

Osteobiologics and Value-Based Care: Challenges and Opportunities

Safdar N. Khan and Hania Shahzad

Int J Spine Surg 2023, 17 (S3) S44-S52

doi: <https://doi.org/10.14444/8560>

<https://www.ijssurgery.com/content/17/S3/S44>

This information is current as of May 3, 2025.

Email Alerts Receive free email-alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up at:
<http://ijssurgery.com/alerts>

Osteobiologics and Value-Based Care: Challenges and Opportunities

SAFDAR N. KHAN, MD^{1*} AND HANIA SHAHZAD, MD^{2*}

¹Department of Orthopedics, UC Davis Health, Sacramento, California, USA; ²Department of Orthopedics, UC Davis Health, Sacramento, California, USA

*Safdar N. Khan and Hania Shahzad contributed equally to the work.

ABSTRACT

Background: Autologous bone grafts, sourced from the iliac crest, are the gold standard for bone substitution in spine surgery. However, harvesting autografts increases the risk of postoperative complications. Bone allografts are another popular source of graft material, but their use is rapidly surpassing their availability. There has been considerable interest in manufactured bone graft substitutes, commonly referred to as osteobiologics, which mimic the properties of autologous bone and may be osteoconductive, osteoinductive, osteogenic, or a combination.

Objective: Osteobiologics have been developed to mimic the properties of autologous bone, but their high cost and variable effectiveness raise questions about their value. This article explores the challenges and opportunities associated with the use of osteobiologics used to aid in bone healing in spinal fusion surgery within a value-based care framework. Spinal fusion treatments such as bone morphogenetic proteins, platelet-rich plasma, autologous conditioned serum, demineralized bone matrix, biomaterial scaffolds, stem cells, and cellular bone matrices are compared.

Summary: Bone morphogenetic proteins are highly effective but often associated with serious risks; platelet-rich plasma shows promising results but lacks standardization in research protocols. Autologous conditioned serum is inconclusive and cost-effective, while demineralized bone matrix has variable effectiveness and limited data to use in anterior spinal fusions. Biomaterial scaffolds have limited application in the anterior spine but demonstrate high efficacy when it comes to spinal fusion. Stem cells demonstrate improved postsurgical outcomes but have low yield from bone marrow and potential risks associated with genetic engineering and cell therapy. Cellular bone matrices show promising results and have high fusion rates, yet there is currently no US Food and Drug Administration requirement for preclinical or clinical data before commercial usage. Although osteobiologics have considerable potential, their high price and uncertain efficiency raise questions concerning their usefulness in spinal fusion surgery. To ensure better patient outcomes, extensive research is needed to explore their utilization within a value-based care framework.

Biologics

Keywords: osteobiologic, DBM, stem cells, CBM

INTRODUCTION

Osteobiologics are substances that promote bone healing and are being utilized more frequently in spine surgery to avoid nonunion.¹ The gold standard for bone replacement in spine surgery continues to be autologous bone grafts, which are harvested from iliac crest bone grafts (ICBGs). However, harvesting autografts increases the risk of postoperative pain, wound complications, longer operating times, and donor site pain.²

Bone allografts, sourced from human cadavers,³ are another popular source of graft material. Earlier studies provided evidence in favor of allografts with comparable fusion rates and clinical outcomes to autografts.^{4,5} According to more recent studies, autologous bone grafts have better fusion rates than allogeneic bone grafts,⁶ which may be due to the absence of viable cells, rendering the allografts nonosteogenic.

Moreover, postexcision processing techniques, such as gamma irradiation, reduce the load-bearing capacity of allografts in comparison to autografts. Despite the variability in literature, allografts have historically been used to substitute autografts until now as their high demand is rapidly surpassing their availability.⁷

Consequently, there has been considerable interest in manufactured bone graft substitutes, commonly referred to as osteobiologics. The use of osteobiologics, such as growth factors, demineralized bone matrices (DBMs), biomaterial scaffolds, as well as bone marrow aspirate (BMA) and its derivatives, have become an integral part of spinal fusion surgery. Osteobiologics can be osteoconductive, osteoinductive, osteogenic, or a combination of the 3, and they mirror the characteristics of an autologous bone. The use of osteobiologics in spine surgery has been shown to enhance clinical results and fusion rates and improve pain management.⁸ However,

Table 1. Comparing efficacy, utility, and cost challenges of osteobiological agents.

