

1 *Effect of Long Spinal Fusion Including the Pelvis on Activities of Daily Living Related to Lumbar*
2 *Spinal Function in Adults with Spinal Deformity*

3

4

5 **Abstract**

6 **Background** Spinal sagittal malalignment is managed via long spinal fusion including the pelvis,
7 which reduces the lumbar spinal range of motion, impairing the ability to perform certain activities
8 of daily living. The present study aimed to evaluate the changes in activities of daily living after long
9 spinal fusion in adults with spinal deformity, and to clarify the specific activities of daily living for
10 which patients perceived postoperative improvement or deterioration.

11 **Methods** We retrospectively reviewed 40 adults who underwent long spinal fusion in a single
12 institution between 2014 and 2016 (39 females, one male, age 68.5 (52–79) years). Each patient
13 undertook three self-assessed health-related quality of life measures preoperatively and 2 years
14 postoperatively: Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), Scoliosis Research Society (SRS)-22
15 questionnaire, and Japanese Orthopaedic Association back pain evaluation questionnaire
16 (JOABPEQ). Radiographic outcomes were measured preoperatively and at 2 years postoperatively.

17 **Results** The total ODI and all SRS-22 domains were improved at 2 years postoperatively. The
18 JOABPEQ scores were improved at 2 years postoperatively in all domains, except lumbar function.
19 The change in pelvic incidence minus lumbar lordosis correlated with improvements in total ODI,
20 SRS-22 function, and self-image scores. At 2 years postoperatively, satisfaction was correlated with
21 total ODI, all SRS-22 domains, and the pain domain of the JOABPEQ. Subclass analysis of the
22 JOABPEQ lumbar function domain at 2 years postoperatively revealed that 65% of patients had
23 difficulty ‘putting on socks or stockings’, 42% had great difficulty ‘bending forward, kneeling, or
24 stooping’, 32% reported improvement in ‘sit to stand’, and 32% reported deterioration in ‘putting on
25 socks or stockings’ after surgery compared with before surgery. The JOABPEQ lumbar spine
26 function domain was not correlated with the SRS-22 satisfaction domain.
27 **Conclusions** Despite restricting lumbar function, spinopelvic fusion improves health-related quality
28 of life. The JOABPEQ evaluates activities of daily living related to lumbar function.
29
30

31 **Introduction**

32 The pathology of adult spinal deformity (ASD) involves not only coronal deformity, but also sagittal
33 malalignment such as loss of lumbar lordosis (LL), retroversion of the pelvis, and anterior shift of
34 the center of gravity axis with stooping. Sagittal malalignment in patients with ASD is associated
35 with physical and emotional disability, and a considerably impaired health-related quality of life
36 (HRQOL) [1, 2, 3]. Sagittal malalignment was quantified by the Scoliosis Research Society (SRS)-
37 Schwab ASD classification system using three radiographic parameters: mismatch between pelvic
38 incidence (PI) and LL (PI-LL), pelvic tilt (PT), and sagittal vertical axis (SVA), with cutoff values
39 reported for each parameter [4]. Improvement of these three parameters is currently the goal of ASD
40 surgery, so corrective long spinal fusion including the pelvis has been widely adopted for these
41 patients, especially those with severe deformities [5, 6]. However, this corrective spinal fusion
42 reduces the range of motion (ROM) of the lumbar spine, causing a decrease in the ability to perform
43 activities of daily living (ADL) related to the lumbar spine [7]. Understanding of these pathological
44 conditions has deepened recently, and tools for the evaluation of lumbar spine function have been
45 developed, typified by the lumbar stiffness disability index (LSDI) [8, 9, 10]. However, no studies
46 have investigated the effect of spinal fusion for restoration of spinal alignment in ASD on ADL

47 related to lumbar function. The present study aimed to compare the pre- and postoperative ADL of
48 ASD surgical patients using self-reported HRQOL questionnaires such as the Oswestry disability
49 index (ODI), SRS-22 questionnaire, and Japanese Orthopaedic Association back pain evaluation
50 questionnaire (JOABPEQ), and to identify the specific ADL for which the patients perceived
51 postoperative improvement or deterioration.

