Vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty have recently been used to treat painful osteoporotic compression fractures. Early clinical results have been encouraging, but very little is known about the consequences of augmentation with cement for adjacent, unaugmented levels.

**Background:** Vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty have recently been used to treat painful osteoporotic compression fractures. Early clinical results have been encouraging, but very little is known about the consequences of augmentation with cement for adjacent, unaugmented levels.

**Objective:** This study performed a systemic review of the studies concerning whether the incidence of subsequent vertebral body fracture after vertebral augmentation therapy would be increased long-term.

**Study Design:** A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials was performed comparing the long-term incidence of subsequent vertebral body fracture between vertebral augmentation surgeries like vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty and conventional nonsurgical management.

**Setting:** The MEDLINE, EMBASE, ISI Web of Science and Cochrane Library databases and abstracts published in annual proceedings were systematically searched for evidence.

**Methods:** Relevant reports were reviewed by 2 reviewers independently and the references from these reports were searched for additional trials, using guidelines set by QUOROM statement criteria.

**Results:** Pooled results from 2 randomized controlled trials showed no significant increase of the secondary fracture rate after vertebral augmentation therapy compared with that of conventional treatment ($P = 0.07$). Few large-sample randomized controlled trials were specifically performed to investigate new fractures as an outcome of vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty.

**Limitations:** There were few data sources from which to extract abstracted data or published studies. There were only 2 randomized controlled trials that met criteria.

**Conclusions:** Although vertebral augmentation therapies, such as vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty, have been widely used in clinics to treat patients’ back pain caused by vertebral compression fractures due to osteoporosis, no evidence shows that they can increase the fracture of adjacent vertebral bodies.
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Vertebroplasty is an effective surgery, proven by multiple studies, for relieving or decreasing pain and has become an emerging choice for clinical vertebral body compression fractures (1-8). Vertebroplasty has recently been used to treat painful osteoporotic compression fractures. Kyphoplasty includes an additional step. Prior to injecting the cement-like material, a special balloon is inserted and gently inflated inside the fractured vertebra. The goal of this step is to restore height to the bone, thus
reducing deformity (9-18). Most patients return to their normal daily activities after either procedure. Early clinical results have been encouraging, but very little is known about the consequences of augmentation with cement for adjacent, unaugmented levels.

However, vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty are associated with some risks. Some of these risks are procedure-related risks, whereas some are postprocedural. One of the most important postprocedural risks is related to vertebral body augmentation. An excessive injection of cement may cause some biomechanical changes, including endplate necrosis; leakage into the disc space, spinal canal, and vascular area; increased stiffness of the vertebral body; and increased stress on the adjacent vertebrae, which may cause a new fracture or re-fracture. Therefore, this study performed a systemic review of the studies concerning whether vertebral augmentation would increase re-fracture occurrence due to a change in the biomechanical environment.

**METHODS**

**The data**

A total of 836 abstracts were identified. Of these, 64 studies met the inclusion criteria. Patients were required to have at least a 15% loss in vertebral body height (anterior, median, or posterior) as assessed by X-ray imaging. The pain related to the fractured vertebrae is the more prevalent (more prevalent than what?). They must have had more than 3 months life expectancy. Their blood platelets rate must have been more than or equal to 50,000/mm3 within the week before vertebroplasty (after a correct blood transfusion). The patients must have signed a consent form. Published randomized controlled trials were eligible for this meta-analysis. Published abstracts were included, but unpublished studies were also sought. Studies published in any language were also eligible if they fulfilled the inclusion criteria. No authors were contacted for clarification or verification of patient data.

**Search strategy for identification of studies**

Medline and manual searches were done (completed independently and in duplicate) to identify all published manuscripts, abstracts, and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing the incidence of new fractures between vertebral augmented therapies and conventional nonsurgical management.

The Medline search was done on PubMed covering from 1966 through 2010 with no language restrictions. Search terms included: “kyphoplasty” or “vertebroplasty” or “cementoplasty” or “vertebral augmentation” and “refract*” or “secondary fract*” or “new” or “worsening” and “incident” or “adjacent” and “convention*” or “optimal pain medication”. The second search was done through the Cochrane Library to identify randomized trials published from January 1998 through July 2010, using MeSH headings (“kyphoplasty” or “vertebroplasty” and “spinal fracture”, ex-lode Clinical Trials, clinical trial {publication type}) and text words (“kyphoplasty” or “vertebroplasty” or “cementoplasty” and “refraction” or “retractory” or “refracture” or “new” or “worsening” and “incident” or “adjacent” and “convention*”) without language restrictions. All the searched abstracts were screened for relevance. Manual searches were done by reviewing articles and abstracts cited in the reference lists of identified RCTs, by reviewing the first author’s article, abstract file, from reference lists of retrieved papers, textbooks and review articles. Also, abstracts published in the Proceedings of the OSTEOPOROSIS INTERNATIONAL (through 2000) were systematically searched for evidence relevant to this Meta analysis. The selection of studies for inclusion was carried out independently by two of the authors (X Mei & X Zhu). Each study was evaluated for quality using the scale of 0 to 5 proposed by Jadad (19). If reviewers disagreed on the quality scores, discrepancies were identified and a consensus was reached. Trial data abstraction was also done independently and in duplicate, but abstractors were not blinded to the trials’ authors or institution. Any discrepancies in data abstraction were examined further and resolved by consensus.

