

Original Article

Corresponding Author

Lee A. Tan https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3497-3321

Department of Neurological Surgery, UCSF Medical Center, 505 Parnassus Ave. Rm. M779, San Francisco, CA 94143, USA Tel: +1-415-353-2739 Fax: +1-415-353-2176 E-mail: Lee.Tan@ucsf.edu

Received: June 13, 2019 Revised: September 18, 2019 Accepted: September 20, 2019



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Copyright © 2019 by the Korean Spinal Neurosurgery Society

Preoperative Narcotic Use, Impaired Ambulation Status, and Increased Intraoperative Blood Loss Are Independent Risk Factors for Complications Following Posterior Cervical Laminectomy and Fusion Surgery

Ryan K. Badiee¹, Andrew K. Chan², Joshua Rivera³, Annette Molinaro², Brianna R. Doherty¹, K. Daniel Riew⁴, Dean Chou², Praveen V. Mummaneni², Lee A. Tan²

¹University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA, USA
 ²Department of Neurological Surgery, UCSF Medical Center, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
 ³Department of Integrative Biology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA
 ⁴The Spine Hospital, New York Presbyterian/Columbia University Medical Center, New York, NY, USA

Objective: This retrospective cohort study seeks to identify risk factors associated with complications following posterior cervical laminectomy and fusion (PCLF) surgery.

Methods: Adults undergoing PCLF from 2012 through 2018 at a single center were identified. Demographic and radiographic data, surgical characteristics, and complication rates were compared. Multivariate logistic regression models identified independent predictors of complications following surgery.

Results: A total of 196 patients met the inclusion criteria and were included in the study. The medical, surgical, and overall complication rates were 10.2%, 23.0%, and 29.1% respectively. Risk factors associated with medical complications in multivariate analysis included impaired ambulation status (odds ratio [OR], 2.27; p = 0.02) and estimated blood loss over 500 mL (OR, 3.67; p = 0.02). Multivariate analysis revealed preoperative narcotic use (OR, 2.43; p = 0.02) and operative time (OR, 1.005; p = 0.03) as risk factors for surgical complication, whereas antidepressant use was a protective factor (OR, 0.21; p = 0.01). Overall complication was associated with preoperative narcotic use (OR, 1.97; p = 0.04) and higher intraoperative blood loss (OR, 1.0007; p = 0.03).

Conclusion: Preoperative narcotic use and estimated blood loss predicted the incidence of complications following PCLF for CSM. Ambulation status was a significant predictor of the development of a medical complication specifically. These results may help surgeons in counseling patients who may be at increased risk of complication following surgery.

Keywords: Posterior cervical fusion, Complication, Risk factor, Narcotics, Cervical spondylotic myelopathy

INTRODUCTION

Cervical spondylotic myelopathy (CSM) is a major cause of disability in the United States.1 When compared to patients with other chronic debilitating diseases, those with CSM had a high rate of baseline disability and increased socioeconomic burden.¹ It is estimated that 1.6 per 100,000 people have symptomatic CSM requiring surgery, and its incidence continues to rise with the aging patient population.^{2,3} The onset of symptoms is usually insidious, with patients experiencing a variety of different symptoms which may include neck pain with or without associated radiculopathy, decreased hand dexterity, gait imbalance, and bowel or bladder incontinence.4,5 Posterior cervical laminectomy and fusion (PCLF) remain a highly effective treatment strategy for patients with multi-level disease and significant dorsal compression. It may become even more utilized as the aging population demonstrates the increasing severity of cervical spondylosis.6,8

Complication rates for procedures that treat CSM are estimated to be about 10.4% overall, and the reported complication rates for PCLF are even greater, ranging from 12.5% to 16.9% in the existing literature.⁹⁻¹² Therefore, it is important to identify potential risk factors in order to optimize clinical outcomes. A recent study found that hypoalbuminemia, indicating malnutrition, was a significant risk factor for complication and prolonged length of stay following PCLF surgery.¹⁰ However, few others have examined potential predictors of complications associated with PCLF specifically.¹³ Our study seeks to identify potential risk factors for medical and surgical complications following PCLF surgery.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Patient Population

The electronic medical records of consecutive patients who underwent PCLF were reviewed from May 2012 through July 2018 at a single, high-volume academic spine center. Exclusion criteria included non-CSM diagnosis such as vertebral neoplasm or acute vertebral fracture, and patients who had concurrent or staged anterior cervical spine surgery. The perioperative records and imaging were reviewed and analyzed. Clinical records and imaging up to 3 months postoperatively were reviewed to identify adverse events. Medical research was conducted according to the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. This study was approved by our Institutional Committee on Human Research as the Institutional Review Board of record (study #1824941). Patient consent was not required given that the only record linking the subject and the research would be the informed consent form and the principal risk of the present study is the potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality.

2. Data Collection

Demographic variables examined included age, sex, smoking status (current smoker or never/former smoker), insurance (private insurance, Medicare, Medicaid, or uninsured), revision surgery, and American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status classification grades. Neurologic risk factors included an ambulation status (independent, assisted, or nonambulatory), primary indication for surgery (radiculopathy or myelopathy), and the presence of any motor deficit. Comorbidities examined included diabetes, coronary artery disease (CAD), psychiatric disorder, chronic renal disease, chronic pulmonary disease, arthritis of a major joint (shoulder, hip, or knee), and osteoporosis. Preoperative medications examined included muscle relaxants, antidepressants, antianxiety medication, and narcotic use. Preoperative medication use was defined as the presence of any active prescription at the time of surgery. Preoperative radiographic data examined included cervical lordosis, T1 slope, cervical sagittal vertical axis, chin-brow vertical angle, proximal junctional angle, distal junctional angle, sacral slope, pelvic incidence, pelvic tilt, lumbar lordosis, and thoracic kyphosis. All radiographic measurements were taken of sagittal plain film X-rays using eUnity software (ver. 6.3.0.1-4; Client Outlook Inc., Waterloo, ON, Canada). Measurements were made by 2 observers using radiographic parameters defined in previous literature.^{7,14,15} Interrater reliability, as measured by intraclass correlation, was 0.947 (95% confidence interval [CI], 0.943-0.951). Surgical characteristics examined included number of vertebrae fused, whether fusion crossed the cervicothoracic junction, estimated blood loss (EBL), operative time and whether laminectomy was performed, concurrently or in stages.

