

Original Research Article

The Outcome of Lumbar Discectomy: A Comparative Study of Fenestration Discectomy Versus Hemilaminectomy and Discectomy

Ali Abd-Alnibi Alwan Al-Tamimi

School of Medicine, Faculty of Medical Sciences, University of Sulaimaniyah, Sulaimaniyah, IRAQ

E-mail:alialwan2003@yahoo.com

Accepted 23 May, 2017

Abstract

Lumbar disc prolapse accounts for only 5% of all low back pain problems but is the most common cause of radiating nerve root pain which called sciatica. In the 20th century, techniques were developed to remove the herniated disc with minimal invasiveness, with these minimally invasive techniques; authors demonstrated decreased soft tissue manipulation, operative time, blood loss, and hospital stay, allowing early recovery.

This is a prospective study carried in Sulaimaniyah Teaching hospital for 111 patients (72 male and 39 female) complained from lumbar disc prolapse from May 2010 till May 2015. Two different surgical discectomy procedures were done to these patients as follows:

1-Fenestration discectomy was performed to 53 patients through 2-5 cm skin incision.

2-Hemilaminectomy and discectomy had done to 58 patients through skin incision 4-7 cm.

The patients were evaluated preoperatively and 6 months postoperatively by PROLO score.

111 patients (72 male and 39 female with ratio 1.8:1) underwent surgical discectomy. The mean age of the patient was 36.2 ± 6.2 years. 53 patients (47.7%) underwent fenestration discectomy. The operation time was ranging from 48 – 92 minutes with mean operative duration 69.13 ± 8.96 minutes. The mean hospital stay was 1.31 ± 0.73 days ranging from 16 hours to 3days. According to PROLO score, fair results were reported in four (7%) patients while good result obtained in 12 patients (23%) and 37 patients (70%) showed excellent result. No patient expressed poor result.

58 patients (52.3%) underwent hemilaminectomy and discectomy. The operation time was ranging from 56 – 103 minutes with mean operative time 78.66 ± 10.31 minutes. The mean hospital stay was 2.46 ± 1.42 days ranging from 1 day to 10 days. According to PROLO score, 9 patients (16%) obtained fair results while good results obtained in 15 patients (26%) and excellent results founded in 34 patients (58%). No patient showed poor results.

Duration of the operation and hospital stay were significantly shorter in fenestration discectomy group than hemilaminectomy and discectomy one (P value less than 0.001). Through PROLO score both procedures showed significant improvement postoperatively in both economic and functional assessments. Most of our patients gain excellent results according to PROLO score in both surgical procedures. In this series 92% of patients treated with fenestration discectomy improved postoperatively with good or excellent score, while 85% of the patients treated with hemilaminectomy have that improvement. Both fenestration discectomy and hemilaminectomy with discectomy showed the same final postoperative outcome but the fenestration discectomy is superior since the operation duration, hospital stay are less and overall improvement is relatively better.

Key Words: Lumbar Discectomy, Fenestration Discectomy, Hemilaminectomy, Discectomy.

محصلة ازالة غضروف قطني منزلق: دراسة مقارنة بين ازالة الغضروف بالثقب الجراحي ضد ازالة الغضروف من خلال ازاله جزئية لصفحة العظمية الخلفية للفقرة

الخلاصة

يشكل الانزلاق الغضروفي القطني ٥٪ من جميع الام أسفل الظهر ويعتبر السبب الأساسي لتهيج العرق النسوي. خلال القرن العشرين تم تطوير اكثر من تقنية لإجراء عملية ازالة الغضروف المنزلق وأحدثها التقنيات التي اعتمدت على التقليل من ضرار الأنسجة من خلال اقل اجتياح جراحي ممكن ومن خلال هذه التقنيات استطاعوا ان يقللوا من أضرار الأنسجة الرخوة والمدة التي تجرى بها العملية وفترة الرقود في المستشفى. دراسة مستقبلية أجريت في المستشفى التعليمي في مدينة السلیمانية ل ١١١ مريض (٧٢ ذكرو ٣٩ أنثى) كانوا يعانون من انزلاق غضروفي قطني في الفترة الممتدة من أيار ٢٠١٠ الى أيار ٢٠١٥. تم اعتماد طريقتان جراحيتان لإزالة الغضروف المنزلق.