| Agent | Properties | Efficacy | Costs | Challenges | Opportunities |
|--|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Bone morphogenetic proteins | Proteins involved in the differentiation of osteoblasts and chondroblasts | Comparable and high | High | Variable fusion rates across different procedures, associated with serious complications | New delivery methods to reduce dose-limiting effects; advantages outweigh risks in vulnerable population |
| Platelet-rich plasma | Contains growth factors | Promising | Unavailable | Lack of standardization in research protocols | High fusion rates |
| Autologous conditioned serum | Growth factors extracted from the patient's serum | Inconclusive | Unavailable | No evidence regarding improving fusion rates | Cost-effective |
| Demineralized bone matrix | Graft extender containing growth factors | Effective, but as an adjunct | Lower than nonautologous graft materials but still relatively high | Extreme variability in the number and types of products available for an accurate comparison, limited data for use in anterior spinal fusions | Improved clinical outcomes, lower intraoperative blood loss, and improved physical function. |
| Biomaterial scaffolds (ceramics and polypeptide-based compounds) | Synthetic grafts made of osteoconductive materials | Variable | High | Limited use in the anterior spine, increased resorption rates, brittle and weak in tension-based posterior spinal fusions | High efficacy in spinal fusion, synthetic, biodegradable, nontoxic, and noninflammatory. |
| Stem cells (mesenchymal and adipose-derived) | Possessing autocrine and paracrine properties, effective for lineage progression and differentiation | Limited studies in humans | High | Low yield of mesenchymal stem cells from bone marrow, difficulty in increasing their concentration in implanted grafts, potential risks associated with systemic viral or bacterial toxicity, immunity to certain viral strains, and ethical concerns surrounding genetic engineering and cell therapy. | Improved postsurgery outcomes, comparable uptake, reduced healing time, comorbidities and systemic factors do not affect their outcomes adversely. |
| Cellular bone matrices | Osteoconductive grafts made by combining allogeneic bone with allogeneic stem cells | Promising | High | Lack of FDA requirement for preclinical or clinical data before commercial usage, effective concentration threshold rates still unknown. | High fusion rates |

Abbreviation: FDA, US Food and Drug Administration.

their high cost and varying efficacy have raised concerns about their value in spinal fusion surgery. This article explores the challenges and opportunities associated with the use of osteobiologics in spinal fusion surgery within a value-based care framework.

EXPLORING THE CURRENT EVIDENCE IN THE USE OF OSTEOBIOLOGICS: EFFECTIVENESS, LIMITATIONS, AND REGULATORY CHALLENGES

Currently available osteobiologics include growth factor derivatives, which include bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs) and platelet-rich plasma (PRP), DBM, biomaterial scaffolds or synthetics, and BMA derivatives (Table 1). Although each of these have shown a potential to enhance bone fusion rates in spinal surgeries, each material has its limitations and complications.

Bone Morphogenetic Proteins

The effects of BMP on fusion rates are not consistent across various spine procedures and must be approached with caution. Compared with other materials, BMP has

shown improved fusion rates in anterior lumbar interbody fusion and posterior lumbar fusion (PLF) but not as much in posterior lumbar interbody fusions (PLIFs) and transforaminal lumbar interbody fusions (TLIFs).⁹ Therefore, the use of rhBMP-2 is only FDA-approved for anterior lumbar interbody fusion (ALIF), while its use in PLIF,¹⁰ TLIF,¹¹ and PLF¹² remains off-label. Despite showing augmented fusion rates and clinical outcomes in the cervical spine,^{13–15} the FDA continues to have a black box warning for its use in cervical procedures due to complications such as cervical airway edema and dysphagia.¹⁶ BMP has also been linked to various complications, including seroma/hematoma formation, prevertebral swelling, radiculitis, retrograde ejaculation, vertebral osteolysis, heterotopic ossification, allograft resorption,^{17–22} and increased cancer risk,²³ which create barriers to its widespread adoption in spinal arthrodesis. The limited ability of carrier molecules to bind and release the product results in such complications.

Methods to enhance localized delivery of rhBMP-2 to the site of healing using nanostructure biomaterials which enhance growth factor retention resulting

in reduced suprathreshold doses of rhBMP-2 have shown efficiency in animal studies.^{24,25} These delivery techniques help to mitigate dose-limiting side effects by decreasing the therapeutic dose of growth factors.²⁵ Despite the apprehensions regarding its use, rhBMP-2 is widely used across various spinal fusion surgeries, including cervical and thoracic procedures. Between 2002 and 2011, rhBMP-2 use skyrocketed from slightly more than 1000 to nearly 80,000 cases, and approximately 85% of rhBMP-2 use was deemed off-label.^{2,26} Currently, the evidence regarding the benefits of rhBMP-2 is more tangible, especially in vulnerable populations with poor bone quality, those undergoing revision surgery, and smokers, than the evidence concerning the risks.²⁵

Platelet-Rich Plasma

The use of PRP for spinal arthrodesis and its role in regenerating bone has been explored in animal models with promising results, with fusion rates of 100% and 86% reported in rodent and rabbit models, respectively, when used in conjunction with other substances. However, a sheep model did not demonstrate significant osteoinductive effects of PRP. Consequently, there is a need for standardized research exploring PRP use in spine surgery.^{27,28} A step ahead of PRP is an autologous conditioned serum (ACS), which is created by extracting and modifying a patient's serum containing growth factors such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF) and transforming growth factor- β (TGF- β) and reintroducing it to the patient. Although ACS is a cost-effective way to enhance new bone formation, studies have not yet been able to prove the superiority of using ACS in enhancing posterior spinal fusion or TLIF fusion rates.³

