Motion preservation in cervical prosthesis surgery: Implications for adjacent segment degeneration

Yang, X.

Chapter 4

Prosthesis in Anterior Cervical Herniated Disc Approach Does Not Prevent Radiological Adjacent Segment Degeneration

Xiaoyu Yang MD, MSc[1], Roland Donk MD, PhD[2], Mark P. Arts MD, PhD[3], Ronald H.M.A. Bartels MD, PhD[4], Carmen L.A. Vleggeert-Lankamp MD, PhD[1]

[1]Department of Neurosurgery, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, The Netherlands

[2]Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Via Sana Clinics, Mill, The Netherlands

[3]Department of Neurosurgery, Haaglanden Medical Centre, The Hague, The Netherlands

[4]Department of Neurosurgery, Radboud University Medical Centre, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Spine

ABSTRACT

Objective

This study aimed to report on the incidence of radiological adjacent segment degeneration (ASD) in patients with cervical radiculopathy due to a herniated disc that were randomized to receive cervical arthroplasty or arthrodesis.

Methods

A total of 253 patients were included in two randomized, double-blinded trials comparing anterior cervical discectomy with arthroplasty (ACDA), with intervertebral cage (ACDF), or without intervertebral cage (ACD) for single-level disc herniation. Neutral lateral radiographs were obtained preoperatively, at one- and two-year follow-up after surgery. ASD was evaluated on x-ray and defined by a decrease in disc height and the presence of anterior osteophyte formation on both the superior and the inferior level in relation to the target level.

Results

ASD was present in 34% of patients at baseline and increased to 59% at two-year follow-up in the arthrodesis groups (ACD and ACDF combined), and to 56% in the arthroplasty group. Progression of ASD was present in 29% of patients in the arthrodesis group and in 31% of patients in the arthroplasty group for two-year follow-up.

Conclusions

Radiological ASD occurs in a similar manner in patients that were subjected to arthrodesis in cervical radiculopathy and in patients that received arthroplasty to maintain motion. Current data tend to indicate that the advantage of cervical prosthesis in preventing radiological ASD is absent.

INTRODUCTION

Anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF) has been a common surgical treatment for cervical radiculopathy since it was initially described in the 1950s[1-3] and became the gold standard procedure. The procedure remained largely unchanged until the 1990s. Cages, and allograft bone were introduced to reduce the complications of harvesting autologous bone graft from the iliac crest. To decrease the prevalence of pseudarthrosis, plates were successfully introduced[4-6]. However, it was shown that arthrodesis of a motion segment caused by ACDF leads to increased mechanical load at the adjacent levels[7], and hypothetically this can contribute to degeneration of the cervical discs at the adjacent levels (ASD). In the effort to avoid ASD in post-surgical follow-up, artificial disc (ACDA) was developed with the rationale of maintaining motion. Some researchers reported that patients treated with ACDF have higher rates of ASD than those who underwent ACDA during follow-up[8-12]. However, baseline information lacked in most studies. It is highly likely that pre-existing degeneration of the cervical spine, and thus also of the levels adjacent to the operated level, continues, and that the finding of ASD at follow-up is merely the result of pre-existent degeneration with possible additional pre-existing degeneration.

In our clinics, we performed two randomized double-blind trials in which we treated patients with cervical radiculopathy with anterior discectomy. One third of patients received a polyetheretherketone (PEEK) cage in the intervertebral space to restore disc height, leading to fusion of the segments. One third of patients did not receive an intervertebral spacer leading to fusion without restoring disc height and one third of patients received arthroplasty leading to preservation of motion.

The objective of this retrospective cohort study is to compare the incidence of radiological ASD in patients that were enrolled in those two trials.

METHODS

Study design

NECK trial

A prospective, randomized double-blind multicentre trial among patients with cervical radiculopathy due to single-level disc herniation was conducted. Patients were randomly assigned into three groups: anterior cervical discectomy with arthroplasty (ACDA; activC, Aesculap AG, Tuttlingen, Germany), anterior cervical discectomy with fusion (ACDF; Cage standalone) and anterior cervical discectomy without fusion (ACD). The design and study protocol were published previously[13]. The protocol was approved by medical ethics committees, including an approval for randomization after anaesthetic induction. All patients gave informed consent. The two-year follow-up data revealed no differences in clinical outcomes[14].