The primary outcome measured was the 30-day complication rate, defined as the proportion of patients who experienced an adverse event. This was refined further into 3 categories: medical complications, surgical complications, and overall complication. Medical complications included urinary tract infection (UTI), anemia, thrombotic events, arrhythmia, cardiac arrest, pneumonia, sepsis, and death. Surgical complications included dysphagia, durotomy, surgical site infection, seroma, new neurologic deficit, implant malposition, and surgical revision within 30 days. Overall complication was defined as the presence of a medical complication, a surgical complication, or both.

Table 1. Patient demographics

Demographic	Value
Age (yr)	63 ± 11.37
Female sex	90 (45.9)
Current smoker	17 (8.7)
Insurance	
Medicare	110 (56.1)
Medicaid	24 (12.2)
Private Insurance	90 (45.9)
Uninsured	2 (1.0)
Revision surgery	20 (10.2)
ASA grade III+	90 (45.9)
Neurologic	
Ambulatory status	
Independent	135 (68.9)
Assisted	36 (18.4)
Nonambulatory	25 (12.7)
Indication for surgery	
Radiculopathy	28 (14.3)
Myelopathy	155 (79.1)
Cervical instability	12 (6.1)
Motor deficit	132 (67.3)
Comorbidities	
Diabetes	33 (16.8)
CAD	14 (7.1)
Psychiatric disorder	69 (35.2)
Chronic renal disease	12 (6.1)
Chronic pulmonary disease	21 (10.7)
Arthritis	32 (16.3)
Osteoporosis	20 (10.2)
Preoperative medications	
Muscle relaxants	39 (19.9)
Antidepressant	37 (18.9)
Antianxiety	34 (17.3)
Narcotics	101 (51.5)
Preoperative radiographic parameters	
Cervical lordosis (°)	8.53 ± 14.61
T1 slope (°)	29.37 ± 10.86
cSVA (mm)	33.82 ± 17.61
Chin-brow vertical angle (°)	1.94 ± 8.79
Proximal junctional angle (°)	-34.25 ± 18.53
Distal junctional angle (°)	0.09 ± 6.44
Sacral slope (°)	38.12 ± 11.84
	(Continued to the next

(Continued to the next)

Table 1. Continued

Demographic	Value
Pelvic incidence (°)	58.89 ± 14.46
Pelvic tilt (°)	21.70 ± 11.98
Lumbar lordosis (°)	48.792 ± 15.82
Thoracic kyphosis (°)	31.31 ± 11.64
SVA (mm)	37.73 ± 40.92
Procedure	
Laminectomy performed	184 (93.9)
No. of vertebrae fused	4.2 ± 1.9
EBL over 500 mL	28 (14.3)
Operative time (min)	221.4 ± 97.7

Values are presented as mean ± standard deviation or number (%). ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status classification; CAD, coronary artery disease; cSVA, cervical sagittal vertical axis; SVA, sagittal vertical axis; EBL, estimated blood loss.

3. Statistical Analysis

Continuous risk factors are presented as means and standard deviations. Categorical risk factors are presented as the number of cases and percentages. Univariate analysis was used to identify predictors of postoperative complication. Chi-square, Fisher exact, and Student t-tests were performed and OR, 95% CI, and p-values were generated. Variables significant at p = 0.20 were included in multivariate analysis. Patients with missing data for any included variable were omitted. A stepwise multivariate logistic regression was performed to examine each variable's relative contribution and calculate the adjusted OR, CI, and p-values. Statistical analyses were performed using custom scripts (RStudio software ver. 1.1.463; RStudio, Boston, MA, USA) running on Windows 10 Pro.

RESULTS

1. Demographics

A total of 291 patients were initially identified from the electronic database. There were 81 patients excluded due to non-CSM diagnosis such as vertebral neoplasm or acute vertebral fracture, or other diagnoses unrelated to CSM, and another 14 patients were excluded due to concurrent or staged anterior cervical surgery. After applying the exclusion criteria, the perioperative records and imaging studies of the remaining 196 patients were reviewed and analyzed. Clinical records and imaging up to 3 months postoperatively were reviewed to identify adverse events.

The demographics of this cohort are provided in Table 1. The

mean age was 63 ± 11.37 years, there were 90 female patients (45.9%) and 17 patients (8.7%) were smokers. There were 20 revision cases (10.2%), and 90 patients (45.9%) had ASA physical status classification grade of III or greater. Most patients ambulated independently (n = 135, 68.9%), but many also had one or more motor deficit (n = 132, 67.3%). The most common comorbidities were psychiatric disorders (n = 69, 35.2%), diabetes (n = 33, 16.8%), and arthritis (n = 32, 16.3%). Approximately half of patients (n = 101, 51.5%) reported preoperative narcotic use. Approximately 20% of patients had preoperative use of muscle relaxants (n = 39, 19.9%), antidepressants (n = 37, 18.9%), and antianxiety medications (n=34, 17.4%). Preoperative imaging showed an average cervical lordosis of 8.5°±14.6°, a T1 slope of $29.3^{\circ} \pm 10.9^{\circ}$, and a cervical sagittal vertebral axis (cSVA) of 33.8 ± 17.6 mm. The average number of fused levels was $4.2 \pm$ 1.9, with a mean operative time of 221.4 ± 97.7 minutes.

2. Postoperative Complications

The 30-day postoperative complication rates are shown in Table 2. Medical complications occurred in 20 patients (10.2%), the most common of which were acute blood loss anemia (n = 7, 3.6%), UTIs (n = 5, 2.6%), and cardiac arrhythmias (n = 4, 2.0%). Major medical complications occurred in 6 patients (3.1%), with 2 cases of pneumonia, one cardiac arrest, and one death within 30 days of surgery. Surgical complications occurred in 45 patients (23.0%). Of these, the most common complications included a new neurologic deficit following surgery (n = 16, 8.2%), durotomy (n = 11, 5.6%), and wound infections (n = 7, 3.6%). Three patients (1.5%) had malpositioned implants or grafts and required revision surgery within 30 days. Overall, 57 patients (29.1%) experienced at least one medical or surgical complication.

