



HAL
open science

Surgical management of lumbar spinal stenosis in patients over 80: is there an increased risk?

Frédéric Rault

► **To cite this version:**

Frédéric Rault. Surgical management of lumbar spinal stenosis in patients over 80: is there an increased risk?. Human health and pathology. 2021. dumas-03561769

HAL Id: dumas-03561769

<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-03561769>

Submitted on 8 Feb 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

UNIVERSITÉ de CAEN NORMANDIE

UFR SANTÉ

FACULTÉ de MÉDECINE

Année 2020/2021

THÈSE POUR L'OBTENTION
DU GRADE DE DOCTEUR EN MÉDECINE

Présentée et soutenue publiquement le 05 octobre 2021

par

M. RAULT Frédéric

Né le 14/09/1993 à Gisors (27)

TITRE DE LA THÈSE :

Prise en charge chirurgicale du canal lombaire étroit chez les patients de plus de 80 ans : y a-t-il un risque augmenté ?

Président : Madame le Professeur Emery Evelyne

Membres : Monsieur le Professeur Marcelli Christian

Monsieur le Professeur Gaberel Thomas

Monsieur le Docteur Kamga Hervé

Monsieur le Docteur Khouri Samih

Directeur de thèse : Pr Emery Evelyne

Année Universitaire 2020/2021**Doyen**

Professeur Emmanuel TOUZÉ

Assesseurs

Professeur Paul MILLIEZ (pédagogie)

Professeur Guy LAUNOY (recherche)

Professeur Sonia DOLLFUS & Professeur Evelyne EMERY (3^{ème} cycle)**Directrice administrative**

Madame Sarah CHEMTOB

PROFESSEURS DES UNIVERSITÉS - PRATICIENS HOSPITALIERS

M.	AGOSTINI Denis	Biophysique et médecine nucléaire
M.	AIDE Nicolas	Biophysique et médecine nucléaire
M.	ALEXANDRE Joachim	Pharmacologie clinique
M.	ALLOUCHE Stéphane	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
M.	ALVES Arnaud	Chirurgie digestive
M.	AOUBA Achille	Médecine interne
M.	BABIN Emmanuel	Oto-Rhino-Laryngologie
M.	BÉNATEAU Hervé	Chirurgie maxillo-faciale et stomatologie
M.	BENOIST Guillaume	Gynécologie - Obstétrique
M.	BERGER Ludovic	Chirurgie vasculaire
M.	BERGOT Emmanuel	Pneumologie
M.	BIBEAU Frédéric	Anatomie et cytologie pathologique
Mme	BRAZO Perrine	Psychiatrie d'adultes
M.	BROUARD Jacques	Pédiatrie
M.	BUI Thanh-huy Eric	Psychiatrie d'adultes
M.	BUSTANY Pierre	Pharmacologie
Mme	CHAPON Françoise	Histologie, Embryologie
Mme	CLIN-GODARD Bénédicte	Médecine et santé au travail
M.	DAMAJ Ghandi Laurent	Hématologie
M.	DAO Manh Thông	Hépatologie-Gastro-Entérologie
M.	DAMAJ Ghandi Laurent	Hématologie
M.	DEFER Gilles	Neurologie
M.	DELAMILLIEURE Pascal	Psychiatrie d'adultes
M.	DENISE Pierre	Physiologie
Mme	DOLLFUS Sonia	Psychiatrie d'adultes

Mme DOMPMARTIN-BLANCHÈRE Anne	Dermatologie
M. DREYFUS Michel	Gynécologie - Obstétrique
M. DU CHEYRON Damien	Réanimation médicale
Mme ÉMERY Evelyne	Neurochirurgie
M. ESMAIL-BEYGUI Farzin	Cardiologie
Mme FAUVET Raffaèle	Gynécologie – Obstétrique
M. FISCHER Marc-Olivier	Anesthésiologie et réanimation
M. GÉRARD Jean-Louis	Anesthésiologie et réanimation
M. GUÉNOLÉ Fabian	Pédopsychiatrie
Mme GUITTET-BAUD Lydia	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
M. HAMON Martial	Cardiologie
Mme HAMON Michèle	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
M. HANOUS Jean-Luc	Anesthésie et réa. médecine péri-opératoire
M. HITIER Martin	Anatomie –ORL Chirurgie Cervico-faciale
M. HULET Christophe	Chirurgie orthopédique et traumatologique
M. ICARD Philippe	Chirurgie thoracique et cardio-vasculaire
M. JOIN-LAMBERT Olivier	Bactériologie - Virologie
Mme JOLY-LOBBEDEZ Florence	Cancérologie
M. JOUBERT Michael	Endocrinologie
M. LAUNOY Guy	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
M. LE HELLO Simon	Bactériologie-Virologie
Mme LE MAUFF Brigitte	Immunologie
M. LOBBEDEZ Thierry	Néphrologie
M. LUBRANO Jean	Chirurgie viscérale et digestive
M. MAHE Marc-André	Cancérologie
M. MANRIQUE Alain	Biophysique et médecine nucléaire
M. MARCÉLLI Christian	Rhumatologie
M. MARTINAUD Olivier	Neurologie
M. MAUREL Jean	Chirurgie générale
M. MILLIEZ Paul	Cardiologie
M. MOREAU Sylvain	Anatomie/Oto-Rhino-Laryngologie
M. MOUTEL Grégoire	Médecine légale et droit de la santé
M. NORMAND Hervé	Physiologie
M. PARIENTI Jean-Jacques	Biostatistiques, info. médicale et tech. de communication

M. PELAGE Jean-Pierre	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
Mme PIQUET Marie-Astrid	Nutrition
M. QUINTYN Jean-Claude	Ophtalmologie
Mme RAT Anne-Christine	Rhumatologie
M. REPESE Yohann	Hématologie
M. REZNIK Yves	Endocrinologie
M. ROD Julien	Chirurgie infantile
M. ROUPIE Eric	Médecine d'urgence
Mme THARIAT Juliette	Radiothérapie
M. TILLOU Xavier	Urologie
M. TOUZÉ Emmanuel	Neurologie
Mme VABRET Astrid	Bactériologie - Virologie
M. VERDON Renaud	Maladies infectieuses
Mme VERNEUIL Laurence	Dermatologie
M. VIVIEN Denis	Biologie cellulaire

PROFESSEURS ASSOCIÉS DES UNIVERSITÉS A MI-TEMPS

Mme BELLOT Anne	Pédiatrie
M. DE LA SAYETTE Vincent	Neurologie
M. GUILLAUME Cyril	Médecine palliative
M. LE BAS François	Médecine Générale
M. SABATIER Rémi	Cardiologie

PRCE

Mme LELEU Solveig	Anglais
-------------------	---------

PROFESSEURS ÉMÉRITES

M. DERLON Jean-Michel	Neurochirurgie
M. GUILLOIS Bernard	Pédiatrie
M. HABRAND Jean-Louis	Cancérologie option Radiothérapie
M. HURAUULT de LIGNY Bruno	Néphrologie
Mme KOTTLER Marie-Laure	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
M. LE COUTOUR Xavier	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
M. LEPORRIER Michel	Hématologie
M. RAVASSE Philippe	Chirurgie infantile

M. TROUSSARD Xavier

Hématologie

M. VIADER Fausto

Neurologie

Année Universitaire 2020/2021**Doyen**

Professeur Emmanuel TOUZÉ

Assesseurs

Professeur Paul MILLIEZ (pédagogie)

Professeur Guy LAUNOY (recherche)

Professeur Sonia DOLLFUS & Professeur Evelyne EMERY (3^{ème} cycle)**Directrice administrative**

Madame Sarah CHEMTOB

MAITRES DE CONFERENCES DES UNIVERSITÉS - PRATICIENS HOSPITALIERS

Mme BENHAÏM Annie	Biologie cellulaire
M. BESNARD Stéphane	Physiologie
Mme BONHOMME Julie	Parasitologie et mycologie
M. BOUVIER Nicolas	Néphrologie
M. BROSSIER David	Pédiatrie
M. COULBAULT Laurent	Biochimie et Biologie moléculaire
M. CREVEUIL Christian	Biostatistiques, info. médicale et tech. de communication
M. DE BOYSSON Hubert	Médecine interne
Mme DINA Julia	Bactériologie - Virologie
Mme DUPONT Claire	Pédiatrie
M. ÉTARD Olivier	Physiologie
M. GABEREL Thomas	Neurochirurgie
M. GRUCHY Nicolas	Génétique
M. ISNARD Christophe	Bactériologie Virologie
M. JUSTET Aurélien	Pneumologie
Mme KRIEGER Sophie	Pharmacie
M. LEGALLOIS Damien	Cardiologie
Mme LELONG-BOULOUARD Véronique	Pharmacologie fondamentale
Mme LEVALLET Guénaëlle	Cytologie et Histologie
M. MACREZ Richard	Médecine d'urgence
M. MITTRE Hervé	Biologie cellulaire
M. MOLIN Arnaud	Génétique
M. SAINT-LORANT Guillaume	Pharmacie

M. SESBOÛÉ Bruno	Physiologie
M. TOUTIRAIS Olivier	Immunologie
M. VEYSSIERE Alexis	Chirurgie maxillo-faciale et stomatologie

MAITRE DE CONFERENCES DES UNIVERSITÉS DE MÉDECINE GÉNÉRALE

M. HUMBERT Xavier

MAITRES DE CONFERENCES ASSOCIÉS DES UNIVERSITÉS A MI-TEMPS

Mme ABBATE-LERAY Pascale	Médecine générale
M. BANSARD Mathieu	Médecine générale
M. COUETTE Pierre-André	Médecine générale
Mme NOEL DE JAEGHER Sophie	Médecine générale
M. PITHON Anni	Médecine générale
M. SAINMONT Nicolas	Médecine générale
Mme SCHONBRODT Laure	Médecine générale

MAITRES DE CONFERENCES ÉMÉRITES

Mme DEBRUYNE Danièle	Pharmacologie fondamentale
Mme DERLON-BOREL Annie	Hématologie
Mme LEPORRIER Nathalie	Génétique

A Madame le Professeur Evelyne Emery ;

A Monsieur le Professeur Christian Marcelli ;

A Monsieur le Professeur Thomas Gaberel ;

A Monsieur le Docteur Hervé Kamga ;

A Monsieur le Docteur Samih Khouri ;

C'est un honneur de vous avoir en tant que membres de mon jury de thèse.

A ma directrice de thèse, le Pr Evelyne Emery, qui m'a transmis sa passion de la neurochirurgie. Vous êtes un exemple par vos connaissances et votre dévouement à la spécialité. Je vous remercie de m'avoir accompagné pour ce travail.

Au Pr Christian Marcelli, fier que vous puissiez juger ce travail avec toute votre expérience. Je vous remercie d'avoir accepté de faire partie de ce jury. Le rachis dégénératif est en effet un sujet que partagent rhumatologues et neurochirurgiens.

