Incidental Durotomies: Does Surgeon Preference Affect Patient Outcomes?

Fares Ani, Camryn Patz Myers¹, Abel De Varona Cocero², Constance Maglaras, Themistocles Stavros Protopsaltis³, Tina Raman⁴

¹NYU Langone Health, ²NYU Langone Health Orthopedic Surgery, ³NYU Hosptial For Joint Disorders, ⁴NYU Langone Orthopedic Hospital

INTRODUCTION: There are various surgical approaches to resolving incidental durotomies. Surgeons often will address durotomy tears with primary repair, patches, glue or a compilation of these to minimize sequella, however superiority of these techniques has yet to be evaluated.

METHODS:

This is a single-center retrospective chart review for adult patients who suffered incidental durotomies (ID) from 2015-2020 with minimum 1-year follow up. T-test and Chi-square analysis were used to compare the following outcomes: location of ID, type of surgery, portion of the procedure, procedure invasiveness, repair type (primary, patch, glue or combination), number of drains, total drain output, sequella of ID, neurological complications, days of bed flat status, return to operating room (RTO), readmission, and emergency room visit.

RESULTS: A total of 120 patients (mean age: 64.0±9.0, BMI:28.2±4.0kg/m², gender: 49.6% female, days of bed flat status: 1.5±0.9, and total inpatient drainage: 548.1±848ml). ID was most prevalent at the lateral edge of the dural tube (53.0%). L3/L4 (24.2%) and L4/L5 (25%) were the most commonly injured levels. Laminectomy and fusion were most likely to incur a durotomy (46.6%). Surgeons were more likely to primarily repair the dura if the procedure was open compared to minimally invasive (26.7% vs. 11%, p=0.04). IDs occurred most frequently during decompression (78.5%), exposure (7.5%), thecal sac manipulation (4.7%), and cage trialing and placement (3.7%). Eighty-two (73%) of ID were primary repairs, 98.3% utilized glue, and 58 (48.3%) used a patch. During the hospital course, 20 patients (16.7%) experienced headache, 1 (0.8%) experienced a CSF Leak through the skin, 7 (5.8%) had a postoperative neurologic deficit, and 4 (3.3%) returned to the OR during their index stay. After discharge, there were 10 (8.3%) wound complications. At the first postoperative visit, 6 (5.0%) experienced headaches, 23 (19.2%) neuro deficits, 2 of which were noted to be due to intraoperative injury, 1 (0.8%) episode of Arachnoiditis, 2 (1.7%) CSF leaks through skin, and 4 (3.3%) pseudomeningoceles. In total, 8.5% of patients were readmitted within the next year, most commonly for wound drainage (6.7%).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: When comparing repairs that were primary to secondary, no significant differences in neurological complications, durotomy complications, infection, RTO, or readmission were observed. Defects that were patched were more likely to develop pseudomeningocele compared to those without patch; however, no differences in overall wound complications, RTO, neurological deficits, headaches, leaks, or other durotomy sequella.

