Spinal cord stimulation (SCS) was introduced over 40 years ago as a treatment for chronic low back pain (1). Several randomized control trials have established SCS as a viable treatment option for complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS), chronic back and leg pain (CBLP) and failed back surgery syndrome (FBSS) (2-6). One large study found SCS to be particularly effective for FBSS with predominant leg pain of neuropathic radicular origin (7). SCS has also been applied in the treatment of ischemic limb pain and intractable angina (8,9). In the United States, current indications for SCS are neuropathic pain, pain
of FBSS, or CRPS (10). From an economic standpoint, there is evidence that suggests that for CRPS and FBSS, SCS may be more cost effective that traditional management (6,11).

SCS works by placing an electrode in the epidural space that stimulates the dorsal columns inducing paresthesia that can replace the pain. The types of electrodes used most frequently are plate or paddle electrodes and round shaped electrodes. Paddle electrodes are inserted through a small laminotomy or laminectomy (8).

Spinal cord stimulator implantation has been reported to be generally safe (8,9). Most of the research on safety and efficacy of spinal cord stimulators has been in case series and case reports (8,9). A systematic review by Turner et al (4) in 2004 reported the overall complication rate to be 34%. Most reported complications were reported to be minor and included need for stimulator revision or removal (33%), equipment failure (10%), pain in region of hardware (5.8%), and superficial infection (4.5%) (4). The overall incidence of lead migration alone has been reported to be 5.7 to 13.5% (12-13). Turner at al (4) found no reports of neurologic related events. A systematic review by Taylor et al (8) also in 2004, found the overall complication rate to be 43%. The most common complications were found to be electrode or lead dysfunction (27%), extension cable problems (10%), CSF leaks (7%), and infections (6%) (9). Again no neurologic related complications were reported. A prospective observational study by Kemler et al (5) in 1997 found that 11% of patients undergoing test spinal cord stimulation suffered intradural puncture, though complications were limited to temporary headache. Adverse events published in case reports include epidural hematoma, subdural hematoma, acute renal failure, allergic reaction and epidural abscess (14-20). In 2007, Meyer et al (18) published a report of quadripareisis following dural puncture and intramedullary placement of leads. Barolat et al (9) describe a case in which a patient suffered a spinal cord injury resulting in quadriplegia after needle penetration in the lower cervical cord. Several authors suggested that the true incidence of neurologic complications of spinal cord stimulation may be under-reported.

We present 4 cases of neurologic injury after SCS implantation. Two cases involve injury secondary to epidural hematoma; one case involves injury secondary to cord contusion and one injury secondary to thoracic disc herniation. The clinical courses and outcomes are presented.

Case #1

The patient is a 59-year-old man with a history of chronic back and leg pain and FBSS. Several years prior to presentation he underwent L5 laminecotomy and L5-S1 posterior fusion for chronic low back pain with radiation to the posterior legs. The surgery did not relieve his symptoms. He underwent implantation of a spinal cord stimulator with bipolar leads. This procedure resulted in improvement of his lower extremity symptoms but did not affect his low back pain.

The patient sought a second opinion on his back pain from another physician. Together, it was decided that the patient would undergo a spinal cord stimulator revision with placement of triplolar paddle leads and T8 and T9 laminectomy with the goal of improving the patient’s back pain.

On date of surgery, the patient was placed under monitored anesthesia care. First, the 2 previously placed electrode leads and the associated neurostimulator were removed. Next, a T8 and T9 laminectomy was performed. The surgeon noted difficult dissection due to the presence of scarring of the dura to the underlying lamina. Tripolar paddle leads were placed and the screening cable was then connected to the screener for trial spinal cord stimulation. The patient was noted to have excellent coverage of his painful area of the low back and both legs.

When the patient awoke from anesthesia, he noted right greater than left lower extremity weakness. He also had difficulty urinating. He reported a band-like loss of sensation around his lower abdomen. On post-operative day #1, neurostimulator and leads were removed. The patient reported that following removal of leads, he had improved strength in his left lower extremity. His right leg weakness, sensory symptoms and bowel/bladder symptoms did not change.