الأولى هي إزالة الغضروف المنزلق عن طريق ثقب جراحي صغير طوله ٢-٥ سم.

الثانية هي إزالة الغضروف المنزلق عن طريق فتحة جراحيين بطول ٤-٧ سم وإزالة جزء من الصفيحة العظمية الخلفية للفقرة القطنية.

تم تقييم حالة المرضى بواسطة PRPLO score قبل اجراء العملية وستة أشهر بعد إجراءها. ١١١ مريض (٧٢ ذكرو ٣٩ أنثى) خضعوا الى عملية ازالة الغضروف المنزلق بالتداخل الجراحي وكان معدل اعمار المرضى ٦٠,٢±٣٦,٢ سنة. المجموعة الاولى (ازالة الغضروف عن طريق الثقب الجراحي) : - ٥٣ مريض (٤٧,٧٪) خضعوا لهذه التقنية هو كان معدل مدة العملية التي استغرقتها هذه التقنية هي ٨,٩٦±٦٩,١٣ دقيقة، وكان معدل فترة رقاد المرضى في المستشفى هو ١٠,٣١±٠,٧٣ يوم وتم تقييم استجابة المرضى بواسطة PROLO score وكانت النتائج النهائية كما يلي : ٤ مريض (٧٪) حصلوا على نتائج مقبولة و ١٢ مريض (٢٣٪) حصلوا على نتائج جيدة وحصل ٣٧ (٧٠٪) مريض على نتيجة ممتازة. ولم يحصل أي مريض على نتيجة ضعيفة.

المجموعة الثانية (ازالة الغضروف المنزلق بعد ازالة الصفيحة العظمية الخلفية للفقرة) : - ٥٨ مريض (٥٢,٣٪) خضعوا لهذه التقنية وكان معدل المده التي استغرقتها هذه العملية هي ١٠,٣١±٧٨,٦٦ دقيقة، وكان معدل فترة رقاد المرضى في المستشفى هو ١٠,٤٦±٢,٤٦ يوم وتم تقييم استجابة المرضى بواسطة PROLO score وكانت النتائج النهائية كما يلي : ٩ مريض (١٦٪) حصلوا على نتائج مقبولة و ١٥ مريض (٢٦٪) حصلوا على نتائج جيد هو حصل ٣٤ مريض (٥٨٪) على نتيجة ممتازة. ولم يحصل أي مريض على نتيجة ضعيفة

من خلال النتائج اكتشف ان المدة التي استغرقتها العملية الجراحية وفترة رقاد المرضى في المستشفى كانت اقل بشكل ملحوظ في المجموعة الأولى قياسا لنفس النتائج في المجموعة الثانية. من خلال استعمال PROLO score اكتشف أنه كل التقنيتين الجراحية أظهرتا نفس التحسن النهائي في التقييم الاقتصادي والوظيفي حيث ان هذه الدراسة أظهرت انه ٩٢٪ من المرضى المعالجين بالطريقة الأولى حصلوا على نتيجة مابين جيدة وممتازة و ٨٥٪ من المرضى المعالجين بالطريقة الثانية حصلوا على نفس النتائج المذكورة سابقا.

من خلال النتائج التي أظهرتها هذه الدراسة نستنتج انه كل التقنيتين أظهرتا نفس المحصلة النهائية من حيث استجابة المرضى للعملية الجراحية اقتصاديا ووظيفيا ولكن قصر فترة الرقاد في المستشفى وقصر ألمده التي استغرقتها العملية وقلة تلفا للأنسجة الرخوة وقلة الآلام بعد العميلة التي أظهرتها الطريقة الأولى أي طريقة إزالة الغضروف المنزلق بواسطة الثقب الجراحي جعلها متفوقة على سابقتها وبالتالي تزكى هذه الطريقة على الطريقة الأخرى.