PROCON trial

The trial design was a prospective, double-blind, single-centre randomized study, with a three-arm parallel group. Patients were randomly allocated into three groups: ACDA (Bryan disc prosthesis, Sofamor Danek, Kerkrade, the Netherlands), ACDF (Cage standalone, DePuy Spine, Johnson and Johnson, Amersfoort, the Netherlands), and ACD. The trial was approved by medical ethics committee and all patients gave informed consent. The design and study protocol were published previously[15]. The follow-up data up to eight years post-surgery revealed no differences in clinical outcomes[16].

Radiological outcomes

Flexion-extension radiographs were obtained preoperatively and at 12 and 24 months post-operatively. The range of motion (ROM) at the index level was defined as the intervertebral sagittal rotation between full flexion and extension. The ROM at index level was measured on dynamic lateral radiographs with a custom developed image analysis tool (BMGO, KU Leuven, Belgium), which has a measurement error of 0.3 degree and 0.3 mm and excellent interrater and intrarater agreement (intraclass correlation coefficient >0.75)[17]. Fusion was defined as ROM less than four degrees[18,19]. Lateral radiographs of the cervical spine were obtained with the patients in a neutral standing position and instructed to look straight ahead, with hips and knees extended. ASD was evaluated based on the height of the adjacent level disc (four grades) and the anterior osteophyte formation (four grades) on x-rays according to the classification reported by Goffin et al.[7] preoperatively, and at 12 and 24 months postoperatively (Table 1).

Table 1 The classification of adjacent segment degeneration

	Disc height	Anterior osteophyte formation
Normal	Same as adjacent disc	No anterior osteophyte
Mild	75-100% of normal disc	Just detectable anterior osteophyte
Moderate	50-75% of normal disc	Clear anterior osteophyte <25% of AP diameter of corresponding vertebral body
Severe	<50% of normal disc	Clear anterior osteophyte >25% of AP diameter of corresponding vertebral body

AP: Anteroposterior

ASD was defined in three different ways:

1) If the patient did not have any loss of disc height and did not have osteophyte formation (*normal)*, the patient was scored as 'non-ASD'. All patients that had loss of disc height, or osteophyte formation, either being *mild*, *moderate* or *severe*, were scored as 'ASD'.
2) If the patient had either no or *mild* loss of disc height (75-100% of the adjacent level, not being the target level) or no or a *mild* osteophyte formation the patient was scored as

'mild-ASD' and all other patients with *moderate* or *severe* loss of disc height or osteophyte formation were scored as 'severe ASD'.

3) In order to evaluate the progression of ASD during follow-up period, the patient was judged as positive if the patient increased in ASD grading during follow-up period. For the patient that did not increase in Goffin score, the ASD progression was marked as negative.

The radiographs were independently evaluated by one senior neurosurgeon dedicated to spine surgery and a junior medical doctor educated for this purpose. If deemed necessary, a third reviewer (senior neurosurgeon) was consulted. The reviewers were blinded to the type of surgery at baseline. The reviewers were not provided with any clinical information of the included patients. Prior to the evaluation of radiographs, the reviewers met in person to evaluate and refine the definitions.

Statistical analysis

All the data were presented as mean ± standard deviation. Baseline and follow-up characteristics of the ACD, ACDF and ACDA treatment group were compared using analysis of variance for continuous data and chi-square test for categorical data. The patients in ACD and ACDF group were combined as 'arthrodesis group', in order to be compared with the patients in 'arthroplasty' group (ACDA). The incidence of ASD between two groups were compared using chi-square test for categorical data. Tests were two tailed, and a P value of < 0.05 was considered significant. SPSS software, version 23.0 was used for all statistical analyses (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

RESULTS

In the NECK trial, 111 patients were included and randomly assigned to ACD (38 patients), ACDF (38 patients) or ACDA (35 patients). At baseline, X-ray data were available for 107 patients and for 98 patients at two-year follow-up.

In the PROCON trial, 142 patients were randomized into ACD (45 patients), ACDF (47 patients) or ACDA (50 patients). At baseline, X-ray data were available for 121 patients and for 70 patients at two-year follow-up.

