lumbar Spinal  
339 Stenosis: A Bibliometric and Visualization Study. *Clinical spine surgery*. 2022;35(1):E259-e66.
- 340 23. Li Y, Wei B, Zhong Y, Feng H, Wu H. A bibliometric analysis of global research on spinal cord  
341 injury: 1999-2019. *Spinal cord*. 2021.
- 342 24. Zhao T, Li Y, Dai Z, Zhang J, Zhang L, Shao H, et al. Bibliometric Analysis of the Scientific  
343 Literature on Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis. *World neurosurgery*. 2021;151:e265-e77.
- 344 25. Wang K, Feng C, Li M, Pei Q, Tan F. A bibliometric analysis of 23,492 publications on rectal  
345 cancer by machine learning: basic medical research is needed. *Therapeutic Advances in*  
346 *Gastroenterology*. 2020;13:175628482093459.
- 347 26. Stout NL, Alfano CM, Belter CW, Nitkin R, Cernic H A, Siegel KL, et al. A Bibliometric  
348 Analysis of the Landscape of Cancer Rehabilitation Research (1992–2016). *JNCI: Journal of the*  
349 *National Cancer Institute*. 2018.
- 350 27. Zhang Z, Yao L, Wang W, Jiang B, Xia F, Li X. A Bibliometric Analysis of 34,692 Publications on  
351 Thyroid Cancer by Machine Learning: How Much Has Been Done in the Past Three Decades?  
352 *Frontiers in oncology*. 2021;11:673733.
- 353 28. Garfield E. The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. *Jama*. 2006;295(1):90-3.
- 354 29. Chen X, Xie H, Fu LW, Liu Z, Xu J, Hao T. A bibliometric analysis of natural language  
355 processing in medical research. *Bmc Medical Informatics & Decision Making*. 2018;18(1):14.
- 356 30. Martikos K, Greggi T, Faldini C. High grade isthmic spondylolisthesis; can reduction always  
357 re-align the unbalanced pelvis? *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2019;20(1):499.
- 358 31. Zhang GZ, Deng YJ, He XG, Ren EH, Wu ZL, Yang FG, et al. Different Types of Double-Level  
359 Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: What Is Different in the Sagittal Plane? *World neurosurgery*.  
360 2021;150:e127-e34.

- 361 32. Wang S, Zhou Q, Xu L, Wang M, Qiu Y, Zhu Z, et al. Impact of lumbar fusion on sitting  
362 spinopelvic balance: Multisegmental versus monosegmental. *Clinical neurology and neurosurgery*.  
363 2021;209:106905.
- 364 33. Shao X, Liu H, Wu J, Qian Z, Qu R, Liu T. A retrospective comparative study of postoperative  
365 sagittal balance in isthmic L5-S1 spondylolisthesis using single segment or two-segment pedicle screw  
366 fixation. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2022;23(1):145.
- 367 34. Pan W, Zhao JL, Xu J, Zhang M, Fang T, Yan J, et al. Lumbar alignment and patient-reported  
368 outcomes after single-level transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative lumbar  
369 spondylolisthesis with and without local coronal imbalance. *Journal of neurosurgery Spine*. 2020:1-7.
- 370 35. Akkawi I, Zmerly H. Degenerative Spondylolisthesis: A Narrative Review. *Acta bio-medica :  
371 Atenei Parmensis*. 2022;92(6):e2021313.
- 372 36. Austevoll IM, Hermansen E, Fagerland MW, Storheim K, Brox JI, Solberg T, et al.  
373 Decompression with or without Fusion in Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. *The New England  
374 journal of medicine*. 2021;385(6):526-38.
- 375 37. Davison MA, Lilly DT, Moreno J, Bagley C, Adogwa O. A comparison of successful versus failed  
376 nonoperative treatment approaches in patients with degenerative conditions of the lumbar spine.  
377 *Journal of clinical neuroscience : official journal of the Neurosurgical Society of Australasia*.  
378 2021;86:71-8.
- 379 38. Tschugg A, Kavakebi P, Hartmann S, Lener S, Wipplinger C, Löscher WN, et al. Clinical and  
380 radiological effect of medialized cortical bone trajectory for lumbar pedicle screw fixation in patients  
381 with degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial (mPACT).  
382 *Trials*. 2018;19(1):129.
- 383 39. Chang MC, Choo YJ, Lee GW. Pedicle screws versus cortical screws in posterior lumbar  
384 interbody fusion surgery for degenerative spondylolisthesis: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
385 *The Spine Journal*. 2021;21(7):1126-34.
- 386 40. Sakaura H, Miwa T, Yamashita T, Kuroda Y, Ohwada T. Posterior lumbar interbody fusion with  
387 cortical bone trajectory screw fixation versus posterior lumbar interbody fusion using traditional  
388 pedicle screw fixation for degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: a comparative study. *Journal of  
389 neurosurgery Spine*. 2016;25(5):591-5.
- 390 41. Ding H, Hai Y, Liu Y, Guan L, Pan A, Zhang X, et al. Cortical Trajectory Fixation Versus  
391 Traditional Pedicle-Screw Fixation in the Treatment of Lumbar Degenerative Patients with  
392 Osteoporosis: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clinical interventions in aging*.  
393 2022;17:175-84.
- 394 42. Du X, She Y, Ou Y, Zhu Y, Luo W, Jiang D. Oblique Lateral Interbody Fusion versus  
395 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion in Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Single-Center  
396 Retrospective Comparative Study. *BioMed research international*. 2021;2021:6693446.
- 397 43. Abbasi H, Abbasi A. Oblique Lateral Lumbar Interbody Fusion (OLLIF): Technical Notes and  
398 Early Results of a Single Surgeon Comparative Study. *Cureus*. 2015;7(10):e351.
- 399 44. Li ZZ, Wang JC, Cao Z, Zhao HL, Lewandrowski KU, Yeung A. Full-Endoscopic Oblique Lateral  
400 Lumbar Interbody Fusion: A Technical Note With 1-Year Follow-Up. *International journal of spine  
401 surgery*. 2021;15(3):504-13.
- 402 45. Li J, Sun Y, Guo L, Zhang F, Ding W, Zhang W. Efficacy and safety of a modified lateral lumbar  
403 interbody fusion in L4-5 lumbar degenerative diseases compared with traditional XLIF and OLIF: a  
404 retrospective cohort study of 156 cases. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2022;23(1):217.