3. Univariate Analysis

Univariate analysis of risk factors for postoperative complications is presented in Table 3. Significant predictors for medical complication included EBL over 500 mL (OR, 3.97; p = 0.01), thoracic kyphosis (OR, 1.07; p = 0.01), cSVA (OR, 1.03; p = 0.04), and operative time (OR, 1.007; p = 0.004). ASA physical status classification grade was not a significant predictor at the univariate level (OR, 2.25; p = 0.09). There were no significant risk factors for surgical complication on univariate analysis. Overall complication incidence was predicted by EBL over 500 mL (OR, 2.91; p = 0.01) operative time (OR, 1.004; p = 0.03).

Table 2. Incidence of 30-day complications	
Complication	No. (%)
Medical complications	
Minor	18 (9.2)
Urinary tract infection	5 (2.6)
Anemia	7 (3.6)
Excessive blood loss (>3 L)	1 (0.5)
Pneumothorax	0 (0)
Deep vein thrombosis	3 (1.5)
Arrhythmia*	4 (2.0)
Major	6 (3.1)
Myocardial infarction	0 (0)
Cardiac arrest	1 (0.5)
Pneumonia	2 (1.0)
Pulmonary embolism	1 (0.5)
Cerebrovascular event	1 (0.5)
Sepsis	1 (0.5)
Death	1 (0.5)
Any medical complication	20 (10.2)
Surgical complications	
Minor	39 (19.9)
Dysphagia	5 (2.6)
Vocal cord paralysis	1 (0.5)
Pain control	4 (2.0)
Durotomy	11 (5.6)
Superficial wound infection	4 (2.0)
Cerebrospinal fluid leak	0 (0)
Seroma	5 (2.6)
Wound dehiscence	0 (0)
New neurologic deficit (weakness, palsy, numbness)	16 (8.2)
Major	8 (3.8)
Deep wound infection	3 (1.5)
Implant/graft malposition	3 (1.5)
Wrong level surgery	0 (0)
Pseudomeningocele	0 (0)
Revision required within 30 days	3 (1.5)
Any surgical complication	45 (23.0)
Any medical or surgical complication	57 (29.1)
* A why there is in also does at wish fiberillation encourations at wish	lagantus ation

*Arrhythmia includes atrial fibrillation, premature atrial contraction, premature ventricular contraction, and sinus tachycardia.

4. Multivariate Analysis

Each multivariate regression model initially included all variables significant at p < 0.20 on univariate analysis and was iterated until only variables significant at p < 0.05 remained. Poten-

	Medical complication	OR (95% CI)	p-value	Surgical complication	OR (95% CI)	p-value	Any com- plication	OR (95% CI)	p-value
Demographics									
Age (yr)									
<65	9 (8.4)	Ref	Ref	24 (22.4)	Ref	Ref	29 (2.1)	Ref	Ref
≥65	11 (12.4)	1.02(0.98 - 1.06)	0.43	21 (23.6)	$1.01\ (0.98{-}1.04)$	0.61	28 (31.5)	1.01(0.99 - 1.04)	0.38
Sex									
Male	14(13.2)	Ref	Ref	25 (23.6)	Ref	Ref	34 (32.1)	Ref	Ref
Female	6 (6.7)	$0.47 \ (0.16 - 1.23)$	0.14	20 (20.2)	$0.93\ (0.47 - 1.80)$	0.43	23 (25.6)	$0.73\ (0.39{-}1.35)$	0.32
Smoking status									
Never or former smoker	20 (11.5)	Ref	Ref	35 (20.1)	Ref	Ref	47 (27.0)	Ref	Ref
Current smoker	0 (0)	N/A	N/A	6 (35.3)	2.17 (0.71-6.11)	0.14	6 (35.3)	$1.47\ (0.48-4.10)$	0.54
Medicare	13 (11.8)	$1.51 \ (0.59 - 4.19)$	0.40	28 (25.5)	1.39 (0.71–2.78)	0.62	34 (30.9)	1.23(0.66-2.31)	0.52
Medicaid	2 (8.3)	0.78 (0.12–2.95)	0.75	5 (20.8)	0.87 (0.27–2.32)	0.55	7 (29.2)	1.00 (0.36-2.48)	0.99
Private insurance	9(10.0)	0.96 (0.37-2.43)	0.93	19 (21.1)	0.82 (0.42-1.61)	0.65	25 (27.8)	$0.89\ (0.48{-}1.65)$	0.71
Uninsured	0 (0)	0 (0-NaN)	1	1(50.0)	3.41 (0.13-87.39)	0.36	1(50.0)	2.46 (0.10-63.04)	0.53
Revision surgery									
No	17 (9.7)	Ref	Ref	39 (22.3)	Ref	Ref	51 (29.1)	Ref	Ref
Yes	3 (15.0)	1.64(0.36-5.54)	0.46	6(30.0)	$1.49\ (0.50-4.00)$	0.69	6(30.0)	$1.04\ (0.35-2.75)$	0.94
ASA grade									
<iii< td=""><td>7 (6.6)</td><td>Ref</td><td>Ref</td><td>23 (21.7)</td><td>Ref</td><td>Ref</td><td>28 (26.4)</td><td>Ref</td><td>Ref</td></iii<>	7 (6.6)	Ref	Ref	23 (21.7)	Ref	Ref	28 (26.4)	Ref	Ref
III+	13(14.4)	2.25 (0.90-6.19)	0.09	22 (24.4)	1.07 (0.56–2.06)	1	29 (32.2)	1.21 (0.67–2.23)	0.53
Neurologic									
Ambulatory status		1.65(0.91-2.90)	0.09		1.07 (0.66–1.68)	0.73		1.21(0.79 - 1.84)	0.38
Independent	10(7.4)			29 (21.5)			36 (26.7)		
Assisted	6 (16.7)			11 (30.6)			13 (36.1)		
Nonambulatory	4(16.0)			5 (20.0)			8 (32.0)		
Indication for surgery		2.21 (0.78-6.58)	0.15		1.17 (0.57–2.46)	0.96		1.15 (0.59–2.30)	0.68
Radiculopathy	0 (0)			6 (21.4)			6(21.4)		
Myelopathy	16(10.3)			36 (23.2)			46 (29.7)		
Motor deficit	14(10.6)	1.04(0.40-2.94)	0.94	33 (25.0)	1.57 (0.75–3.48)	0.33	40(30.3)	1.25 (0.64–2.49)	0.52
Comorbidities									
Diabetes	6 (18.2)	2.33 (0.77–6.39)	0.11	8 (24.2)	1.07(0.42 - 2.49)	0.69	11 (33.3)	1.25(0.55-2.74)	0.58
	(1, 10) 0		5			010			