Demographics

Baseline characteristics are presented in Table 2. The mean age of the study population was 45.2 years, ranging from 27 to 70 years. There was no difference regarding baseline characteristics between treatment groups. Surgery was most frequent at levels C5-C6 and C6-C7.

Table 2 Patient demographics by treatment arm

		ACD	ACDF	ACDA	Total	P value
Population		83	85	85	253	
Age (years, Mean ± SD)		45.3±6.7	45.6±7.6	44.8±7.7	45.2±7.3	0.787
Body Mass Index (Mean ± SD)		26.2±3.8	26.6±4.7	26.7±4.1	26.5±4.2	0.726
Sex	Male	42	37	43	122	0.939
	Female	41	48	42	131	
Smoking	Yes	33	40	41	118	0.305
	No	50	43	44	133	
Alcohol	Yes	46	52	55	153	0.565
	No	37	31	30	98	
Herniated level						
C4-C5		1	2	0	3	
C5-C6		46	39	40	125	
C6-C7		36	43	45	124	
C7-Th1		0	1	0	1	

ACD: Anterior cervical discectomy
ACDF: Anterior cervical discectomy with fusion
ACDA: Anterior cervical discectomy with arthroplasty
SD: Standard deviation

Fusion rate

If a cut-off value of four degrees movement was taken into consideration, it was demonstrated that 96% of patients in the ACD group (44 patients) and 86% of patients in the ACDF group (38 patients) were fused at two-year follow-up, and that 63% of patients in the ACDA group (36 patients) maintained mobile.

Incidence of adjacent segment degeneration (combined superior with inferior level)

Preoperatively, the incidence of ASD did not differ in the two groups: 37 % in the arthrodesis group (56 patients), and 29% (22 patients) in the arthroplasty group (P=0.2). One year after surgery, the incidence of ASD increased, but was still comparable in the two groups: 47% (59 patients) in the arthrodesis group, and 47% (35 patients) in arthroplasty group (P=0.98). At two-year follow-up, ASD increased to 59% of patients in the arthrodesis group (63 patients), and to 56% (34 patients) in the arthroplasty group. Likewise, there was no statistically significant difference between two groups (P=0.67).

At baseline the incidence of severe ASD was comparable in the two groups: 15% (22 patients) in the arthrodesis group, and 13% (10 patients) in the arthroplasty group (P=0.75). Likewise, at one-year as well as two-year follow-up after surgery, the incidence of ASD still did not differ in the two groups: 22% (28 patients) in the arthrodesis group, and 15% (11

Table 3 Adjacent segment degeneration at superior and inferior level

	Superior Level						Inferior Level					
	Disc height			Osteophyte			Disc height			Osteophyte		
	ACD	ACDF	ACDA	ACD	ACDF	ACDA	ACD	ACDF	ACDA	ACD	ACDF	ACDA
Baseline												
Normal	67 (94.4%)	72 (90%)	71 (93.4%)	52 (73.2%)	59 (73.8%)	60 (80%)	50 (90.9%)	58 (92.1%)	59 (92.2%)	44 (80%)	52 (82.5%)	54 (84.4%)
Mild	4 (5.6%)	8 (10%)	4 (5.3%)	13 (18.3%)	14 (17.5%)	8 (10.7%)	5 (9.1%)	4 (6.3%)	2 (3.1%)	6 (10.9%)	7 (11.1%)	6 (9.4%)
Moderate	0	0	0	5 (7%)	5 (6.3%)	6 (8%)	0	1 (1.6%)	3 (4.7%)	4 (7.3%)	4 (6.3%)	1 (1.6%)
Severe	0	0	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.4)	2 (2.5)	1 (1.3%)	0	0	0	1 (1.8%)	0	3 (4.7%)
1-year												
Normal	60 (92.3%)	51 (85%)	67 (90.5%)	44 (67.7%)	43 (70.5%)	51 (68.9%)	47 (87%)	41 (87.2%)	55 (87.3%)	41 (75.9%)	37 (77.1%)	47 (74.6%)
Mild	5 (7.7%)	7 (11.7%)	6 (8.1%)	14 (21.5%)	11 (18%)	17 (23%)	7 (13%)	5 (10.6%)	5 (7.9%)	5 (9.3%)	6 (12.5%)	10 (15.9%)
Moderate	0	2 (3.3%)	0	4 (6.2%)	5 (8.2%)	4 (5.4%)	0	1 (2.1%)	2 (3.2%)	6 (11.1%)	5 (10.4%)	1 (1.6%)
Severe	0	0	1(1.4%)	3 (4.6%)	2 (3.3%)	2 (2.7%)	0	0	1 (1.6%)	2 (3.7%)	0	5 (7.9%)
2-year												
Normal	50 (89.3%)	43 (86%)	55 (91.7%)	31 (55.4%)	30 (60%)	37 (61.7%)	35 (85.4%)	37 (92.5%)	46 (88.5%)	26 (63.4%)	24 (60%)	37 (71.2%)
Mild	6 (10.7%)	5 (10%)	4 (6.7%)	15 (26.8%)	13 (26%)	17 (28.3%)	6 (14.6%)	2 (5%)	2 (3.8%)	8 (19.5%)	9 (22.5%)	8 (15.4%)
Moderate	0	2 (4%)	0	7 (12.5%)	5 (10%)	4 (6.7%)	0	1 (2.5%)	2 (3.8%)	4 (9.8%)	5 (12.5%)	3 (5.8%)
Severe	0	0	1 (1.7%)	3 (5.4%)	2 (4%)	2 (3.3%)	0	0	2 (3.8%)	3 (7.3%)	2 (5%)	4 (7.7%)

