

1 **Surgical Treatments for Lumbar Spine Diseases: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

2 **Kanthika Wasinpongwanich¹ · Tanawin Nopsopon² · Krit Pongpirul^{2,3,4}**

3 ¹ Department of Orthopedics, Faculty of Medicine, Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima,
4 Thailand

5 ² Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok,
6 Thailand

7 ³ Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

8 ⁴ Bumrungrad International Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand

9

10 **Corresponding author: Krit Pongpirul**

11 Email: doctorkrit@gmail.com

12

13 **ORCID ID**

14 KW: [0000-0002-2649-2846](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2649-2846)

15 TN: 0000-0003-0428-973X

16 KP: 0000-0003-3818-9761

17

18 **Abstract**

19 **Purpose** Surgical treatment is mandatory in some patients with lumbar spine diseases. To obtain spine fusion, many
20 operative techniques were developed with different fusion rates and clinical results. This study aimed to collect
21 randomized controlled trial (RCT) data to compare fusion rate, clinical outcomes, complications among
22 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion (TLIF), and other techniques for lumbar spine diseases.

23 **Methods** A systematic literature search of PubMed, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science, and CENTRAL databases
24 was searched for studies up to 13 February 2020. The meta-analysis was done using a random-effects model. Pooled
25 risk ratio (RR) or mean difference (MD) with a 95% confidence interval of fusion rate, clinical outcomes, and
26 complication in TLIF and other techniques for lumbar diseases.

27 **Results** The literature search identified 3,682 potential studies, 15 RCTs (915 patients) were met our inclusion
28 criteria and were included in the meta-analysis. Compared to other techniques, TLIF had slightly lower fusion rate
29 (RR=0.84 [95% CI 0.72, 0.97], $p=0.02$, $I^2=0.0\%$) at 1-year follow-up while there was no difference on fusion rate at
30 2-year follow up (RR=1.06 [95% CI 0.96, 1.18], $p=0.27$, $I^2=69.0\%$). The estimated risk ratio of total adverse events
31 (RR=0.90 [95% CI 0.59, 1.38], $p=0.63$, $I^2=0.0\%$) and revision rate (RR=0.78 [95% CI 0.34, 1.79], $p=0.56$, $I^2=39.0\%$)
32 showed no difference. TLIF had approximately half an hour more operative time than other techniques (MD=31.88
33 [95% CI 5.33, 58.44], $p=0.02$, $I^2=92.0\%$). There was no significant difference between TLIF and other techniques in
34 terms of the blood loss, and clinical outcomes.

35 **Conclusions** Besides fusion rate at 1-year follow-up and operative time, our study demonstrated similar outcomes of
36 TLIF with other techniques for lumbar diseases in regard to fusion rate, clinical outcomes, and complications.

37 **Keywords:** Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion · Lumbar disease · Meta-analysis · Spondylolisthesis ·
38 Degenerative lumbar disease

39

40 **Introduction**

41 Surgical treatment is mandatory in some patients with lumbar spine diseases. To obtain spine fusion, many operative
42 techniques have been developed with different fusion rates and clinical results. Cloward et al. first described
43 Posterolateral Lumbar Interbody Fusion (PLIF) in 1952 [1] whereas Harm & Rollinger introduced Transforaminal
44 Lumbar Interbody Fusion (TLIF) three decades later [2]. In early 2002, the minimally invasive surgical (MIS)
45 approach was promoted to TLIF by Foley and Lefkowitz to improve peri-postoperative morbidity and clinical results
46 [3]. For anterior lumbar interbody fusion has a long history in the tuberculous spine however the technique was
47 adapted to other lumbar spine diseases [4]. Ozgur et al. describe a novel spine procedure called the Extreme Lateral
48 Interbody Fusion or XLIF in 2006 [5].

49 Several systematic reviews compared either MIS TLIF or Open TLIF with other techniques e.g. MIS vs
50 open TLIF/PLIF [6], TLIF vs ALIF [7], MIS TLIF vs LLIF [8], TLIF vs PLIF [9], TLIF vs PLF [10]. The studies
51 were conducted around 2014-2018 [6-8,10-14]. Most of them compared 1 or 2 techniques with TLIF for lumbar
52 spine diseases [6-14]. Half of them concluded the level of evidence on their study was low and need more
53 randomized control trials (RCTs) [6-8,10,15]. The fusion rates, clinical outcomes, and complications among
54 operative techniques for lumbar spine diseases have been inconclusive. As time passed, the learning curve of
55 different techniques was theoretically decreased and more RCTs were recently propagated[16-30].