52 **Materials and Methods**

53 *Study patients*

54 After receiving institutional review board approval, 149 consecutive patients with ASD were
55 identified in the surgical registry of a single center. The present study is a retrospective case review
56 of these consecutive patients with ASD who underwent corrective spinal surgery in a single
57 institution between 2014 and 2016. The surgical indication for these patients was severe spinal
58 deformity with a stooped posture, abnormal gait, lower back pain due to sagittal imbalance, and
59 lumbar or thoracolumbar kyphosis. To standardize the fusion level of the included patients, we
60 selected patients whose main deformity was localized as a thoracolumbar or lumbar lesion requiring
61 long spinal fusion of more than eight segments from the lower thoracic vertebrae (T9 or T10) to the
62 pelvis. We excluded patients with rigid thoracic deformity requiring upper thoracic fusion, and/or

63 those with posttraumatic severe kyphosis, ankylosing spondylitis, a rounded back due to Parkinson's
64 disease, or a follow-up duration of less than 2 years. A final total of 40 patients were eligible for
65 study inclusion. The included patients comprised 39 females and one male, with a median age of
66 68.5 years (range, 52–79 years), and a mean follow-up period for clinical and radiographic outcomes
67 of 33.4 months (range, 24–66 months).

68 *Health-related quality of life domains and the definitions of improvement rate*

69 Each patient undertook three self-assessed HRQOL measures: the ODI [11], SRS-22
70 questionnaire [12], and JOABPEQ [13] preoperatively and at 2 years postoperatively. We
71 investigated the improvement rate for each subclass in accordance with the definitions reported by
72 Yoshida et al. [14]. For the SRS-22 and JOABPEQ, the improvement rate was calculated as $100 \times [2$
73 $\text{year postoperative score} - \text{preoperative score}] / \text{preoperative score}$. For the ODI, the improvement
74 rate was calculated as $100 [\text{preoperative score} - 2 \text{ year postoperative score}] / \text{preoperative score}$.

75 *Subclass analysis of the lumbar function domain on the Japanese Orthopaedic Association back*
76 *pain evaluation questionnaire*

77 To evaluate the impact of limitation of lumbar function, we analyzed each item of the
78 lumbar function domain in the JOABPEQ (Q2-1 to Q2-6), and compared the preoperative and 2-

79 year-postoperative scores. Each item is described in Figure 1. We defined improvement as an answer
80 of “Yes” preoperatively, and “No” postoperatively for each question from Q2-1 to Q2-5;
81 deterioration was defined as an answer of “No” preoperatively, and “Yes” postoperatively. We
82 defined improvement as an answer more than one level better postoperatively than preoperatively,
83 such as a change from “great difficulty” preoperatively to “no difficulty” or “some difficulty”
84 postoperatively for Q2-6. We defined deterioration as an answer more than one level worse
85 postoperatively than preoperatively, such as a change from “no difficulty” preoperatively to “some
86 difficulty” or “great difficulty” postoperatively for Q2-6.

87 *Radiographic analysis*

88 Anteroposterior and lateral full-length standing spine radiographs were obtained at
89 preoperative and at two years after surgery. Measurements made in the sagittal plane included
90 thoracic kyphosis (T5-T12), LL (L1-S1), SVA, PI, PT, PI-LL and T1-pelvic angle (TPA). These
91 radiographic parameters were classified in accordance with the SRS-Schwab ASD classification [4].

92 *Statistical analysis*

93 Normal distribution of the data was demonstrated with the Shapiro-Wilk test. Changes
94 between the preoperative and 2-year-postoperative radiographic parameters and HRQOL scores

95 were evaluated using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, and categorical variables were evaluated using
96 Fisher's exact test. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to analyze the correlation
97 between the radiographic parameters and HRQOL. The rates of improvement and deterioration in
98 each question of the JOABPEQ regarding lumbar function were evaluated using the McNemar test.
99 Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS version 25 statistical software package (IBM-
100 SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL). A P value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

101 **Results**

102 Table 1 shows the three sagittal modifiers [4] and radiographic parameters, most of
103 which had improved significantly at 2 years postoperatively.

104 *Improvement rate of the health-related quality of life score*

105 The mean total ODI score and all SRS-22 domain scores were significantly improved at
106 2 years postoperatively. The mean JOABPEQ scores were improved at 2 years postoperatively in all
107 domains, except the lumbar function domain (Table 2). The mean improvement rate at 2 years
108 postoperatively exceeded 20% in many domains, while the improvement rate did not change at all (-
109 3%) in the lumbar function domain of the JOABPEQ (Table 2).