ACD: Anterior cervical discectomy

ACDF: Anterior cervical discectomy with fusion

ACDA: Anterior cervical discectomy with arthroplasty

patients) in the arthroplasty group (P=0.18), respectively, 27% (29 patients) in the arthrodesis group, and 20% (12 patients) in the arthroplasty group (P=0.28).

At one-year follow-up, the proportion of patients with positive ASD progression did not differ in the two groups: 21% (22 patients) of patients demonstrated progression in the arthrodesis group, and 21% (13 patients) in the arthroplasty group (P=0.99). Again, at two years after randomization, the proportion of positive ASD progression was comparable in the two arms (29% in the arthrodesis group (27 patients), and 31% in the arthroplasty group (17 patients; P=0.78)).

An additional analysis in the arthroplasty group, comparing patients that maintained mobile (63%) to patients that demonstrated fusion (although they received a prosthesis (36%)), demonstrated no difference between the groups (ASD, P=0.384; severe ASD, P=0.473; positive ASD progression, P=1.0)

Incidence of adjacent segment degeneration (superior and inferior level respectively)

In the analysis of ASD at superior and inferior level separately, the data on the degree of ASD were demonstrated in Table 3. If ASD was evaluated by the loss of disc height, the incidence of ASD was comparable between arthrodesis and arthroplasty at baseline and at two-year follow-up, at either superior or inferior level (Table 4). When ASD was judged by the presence of anterior osteophyte formation, a similar incidence of ASD was shown between arthrodesis and arthroplasty, both at baseline and at two years after surgery, either at superior level or inferior level (Table 4).

Table 4 Incidence of adjacent segment degeneration at superior and inferior level

		ASD (Defined by loss of disc height)			ASD (Defined by osteophyte formation)		
Level	Follow-up	Arthrodesis	Arthroplasty	P	Arthrodesis	Arthroplasty	P
Superior level	Baseline	12 (7.9%)	5 (6.6%)	0.712	40 (26.5%)	15 (20%)	0.284
	1-year	14 (11.2%)	7 (9.5%)	0.699	39 (31.0%)	23 (31.1%)	0.985
	2-year	13 (12.3%)	5 (8.3%)	0.434	45 (42.5%)	23 (38.3%)	0.604
Inferior level	Baseline	10 (8.5%)	5 (7.8%)	0.877	22 (18.6%)	10 (15.6%)	0.609
	1-year	13 (12.9%)	8 (12.7%)	0.974	24 (23.5%)	16 (25.4%)	0.786
	2-year	9 (11.1%)	6 (11.5%)	0.939	31 (38.3%)	15 (28.8%)	0.265

ACD: Anterior cervical discectomy
ACDF: Anterior cervical discectomy with fusion
ACDA: Anterior cervical discectomy with arthroplasty

DISCUSSION

The rationale of cervical motion preservation technology has been not only maintenance of normal mobility at the index level, but also reduction of accelerated degeneration at adjacent

levels. Based on a recent systematic review[20], the previous research failed to report the incidence of radiological ASD among patients who suffered from radiculopathy exclusively. In this study, we have evaluated the degree of ASD according to the decrease of disc height and the severity of osteophyte formation on x-rays, at both superior and inferior level. We demonstrated that there was no difference in ASD in patients who underwent cervical anterior discectomy with fusion or patients who received an artificial cervical disc, neither at superior nor inferior level.