Demineralized Bone Matrix

The use of DBM in spinal fusion presents both challenges and opportunities. Multiple studies have found no significant disparities in fusion or pseudoarthrosis development rates between DBM and other bone graft materials.^{25–27,29,30} DBM has been extensively studied as an autograft extender in posterior spinal fusions, but limited data are available regarding its use in anterior spinal fusions.^{31–33} Despite this, using DBM as an adjunct has been found to improve clinical outcomes, lower intraoperative blood loss, and improve physical function.³¹ However, it is important to note that these studies explored the use of DBM as an adjunct to local autograft, BMA, or ICBG, and there is currently no evidence to support the use of DBM as an autonomous osteobiologic. Surgeons must be diligent in selecting DBM

products due to the extreme variability in the number and types available. DBM products are effective in treating multilevel cervical disc disease and augmenting spinal fusions, and several authors have suggested standardized paradigms for selecting DBM products.³⁴ For routine spinal fusions, it is advisable to use a pure 100% DBM paste without a carrier as a complement to autologous bone grafts. In posterior spinal surgery, one may consider using a soft and porous DBM bone strip, which provides immediate support and scaffolding. This approach can be particularly beneficial when combined with autologous Bone Marrow Aspirate Concentration (BMAC). In cases where there is a need to inject DBM into a bone defect, such as those resulting from the removal of a pedicle screw, it is preferred to use DBM with a carrier in a viscous formulation.³⁴ Manufacturing companies and the FDA should provide more information on the origin, processing, storage parameters, and final DBM content of these products to aid in product selection.

Synthetics: Ceramics and Polypeptide-Based Compounds

Ceramics, such as hydroxyapatite and tricalcium phosphate, have shown high efficacy in spinal fusion and have the advantage of being synthetic, biodegradable, non-toxic, and noninflammatory.^{35–37} Since they need to be shielded from severe compression load, their use in the anterior spine is limited,³⁸ and their increased resorption rates³⁹ may limit their applicability. The major challenge is that ceramics are weak and brittle and susceptible to the same disadvantages as allograft in tension-based posterior fusions.³⁸ While earlier studies suggest ceramics may serve as viable alternatives to autograft bone, newer studies have evaluated their use without standard control or comparison groups.^{40–42} Several studies have reported varying fusion rates, depending on surgical technique, number of levels fused, criteria for radiographic fusion assessment and follow-up period, and patient factors such as smoking. Consequently, it is challenging to draw fair comparisons between these studies.⁴³ New evidence has surfaced regarding the practical application of synthetics (ie, AttraX Putty) as a standalone bone graft substitute for autograft in instrumented thoracolumbar PLF.⁴⁴

Polypeptide-based compounds like ABM/P-15 offer an opportunity for spinal fusion because they are noninferior to autograft in fusion rates and adverse events,^{45,46} and some studies indicate higher success rates.⁴⁷ However, more research is needed to assess their effectiveness and safety fully. While ABM/P-15 has shown promising results in Europe, it has not undergone comprehensive

investigation in the United States and lacks FDA clearance as a lumbar fusion device, thereby hindering its application in this clinical setting. P-15 is currently undergoing an active FDA study, focusing on its PLIF indication, and this study is nearing completion.⁴⁸ Successful results from this study would result in the attainment of an on-label indication, significantly enhancing the product's value. Recently, insurance carriers have been placing a growing emphasis on FDA-approved indications for medical products. Recognizing this trend, P-15 aims to leverage the potential on-label status to its advantage. As a consequence, spine surgeons may contemplate the use of P-15, particularly when seeking pre-authorization, as it could streamline the process of obtaining insurance approval for a given case.

Stem Cell Derivatives

Stem cell derivatives offer potential for spinal fusion, but their use in humans is still limited. Animal studies have shown success with autologous stem cells and BMAC, but the yield of mesenchymal stem cells from bone marrow is low,⁴⁹ and methods to increase their concentration in implanted grafts are ineffective and expensive, and it is challenging to maintain sterility during surgery where cells are required to be added into the bone graft. Additionally, there have been no investigations into commercial methods yet. Although studies in animals have shown promising results with cultured and engineered stem cells, the use of stem cell derivatives in spinal fusion is still limited in human trials. The main challenge is the potential risks associated with systemic viral or bacterial toxicity, immunity to certain viral strains, and ethical concerns surrounding genetic engineering and cell therapy. However, recent research has shown that BMAC can be an effective alternative to the "gold standard" ICBG in posterior lumbar fusions, with comparable fusion rates.⁵⁰ Stem cell product lines are also more favorable compared with synthetic materials because comorbidities and other systemic factors do not affect their outcomes adversely. Inadequate fusion following spinal surgery can lead to reduced quality of life and patient morbidity. Stem cell therapy has the potential to improve postoperative outcomes, especially in terms of fusion, with uptake comparable to or even better than traditional materials while also reducing healing time.

Cellular Bone Matrices

The use of cellular bone matrices (CBMs) in spinal fusion has shown promise in achieving high rates of fusion. However, the content of CBMs varies greatly regarding total mesenchymal stem cell concentration, donor age, shelf life, and cell viability. Moreover, the concentration thresholds required for satisfactory

fusion rates are still unknown.⁵¹ The lack of FDA requirements for preclinical or clinical data prior to commercial use makes an accurate comparison between different commercial CBMs challenging. Additionally, the evidence regarding CBM outcomes has been largely derived from industry-sponsored studies, and the lack of standardized regulation and data raises concerns about their efficacy and safety in spinal fusion surgery.

