

INTERNATIONAL
JOURNAL
of
SPINE
SURGERY

Value and cost in less invasive spinal fusion surgery: lessons from a community hospital

Kevin J. Deluzio, John C. Lucio and W.B. Rodgers

Int J Spine Surg 2010, 4 (2) 37-40
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esas.2010.03.004>
<https://www.ijssurgery.com/content/4/2/37>

This information is current as of May 17, 2025.

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

Editorial

Value and cost in less invasive spinal fusion surgery: lessons from a community hospital

As the contentious debate on healthcare reform in the United States moves into its third decade, attention has been increasingly focused on the twin realities of value and cost. Greater and greater demands are made upon all therapies (but, most deservingly, on expensive, technology-driven treatments like spinal surgery) to describe their proven indications, report their complications, and delineate their outcomes. Much is made of well-designed, longitudinal, prospective trials; calls ring out for Class I evidence; and policy makers turn scrutinizing eyes on the drivers of healthcare expenditures and on the healthcare providers' ability to justify their choices of therapies.^{1–3}

At the same time, innovation proceeds apace and evolution occurs within all of medicine. Spinal surgery has evolved, as have all surgical specialties, away from large, disabling procedures, seeking instead to minimize collateral damage while maintaining or improving the outcomes for patients. These 2 realities—that intervention must be worthwhile and that innovation must continue—are, at times, at cross-purposes. One cannot justify newer techniques and novel technologies based on evidence derived from long-term studies of older interventions. Nonetheless, we as surgeons are called to offer our patients treatments of proven value while always searching for ways to provide similar results at lower costs.

It is within this debate that this issue offers information on new, less destructive solutions to spinal maladies. Unfortunately, the evidence level of many of these studies will not rise to Class I data; therefore, readers must, at times, rely on evidence that is available about the value of older interventions. In addition, it is wise to remain mindful of the admonition of Sackett et al in 1996¹: “External clinical evidence can inform, but can never replace, individual clinical expertise, and it is this expertise that decides whether the external evidence applies to the individual patient at all and, if so, how it should be integrated into a clinical decision.”

History

Economic evaluations of orthopedic services have been used previously to inform healthcare policy. Hip and knee arthroplasties are some of the most commonly performed surgeries in North America, effectively reducing pain and improving function and quality of life for patients with advanced osteoarthritis. Evidence for cost-effectiveness was

provided by high-quality studies with large sample sizes, excellent patient follow-up, and detailed methods used for costing.^{4–6} The cost-effectiveness of joint arthroplasty was also shown to be compare favorably with other surgical interventions such as cardiac bypass, liver transplant, or dialysis.^{7,8}

In spinal surgery, the recently completed Spine Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) has proven to a high level of evidence and certainty that surgical intervention results in better outcomes than nonsurgical care in the treatment of lumbar disk herniation, spinal stenosis, and spondylolisthesis.^{9–14} However, even as the value of intervention has been documented, recent interpretations of the SPORT results for surgery for spondylolisthesis have questioned the cost-effectiveness of fusion surgery compared to decompression alone for degenerative stenosis with instability.¹⁵ This study noted a quality adjusted life year (QALY) gain of 0.23 in the fusion cohort; but, this came at a cost of \$115,600 per QALY gained. (In general, \$100,000 denotes a cost-effective therapy.) No breakdown of the 344 fusion surgeries (269 with instrumentation) by type of procedure was provided; however, based on the time frame of the study, it may be inferred that the vast majority of those fusions were performed using traditional open techniques.

We have previously described our early results using less invasive lumbar fusion technologies,^{16–18} discussed our fusion results,¹⁹ and reported our 1-year outcomes for a large (> 300) patient series.²⁰ We have also reported the results of these therapies in difficult anatomic situations^{17,21} and extreme patient populations.^{18,22} We have discussed our complications in a large series (> 600 patients)²³ and have shown that the complications associated with less invasive fusion are less frequent than the complications reported with traditional open approaches, and the length of hospitalization markedly shorter.

It stands to reason that modern surgical fusion options would be expected to yield a decreased dollar cost per QALY gained, because these minimally invasive surgical (MIS) techniques require shorter hospital stays and result in fewer expensive complications. Our outcomes are being reported and value is thereby shown, but what is the effect on costs of the transition from open to less invasive techniques? Since MIS spine surgery appears to provide benefits to the patients, is it truly cost effective?