الكلمات المفتاحية: غضروف قطني، الصفيحة العظمية، الغضروف.

Introduction

Lumber disc prolapse accounts for only 5% of all low back pain problems. It may irritate the dural covering of the adjacent nerve root causing pain in the buttock, posterior thigh and calf, which called sciatica [1]. Although back pain is common from the second

decade of life on, intervertebral disc herniation is most prominent in otherwise healthy people in the third and fourth decades of life [2].

Lumbar discectomy is the most common operation performed in the United States for lumbar-related symptoms [3].

Mixter and Barr described the first surgical procedure to remove the herniated lumbar disc in 1934 through a laminectomy and durotomy, with later enhancement by Semmes, who described approaching the herniated disc through hemilaminectomy and retraction of the dural sac. This became popularized as the “classical discectomy technique” [4]. During the latter half of the 20th century, more techniques were developed to remove the herniated disc with minimal invasiveness [5]. With these minimally invasive techniques, authors demonstrated decreased soft tissue manipulation, operative time, blood loss, and hospital stay, allowing early recovery [5].

Materials and Methods

This is a prospective study carried in Sulaimaniyah Teaching hospital, Iraq, for 111 patients (72 male and 39 female) complained from lumbar disc prolapse from May 2010 till May 2015.

All the patients were interviewed 2-3 days prior the surgery. Detailed history was taken from the patients with special attention to the exact complaint, the duration, the radiation of the pain to the lower limb, numbness, paresthesia, lower limbs weakness, history of previous spine surgery, history of previous spine pathology and any history of conservative management.

The patient examined thoroughly concentrating on neurological status to exclude any sensory or motor deficit and orthopedically to elicit any abnormal gait, sciatica scoliosis and or any sign of root irritation. Tension tests were done in form of straight leg raising test (SLRT), cross leg raising test and Laseaque test.

All patients underwent plain radiographic examination with AP view to exclude sacralization and lumberlization of the

spine and lateral view in flexion and extension to exclude any instability. All the patients should have recent MRI within the last three months.

Preoperative blood test like CBC, blood sugar, viral test and any other test recommended by the anesthesiologist like ECG or ECHO.

All operations done under general anesthesia, intraoperative antibiotic in a form of 1 gram ceftriaxone is given during the induction of the anesthesia. Knee – Chest position was performed to all patients, the level of the prolapsed disc was determined prior to skin incision by the assistance of C- arm fluoroscopy.

1-Fenestration discectomy was performed to 53 patients through 2-5 cm skin incision done according to the intervertebral level.

2-Hemilaminectomy and discectomy had done to 58 patients through skin incision 4-7 cm according to the affected levels.

Radivac drain was inserted in some cases according to the state of haemostasis. The patient kept in supine position in the operative day, the drain removed in the first postoperative day and the patient allowed to get up from bed and start walking, no belt was used and the patient discharged from hospital. Stiches removed in the 10th postoperative day, and then after the patient also examined neurologically for any progress. The patients followed and examined every month for the first 6 months and every 3 months for 2 years.

Patients with intraoperative or post-operative complications were treated and followed postoperatively according to each case.