Disc degeneration and osteophyte formation are physiological processes, and therefore, the observation of degeneration at the adjacent disc levels is not necessarily the result of adjacent segment disease. Particularly in a population with a mean age of 45, it is only the pre-existing degeneration to observe during a degenerative process.

In accordance, our study documented not only ASD in follow-up, but also evaluated degeneration of the cervical spine at the adjacent levels of the target level at baseline. This type of degeneration existed in 34% of the patients at baseline. A similar result was reported previously by Coric et al.[8], who demonstrated that ASD was present in more than 50% of patients before undergoing ACDF or ACDA. Similarly, in the study of Hilibrand et al.[21], 63% of the patients who developed ASD had sign of denegation preoperatively. It is remarkable that only a minority of studies (only in six of the 31 studies that evaluated ASD in published systematic analysis in patients with cervical myelopathy and/or radiculopathy[20]) data on baseline ASD was reported.

It has been suggested before that the addition of a plate to affirm the cage and to further stabilize the two cervical segments may increase the risk of ASD[22]. In a recent systematic review it was discussed that the prevalence of ASD in ACDF is exaggerated in articles from the US, since plating is common there, whereas in Europe, ACDF without a plate is common. It was mentioned that it is an unanswered question whether ASD difference between ACDA and ACDF still exists if ACDF lacks plating[23].This question can be answered in the present study: cage standalone was used in the ACDF approach, and a comparable incidence of ASD was observed between groups.

In the two-year follow-up period of our patients, ASD increased to 58%, irrespective of surgical treatment. It is generally presumed that the development of ASD is a slow process, and that therefore long-term follow-up periods are essential in order to properly judge the occurrence of ASD. Nevertheless, an increase of circa 20% of ASD (or 20% of patients with progression of ASD) in a group of 250 patients, within the first two years after surgery, without a difference between the three groups, justifies the conclusion that ASD is not prevented by the use of cervical prosthesis.

CONCLUSIONS

Cervical disc arthroplasty does not result in less degeneration at the adjacent levels in comparison to patients who were subjected to arthrodesis. The proclaimed advantage of implanting a prosthesis, preventing ASD, is likely to be absent.