COST CHALLENGES

In the context of using osteobiological agents in spinal fusion surgery, there are numerous cost-related challenges to consider. One should exercise caution when evaluating studies that compare osteobiologics because several of these studies are industry-sponsored and necessitate a smaller patient population in comparison to studies that are intended to assess the superiority of the product. FDA clearance is frequently granted for a limited indication, but it is frequently extrapolated to other surgical procedures based on the surgeon's understanding of the literature, resulting in off-label usage and potential hazards for patients. A recently published systematic review highlighted the lack of consensus on the cost-effectiveness of using alternative osteobiologics compared with ICBG for spinal fusion procedures.⁵² The authors concluded that while alternative osteobiologics usually result in greater costs than ICBG, there is wide variability of parameters in each study, such as levels of fusion and variability in the factors that affected the overall costs, which made accurate comparisons unlikely. Additionally, this variability also exists across different health care systems and countries. However, one principle holds: nonautologous graft materials are the most expensive, followed by synthetic and autologous graft materials.⁵³ For example, in New York, USA, the cost of Stryker bioactive foam, Stryker bio4, and Medtronic extra small BMP was \$215, \$255, and \$2010, respectively. Santiago, Chile had 1 cc DBM costing \$319 and 5 cc Tricalcium phosphate costing \$352. Switzerland had 5 cc BMP costing \$952 to \$1270 and a large Induct Os kit costing \$4762. In Egypt, the cost of Tricalcium phosphate ranged from \$49 to \$82, while the cost of BMP and polyetheretherketone cages ranged from \$286 to \$408 and \$61 to \$102, respectively. In Singapore, the cost of Zim Vie, a type of osteobiologic, was \$729.⁵²

The most widely studied agents are allografts and BMPs. Critics frequently argue that the elevated expenses associated with utilizing osteobiologics can

be balanced out by the reduced long-term incidence of complications when compared with conventional autologous ICBG. However, this argument should be approached with caution, as their associated higher hospital-reported charges may not be worth it especially when patients show similar fusion rates, post-operative complication rates, and time-to-readmission regardless of osteobiologic type.⁵³ For example, rhBMP-2 in spinal deformity surgery can add as much as \$20,000, but it mitigates the probability of surgical intervention for pseudarthrosis, which would otherwise result in expenses ranging from \$30,000 to \$60,000 per surgery.^{54,55} Data from a multicenter, prospective registry of 522 patients with adult spinal deformity were analyzed by the International Spine Study Group. The findings indicated that the incidence of revision surgery for symptomatic pseudoarthrosis was twice as high in patients who did not receive rhBMP-2 compared with those who received rhBMP-2. Additionally, patients who necessitated revision surgery for pseudoarthrosis incurred direct costs that were more than twice as high as patients who did not require surgery for pseudoarthrosis, as determined by the mean 2-year direct costs.^{55,56} Therefore, the use of rhBMP-2 seems to be a cost-effective option, given the high patient and economic costs of failed fusion surgery. This principle may not apply to anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF) surgeries where BMP is associated with dysphagia and/or hoarseness.⁵⁷ Therefore, it remains unclear whether its use in ACDF can be deemed cost-effective even when considering the fusion and complication rates. Regardless, utilizing rhBMP-2 in spine surgeries has always been a costly approach, and to date, there are no cheaper variants of rhBMP-2 available. Efforts have been geared toward developing guidelines for appropriate use of rhBMP-2, with indications including adult spinal deformity surgery, revision spine surgery, and surgery involving long constructs.⁵⁸

Contemporary medical advancements, including BMAC and DBM, have been preliminarily investigated for their cost-effectiveness in comparison to other products. These investigations have suggested similar clinical efficacy at reduced costs.⁵⁹ According to Patel and Silver, patients who were treated with BMAC had a shorter average hospital stay and fewer days from discharge to the commencement of physical therapy compared with patients who received autograft or BMA for spinal fusion. Additionally, the average cost of treating spine fusion patients with significant comorbidities was found to be lower in

patients treated with BMAC in comparison to those treated with BMP.⁶⁰ The presented data demonstrate the potential benefits of utilizing BMAC as a biological agent in the treatment of spinal fusion patients, including the reduction of expenses and a positive impact on health outcomes. However, these are preliminary results, and there is an eminent need for further research to determine the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of different osteobiologic materials.

The interest of spine surgeons in stem cell therapies is notable; however, it should be noted that these therapies are not associated with lower costs. Although few studies report costs to patients, or the funding institution, stem cell therapy can incur greater costs than traditional therapy.⁶¹ As with any relatively new modality, we can expect these costs to decrease with greater adoption and optimization. The direct expenses associated with these alternatives do not significantly differ from those of commonly employed methods. However, the hidden costs involved in processing, activating, testing for infections, and other tasks associated with high sterility procedures serve as significant hurdles in effectively comparing their utility in value-based health care.⁶²

Estimating based on the previously defined nonfusion rate of 10% to 28%,^{63,64} it becomes evident that a substantial number of individuals experience nonfusion following spinal surgery. Importantly, nonfusion patients exhibit a significantly higher early loosening rate of pedicle screws, contributing to 62.5% of subsequent reoperations.^{65,66} Therefore, justifying a high cost of an agent becomes possible only if it significantly contributes to fusion. This is particularly important because spinal nonfusion is a common and severe postoperative complication that can profoundly affect patient satisfaction, postoperative function, and mental well-being.⁶⁵

Disclosing costs for osteobiologic products from different companies has proven to be challenging due to the sensitivity and confidentiality surrounding dealings with each hospital. Our attempt was to comprehensively summarize and compare the costs of each biologic based on published data across 3 different states in the United States (Table 2),^{52,67} with fusion success serving as the measure of benefit. It is crucial to note that these opinions are based on available literature.