56 This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to offer updated results based on fusion rate, clinical
57 outcomes, and complications between TLIF, decompression alone (no fusion), posterolateral fusion, and other
58 interbody fusion (PLIF, ALIF, XLIF).

59 **Methods**

60 This study was conducted following the recommendations of the Preferred Reporting Items of Systematic Reviews
61 and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement. We prospectively registered the systematic review with PROSPERO
62 International Prospective Register of Ongoing Systematic Reviews (Registration number: CRD42020186858).

63 **Search strategy**

64 A systematic literature search of PubMed, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science, and CENTRAL databases were
65 searched for studies published between January 2010 and January 2019. The electronic databases were searched up

66 to 13 February 2020. The reproducible search strategy was presented in detail in the Supplement. Besides, the
67 reference lists of included articles were searched, as well as related citations from other journals via Google Scholar.

68 **Study selection**

69 Only randomized controlled trials comparing lumbar interbody fusion with posterolateral fusion and/or other lumbar
70 interbody fusion were anticipated in this review. Inclusion criteria were established as follows: (1) the studies with a
71 population of patient age >18 years old (2) randomized controlled trial investigating lumbar spine disease treated
72 with any Lumbar Interbody Fusion or Posterolateral Fusion or No fusion, (3) the study included at least one outcome
73 (fusion rate, disability and pain or complications, operative time, blood loss, hospital length of stay). Exclusion
74 criteria were (1) biomechanical and cadaveric studies, (2) paper that is not in English, (3) duplicated studies.

75 The title and abstracts of each study were independently reviewed by 2 authors (KW, TN) to assess for
76 inclusion in the meta-analysis. For studies that meet the inclusion criteria, 2 reviewers (KW, TN) independently
77 reviewed the full manuscripts. Discrepancies between the 2 reviewers were resolved by discussion until reach
78 consensus among the authors. In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the process is presented in a flow chart [31]
79 (Fig.1)

80 **Data extraction**

81 The following data items were independently extracted by two authors (KW, TN) from the included studies; study
82 design (author, year, country), study population (number of included patients, age, indication for surgery), Visual
83 Analog Score (VAS) for back and leg pain, Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), parameters concerning operation
84 (operative time, length of hospital stay, blood loss, revision) Complications (total adverse events, infection, dural
85 tear, etc.). Discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

86 **Quality assessment**

87 The authors worked independently to assess the risk of bias in the included trials using the Cochrane Risk of Bias
88 tool 2.0 for a randomized control trial study[32]. We assessed the randomization process, deviations from intended
89 intervention, missing outcome data, measurement of the outcome, selection of the reported result. We assigned each
90 domain as a low risk of bias, some concerns, and a high risk of bias. We contacted the authors if there was not
91 enough information to assess. If the trial authors did not respond within 14 days, we conducted the assessment using

92 available data. We resolved the disagreement through discussion. We presented our risk of bias assessment in Figs.
93 2 and 3.

94 **Statistical Analysis**

95 The primary outcome was fusion rate, total adverse events, and revision rate. The outcomes measured were the
96 mean difference for VAS back and leg pain, Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) score, operative time, blood loss,
97 length of hospital stay with associated 95% CI. Fusion rate, total adverse events, infection rate, revision rate, dural
98 tear were reported as the risk ratio (RR) with 95% CI. The results of the studies were included in the meta-analysis
99 and presented in a forest plot, which also showed statistical powers, confidence intervals, and heterogeneity. The
100 variability within-a study and between studies was assessed by an I^2 estimate of heterogeneity. We regarded level of
101 heterogeneity for I^2 statistic as defined in chapter 9 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of
102 Interventions: 0–40% might not be important; 30–60% may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50–90% may
103 represent substantial heterogeneity; 75–100% considerable heterogeneity. The random-effects meta-analysis by
104 DerSimonian and Laird method was used as clinical, methodological, and statistical heterogeneity encountered.
105 Prespecified subgroup analyses by type of comparators were performed. We assessed publication bias by computing
106 each study effect size against standard error and plotted it as a funnel plot to assess asymmetry visually. The
107 significant asymmetry indicated the possibility of publication bias or heterogeneity. The meta-analysis was
108 performed using Revman 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK).

109 **Results**

110 **Systematic Review**

111 A systematic search identified 3,682 potential English articles, 1,957 were removed due to duplication. Two
112 reviewers assessed the title and abstracts of 1,725 studies which 144 manuscripts remained for full-text assessment.
113 Eventually, 18 RCTs were met the inclusion criteria. 2 RCTs were considered the same population of the TLIF
114 group therefore one study was excluded from the analysis. The studies which did not report the variation were
115 excluded. A preferred reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses diagram is shown in Fig. 1.

