

ICMJE DISCLOSURE FORM

Date: 11/09/2022

Your Name: Pravesh Gadraj

Manuscript Title: Sciatica: Predicting who would undergo Surgery and who not

Manuscript number (if known): JSS-22-97(E-JSS-22-43)

In the interest of transparency, we ask you to disclose all relationships/activities/interests listed below that are related to the content of your manuscript. "Related" means any relation with for-profit or not-for-profit third parties whose interests may be affected by the content of the manuscript. Disclosure represents a commitment to transparency and does not necessarily indicate a bias. If you are in doubt about whether to list a relationship/activity/interest, it is preferable that you do so.

The following questions apply to the author's relationships/activities/interests as they relate to the current manuscript only.

The author's relationships/activities/interests should be defined broadly. For example, if your manuscript pertains to the epidemiology of hypertension, you should declare all relationships with manufacturers of antihypertensive medication, even if that medication is not mentioned in the manuscript.

In item #1 below, report all support for the work reported in this manuscript without time limit. For all other items, the time frame for disclosure is the past 36 months.

		Name all entities with whom you have this relationship or indicate none (add rows as needed)	Specifications/Comments (e.g., if payments were made to you or to your institution)
Time frame: Since the initial planning of the work			
1	All support for the present manuscript (e.g., funding, provision of study materials, medical writing, article processing charges, etc.) No time limit for this item.	<u>__X__</u> None	
Time frame: past 36 months			
2	Grants or contracts from any entity (if not indicated in item #1 above).	<u>__X__</u> None	
3	Royalties or licenses	<u>__X__</u> None	
4	Consulting fees	<u>__X__</u> None	

5	Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
6	Payment for expert testimony	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
7	Support for attending meetings and/or travel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
8	Patents planned, issued or pending	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
9	Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
10	Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society, committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
11	Stock or stock options	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
12	Receipt of equipment, materials, drugs, medical writing, gifts or other services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
13	Other financial or non-financial interests	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	

Please summarize the above conflict of interest in the following box:

None.

Please place an "X" next to the following statement to indicate your agreement:

I certify that I have answered every question and have not altered the wording of any of the questions on this form.

Title: Sciatica: Predicting who would undergo Surgery and who not

Running title: Who would undergo Surgery for Sciatica

Pravesh S. Gadjradj MD, PhD¹, Kaleem Ullah MD¹, Roger Härtl MD¹

¹ Weill Cornell Medicine-Department of Neurosurgery, New York-Presbyterian - Ochsner Medical Center, New York, NY, the USA.

Figures: 0

Tables: 0

Supplementary material: 0

Corresponding author's name and complete mailing address:

Pravesh S. Gadjradj, MD
Weill Cornell Medicine- Department of Neurosurgery
New York-Presbyterian - Ochsner Medical Center
New York, NY, U.S.A.
[435 E 70 street, 11](#)
[10021 NY, New York, the USA.](#)
Phone: 646 207-1012
Email: p.gadjradj@erasmusmc.nl

It is with great interest, we read the publication by Pacaud et al. entitled "Frequency and determinants of surgical treatment in patients with uncomplicated disc-related sciatica hospitalized in the Rheumatology Department of Lille University Hospital"¹. In their retrospective analysis of 405 patients, the authors aimed to assess the proportion of patients with sciatica that would undergo surgery, a year after hospitalization. Patients who had a direct indication for surgery were excluded from this study. Furthermore, they aimed to identify patient

characteristics that may be related to outcomes of surgery. The authors demonstrated that only a small proportion of the patients admitted to the hospital due to sciatica, around a third, would eventually undergo surgery. Furthermore, in a multivariate analysis the authors showed that having work, impulsive pain, motor loss, a duration of pain for three months, and multiple epidural injections, were all associated with a higher hazard for surgery. Of these factors, having work (HR, hazard ratio, 2.3), pain increasing during moments of increased abdominal pressure (HR 2.0) and motor loss level 4 out of 5 on the Medical Research Council-scale (HR 1.7), were the strongest predictors. On the other hand, surgery was less frequently observed in patients who had a decrease in pain score during their hospitalization.

Throughout the years, decision-making for surgery due to sciatica has proven itself to remain complex and with their current study, Pacaud et al. tried to give some guidance on this matter. Even though all 405 patients in this study were hospitalized for their sciatica, still only around a third eventually underwent surgery within one year of follow-up, underlining the importance for conservative treatment as the first method of treatment.