Methods

We analyzed retrospectively the effect on costs seen at our institution (St. Mary's Health Center, Jefferson, City, MO, a 160-bed community hospital in a mid-sized middle American city) associated with the transition from a traditional, open fusion platform to a less destructive surgical approach on a specific intervention and a specific treatment scenario in a selected patient cohort. A hospital cost comparison of the perioperative period was performed between the 2 groups. St. Mary's Health Center (SMHC) operating costs, including direct patient costs and overhead, were retrospectively collected from hospital cost accounting records for each patient in the 2 groups. The perioperative period was defined as the surgery and the first 45 days postoperation. All costs obtained were broken down by hospital revenue code, allowing for a more detailed analysis. Costs were adjusted for inflation to 2009 US dollars.

We elected to study patients treated for degenerative spinal conditions in a specific manner: an instrumented, 2-level lumbar interbody fusion. Prior to 2006, these patients were treated using a traditional open posterior lateral interbody fusion (PLIF) technique. Late that year, we transitioned to a minimally invasive platform and began employing extreme lateral technology (XLIF) from L1-2 to L4-5 and MIS TLIF or transsacral fusion at L5-S1. Having prospectively collected clinical and fusion data on our 2-level PLIF cases and clinical outcomes, and fusion data on our less invasive 2-level fusions, we were able to retrospectively access hospital billing information, and analyze the costs seen during the in-hospital treatment interval and the first 45 days after operation. All patients treated with 2-level instrumented lumbar interbody fusion at SMHC during this time interval were included in the study. The proposed analysis was presented to the SMHC Institutional Review Board and their approval obtained. There were 102 patients in the open 2-level PLIF group and 109 in the less disruptive MIS 2-level fusion group.

The perioperative costs collected were divided into 4 groups: the index surgical procedure and initial hospital stay, transfusions, reoperations, and residual events. The index surgical procedure and reoperations were prospectively recorded in clinical databases. Costs were obtained based on patient identification numbers and dates provided to the hospital. Transfusions were not tracked prospectively in the open group, so the hospital laboratory obtained transfusion records retrospectively based on the list of patient identification numbers and the index procedure date. Records included patient typing, cross-matching, autologous donation, and transfusions. Those records were sent to the hospital cost accounting department and costs were acquired.

Residual events were defined as any event, excluding the initial procedure and hospital stay, that occurred in the first 45 days following surgery. Residual events encompassed ER visits or readmissions to the hospital for pain or complications relating the surgery, physical therapy and other

Table 1

Total costs, eriooperative period up to 45 days postoperatively

	Open	MIS
Total patients	101	109
Original procedure	\$2,552,503.48	\$2,581,871.77
Residual events	\$131,825.50	\$33,387.67
Totals per group	\$2,703,824.32	\$2,638,679.15
Average total cost per procedure	\$26,770.54	\$24,208.07

postoperative rehabilitative treatments, and additional diagnostics. Residual events were not tracked prospectively in the open group. To retrospectively obtain all residual events without compromising private health information not relevant to this study, the hospital provided a blinded list of all patients' hospital events occurring between 2005 and 2009. Hospital diagnosis and procedure codes identified each event. Three staff members, the research coordinator and 2 coding specialists, reviewed the list of events and excluded those not relevant. The hospital then provided cost information for the residual events. Because of the tracking methods used to determine transfusion in the open PLIF group, transfusions were classified as residual events (in both groups) and those costs assigned accordingly.

Results

This report represents a preliminary discussion of our findings in the format of a position paper, and it is our intention to provide a more detailed accounting in the near future. In brief, we found that the average length of stay in the MIS group was 49% less than open group (1.2 vs 3.2 days) and that the average cost for the surgical procedure and initial hospital stay in the MIS group was 6% (\$997/patient) less than the open group.

These cost savings increased in the early postoperative period as the residual events began to occur. There was a 76% decrease in the rate of residual events from the open to the less invasive group. The costs savings from this decrease in residual events was \$986/patient.

Transfusion-related costs were calculated separately from residual event costs. In the open group, all patients were cross-matched for 2 units of packed red blood cells and 18 patients (17.6%) received transfusions. After reviewing this data, we noted that only 1 of the 109 patients in the less invasive group had required a transfusion, but these patients had been routinely cross-matched by hospital protocol. This change in our protocol will result in savings of \$123/patient going forward.

For the entire perioperative period, including both surgical and post-surgical costs out to 45 days, there was an average savings of 9.6% or \$2,563/patient (Table 1).

Discussion

As the costs of health care continue to grow, it becomes imperative that all providers critically examine their as-

assumptions about the efficacy, value, and cost-effectiveness of the interventions they employ to treat their patients. As mentioned earlier, large-scale, well-controlled trials have documented the efficacy of surgical intervention for lumbar disk herniation, spinal stenosis, and spondylolisthesis using traditional open surgical techniques.^{9–15} The value of intervention has been proven.