116 There were 15 RCTs included with 915 patients (470 TLIF, 258 PLF, 87 PLIF, 26 ALIF, 29 XLIF, 45 no
117 fusion). The TLIF group in the 2 studies was in addition to posterolateral fusion (PLF). Publication years ranged

118 from 2013 to 2019. Two studies reported outcome 1-year follow-up the other reported at least 2-year follow-up.

119 Study characteristics are provided in Table 1.

120

121 **Table 1** Study characteristics

| Author | Surgical technique | TLIF, n | Other techniques, n | Follow up |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Challier 2017 | PLF+TLIF vs PLF | 30 | 30 | 2y |
| Christensen 2014 | TLIF vs PLF | 51 | 49 | 1y, 2y |
| ElShazly 2013 | Discectomy+TLIF vs no fusion | 15 | 15 | 2y |
| | Discectomy+TLIF vs Discectomy+PLF | 15 | 15 | 2y |
| Etemadifar 2016 | PLF+TLIF vs PLF | 25 | 25 | 1.5m, 3m, 6m, 1y, 2y |
| Fariborz 2016 | TLIF vs PLIF | 30 | 30 | 6m, 1y |
| | TLIF vs PLF | 30 | 30 | 6m, 1y |
| | TLIF vs no fusion+instrumentation | 30 | 30 | 6m, 1y |
| Hoff 2016 | TLIF vs ALIF | 24 | 26 | 1y, 3y |
| Høy 2013* | TLIF vs PLF | 51 | 49 | 1y, 2y |
| Høy 2017* | TLIF vs PLF | 44 | 44 | 1y, 2y, 5-10y |
| Høy 2019* | TLIF vs PLF | 51 | 49 | 1y, 2y |
| Isaacs 2016** | TLIF vs XLIF | 26 | 29 | 1y, 2y |
| Jalalpour 2015 | TLIF vs PLF | 68 | 67 | 1y, 2y |
| Li 2013 | TLIF vs PLF | 19 | 18 | 2-5y |
| Putzier 2016 | TLIF vs PLIF | 24 | 23 | 1y |
| Sembrano 2016** | TLIF vs XLIF | 55 | 26 | 1y |
| Yang 2016 | TLIF vs PLIF | 32 | 34 | 3m, 1-2y |

122 * same sample group, ** same sample group

123

124 **Quality assessment**

125 For the risk of bias assessment, the included randomized controlled trials had a relatively high percentage of low risk
126 in the randomization process and deviations from intended intervention domains. All included RCTs had some
127 concerns risk of bias on measurement of the outcome. There was some high risk of bias in deviations from intended
128 interventions and selection of the reported result domains. Detailed risk-of-bias assessment for included randomized
129 controlled trials was provided in Fig. 2. A summary of the percentages of RCTs which were at low, some concerns,
130 and high risk for each risk of bias domain was presented in Fig. 3. The funnel plots showed no significant
131 asymmetry which highlighted no evidence of publication bias on the fusion rate, total adverse events, and revision
132 rate. (Supplementary File 1).

133 **Meta-analysis**

134 A total of 15 included studies were included in the meta-analysis with 915 patients (470 TLIF, 258 PLF, 87 PLIF, 26
135 ALIF, 29 XLIF, 45 no fusion).

136 **Fusion rate**

137 Fusion rate was 72.7% on TLIF group at 1 year follow up whereas 87.03% fusion rate was reported on other
138 techniques. TLIF had slightly lower fusion rate at 1 year follow up compared to other techniques (RR=0.84 [95% CI
139 0.72, 0.97], $p=0.02$, $I^2=0.0\%$) (Fig. 4). However, the fusion rate at 2 years was not shown any statistically significant
140 differences (RR=1.06 [95% CI 0.96, 1.18], $p=0.27$, $I^2=69.0\%$) as shown in Fig. 5.

141 **Complications: total adverse events, revision, infection, and dural tear**

142 Total adverse events were reported in 10 studies. TLIF had similar total adverse events compared with PLIF, XLIF
143 and no fusion group (RR=0.90 [95% CI 0.59, 1.38], $p=0.63$, $I^2=0.0\%$) as shown in Fig. 6. For the revision needed
144 after surgical procedures, the results indicated a different revision rate among groups. (RR=0.78 [95% CI 0.34, 1.79],
145 $p=0.56$, $I^2=39.0\%$) as shown in Fig. 7.