In 2006, The Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial showed that there were only small differences in patient-reported outcome measures 2-years after randomization in patients who underwent surgery vs conservative treatment for sciatica². Thirty percent, however, of the patients that were assigned to non-operative treatment, received surgery. A year later, the results of the Sciatica-trial showed a comparable finding, namely that of the 283 patients that would be assigned to either early surgery or prolonged conservative treatment, eventually 39% of the patients in the conservative treatment group would undergo surgery³. After publication of these two landmark studies, conservative treatment itself became more commonly used as a treatment modality. Throughout the years, innovation in the treatment of sciatica has also continued and both surgical and conservative treatment have improved. For instance, a recent British study showed that transforaminal epidural steroid injections had similar effectiveness as surgery in patients with at least 6 weeks of sciatica and that injections as first treatment would be highly cost-effective compared to surgery⁴. Another recent study showed that a combination of Mechanical Diagnosis and Treatment and transforaminal epidural steroid injections, was also successful in preventing surgery in 67% of the patients with sciatica that were already on the waiting list for surgery. In their cost-effectiveness analysis, they showed that on average, €1,363 could be saved per patient when treating them with conservative treatment instead of surgery. Both these studies demonstrate the success of conservative treatment, which is supported by the study by Pascaud et al.

Aside from these medical determinants for surgery, there is also the perspective from a health economics point, which was not addressed in the current publication. In the current era in which the value-based healthcare model becomes more and more important, it is of great importance for both doctors and policy-makers to choose the treatment plan which is most effective and least costly. It is true that for acute sciatica, both conservative care and surgery lead to similar leg pain reduction, one year after treatment³. However, the question remains if surgery would be more cost-effective when it is provided early after onset of the symptoms and whether it would prevent or shorten these 405 hospitalizations as reported by Pacaud et al. This is important since surgery nowadays is performed from a minimally invasive approach in an ambulatory surgery setting and there is a growing amount of evidence claiming that surgery is more effective for chronic sciatica compared to conservative treatment^{5,6}. Both factors highlight the gap that Parcaud et al. tried to

删除的内容: (HR)

带格式的: 非突出显示

删除的内容: HR

删除的内容: MRC

带格式的: 非突出显示

address which was whether patients may benefit more from surgery than from conservative treatment. Having work appeared to be the most important predictor for undergoing surgery in the first year after hospitalization. This may not be so surprising as patients with sciatica are usually somewhat younger and in the middle of their career. In these situations where there are no red flags present and the indication for surgery is relative, it is imaginable that these patients would opt for surgery if given the choice⁷.

Overall, this study is an excellent addition to the literature as sciatica is a highly prevalent condition which many health care professionals are confronted with. We applaud the authors on their effort to give readers some nuance on the role of surgery in the treatment of sciatica and by formulating predictors for undergoing surgery. However, before these predictors can be used in other patient settings and even more so in other countries, validation of this model in independent patient samples, is warranted.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Comment on JSS-22-43

<https://jss.amegroups.com/article/view/5825/pdf>

Frequency and determinants of surgical treatment in patients with uncomplicated disc-related sciatica hospitalized in the Rheumatology Department of Lille University Hospital

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned by the editorial office, Journal of Spine Surgery. The article did not undergo external peer review.


Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form. The authors have conflicts of interest to declare. ▼

删除的内容: None of the authors currently serve as an Editorial Team member for the Journal of Spine Surgery.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of

the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



References

1. [Pacaud A, Darloy J, Flipo RM, et al. Frequency and determinants of surgical treatment in patients with uncomplicated disc-related sciatica hospitalized in the Rheumatology Department of Lille University Hospital. J Spine Surg 2022.](#)
2. [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\(20\):2441-50. DOI: 10.1001/jama.296.20.2441.](#)
3. [Peul WC, van Houwelingen HC, van den Hout WB, et al. Surgery versus prolonged conservative treatment for sciatica. N Engl J Med 2007;356\(22\):2245-56. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa064039.](#)
4. [Wilby MJ, Best A, Wood E, et al. Surgical microdiscectomy versus transforaminal epidural steroid injection in patients with sciatica secondary to herniated lumbar disc \(NERVES\): a phase 3, multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial and economic evaluation. Lancet Rheumatol 2021;3\(5\):e347-e356. DOI: 10.1016/S2665-9913\(21\)00036-9.](#)
5. [Bailey CS, Rasoulinejad P, Taylor D, et al. Surgery versus Conservative Care for Persistent Sciatica Lasting 4 to 12 Months. N Engl J Med 2020;382\(12\):1093-1102. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1912658.](#)
6. [Gadjradj PS, Rubinstein SM, Peul WC, et al. Full endoscopic versus open discectomy for sciatica: randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. BMJ 2022;376:e065846. DOI: 10.1136/bmj-2021-065846.](#)
7. [Gadjradj PS, Smeele NVR, de Jong M, et al. Patient preferences for treatment of lumbar disc herniation: a discrete choice experiment. J Neurosurg Spine 2021;1-9. DOI: 10.3171/2021.8.SPINE21995.](#)