405 46. Limthongkul W, Chantharakomen R, Tanasansomboon T, Yingsakmongkol W, Yoong-Leong Oh J,  
406 Kotheeranurak V, et al. Comparison of Unremoved Intervertebral Disc Location Between 2 Lateral  
407 Lumbar Interbody Fusion (LLIF) Techniques. *World neurosurgery*. 2022.

408 47. Liu JB, Wu JL, Zuo R, Li CQ, Zhang C, Zhou Y. Does MIS-TLIF or TLIF result in better pedicle  
409 screw placement accuracy and clinical outcomes with navigation guidance? *BMC musculoskeletal*  
410 *disorders*. 2022;23(1):153.

411 48. Phani Kiran S, Sudhir G. Minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion - A narrative  
412 review on the present status. *Journal of clinical orthopaedics and trauma*. 2021;22:101592.

413

## 414 **Declarations**

## 415 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

416 Not applicable.

## 417 **Availability of data and materials**

418 All data generated or analysed during this study are either included in this published article or its  
419 supplementary information fles.

## 420 **Competing interests**

421 Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## 422 **Funding**

423 Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (2019A1515111171) and National Natural  
424 Science Foundation of China (82102640) were received in support of this work. The funders had no  
425 role in study design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, writing of this report and in the  
426 decision to submit the paper for publication.

## 427 **Authors' contributions**

428 G.F. contributed to writing and data interpreting; J.Q. contributed to data analysis; Y.L. and S.Y.  
429 contributed to drafting and data extraction; H.L. and L.H. contributed to data analysis and critical  
430 revisions; X.L. and S.H. contributed to study design and administration support.

## 431 **Acknowledgements**

432 Not applicable.

## 433 **Authors' information**

434 <sup>1</sup> Department of Pain Medicine, Huazhong University of Science and Technology Union Shenzhen  
435 Hospital, Shenzhen, 518060, China.

436 <sup>2</sup> Guangdong Key Laboratory for Biomedical Measurements and Ultrasound Imaging, School of  
437 Biomedical Engineering, Shenzhen University Health Science Center, Shenzhen 518060, China.

438 <sup>3</sup> Artificial Intelligence Innovation Center, Research Institute of Tsinghua, Pearl River Delta,  
439 Guangzhou, 510735, China.

440 <sup>4</sup> Department of Orthopedics, The Eighth Affiliated Hospital Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen,  
441 518033, China.

442 <sup>5</sup> Department of Orthopedics, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of  
443 Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China

444 <sup>6</sup> Spinal Pain Research Institute, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China.

445 <sup>7</sup> Department of Orthopedics, Nanchang Hongdu Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 1399  
446 Diezihu Road, Donghu District, Nanchang, 330006, China

#### 447 **Consent for publication**

448 Not applicable.

449

#### 450 **Figure captions**

451 Figure1. Annual publication production and the top 20 authors over time.

452 Figure2. Collaborations in lumbar spondylolisthesis field. A: collaborations among  
453 countries/regions; B: collaborations among institutions.