At the end of the follow up PROLO scale6(Economical and Functional scale) was used to evaluate the final outcome of the surgery

Economic status

Economic ability	Score
Complete invalidity	1
No gainful occupation, including ability to do housework, or continue retirement activities	2
Able to work, but not at previous occupation; able to perform housework and retirement activities	3
Working at previous occupation part-time or limited status	4
Able to work at previous occupation with no restrictions of any kind	5

Functional status

Functional ability	Score
Total incapacity (postoperative: worse than prior to operation)	1
Difficulty in walking, needing a cane or crutch or persistent moderate motor weakness (able to perform tasks of daily living)	2
Slight difficulty in walking, but without help; slight motor weakness, moderate pain, persistent paraesthesia	3
No difficulty in walking, no motor weakness, no pain but persistent paraesthesia.	4
No difficulty in walking, no motor weakness, no pain, no paraesthesia, able to perform sports activities	5

Total score will be 2–10, scoring method and Interpretation is that, the lower the score is the more severe the deficits. Excellent: 9 – 10, Good: 7 – 8, Fair: 5 – 6, Poor: 2– 4[6].

Inclusion criteria

1. One level or two level disc prolapse.
2. Age between 18-45 years.

Exclusion criteria

1. Multiple level disc prolapse (more than 2 levels).
2. Unstable spine
3. Age above 45 years.
4. Cauda equine syndrome.
5. Previous spine or disc surgery.
6. History of spine pathology like TB or Malignancy and major trauma that might cause fracture spine.

Statistical Analysis

After data collection and prior to data entry and analysis, the questions of study were

coded. Data entry performed via using an excel spreadsheet then the statistical analysis was performed by SPSS program, version 21 (IBM SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The quantitative continuous variables were described by mean and SD (standard deviation). Chi-square tests were used to compare the categorical data between these two groups of patients (the two methods of surgery) in respect to different variables. P values of 0.05 were used as a cut off point for significance of statistical tests.

Results

111 patients (72 male and 39 female with ratio 1.8:1) underwent surgical discectomy. The mean age of the patient was 36.2 ± 6.2 years; ranged between 18 – 45 years. 60% of our patients were aged between 31 – 40 years. (Histogram 1)




Figure 1: Age distribution among the studied cases.

The back pain was radiated to the left lower limb in 63 patients (56.7%) and to the right lower limb in 40 patients (36%) and to both limb in 8 patients (7.2%). Sciatic scoliosis was complained by 17 patients (15.3%). All patients (100%) presented with sciatica. Numbness was

founded in 59 patients (53.2%). SLRT was positive in all patients at angle 30 – 60°, cross leg raising test was positive in 42 patients (37.8%), sensory deficit was found in 47 patients (42.3%), motor deficit was found in 67 patients (60.4%) and deep ankle reflex was altered in 23 patients (20.7%).(Table 1)

Table 1 : Detailed physical examination findings in both surgical groups.

Symptoms & signs	Fenestration discectomy		Laminectomy & discectomy	
	No.	%	No.	%
Sciatic scoliosis	7	13	10	17
SLRT	53	100	58	100
Cross leg raising test	19	36	23	40
Sensory deficit	25	47	22	38
Motor deficit	31	58	36	62
Diminished ankle reflex	16	30	7	12

The prolapsed disc was at L4 - 5 level in 72 patients (64.9%), while in 27 patients (24.3%) the prolapse disc was at L5 – S1 and in 12 patients (10.8%) both levels L4 – 5 and L5 –S1 were affected. Lateral disc

was found in 89 patients (80.2%), central disc prolapse was found in 17 patients (15.3%) and in five patients (4.5%) the disc was prolapsed laterally in one level and centrally in the other level. Protruded

disc was found in 20 patients (18%),
extruded disc was found in 83 patients

(74.8%) and sequestrated disc was found
in 8 patients (7.2%). (Table 2)

Table 2: The characteristics of disc prolapse in both surgical groups.