删除的内容: 1. Pacaud A, Darloy J, Flipo RM, Paccou J, Assaker R, Cortet B. Frequency and determinants of surgical treatment in patients with uncomplicated disc-related sciatica hospitalized in the Rheumatology Department of Lille University Hospital. Journal of Spine Surgery 2022.
2. 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(20):2441-50. DOI: 10.1001/jama.296.20.2441.
3. Peul WC, van Houwelingen HC, van den Hout WB, et al. Surgery versus prolonged conservative treatment for sciatica. N Engl J Med 2007;356(22):2245-56. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa064039.
4. Wilby MJ, Best A, Wood E, et al. Surgical microdiscectomy versus transforaminal epidural steroid injection in patients with sciatica secondary to herniated lumbar disc (NERVES): a phase 3, multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial and economic evaluation. Lancet Rheumatol 2021;3(5):e347-e356. DOI: 10.1016/S2665-9913(21)00036-9.
5. Bailey CS, Rasoulinejad P, Taylor D, et al. Surgery versus Conservative Care for Persistent Sciatica Lasting 4 to 12 Months. N Engl J Med 2020;382(12):1093-1102. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1912658.
6. Gadjradj PS, Rubinstein SM, Peul WC, et al. Full endoscopic versus open discectomy for sciatica: randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. BMJ 2022;376:e065846. DOI: 10.1136/bmj-2021-065846.
7. Gadjradj PS, Smeele NVR, de Jong M, et al. Patient preferences for treatment of lumbar disc herniation: a discrete choice experiment. J Neurosurg Spine 2021;1-9. DOI: 10.3171/2021.8.SPINE21995. ... [1]

带格式的: 英语(美国)

带格式的: 英语(美国)

带格式的: 英语(美国)

带格式的: 英语(美国)

带格式的: 英语(美国)



ICMJE DISCLOSURE FORM

Date: 11/09/2022

Your Name: Roger Hartl

Manuscript Title: Sciatica: Predicting who would undergo Surgery and who not

Manuscript number (if known): JSS-22-97(E-JSS-22-43)

In the interest of transparency, we ask you to disclose all relationships/activities/interests listed below that are related to the content of your manuscript. "Related" means any relation with for-profit or not-for-profit third parties whose interests may be affected by the content of the manuscript. Disclosure represents a commitment to transparency and does not necessarily indicate a bias. If you are in doubt about whether to list a relationship/activity/interest, it is preferable that you do so.

The following questions apply to the author's relationships/activities/interests as they relate to the current manuscript only.

The author's relationships/activities/interests should be defined broadly. For example, if your manuscript pertains to the epidemiology of hypertension, you should declare all relationships with manufacturers of antihypertensive medication, even if that medication is not mentioned in the manuscript.

In item #1 below, report all support for the work reported in this manuscript without time limit. For all other items, the time frame for disclosure is the past 36 months.

		Name all entities with whom you have this relationship or indicate none (add rows as needed)	Specifications/Comments (e.g., if payments were made to you or to your institution)
Time frame: Since the initial planning of the work			
1	All support for the present manuscript (e.g., funding, provision of study materials, medical writing, article processing charges, etc.) No time limit for this item.	<u>__X__</u> None	
Time frame: past 36 months			
2	Grants or contracts from any entity (if not indicated in item #1 above).	<u>__X__</u> None	
3	Royalties or licenses	<u>__X__</u> None	
4	Consulting fees	<u>__X__</u> None	

5	Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
6	Payment for expert testimony	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
7	Support for attending meetings and/or travel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
8	Patents planned, issued or pending	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
9	Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
10	Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society, committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
11	Stock or stock options	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
12	Receipt of equipment, materials, drugs, medical writing, gifts or other services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	
13	Other financial or non-financial interests	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	

Please summarize the above conflict of interest in the following box:

None.

Please place an "X" next to the following statement to indicate your agreement:

I certify that I have answered every question and have not altered the wording of any of the questions on this form.