146 Infection was reported in 6 studies, overall infection was similar among groups (RR=1.78 [95% CI 0.58,
147 5.46], $p=0.31$, $I^2=0.0\%$). More infection reported in the TLIF group but was not statistically significant. The dural

148 tear was higher in other techniques esp. XLIF group but not reach statistically significant (RR=1.19 [95% CI 0.49,
149 2.89], $p=0.70$, $I^2=0.0\%$). The results of secondary outcomes were reported as shown in Table 2.

150 **Operative time**

151 ALIF, PLF, no fusion group has shorter operative time whereas PLIF has longer operative time compared to TLIF.
152 The pooled mean difference in operative time of other techniques was 31.88 minutes shorter than TLIF (MD=31.88
153 [95% CI 5.33, 58.44], $p=0.02$, $I^2=92.0\%$)

154 **Blood loss**

155 TLIF has less blood loss than PLIF 88.80 ml. No fusion has less blood loss among groups. Pooled mean difference
156 in blood loss showed no significant difference (MD=191.00 [95%CI -53.93, 435.93], $p=0.13$, $I^2=90.0\%$).

157 **Length of hospital stay**

158 Length of hospital stay between subgroup were not significantly difference. Pooled mean difference in hospital stay
159 was 0.12. (MD=0.12 [95% CI -0.30, 0.54], $p=0.58$, $I^2=0.0\%$).

160 **Back and leg pain**

161 Visual Analog Scale (VAS) for back were extracted from 6 studies. There was no difference between back pain at
162 last follow up in TLIF and other techniques group (MD=0.13 [95% CI -0.40, 0.66], $p=0.62$, $I^2=82.0\%$). ALIF
163 (MD=1.20 [95% CI 0.53, 1.87], $p<0.01$) and no fusion techniques (MD=0.60 [95% CI 0.08, 1.12], $p=0.02$) were
164 shown less back pain at last follow up. Visual Analog Scale (VAS) for leg was extracted from only PLF studies.
165 There was no difference between leg pain at last follow up in TLIF and PLF group (MD=-0.07 [95% CI -1.43, 1.30],
166 $p=0.92$, $I^2=77.0\%$).

167 **ODI**

168 No difference in ODI was observed (MD=-4.82 [95% CI -11.72, 2.08], $p=0.17$, $I^2=90.0\%$). Compared to TLIF, no
169 fusion group had higher ODI at last follow up (MD=-41.30 [95% CI -50.15, -32.45], $p<0.001$).

170

171 **Table 2** Secondary outcomes

| Outcomes | Studies | Patients | Statistical Method | Effect size [95% CI] |
|----------------------------|---------|----------|--------------------|---|
| Infection | 6 | 433 | IV, random, 95% CI | RR=1.78 [95% CI 0.58, 5.46], $p=0.31, I^2=0.0\%$ |
| Dural tear | 7 | 570 | IV, random, 95% CI | RR=1.19 [95% CI 0.49, 2.89], $p=0.70, I^2=0.0\%$ |
| Operative time | 6 | 353 | IV, random, 95% CI | MD=31.88 [95% CI 5.33, 58.44], $p=0.02, I^2=92.0\%$ |
| Blood loss | 4 | 248 | IV, random, 95% CI | 191.00 [95% CI -53.93, 435.93], $p=0.13, I^2=90.0\%$ |
| Length of Hospital stay | 3 | 200 | IV, random, 95% CI | MD=0.12 [95% CI -0.30, 0.54], $p=0.58, I^2=0.0\%$ |
| VAS back at last follow up | 6 | 335 | IV, random, 95% CI | MD=0.13 [95% CI -0.40, 0.66], $p=0.62, I^2=82.0\%$ |
| VAS leg at last follow up | 2 | 150 | IV, random, 95% CI | MD=-0.07 [95% CI -1.43, 1.30], $p=0.92, I^2=77.0\%$ |
| ODI at last follow up | 7 | 521 | IV, random, 95% CI | MD=-4.82 [95% CI -11.72, 2.08], $p=0.17, I^2=90.0\%$ |

172 *CI* confidence interval; *IV* inverse variance; *MD* mean difference; *RR* risk ratio; *VAS* Visual Analog Scale

173 **Discussion**

174 Patients with degenerative lumbar spine disease require surgical intervention when the conservative treatments
 175 failed [7–10]. The operative methods are varyingly selected among spine surgeons. Therefore, the clinical outcomes
 176 esp. fusion rate, and other outcomes were reported in different studies. This systematic review and meta-analysis are
 177 to investigate the benefits and risks of lumbar interbody fusion, no fusion, and posterolateral fusion by comparing
 178 the fusion rate, clinical outcomes (VAS back, VAS leg, and ODI), parameters concerning operation (operative time,
 179 length of hospital stay, blood loss, revision) and complications in TLIF and other techniques for lumbar diseases.