Disc level	Fenestration discectomy		Laminectomy and discectomy	
	No.	%	No.	%
L4 – L5	32	60	40	69
L5 – S1	16	30	11	19
Both	5	10	7	12
Total	53	100	58	100

Direction of prolapse	Fenestration discectomy		Laminectomy and discectomy	
	No.	%	No.	%
Para central	43	81	46	79
Central	7	13	10	17
Both	3	6	2	4
Total	53	100	58	100

Type of prolapse	Fenestration discectomy		Laminectomy and discectomy	
	No.	%	No.	%
Protrusion	12	23	8	14
Extrusion	36	68	47	81
Sequestration	5	9	3	5
Total	53	100	58	100

Fenestration discectomy group

53 patients (47.7%) underwent fenestration discectomy, 32 patients were male and 21 patients were female. The operation time was ranging from 48 – 92 minutes with mean operative duration 69.13 ± 8.96 minutes. The mean hospital stay was 1.31 ± 0.73 days ranging from 16 hours to 3 days. (Table 3)

Hemilaminectomy & discectomy group

58 patients (52.3%) underwent hemilaminectomy and discectomy, 40 patients were male and 18 were female. The operation time was ranging from 56 – 103 minutes with mean operative time 78.66 ± 10.31 minutes. The mean hospital stay was 2.46 ± 1.42 days ranging from 1 day to 10 days. (Table3)

Table 3: Mean operative time and hospital stay of fenestration discectomy and hemilaminectomy and discectomy groups.

operation duration and hospital stay	Fenestration discectomy		Hemilaminectomy and discectomy		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	P value
Operation duration (Minutes)	69.13	8.96	78.66	10.31	< 0.001
Hospital stay (Days)	1.31	0.73	2.46	1.42	< 0.001

The operative time and hospital stay in fenestration discectomy is significantly shorter than that of hemilaminectomy and discectomy since the P value less than 0.001.

Out of 53 patients treated by fenestration discectomy only 4 patients (8%) suffered

from different types of intra and/ or postoperative complications; while 7 patients (12%) out of 58 suffered from that complications in those patients whom operated on by hemilaminectomy and discectomy (Table-4)

Table 4: Complications of both surgical groups.

Complications	Fenestration discectomy		Laminectomy and discectomy		P value
	No.	%	No.	%	
Dural tear	0	0	1	2	0.34
Nerve root injury	1	2	1	2	0.95
Superficial infection	3	6	5	8	0.55
Total	4	8	7	12	

There are no significant differences between the two modalities regarding the various types of reported complications since the P value more than 0.05.

All patients were subjected to economical and functional score (PROLO) preoperatively and 6 months postoperatively.

1-In fenestration group four (7%) patients showed fair results while good result

obtained in 12 patients (23%) and 37 patients (70%) showed excellent result. No patient expressed poor result.

2-In hemilaminectomy and discectomy group nine patients (16%) obtained fair results while good results obtained in 15 patients (26%) and excellent results founded in 34 patients (58%). No patient showed poor results. (Table 5, 6 and histogram 2)

Table 5: Distribution of patients according to economic and functional PROLO scale of both procedures.

PROLO Economic and Functional assessment scale		Mode of surgery		P value
		Fenestration discectomy	Hemilaminectomy & discectomy	
Economic Pre op	E1	16	19	0.92
	E2	33	34	
	E3	4	5	
Economic Post op	E3	7	12	0.27
	E4	8	13	
	E5	38	33	
Functional Pre op	F1	20	15	0.38
	F2	29	39	
	F3	4	4	
Functional Post op	F3	8	13	0.31
	F4	10	15	
	F5	35	30	

Table 6: Final outcome of both fenestration and hemilaminectomy groups

Final outcome	Fenestration discectomy	Hemilaminectomy & discectomy	P value
Fair	4	9	0.34
Good	12	15	
Excellent	37	34	
Total	53	58	




Figure 2 : Final outcome of both fenestration and hemilaminectomy groups

From the above data one can notice that despite the differences in the values of the outcome but there were no significant differences between the two procedures in term economic, functional and in the overall final results (P value more than 0.05).

There were significant differences between the pre and postoperative results regarding the economic and functional assessment in both fenestration discectomy and hemilaminectomy and discectomy procedures (P< 0.001) (Table 7 & 8).