Au Pr Thomas Gaberel, je te remercie pour ta volonté et ton implication dans le travail universitaire. Pour moi, tu es une référence au bloc opératoire et en dehors, j'ai encore beaucoup à apprendre à tes côtés.

Au Dr Hervé Kamga, merci pour ton expérience de l'anesthésie partagée au bloc opératoire. Tu es toujours enclin à faire diminuer la morbidité périopératoire, ce qui m'a motivé dans la réalisation de ce travail.

Au Dr Samih Khouri, vous m'avez énormément appris en 3 ans et demi avec gentillesse et respect. Vous m'avez accordé votre confiance au bloc opératoire. Je suis très fier d'avoir pu bénéficier de votre savoir. Merci d'avoir fait le déplacement pour juger ce travail.

Au Dr Bohra, merci pour le partage de ton expérience et tes précieux conseils au quotidien. Je serai toujours impressionné par ta technique microchirurgicale, ta gestion du stress à chaque instant et l'implication que tu mets pour chacun de tes patients.

Au Dr Di Palma, merci pour ta confiance accordée au bloc opératoire et ta gentillesse.

Au Dr Berro, toujours de bon conseil face à une IRM douteuse. Heureux d'avoir participé à tes chirurgies éveillées, toujours impressionnantes.

Au Dr Guillard, merci pour ta confiance, tu m'as grandement fait progresser en chirurgie du rachis même si je suis loin d'avoir atteint ta vitesse de croisière. Je te remercie de tes conseils avisés sur tous les dossiers de rachis.

Au Dr Ben Tebra, opérer à tes côtés est un réel plaisir par ton expérience et ta bonne humeur. Tu as toujours une oreille attentive pour discuter de tous les dossiers, merci !

Au Dr Metayer, mon premier binôme au Chu de Caen. Merci pour tous les moments passés à échanger de tout et de rien. On continuera à aller au labo d'anatomie et à se retrouver au bloc.

A mes co-internes neurochirurgiens : Paul, Laura, Arthur, Joséphine et Louis, merci pour ces 4 années.

Aux co-internes neurochirurgiens FFI : à Daouda pour les premières DVE, à Henri un ami que je n'oublierai pas et avec qui j'ai passé une super année, à Hugues le Professeur, à Didier qui m'a beaucoup appris, au Dr Benghalia le pro du rachis, à Stachys le footballeur.

A tous les internes d'ORL avec qui j'ai eu la chance de partager un semestre. Au Pr Babin, vous êtes un modèle pour la formation des internes, vos conseils avisés m'ont beaucoup aidé. Au Dr Patron le maître de la « skull base », merci de m'avoir initié à la chirurgie endonasale avec exigence. Au Pr Hitier : merci pour ces 6 mois dans votre service où j'ai pu voir la chirurgie des neurinomes.

Aux autres internes qui sont venus dans le service : aux rouennais Alice, Elisabeth et Anissa, à Pierre-Louis mon ami CMF, Benoit et Renaud.

A ces 4 mois d'interne « junior » passés dans le service du Pr Derrey à Rouen qui m'ont donné envie de me lancer dans cette spécialité.

A toute l'équipe du bloc 12, la bonne humeur qui règne dans ce bloc est inestimable.

A toutes les infirmières et aide soignantes du 12 et du 11/29 pour leur dynamisme et gentillesse.

A mes amis, à Bhavani avec qui nous avons traversé ensemble ces années d'études. A Guillaume, se retrouver est toujours un plaisir. A Lazare et Alexis pour les randonnées qui m'ont permis de m'évader. A Bastien, qui apporte sa bonne humeur. A la musique que nous referons un jour avec Alexis, Charles, Tibo, Baptiste. Aux instants partagés avec Marie et Adrien.

A ma famille, à qui je dois tout. A ma mère dont le soutien est sans faille, à mon père dont le courage et la détermination sont un exemple et un moteur pour moi, à mon énergique sœur et à mon frère pour qui je souhaite le meilleur et que j'aime.

A Domitille,

Merci pour la relecture de cette thèse,

Merci de m'avoir soutenu à chaque instant pendant ces quatre années,

Merci de continuer à m'apporter ta volonté,

Merci pour ton amour et ta tendresse,

A nous deux, pour toujours.

Abbreviations

ASA : American Society of Anaesthesiologists

BMI : Body mass index

CCI : Charlson comorbidity index

CSF : Cerebrospinal fluid

CKD : Chronic kidney disease

DS : Degenerative spondylolisthesis

ERAS : Enhanced recovery after surgery

IF: Interbody fusion

INSEE : French national institute for statistics and economic studies

IQR : Interquartile range

LSS : Lumbar spinal stenosis

LOS : Length of stay

PA : Posterolateral arthrodesis

PE : Pulmonary embolism

SC : Severe complications

STD : Standard deviation

SFAR : French Society of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care

Tables and figures

Figures

1. Flow chart

Tables

1. Comorbidities
2. Comparison of surgical characteristics
3. Comparison of complications
4. Relationship between two groups and severe complications
5. Risk factors of severe complications

CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Introduction	2
Methods	3
Results	6
Discussion	12
Conclusion	21
References	22
Appendices	27

Abstract:

Background: The management of Lumbar Spinal Stenosis (LSS) represents the first cause of spinal surgery for the elderly and will increase with the aging population. Although the surgery improves quality of life, the procedure involves anaesthetic and operative risks. The aim of this study was to assess whether the postoperative complications rate was higher for elderly patients and to find confounding factors.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective study including all LSS surgeries between 2012 and 2020 at the University Hospital of Caen. We compared two populations opposing patients aged over 80 with others. The primary endpoint was the occurrence of a severe complication (SC) within 30 days after the surgery. The occurrence of a minor complication was the secondary endpoint. Comorbidities, history of lumbar spine surgery and surgical characteristics were recorded.

Results: A total of 996 patients undergoing surgery for degenerative LSS was identified. Patients over 80 years were significantly affected by additional comorbidities: high blood pressure, heart diseases, higher age adjusted CCI, ASA score and use of anticoagulants ($p < 0.001$). Knee-chest position was preferred for younger patients (76% vs 57%, $p < 0.001$). Older patients underwent a more extensive decompression and had more incidental durotomies ($p < 0.001$). 5.2% of patients presented SC in the cohort. Using the propensity score, age over 80 did not appear to be a significant risk factor for SC (6.9% vs 4.8%, $p = 0.797$), but the rate of minor complications increased ($p < 0.001$). Multivariate analysis showed that heart diseases ($p = 0.03$), history of laminectomy ($p = 0.05$), age adjusted CCI ($p < 0.001$), and accidental durotomies ($p = 0.002$) were independent risk factors for SC.

Conclusion: Surgical management for lumbar spinal stenosis is not associated to a higher rate of severe complications for patients over the age of 80. However, preoperative risk factors should be investigated to warn the elderly patients that the complications risk is increased.

Background

Demographic evolution in Normandy

Neurosurgical practice will naturally evolve with the demographic changes. Indeed, an aging population has been observed for several years in France. In 2020, the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) reported an increasing number of people aged over 65 years old: 15% in 2000 compared to 20% in 2020(1). This social trend is more pronounced in Normandy, a northwest region of France, where an increasing number of retirees lives. By 2050, the INSEE forecasts an inflation for the seniors of 37% and of 127% for the over 80s in Normandy(2), while the number of dependent persons will increase by 50%(3). Consequently, geriatric pathologies will represent most of the neurosurgical activity.

LSS: a usual pathology for Neurosurgeons

LSS is defined by the North American Spine Society (NASS) as “the narrowing of the vacant space for the roots of the equina cauda and their vessels in the lumbar spine due to degenerative processes”(4). Neurologic claudication in the legs exacerbated when walking and decreased when sitting is a typical symptom of LSS(6). This condition affects 8-23% of patients suffering from low back pain(5) and is the number one spinal surgery in the US for seniors(6). In France, LSS accounted for 24737 hospitalizations in 2019 and is a frequent cause of consultation(7). The lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) remains a classic geriatric condition leading to dependency and weakness in the elderly(8)(9)(11).

The balance risk/benefit

The surgery offers an advantage over nonsurgical management for selected individuals suffering from LSS and disabling symptoms(10). The surgical technique is based on posterior decompression of the lumbar canal with a laminectomy and a bilateral foraminotomy with or without fusion.

However, patient's age and comorbidities may impact the invasiveness of the surgery and affect the risk-benefice balance. Many studies have attempted to assess the potential increased risk for older patients, but their results were different(12)(13). The aim of our study was to find out whether patients over 80 years have an increased risk of developing postoperative complications and to identify risk factors.

Methods

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We conducted a single-centre retrospective study at the University Hospital of Caen in the neurosurgical unit.

All patients admitted for a planned surgery of LSS between 2012 and 2020 were included. We used the surgical planning software to include patients according to precise surgical criteria (classical lumbar laminectomy with foraminotomy, segmental arthrodesis no more than one level, mini-invasive decompression surgery with interspinous device or unilateral foraminotomy). It was decided to exclude aggressive surgical procedures such as: scoliosis correction, interbody fusion and posterolateral arthrodesis affected at least two-level. The study obtained the consent of the ethic committee of the French College of Neurosurgery (showed in appendices).

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the occurrence of severe complications within the 30 days following the surgery.

A severe complication was defined as death, intensive-care unit hospitalization, reoperation, severe organ failure or severe medical complications. The secondary outcome was the occurrence of minor complications, including sepsis, thrombosis without PE, transfusions, urinary retentions, or abdominal occlusions, and rehospitalizations within the 30 days after discharge.

Variables

We retrospectively recorded patient characteristics from the medical records. We reported:

- Demographic data: age, sex
- Body mass index (BMI)
- Comorbidities described during the pre-anaesthetic consultation: diabetes mellitus, high blood pressure, heart diseases (valvulopathy, arrhythmia, myocardial infarction or angina pectoris, hypertrophic heart disease, heart transplantation and congestive heart failure), breathing disorders (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, severe asthma, severe sleep apnea) and chronic kidney disease
- Medication: anticoagulants and platelet antiaggregants
- ASA score and age-adjusted Charlson Comorbidity index (CCI)(14). The CCI is widely used in the spine literature to evaluate postoperative risk in relation to comorbidities(15).
- Medical history of lumbar spinal surgery
- Presence of scoliosis or degenerative spondylolisthesis (DS)
- Surgical procedures: position, length of the surgery, number of decompressed levels, technique, use of a drain in the surgical site, and incidental durotomy.

