## Impact of Prolonged Symptom Duration Prior to Cervical Disc Replacement in the Ambulatory Surgical Setting

Andrea Roca, Fatima Anwar, Timothy J Hartman, James Nie<sup>1</sup>, Alexandra Loya, Srinath Medakkar, Eileen Zheng, Keith R. Macgregor<sup>2</sup>, Omolabake Oyetayo<sup>2</sup>, Vincent Federico<sup>1</sup>, Dustin H Massel, Arash J Sayari, Gregory Lopez<sup>3</sup>, Kern Singh<sup>2</sup>
<sup>1</sup>Rush University Medical Center, <sup>2</sup>Midwest Orthopaedics At Rush, <sup>3</sup>Rush University

INTRODUCTION: Greater preoperative symptom duration may be associated with inferior outcomes following spine surgery. The objective of this study is to assess the impact of preoperative symptom duration (PSD) on patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) following cervical disc replacement (CDR) in the ambulatory surgical center (ASC) setting. METHODS: Patient data was retrospectively gueried from a single-surgeon database. Inclusion criteria were those who

METHODS: Patient data was retrospectively queried from a single-surgeon database. Inclusion criteria were those who had undergone primary, elective CDR for disc herniation at an ASC with a recorded PSD. Patients were divided into two cohorts by PSD: Shorter Duration (SD; PSD<180 days) or Greater Duration (GD; PSD≥180 days). PROMs were compared between cohorts at preoperative, 6-week postoperative, and final follow-up periods. Mean time to final follow up was 9.9±7.2 months. Improvements in PROMs within cohorts from preoperative baseline to 6-week and final follow-up periods were assessed via paired sample t-tests. Magnitudes of improvement in PROMs (ΔPROM) from preoperative baseline to 6-week (ΔPROM-6W) and final follow up (ΔPROM-FF) were compared between cohorts. Achievement rates of minimal clinically important differences (MCID) were compared between cohorts. All between group comparisons were performed utilizing multivariable regression accounting for demographic variations between cohorts.

RESULTS: The GD cohort was older and had a greater prevalence of female patients (p≤0.046, both). Mean preoperative PROMs did not vary between cohorts. PHQ-9 was worse in the GD cohort at 6-week and final follow up (p≤0.041, both). The SD cohort demonstrated improvements in all PROMs at both 6-week and final follow-up periods (p≤0.049, all). The GD cohort demonstrated improvements in all PROMs except PHQ-9 at 6-weeks,and all PROMs at final follow up (p≤0.005, all). ΔPROM-6W, ΔPROM-FF, and MCID achievement rates did not vary between cohorts.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: Independent of symptom duration prior to surgery, patients who underwent CDR for disc herniation at an ASC demonstrated significant improvements in physical function, pain, disability, and mental health outcomes. Patients with a greater duration of preoperative symptoms reported worse mental health scores in the postoperative period at early and final follow up. Magnitude of improvement and rates of clinically meaningful improvement in each domain did not vary by preoperative symptom duration.

	Shorter Duration	†p-value	Greater Duration	†p-value	*p-value
Pre-Op					
PROMIS-PF	41.0±6.7		39.0±7.3		0.186
NDI	40.5±17.9		42.6±20.0		0.564
VAS-N	6.6±2.1		6.3±2.4		0.700
/AS-A	6.7±2.0		5.6+2.9		0.075
PHQ-9	4.9±5.1		6.6±5.3		0.056
i-week Post-Op					
ROMIS-PF	47.3±8.0	0.028	43.6±9.7	0.005	0.153
IDI	24.0±16.6	< 0.001	30.5±23.0	0.002	0.266
AS-N	2.6±2.3	< 0.001	3.5±2.9	< 0.001	0.238
AS-A	2.4±2.9	< 0.001	2.4±2.9	< 0.001	0.965
HQ-9	3.1±4.0	0.049	6.0±6.0	0.334	0.029
inal Post-Op					
ROMIS-PF	50.3±10.6	< 0.001	47.8±9.9	< 0.001	0.209
DI	16.5±14.9	< 0.001	21.8+20.5	< 0.001	0.091
AS-N	2.5±2.5	< 0.001	2.6±2.7	< 0.001	0.600
AS-A	2.3±2.7	< 0.001	2.1±2.8	< 0.001	0.927
HQ-9	2.9±3.9	0.023	5.0±5.9	0.010	0.041
Pre-Op to 6-					
cek Post-Op ROMIS-PF	5.3±8.8		4.2±6.5		0.649
OMIS-PF	5.3±8.8 16.7+18.5		4.2±6.5		0.649
AS-N					
iS-N	3.8±3.3 4.2±3.4		3.8±3.3 2.7±3.7		0.205
NS-A IO-9	4.243.4 1.944.3		2.743.7		0.245
Pre-Op to Final	1,914,3		0.814.5		0.492
rre-Op to Final					
ROMIS-PF	10.4±10.2		8.6±8.1		0.297
DI	23.9±21.0		21.0±15.1		0.337
AS-N	3.9±3.2		3.5±2.9		0.614
AS-A	4.1±3.4		3.0±3.7		0.197
IQ-9	1.8±4.1		1.7±3.7		0.934
ICID chievement					
ROMIS-PF	87.5%		71.9%		0.133
IDI	79,4%		79.4%		0.833
A P N	70.40		80.66		0.000

reported outcome measures and McLD active/ment rates, respectively

p-value calculated using paired samples t-tests assessing 6-week PROMs and Final PROMs to Preoperative PROMs

Bolding denotes statistical significance (p=0.05)

Table 1. Patient Demographics and Perioperative Characteristics Greater Duration **Shorter Duration** \*p-value Characteristic (n=112) BMI (mean ± SD, kg/m<sup>2</sup>) 28.6±5.4 28.4±6.2 28.7±4.8 0.775 0.266 2.7% (3) 4.0% (2) 1.7%(1) Black Hispan White 10.0% (5) 4.0% (2) 80.0% (40) 8.3% (5) 15.0% (9) 75.0% (45) Other 0.9%(1) 2.0% (1) 0.0%(0) Comorbidities Smoker 8.0% (9) 10.0% (5) 6.5% (4) 0.492 Hypertension 15.3% (17) 14.0% (7) 16.4% (10) 0.728 4.8% (3) 1.9±0.5 ASA Score (mean ± SD) CCI Score (mean ± SD) Insurance Type Medicare/Medicaid 0.9±1.0 0.8±1.0 1.0±1.0 Workers' Comp Private 67.9% (76) 78.0% (39) 59.7% (37) No. Consecutively Operated Levels 0.622 72 3% (81) 70.0% (35) 74.2% (46 25.8% (16) 52.7±17.9 Operative Time (min; mean±SD) 52.1±16.8 51.4±15.4 0.696 Estimated Blood Loss (mL; mean±SD) 25.8±4.3 26.1±5.2 25.5±3.4 0.459 Postoperative Length of Stay (hours; mean±SD POD 0 VAS Pain 6.6±4.0 4.8±2.3 POD 0 Narcotic Consumption (OME) 17.2±14.1 17.2±15.0 17.2±13.4 0.981 SD = Standard Deviation; BMI = Body Mass Index; ASA = American Society of An

SD = Standard Deviation; BMI = Body Mass Index; XSA = American Society of Anesthesiologists; CCI = Charlson Comorbidity Index; Workers' Comp = workers' compensation; POD = postoperative day of discharge; No. = Number of; VAS = Visual analog scale; OME = oral morphine equivalents

\*p-value calculated using Chi-square analysis for categorical variables or Student's t-test for continuous variables **Boldface** indicates significance