Table 7: The mean score of pre and postoperative economic score in both procedures

Type of surgery	Mean PROLO economic Score ± SD		P Value*
	Economic Pre op Scale	Economic Post op Scale	
Fenestration discectomy	1.77 ± 0.57	4.58 ± 0.71	< 0.001
Hemilaminectomy and discectomy	1.76 ± 0.60	4.36 ± 0.80	< 0.001

- * Performed by paired t test

Table 8: The mean score of pre and postoperative functional score in both procedures

Type of surgery	Mean Score \pm SD		P Value *
	Functional Pre op Scale	Functional Post op Scale	
Fenestration discectomy	1.70 \pm 0.60	4.51 \pm 0.74	< 0.001
Hemilaminectomy and discectomy	1.81 \pm 0.54	4.29 \pm 0.81	< 0.001

- Performed by paired t test

Discussion

Lumbar disc prolapse consider as one of most common causes of spine surgery. Many surgical procedures were described for discectomy like full or total laminectomy with discectomy, hemilaminectomy and discectomy, fenestration discectomy, microscopic discectomy and endoscopic discectomy.

In this study we compare between two modalities of discectomy, which are fenestration discectomy and classical hemilaminectomy and discectomy. Since most of lumbar disc prolapse affected young adults in their productive life, so we need to evaluate which procedure provide quick return to normal life.

In this study 60% of our patients aged between 31 – 40 years with males affected as twice as the females. This is a known fact in all literatures in which they showed that lumbar disc prolapse is more common young active healthy people in their third and fourth decades of life, this is because the prolapse happen due to heavy exertion, repetitive bending, twisting, or heavy lifting; things that usually done by young adult male [2, 7].

In this study the back pain radiated (sciatica) more to left lower limb 56.7% and only 7.2% of patients, the pain was radiated to both limbs. There were no any difference in the outcome and the complication that related to the side of pain radiation.

SLRT was positive in all cases while cross leg raising test was positive in 37.8% of cases; this is comparable to study done by Ujwal et al [8]. Sensory deficit was elicited in 42.3% of the patients; motor deficit in 60.4% and diminished ankle reflex was founded in 20.7%. Sciatic scoliosis was found in 15.3% of the patients in this study.

Most of prolapsed disc was found at L4-L5 level (64%) and only 12% of the patients suffered from L4-L5 and L5-S1 simultaneously. 75% of the prolapsed discs was found extruded, while sequestered discs were diagnosed in 7% of the patients. Most of the patients were presented with pure lateral disc herniation (80%). In this study; the level of the prolapsed discs, the location of the discs and the type of the disc prolapse play no role in the selection of the type of surgery, the complications and the final outcome. Omidi-Kashani Fet al[9] reported that the ultimate satisfaction rates at final follow-up visit are similar and comparable between the L4-5 and L5-S1 levels.

Fenestration discectomy was performed to 53 patients (47.7%) and discectomy through hemilaminectomy were done to 58 patients (52.3%). We compare both procedures in the following points:

In the fenestration group, the mean operative time was 69.13 ± 8.96 minutes which was significantly shorter than the hemilaminectomy group which was 78.66

± 10.31 minutes (p value >0.001), this is can be attributed to less soft tissue dissection, minimal bonny procedure with flavectomy and smaller incision which need less time for closure. Ujwal et al [8] reported 75 minutes as a mean operative time for fenestration discectomy. A study done by Adam et al[10] showed significant shorter operative time with fenestration (mean time was 70 minutes) than the time of laminectomy (mean time 105 minutes).

In this series, the hospital stay in fenestration group (mean 1.31 ± 0.73 days) was significantly less than the hemilaminectomy group (mean 2.46 ± 1.42 days) with P value less than 0.001. The small incision, less muscle dissection will decrease the postoperative pain in which will decrease hospital stay. Harrington [11] stated that reduced postoperative pain in minimally invasive techniques would reduce hospital stay.