110 *Correlation between the health-related quality of life scores and radiographic parameters*

111 The correlations between the changes in radiographic parameters and improvement in
112 HRQOL are shown in Table 3. The change in PI-LL correlated with improvement in the total ODI
113 score, and in the function and self image scores of the SRS-22 (Table 3). Table 4 shows the factors
114 affecting patient satisfaction at 2 years postoperatively. The total ODI score and all SRS-22 domains
115 were significantly correlated with satisfaction at 2 years postoperatively. There was no correlation
116 between satisfaction at 2 years postoperatively and any of the JOABPEQ domains, except the pain
117 domain, or the three sagittal modifiers (Table 4).

118 *Subclass analysis of lumbar function in the Japanese Orthopaedic Association back pain evaluation*
119 *questionnaire*

120 Table 5 shows the subclass analysis of lumbar function in the JOABPEQ (Q2-1 to Q2-6).
121 At 2 years postoperatively, a limitation was perceived by 30% or less of patients in Q2-1, Q2-3 and
122 Q2-4, whereas 65% of patients perceived a limitation in Q2-5 (putting on socks or stockings) (Table
123 5). Figure 1 shows the rates of improvement and deterioration for each question. Significant
124 improvement was observed in Q2-3, with 32.5% of patients gaining the ability to perform the ‘sit to
125 stand’ ADL; significant deterioration was observed in Q2-5, with 32.5% of patients losing the ability
126 to perform the ADL of ‘putting on socks or stockings’ (Figure 1).

127 **Discussion**

128 The current study revealed that the patient-reported lumbar function score in patients
129 with ASD who underwent long spinal fusion including the pelvis had not improved at 2 years
130 postoperatively. Subclass analysis of the JOABPEQ lumbar function domain revealed that 65% of
131 patients had difficulty ‘putting on socks or stockings’, and 42% of patients had great difficulty
132 ‘bending forward, kneeling, or stooping’ at 2 years postoperatively. In addition, 32% of patients
133 perceived a postoperative improvement in the ADL of ‘sit to stand’, whereas 32% of patients
134 perceived a postoperative deterioration in ‘putting on socks or stockings’. The novelty of the present
135 study was the investigation of the improvement and deterioration rates of ADLs related to the
136 lumbar spine by subclass analysis of self-reported lumbar function outcomes. This was not
137 mentioned in previous reports.

138 Previous studies report that poor sagittal spinopelvic parameters (such as a large SVA or
139 PT) are correlated with poor HRQOL, and surgical correction of spinopelvic parameters results in
140 improvement of HRQOL [1, 2]. An expanded indication of spinopelvic fusion for patients with ASD
141 led to a focus on trunk mobility and ADLs, while the LSDI is used to evaluate lumbar stiffness [9,
142 10]. Sciubba et al. reported that the scores for most of the LSDI questions did not significantly

143 change from preoperatively to 2 years postoperatively, while there was a tendency for postoperative
144 worsening in Q1 (putting on underwear and pants) and Q4 (personal hygiene functions following
145 toileting), and a significant postoperative worsening regarding Q2 (socks and shoes) and Q8
146 (bathing the lower half of the body) [15]. Hart et al. showed that patients who underwent long spinal
147 fusion (more than five segments) had worsened LSDI scores postoperatively, and 35.3% of patients
148 considered lower back stiffness to be a significant limitation on daily activities [16]; however,
149 postoperative lumbar stiffness was reportedly within an acceptable range as a trade-off for
150 improvement in function and pain at 93.8% [16]. Subclass analysis of the lumbar function domain of
151 the JOABPEQ in the current study showed that there was significant deterioration in the ADL of
152 'putting on socks or stockings', while there was no correlation between the lumbar spine function
153 score in the JOABPEQ and the satisfaction score in the SRS-22. Similarly, Hart et al. reported no
154 correlation between final LSDI and satisfaction scores at 2 years postoperatively [17]. These results
155 indicate that the restriction of lumbar function due to spinopelvic fusion does not diminish the
156 benefit of these surgeries.

157 Bible et al. used a noninvasive electrogoniometer and torsionmeter to investigate the
158 relationships between 15 ADLs and lumbar ROM in 60 asymptomatic adults, and reported that a