While the high costs of BMP are justified as they provide superior fusion benefit, DBM's low costs and noninferiority to autograft bone favor its independent use to avoid autograft morbidity. PRP has low costs

Table 2. Cost comparisons and noninferiority evidence for various osteobiologics in 3 US states.

| Osteobiologics | Costs Across 3 States | | | Cost Range | Noninferiority | Verdict |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | Maryland | New York | California | | | |
| Bone morphogenetic proteins | Infuse, large kit, 8 cc: \$6,000 | Medtronic extra small BMP: \$2010 | inFUSE large pack: \$5100–5408 | \$–\$\$\$\$ | Superior effect in combination with autograft | High costs justified |
| Platelet-rich plasma | | | \$450–475 | \$ | No evidence to establish noninferiority | Low costs justified for trial exploration, not for routine use |
| Demineralized bone matrix | Optium, 10 g: \$900 | Stryker, 1 cc: \$191 | DBX: \$576–\$880, Grafton: \$575–600 | \$ | Noninferiority to autograft bone | Low costs justified for independent use, avoiding autograft morbidity |
| Biomaterial scaffolds | | | | | | |
| Tricalcium phosphate | Chronos, 10 g: \$635 | Stryker, 1.2 cc: \$211 | | \$ | No evidence to establish noninferiority | Not enough evidence to comment |
| Bioactive glass | Fibergraft, 10 g: \$2,900 | Stryker vitoss bioactive foam, 1.2 cc: \$215 | | \$–\$\$ | No evidence to establish noninferiority | Not enough evidence to comment |
| Stem cells (mesenchymal and adipose-derived) | Vivigen, 10 g: \$3,300 | Stryker bio4, 1 cc: \$255 | | \$–\$\$\$ | No evidence to establish noninferiority in spinal fusion | Not enough evidence to comment |

Note: Costs are represented in US dollars (\$). The cost range indicates the relative costliness of each biologic and is based on the following scale: <\$1000: \$, >\$1000: \$\$, <\$5000: \$\$\$, >\$5000: \$\$\$\$.

justified for trial exploration but not routine use due to insufficient evidence for noninferiority. Biomaterial scaffolds like tricalcium phosphate and bioactive glass lack evidence for noninferiority, making it difficult to comment on their cost-effectiveness. Stem cells (mesenchymal and adipose-derived) also lack evidence for noninferiority in spinal fusion, with insufficient data for a cost-effectiveness assessment.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the use of osteobiologics in spinal fusion surgery has presented both challenges and opportunities for spine surgeons. While autologous bone grafts remain the gold standard, their use presents a risk of postoperative complications. Allografts, on the other hand, are inferior to autografts due to the absence of viable cells and processing techniques that reduce their load-bearing capacity. As a result, osteobiologics have become an integral part of spinal fusion surgery, mimicking the properties of autologous bone and improving pain reduction, fusion rates, and clinical outcomes. While osteobiologics have shown promising results, their high cost and varying efficacy have raised concerns about their value in spinal fusion surgery. Therefore, further research is needed to explore the use of osteobiologics within a value-based care framework to ensure that the benefits of these materials outweigh their cost and complications, ultimately leading to better patient outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Bhatt RA, Rozental TD. Bone graft substitutes. *Hand Clin.* 2012;28(4):457–468. doi:10.1016/j.hcl.2012.08.001
2. Kannan A, Dodwad SNM, Hsu WK. Biologics in spine arthrodesis. *J Spinal Disord Tech.* 2015;28(5):163–170. doi:10.1097/BSD.0000000000000281
3. Gupta A, Kukkar N, Sharif K, Main BJ, Albers CE, El-Amin Iii SF. Bone graft substitutes for spine fusion: a brief review. *World J Orthop.* 2015;6(6):449–456. doi:10.5312/wjo.v6.i6.449
4. Putzier M, Strube P, Funk JF, et al. Allogenic versus autologous cancellous bone in lumbar segmental spondylodesis: a randomized prospective study. *Eur Spine J.* 2009;18(5):687–695. doi:10.1007/s00586-008-0875-7
5. Suchomel P, Barsa P, Buchvald P, Svobodnik A, Vanickova E. Autologous versus allogenic bone grafts in instrumented anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a prospective study with respect to bone union pattern. *Eur Spine J.* 2004;13(6):510–515. doi:10.1007/s00586-003-0667-z
6. Gao Y, Li J, Cui H, et al. Comparison of intervertebral fusion rates of different bone graft materials in extreme lateral interbody fusion. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2019;98(44):e17685. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000017685
7. Abbas G, Bali SL, Abbas N, Dalton DJ. Demand and supply of bone allograft and the role of orthopaedic surgeons. *Acta Orthop Belg.* 2007;73(4):507–511.
8. Hsu WK, Goldstein CL, Shamji MF, et al. Novel osteobiologics and biomaterials in the treatment of spinal disorders. *Neurosurgery.* 2017;80(3S):S100–S107. doi:10.1093/neuros/nyw085
9. Galimberti F, Lubelski D, Healy AT, et al. A systematic review of lumbar fusion rates with and without the use of rhBMP-2. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2015;40(14):1132–1139. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000000971
10. Haid RW, Branch CL, Alexander JT, Burkus JK. Posterior lumbar Interbody fusion using recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein type 2 with cylindrical interbody cages. *Spine J.* 2004;4(5):527–538. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2004.03.025