180 Findings from our study were similar to the previous systematic review that reported 89.1% fusion rate and
181 12.5% reoperation rate [33]. Manzur et al. reported 85.6% fusion rate on LLIF [34]. Similar to Tao et al. study
182 which PLIF compared with TLIF, demonstrated similar outcomes and complications [35].

183 Surgical complications evaluated by total adverse events were not shown statistically significant
184 differences among lumbar interbody fusion, no fusion, and posterolateral fusion. However, TLIF seems to be safer
185 than PLIF and ALIF in neural, spinal and vascular events, similar to previous study by Chi et al. [36]. Nonetheless,
186 Yavin et al. demonstrated more complications on fusion group compared to non-fusion group [37].

187 **Strength and limitations**

188 The strength of this study was that we included only RCTs that showed no significant asymmetry which highlighted
189 no evidence of publication bias on the fusion rate, total adverse events, and revision rate. However, the small
190 number of RCT on TLIF was the limitation of our study. The heterogeneity of the enrolled studies was another
191 limitation. Furthermore, sample group of some the same population as shown in table 1. We try to reduce the bias by
192 excluded the repeated data from the analysis.

193 The overall lumbar spine disease were heterogenous in approach for each studies which may complicated
194 the results. Different surgical approach, experience and outcome measure were also observed. The outcomes were
195 referred to single level surgery which couldn't apply to multi-level diseases.

196

197 **Conclusion**

198 The present systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTS demonstrated lower fusion rate of TLIF at 1 year but
199 similar outcomes of TLIF with other techniques (no fusion, PLF, PLIF, ALIF, XLIF) for lumbar diseases in regards
200 to fusion rate at 2 years, clinical outcomes and complications. Anticipate in randomized control trials are needed for
201 selecting a surgical approach for lumbar spinal diseases.

202 **Authors' contribution** KW and KP contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation and data
203 collection were performed by KW and TN. Data analysis was performed by TN. All authors wrote the first draft of
204 the manuscript, revised, and approved the final manuscript.

205 **Funding** No funding was received for this study.

206 **Data Availability Statement** All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article
207 (and its supplementary information files).

208 **Compliance with ethical standards**

209 **Conflicts of interest** All authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

210

211 **References**

- 212 1. Cloward RB. The treatment of ruptured lumbar intervertebral discs by vertebral body fusion. I. Indications,
213 operative technique, after care. *J Neurosurg.* 1953 Mar;10(2):154-68. doi: 10.3171/jns.1953.10.2.0154.
214 PMID: 13035484.
- 215 2. Harms J, Rolinger H. Die operative Behandlung der Spondylolisthese durch dorsale Aufrichtung und
216 ventrale Verblockung [A one-stager procedure in operative treatment of spondylolistheses: dorsal traction-
217 reposition and anterior fusion (author's transl)]. *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb.* 1982 May-Jun;120(3):343-7.
218 German. doi: 10.1055/s-2008-1051624. PMID: 7113376.
- 219 3. Foley KT, Lefkowitz MA. Advances in minimally invasive spine surgery. *Clin Neurosurg.* 2002;49:499-
220 517. PMID: 12506566.
- 221 4. Choy WJ, Abi-Hanna D, Cassar LP, Hardcastle P, Phan K, Mobbs RJ. History of Integral Fixation for
222 Anterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion (ALIF): The Hartshill Horseshoe. *World Neurosurg.* 2019 Sep;129:394-
223 400. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2019.06.134. Epub 2019 Jun 27. PMID: 31254709.
- 224 5. Ozgur BM, Aryan HE, Pimenta L, Taylor WR. Extreme Lateral Interbody Fusion (XLIF): a novel surgical
225 technique for anterior lumbar interbody fusion. *Spine J.* 2006 Jul-Aug;6(4):435-43. doi:
226 10.1016/j.spinee.2005.08.012. PMID: 16825052.
- 227 6. Goldstein CL, Macwan K, Sundararajan K, Rampersaud YR. Perioperative outcomes and adverse events of
228 minimally invasive versus open posterior lumbar fusion: meta-analysis and systematic review. *J Neurosurg*
229 *Spine.* 2016 Mar;24(3):416-27. doi: 10.3171/2015.2.SPINE14973. Epub 2015 Nov 13. PMID: 26565767.
- 230 7. Phan K, Thayaparan GK, Mobbs RJ. Anterior lumbar interbody fusion versus transforaminal lumbar
231 interbody fusion--systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Neurosurg.* 2015;29(5):705-11. doi:
232 10.3109/02688697.2015.1036838. Epub 2015 May 12. PMID: 25968330.
- 233 8. Joseph JR, Smith BW, La Marca F, Park P. Comparison of complication rates of minimally invasive
234 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion and lateral lumbar interbody fusion: a systematic review of the
235 literature. *Neurosurg Focus.* 2015 Oct;39(4):E4. doi: 10.3171/2015.7.FOCUS15278. PMID: 26424344.
- 236 9. Chi KY, Cheng SH, Kuo YK, Lin EY, Kang YN. Safety of Lumbar Interbody Fusion Procedures for
237 Degenerative Disc Disease: A Systematic Review With Network Meta-Analysis of Prospective Studies.