REFERENCES

1. Smith GW, Robinson RA. The treatment of certain cervical-spine disorders by anterior removal of the intervertebral disc and interbody fusion. The Journal of bone and joint surgery American volume 1958;40-a:607-24.
2. Bartels R, Goffin J. Albert Dereymaeker and Joseph Cyriel Mulier's description of anterior cervical discectomy with fusion in 1955. J Neurosurg Spine 2018;28:395-400.
3. Cloward RB. The anterior approach for removal of ruptured cervical disks. J Neurosurg 1958;15:602-17.
4. Cagli S, Isik HS, Zileli M. Cervical screw missing secondary to delayed esophageal fistula: case report. Turkish neurosurgery 2009;19:437-40.
5. Mummaneni PV, Srinivasan JK, Haid RW, et al. Overview of anterior cervical plating. Spine Surgery 16: 207-216, 2002.
6. Sahjpaul RL. Esophageal perforation from anterior cervical screw migration. Surgical neurology 2007;68:205-9; discussion 9-10.
7. Goffin J, Geusens E, Vantomme N, et al. Long-term follow-up after interbody fusion of the cervical spine. Journal of spinal disorders & techniques 2004;17:79-85.
8. Coric D, Nunley PD, Guyer RD, et al. Prospective, randomized, multicenter study of cervical arthroplasty: 269 patients from the Kineflex|C artificial disc investigational device exemption study with a minimum 2-year follow-up: clinical article. Journal of neurosurgery Spine 2011;15:348-58.
9. Phillips FM, Geisler FH, Gilder KM, Reah C, Howell KM, McAfee PC. Long-term Outcomes of the US FDA IDE Prospective, Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial Comparing PCM Cervical Disc Arthroplasty With Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion. Spine 2015;40:674-83.
10. Hisey MS, Zigler JE, Jackson R, et al. Prospective, Randomized Comparison of One-level Mobi-C Cervical Total Disc Replacement vs. Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion: Results at 5-year Follow-up. International journal of spine surgery 2016;10:10.
11. Sun Y, Zhao YB, Pan SF, Zhou FF, Chen ZQ, Liu ZJ. Comparison of adjacent segment degeneration five years after single level cervical fusion and cervical arthroplasty: a retrospective controlled study. Chinese medical journal 2012;125:3939-41.
12. Davis RJ, Nunley PD, Kim KD, et al. Two-level total disc replacement with Mobi-C cervical artificial disc versus anterior discectomy and fusion: a prospective, randomized, controlled multicenter clinical trial with 4-year follow-up results. Journal of neurosurgery Spine 2015;22:15-25.
13. Arts MP, Brand R, van den Akker E, Koes BW, Peul WC. The NEtherlands Cervical Kinematics (NECK) trial. Cost-effectiveness of anterior cervical discectomy with or without interbody fusion and arthroplasty in the treatment of cervical disc herniation; a double-blind randomised multicenter study. BMC musculoskeletal disorders 2010;11:122.
14. Vleggeert-Lankamp CLA, Janssen TMH, van Zwet E, et al. The NECK trial: Effectiveness of anterior cervical discectomy with or without interbody fusion and arthroplasty in the treatment of cervical disc herniation; a double-blinded randomized controlled trial. The spine journal : official journal of the North American Spine Society 2019;19:965-75.
15. Bartels RH, Donk R, van der Wilt GJ, Grotenhuis JA, Venderink D. Design of the PROCON trial: a prospective, randomized multi-center study comparing cervical anterior discectomy without fusion, with fusion or with arthroplasty. BMC musculoskeletal disorders 2006;7:85.
16. Donk RD, Verbeek ALM, Verhagen WIM, Groenewoud H, Hosman AJF, Bartels R. What's the best surgical treatment for patients with cervical radiculopathy due to single-level degenerative disease? A randomized controlled trial. PloS one 2017;12:e0183603.

17. Walraevens J, Demaerel P, Suetens P, et al. Longitudinal prospective long-term radiographic follow-up after treatment of single-level cervical disk disease with the Bryan Cervical Disc. Neurosurgery 2010;67:679-87; discussion 87.
18. Baskin DS, Ryan P, Sonntag V, Westmark R, Widmayer MA. A prospective, randomized, controlled cervical fusion study using recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 with the CORNERSTONE-SR allograft ring and the ATLANTIS anterior cervical plate. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2003;28:1219-24; discussion 25.
19. Heller JG, Sasso RC, Papadopoulos SM, et al. Comparison of BRYAN cervical disc arthroplasty with anterior cervical decompression and fusion: clinical and radiographic results of a randomized, controlled, clinical trial. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2009;34:101-7.
20. Yang X, Janssen T, Arts MP, Peul WC, Vleggeert-Lankamp CLA. Radiological follow-up after implanting cervical disc prosthesis in anterior discectomy: a systematic review. The spine journal : official journal of the North American Spine Society 2018;18:1678-93.
21. Hilibrand AS, Carlson GD, Palumbo MA, Jones PK, Bohlman HH. Radiculopathy and myelopathy at segments adjacent to the site of a previous anterior cervical arthrodesis. The Journal of bone and joint surgery American volume 1999;81:519-28.
22. Ahn SS, Paik HK, Chin DK, Kim SH, Kim DW, Ku MG. The Fate of Adjacent Segments After Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion: The Influence of an Anterior Plate System. World neurosurgery 2016;89:42-50.
23. Findlay C, Ayis S, Demetriades AK. Total disc replacement versus anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a systematic review with meta-analysis of data from a total of 3160 patients across 14 randomized controlled trials with both short- and medium- to long-term outcomes. The bone & joint journal 2018;100-b:991-1001.