11. Mummaneni PV, Pan J, Haid RW, Rodts GE. Contribution of recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein—2 to the rapid creation of interbody fusion when used in transforaminal lumbar Interbody fusion: a preliminary report. *J Neurosurg*. 2004;1(1):19–23. doi:10.3171/spi.2004.1.1.0019
12. Dimar JR, Glassman SD, Burkus JK, Pryor PW, Hardacker JW, Carreon LY. Clinical and radiographic analysis of an optimized rhBMP-2 formulation as an autograft replacement in posterolateral lumbar spine arthrodesis. *J Bone Joint Surg*. 2009;91(6):1377–1386. doi:10.2106/JBJS.H.00200
13. Lu DC, Tumialán LM, Chou D. Multilevel anterior cervical discectomy and fusion with and without rhBMP-2: a comparison of dysphagia rates and outcomes in 150 patients. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2013;18(1):43–49. doi:10.3171/2012.10.SPINE10231
14. Burkus JK, Dryer RF, Arnold PM, Foley KT. Clinical and radiographic outcomes in patients undergoing single-level anterior cervical arthrodesis. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2017;30(9):E1321–E1332. doi:10.1097/BSD.0000000000000409
15. Tumialán LM, Pan J, Rodts GE, Mummaneni PV. The safety and efficacy of anterior cervical discectomy and fusion with polyetheretherketone spacer and recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2: a review of 200 patients. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2008;8(6):529–535. doi:10.3171/SPI/2008/8/6/529
16. Carragee EJ, Hurwitz EL, Weiner BK. A critical review of recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 trials in spinal surgery: emerging safety concerns and lessons learned. *Spine J*. 2011;11(6):471–491. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2011.04.023
17. Vincentelli AF, Szadkowski M, Vardon D, et al. rhBMP-2 (recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2) in real world spine surgery. A phase IV, national, multicentre, retrospective study collecting data from patient medical files in French spinal centres. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res*. 2019;105(6):1157–1163. doi:10.1016/j.otsr.2019.04.023
18. Tannoury CA, An HS. Complications with the use of bone morphogenetic protein 2 (BMP-2) in spine surgery. *Spine J*. 2014;14(3):552–559. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2013.08.060
19. Pradhan BB, Bae HW, Dawson EG, Patel VV, Delamarter RB. Graft resorption with the use of bone morphogenetic protein: lessons from anterior lumbar interbody fusion using femoral ring allografts and recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2006;31(10):E277–E284. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000216442.12092.01
20. Crandall DG, Revella J, Patterson J, Huish E, Chang M, McLemore R. Transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion with rhBMP-2 in spinal deformity, spondylolisthesis, and degenerative disease-part 1: large series diagnosis related outcomes and complications with 2- to 9-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013;38(13):1128–1136. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31828864e6
21. Fu R, Selph S, McDonagh M, et al. Effectiveness and harms of recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 in spine fusion: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(12):890–902. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-12-201306180-00006
22. Simmonds MC, Brown JVE, Heirs MK, et al. Safety and effectiveness of recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 for spinal fusion. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(12):877. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-12-201306180-00005
23. Carragee EJ, Chu G, Rohatgi R, et al. Cancer risk after use of recombinant bone morphogenetic protein-2 for spinal arthrodesis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2013;95(17):1537–1545. doi:10.2106/JBJS.L.01483
24. Smith KA, Russo GS, Vaccaro AR, Arnold PM. Scientific, clinical, regulatory, and economic aspects of choosing bone graft/biological options in spine surgery. *Neurosurgery*. 2019;84(4):827–835. doi:10.1093/neuros/nyy322
25. Osteobiologics: Operative Neurosurgery. <https://journals.lww.com/onsonline/Fulltext/2021/07001/Osteobiologics.2.aspx>. Accessed March 23, 2023.
26. Sykaras N, Opperman LA. Bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs): how do they function and what can they offer the clinician? *J Oral Sci*. 2003;45(2):57–73. doi:10.2334/josnurd.45.57
27. Elder BD, Holmes C, Goodwin CR, et al. A systematic assessment of the use of platelet-rich plasma in spinal fusion. *Ann Biomed Eng*. 2015;43(5):1057–1070. doi:10.1007/s10439-015-1300-0
28. Yoo JS, Ahn J, Patel DS, Hrynewycz NM, Brundage TS, Singh K. An evaluation of biomaterials and osteobiologics for arthrodesis achievement in spine surgery. *Ann Transl Med*. 2019;7(Suppl 5):S168. doi:10.21037/atm.2019.06.80
29. Moon HJ, Kim JH, Kim J-H, Kwon T-H, Chung H-S, Park Y-K. The effects of anterior cervical discectomy and fusion with stand-alone cages at two contiguous levels on cervical alignment and outcomes. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 2011;153(3):559–565. doi:10.1007/s00701-010-0879-z
30. Hoffmann MF, Jones CB, Sietsema DL. Adjuncts in posterior lumbar spine fusion: comparison of complications and efficacy. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2012;132(8):1105–1110. doi:10.1007/s00402-012-1529-0
31. Kang J, An H, Hilibrand A, Yoon ST, Kavanagh E, Boden S. Grafton and local bone have comparable outcomes to iliac crest bone in instrumented single-level lumbar fusions. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012;37(12):1083–1091. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31823ed817
32. Epstein NE, Epstein JA. SF-36 outcomes and fusion rates after multilevel laminectomies and 1 and 2-level instrumented posterolateral fusions using lamina autograft and demineralized bone matrix. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2007;20(2):139–145. doi:10.1097/01.bsd.0000211261.36120.3e
33. Cammisa FP, Lowery G, Garfin SR, et al. Two-year fusion rate equivalency between Grafton® DBM GEL and autograft in posterolateral spine fusion: a prospective controlled trial employing a side-by-side comparison in the same patient. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2004;29(6):660–666. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000116588.17129.b9
34. Shehadi JA, Elzein SM. Review of commercially available demineralized bone matrix products for spinal fusions: a selection paradigm. *Surg Neurol Int*. 2017;8:203. doi:10.4103/sni.sni_155_17
35. Dai L-Y, Jiang L-S. Single-level instrumented posterolateral fusion of lumbar spine with beta-tricalcium phosphate versus autograft: a prospective, randomized study with 3-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008;33(12):1299–1304. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181732a8e
36. Korovessis P, Koureas G, Zacharatos S, Papazisis Z, Lambiris E. Correlative radiological, self-assessment and clinical analysis of evolution in instrumented dorsal and lateral fusion for degenerative lumbar spine disease. Autograft versus coralline hydroxyapatite. *Eur Spine J*. 2005;14(7):630–638. doi:10.1007/s00586-004-0855-5
37. Chang C-H, Lin M-Z, Chen Y-J, Hsu H-C, Chen H-T. Local autogenous bone mixed with bone expander: an optimal option of bone graft in single-segment posterolateral lumbar fusion. *Surg Neurol*. 2008;70 Suppl 1:S1. doi:10.1016/j.surneu.2008.05.022
38. Miller CP, Jegede K, Essig D, et al. The efficacies of 2 ceramic bone graft extenders for promoting spinal fusion in a rabbit