- 238 Global Spine J. 2020 Jul 28;2192568220938024. doi: 10.1177/2192568220938024. Epub ahead of print.
239 PMID: 32720524.
- 240 10. Zhang BF, Ge CY, Zheng BL, Hao DJ. Transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion versus posterolateral
241 fusion in degenerative lumbar spondylosis: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016
242 Oct;95(40):e4995. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000004995. PMID: 27749558; PMCID: PMC5059060.
- 243 11. Lan T, Hu SY, Zhang YT, Zheng YC, Zhang R, Shen Z, Yang XJ. Comparison Between Posterior Lumbar
244 Interbody Fusion and Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion for the Treatment of Lumbar Degenerative
245 Diseases: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *World Neurosurg*. 2018 Apr;112:86-93. doi:
246 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.01.021. Epub 2018 Jan 31. PMID: 29367001.
- 247 12. Keorochana G, Setrkraising K, Woratanarat P, Arirachakaran A, Kongtharvonskul J. Clinical outcomes
248 after minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion and lateral lumbar interbody fusion for
249 treatment of degenerative lumbar disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosurg Rev*. 2018
250 Jul;41(3):755-770. doi: 10.1007/s10143-016-0806-8. Epub 2016 Dec 24. PMID: 28013419.
- 251 13. Zhang Q, Yuan Z, Zhou M, Liu H, Xu Y, Ren Y. A comparison of posterior lumbar interbody fusion and
252 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: a literature review and meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*.
253 2014 Nov 5;15:367. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-15-367. PMID: 25373605; PMCID: PMC4232693.
- 254 14. Lan T, Hu SY, Zhang YT, Zheng YC, Zhang R, Shen Z, Yang XJ. Comparison Between Posterior Lumbar
255 Interbody Fusion and Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion for the Treatment of Lumbar Degenerative
256 Diseases: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *World Neurosurg*. 2018 Apr;112:86-93. doi:
257 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.01.021. Epub 2018 Jan 31. PMID: 29367001.
- 258 15. Teng I, Han J, Phan K, Mobbs R. A meta-analysis comparing ALIF, PLIF, TLIF and LLIF. *J Clin*
259 *Neurosci*. 2017 Oct;44:11-17. doi: 10.1016/j.jocn.2017.06.013. Epub 2017 Jul 1. PMID: 28676316.
- 260 16. Challier V, Boissiere L, Obeid I, Vital JM, Castelain JE, Bénard A, Ong N, Ghailane S, Pointillart V,
261 Mazas S, Mariey R, Gille O. One-Level Lumbar Degenerative Spondylolisthesis and Posterior Approach:
262 Is Transforaminal Lateral Interbody Fusion Mandatory?: A Randomized Controlled Trial With 2-Year
263 Follow-Up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2017 Apr 15;42(8):531-539. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0000000000001857.
264 PMID: 27548582.