The patient worked with physical therapy and was reportedly walking with a rolling walker with assistance. He was discharged to home on post-operative day #2. Patient returned to the emergency department (ED) 3 hours later complaining of ongoing sensory changes, inability to void, and inability to ambulate secondary to right leg weakness. The patient received IV steroids. An MRI was performed on post-operative day #3 showing no evidence of cord compression or epidural hematoma. MRI was repeated on post-operative day #5 and did show slight signal enhancement at the T8/T9 level (Fig. 1). He continued to have right leg weakness, and sensory changes.
He was transferred to an inpatient rehabilitation hospital 8 days after the SCS revision. Manual motor strength testing in the lower extremity revealed hip flexion to be 1/5 on the right and 5/5 on the left. Hip extension was 1/5 on the right and 5/5 on the left. Knee extension was 1/5 on the right and 4/5 on the left. Knee flexion was 1/5 on the right and 4/5 on the left. Ankle dorsiflexion was 1/5 bilaterally, plantar flexion was 1/5 bilaterally and EHL was 1/5 bilaterally. Sensation was normal to LT and pinprick to T5. Sensation was diminished bilaterally in the T6-T11 dermatomes. Sensation was absent at the T12-S1 on the right and present but diminished on the left. Perianal sensation was present but diminished.

The patient participated in comprehensive interdisciplinary rehabilitation. The patient experienced full return of motor strength in the left leg, but only partial return on the right. At discharge, the patient was walking with a rolling walker and minimum assistance. He was voiding volitionally but was still using a suppository nightly. His discharge American Spinal Injury Association (ASIA) exam was consistent with a T8 ASIA D spinal cord injury.

**Case #2**

The patient is a 44-year-old male with a 10-year history of chronic low back pain and peripheral neuropathy localized to his bilateral lower extremities secondary to diabetes mellitus (DM).

The patient underwent consultation with neurosurgery for his lower extremity pain. Spinal cord stimulator trial was reportedly successful and without complications. He underwent placement of spinal cord stimulator and leads without any acute post operative complications. Patient was discharged from the hospital having reportedly experienced significant symptom alleviation. However on post-operative day #5; patient noted an acute development of new mid back pain associated with rapid progressive weakness and motor loss to his bilateral lower extremities. There was associated urinary retention. The pattern of weakness began in this right lower extremity and then progressed to the left lower extremity. The onset was acute and progressed over the course of several hours.

The patient was taken to a local ED and was transferred the same day to the facility where the surgery had been performed. Post transfer; patient was started on intravenous methylprednisolone protocol. A thoracic CT myelogram and CT thoracic spine with intrathecal contrast were performed. Study results indicated evidence of an epidural hematoma which extended 2 levels above the area of spinal cord stimulator placement (Fig. 2). Complete blood count (CBC) and coagulation...
The patient was a 66-year-old female with a history of chronic low back pain and failed back surgery syndrome (FBSS). She had previously undergone decompressive laminectomies at the L3, L4 and L5 levels. The patient complained of persistent and progressive low back pain.

She then underwent a spinal cord stimulator trial with successful lead placement. Immediately after the procedure, as the technician was adjusting the settings on the external spinal cord stimulator, the patient experienced sudden low back pain with bilateral lower extremity dysesthesias followed by lower extremity paralysis. The trial leads were removed and emergent MRI of the lumbar spine was performed. MRI revealed moderate to severe canal stenosis at L1/L2 and L2/L3 with epidural hematoma and air spanning T9 to L2-3 and mass effect increasing the canal narrowing at the L1/L2 and L2/L3 levels (Fig. 3). Complete blood count (CBC) and coagulation studies were normal. The patient was not on any anti-platelet medications or anticoagulants. She then underwent decompressive thoracic and lumbar laminectomies of the T11 through L2 levels that same day.

She transferred to an acute inpatient rehabilitation hospital 20 days after her decompressive surgery. She complained of persistent low back pain, bilateral left greater than right lower extremity weakness, and decreased sensation in her bilateral legs. She had neurogenic bowel and bladder. Manual muscle testing revealed bilateral 5/5 right hip flexion and 2/5 left hip flexion strength. Exam also revealed bilateral 4/5 toe dorsiflexion and ankle planar flexion strength, and 2/5 knee extension and ankle dorsiflexion strength. Deep tendon reflexes were 2/4 at the bilateral patella and Achilles tendon. She had negative Babinski reflexes and normal tone bilaterally. Her sensation was intact to light touch and pinprick from C2 to T7 and diminished below T8. Patient demonstrated intact clitoral-anal-reflex and voluntary anal contraction.

Upon completion of her acute inpatient rehabilitation stay, she had recovered full motor strength in bilateral lower extremities. At discharge, she was modified independent with limited community ambulation and had full bladder and bowel function recovery. Her discharge American Spinal Injury Association exam was consistent with a T7 ASIA D spinal cord injury.
Case #4

The patient is a 55-year-old female with a history of chronic low back pain and bilateral leg pain with associated numbness. She has a history of 2 previous lumbar fusion surgeries. She continued to experience low back and leg pain and she complained of mild of mid-thoracic pain.

She underwent spinal cord stimulator trial which was reported as successful without any complications. She then underwent spinal cord stimulator implantation with leads extending to the T8-9 level. There were no peri-operative adverse events. Three days post-operatively, she developed worsening numbness and weakness in her legs with progressive inability to move her left lower extremity and some voluntary movement in the right lower extremity. Neurological examination at that time reportedly revealed 2/5 strength throughout her bilateral lower extremities.