Statistical analysis

The baseline characteristics were described by the mean (std) or the median (IQR) for quantitative variables according to their distribution and by the number (frequency) for qualitative variables. The two groups were independent. The comparisons of these variables between the age groups were performed using the Student's t-test or the Mann-Whitney test for quantitative variables giving to their normal distribution or not. We performed the Chi² test or the Exact Fisher test for qualitative variables. To identify potential risk factors of severe complications up to 30 days, univariate analyses were performed using logistic regression. All significant variables associated with serious complications on univariate analysis ($p < 0.05$) were considered for inclusion in the multivariate logistic regression analysis. We explored collinearity among these potential risk factors by

calculating the variance inflation factor (VIF), with a value above 5 indicating collinearity. We followed a backward procedure among qualified variables for selecting independent risk factors associated with severe complications, with the threshold of $p < 0.10$ to stay in the model. Only our variable of interest, the age group, was included in every model. The minor complications and the length of hospitalisation were compared between the age groups using the Chi² test and the Mann-Whitney test, respectively.

A sensitivity analysis was performed using the propensity score matching method to take into account the potential channelling bias on the endpoints. We modelled the probability of being ≥ 80 years old implementing a non-parsimonious logistic regression including the following variables: sex, BMI, diabetes, high blood pressure, heart diseases, anticoagulants, platelet antiaggregants, breathing disorders, chronic kidney diseases, Charlson comorbidity index, ASA Score, history of lumbar surgery, herniated disc, spondylolisthesis, scoliosis, operative position, time, number of operating levels, L4L5, L3L4, L2L3, L1L2, laminectomy, foraminotomy, arthrodesis, interspinous spacer, durotomies, sutured, patch of fat to overcome the gap, organic glue, setting up a drain in suction (Showing in the appendices: Odds Ratios with 95% Wald Confidence Limits). We performed a one-to-one procedure (macro ONETOMANY) to match age groups based on their propensity score. Next, we analysed this paired population adopting the generalized linear model with the binomial distribution. Baseline characteristics were compared between groups before and after the matching procedure exploiting the standardized average differences.

All analyses were conducted in the thorough case analysis. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered significant; all p values were two-tailed. Statistical analysis was performed with SAS software V9.4 (SAS institute, NC, Cary) and R software, version 4.0.5 (the R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

Results

Cohort

From 2012 to 2020, we included 1409 surgical procedures for lumbar spine stenosis in the neurosurgical unit of the University Hospital of Caen and 413 patients were excluded (figure 1). The mean age was 71.2 years. The over 80s represented 20.4% of patients. The youngest patient was 38 years old and the oldest was 99. Considering the sex ratio, 53.2% of the patients were women. The oldest age group contained significantly more women (61% vs 51% $p=0.019$, Table 1).




Figure 1 : Flowchart

IF, interbody fusion; PA, posterolateral arthrodesis

Comorbidities

The mean BMI was 28.4kg/m² (+/-5.12) and the elderly had on average a significantly lower BMI (27.2kg/m² vs 28.7kg/m², $p<0.001$). High blood pressure was the main comorbidity for 60% of the patients and the elderly were more affected. Patients over 80 years of age presented significantly more heart diseases and use of anticoagulants. Age adjusted CCI and ASA score were higher for these patients. The rate of diabetes was 17.8% and this disease mainly affected the youngest patients, but no statistical difference was found as for breathing disorders and CKD (see Table 1).

Comorbidities	< 80 (n=793)	≥ 80 (n=203)	P
BMI (kg/m ²), mean ± SD	28.7 ± 5.1	27.2 ± 5.0	<0.001
Female, n (%)	407 (51)	123 (61)	0.019
Diabetes, n (%)	146 (18)	31 (15)	0.310
High blood pressure, n (%)	446 (56)	141 (69)	<0.001
Heart disease, n (%)	179 (23)	78 (39)	<0.001
Anticoagulant, n (%)	50 (6)	33 (16)	<0.001
Platelet Antiaggregant, n (%)	227 (29)	68 (34)	0.169
Breathing disorder, n (%)	104 (13)	19 (9)	0.147
CKD, n (%)	29 (4)	10 (5)	0.408
Age Adjusted Charlson comorbidity index, median (IQR)	3 (2 - 4)	4 (4- 5)	<0.001
ASA Score, median (IQR)	2 (2- 3)	3 (2 - 3)	<0.001

Table 1: Comorbidities

BMI, body mass index; CKD, chronic kidney disease; IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation. p-value obtained by chi² or Fischer's exact test for qualitative variables, and by Student's t test or Mann-Whitney test if the distribution does not follow a normal distribution, for quantitative variables.

Surgical characteristics (table 2)

A history of lumbar spinal surgery was present in 13.8% of cases with no difference between the two classes studied. Regarding the morphology of the lumbar spine, 23.2% of the patients were affected by a degenerative spondylolisthesis DS and 9,7% by a degenerative scoliosis in the entire cohort. The rate of scoliosis was higher in the elderly whereas the rate of DS was equivalent.

In most cases (72%), patients were positioned in knee-chest. This position was more used in younger patients and the prone position was predominant in the elderly (43% vs 24%, p<0.001).

63.5% of patients underwent laminectomy with bilateral foraminotomy without fusion as a decompression technique. This technique was more commonly realized in older patients (81% vs 59%, p<0.001). The most decompressed level was L4L5. The number of decompressed levels was higher in the elderly group (p<0.001). We found a statistical difference for the levels L4L5, L3L4,

L2L3, and L1L2, which were more decompressed in the elderly group. Posterolateral arthrodesis

was performed in 22.2% of cases, mainly in young subjects (24% vs 16%, p=0.02) as the use of

interspinous devices (11% vs 1%, p<0.001). Regarding the duration of surgery, it was similar

between two groups. The rate of durotomies was higher in the elderly group. We found a rate of

17.3% in the entire cohort. Durotomies were treated with sutures in 53.2% of leakages, 60.7% with

fat graft and 70.5% with biologic glue. In most cases, surgeons used drains (93.8%). Finally, the average LOS was 5.8 days, and the elderly patients had a longer LOS showed by the median LOS (6 days vs 5 days, $p < 0.001$; table 3).

Surgical characteristics	< 80 (n=793)	≥ 80 (n=203)	p
History of lumbar spinal surgery	114 (14)	23 (11)	0.256
Disc herniation, n (%)	61 (8)	9 (4)	0.106
Laminectomy, n (%)	34 (4)	8 (4)	0.827
Interepinous spacer, n (%)	10 (1)	0 (0)	0.228
Arthrodesis, n (%)	21 (3)	7 (3)	0.524
Foraminotomy, n (%)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	1.000
Radiological characteristics			
Spondylosthesis, n (%)	178 (22)	53 (26)	0.270
Scoliosis, n (%)	70 (9)	27 (13)	0.056
Position, n (%)			
Ventral (0)	188 (24)	86 (43)	<0.001
Knee-chest (1)	601 (76)	116 (57)	
Length (min), median (IQR)	82 (63 - 107)	84 (70 - 113)	0.071
Level			
Number, médiane (IQR)	1 (1 - 2)	2 (1 - 2)	<0.001
L5S1, n (%)	40 (5)	11 (5)	0.832
L4L5, n (%)	615 (78)	174 (86)	0.011
L3L4, n (%)	424 (53)	135 (67)	<0.001
L2L3, n (%)	115 (15)	41 (20)	0.048
L1L2, n (%)	8 (1)	7 (3)	0.020
Procedure			
Laminectomy, n (%)	467 (59)	165 (81)	<0.001
Discectomy, n (%)	22 (3)	4 (2)	0.630
Foraminotomy, n (%)	32 (4)	4 (2)	0.207
Arthrodesis, n (%)	189 (24)	33 (16)	0.020
Interspinous spacer, n (%)	91 (11)	2 (1)	<0.001
Durotomy	125 (16)	48 (24)	0.008
Sutured, n (%)	67 (8)	25 (13)	0.079
Fat graft, n (%)	79 (10)	26 (13)	0.223
Biologic glue, n (%)	91 (12)	31 (15)	0.131
Use of drain	737 (94)	192 (96)	0.207
Drain in suction, n (%)	631 (80)	152 (76)	0.156

Table 2: Comparison of surgical characteristics

p-value obtained by χ^2 or Fischer's exact test for qualitative variables and by Student's t test, or Mann-Whitney test if the distribution does not follow a normal distribution, for quantitative variables.

Complications between the two groups (table 3)

In our study, 52 severe complications were reported representing 5.2% of cases. Two patients aged of 77 and 79 years old died within thirty days after surgery. Three cases were admitted to ICU.

Regarding the surgical procedure, 3.6% of patients underwent revision, and the main cause was a postoperative epidural hematoma. Among the 222 patients who had a segmental fusion, 3.6% had revisions for symptomatic pedicle screws malposition. Removal of drains was impossible for the nurses and required revision for two patients.

Regarding the medical management, 14 patients suffered from severe medical complications. We described two anaphylactic shocks, one severe pneumopathy with death, three hypovolemic shocks, two myocardial infarctions, one pulmonary embolism, one congestive heart failure, one acute respiratory failure due to Covid infection, one acute ischemic stroke with aphasia, one acute tubular necrosis and one cerebellar haemorrhage. Regarding minor events, 8% of patients had minor complications after surgery: sepsis was the main complication for 3% of cases. 0.9% of patients had a transfusion in postoperative period. 2.6% of patients were readmitted within 30 days of surgery.

Outcomes	All (n=996)	< 80ans (n=793)	≥ 80 ans (n=203)	P
Severe complications, n (%)	52 (5.2)	38 (4.8)	14 (6.9)	0.229
Death	2 (0.2)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	
ICU admission	3 (0.3)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.5)	
Revision surgery	36 (3.6)	29 (3.7)	7 (3.5)	
Malposition of screws	8 (0.8)	7 (0.9)	1 (0.5)	
Wound infection	10 (1.0)	9 (1.1)	1 (0.5)	
Epidural hematoma	17 (1.7)	12 (1.5)	5 (2.5)	
Trapped drain	2 (0.2)	0 (0)	2(0.1)	
CSF leakage (sutured, fat graft, biologic glue)	6 (0.6)	6 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	
Severe medical complications	14 (1.4)	7 (0.9)	7 (3.5)	
Minor complications n (%)	80 (8.0)	51 (6.4)	29 (14.3)	<0.001
Phlebitis	3 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (1.5)	
Sepsis	30 (3.0)	23 (2.9)	7 (3.5)	
Abdominal occlusion and urine retention	25 (2.5)	13 (1.6)	12 (5.9)	
Transfusion	9 (0.9)	4 (0.5)	5 (2.5)	
CSF leakage without surgery	3 (0.3)	3 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	
Fracture	2 (0.2)	2 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	
Confusion	2 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.5)	
Readmission	26 (2.6)	22 (2.8)	4 (2.0)	
Length of stay (days), median (IQR)	5 (4 - 7)	5 (4 - 6)	6 (4 - 9)	<0.001

Table 3: Comparison of complications

ICU, intensive care unit; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid

p-value obtained by χ^2 or Fischer's exact test for qualitative variables and by Student's t test, or Mann-Whitney test if the distribution does not follow a normal distribution, for quantitative variables.