From the data collected in this series one can notice that, although the complications reported in the hemilaminectomy were more than those in fenestration group there were no significant differences between both procedures (P value > 0.05). Two root injuries one in each group were recorded in this study, it is well known fact that root injury is represent 1% of all discectomy procedures, although Nancy E. Epstein [12] stated that the minimal invasive techniques carries more nerve root injuries than the classical one. Dural tear was reported in one patient of the hemilaminectomy group and not recorded in fenestration one this was happened accidentally while retracting the Dura to separate a very adherent sequestered disc. Superficial stitch infection recorded in 8 patients in both groups and treated conservatively by antibiotics without any effect on the overall result of surgery.

In this series, most of the patients in both groups are preoperatively economically scored E2 which is No gainful occupation, including ability to do housework, or

continue retirement activities and functionally scored F2 which is Difficulty in walking, needing a cane or crutch or persistent moderate motor weakness (able to perform tasks of daily living). There were no statistical differences between the fenestration and hemilaminectomy groups preoperatively and postoperatively in both economical and functional scores (P value more than 0.05). Six months postoperatively, the score is significantly improved in both procedures economically and functionally (P value less than 0.001). PROLO score assessed the patient economically and functionally and it describes more details than other score systems like Macnabs, although the end score of both systems are the same [8]. PROLO score when created in 1986, it was for evaluation of vertebral interbody fusion. This rating scale is easily applicable and can delineate pre- and postoperative conditions of patients on a semiquantitative basis [13]. Several researchers administered the original PROLO score as a main outcome or in association with other outcome measures, mostly in studies conducted on degenerative pathologies of the lumbar spine. Some authors used the PROLO by properly adapting items for the postoperative evaluation of function of other spinal districts, for example, the thoracic spine in case of fracture stabilization or discectomy or the cervical spine [6]. PROLO score system consist of two scores the first one is Economic (E), in which the patient evaluated according to the ability to return back to his previous job in complete or part time, need modification of the job, need to change the entire job or should retired. The other score is the functional (F) which related to the degree of pain, motor and sensory deficit postoperatively.

In this series 38 patients out of 53 (71.69%) in fenestration group and 33 patients out of 58 (56.89%) in

hemilaminectomy group were returned back to their previous jobs within 6 months postoperatively. These results in fenestration group were comparable with Ujwal et al [8] who stated that; according to PROLO economical scale, (72%) of cases were able to work at their previous job without any recurrences while (12%) were able to work at previous occupation but part time or limited status while (16%) cases were able to work but had to abandon their previous occupation. In our study 15% of fenestration group and 22% of hemilaminectomy group were able to returned back to their previous job but in part time or with limited effort, while the rest of the patients were able to work but they changed their previous jobs. In this series, there were a considerable number of patients even if their final functional score were F3 or F4, they scored E5 in economic score. This is due to that many of our patients (especially the governmental employers) were not able to change their jobs style easily, so they were enforced to continue with their previous jobs even with remnant postoperative symptoms.

In this study, 45 patients (85%) of fenestration group and 45 patients (77.5%) in hemilaminectomy group were free of pain (F4 and F5) at the end of 6 months. This is also comparable with Ujwalet al8 study in which they recorded that 88% of their patients were relieved of pain at the end of 6 months.

Most of the patients in this study gain excellent results according to PROLO score in both surgical procedures. Excellent results were more in fenestration group (37 patients) than that in hemilaminectomy group (34 patients). There was no significant statistical differences between the two procedures (P vale more than 0.05). Overall most of the patients improve in both economic and functional scores in both procedures, which mean that final satisfactory outcome, were gained in both procedures.

In this series 92% of patients treated with fenestration discectomy improved postoperatively to good or excellent, while 85% of the patients treated with hemilaminectomy and discectomy group were improved to good or excellent postoperatively. This is comparable to study of Dennis Antony et al [14] who recorded good improvement in 88% of the patients. Ujwal et al [8] in their study reported good improvement in 84% of their cases.