- 265 17. Christensen A, Høy K, Bünger C, Helmig P, Hansen ES, Andersen T, Søggaard R. Transforaminal lumbar
266 interbody fusion vs. posterolateral instrumented fusion: cost-utility evaluation along side an RCT with a 2-
267 year follow-up. *Eur Spine J.* 2014 May;23(5):1137-43. doi: 10.1007/s00586-014-3238-6. Epub 2014 Feb
268 21. PMID: 24557326.
- 269 18. El Shazly AA, El Wardany MA, Morsi AM. Recurrent lumbar disc herniation: A prospective comparative
270 study of three surgical management procedures. *Asian J Neurosurg.* 2013;8(3):139-146. doi:10.4103/1793-
271 5482.121685
- 272 19. Etemadifar MR, Hadi A, Masouleh MF. Posterolateral instrumented fusion with and without transforaminal
273 lumbar interbody fusion for the treatment of adult isthmic spondylolisthesis: A randomized clinical trial
274 with 2-year follow-up. *J Craniovertebr Junction Spine.* 2016 Jan-Mar;7(1):43-9. doi: 10.4103/0974-
275 8237.176623. PMID: 27041885; PMCID: PMC4790148.
- 276 20. Fariborz, Samini MD; Gharedaghi, Mohammad MD; Khosravi, Abbas F. MD; Samini, Mohammad MS
277 Comparison of Results of 4 Methods of Surgery in Grade 1 Lumbosacral Spondylolisthesis, Neurosurgery
278 Quarterly: February 2016 - Volume 26 - Issue 1 - p 14-18 doi: 10.1097/WNQ.0000000000000197
- 279 21. Hoff EK, Strube P, Pumberger M, Zahn RK, Putzier M. ALIF and total disc replacement versus 2-level
280 circumferential fusion with TLIF: a prospective, randomized, clinical and radiological trial. *Eur Spine J.*
281 2016 May;25(5):1558-1566. doi: 10.1007/s00586-015-3852-y. Epub 2015 Mar 7. PMID: 25749689.
- 282 22. Høy K, Bünger C, Niederman B, Helmig P, Hansen ES, Li H, Andersen T. Transforaminal lumbar
283 interbody fusion (TLIF) versus posterolateral instrumented fusion (PLF) in degenerative lumbar disorders:
284 a randomized clinical trial with 2-year follow-up. *Eur Spine J.* 2013 Sep;22(9):2022-9
- 285 23. Høy K, Truong K, Andersen T, Bünger C. Addition of TLIF does not improve outcome over standard
286 posterior instrumented fusion. 5-10 years long-term Follow-up: results from a RCT. *Eur Spine J.* 2017
287 Mar;26(3):658-665. doi: 10.1007/s00586-016-4592-3. Epub 2016 May 7. PMID: 27155825.
- 288 24. Høy K, Grycel B, Andersen T, Bünger C. Does transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion produce leg pain? -
289 Results from a RCT. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong).* 2019 Sep-Dec;27(3):2309499019869469. doi:
290 10.1177/2309499019869469. PMID: 31530081.
- 291 25. Isaacs RE, Sembrano JN, Tohmeh AG; SOLAS Degenerative Study Group. Two-Year Comparative
292 Outcomes of MIS Lateral and MIS Transforaminal Interbody Fusion in the Treatment of Degenerative

- 293 Spondylolisthesis: Part II: Radiographic Findings. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2016 Apr;41 Suppl 8:S133-44.
294 doi: 10.1097/BRS.0000000000001472. PMID: 26839992.
- 295 26. Jalalpour K, Neumann P, Johansson C, Hedlund R. A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing
296 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion and Uninstrumented Posterolateral Fusion in the Degenerative
297 Lumbar Spine. *Global Spine J*. 2015 Aug;5(4):322-8. doi: 10.1055/s-0035-1549033.
- 298 27. Li FC, Chen QX, Chen WS, Xu K, Wu QH, Chen G. Posterolateral lumbar fusion versus transforaminal
299 lumbar interbody fusion for the treatment of degenerative lumbar scoliosis. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2013
300 Sep;20(9):1241-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jocn.2012.10.031. Epub 2013 Jul 1. PMID: 23827174.
- 301 28. Putzier M, Hartwig T, Hoff EK, Streitparth F, Strube P. Minimally invasive TLIF leads to increased muscle
302 sparing of the multifidus muscle but not the longissimus muscle compared with conventional PLIF-a
303 prospective randomized clinical trial. *Spine J*. 2016 Jul;16(7):811-9. doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2015.07.460.
304 Epub 2015 Jul 30. PMID: 26235468.
- 305 29. Sembrano JN, Tohmeh A, Isaacs R; SOLAS Degenerative Study Group. Two-year Comparative Outcomes
306 of MIS Lateral and MIS Transforaminal Interbody Fusion in the Treatment of Degenerative
307 Spondylolisthesis: Part I: Clinical Findings. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2016 Apr;41 Suppl 8:S123-32. doi:
308 10.1097/BRS.0000000000001471. PMID: 26825788.
- 309 30. Yang EZ, Xu JG, Liu XK, Jin GY, Xiao W, Zeng BF, Lian XF. An RCT study comparing the clinical and
310 radiological outcomes with the use of PLIF or TLIF after instrumented reduction in adult isthmic
311 spondylolisthesis. *Eur Spine J*. 2016 May;25(5):1587-1594. doi: 10.1007/s00586-015-4341-z. Epub 2015
312 Dec 9. PMID: 26649555.
- 313 31. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). *Preferred Reporting Items for*
314 *Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement*. *PLoS Med* 6(7): e1000097.
315 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
- 316 32. Sterne J, Savović J, Page M et al (2019) RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised
317 trials. *BMJ* 366:i4898
- 318 33. Phillips FM, Slosar PJ, Youssef JA, Andersson G, Papatheofanis F. Lumbar spine fusion for chronic low
319 back pain due to degenerative disc disease: a systematic review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013;38(7):E409-
320 E422. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3182877f11