159 large proportion of lumbar ROM was required for some ADLs such as squatting, bending, sit to
160 stand, stand to sit, putting on socks, and putting on shoes [18]. Hence, patients with long spinal
161 fusion including the pelvis are expected to lose the ability to perform most of these ADLs, and so it
162 is acceptable that 32% of patients postoperatively lost the ability to put on socks or stockings in the
163 present study. However, it was paradoxical that 32% of patients postoperatively gained the ability to
164 perform the ADL 'sit to stand', which requires a large lumbar ROM. The difference between these
165 two ADLs may be the maximum flexion angle required by each activity. Lumbar flexion of up to
166 30° is required for 'sit to stand', whereas lumbar flexion of up to 50° is required for 'putting on
167 socks' [18]. The ADLs related to the lumbar spine were influenced not only by the lumbar ROM, but
168 also by the ROM of the hip and knee joints. Therefore, support via the ROM of the hip and knee
169 joints and/or the stable spine with postoperative optimal sagittal alignment may have enabled the
170 present patients to postoperatively attain the ability to perform the ADL of 'sit to stand'. In contrast,
171 the loss of the ADL 'putting on socks' was inevitable, even with the support of the hip and knee
172 joints and the postoperatively stable spine, as this ADL requires deeper lumbar flexion.

173 The SRS-22 is widely used as an evaluation tool for patients with ASD who undergo
174 surgery, but it cannot evaluate lumbar spine function in detail. The ODI is also widely used as an

175 evaluation tool for spinal surgery, and contains some questions to evaluate lumbar spine function,
176 but is not as definitive as the LSDI. Yoshida et al. performed an ODI subclass analysis that revealed
177 that patients with ASD who undergo spinal fusion of more than four levels remain restricted in the
178 two subdomains of 'personal care' and 'lifting', even 1 year postoperatively [14]. In the present study,
179 60% of patients had difficulty putting on socks or stockings preoperatively, but the remaining 40%
180 of patients did not have difficulty with this ADL. For such patients without preoperative restrictions
181 in putting on socks or stockings, it is necessary to sufficiently explain that the ADLs related to
182 lumbar stiffness become difficult postoperatively.

183 The current study had some limitations. First, it was a retrospective and single-center
184 study. Therefore, the possibility of unintentional selection bias in the selection of patients could not
185 be fully excluded. Second, we used the JOABPEQ, which is not commonly used as an evaluation
186 tool for ASD worldwide. The present results need to be compared with results obtained using more
187 widespread tools such as the LSDI to determine whether they are universal. Finally, we did not
188 accurately evaluate the postoperative changes in trunk ROM (including the lumbar spine and hip
189 joints), trunk muscular strength, and walking ability. In the future, these parameters should be

190 evaluated, as they may have a greater impact on lumbar spine function than postoperative spinal
191 alignment.

192 In summary, the HRQOL scores (except the lumbar function of the JOABPEQ)
193 improved along with the correction of global alignment after ASD surgery. Long spinal fusion
194 including the pelvis enabled one-third of patients to gain the ability to perform the ADL of ‘sit to
195 stand’, and caused one-third of patients to lose the ability to ‘put on socks or stockings’. We should
196 recognize these limitations, and thoroughly explain them to patients with ASD and their families.

197 **Acknowledgments**

198 We thank Kelly Zammit, BVSc, from Edanz Group (www.edanzediting.com/ac), for editing a draft
199 of this manuscript.

200

201 **References**

- 202 1. Glassman SD, Bridwell K, Dimar JR, Horton W, Berven S, Schwab F. The impact of positive
203 sagittal balance in adult spinal deformity. *Spine*. 2005 Sep 15;30(18):2024-9.
- 204 2. Lafage V, Schwab F, Patel A, Hawkinson N, Farcy JP. Pelvic tilt and truncal inclination: two key
205 radiographic parameters in the setting of adults with spinal deformity. *Spine*. 2009 Aug

- 206 1;34(17):599-606.
- 207 3. Pellisé F, Vila-Casademunt A, Ferrer M, Domingo-Sàbat M, Bagó J, Pérez-Grueso FJ, Alanay
208 A, Mannion AF, Acaroglu E; European Spine Study Group, ESSG . Impact on health related
209 quality of life of adult spinal deformity (ASD) compared with other chronic conditions. Euro
210 Spine J. 2015 Jan 1;24(1):3-11.
- 211 4. Schwab F, Ungar B, Blondel B, Buchowski J, Coe J, Deinlein D, DeWald C, Mehdian
212 H, Shaffrey C, Tribus C, Lafage V. Scoliosis Research Society-Schwab adult spinal deformity
213 classification: a validation study. Spine. 2012 May 20;37(12):1077-82.
- 214 5. Ploumis A, Transfeldt EE, Denis F. Degenerative lumbar scoliosis associated with spinal stenosis.
215 Spine J. 2007 Jul 1;7(4):428-36 .
- 216 6. Silva FE, Lenke LG. Adult degenerative scoliosis: evaluation and management. Neurosurg Focus.
217 2010 Mar;28(3):E1.
- 218 7. Bafus T, Shea M, Hart R. Impairment of perineal care functions after long fusion of the lumbar
219 spine. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2005 Apr 1;433:111-4.
- 220 8. Choi JH, Jang JS, Yoo KS, Shin JM, Jang IT. Functional limitations due to stiffness after long
221 level spinal instrumented fusion surgery to correct lumbar degenerative flat back. Spine. 2018