However, advances in technology have begun the evolution of spinal surgery from an open to a less invasive specialty. In a series of reports from the podium and in the literature, the improvements in complication rates, decreases in hospitalization time, and the overall good outcomes of less invasive techniques have been well documented.^{24–32} Within one subcategory of spinal surgery, less invasive lumbar fusion, we have reported our own improvements in length of hospitalization,¹⁶ complication incidence,^{18,23} and patient outcomes.²⁰ We have demonstrated the applicability of these new techniques to complex anatomic,²¹ clinical,¹⁷ and demographic scenarios.^{18,22}

These improvements in technology come at a cost: an investment of private and public capital in research and development, physician training, and patient education. These investments can be recovered on a societal basis if the results of intervention with these new technologies results in more effective care, even if that care is initially more costly. In a recent report from Toronto, Rampersaud et al³³ reported marked improvements in health utility index between patients treated with less invasive fusion techniques compared to traditional open surgery.

Our own data will not, at present, allow calculation of health utility indices, because the follow-up intervals are different for our 2 groups. It should be noted, however, that even in the very early going, less invasive fusion has resulted an absolute cost savings of over \$2500/patient in groups of similar patients treated with the similar operations (2-level interbody lumbar fusion) at the same center. The savings are nearly equally divided between the initial treatment hospitalization (which derive primarily for the decrease in length of stay) and the occurrence of residual events that may or may not be considered complications but which necessitate expenditures for treatment. While longer-term deterioration of the less invasive cohort might result in a loss of some of these savings, we must opine that it is our impression that the rate of residual events in the less invasive group is significantly decreased when compared to the open group, even out to 12 months after the index procedure. Furthermore, going forward, we have identified from an analysis of this data at least 1 area (cross-matching of blood for transfusion) where an additional \$120/patient will be saved.

What then is the importance of the savings we herein report? In comparison to the trillions of dollars that health care will cost in the coming years, what difference does \$2500 make? It is not in the individual treatment interval where less invasive spinal surgery offers its true promise, obviously, but rather in the potential savings to society from

the application of these cost-saving technologies to the half million lumbar fusions done each year in the United States.^{2,3,34,35} A nearly 10% reduction in costs, within the first 45 days after an intervention, augurs well for a massive cost savings if implemented on a societal scale.

Kevin J. Deluzio, PhD

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

E-mail address: delzuo@me.queensu.ca

John C. Lucio, DO, MS, CPE, FACHE

Vice President, Medical Affairs

St. Mary's Health Center

Jefferson City, MO

E-mail address: John_lucio@SSMHC.com

W.B. Rodgers, MD

President

Spine Midwest

Jefferson City, MO

E-mail address: brodgers@spinemidwest.com

References

1. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Gray JA, Haynes RB, Richardson WS. Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *BMJ* 1996;312:71–2.
2. Dagenais S, Haldeman S, Polatin PB. It is time for physicians to embrace cost effectiveness and cost utility analysis research in the treatment of spinal pain. *Spine J* 2005;5:357–60.
3. Korthals-de Bois, I, van TM, van DH, Bouter L. Economic evaluations and randomized trials in spinal disorders: principles and methods. *Spine* 2004;29:442–8.
4. Laupacis A, Feeny D, Detsky AS, Tugwell PX. How attractive does a new technology have to be to warrant adoption and utilization? Tentative guidelines for using clinical and economic evaluations. *CMAJ* 1992;146:473–81.
5. Laupacis A, Bourne R, Rorabeck C, et al. The effect of elective total hip replacement on health-related quality of life. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1993;75:1619–26.
6. Laupacis A, Bourne R, Rorabeck C, et al. Costs of elective total hip arthroplasty during the first year. Cemented versus noncemented. *J Arthroplasty* 1994;9:481–7.
7. Lavernia CJ, Guzman JF, Gachupin-Garcia A. Cost-effectiveness and quality of life in knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 1997;345:134–9.
8. Rorabeck CH, Murray P. The cost benefit of total knee arthroplasty. *Orthopedics* 1996;19:777–9.
9. Pearson AM, Lurie JD, Blood EA, et al. Spine patient outcomes research trial: radiographic predictors of clinical outcomes after operative or nonoperative treatment of degenerative spondylolisthesis. *Spine* 2008;33:2759–66.
10. 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;296:2451–9.
11. Weinstein JN, Tosteson TD, Lurie JD, et al. Surgical vs nonoperative treatment for lumbar disk herniation: the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT): a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2006;296:2441–50.
12. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, et al. Surgical versus nonsurgical treatment for lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:2257–70.