**Analysis of the review**

The data analyses were made with RevMan Version 5.0.2 provided by The Cochrane Collaboration. All analyses were carried out on an intention-to-treat basis; that is, all patients randomly assigned to a treatment group were included in the analyses according to the assigned treatment, irrespective of whether they received the treatment or were excluded from analysis by the investigators. For categorical variables, weighted risk ratios and their 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated using RevMan 5.0.2 software according to the Peto method. Results were tested for heterogeneity at a significance level of $P < 0.05$ according to the methods outlined. A fixed effects model was used if there was no evidence of heterogeneity between studies; if there was evidence of heterogeneity, a random
Effects model was used for the meta-analysis. The odds ratio (OR) and 95% CI were calculated for each trial and presented in a Forrest plot.

Publication bias is a common concern in meta-analyses. It is related to the tendency of journals to favor publishing large, positive studies. We chose a commonly used method for detecting publication bias, which is a graphical plot of estimates of the ORs from the individual studies versus the inverse of their variances, which is commonly referred to as a “funnel plot.” An asymmetry in the funnel would be expected if there was publication bias, with smaller studies tending to show larger ORs, because small studies with no significant statistical results would be less likely to be reported.

**Results**

The 2 trial assessors agreed on the selection of 4 clinical trials relevant to our study (20-23). The QUOROM flow diagram illustrates the main reasons for trial exclusion (Fig. 1). One short-term RCT was excluded, and another one was excluded due to its not being an experimental study. Only 2 trials, a prospective observational study and a multi-center RCT, were chosen for further quality analysis and review.

**Description of studies**

The designs of both included studies are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Both trials enrolled patients with vertebral compression fractures (VCFs). Patients

---

**Table 1. Summary of patient characteristics from the found trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Case no.</th>
<th>M/F ratio</th>
<th>Mean age</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wardlaw 2009[23]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>68/232</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thillaiinadesan 2010[20]</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10/24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
could have painful, acute or subacute, osteoporotic/osteolytic metastatic/multiple myeloma VCFs. In addition, patients were required to have at least a 15% loss of vertebral body height (anterior, median, or posterior) as assessed by X-ray imaging. In the Thilliainadesan (20) study, vertebroplasty was chosen as the experimental procedure, while in the Wardlaw (23) trial, balloon kyphoplasty was performed. New or worsening VCFs were treated as the outcomes in both included studies.

**Methodological Quality of Included Studies**

Each published randomized trial reported was assessed for quality using the validated scale developed by Jadad et al (19). All the studies included were randomized. All studies reported the randomization procedure. The quality scores of included studies are summarized in the table of characteristics in Table 2.

**Long-term Refracture Ratio**

Both studies reported secondary vertebral compression fractures as one of the outcomes. Altogether, the analysis included 2 trials with 334 patients. The overall long-term refracture rate was 12.57% for the experimental group (42/334) compared to 7.78% in the conventional group (26/334). The test for heterogeneity was not statistically significant with a \( P \) value of 0.32, which indicates that the pooling of the data was valid. The overall odds ratio confidence interval ranged from 0.97 to 2.89 with no significant difference (\( P = 0.07 \)). There was no significant difference in the long-term fracture rate in either study (Fig. 2) (10,13).

**Evaluation of publication bias**

The funnel plot of the log ORs versus the inverse of their variances of the individual studies is displayed in Fig. 3. The plot formed a very distinct funnel shape with the log ORs evenly distributed around the meta-analysis OR regardless of the study variance. Therefore, there was no indication of an asymmetry in the study findings by the variance or size of the studies and, thus, little evidence for publication bias.

**Discussion**

Vertebral augmentation procedures have become enormously popular in the United States and abroad for treating painful osteoporotic VCFs. This minimally invasive procedure avoids or mitigates the direct and indirect adverse effects of pharmacologic and conventional pain treatment modalities while providing pain relief and improved function in an expedited fashion. Vertebral augmentation procedures include percutaneous vertebroplasty, the injection of bone cement directly into a fractured vertebral body, and balloon kyphoplasty, in which an inflatable bone tamp is employed to create a cavity in the bone prior to cement injection. These procedures are performed on fractures of thoracolumbar vertebrae and the sacral vertebrae (sacroplasty) (24-28).

Until recently, the efficacy of vertebral augmentation

---

**Table 2. Quality analysis on included trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Randomization</th>
<th>Concealment</th>
<th>Loss</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wardlaw 2009 [23]</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thilliainadesan 2010 [20]</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 2. Long-term fracture rate.**
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procedures had been supported in numerous case reports, case series, and nonrandomized trials. Practitioners valued the procedures, and patients seemed to prefer the active intervention as opposed to medical therapy. However, the level of evidence of these early reports was fair to poor because of the lack of randomized controlled trials. Recent prospective, randomized, and controlled trials have done little to confirm or deny the efficacy of the techniques. In general, they have found percutaneous vertebroplasty or balloon kyphoplasty either beneficial, or not any different when compared to conservative therapy with regards to primary (pain and disability) and secondary outcome indexes (quality of life, analgesic usage, secondary vertebral re-fracture, etc.) (29-33).