Risk factors of complications

An age over 80 did not appear to be a risk factor for SC because the difference between two classes was not significant in the multivariate analysis and with propensity score matching (table 4). However, age was identified as a risk factor in the univariate analysis (table 5). In addition, the rate of minor complications increased for the elderly: we noted more phlebitis, sepsis, abdominal obstructions and urinary retentions, and transfusions.

The length of stay was extended for the elderly, but the rate of readmissions was relatively similar between the two groups.

Risk factors for severe complications	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysis (n=978)			Propensity score matching (n=270)			
	OR	95%IC	p*	OR	95%IC	p**	OR	95%IC	p***	
Age class										
	<80	1		1			1			
	≥80	1.47	[0.78-2.77]	0.232	0.82	[0.40-1.66]	0.573	1.15	[0.39-3.37]	0.797

Table 4: Relationship between two groups and severe complications

* *p-value obtained by univariate logistic regression*

** *p-value obtained by multivariate logistic regression with stepwise downward selection and holding condition in the model fixed at 0.10 except for the variable of interest (age class) which was fixed in the model.*

*** *p-value obtained by generalized linear model with a binomial distribution and taking into account the matching*

Regarding gender differences, we described that woman had more complications, but we did not find any statistically difference. Concerning the comorbidities, the presence of heart disease, breathing disorders, and platelet antiaggregants increased the risk of developing a SC. Anticoagulants and CKD did not appear to be risk factors. A higher ASA score and an age adjusted CCI were strongly associated with the development of SC. Even though these scores were higher in older patients, the age-adjusted CCI was an independent risk factor of the postoperative complication with a p-value significant in the multivariate analysis.

Scoliosis and a history of laminectomy was associated with increased postoperative complications. For the surgical features, the knee-chest position and a quick procedure seemed to decrease the risk of SC. We did not find any difference in SC related to the surgical procedure. The intraoperative

durotomy was a high-risk factor for SC with a p-value of 0.002. At the opposite the use of drains in suction prevented the occurrence of severe complications.

Baseline characteristics	n	Severe complication within 30 days	No complications within 30 days	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysis		
				OR	95%IC	p*	OR	95%IC	p**
Age, mean ± SD	996	73.9 ± 7.1	71.0 ± 10.0	1.03	[1.00 - 1.07]	0.043			
Age class, n(%)									
	< 80	38 (73)	752 (80)	1			1		
	≥ 80	14 (27)	189 (20)	1.47	[0.78 - 2.77]	0.232	0.82	[1.07 - 1.66]	0.573
Female, n(%)	996	30 (58)	500 (53)	1.21	[0.69 - 2.13]	0.507			
BMI (kg/m ²), mean ± SD	957	28.9 ± 4.7	28.4 ± 5.1	1.02	[0.96 - 1.08]	0.487			
Comorbidities									
Diabetes, n(%)	995	12 (23)	165 (18)	1.41	[0.73 - 2.76]	0.308			
High blood pressure, n(%)	993	36 (69)	550 (58)	1.60	[0.87 - 2.92]	0.127			
Heart diseases, n(%)	995	24 (46)	233 (25)	2.61	[1.48 - 4.60]	<0.001	2.02	[1.07 - 3.81]	0.031
Anticoagulant, n(%)	994	5 (10)	78 (8)	1.18	[0.46 - 3.05]	0.735			
Platelet antiaggregant, n(%)	993	24 (46)	271 (29)	2.12	[1.21 - 3.72]	0.009	-	-	-
Breathing disorder, n(%)	996	11 (21)	112 (12)	1.99	[1.00 - 3.99]	0.052	-	-	-
Chronic kidney disease, n(%)	995	1 (2)	38 (4)	0.47	[0.06 - 3.47]	0.457			
Age adjusted Charlson Comorbidity index, median (IQR)	996	4 (3-5)	3 (2-4)	1.31	[1.12 - 1.53]	<0.001	1.23	[1.02 - 1.49]	0.029
Score ASA, median (IQR)	974	3 (2-3)	2 (2-3)	1.96	[1.21 - 3.15]	0.006			
History of lumbar spinal surgery	994	11 (21)	126 (13)	1.74	[0.87 - 3.47]	0.118			
Disc herniation, n(%)	996	5 (10)	65 (7)	1.44	[0.55 - 3.74]	0.456			
Laminectomy, n(%)	996	6 (12)	36 (4)	3.29	[1.32 - 8.20]	0.011	2.62	[1.00 - 6.86]	0.050
Interspinous device, n(%)	996	0 (0)	10 (1)		<i>Not applicable</i>				
Arthrodesis, n(%)	994	2 (4)	26 (3)	1.41	[0.33 - 6.11]	0.647			
Foraminotomy, n(%)	996	0 (0)	2 (<1)		<i>Not applicable</i>				
Morphology of the spine									
Spondylolisthesis, n(%)	996	12 (23)	219 (23)	0.99	[0.51 - 1.93]	0.984			
Scoliosis, n(%)	996	9 (17)	88 (9)	2.04	[0.96 - 4.32]	0.064			
Surgery									
Position opératoire, n(%)									
	Prone (0)	20 (39)	254 (27)	1					
	Knee-chest (1)	31 (61)	686 (73)	0.57	[0.32 - 1.03]	0.061			
Duration (minutes), mean ± SD	983	96.0 ± 39.3	88.6 ± 35.3	1.01	[1.00 - 1.01]	0.159			
Level									
Number, median (IQR)	994	1 (1-2)	1 (1-2)	1.12	[0.75 - 1.66]	0.591			
L5S1, n(%)	995	0 (0)	51 (5)		<i>Not applicable</i>				
L4L5, n(%)	996	38 (73)	751 (80)	0.70	[0.37 - 1.31]	0.265			
L3L4, n(%)	995	30 (58)	529 (56)	1.07	[0.61 - 1.88]	0.822			
L2L3, n(%)	995	16 (31)	140 (15)	2.55	[1.38 - 4.72]	0.003	2.31	[1.22 - 4.39]	0.011
L1L2, n(%)	995	3 (6)	12 (1)	4.75	[1.30 - 17.38]	0.019	-	-	-
Procedure									
Laminectomy, n(%)	991	35 (69)	597 (64)	1.26	[0.69 - 2.30]	0.460			
Discectomy, n(%)	994	2 (4)	24 (3)	1.53	[0.35 - 6.66]	0.571			
Foraminotomy, n(%)	995	0 (0)	36 (4)		<i>Not applicable</i>				
Arthrodesis, n(%)	994	14 (27)	208 (22)	1.30	[0.69 - 2.45]	0.416			
Interspinous device, n(%)	994	2 (4)	91 (10)	0.38	[0.09 - 1.60]	0.188			
Durotomy	989	18 (35)	155 (17)	2.67	[1.47 - 4.85]	0.002	2.81	[1.51 - 5.23]	0.002
Sutured, n(%)	987	9 (17)	83 (9)	2.15	[1.01 - 4.56]	0.047			
Fat graft, n(%)	988	15 (29)	90 (10)	3.81	[2.01 - 7.21]	<0.001			
Biologic glue, n(%)	987	12 (23)	110 (12)	2.25	[1.15 - 4.42]	0.019			
Drains	987	48 (92)	881 (94)	0.73	[0.26 - 2.11]	0.568			
In aspiration, n(%)	988	31 (60)	752 (80)	0.36	[0.20 - 0.64]	<0.001			

Table 5: Risk factor of severe complications

BMI, body mass index; CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index, * p-value obtained by univariate logistic regression, ** p-value obtained by multivariate logistic regression with stepwise downward selection and holding condition in the model fixed at 0.10 except for the variable of interest (age class) which was fixed in the model.

Discussion

Complications in elderly patients

We found a 6.9% risk of SC within 30 days following LSS surgery for patients over 80. For patients over 80s undergone LSS surgery, the complications rate is variable in the literature, according to the definition of a SC. Saleh et al(16) did a retrospective study in US based on national data with 2320 patients over 80 years of age. They found a lower risk of severe complications of 3.23%. However, they did not include revisions as severe complications. Their SC corresponded to our severe medical complications with a similar rate: 3.5%. Contrary to this study, we believe that a surgery revision should be considered as a severe complication. Another French study by Balabaud et al(17) showed a 13% rate of SC: they counted a higher epidural hematomas and wound infections rate of 3.3% and 4% (against 2.5% and 0.5% respectively for us). Their definition of severe medical complications was larger including new-onset cardiac arrhythmia and SIADH. Wang et al(18) made a same study with 26 patients over 85 years. Their complication rate was higher: 7.6% of SC. These observations continue to raise the question of the relationship between age and complications.

In our study, **we showed that the risk of SC was not increased after surgical management of LSS in patients older than 80.** To compare Giannadakis et al(13) using the same design that us, showed that an age over 80 was not associated with increased complications. Murphy et al(12) made the same observation in a US national cohort of 8,744 patients divided into four classes: <65, 65-75, 75-85, >85YO. They showed an increased complication rate for patients over 65 years of age. Dividing the cohort into several classes was interesting, nevertheless 58% of patients were under 65 years while the LSS mainly involved older people. Thus, our main question was to know whether in a group of seniors, the oldest patients were more likely to have complications. We also included patients under 65, but they represented only 25%. Li et al(19) published in 2008 the largest study on this topic with 471,215 patients. They found a direct association between the occurrence of

complications and an age above 65. More interestingly, they showed an excess risk for people over 85 to develop a complication after a decompression of the lumbar spine.

Regarding complications in our cohort, the death rate was 0.2%, but no patient died in the older group. Studies with young patients like the studies of Li et al(19) and Murphy (12) found a similar death rate. Studies including only elderly patients found a higher number: Gerhardt et al(20) reached a death rate of 0.8% while Saleh(16) found a rate of 0.4%. In our cohort, a 77-year-old patient with high CCI score of 9 died on the 14th day after surgery from nosocomial pneumopathy. This patient had multimetastatic lung cancer with a grave prognosis. With distance and hindsight, we believe that in this case, the medical history of cancer should have been taken into account for the indication of surgery. The other patient aged 79 died of a remote cerebellar hemorrhage. This is a rare complication of CSF leakage with a poor outcome rate of 57% in case of intracerebellar hemorrhage(21). Our patient presented several risk factors described by Lim et al: platelet antiaggregants, use of drains and high blood pressure(22). We avoid using a drain in suction, described as a risk factor of revisions when there is a durotomy(23). Therefore, in our study, the use of drain appeared to be a protective factor for SC, explained by the absence of a durotomy for its use. In a few cases, surgeons still decide to use a drain without aspiration if the durotomy is efficiently sutured, it was the case for this patient.