VariableMedical complicationOR (95% CI) $P-val.$ Psychiatric disorder10 (14.5)1.98 (0.77-5.09)0.15Psychiatric disorder10 (14.5)1.98 (0.77-5.09)0.08Chronic renal disease0 (0)0 (0 - NaN)0.08Chronic pulmonary disease0 (0)0 (0 - NaN)0.08Arthritis2 (6.3)1.81 (0.55-5.14)0.28Chronic pulmonary disease0 (0)0 (0 - NaN)0.08Arthritis2 (6.3)1.81 (0.55-5.14)0.26Muscle relaxants3 (15.0)2.47 (0.65-7.75)0.14Muscle relaxants3 (7.7)0.67 (0.15-2.14)0.54Antidepressant6 (16.7)1.96 (0.65-7.35)0.73Antidepressant5 (15.0)1.47 (0.58-3.91)0.43Antianxiety15 (15.0)1.47 (0.58-3.91)0.43Preoperative radiographic parameters1.01 (0.98-1.05)0.26Cervical lordosis1.5 (15.0)1.47 (0.58-3.91)0.43Preoperative radiographic parameters1.01 (0.98-1.05)0.26Cervical lordosis1.19 (0.32-3.53)0.26Ti slope1.101 (0.98-1.05)0.26Crin-brow vertical angle1.00 (0.95-1.05)0.26Proximal junctional angle1.00 (0.95-1.05)0.26Proximal junctional angle1.00 (0.95-1.06)0.26Proximal junctional angle1.00 (0.95-1.06)0.26Provinal junctional angle1.00 (0.95-1.06)0.26Provinal junctional angle1.00 (0.95-1.06)	2	Surgical complication 14 (20.3) (4 4 (33.3) (4 4 (33.3) (6 5 (30.0) (6 4 (10.8) (30.0)	OR (95% CI) 0.79 (0.38–1.58) 1.72 (0.44–5.75) 0.52 (0.12–1.63) 0.73 (0.26–1.79) 1.48 (0.50–3.97) 1.48 (0.50–3.97) 1.48 (0.50–3.53) 0.35 (0.10–0.95) 1.28 (0.52–2.90) 1.76 (0.90–3.53) 1.76 (0.90–3.53) 1.01 (0.98–1.04) 1.01 (0.99–1.03) 0.98 (0.90–1.06)	p-value 0.52 0.39 0.97 0.13 0.13 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.10 0.72 0.10 0.48 0.48	Any com- plication 22 (31.9) 4 (33.3) 4 (33.3) 10 (31.3) 8 (40.0) 9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	OR (95% CI) 1.23 (0.64–2.32) 1.22 (0.31–4.04) 0.37 (0.08–1.14) 1.11 (0.47–2.48) 1.70 (0.63–4.37) 0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	p-value 0.52 0.76 0.12 0.80 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.36 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7		7.79 (0.38-1.58) 72 (0.44-5.75) .52 (0.12-1.63) .73 (0.26-1.79) .48 (0.50-3.97) 48 (0.50-3.97) 35 (0.10-0.95) 35 (0.10-0.95) 36 (0.90-3.53) 76 (0.90-3.53) 01 (0.99-1.02) 01 (0.99-1.03)	0.52 0.39 0.97 0.13 0.13 0.43 0.43 0.43 0.72 0.72 0.10 0.48 0.48	22 (31.9) 4 (33.3) 4 (33.3) 10 (31.3) 8 (40.0) 9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	1.23 (0.64–2.32) 1.22 (0.31–4.04) 0.37 (0.08–1.14) 1.11 (0.47–2.48) 1.70 (0.63–4.37) 0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.52 0.76 0.12 0.80 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.2
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7		72 (0.44–5.75) .52 (0.12–1.63) .73 (0.26–1.79) 48 (0.50–3.97) 69 (0.26–1.62) 35 (0.10–0.95) 28 (0.52–2.90) 76 (0.90–3.53) 76 (0.90–3.53) 01 (0.98–1.04) 01 (0.99–1.03)	0.32 0.39 0.97 0.13 0.13 0.43 0.43 0.72 0.72 0.10 0.72 0.10	$\begin{array}{c} 4 \ (33.3) \\ 4 \ (33.3) \\ 10 \ (31.3) \\ 8 \ (40.0) \\ 8 \ (40.0) \\ 10 \ (27.0) \\ 11 \ (32.4) \\ 35 \ (34.7) \end{array}$	1.22 (0.31–4.04) 0.37 (0.08–1.14) 1.11 (0.47–2.48) 1.70 (0.63–4.37) 0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.76 0.12 0.80 0.80 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.2
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	0		 .52 (0.12-1.63) .73 (0.26-1.79) 48 (0.50-3.97) 69 (0.26-1.62) 35 (0.10-0.95) 35 (0.10-0.95) 28 (0.52-2.90) 26 (0.90-3.53) 00 (0.97-1.02) 01 (0.99-1.04) 01 (0.99-1.06) 98 (0.90-1.06) 	0.39 0.97 0.13 0.43 0.43 0.72 0.10 0.72 0.10 0.48 0.48	4 (33.3) 10 (31.3) 8 (40.0) 9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	0.37 (0.08–1.14) 1.11 (0.47–2.48) 1.70 (0.63–4.37) 0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.12 0.80 0.28 0.28 0.77 0.77 0.64 0.07 0.07 0.97
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7		.73 (0.26-1.79) .48 (0.50-3.97) .69 (0.26-1.62) .35 (0.10-0.95) .28 (0.52-2.90) .76 (0.90-3.53) .00 (0.97-1.02) .01 (0.98-1.04) .01 (0.99-1.03)	0.97 0.13 0.43 0.06 0.72 0.10 0.10 0.48 0.48	10 (31.3) 8 (40.0) 9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	1.11 (0.47–2.48) 1.70 (0.63–4.37) 0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.80 0.28 0.36 0.77 0.64 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.97
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7		48 (0.50–3.97) 69 (0.26–1.62) 35 (0.10–0.95) 28 (0.52–2.90) 76 (0.90–3.53) 00 (0.97–1.02) 01 (0.99–1.03) 98 (0.90–1.06)	0.13 0.43 0.06 0.72 0.10 0.10 0.48 0.48	8 (40.0) 9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	1.70 (0.63–4.37) 0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.28 0.36 0.77 0.64 0.07 0.07 0.97
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	(1		 .69 (0.26-1.62) .35 (0.10-0.95) .28 (0.52-2.90) 76 (0.90-3.53) 00 (0.97-1.02) .01 (0.99-1.03) .98 (0.90-1.06) 	0.43 0.06 0.72 0.10 0.48 0.48	9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.36 0.77 0.64 0.07 0.97 0.97
