

Lumbar Spine Sagittal Kinetics: A Flexion-extension X-rays Based Study of Hospital Population Javed Khader Eliyas MD; Kenneth Bishop; Dominic Catalano; Martha Pemberton Heath; Ben Z. Roitberg MD [Institution]

Click To Add Logo

Introduction

Limited data on the range of motion of lumbar spine in hospital populations exist. Knowing and understanding normal range of motion is essential in planning and preparing management strategies. We present norm data on a large set of hospital patients, selected for no radiological abnormality.

Methods

Lumbar flexion-extension roentgenograms performed at one institution between 2004 and 2010 were retrospectively reviewed and patients with normal images were selected. Lumbosacral angle between flexion and extension, as well as individual angles at each vertebral segment were measured.

Three observers analyzed 40 randomly selected patients, independently, to estimate interobserver reliability (12 angles per patient and 480 measurements per rater).

Results

Total of 288 patients, ages 11 to 83 years, with unremarkable lumbar images were studied; 150 males (52%) and 138 females (48%).

The two-way random effects intraclass correlation coefficient (Figure 1), measuring inter-observer reliability, showed excellent consistency and agreement between raters (r = 0.971 (0.966-0.976), p<0.001).

The mean lumbosacral range of motion was 29.50, with greatest contributions from L4-5 and L5-S1 (Table 1). There was no statistically significant gender difference (Wilcoxon Rank-Sum tests) for any level (Table 2).

Spearman rank correlation coefficient for continuous age showed statistically significant decrease in range of movement with increasing age for all levels (Figures 2, 3 & 4).

Overall and individual segment motion was statistically decremental (Kruskal-Wallis test) between age groups < 40 (n=89), 41-60 (n=143) and > 60 (n=56) (Figures 5 & 6).

Conclusions

Lumbar range of movement is not static over different intervertebral

Learning Objectives

1. To describe normal lumbar spine characteristics.

2. To explain differences in motion between different spine levels.

3. To enumerate differences in lumbar kinetics with increasing age.

References

1.Dvorak J, Panjabi MM, Novotny JE, Chang DG, Grob D (1991) Clinical validation of functional flexionextension roentgenograms of the lumbar spine. Spine 16:943-950

2.Hayes MA, Howard TC, Gruel CR, Kopta JA (1989) Roentgenographic evaluation of lumbar spine flexionextension in asymptomatic individuals. Spine 14:327-331

3.Panjabi MM, White AA, 3rd (1980) Basic biomechanics of the spine. Neurosurgery 7:76-93

4.Pannell WC, Savin DD, Scott TP, Wang JC, Daubs MD (2015) Trends in the surgical treatment of lumbar spine disease in the United States. Spine J 15:1719-1727

5.Pearcy M, Portek I, Shepherd J (1984) Threedimensional x-ray analysis of normal movement in the lumbar spine. Spine 9:294-297

6.Pearcy MJ, Tibrewal SB (1984) Axial rotation and lateral bending in the normal lumbar spine measured by three-dimensional radiography. Spine 9:582-587

7.Putto E, Tallroth K (1990) Extension-flexion radiographs for motion studies of the lumbar spine. A comparison of two methods. Spine 15:107-110

8.White AA, 3rd, Panjabi MM (1978) The basic kinematics of the human spine. A review of past and current knowledge. Spine 3:12-20

9.Yoshihara H, Yoneoka D (2015) National trends in the surgical treatment for lumbar degenerative disc disease: United States, 2000 to 2009. Spine J 15:265-271