In addition to the two previous cases, another patient was admitted to ICU in postoperative period for hypovolemic shock within 24 hours of surgery. Kay et al(24) reported a 5.1% rate of ICU admissions after lumbar spinal surgery, more than ours: 0.3%. However, they included more aggressive procedures: the rates of fusions and length of surgery were higher. In their study, female gender, ASA grade, cardiac comorbidities, age, length of surgery and blood loss were identified as risk factors for ICU admissions. Our patient was a woman of 80 who had a heart disease with a grade of 2 for ASA score. Surgery was performed in 56 minutes, and she benefited from decompression with fusion. Although she presented risk factors, we were unable to collect the exact cause of hypovolaemic shock.

For unplanned readmissions, 2.6% of patients returned to the neurosurgical unit in our cohort. This rate is low compared to the literature: 6.39% for Saleh et al(16) with patients over 80 and 4.4% found in the Kim et al study(25). This last study showed that a high ASA score, venous thromboembolic events, re-operations in the first stay, post operative complications were risk factors. **In our cohort, the rate of readmissions was similar between the older and younger groups.** Murphy et al(12) found a higher readmission rate in older people compared to those under 65, but they did not show evidence of an increased risk after 85 years old.

Concerning the LOS, **older patients stayed longer in hospital** as reported in the literature(13)(12). Our median length of stay (five days for the youngest and six days for the oldest) could be improved with the introduction of the enhanced Recovery After Surgery: currently four days in hospital for the surgical management of LSS is our daily goal regardless of the age class.

Management of comorbidities

Beyond age, it seems that the postoperative outcome is related to several other factors. To start with the patient's comorbidities: **we noticed that patients over 80 had higher CCI and ASA score meaning more comorbidities.** To compare with the literature, the studies of Giannadakis (13) and Nanjo (26) found almost the same result (p-value at 0.09 and 0.07 respectively). In the study of Murphy et al(12), they showed an association between the increasing comorbidities and the aging excepted for high blood pressure. In our cohort, the elderly were significantly more affected by hypertension, the most frequent affection with 69% of cases. In France, hypertension is the leading cardiovascular risk factor. It increases with age and affects more than two-thirds of the population aged 65 to 75 years of age(27), consistent with our observations.

In our study, **the risk of postoperative SC was independently related to heart diseases and to the use of antiaggregants.** Cardiac assessment by the anaesthesiologist is essential before surgery. Spinal surgery is considered by the French Society of Anaesthesia and Resuscitation (SFAR) to be an intermediate risk for the heart(28). The anaesthesiologist must identify risk factors for cardiac complications and, if so, seek the advice of a cardiologist(29). The management of anticoagulants

and platelet antiaggregants must be a compromise between the risk of intraoperative blood loss or epidural hematoma and the risk of arterial thrombosis. For aspirin, the SFAR advises to perform the procedure under antiaggregants if they are necessary. However, the surgery has to be postponed if the patient has an active stent. Aspirin can be stopped in three days if used for primary prevention. The resumption of the antiaggregant should be early after surgery, usually the next day(28). **Concerning postoperative hematoma, it concerned 1.7% of patients in our cohort and the risk was non-significantly increased with an age over 80.** This subgroup analysis was undescribed in the results. Moreover, when we compared patients with or without antiaggregant and the occurrence of epidural hematoma, the risk was increased with a p-value was 0.18. These other subgroup analyses undescribed in the results would concern a future study.

These results highlight why the discontinuation of aspirin is debated. Soleman et al(30) compared the impact of aspirin in 102 patients on the postoperative complications after LSS or herniated disc surgery. They showed no significant difference between the groups. However, they found higher blood loss, lower postoperative haemoglobin, more transfusions in the Aspirin group. Comparing with other studies, the rate of epidural hematoma varies between 0 to 1%(31). Park et al(32) made a large retrospective study of 17,549 patients who underwent spinal decompression. They found a 1.15% rate of postoperative epidural hematoma. Risk factors were a high blood loss greater than 500ml, a surgical duration greater than two hours, hypertension. The use of anticoagulants increases the risk, but the result was near significant. Anticoagulants were not considered as a risk factor of SC in our study. Concerning the management of anticoagulants, the oral anticoagulant is replaced five days before surgery with heparin and we can resume the oral anticoagulant the next day to avoid thromboembolic event. Our rate of thromboembolic events was similar to the literature : 0.2% for Ginnadakis(13), 0.5% for Murphy(12), 0.4% for Li(19). In our study, the four patients concerned belonged to the elderly group. We did not perform a subgroup analysis for this risk factor although **it appears that age may be a risk factor of thromboembolic events.** This observation can be supported by Yoshioka's prospective study about thromboembolic events after degenerative spine surgery, which showed that advanced age was a risk factor(33).

Other comorbidities did not play a major role in the occurrence of SC. **Regarding diabetes, this condition was slightly increased in patients with SC.** The rate observed in the two groups was consistent to epidemiological data. Diabetes affected 20% of the population from the age of 70 in France(34). A large study based on data from the Korean National Health Insurance Service, showed that after surgery for LSS, the mortality rate was multiplied by 1.35 for diabetes patients (35). The criteria of inclusion in the Korean study are less restricted than ours: no exclusion for aggressive surgical procedures. Furthermore, the result was significant in univariate analysis, but diabetic patients had more heart disease and chronic kidney disease which could impact the rate of severe complications. **CKD did not appear as a risk factor of severe complications.** To talk to diabetes again, its management must involve the anaesthesiologist. The SFAR recommends to look for its complications, to evaluate its control, and to follow the prescription of antidiabetic drugs(36). The major risk of unbalanced diabetes is the surgical site infection(37).

Concerning the BMI for the elderly, the standards are different from those for the youth. We talk about undernutrition for patients whose BMI is under 21 and obesity when BMI is over 30. Undernutrition is a known risk for spinal infections and can multiply the risk by 2.3(38). Like in the study of Giannadakis et al(13), **the BMI was significantly lower for the elderly in our cohort, but no link with SC was noticed.** A recent Chinese study made by Kong et al(39) evaluated the impact of BMI on lumbar arthrodesis for elderly patients: they found that low BMI under 24kg/m² increased the complication rates. The preoperative nutritional evaluation is a way to minimize these risks. This topic is included in our current protocol “enhanced recovery after surgery” and was described in the literature(40). Patients are assessed by dieticians and receive nutrition therapy if necessary. The rate of serum albumin level was described in the literature to detect undernutrition: low albumin are associated with an increased risk of readmissions, mortality, length of stay, and mortality(41)(42). This data was not available. As the undernutrition, obesity also presented risks. Giannadakis et al(43) found that obesity the duration of the surgery. In addition to being a risk factor for LSS(44), it rises postoperative complications in spine surgery (45) especially for spinal infections. Beside obesity, other risk factors for wound infections have been

described in the literature: blood loss, reoperation, diabetes, duration of the surgery and length of stay at hospital(46). **Age over 80 was not found to be a risk factor of wound infection in our study.**

Regarding breathing disorders, no difference was observed between the two groups. **These diseases appeared as a risk factor for complications with a p-value close to 0.05.** Our broad definition of breathing disorders would allow us to detect a possible risk factor that was not described in the literature. To go on, this study did not evaluate the impact of smoking on SC. Giannadakis et al(13) found that the proportion of smokers was lower in the older group, but they did not find an increased risk of complications in LSS surgery. Smoking is known to be a risk factor for surgical site infections(47). It is a target of our enhanced recovery after surgery program, as described in the literature(40).

Performing the least morbid surgery ?

We have shown in our study that surgical procedures have an impact on the risk of SC. This highlights the issue of the invasiveness of the surgery. We need to propose the least risky surgery with the best benefit-risk ratio. This starts with the selection of the best operative position. In our cohort, the knee-chest position was the most used position for the management of LSS. Some compression complications, unfound in our cohort, have been described in the literature, such as blindness due to eyeball support, limb paralysis and shoulder dislocation(48). Elderly patients were less likely to be positioned in knee-chest for hemodynamic reasons. The knee-chest position decreases the cardiac ejection fraction due to lack of venous return. It theoretically affects the elderly, who are more likely to suffer from heart disease. This position can lead to hypotension during surgery, which can cause strokes and acute renal failures(49). However, this position is interesting for the surgeon: this hypotension reduces epidural blood loss during laminectomy and facilitates decompression by reducing the lordosis(50) leading to faster surgical procedures. In our cohort, **the knee-chest position seemed to have a protective effect on the occurrence of serious postoperative complications.** This topic should be further investigated in a future study.

Secondly, regarding durotomy, its rate varies in the literature between 0.5 and 18%(51). **In our study, the occurrence of a durotomy represented a strong risk factor for severe complications.** Its rate was high: 17.3%. The Swedish study of Strömquist et al(52) evaluated the risk factors for the occurrence of durotomy in 64,431 patients. They found that age and history of lumbar spinal surgery were risk factors. **In our cohort, older patients had significantly more durotomies**, as shown in the literature(13). In addition, they have undergone a significantly more extensive decompression that increases the risk to make a durotomy. Anatomically, during LSS decompression, most durotomies occur in the medial part of the joint(53), where the enlarged ligament sticks(52) especially for the elderly. Lateral durotomies can be delicate to suture, however no patient over 80 underwent a revision for CSF leakage. Another study from USA(54) with 766 patients showed a risk of durotomy of 19% in patients over 65 years old. In practice, durotomy will result in the confinement to bed of the patient for 48 hours. This bed rest can cause complications as confusion for the elderly patients. Concerning confusions, its rate was very low and we think that we had a bias of information due to a lack of data in medical records. The rate of confusion after lumbar spinal surgery is variable in the literature: 0.8-13%(39) (26) (17). Increased age was found as risk factor in a large study of 578,457 lumbar decompressions(55). Pernik et al(56) study the impact of geriatric optimization before spinal surgery on the postoperative delirium. Patients with geriatric assessment were older and had more comorbidities, but they had less delirium in postoperative time. Involving geriatricians in our care could therefore be a way to reduce minor complications for the oldest patients. Finally, Balabaud et al(17) found an association between instrumentation and the occurrence of delirium.

The question of whether an additional arthrodesis in the elderly should be performed is still being debated. We included in our study only arthrodesis with one level. The WNFS recommends a decompression alone if the patient has a predominantly radicular pain without signs of instability or with stable spondylolisthesis(57). In our cohort, the prevalence of spondylolisthesis was 23%. The prevalence of degenerative spondylolisthesis was determined in the Kalichman et al study using the Framingham cohort(58): 16% for patients over 70 and 16% for patients with low back pain.