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7		 .69 (0.26-1.62) .35 (0.10-0.95) .28 (0.52-2.90) .76 (0.90-3.53) .00 (0.97-1.02) .01 (0.99-1.03) .98 (0.90-1.06) 	0.43 0.06 0.72 0.10 0.91 0.48 0.48	9 (23.1) 10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	0.69 (0.29–1.50) 0.89 (0.38–1.93) 1.21 (0.53–2.64) 1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.36 0.77 0.64 0.07 0.07 0.97 0.67
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7			0.06 0.72 0.10 0.91 0.48 0.17	10 (27.0) 11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	0.89 (0.38-1.93) 1.21 (0.53-2.64) 1.76 (0.94-3.33)	0.77 0.64 0.07 0.97 0.67
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			28 (0.52–2.90) 76 (0.90–3.53) 00 (0.97–1.02) 01 (0.98–1.04) 01 (0.99–1.03) 98 (0.90–1.06)	0.72 0.10 0.91 0.48 0.17	11 (32.4) 35 (34.7)	1.21 (0.53-2.64) $1.76 (0.94-3.33)$	0.64 0.07 0.97 0.67
15 (15.0) 1.47 (0.58–3.91) 1.01 (0.98–1.05) 1.01 (0.98–1.04) 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 1.06 (0.94–1.19) 1.00 (0.95–1.05) 1.04 (0.94–1.16) 1.04 (0.98–1.09) 1.01 (0.97–1.06) 0.97 (0.92–1.03) 1.03 (0.99–1.07) 1.07 (1.02) (1.02)		_	76 (0.90-3.53) 00 (0.97-1.02) .01 (0.99-1.03) 01 (0.99-1.03)	0.10 0.91 0.48 0.17	35 (34.7)	1.76 (0.94–3.33)	0.07 0.97 0.67
$\begin{array}{c} 1.01 & (0.98 - 1.05) \\ 1.01 & (0.98 - 1.04) \\ 1.01 & (0.98 - 1.04) \\ 1.03 & (1.00 - 1.06) \\ 1.06 & (0.94 - 1.19) \\ 1.06 & (0.94 - 1.16) \\ 1.04 & (0.94 - 1.16) \\ 1.04 & (0.94 - 1.06) \\ 1.04 & (0.98 - 1.09) \\ 1.01 & (0.97 - 1.06) \\ 0.97 & (0.92 - 1.07) \\ 1.02 & (0.99 - 1.07) \end{array}$	0.59 0.26 0.04		.00 (0.97–1.02) .01 (0.98–1.04) .01 (0.99–1.03) .98 (0.90–1.06)	0.91 0.48 0.17			0.97 0.67
cal lordosis 1.01 (0.98-1.05) pe 1.01 (0.98-1.04) brow vertical angle 1.01 (0.98-1.04) brow vertical angle 1.00 (0.95-1.05) mal junctional angle 1.06 (0.94-1.19) junctional angle 1.00 (0.95-1.05) junctional angle 1.04 (0.94-1.16) incidence 1.04 (0.92-1.09) incidence 0.97 (0.92-1.03) ar lordosis 1.03 (0.99-1.07)	0.59 0.26 0.04		00 (0.97–1.02) 01 (0.98–1.04) 01 (0.99–1.03) .98 (0.90–1.06)	0.91 0.48 0.17			0.97 0.67
pe 1.01 (0.98-1.04) brow vertical angle 1.03 (1.00-1.06) mal junctional angle 1.06 (0.94-1.19) junctional angle 1.04 (0.94-1.16) incidence 1.04 (0.98-1.09) incidence 1.01 (0.97-1.06) incidence 0.97 (0.92-1.03) ar lordosis 1.03 (0.99-1.07)	0.26 0.04		01 (0.98–1.04) 01 (0.99–1.03) 98 (0.90–1.06)	0.48 0.17		1.00(0.98 - 1.02)	0.67
1.03 (1.00-1.06) brow vertical angle 1.06 (0.94-1.19) mal junctional angle 1.00 (0.95-1.05) junctional angle 1.04 (0.94-1.16) islope 1.04 (0.94-1.16) islope 1.04 (0.94-1.16) islope 1.01 (0.97-1.06) incidence 0.97 (0.92-1.03) ar lordosis 1.03 (0.99-1.07)	0.04		.01 (0.99–1.03) .98 (0.90–1.06)	0.17		1.00(0.98 - 1.04)	11
$1.06 (0.94-1.19) \\ 1.00 (0.95-1.05) \\ 1.04 (0.94-1.16) \\ 1.04 (0.98-1.09) \\ 1.01 (0.97-1.06) \\ 0.97 (0.92-1.03) \\ 1.03 (0.99-1.07) \\ 1.01 (1.02 (1.02) \\ 1.01 (1.02 (1.02) \\ 1.01 (1.0$	0.00	0	.98 (0.90–1.06)			1.02(0.99 - 1.04)	0.11
gle 1.00 (0.95–1.05) 1.04 (0.94–1.16) 1.04 (0.98–1.09) 1.01 (0.97–1.06) 0.97 (0.92–1.03) 1.03 (0.99–1.07)	00.0	,		0.67		1.01(0.93 - 1.08)	0.89
1.04 (0.94-1.16) 1.04 (0.98-1.09) 1.01 (0.97-1.06) 0.97 (0.92-1.03) 1.03 (0.99-1.07) 1.07 (1.02 1.14) 1.07 (1.02	0.98		0.99(0.96-1.01)	0.43		0.99 (0.97-1.02)	0.58
$1.04 (0.98-1.09) \\1.01 (0.97-1.06) \\0.97 (0.92-1.03) \\1.03 (0.99-1.07) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 (1.02 (1.107) \\1.07 ($	0.50		1.02(0.95 - 1.10)	0.63		1.00 (0.95-1.07)	06.0
1.01 (0.97–1.06) 0.97 (0.92–1.03) 1.03 (0.99–1.07)	0.18		1.00(0.96 - 1.04)	0.97		1.02 (0.99–1.05)	0.38
0.97 (0.92–1.03) 1.03 (0.99–1.07)	0.56		1.01(0.98 - 1.04)	0.64		1.01(0.98 - 1.04)	0.40
1.03 (0.99–1.07)	0.40		.00 (0.97–1.04)	0.84		1.00(0.96 - 1.03)	0.80
	0.17		1.01(0.98 - 1.04)	0.51		1.01(0.99 - 1.04)	0.34
(1.1.1 - 70.1) (0.1	0.01		1.03(0.99 - 1.07)	0.14		1.03(0.99-1.06)	0.10
SVA 0.99 (0.98–1.01) 0.34	0.34		1.00(0.99 - 1.01)	0.99		1.00(0.99 - 1.01)	0.89
Procedure							
Laminectomy performed 20 (11.0) 0.54 (0.13–3.71) 0.45	0.45 43 (3	43 (23.4)	$1.52\ (0.38 - 10.17)$	0.59	54 (29.3)	1.25 (0.36–5.78)	0.74
Length of fusion 0.14 0.94-1.51 0.14	0.14		1.03(0.86 - 1.22)	0.78		1.05 (0.90-1.23)	0.54
Estimated blood loss (per mL) 1.001 (1.00–1.002) 0.00	0.004		1.00(1.00-1.00)	0.22		1.0005(1.00003 - 1.001)	0.11
≤500 mL 13 (7.7) Ref Ref	Ref 35 (2	35 (20.8)	Ref	Ref	43 (25.6)	Ref	Ref
>500 mL 7 (25.0) 3.97 (1.36–10.91) 0.01		10 (35.7)	2.11 (0.87-0.91)	0.09	15(50.0)	2.91 (1.28-6.64)	0.01
Operative time (min) 1.007 (1.003–1.01) 0.00	0.004	1.	1.003(1.00-1.006)	0.10		1.004(1.00-1.01)	0.03