13. Weinstein JN, Tosteson TD, Lurie JD, et al. Surgical versus nonsurgical therapy for lumbar spinal stenosis. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:794–810.
14. Weinstein JN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, et al. Surgical compared with nonoperative treatment for lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. four-year results in the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) randomized and observational cohorts. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2009;91:1295–304.
15. Tosteson AN, Lurie JD, Tosteson TD, et al. Surgical treatment of spinal stenosis with and without degenerative spondylolisthesis: cost-effectiveness after 2 years. *Ann Intern Med* 2008;149:845–53.
16. Rodgers WB, Cox CS, Gerber EJ. Experience and early results with a minimally invasive technique for anterior column support through extreme lateral interbody fusion (XLIF®). *US Musculoskeletal Rev* 2007;2:28–32.
17. Rodgers WB, Cox CS, Gerber EJ. Minimally invasive treatment (XLIF) of adjacent segment disease after prior lumbar fusions. *Int J Minimal Invasive Spinal Technol* 2009;3:1–7.
18. Rodgers WB, Cox CS, Gerber EJ. Early complications of extreme lateral interbody fusion in the obese. *J Spinal Disord Tech* (In press).
19. Rodgers WB, Gerber EJ, Patterson JR. Fusion after minimally disruptive ALIF: analysis of XLIF by computed tomography. Submitted for Publication.
20. Rodgers WB, Gerber EJ. Clinical and radiographic outcome in less invasive lumbar fusion: XLIF at one year follow-up. Submitted for Publication.
21. Rodgers WB, Gerber EJ, Patterson JR. Grade 2 spondylolisthesis at L4-5 treated by XLIF: safety and mid-term results in the “Worst Case Scenario.” Submitted for Publication.
22. Rodgers WB, Gerber EJ, Patterson JR. Lumbar fusion in octogenarians: the promise of minimally invasive surgery. Submitted for Publication.
23. Rodgers WB, Gerber EJ, Patterson JR. Intraoperative and early post-operative complications in extreme lateral interbody fusion (XLIF): An analysis of 600 cases. Submitted for Publication.
24. Asgarzadie F, Khoo LT. Minimally invasive operative management for lumbar spinal stenosis: overview of early and long-term outcomes. *Orthop Clin North Am* 2007;38:387–99.
25. Eck JC, Hodges S, Humphreys SC. Minimally invasive lumbar spinal fusion. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2007;15:321–9.
26. Hermantin FU, Peters T, Quartararo L, Kambin P. A prospective, randomized study comparing the results of open discectomy with those of video-assisted arthroscopic microdiscectomy. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1999;81:958–65.
27. Kaiser MG, Haid RW Jr, Subach BR, Miller JS, Smith CD, Rodts GE Jr. Comparison of the mini-open versus laparoscopic approach for anterior lumbar interbody fusion: a retrospective review. *Neurosurgery* 2002;51:97–103.
28. Kim JS, Kang BU, Lee SH, et al. Mini-transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion versus anterior lumbar interbody fusion augmented by percutaneous pedicle screw fixation: a comparison of surgical outcomes in adult low-grade isthmic spondylolisthesis. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2009;22:114–21.
29. Lee SH, Kang BU, Ahn Y, et al. Operative failure of percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy: a radiologic analysis of 55 cases. *Spine* 2006;31:E285–90.
30. Podichetty VK, Spears J, Isaacs RE, Booher J, Biscup RS. Complications associated with minimally invasive decompression for lumbar spinal stenosis. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2006;19:161–6.
31. Rahman M, Summers LE, Richter B, Mimran RI, Jacob RP. Comparison of techniques for decompressive lumbar laminectomy: the minimally invasive versus the “classic” open approach. *Minim Invasive Neurosurg* 2008;51:100–5.
32. Seldomridge JA, Phillips FM. Minimally invasive spine surgery. *Am J Orthop* 2005;34:224–32.
33. Rampersaud YR, Gray R, Fehlings M, Lewis S, Massicotte E. Direct economic impact of posterior minimally invasive compared to conventional open fusion procedures for lumbar spondylolisthesis. Society of Minimally Invasive Spine Surgery, 3rd Annual Meeting, 2009 Oct 9; Las Vegas, NV.
34. Glassman SD, Carreon LY, Djurasovic M et al. Lumbar fusion outcomes stratified by specific diagnostic indication. *Spine J* 2009;9:13–21.
35. Kalanithi PS, Patil CG, Boakye M. National complication rates and disposition after posterior lumbar fusion for acquired spondylolisthesis. *Spine* 2009;34:1963–9.