	No Patch	Patch	P value
N	66	54	TOIGE
Gender (% Female)	31 (47.0%)	28 (52.8%)	0.5
Revision Surgery	17 (25.8%)	16 (29.6%)	0.6
Age	63.8 ± 13.1		
BMI	29.2 ± 6.1	29.6 ± 5.3	0.7
	l characterist		
Levels fused	2.5 ± 1.8	3.5 ± 4.0	0.0
primary repair	35 (57,4%)	47 (92.2%)	0.00
Muscule Overlay	5 (7.6%)	1 (1.9%)	0.152
EBL	481 ± 651	561 ± 802	0.6
Optime	257 ± 125	268 ± 161	0.3
Number of Drains	1.1 ± 1.1	1.2 ± 1.2	0.6
Post-	operative star	,	
Days after initiating ambulation to	2.3 ± 2.1	2.6 ± 2.9	0.6
days of flat bed status	1.4 ± 0.8	1.6 ± 1.1	0.3
Headache	14 (21.2%)	6 (11.1%)	0.14
Neurodeficit	3 (4.5%)	4 (7.4%)	0.51
MRI/CT Index	3 (4.5%)	2 (3.7%)	0.82
RTO Index	2 (3.0%)	2 (3.7%)	0.84
CSF leak through skin	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)	0.27
Surgical site Infection	3 (4.5%)	2 (3.7%)	0.8
Length of Stay	4.8 ± 2.8	5.2 ± 3.6	0.5
Total drain output during stay	557 ± 889	536 ± 802	0.9
Aft	er Discharge		
Wound Complications	5 (7.6%)	5 (9.3%)	0.7
Antibiotics	2 (3.0%)	3 (5.6%)	0.9
Headache	4 (6.1%)	2 (3.7%)	0.6
Neurodeficit	10 (15.2%)	13 (24.1%)	0.2
Neurodeficit resolved by 6MO	2 (3.0%)	4 (7.4%)	0.4
MRI/CT	10 (15.2%)	7 (13.0%)	0.7
Arachnoiditis	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	0.4
RTO 90days	4 (6.1%)	2 (3.7%)	
RTO diccharge - 6mo	4 (6.1%)	2 (3.7%)	0.6
CSF Leak		1	
recurrent HNP		1	
Dehiscence ER visit - 6MO			
Readdmission - 6MO	6 (9.1%)	2 (3.7%) 4 (7,4%)	0.2
Readdmission - 6MO CSF-leak through skin	7 (10.6%)		0.5
C31-leav nilonäli 2viii	2 (0.0%)	0 (0%)	0.2

	Primary Repair (N=82)	No Primary repair (N=30)	P valu
Gender (% Female)	39 (47.6%)	16 (53.3%)	0.
Revision Surgery	24 (29.3%)	7 (23.3%)	0.5
Age	64.6 ± 12.6	60.9 ± 12.1	0.1
BMI	29.5 ± 5.6	30.0 ± 5.6	0.
	Surgical character		
Minimally invasive	9 (11.0%)	8 (26.7%)	0.0
Levels fused	24+31	3.0 ± 3.1	0.4
Glue	80 (97.6%)	30 (100%)	0.3
Patched	51 (62.2%)	4 (13.3%)	0.00
Muscule Overlay	2 (2.4%)	4 (13.3%)	0.02
FRI	578 ± 819	299 ± 338	0.01
Optime	260 ± 141	244 ± 124	0.6
Osteotomy done	6 (7.3%)	2 (6.7%)	0.9
Number of Drains	1.2 ± 1.1	0.7 ± 1.1	0.0
	Post-operative s		
Days of Flat Bed Status	15+10	14+09	0.6
Headache	6 (20%%)	12 (14.6%)	0.4
Neurodeficit	4 (4.9%)	1 (3.3%)	0.7
MRI/CT Index	4 (4.9%)	0 (0%)	0.2
CSF leak through skin	1 (1.2%)	O (0%)	0.5
Surgical site Infection	5 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	0.1
Length of Stay	5.0 ± 3.4	4.3 ± 2.2	0.2
Total drain output during stay	468 ± 692	460 ± 834	0.9
	After Discharg	e	
Wound Complications	7 (8.5%)	1 (3.3%)	0.3
Antibiotics	5 (6.1%)	0 (0%)	0.1
Headache	2 (2.4%)	1 (3.3%)	0.
Meningocele	3 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	0.2
Neurodeficit	14 (17.1%)	6 (20.0%)	0.7
Neurodeficit resolved by 6MO	1 (16.7%)	4 (23.5%)	0.7
MRI/CT	10 (12.2%)	5 (16.7%)	0.5
Arachnoiditis	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	0.0
RTO 1yr	5 (6.1%)	1 (3.3%)	0.5
CSF Leak	2	1	
Cauda Equina Syndrome	2	0	
Dehiscence	1	0	
ER visit - 1yr	5 (6.1%)	1 (3.3%)	0.5
Readdmission - 1yr	7 (8.5%)	2 (6.7%)	0.7
CSF-leak through skin	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	0.0
Persistant neuroeficit	10 (12.2%)	5 (16.7%)	0.5