sagittal vertical axis; N/A, not applicable; NaN, not a number.

Table 3. Continued

Risk factor	Odds ratio	95%	6 CI	p-value
Impaired ambulation	2.27	1.14	4.50	0.02*
Thoracic kyphosis (°)	1.08	1.03	1.14	0.004*
EBL over 500 mL	3.67	1.15	11.27	0.02*

 Table 4. Multivariate logistic regression of risk factors for 30day medical complication

CI, confidence interval; EBL, estimated blood loss. $^{*}\mathrm{p}\,{<}\,0.05.$

 Table 5. Multivariate logistic regression of risk factors for 30day surgical complication

Risk factor	Odds ratio	95%	6 CI	p-value
Antidepressant use	0.21	0.05	0.64	0.01*
Narcotic use	2.43	1.17	5.18	0.02*
Operative time (min)	1.005	1.00	1.01	0.03*

CI, confidence interval.

*p<0.05.

tial risk factors for medical complications included ambulation status, indication for surgery, several comorbidities (diabetes, CAD, psychiatric disorders, osteoporosis), preoperative antidepressant use, ASA score, cSVA, lumbar lordosis, thoracic kyphosis, length of fusion, EBL, and operative time (Table 4). Of these, ambulation status (OR, 2.27; p = 0.02), EBL over 500 mL (OR, 3.67; p = 0.02), and thoracic kyphosis (OR, 1.08; p = 0.004) emerged as significant predictors. Impaired ambulation was significantly associated with increased incidence of postoperative UTI (p = 0.004) (Supplementary Table 1) and EBL greater than 500 mL was associated with acute anemia (p = 0.006, Supplementary Table 2).

Variables included in the surgical complication model included smoking, CAD, osteoporosis, preoperative antidepressant and narcotic use, cSVA, thoracic kyphosis, EBL, and operative time. Of these, preoperative narcotic use (OR, 2.43; p = 0.02) and operative time (OR, 1.005; p = 0.03) were risk factors for surgical complication, whereas preoperative antidepressant use (OR, 0.21; p = 0.01) was a protective factor (Table 5). More specifically, operative time was significantly associated with increased incidence of dysphagia (p = 0.01) (Supplementary Table 3). Independent risk factors for overall postoperative complication were narcotic use (OR, 1.97; p = 0.04) and EBL (OR, 1.0007; p = 0.03) (Table 6), the latter of which was associated with new postoperative neurologic deficit (p = 0.02) (Supplementary Table 2).