Out of 111 patients, only 13 patients with fair outcome at the end of 6 months (4 patients in fenestration and 9 in hemilaminectomy groups); although the number of patients was much less in fenestration group, this difference was statistically not significant (P value more than 0.05). Both Dennis14 and Ujwal8 drop excellent from their studies and they consider score below 5 as poor, 6-7 as fair and 8-10 as good.

Conclusions

From this study you can conclude that although fenestration discectomy and discectomy through hemilaminectomy carries almost the same successful and satisfactory final outcome, fenestration discectomy is superior in minimizing dissection, operation duration, postoperative pain and hospital stay. PROLO score is easy, dependable and predictable way to evaluate the economic and the functional outcome of the patients treated with lumber discectomy.

References

1. Louis Solomon, David Warwick, Selvadurai Nayagam. Apley's System of Orthopaedics and Fractures. Ninth edition. 2010. Hodder Arnold. Pp. 478 – 481.
2. S. Terry Canale, James H. beaty. Campbell's Operative Orthopaedics, Twelfth edition 2013, International edition. Volume II. Elsevier Mosby. Page 1935.

3. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, et al. Surgical vs nonoperative treatment for lumbar disk herniation: the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) observational cohort. *JAMA*. 2006; 296(20): 2451-9.
4. Gotfryd A, Avanzi O. A systematic review of randomised clinical trials using posterior discectomy to treat lumbar disc herniations. *IntOrthop*. 2009; 33(1): 11-7.
5. Evaniew N, Khan M, Drew B, Kwok D, Bhandari M, Ghert M. Minimally invasive versus open surgery for cervical and lumbar discectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *CMAJ Open*. 2014; 2(4): E295-305.
6. Carla Vanti, Donatella Prospero, and Marco Boschi. The Prolo Scale: history, evolution and psychometric properties. *J OrthopTraumatol*. 2013; 14(4): 235–245.
7. Kenneth J. Koval, MD. Orthopaedics Knowledge Update, Home Study Syllabus 7. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. 2002. Page 632.
8. Ujwal Gowadhan Wankhade, Mahesh Kotahal Umashankar, and B.S. Jayakrishna Reddy. Functional Outcome of Lumbar Discectomy by Fenestration Technique in Lumbar Disc Prolapse – Return to Work and Relief of Pain. *J ClinDiagn Res*. 2016; 10(3): RC09–RC13.
9. Omidi-Kashani F, Jarahi L, Jafarian M, Rahimi and Anjomrouz M. Impact of Herniation Level on Surgical Outcome of Microlumbar Discectomy. *Austin J Orthopade & Rheumatol*. 2014;1(1): 3.
10. D. Adam, Ioana Hornea, Gina Burduşa, D. Iftimie, Cristiana Moisesescu. A retrospective comparison of laminectomy and unilateral fenestration with foraminotomy on outcome of patients with lumbar spinal stenosis. *Romanian Neurosurgery (2016) XXX 1: 6 – 14*.
11. J. F. Harrington, P. French. Open versus Minimally Invasive Lumbar Microdiscectomy: Comparison of Operative Times, Length of Hospital Stay, Narcotic Use and Complications. *Minim Invasive Neurosurg* 2008; 51(1): 30-35.
12. Nancy E. Epstein. More nerve root injuries occur with minimally invasive lumbar surgery, especially extreme lateral interbody fusion: A review. *Surg Neurol Int*. 2016; 7(Suppl 3): S83–S95.
13. Prolo DJ, Oklund SA, Butcher M. Toward uniformity in evaluating results of lumbar spine operations. A paradigm applied to posterior lumbar interbody fusions. *Spine*. 1986; 11:601–606.
14. Dennis Antony, Rajany Jose. Functional outcome of lumbar fenestration discectomy in patients with intervertebral disc prolapse treated at a tertiary care Centre in south India. *JEMDS*, 2016; 5(90) 6689–6693.