- 222 Aug 1;43(15):1044-51.
- 223 9. Hart RA, Pro SL, Gundle KR, Marshall LM. Lumbar stiffness as a collateral outcome of spinal
224 arthrodesis: a preliminary clinical study. *Spine J.* 2013 Feb 1;13(2):150-6.
- 225 10. Hart RA, Gundle KR, Pro SL, Marshall LM. Lumbar Stiffness Disability Index: pilot testing of
226 consistency, reliability, and validity. *Spine J.* 2013 Feb 1;13(2):157-61.
- 227 11. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry Disability Index. *Spine.* 2000 Nov 15;25:2940-52.
- 228 12. Haer TR, Gorup JM, Shin TM, Homel P, Merola AA, Grogan DP, Pugh L, Lowe TG, Murray
229 M. Results of the Scoliosis Research Society instrument for evaluation of surgical outcome in
230 adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. A multicenter study of 244 patients. *Spine.* 1999 Jul
231 15;24(14):1435-40.
- 232 13. Fukui M, Chiba K, Kawakami M, Kikuchi S, Konno S, Miyamoto M, Seichi A, Shimamura T,
233 Shirado O, Taguchi T, Takahashi K, Takeshita K, Tani T, Toyama Y, Yonenobu K, Wada E,
234 Tanaka T, Hirota Y. Japanese Orthopaedic Association back pain evaluation questionnaire. Part
235 2. Verification of its reliability. *J Orthop Sci.* 2007 Nov 1;12(6):526-32.
- 236 14. Yoshida G, Boissiere L, Larrieu D, Bourghli A, Vital JM, Gille O, Pointillart V, Challier
237 V, Mariey R, Pellisé F, Vila-Casademunt A, Perez-Gruoso FJ, Alanay A, Acaroglu

- 238 E, Kleinstück F, Obeid I; ESSG, European Spine Study Group. Advantages and disadvantages
239 of adult spinal deformity surgery and its impact on health-related quality of life. *Spine*. 2017 Mar
240 15;42(6):411-9.
- 241 15. Sciubba DM, Scheer JK, Smith JS, Lafage V, Klineberg E, Gupta M, Mundis GM, Protopsaltis
242 TS, Kim HJ, Hiratzka JR, Koski T, Shaffrey CI, Bess S, Hart RA, Ames CP. Which daily
243 functions are most affected by stiffness following total lumbar fusion: comparison of upper
244 thoracic and thoracolumbar proximal endpoints. *Spine*. 2015 Sep 1;40(17):1338-44.
- 245 16. Hart RA, Marshall LM, Hiratzka SL, Kane MS, Volpi J, Hiratzka JR. Functional limitations due
246 to stiffness as a collateral impact of instrumented arthrodesis of the lumbar spine. *Spine*. 2014
247 Nov 15;39(24):E1468-74.
- 248 17. Hart RA, Hiratzka J, Kane MS, Lafage V, Klineberg E, Ames CP, Line BG, Schwab F, Scheer
249 JK, Bess S, Hamilton DK, Shaffrey CI, Mundis G, Smith JS, Burton DC, Sciubba DM, Deviren
250 V, Boachie-Adjei O. International Spine Study Group. Stiffness after pan-lumbar arthrodesis for
251 adult spinal deformity does not significantly impact patient functional status or satisfaction
252 irrespective of proximal endpoint. *Spine*. 2017 Aug 1;42(15):1151-1157.
- 253 18. Bible JE, Biswas D, Miller CP, Whang PG, Grauer JN. Normal functional range of motion of the

254 lumbar spine during 15 activities of daily living. J Spinal Disord Tech. 2010 Apr 1;23(2):106-12.

255

256 **Figure Legends**

257 Figure 1. Graph showing the improvement and deterioration rates for each item related to lumbar

258 function in the Japanese Orthopaedic Association back pain evaluation questionnaire. The asterisks

259 indicate significant differences ($P < 0.05$) in McNemar's test.

260