The use of fusion depends on the preoperative evaluation on the X-ray and on the search for instability(59). Regarding grade 1 spondylolisthesis, Blumenthal et al(60) described the criteria for instability: sagittal facet joints with an angle $> 50^\circ$, a disc height greater than 6.5mm, and a mobile spondylolisthesis of more than 1.25mm on dynamic X-ray. In addition, it is recognised that arthroctomy or isthmus resection creates postoperative instability(61). In our study, these criteria were not available in all hospital records. Our philosophy on LSS and fusions is to follow guidelines while remaining as minimally invasive as possible. We have to keep in mind that fusion does not improve the functional status at two and five years and increases the blood loss and surgical costs(62). **In our study, fusions were not a risk factor to develop SC.** We reported an occurrence of symptomatic screw malposition of 3% comparing with 10% in mean in the literature(63). These results can be explained by the fact that we excluded patients with posterolateral arthrodesis more than one level. Saleh et al(16), who did not apply these criteria, found a complication rate twice as high in patients with arthrodesis. The sparing use of fusion reduces the risk of postoperative complications.

Then, the number of decompressed levels was greater in elderly subjects. Contrary to Murphy et al (12), **we did not detect the number of levels as a major complications factor.** The length of the surgery was also reported as a risk factor in their study. For Saleh et al(16), procedures lasting over 180 minutes presented an extra risk. In our cohort, only 1.8% procedures lasted over 180 minutes. Kong et al(39) reported decompression as risk factor from three levels. In our study, only 46 patients had a more than three levels extension decompression, showing our desire to be less invasive. Continuing with the use of minimally invasive surgery, 9.3% of patients underwent the installation of interspinous device, allowing correction of the hyperlordosis responsible for radicular pain. 9.3% of patients underwent this technique. However, the disadvantage of this technique is its efficiency. Indeed, the decompression may be insufficient with a reoperation rate of up to 27%(64).

Finally, a more aggressive procedure may be related to increased blood loss during the operation. The postoperative red blood cell transfusion rate was 0.9% in our study. Giannadakis et al(13) found an almost similar rate of 1.2% in their cohort. Our transfusion rate was higher in the elderly, but no

subgroup analysis was performed in this study. ASA grade, duration of surgery and multilevel fusion were known risk factors of blood transfusion in the study of Morcos et al(65) while age did not appear as a risk factor. They did not study the potential association between the operative position of the patient and transfusion. In our study, among nine transfused patients, five were positioned in prone position (55.6%). As we have seen previously, this position could potentially increase blood loss and postoperative transfusions. When we performed a subgroup analysis not described in the result section, the difference was not significant ($p=0.12$). Only one study by Rigamonti et al(66) was found in the literature. With only 30 patients undergoing microdiscectomy they compared prone vs knee-chest positions and their impact on blood loss. They reported significantly increased blood loss with knee-chest position. However, when the knee-chest position was contraindicated due to cardiac or renal or respiratory disorders, patients were excluded. Moreover, microdiscectomy frequently involved younger patients with a mean age around 50, not comparable with our cohort. To avoid post operative transfusions in lumbar spinal surgery, some authors reported the use of tranexamic acid before procedure. This drug should be used with caution in the elderly. CKD, epilepsy, venous and arterial thrombosis contraindicate its use(67). In addition, minimally invasive techniques reduces intraoperative blood loss(68). Finally, the search for preoperative anaemia may also have an impact on the transfusion rate. This is a target of our ERAS program: patients with anaemia receive an iron infusion or erythropoietin.

Limitations

We must point out some boundaries of our study. First, the retrospective design of the study may cause bias.

For statistics, the use of propensity score was very helpful to guarantee a good comparison between groups. It should be highlight that the standardized mean differences were 0.12 for an interspinous device (see table in appendix) and must keep between -0.10 and 0.10 to have good comparison. 0.12 is very close to 0.10 and we considered with statisticians that the model can still be used.

Regarding the risk factor in a geriatric population, the evaluation of frailty could be recorded.

Frailty corresponds to the reduction of physiological reserves through a multi-organ system that decreases resistance to stress(69). We can measure this parameter with Fried's criteria. The review done by Simcox et al(15) showed a link between frailty and postoperative mortality, postoperative complications, and the risk of prolonged hospitalization. Concerning the impact of heart diseases on postoperative prognosis, anaesthetic score like MET or Lee were interesting to study this link.

Conclusion

To conclude, an age over 80 does not lead to higher surgical morbidity. Multidisciplinary management with the anaesthetist, geriatricians and other specialities seems essential to avoid the occurrence of postoperative complications.

Operating on increasingly fragile patients, the neurosurgeon must warn his patients of the potential risks associated with his comorbidities, previous surgeries, and the procedure itself. Indeed, we have detected many risk factors in this study. Enhanced recovery after surgery is potentially a useful tool to prevent from complications by correcting risk factors. It would be interesting to evaluate its usefulness in elderly patients.

For the future, a prospective study could support these findings. Some risk factors should be detailed to better target the conditions in preoperative care.

References

1. Bilan démographique 2020 - Insee Première - 1834 [Internet]. [cité 14 juill 2021]. Disponible sur: https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/5012724#figure6_radio2
2. Le vieillissement démographique en Normandie à l'horizon 2050 : une forte poussée des populations dépendantes à partir de 2030 - Insee Flash Normandie - 65 [Internet]. Disponible sur: <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3574506>
3. La dépendance des personnes âgées : une projection en 2040 – Données sociales : La société française | Insee [Internet]. [cité 14 juill 2021]. Disponible sur: <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/1371933?sommaire=1372045>
4. Kreiner DS, Shaffer WO, Baisden J, Gilbert T, Summers J, Toton J, et al. Diagnosis and Treatment of Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Stenosis. :104.
5. Kalichman L, Cole R, Kim DH, Li L, Suri P, Guermazi A, et al. Spinal stenosis prevalence and association with symptoms: the Framingham Study. *Spine J.* juill 2009;9(7):545-50.
6. Deyo RA, Mirza SK, Martin BI, Kreuter W, Goodman DC, Jarvik JG. Trends, major medical complications, and charges associated with surgery for lumbar spinal stenosis in older adults. *JAMA.* 7 avr 2010;303(13):1259-65.
7. MCO par diagnostic ou acte | Stats ATIH [Internet]. Disponible sur: <https://www.scansante.fr/applications/statistiques-activite-MCO-par-diagnostique-et-actes/submit?snatnav=&snatdoc=&mbout=&annee=2019&base=deux&typt=cim&code=M4806&ok=Lancer+le+traitement&niveau=0&codh=0000000000>
8. Chad DA. Lumbar spinal stenosis. *Neurol Clin.* mai 2007;25(2):407-18.
9. Kim H-J, Park S, Park S-H, Lee JH, Chang B-S, Lee C-K, et al. The prevalence and impact of frailty in patients with symptomatic lumbar spinal stenosis. *Eur Spine J.* janv 2019;28(1):46-54.
10. Weinstein JN, Tosteson TD, Lurie JD, Tosteson ANA, Blood E, Hanscom B, et al. Surgical versus nonsurgical therapy for lumbar spinal stenosis. *N Engl J Med.* 21 févr 2008;358(8):794-810.
11. Otani K, Kikuchi S, Yabuki S, Igarashi T, Nikaido T, Watanabe K, et al. Lumbar Spinal Stenosis Has a Negative Impact on Quality of Life Compared with Other Comorbidities: An Epidemiological Cross-Sectional Study of 1862 Community-Dwelling Individuals. *ScientificWorldJournal* [Internet]. 23 déc 2013 [cité 10 mai 2020];2013. Disponible sur: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3885225/>
12. Murphy ME, Gilder H, Maloney PR, McCutcheon BA, Rinaldo L, Shepherd D, et al. Lumbar decompression in the elderly: increased age as a risk factor for complications and nonhome discharge. *J Neurosurg Spine.* mars 2017;26(3):353-62.
13. Giannadakis C, Solheim O, Jakola AS, Nordseth T, Gulati AM, Nerland US, et al. Surgery for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis in Individuals Aged 80 and Older: A Multicenter Observational Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2016;64(10):2011-8.

14. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis.* 1987;40(5):373-83.
15. Simcox T, Antoku D, Jain N, Acosta F, Hah R. Frailty Syndrome and the Use of Frailty Indices as a Preoperative Risk Stratification Tool in Spine Surgery: A Review. *Asian Spine J.* oct 2019;13(5):861-73.
16. Saleh A, Thirukumaran C, Mesfin A, Molinari RW. Complications and readmission after lumbar spine surgery in elderly patients: an analysis of 2,320 patients. *Spine J.* 2017;17(8):1106-12.
17. Balabaud L, Pitel S, Caux I, Dova C, Richard B, Antonietti P, et al. Lumbar spine surgery in patients 80 years of age or older: morbidity and mortality. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* juill 2015;25 Suppl 1:S205-212.
18. Wang MY, Widi G, Levi AD. The safety profile of lumbar spinal surgery in elderly patients 85 years and older. *Neurosurg Focus.* oct 2015;39(4):E3.
19. Li G, Patil CG, Lad SP, Ho C, Tian W, Boakye M. Effects of age and comorbidities on complication rates and adverse outcomes after lumbar laminectomy in elderly patients. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 15 mai 2008;33(11):1250-5.
20. Gerhardt J, Bette S, Janssen I, Gempt J, Meyer B, Ryang Y-M. Is Eighty the New Sixty? Outcomes and Complications after Lumbar Decompression Surgery in Elderly Patients over 80 Years of Age. *World Neurosurg.* avr 2018;112:e555-60.
21. Sturiale CL, Rossetto M, Ermani M, Baro V, Volpin F, Milanese L, et al. Remote cerebellar hemorrhage after spinal procedures (part 2): a systematic review. *Neurosurg Rev.* juill 2016;39(3):369-76.
22. Lim CHS, Salkade PR, Peter AC. Remote cerebellar hemorrhage as a complication of lumbar spine surgery. *J Radiol Case Rep.* 29 févr 2020;14(2):1-11.
23. Kamenova M, Leu S, Mariani L, Schaeren S, Soleman J. Management of Incidental Dural Tear During Lumbar Spine Surgery. To Suture or Not to Suture? *World Neurosurg.* mars 2016;87:455-62.
24. Kay HF, Chotai S, Wick JB, Stonko DP, McGirt MJ, Devin CJ. Preoperative and surgical factors associated with postoperative intensive care unit admission following operative treatment for degenerative lumbar spine disease. *Eur Spine J.* mars 2016;25(3):843-9.
25. Predictors of unplanned readmission in patients undergoing lumbar decompression: multi-institutional analysis of 7016 patients - PubMed [Internet]. [cité 9 sept 2021]. Disponible sur: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24725183/>
26. Nanjo Y, Nagashima H, Dokai T, Hamamoto Y, Hashiguchi H, Ishii H, et al. Clinical features and surgical outcomes of lumbar spinal stenosis in patients aged 80 years or older: a multi-center retrospective study. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* sept 2013;133(9):1243-8.
27. fiche_memo_note_de_cadrage_hta_cd_20150723_vd.pdf [Internet]. [cité 21 août 2021]. Disponible sur: https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2015-09/fiche_memo_note_de_cadrage_hta_cd_20150723_vd.pdf

