No difference in Two-Year Revisions Between Hybrid Fusion and Two-Level Anterior Discectomy and Fusion: A national database study

Jon Raso, Pramod Kamalapathy, Kevin Mo¹, Lawal Abbas Labaran, Jesse Francis Wang², Hamid Hassanzadeh ¹Johns Hopkins University, ²University of Virginia

INTRODUCTION: Currently, anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF) is the gold standard for surgical management of cervical spine pathology providing durable fixation. Cervical disc arthroplasty (CDA) has become a widely accepted motion-sparing alternative to the standard ACDF in appropriately selected patients by preventing excessive load on adjacent discs. Hybrid surgery (HS) combines the benefits of both procedures, yet there is limited literature regarding postoperative outcomes following HS. Thus, the aim of this study was to employ a large national database to evaluate cost effectiveness, as well as both short-term and long-term complications following HS and two level-ACDF. We hypothesize that patients undergoing HS will have lower rates of revision and decreased postoperative complications compared to those undergoing two-level ACDF.

METHODS: This study used the PearlDiver Mariner dataset selecting for patients aged 18 and older who had at least 90day active longitudinal follow-up who underwent two-level ACDF or two-level Hybrid surgery (single level ACDF and single level CDA). Patients with prior spinal trauma, infection, cancer, or posterior fusion were excluded. Primary outcomes measures were 90-day major and minor medical complications, ED visits, readmissions, as well as two-year revisions. Patients were also assessed for postoperative dysphagia, incidental durotomy, vascular injury, 90-day surgical site, and implant complications. Additionally, hospitalization and postoperative costs were evaluated.

RESULTS: There were 4,570 two-level ACDF surgeries and 888 hybrid surgeries. After matching the cohorts, no statistical differences in demographics were found. HS had a lower incidence of major (1.6% vs. 3.1%, p = 0.003) and minor complications (3.0% vs. 4.6%, p = 0.009) than ACDF. 90-day readmission was lower in the HS cohort (2.8% vs. 4.2%), p = 0.024. HS was associated with reduced hospitalization costs -\$2614 (-\$3,916 -- -\$904, p 0.001). 3,516 patients had ACDF, and 699 had HS with 2 years of follow-up. There were no differences in 90-day or 2-year reoperation rates, implant complications, or pseudarthrosis.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: The present study adds to the growing consensus that HS is a safe and effective surgical treatment for treating cervical disease in appropriately selected patients. HS provides a lower rate of 90-day complication and readmission than conventional ACDF and is associated with decreased total hospital costs. Long-term outcomes similar across both surgical procedures.

outcomes							simila		across					both					surgical					
Table 1. Hybrid surgery vs. Two-Level ACDF Patient Demographics								Surgical and	d Postoperativ	e 90-day Outcomes			Table 3. Total baspital and 90-Day Postoperative Cost			P value	Beta		Table 4. ACDF vs. Hybrid Long-term outcomes					
		A	CDF	Н	ybrid						The second second				n=4530	Hybrid n = 888	ed 88	Adjusted \$ (85% CD)	ı f	Properties	ACDF	Hybrid	ACDF vs. Hybrid	ambu
		n=4,570		n = 888		p-value			ACDF	Hybrid	Hybrid vs. ACDP	nyahar	- H	Total in hospital cost	\$11,484 ± 18,447	\$8,815 ± 12,966	<0.001	-2614 [-3,916904]		n=3,516	n = 699	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	y-rask	
	<44 1,353		29.6%	261	29.6%				n=4,570	n = 888	Adjusted OK (95% CI)	p. 1000		98-Day Postsperative Cast	\$2,888 ± 9,572	\$2,478 ± 5889	0.199	-442 [-1,092 - 217]	-	90 days	49 (1.4%)	<11	0.70 (0.29-1.46)	0.389
Age, years																				6 monts	64 (1.8%)	<11 (2.6%)	0.76 (0.36-1.43)	0.442
	45-54	1,736	38.0%	558	38.0%		Major Com	ications 14	40 (3.1%)	14 (1.6%)	14 (1.6%) 0.43 (0.23-0.73) 0.003								1 year	92 (2.45%)	14 (3.24%)	0.78 (0.42-1.34)	0.409	
	55-64	1,133	24.8%	221	24.8%	1.00	Minor Com	ications 21	12 (4.6%)	27 (3.0%) 0.58 (0.37-0.86) 0.009									2 years	128 (3.5%)	21 (4.5%)	0.96 (0.99-1.51)	0.892	
	65-74	283	6.1%	55	6.2%	1	Dysph	ia 28	85 (6.2%)	41 (4.6%) 0.62 (0.35-1.04)	0.089								Implant complication (2 yr.)	131 (3.7%)	19 (2.7%)	0.89 (0.52-1.41)	0.636	
	75-84	55	1.2%	13	1.2%		Impla	1 3	35 (.8%)	<11	0.56 (0.16-1.42)	0.284								Pseudarthrosis (2yr.)	94 (2.7%)	<11	0.54 (0.25-1.03)	0.081
Gender (Female)		2,476	54.1%	481	54.2%	1.00	Duroto	y .	<11	<11	0.85 (0.04-5.06)	0.886												
Comorbidities							Vascular	jury	<11	<11	5.24 (0.31-87.5)	0.248												
Obesity (B)	41>30 kg/m ²)	210	4.8%	42	4.7%	1.00	90-Day E	Visit 55	52 (12.1%)	103 (11.6%)	0.91 (0.72-1.14)	0.458												
Chronic Kidney Disease		48	1.1%	12	1.4%	0.611	90-Day Rea	nission 15	94 (4.2%)	25 (2.8%)	0.61 (0.39-0.92)	0.024												
COPD		\$14	11.6%	107	12.0%	0.765	Infection 9	Days 5	55 (1.2%)	<11	0.52 (0.20-1.13)	0.139												

PE, Palmonary embolism; PNA, pneumonia; CVA, Cerebrovascula kidney injury; UTI, urinary tract infection; DVT, deep vein thromb infanction *Bolded variables indicate similicance with P < 0029 (B*)

Peripheral Vascular Disease

montion Heart Enilore

Hyperlipidemia

136 3.1% 29

363 40.9% 0.931 351 39.5% 0.918

30 0.7% <11 -1% 0.891

 0
 30
 0.7%

 0
 437
 9.8%

 1,797
 40.7%

 1,736
 39.3%

 Substance use

 History of Tobacco Use
 964
 21.8%
 195
 22.0%

 BMI, Body Mass Index, PPD, Peripheral Vascular Disease; COPD, Chronic Obs Palloanoury Thomase
 COPD, Chronic Obs

3.3% 0.849