- bone paucity model. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012;37(8):642–647. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31822e604e
39. Grabowski G, Cornett CA. Bone graft and bone graft substitutes in spine surgery: current concepts and controversies. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2013;21(1):51–60. doi:10.5435/JAAOS-21-01-51
40. Alimi M, Navarro-Ramirez R, Parikh K, et al. Radiographic and clinical outcome of silicate-substituted calcium phosphate (SI-cap) ceramic bone graft in spinal fusion procedures. *Clin Spine Surg*. 2017;30(6):E845–E852. doi:10.1097/BSD.0000000000000432
41. Yoo JS, Min SH, Yoon SH. Fusion rate according to mixture ratio and volumes of bone graft in minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: minimum 2-year follow-up. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol*. 2015;25 Suppl 1(1):S183–S189. doi:10.1007/s00590-014-1529-6
42. Fischer CR, Ducoffe AR, Errico TJ. Posterior lumbar fusion: choice of approach and adjunct techniques. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2014;22(8):503–511. doi:10.5435/JAAOS-22-08-503
43. Bono CM, Lee CK. Critical analysis of trends in fusion for degenerative disc disease over the past 20 years: influence of technique on fusion rate and clinical outcome. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2004;29(4):455–463. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000090825.94611.28
44. Lehr AM, Oner FC, Delawi D, et al. Efficacy of a standalone microporous ceramic versus autograft in instrumented posterolateral spinal fusion: a multicenter, randomized, inpatient controlled, noninferiority trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2020;45(14):944–951. doi:10.1097/BRS.00000000000003440
45. Arnold PM, Sasso RC, Janssen ME, et al. Efficacy of I-factor bone graft versus autograft in anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: results of the prospective, randomized, single-blinded food and drug administration investigational device exemption study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2016;41(13):1075–1083. doi:10.1097/BRS.00000000000001466
46. Mobbs RJ, Maharaj M, Rao PJ. Clinical outcomes and fusion rates following anterior lumbar interbody fusion with bone graft substitute I-FACTOR, an anorganic bone matrix/P-15 composite. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2014;21(6):867–876. doi:10.3171/2014.9.S.PINE131151
47. Jacobsen MK, Andresen AK, Jespersen AB, et al. Randomized double blind clinical trial of ABM/P-15 versus allograft in noninstrumented lumbar fusion surgery. *Spine J*. 2020;20(5):677–684. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2020.01.009
48. CeraPedics, Inc. *An Assessment of P-15L Bone Graft in Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion With Instrumentation*. Clinicaltrials.Gov. 2023. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT03438747>. Accessed September 8, 2023.
49. Pittenger MF, Mackay AM, Beck SC, et al. Multilineage potential of adult human mesenchymal stem cells. *Science*. 1999;284(5411):143–147. doi:10.1126/science.284.5411.143
50. Johnson RG. Bone marrow concentrate with allograft equivalent to autograft in lumbar fusions. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2014;39(9):695–700. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000000254
51. Minamide A, Yoshida M, Kawakami M, et al. The use of cultured bone marrow cells in type I collagen GEL and porous hydroxyapatite for posterolateral lumbar spine fusion. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2005;30(10):1134–1138. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000162394.75425.04
52. Demetriades AK, Mavrovounis G, Deml MC, et al. What is the evidence surrounding the cost-effectiveness of osteobiologic use in ACDF surgery? A systematic review of the literature. *Global Spine J*. 2023;21925682221148139. doi:10.1177/21925682221148139
53. Shahrestani S, Ballatori AM, Chen X, Ton A, Wang JC, Buser Z. The impact of osteobiologic subtype selection on perioperative complications and hospital-reported charges in single- and multi-level lumbar spinal fusion. *Int J Spine Surg*. 2021;15(4):654–662. doi:10.14444/8086