28. Godier A, Fontana P, Motte S, Steib A, Bonhomme F, Schlumberger S, et al. Gestion des agents antiplaquettaires pour une procédure invasive programmée. Propositions du Groupe d'intérêt en hémostase périopératoire (GIHP) et du Groupe français d'études sur l'hémostase et la thrombose (GFHT) en collaboration avec la Société française d'anesthésie-réanimation (SFAR). *Anesthésie & Réanimation*. nov 2018;4(6):548-62.
29. Elsevier. Algorithme simplifié SFAR-SFC d'évaluation et de stratification du risque [Internet]. Elsevier Connect. [cité 21 août 2021]. Disponible sur: <https://www.elsevier.com/fr-fr/connect/medecine/algorithme-simplifie-sfar-sfc-devaluation-et-de-stratification-du-risque>
30. Soleman J, Baumgarten P, Perrig WN, Fandino J, Fathi A-R. Non-instrumented extradural lumbar spine surgery under low-dose acetylsalicylic acid: a comparative risk analysis study. *Eur Spine J*. mars 2016;25(3):732-9.
31. Glotzbecker MP, Bono CM, Wood KB, Harris MB. Postoperative spinal epidural hematoma: a systematic review. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1 mai 2010;35(10):E413-420.
32. Park JH, Park S, Choi SA. Incidence and risk factors of spinal epidural hemorrhage after spine surgery: a cross-sectional retrospective analysis of a national database. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 25 mai 2020;21:324.
33. Yoshioka K, Murakami H, Demura S, Kato S, Tsuchiya H. Prevalence and risk factors for development of venous thromboembolism after degenerative spinal surgery. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1 mars 2015;40(5):E301-306.
34. Prévalence et incidence du diabète [Internet]. [cité 21 août 2021]. Disponible sur: <https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/maladies-et-traumatismes/diabete/prevalence-et-incidence-du-diabete>
35. Lee CK, Choi SK, Shin DA, Yi S, Ha Y, Kim KN, et al. Influence of diabetes mellitus on patients with lumbar spinal stenosis: A nationwide population-based study. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(3):e0213858.
36. Gestion du patient diabétique en périopératoire. Fiches pratiques. *Anesthésie & Réanimation*. mai 2017;3(3):263-300.
37. Yao R, Zhou H, Choma TJ, Kwon BK, Street J. Surgical Site Infection in Spine Surgery: Who Is at Risk? *Global Spine J*. déc 2018;8(4 Suppl):5S-30S.
38. Tsantes AG, Papadopoulos DV, Lytras T, Tsantes AE, Mavrogenis AF, Koulouvaris P, et al. Association of malnutrition with surgical site infection following spinal surgery: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hosp Infect*. janv 2020;104(1):111-9.
39. Kong C, Li X, Sun X, Ding J, Guo M, Lu S. Complications in Elderly Patients Undergoing Lumbar Arthrodesis for Spinal Stenosis. *World Neurosurg*. déc 2019;132:e949-55.
40. Debono B, Wainwright TW, Wang MY, Sigmundsson FG, Yang MMH, Smid-Nanninga H, et al. Consensus statement for perioperative care in lumbar spinal fusion: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS®) Society recommendations. *The Spine Journal*. 1 mai 2021;21(5):729-52.
41. Preoperative Nutritional Status is an Independent Predictor... : *Spine* [Internet]. [cité 6 sept 2021]. Disponible sur:

https://journals.lww.com/spinejournal/Abstract/2016/09010/Preoperative_Nutritional_Status_is_an_Independent.19.aspx

42. Elsamadicy AA, Adogwa O, Vuong VD, Mehta AI, Vasquez RA, Cheng J, et al. Patient Body Mass Index is an Independent Predictor of 30-Day Hospital Readmission After Elective Spine Surgery. *World Neurosurgery*. 1 déc 2016;96:148-51.
43. Giannadakis C, Nerland US, Solheim O, Jakola AS, Gulati M, Weber C, et al. Does Obesity Affect Outcomes After Decompressive Surgery for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis? A Multicenter, Observational, Registry-Based Study. *World Neurosurg*. nov 2015;84(5):1227-34.
44. Knutsson B, Sandén B, Sjöden G, Järvholm B, Michaëlsson K. Body Mass Index and Risk for Clinical Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: A Cohort Study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 15 sept 2015;40(18):1451-6.
45. Bono OJ, Poorman GW, Foster N, Jalai CM, Horn SR, Oren J, et al. Body mass index predicts risk of complications in lumbar spine surgery based on surgical invasiveness. *Spine J*. 2018;18(7):1204-10.
46. Zhang L, Li E-N. Risk factors for surgical site infection following lumbar spinal surgery: a meta-analysis. *Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management*. 2018;14:2161.
47. Jackson KL, Devine JG. The Effects of Smoking and Smoking Cessation on Spine Surgery: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Global Spine J*. nov 2016;6(7):695-701.
48. Shriver MF, Zeer V, Alentado VJ, Mroz TE, Benzel EC, Steinmetz MP. Lumbar spine surgery positioning complications: a systematic review. *Neurosurg Focus*. oct 2015;39(4):E16.
49. Chaló D, Pedrosa S, Amorim P, Gouveia S, Sancho C. Propofol TCI Reductions Do Not Attenuate Significant Falls in Cardiac Output Associated With Anesthesia Induction and Knee-Chest Positioning in Spinal Surgery. *J Neurosurg Anesthesiol*. avr 2020;32(2):147-55.
50. Rudolph C, Schaffranietz L, Hellmundt L, Vitzthum HE, Olthoff D. [Comparative studies of patient positioning for lumbar intervertebral disk operation]. *Anaesthesiol Reanim*. 2002;27(2):38-41.
51. Kim J-E, Choi D-J, Park EJ. Risk Factors and Options of Management for an Incidental Dural Tear in Biportal Endoscopic Spine Surgery. *Asian Spine J*. déc 2020;14(6):790-800.
52. Strömquist F, Sigmundsson FG, Strömquist B, Jönsson B, Karlsson MK. Incidental durotomy in degenerative lumbar spine surgery - a register study of 64,431 operations. *Spine J*. 2019;19(4):624-30.
53. Takahashi Y, Sato T, Hyodo H, Kawamata T, Takahashi E, Miyatake N, et al. Incidental durotomy during lumbar spine surgery: risk factors and anatomic locations: clinical article. *J Neurosurg Spine*. févr 2013;18(2):165-9.
54. Kazarian ER, Lopez WY, Eizember S, Blucher JA, Culley DJ, Javedan H, et al. Incidental Durotomy Is Associated With Increased Risk of Delirium in Patients Aged 65 and Older. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 1 sept 2020;45(17):1215-20.
55. Fineberg SJ, Nandyala SV, Marquez-Lara A, Oglesby M, Patel AA, Singh K. Incidence and risk factors for postoperative delirium after lumbar spine surgery. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 15 sept 2013;38(20):1790-6.

56. Pernik MN, Deme PR, Nguyen ML, Aoun SG, Adogwa O, Hall K, et al. Perioperative Optimization of Senior Health in Spine Surgery: Impact on Postoperative Delirium. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* mai 2021;69(5):1240-8.
57. Sharif S, Shaikh Y, Bajamal AH, Costa F, Zileli M. Fusion Surgery for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: WFNS Spine Committee Recommendations. *World Neurosurg X.* 18 mars 2020;7:100077.
58. Kalichman L, Kim DH, Li L, Guermazi A, Berkin V, Hunter DJ. Spondylolysis and spondylolisthesis: prevalence and association with low back pain in the adult community-based population. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 15 janv 2009;34(2):199-205.
59. Kreiner DS, Shaffer WO, Baisden JL, Gilbert TJ, Summers JT, Toton JF, et al. An evidence-based clinical guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis (update). *Spine J.* juill 2013;13(7):734-43.
60. Blumenthal C, Curran J, Benzel EC, Potter R, Magge SN, Harrington JF, et al. Radiographic predictors of delayed instability following decompression without fusion for degenerative grade I lumbar spondylolisthesis. *J Neurosurg Spine.* avr 2013;18(4):340-6.
61. Masson E. Traitement chirurgical des sténoses du canal lombaire [Internet]. EM-Consulte. [cité 14 juill 2021]. Disponible sur: <https://www.em-consulte.com/article/56019/traitement-chirurgical-des-stenoses-du-canal-lomba>
62. Försth P, Ólafsson G, Carlsson T, Frost A, Borgström F, Fritzell P, et al. A Randomized, Controlled Trial of Fusion Surgery for Lumbar Spinal Stenosis. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 14 avr 2016;374(15):1413-23.
63. Ghasem A, Sharma A, Greif DN, Alam M, Maaieh MA. The Arrival of Robotics in Spine Surgery: A Review of the Literature. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 1 déc 2018;43(23):1670-7.
64. Zaina F, Tomkins-Lane C, Carragee E, Negrini S. Surgical versus non-surgical treatment for lumbar spinal stenosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 29 janv 2016;2016(1):CD010264.
65. Morcos MW, Jiang F, McIntosh G, Johnson M, Christie S, Wai E, et al. Predictors of Blood Transfusion in Posterior Lumbar Spinal Fusion: A Canadian Spine Outcome and Research Network Study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 1 janv 2018;43(1):E35-9.
66. Rigamonti A, Gemma M, Rocca A, Messina M, Bignami E, Beretta L. Prone versus knee-chest position for microdiscectomy: a prospective randomized study of intra-abdominal pressure and intraoperative bleeding. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 1 sept 2005;30(17):1918-23.
67. CT-12342_EXACYL_avis2_RI_reevalSMR_CT12342.pdf [Internet]. [cité 11 sept 2021]. Disponible sur: https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/evamed/CT-12342_EXACYL_avis2_RI_reevalSMR_CT12342.pdf
68. Phan K, Mobbs RJ. Minimally Invasive Versus Open Laminectomy for Lumbar Stenosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Spine.* janv 2016;41(2):E91-100.
69. Rodríguez-Mañas L, Féart C, Mann G, Viña J, Chatterji S, Chodzko-Zajko W, et al. Searching for an Operational Definition of Frailty: A Delphi Method Based Consensus Statement. The Frailty Operative Definition-Consensus Conference Project. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* janv 2013;68(1):62-7.