- 321 34. Manzur MK, Steinhaus ME, Virk SS, Jivanelli B, Vaishnav AS, McAnany SJ, Albert TJ, Iyer S, Gang CH,
322 Qureshi SA. Fusion rate for stand-alone lateral lumbar interbody fusion: a systematic review. *Spine J.* 2020
323 Nov;20(11):1816-1825. doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2020.06.006. Epub 2020 Jun 11. PMID: 32535072.
- 324 35. Lan T, Hu SY, Zhang YT, et al. Comparison Between Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion and
325 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion for the Treatment of Lumbar Degenerative Diseases: A
326 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *World Neurosurg.* 2018;112:86-93.
327 doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2018.01.021
- 328 36. Chi KY, Cheng SH, Kuo YK, Lin EY, Kang YN. Safety of Lumbar Interbody Fusion Procedures for
329 Degenerative Disc Disease: A Systematic Review With Network Meta-Analysis of Prospective
330 Studies. *Global Spine J.* 2020;2192568220938024. doi:10.1177/2192568220938024
- 331 37. Yavin D, Casha S, Wiebe S, et al. Lumbar Fusion for Degenerative Disease: A Systematic Review and
332 Meta-Analysis. *Neurosurgery.* 2017;80(5):701-715. doi:10.1093/neuros/nyw162

333

334






Fig. 1 Flowchart of this systematic review with meta-analysis of prospective studies. RCTs, randomized clinical trials

| | Randomization process | Deviations from intended interventions | Missing outcome data | Measurement of the outcome | Selection of the reported result |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Challier 2017 | + | + | + | ? | ? |
| Christensen 2014 | + | + | ? | ? | ? |
| ElShazly 2013 | + | + | + | ? | ? |
| Etemadifar 2016 | + | + | + | ? | + |
| Fariborz 2016 | ? | ? | ? | ? | - |
| Hoff 2016 | ? | + | ? | ? | + |
| Høy 2013 | + | + | + | ? | + |
| Høy 2017 | + | + | ? | ? | + |
| Høy 2019 | + | + | + | ? | + |
| Isaacs 2016 | ? | - | ? | ? | + |
| Jalalpour 2015 | + | + | + | ? | + |
| Li 2013 | + | + | + | ? | - |
| Putzier 2016 | + | + | + | ? | ? |
| Sembrano 2016 | ? | - | ? | ? | + |
| Yang 2016 | + | + | ? | ? | ? |

Fig. 2 The risk of bias of each included randomized controlled trial. Low risk is presented as green dot, some concerns as yellow dot, and high risk as red dot




Fig. 3 The risk of bias of included randomized controlled trials. Bars show percentages across all included RCTs




Fig. 4 Forest plot and tabulated data illustrating the risk ratio (RR) for fusion rate at 1 year between TLIF, PLF, PLIF and XLIF showing that Other techniques had a better arm fusion rate at 1 year and was therefore superior to TLIF in this respect. *CI* confidence interval; *df* degrees of freedom




Fig. 5 Forest plot and tabulated data illustrating the risk ratio (RR) for fusion rate at 2 years between TLIF, PLF, PLIF and XLIF showing that there was no significant difference of fusion rate at 2 years between procedures. *CI* confidence interval; *df* degrees of freedom




Fig. 6 Forest plot and tabulated data illustrating the risk ratio (RR) for adverse events between TLIF, PLF, PLIF, XLIF and no fusion showing that there was no significant difference of adverse events between procedures. CI confidence interval; *df* degrees of freedom




Fig. 7 Forest plot and tabulated data illustrating the risk ratio (RR) for revision rate between TLIF, PLF and XLIF showing that there was no significant difference of revision rate between procedures. *CI* confidence interval; *df* degrees of freedom