The biomechanical effects of vertebral fracture and subsequent vertebral augmentation therapy are topics for continued investigation. However, altered biomechanical stresses after treatment may affect the risk of adjacent fracture in an osteoporotic patient. The patients successfully treated with augmentation often return with new pain caused by a new vertebral body fracture. The new fractures often are adjacent to the vertebral bodies that were initially treated (34-35). Wilson et al (36) studied the effect of cement augmentation of wedge-fractured vertebral bodies on spine segment compliance in 16 cadaver specimens. The results showed that augmentation could reduce spine segment compliance significantly. It significantly reduced the neutral compliance and the full-load compliance in flexion/extension. Augmentation also significantly reduced the neutral compliance and the full-load compliance in lateral bending (36).

The biomaterials like polymethyl methacrylate cement used in these procedures may have an important effect on load transfer and disc mechanics, and therefore, the variables of cement volume, formulation, and distribution should also be evaluated (37-38). Liebschner et al (39) developed an experimentally calibrated, anatomically accurate finite-element model of an elderly L1 vertebral body for investigating volume and distribution of bone cement on stiffness recovery. Their results demonstrated that the greater filling can result in a substantial increase in stiffness beyond the intact level (39). It is the cement that is thought to transfer a greater proportion of the load through the central augmented trabeculae structure than would occur naturally, causing an altered load distribution within the spinal

---

Fig. 3. Funnel plot for mortality rate in vertebral augmentation therapy trials
The increased mechanical pressure, especially pertinent for patients who increase their daily physical activities as their back pain decreases after augmentation, also placed additional stress on the vertebral bodies (40). Therefore, more and more clinicians believe the stiffening of the treated vertebra might put adjacent vertebrae at higher risk of subsequent fracture or degenerative change.

However, little clinical information is currently available on this topic. In this study, in order to investigate the outcome of a new fracture secondary to vertebral augmentation, we studied the long-term rather than short-term outcome, a period extended to 12 months. It is reported that the median time before re-fracture for patients treated with percutaneous vertebroplasty was 4.5 months (95% CI 1.4-9.3 months); for patients treated with ROPE (this needs to be identified as an exercise program) only, 60.4 months (95% CI, 27.6 months-upper limit undefined); and for patients treated with PVP-ROPE, 20.4 months (95% CI, 2.8 months-upper limit undefined) (P < .001) (41). The greater the anterior vertebral height obtained from vertebroplasty, the greater the risk of re-fracture occurring (P < 0.01). Gas-containing vertebrae were also prone to re-fracture after the procedure (P = 0.01). Anti-osteoporotic treatment was of borderline significance between re-fractured and non-refractured vertebrae (P = 0.07). Only restoration of anterior vertebral height was positively associated with re-fracture during the follow-ups (P < 0.01) (42).

These results indicate that there was no significant difference in the re-fracture ratio after vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty when comparing them to conventional nonsurgical management. The adjacent vertebral body fractures might be related to the natural progression of osteoporosis (40,43). Villarraga et al (44) presented a validated 2 functional spinal unit T12–L2 finite element model with a simulated kyphoplasty augmentation in L1 to predict stresses and strains within the bone cement and bone of the treated and adjacent untreated vertebral bodies. Their findings suggested that changes in stresses and strains in levels adjacent to a kyphoplasty-treated level are minimal. Furthermore, the stress and strain levels found in the treated levels are less than injury tolerance limits of cancellous and cortical bone (44). A retrospective clinical study of patients with at least one vertebral compression fracture conducted by Harrop et al (45), however, suggested that of 17 patients may be adjacent and 7 patients may be remote to the index fracture. The results showed that adjacent untreated vertebral bodies did not undergo immediate biomechanical changes arising from augmentation (45). Therefore, the presence of bone cement following the augmentation, we think, will not substantially alter the overall load transfer and stresses within that vertebral body and within the adjacent vertebral bodies; subsequent adjacent level fractures may be related to the underlying etiology (weakening of the bone) rather than the surgical intervention.

**Limitations**

One limitation in our study is there were few data sources from which to extract abstracted data or published studies. Therefore, we should interpret the results with care, especially for a positive result. Although the risk of publication bias exists in any meta-analysis, whether based on individual patient data or not, we feel that this was not an important aspect of our study, as many positive and negative trials were included in the analysis. The presence and rate of re-fracture could not be determined by follow-up phone interview. The authors of those studies fail to address any investigation as to subsequent spine pain in the percutaneous vertebroplasty group. Only patients who had fractures of an uncertain age were required to have imaging with MRI or bone scan.

**Conclusion**

The results of this meta-analysis indicate that the there was no significant difference in the re-fracture ratio after vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty (compared to what? You indicate what earlier, do it here too). The mechanism for the new fractures is most likely secondary to the underlying degree of osteoporosis.
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