54. Glassman SD, Carreon LY, Shaffrey CI, et al. Cost-effectiveness of adult lumbar scoliosis surgery: an as-treated analysis from the adult symptomatic scoliosis surgery trial with 5-year follow-up. *Spine Deform*. 2020;8(6):1333–1339. doi:10.1007/s43390-020-00154-w
55. Jain A, Yeramaneeni S, Kebaish KM, et al. Cost-utility analysis of rhBMP-2 use in adult spinal deformity surgery. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2020;45(14):1009–1015. doi:10.1097/BRS.00000000000003442
56. Malham GM, Louie PK, Brazenor GA, Mobbs RJ, Walsh WR, Sethi RK. Recombinant human bone morphogenetic protein-2 in spine surgery: recommendations for use and alternative bone substitutes—a narrative review. *J Spine Surg*. 2022;8(4):477–490. doi:10.21037/jss-22-23
57. Cahill KS, Chi JH, Day A, Claus EB. Prevalence, complications, and hospital charges associated with use of bone-morphogenetic proteins in spinal fusion procedures. *JAMA*. 2009;302(1):58–66. doi:10.1001/jama.2009.956
58. Kim HJ, Buchowski JM, Zebala LP, Dickson DD, Koester L, Bridwell KH. Rhbpm-2 is superior to iliac crest bone graft for long fusions to the sacrum in adult spinal deformity: 4- to 14-year follow-up. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013;38(14):1209–1215. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31828b656d
59. Eleswarapu A, Rowan FA, Le H, et al. Efficacy, cost, and complications of demineralized bone matrix in instrumented lumbar fusion: comparison with rhBMP-2. *Global Spine J*. 2021;11(8):1223–1229. doi:10.1177/2192568220942501
60. Patel R, Silver A. Health care costs and characteristics of spinal fusion patients receiving concentrated bone marrow aspirate (BMAC), iliac crest autograft or bone morphogenetic protein (BMP) therapy: a retrospective cohort study utilizing administrative claims [abstract]. *The Spine Journal*. 2020;20(9):S6–S7. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2020.05.115
61. Barr RD. The importance of lowering the costs of stem cell transplantation in developing countries. *Int J Hematol*. 2002;76 Suppl 1(1):365–367. doi:10.1007/BF03165286
62. Zahra SA, Muzavir SR, Ashraf S, Ahmad A. Stem cell research in Pakistan; past, present and future. *IJSC*. 2015;8(1):1–8. doi:10.15283/ijsc.2015.8.1.1
63. Formica M, Vallergera D, Zanirato A, et al. Fusion rate and influence of surgery-related factors in lumbar interbody arthrodesis for degenerative spine diseases: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Musculoskeletal Surg*. 2020;104(1):1–15. doi:10.1007/s12306-019-00634-x
64. Irmola TM, Häkkinen A, Järvenpää S, Marttinen I, Vihtonen K, Neva M. Reoperation rates following Instrumented lumbar spine fusion. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2018;43(4):295–301. doi:10.1097/BRS.00000000000002291
65. Ushirozako H, Hasegawa T, Ebata S, et al. Impact of early intervertebral osseous union after posterior lumbar interbody fusion on health-related quality of life. *Global Spine Journal*. 2022;12(3):399–408. doi:10.1177/2192568220953813
66. Martin BI, Mirza SK, Comstock BA, Gray DT, Kreuter W, Deyo RA. Reoperation rates following lumbar spine surgery and the influence of spinal fusion procedures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2007;32(3):382–387. doi:10.1097/01.brs.0000254104.55716.46

67. Niedermeier SR, Apostel A, Bhatia S, Khan SN. Cost estimates of biologic implants among orthopedic surgeons. *Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ)*. 2014;43(1):25–28.

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

Disclosures: Safdar N Khan discloses paid consulting relationships with Bioventus, Prosidyan, and Spinal Elements, as well as being a paid speaker for Johnson & Johnson.

Corresponding Author: Safdar N. Khan, Department of Orthopaedics, UC Davis Health, Lawrence J. Ellison Ambulatory Care Center, 4860 Y Street, Ste 3800, Sacramento, CA 95817, USA; safdar.khan@osumc.edu

Published 01 December 2023

This manuscript is generously published free of charge by ISASS, the International Society for the Advancement of Spine Surgery. Copyright © 2023 ISASS. To see more or order reprints or permissions, see <http://ijssurgery.com>.