Appendix 1 : Matching with propensity score

Baseline characteristics	Unmatched			Matched		
	< 80ans (n=793)	≥ 80 ans (n=203)	SMD	< 80ans (n=135)	≥ 80 ans (n=135)	SMD
Female, n(%)	407 (51)	123 (61)	0.19	86 (64)	82 (61)	0.06
BMI (kg/m ²), mean ± SD	28.7 ± 5.1	27.2 ± 5.0	0.31	27.3 ± 4.4	27.7 ± 5.3	0.08
Comorbidities						
Diabetes, n(%)	146 (18)	31 (15)	0.08	23 (17)	23 (17)	0.00
High blood pressure, n(%)	446 (56)	141 (69)	0.27	98 (73)	94 (70)	0.07
Heart disease, n(%)	179 (23)	78 (39)	0.35	44 (33)	50 (37)	0.09
Anticoagulant, n(%)	50 (6)	33 (16)	0.32	16 (12)	19 (14)	0.07
Platelet antiaggregant, n(%)	227 (29)	68 (34)	0.11	46 (34)	45 (33)	0.02
Breathing disorder, n(%)	104 (13)	19 (9)	0.12	9 (7)	11 (8)	0.06
Chronic kidney disease, n(%)	29 (4)	10 (5)	0.06	7 (5)	8 (6)	0.03
Age adjusted charlson score, median (IQR)	3 (2 - 4)	4 (4 - 5)	1.12	4 (3 - 5)	4 (4 - 5)	0.09
ASA score, median (IQR)	2 (2 - 3)	3 (2 - 3)	0.42	3 (2 - 3)	3 (2 - 3)	0.04
History of lumbar spine surgery						
Disc herniation, n(%)	114 (14)	23 (11)	0.09	15 (11)	15 (11)	0.00
Morphology of lumbar spine						
Spondylolisthesis, n(%)	178 (22)	53 (26)	0.09	30 (22)	36 (27)	0.10
Scoliosis, n(%)	70 (9)	27 (13)	0.14	19 (14)	18 (13)	0.02
Surgery						
Position, n(%)						
Prone (0)	188 (24)	86 (43)	0.41	49 (36)	47 (35)	0.03
Knee-chest (1)	601 (76)	116 (57)		86 (64)	77 (65)	
Duration (min), median (IQR)	82 (63 - 107)	84 (70 - 113)	0.14	87 (72 - 106)	84 (70 - 113)	0.08
Level						
Number, median (IQR)	1 (1 - 2)	2 (1 - 2)	0.40	2 (1 - 2)	2 (1 - 2)	0.04
L4L5, n(%)	615 (78)	174 (86)	0.21	114 (84)	114 (84)	0.00
L3L4, n(%)	424 (53)	135 (67)	0.28	82 (61)	83 (61)	0.02
L2L3, n(%)	115 (15)	41 (20)	0.15	31 (23)	26 (19)	0.09
L1L2, n(%)	8 (1)	7 (3)	0.17	4 (3)	4 (3)	0.00
Procedure						
Laminectomy, n(%)	467 (59)	165 (81)	0.50	105 (78)	105 (78)	0.00
Foraminotomy, n(%)	32 (4)	4 (2)	0.12	3 (2)	3 (2)	0.00
Arthrodesis, n(%)	189 (24)	33 (16)	0.19	27 (20)	26 (19)	0.02
Interspinous device, n(%)	91 (11)	2 (1)	0.45	3 (2)	1 (1)	0.12
Durotomy						
Sutured, n(%)	125 (16)	48 (24)	0.20	27 (20)	30 (22)	0.05
Sutured, n(%)	67 (8)	25 (13)	0.13	16 (12)	16 (12)	0.00
Fat graft, n(%)	79 (10)	26 (13)	0.09	18 (13)	17 (13)	0.02
Biologic glue, n(%)	91 (12)	31 (15)	0.12	21 (16)	19 (14)	0.04
Drains						
In aspiration, n(%)	737 (94)	192 (96)	0.11	129 (96)	130 (97)	0.08
In aspiration, n(%)	631 (80)	152 (76)	0.11	105 (78)	106 (79)	0.02
Proportion score, mean ± SD	0.12 ± 0.17	0.49 ± 0.26	1.67	0.39 ± 0.22	0.39 ± 0.22	0.02

* *p*-value obtained by *chi*² or Fischer's exact test for qualitative variables and by Student's *t* test, or Mann-Whitney test if the distribution does not follow a normal distribution, for quantitative variables.

Appendix 2 : Age adjusted Charlson Comorbidity score

Weight	Comorbid Condition
1	Myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, peripheral vascular disease, cerebral vascular disease, dementia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, connective tissue disease, ulcer disease, mild liver disease, diabetes
2	Hemiplegia, moderate/severe renal disease, diabetes with end-organ damage, any tumor, leukemia/lymphoma
3	Moderate/severe liver disease
6	Metastatic solid tumor, AIDS
1	For each decade over age 40 years, up to 4 points

AIDS = acquired immune deficiency syndrome.

Appendix 3 : American Society of Anaesthesiologists Physical Status score

ASA Physical Status Classification System

1 : Patient normal

2 : Patient avec anomalie systémique modérée

3 : Patient avec anomalie systémique sévère

4 : Patient avec anomalie systémique sévère représentant une menace vitale constante

5 : Patient moribond dont la survie est improbable sans l'intervention

6 : Patient déclaré en état de mort cérébrale dont on prélève les organes pour greffe

Appendix 4 : Consent of the ethics committee n° IRB00011687 Collège de neurochirurgie IRB #1 : 2020/25



Bordeaux le jeudi 11 juin 2020

Bureau du Collège de Neurochirurgie

Président :

E. CUNY
emmanuel.cuny@neurochirurgie.fr

Vice président :

P.H. ROCHE
pierre-hugues.roche@neurochirurgie.fr

Secrétaire chargé de l'encyclopédie numérique :

G. DECHAMBENOIT
gilbert.dechambenoit@neurochirurgie.fr

Secrétaire chargé de la Pédagogie :

J.R. VIGNES
jean-rodolphe.vignes@neurochirurgie.fr

Secrétaire chargé de l'Accréditation :

M. LOPES
manuel.lopes@neurochirurgie.fr

Secrétaire chargé de la docimologie des évaluations :

F. CAIRE
francois.caire@neurochirurgie.fr

Trésorier :

C. NUTI
christophe.nuti@neurochirurgie.fr

Secrétaire chargé du DPC :

B. DEBONO
bertrand.debono@neurochirurgie.fr

L'IRB de neurochirurgie a évalué le projet :

« Chirurgie du canal lombaire étroit du sujet âgé : Y a-t-il un risque opératoire augmenté? Etude cas - témoins au CHU de Caen. »

à la demande de Mme le Pr Eveline Emery

Service de Neurochirurgie – Hôpital de Caen

Et émet :

un Avis favorable le 11/06/2020
n° IRB00011687 Collège de neurochirurgie IRB #1 : 2020/25

Pr emmanuel CUNY



« Par délibération de son Conseil en date du 10 Novembre 1972, l'Université n'entend donner aucune approbation ni improbation aux opinions émises dans les thèses ou mémoires. Ces opinions doivent être considérées comme propres à leurs auteurs ».

VU, le Président de Thèse

VU, le Doyen de la Faculté

VU et permis d'imprimer
en référence à la délibération
du Conseil d'Université
en date du 14 Décembre 1973

Pour le Président
de l'Université de CAEN et P.O

Le Doyen

ANNEE DE SOUTENANCE : 2020/2021

NOM ET PRENOM DE L'AUTEUR : RAULT Frédéric

TITRE DE LA THESE :

Prise en charge chirurgicale du canal lombaire étroit chez les patients de plus de 80 ans : y a-t-il un risque augmenté ?

RESUME DE LA THESE EN FRANÇAIS : Introduction : La prise en charge chirurgicale des CLE est la première cause de chirurgie rachidienne chez les personnes âgées et augmente avec le vieillissement de la population. La chirurgie améliore la qualité de vie, mais comporte des risques. L'objectif de cette étude était d'évaluer si le taux de complications postopératoires était plus élevé chez les patients les plus âgés. Méthodes : Nous avons mené une étude rétrospective incluant toutes chirurgies de CLE entre 2012 et 2020 au CHU de Caen. Nous avons comparé les plus de 80 ans à tous les autres. Le critère principal était la survenue d'une complication grave dans les 30 jours et les complications mineures étaient le critère secondaire. Nous avons enregistré comme données les comorbidités des patients, les antécédents de chirurgie du rachis lombaire et les données opératoires. Résultats : 996 patients ont été identifiés. Les plus de 80 ans présentaient plus de comorbidités : hypertension, cardiopathies, CCI ajusté à l'âge et ASA plus élevés et plus de traitements anticoagulants. Les jeunes étaient plus souvent positionnés en genu pectoral pour la chirurgie alors que les plus âgés avaient une chirurgie plus étendue avec plus de durotomies. Le taux de CG était de 5,2 % dans la cohorte. L'âge de plus de 80 ans n'a pas été retenu comme facteur de risque, mais le taux de complications mineures augmentait avec l'âge. Les cardiopathies, les antécédents de laminectomie, le CCI, le score ASA et les durotomies étaient des facteurs de risque de CG. Conclusion : la prise en charge du CLE n'est pas associée à un taux plus élevé de CG chez les plus de 80 ans. Les facteurs de risque préopératoires doivent être étudiés pour prévenir le patient âgé du risque accru de complications

MOTS CLES : Canal lombaire étroit – Complications – Personnes âgées – Comorbidités

TITRE DE LA THESE EN ANGLAIS :

Surgical management of lumbar spinal stenosis in patients over 80 : is there an increased risk ?

RESUME DE LA THESE EN ANGLAIS : Background: The management of LSS is the first cause of spinal surgery for the elderly and will increase with the aging population. The surgery improves quality of life but involves operative risks. The aim of this study was to evaluate if the rate of postoperative complications was higher in elderly patients. Methods: We conducted a retrospective study that included all LSS procedures between 2012 and 2020 at the University Hospital of Caen. We compared patients aged over 80 years to all others. The primary endpoint was the occurrence of a severe complication (SC) within 30 days. Minor complications were the secondary endpoint. Comorbidities, history of lumbar spine surgery and surgical characteristics were recorded. Results: 996 patients undergoing surgery for degenerative LSS were identified. Patients over 80 years of age were affected by additional comorbidities: hypertension, heart diseases and higher age adjusted CCI and ASA scores and use of anticoagulants. Knee-chest position was preferred for the younger patients while older patients had more extensive surgery and more incidental durotomies. The rate of severe complications was 5.2% in the cohort. Age over 80 years did not appear to be a significant risk factor for SC, but the rate of minor complications was impacted. Multivariate analysis revealed that heart diseases, history of laminectomy, age adjusted CCI score, ASA grade and durotomies were risk factors for SC. Conclusion: Surgical management for LSS is not associated to a higher rate of SC for patients over the age of 80. Preoperative risk factors should be investigated to warn out the patient aged of the increased risk of complications.

KEY WORDS : Lumbar spinal stenosis – Complications – The elderly – Comorbidities