 Table 6. Multivariate logistic regression of risk factors for 30day overall complication

Risk factor	Odds ratio	95%	CI	p-value
Narcotic use	1.97	1.03	3.82	0.04*
EBL over 500 mL	1.0007	1.00002	1.002	0.03*

CI, confidence interval; EBL, estimated blood loss. *p < 0.05.

DISCUSSION

The present study utilized a retrospective chart review to identify pre- and intraoperative predictors of complication following PCLF surgery. We found statistically significant associations between medical complications and impaired preoperative ambulation status, and increased EBL, and increased preoperative thoracic kyphosis. Surgical complication was associated with preoperative narcotic use and increased operative time. Finally, patients with preoperative narcotic use and intraoperative blood loss > 500 mL had statistically significant increased odds of overall complication following PCLF surgery.

The overall complication rate of 29.1% in this study is higher than those previously reported in the literature.^{9,11,12,16,17} This is mainly due to the expanded definition of "complication" used in our study compared to that of the NSQIP database, which is utilized in many previous studies.¹⁸ We included minor medical complications such as UTI, postoperative anemia, transient cardiac arrhythmia, and other surgical complications inherent to spinal surgery such as incidental durotomy and transient dysphagia were also included. In addition, new neurological deficits in this study included postoperative numbness and transient worsening weakness, which usually improved overtime. Excluding these minor complications from the analysis, the overall complication rate would decrease to 9.8%, which would be consistent with previously reported complication rates in the literature.

Ambulation status was found to be an important predictor for medical complications, in which patients with impaired preoperative ambulation status had 2.27 times greater odds of medical complication compared to those who ambulated independently (p=0.02) and was associated with a greater incidence of postoperative UTIs specifically (p=0.004). This finding is supported by a previous study, which had found that preoperative walking disabilities were associated with increased risk of venous thromboembolic events following spine surgery.¹⁹ The impaired ambulation status can be a consequence of CSM, but it may also be an indicator for patient frailty.^{16,20} The observed relationship between ambulatory status and UTIs may be explained by several mechanisms. Patients with significant CSM causing impaired ambulation are often observed to have neurogenic bladder symptoms associated with their condition as well. Though the goal of PCF surgery is to relieve cord compression and, therefore, bladder dysfunction, in some cases incomplete decompression can lead to continuation of preoperative symptoms. Alternatively, prior work has shown that poor mobility is itself associated with UTIs by allowing patients to independently void and decrease periods of urinary stasis, which is a predisposing factor to infection.²¹ Furthermore, patients with impaired mobility are more likely to have urinary catheter for longer periods of time, which may also increase the risk of UTI. Thus, loss of independent ambulation may serve as a predictor of postoperative complications and poor outcomes, establishing its importance as a potentially modifiable risk factor. "Prehabilitation" programs, which seek to improve surgical outcomes by providing preoperative physical and nutritional therapy to frail patients, may be an apt intervention to address the increased risk conferred by loss of mobility.

EBL is a well-established risk factor for perioperative complication in spine surgery.^{4,22,23} Our study supports this association, finding that EBL > 500 mL is associated with more than threefold greater odds of medical complication (p = 0.02). Increased EBL was also associated with a small, but statistically significant increase in the odds of overall complication (p=0.03). Blood loss may lead to adverse events through a variety of pathways, from fluid shifts affecting cardiac, pulmonary, and renal status to impairment of the immune system leading to postoperative infections.²⁴ The association found in this study between larger blood loss and acute anemia is evident, however the observed relationship with new neurologic deficits after surgery is less obvious. For some patients, EBL may serve as a proxy for invasiveness and complexity of surgery, which could predispose patients to nerve injury and associated deficits. This result suggests that minimizing EBL may help to decrease postoperative complications.25

Preoperative narcotic use was identified as an important predictor of postoperative complications in our study. One previous study found that narcotic use was not associated with complications up to 90 days after surgery.²⁶ However, a recent retrospective database analysis by Jain et al.²⁷ reported that preoperative opioid use was associated with an eightfold increase in odds of complication following posterior lumbar fusion surgery. The present study lends support to the latter finding, which may be explained through several biological mechanisms. Activation of cutaneous opioid receptors has been shown to interfere with angiogenesis, delay and reduce neutrophil and macrophage recruitment to the surgical site, and alter neuropeptide signaling that is essential for wound healing.²⁸⁻³⁰ The difference in effect size (OR of 2.43 for surgical complication and 1.97 for overall complication, versus 8.08 in previous work) may be attributed to a shorter follow-up time capturing fewer complications in narcotic-using patients in our study (30 days versus 90 days). This likely explains the lack of significant associations with specific postoperative complications as well. For example, the incidence of surgical site infection was greater in the narcotic use group and, though this finding is supported by our mechanistic understanding of wound healing, it did not reach significance (Supplementary Table 4).

Antidepressant use was the only protective factor for surgical complication identified. Depression and anxiety have well-documented associations with poor outcomes after spine surgery, having been shown to lead to increased Nurick scores and rates of delirium.^{31,32} Prior research has revealed that treatment of these disorders with antidepressants attenuates this increase in complications.³³ This finding highlights the importance of preoperative treatment of psychiatric conditions.

Several other risk factors previously linked to postoperative complication were not found to be independent predictors in this study. While diabetes is often identified as a modifiable risk factor with a significant role in the incidence of complication, it did not emerge as a significant predictor in the univariate or multivariate analysis here.³⁴⁻³⁶ Likewise, many studies cite body mass index (BMI) as an independent predictor of surgical site infection, though recent work has repudiated this finding.³⁷⁻⁴⁰ In this study, BMI was included in the multivariate models for medical and overall complication, but its independent contribution was found to be insignificant (p=0.33 and p=0.98, respectively).

The present study has several limitations. As a retrospective study relying on chart review for data collection, it is subject to errors in the medical charts (i.e., missed diagnoses) and to the interpretation of the information therein. Underestimation of complications is another concern, as patients may seek care elsewhere within 30 days of surgery. Finally, our definition of preoperative opioid use did not include the actual dose information and is thus an incomplete metric of the extent of patients' actual opioid use.