454 Figure 3. Research topics of lumbar spondylolisthesis over the past 3 decades. A: topic 1-  
455 surgery; B: topic 2- radiology; C:Topic 3: epidemiology; D: publication productivity of the three  
456 topics over the past three decades.

457 Figure 4. Research trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478 **Table 1. Top 20 productive and top 20 impact journals in the field of lumbar**  
 479 **spondylolisthesis.**

Ranking	Journals ranked by articles	Articles	Spine-specialty	Journals ranked by h_index	h_index	Spine-specialty	Total Citations
1	SPINE	750	yes	SPINE	102	yes	42029
2	EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL	361	yes	EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL	49	yes	10390
3	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE	255	yes	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE	47	yes	6836
4	SPINE JOURNAL	205	yes	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-AMERICAN VOLUME	41	no	7068
5	WORLD NEUROSURGERY	178	no	SPINE JOURNAL	39	yes	4903
6	JOURNAL OF SPINAL DISORDERS & TECHNIQUES	149	yes	JOURNAL OF SPINAL DISORDERS & TECHNIQUES	37	yes	4741
7	CLINICAL ORTHOPAEDICS AND RELATED RESEARCH	103	no	CLINICAL ORTHOPAEDICS AND RELATED RESEARCH	30	no	2732
8	CLINICAL SPINE SURGERY	79	yes	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY	27	no	2849
9	BMC MUSCULOSKELETAL DISORDERS	77	no	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-BRITISH VOLUME	27	no	2487
10	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-AMERICAN VOLUME	75	no	NEUROSURGERY	27	no	2332
11	NEUROSURGERY	74	no	NEUROSURGICAL FOCUS	26	no	1715
12	NEUROSURGICAL FOCUS	73	no	JOURNAL OF SPINAL DISORDERS	25	yes	2294
13	JOURNAL OF	57	yes	WORLD	19	no	1453

14	SPINAL DISORDERS JOURNAL OF CLINICAL NEUROSCIENCE	55	no	NEUROSURGER Y JOURNAL OF PEDIATRIC ORTHOPAEDICS	19	no	1019
15	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-BRITIS H VOLUME ZEITSCHRIFT FUR	53	no	INTERNATIONA L ORTHOPAEDICS	14	no	834
16	ORTHOPADIE UND IHRE GRENZGEBIETE	53	no	AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SPORTS MEDICINE	14	no	806
17	GLOBAL SPINE JOURNAL	49	yes	BMC MUSCULOSKEL ETAL DISORDERS	14	no	672
18	JOURNAL OF KOREAN NEUROSURGICA L SOCIETY	49	no	ARCHIVES OF ORTHOPAEDIC AND TRAUMA SURGERY	14	no	547
19	ASIAN SPINE JOURNAL	47	yes	CLINICAL SPINE SURGERY	14	yes	540
20	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY	47	no	JOURNAL OF CLINICAL NEUROSCIENCE	13	no	603


480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496

497 **Table 2. Top 20 productive and impact countries/regions in the field of lumbar**  
 498 **spondylolisthesis.**

Ranking	Country/region ranked by Article productions	Article productions	Developed	Country/region ranked by average article citations	Total Citations	Average Article Citations	Developed
1	USA	1570	yes	SWEDEN	3591	47.25	yes
2	CHINA	536	no	UNITED KINGDOM	7742	45.54	yes
3	JAPAN	531	yes	LUXEMBOURG	42	42.00	yes
4	KOREA	297	yes	AUSTRALIA	2297	40.30	yes
5	GERMANY	239	yes	DENMARK	1849	39.34	yes
6	FRANCE	190	yes	PHILIPPINES	35	35.00	no
7	UNITED KINGDOM	170	yes	USA	52829	33.65	yes
8	CANADA	140	yes	HONG KONG	30	30.00	yes
9	ITALY	116	yes	FINLAND	1820	26.76	yes
10	TURKEY	109	no	CANADA	3713	26.52	yes
11	TAIWAN	105	yes	NEW ZEALAND	340	26.15	yes
12	SWITZERLAND	96	yes	NETHERLANDS	1360	23.45	yes
13	INDIA	85	no	HUNGARY	187	23.38	yes
14	SWEDEN	76	yes	ISRAEL	946	22.52	yes
15	FINLAND	68	yes	SWITZERLAND	2099	21.86	yes
16	NETHERLANDS	58	yes	JAPAN	11336	21.35	yes
17	AUSTRALIA	57	yes	BELGIUM	401	21.11	yes
18	DENMARK	47	yes	SPAIN	856	20.88	yes
19	ISRAEL	42	yes	FRANCE	3936	20.72	yes
20	SPAIN	41	yes	ITALY	2310	19.91	yes


# Annual Scientific Production

Articles



A

## Top-Authors' Production over the Time



B







# Trend Topics