The spinal cord stimulator was removed and the patient underwent an MRI scan which showed a large thoracic disk herniation at T6-7, 7-8 and 8-9 with spinal cord edema and severe thoracic spinal stenosis. The patient was placed on IV steroids. CT scan of the thoracic spine showed multilevel partially calcified disc herniations at T6-7, 7-8 and 8-9 (Fig. 4). At T6-7 there was a large partially calcified anterior soft tissue density suspicious for a large calcified disc herniation with severe central canal compromise, reducing the AP diameter of the thecal sac to 5 mm. At T7-8 there was a large left paramedian disc herniation. At T8-9 there were calcifications in the anterior canal contributing to severe central canal stenosis.

Fig. 3. MRI of the lumbar spine revealed moderate to severe canal stenosis at L1/L2 and L2/L3 with hemorrhage and epidural air spanning T9 to L2-3 and mass effect increasing the canal narrowing at the L1/L2 and L2/L3 levels.

Fig. 4. T2-weighted MRI images post SCS removal showing a broad-based thoracic disk herniation at T6-7, 7-8 and 8-9 with spinal cord edema and severe thoracic spinal stenosis.
The patient was then taken to the operating room for a 2-stage procedure. Stage 1 consisted of a left sided thoracotomy with discectomies performed at T6-7, 7-8, and 8-9. This was followed by arthrodesis and fusion at these same levels. Stage 2 consisted of decompressive laminectomy from T7-9 with posterior instrumentation and fusion from T6 through T10.

Post operatively, the patient had no additional complications but did have severe pain which was managed with morphine and oral oxycodone. She underwent physical therapy and occupational therapy. She was reportedly at a maximal assist level for bed to chair transfers.

She was transferred to acute inpatient rehabilitation 12 days after surgery. Initial exam showed 3/5 strength in her right hip flexors, knee extensors and ankle dorsiflexors and 4/5 strength in her long toe extensors and ankle plantar flexors on the right. She had progressed to 1/5 strength in her left lower extremity hip flexors, knee extensors, ankle dorsiflexors, planter flexors and long toe extensors and she was rated at T11 ASIA C. At the end of the patient’s inpatient rehabilitation stay of 33 days, she had 4/5 strength in her left ankle dorsiflexors, planter flexors and 3/5 strength in her knee extensors. She required the use of a wheelchair and rolling walker for ambulation. She required maximal assistance for stair climbing. The patient was to continue outpatient physical therapy and occupational therapy upon discharge from inpatient rehabilitation. Her discharge American Spinal Injury Association exam was consistent with a T11 ASIA C spinal cord injury.

**Discussion**

Spinal cord stimulation (SCS) is indicated as a treatment for complex regional pain syndrome (CPRS), chronic back and leg pain (CBLP) and failed back surgery syndrome (FBSS) (5-9). Spinal cord stimulation is also used in the treatment of ischemic limb pain and intractable angina (5-9).

This case series suggests that neurologic injury is a rare but serious possible complication of spinal cord stimulator trial and placement. We present 2 cases of epidural hematoma, one of cord contusion, and one of cord edema secondary to thoracic disc herniations. In all 4 cases the injury area included the T8-9 level. Although epidural hematoma may be spontaneous, it often follows minor trauma, which would include spinal cord stimulator placement with or without lumbar puncture. Mechanical compression of the cord causes both an immediate and secondary injury (21). Immediately there is damage to the neural tissue and other soft tissues including endothelial cells of the vasculature. There is also secondary injury thought to be due to immune system reactions, oxidative damage, calcium and excitotoxicity (22).

This case series underscores the need for extreme caution and careful patient selection in performing spinal cord stimulator trial, implantation, or revision. Prior studies have demonstrated the importance of maintaining a high index of suspicion for thoracic disc herniations in patients with unexplainable mid-back or torso pain with or without sensorimotor deficits (23). We agree with the authors of these studies who have advocated the use of MR imaging prior to spinal interventional procedures in these patients. Careful consideration should also be given to patients with abnormal hemotologic or coagulation studies, and for patients on anti-platelet medications or anticoagulants. In the event of neurologic injury, leads should be removed immediately and, in the setting of cord compression, rapid decompression should be performed.

**Conclusion**

This case series underscores the need for extreme caution and careful patient selection in performing spinal cord stimulator trial, implantation, or revision.

Spinal cord injury resulting in paraparesis should be noted in the risk-benefit discussion with the patient as a possible complication of spinal cord stimulator placement or revision. Further investigation into potential complications of this SCS and their true incidence is warranted.
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