CONCLUSION

Preoperative narcotic use and impaired ambulation were identified as modifiable risk factors for complications after PCLF. Preoperative "Opioid-weaning" and "Prehabilitation" programs may help to reduce postoperative complications. Increased EBL and operative time also increased the odds of shortterm complications after surgery. Spine surgeons should keep these results in mind when counseling patients regarding risks associated with PCLF.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have nothing to disclose.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was funded by a PROF-PATH grant from the UCSF School of Medicine. Portions of this work were presented in abstract and poster form at the AANS Annual Scientific Meeting, San Diego, CA, April 13, 2019.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Tables 1-4 can be found via https://doi.org/ 10.14245/ns.1938198.099.

REFERENCES

- Oh T, Lafage R, Lafage V, et al. Comparing quality of life in cervical spondylotic myelopathy with other chronic debilitating diseases using the Short Form Survey 36-Health Survey. World Neurosurg 2017;106:699-706.
- Baron EM, Young WF. Cervical spondylotic myelopathy: a brief review of its pathophysiology, clinical course, and diagnosis. Neurosurgery 2007;60(1 Suppl 1):S35-41.
- 3. Boogaarts HD, Bartels RH. Prevalence of cervical spondylotic myelopathy. Eur Spine J 2015;24 Suppl 2:139-41.
- 4. Matz PG, Anderson PA, Holly LT, et al. The natural history of cervical spondylotic myelopathy. J Neurosurg Spine 2009; 11:104-11.
- 5. Tetreault LA, Karadimas S, Wilson JR, et al. The natural history of degenerative cervical myelopathy and the rate of hospitalization following spinal cord injury: an updated systematic review. Global Spine J 2017;7(3 Suppl):28S-34S.
- 6. Salzmann SN, Derman PB, Lampe LP, et al. Cervical spinal

fusion: 16-year trends in epidemiology, indications, and inhospital outcomes by surgical approach. World Neurosurg 2018;113:e280-95.

- Lau D, Winkler EA, Than KD, et al. Laminoplasty versus laminectomy with posterior spinal fusion for multilevel cervical spondylotic myelopathy: influence of cervical alignment on outcomes. J Neurosurg Spine 2017;27:508-17.
- Oglesby M, Fineberg SJ, Patel AA, et al. Epidemiological trends in cervical spine surgery for degenerative diseases between 2002 and 2009. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2013;38:1226-32.
- Boakye M, Patil CG, Santarelli J, et al. Cervical spondylotic myelopathy: complications and outcomes after spinal fusion. Neurosurgery 2008;62:455-61.
- Lee NJ, Kothari P, Kim JS, et al. Nutritional status as an adjunct risk factor for early postoperative complications following posterior cervical fusion. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2017; 42:1367-74.
- Memtsoudis SG, Hughes A, Ma Y, et al. Increased in-hospital complications after primary posterior versus primary anterior cervical fusion. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2011;469:649-57.
- Yue JK, Upadhyayula PS, Deng H, et al. Risk factors for 30day outcomes in elective anterior versus posterior cervical fusion: A matched cohort analysis. J Craniovertebr Junction Spine 2017;8:222-30.
- Leckie S, Yoon ST, Isaacs R, et al. Perioperative complications of cervical spine surgery: analysis of a prospectively gathered database through the association for collaborative spinal research. Global Spine J 2016;6:640-9.
- Ames CP, Smith JS, Eastlack R, et al. Reliability assessment of a novel cervical spine deformity classification system. J Neurosurg Spine 2015;23:673-83.
- 15. Ames CP, Smith JS, Scheer JK, et al. Impact of spinopelvic alignment on decision making in deformity surgery in adults: A review. J Neurosurg Spine 2012;16:547-64.
- 16. Davis DH, Rockwood MR, Mitnitski AB, et al. Impairments in mobility and balance in relation to frailty. Arch Gerontol Geriatr 2011;53:79-83.
- 17. Lee NJ, Kothari P, Kim C, et al. The impact of resident involvement in elective posterior cervical fusion. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2018;43:316-23.
- 18. Meguid RA, Bronsert MR, Juarez-Colunga E, et al. Surgical Risk Preoperative Assessment System (SURPAS): I. Parsimonious, clinically meaningful groups of postoperative complications by factor analysis. Ann Surg 2016;263:1042-8.

- 19. Wang T, Yang SD, Huang WZ, et al. Factors predicting venous thromboembolism after spine surgery. Medicine (Baltimore) 2016;95:e5776.
- 20. Malone A, Meldrum D, Bolger C. Gait impairment in cervical spondylotic myelopathy: comparison with age- and gender-matched healthy controls. Eur Spine J 2012;21:2456-66.
- 21. Rogers MA, Fries BE, Kaufman SR, et al. Mobility and other predictors of hospitalization for urinary tract infection: a retrospective cohort study. BMC Geriatr 2008;8:31.
- 22. Kobayashi K, Imagama S, Ando K, et al. Complications associated with spine surgery in patients aged 80 years or older: Japan Association of Spine Surgeons with Ambition (JASA) Multicenter Study. Global Spine J 2017;7:636-41.
- 23. Kobayashi K, Imagama S, Sato K, et al. Postoperative complications associated with spine surgery in patients older than 90 years: a multicenter retrospective study. Global Spine J 2018;8:887-91.
- 24. Hu SS. Blood loss in adult spinal surgery. Eur Spine J 2004; 13 Suppl 1:S3-5.
- 25. Choi HY, Hyun SJ, Kim KJ, et al. Effectiveness and safety of tranexamic acid in spinal deformity surgery. J Korean Neurosurg Soc 2017;60:75-81.
- 26. Armaghani SJ, Lee DS, Bible JE, et al. Increased preoperative narcotic use and its association with postoperative complications and length of hospital stay in patients undergoing spine surgery. Clin Spine Surg 2016;29:E93-8.
- 27. Jain N, Brock JL, Phillips FM, et al. Chronic preoperative opioid use is a risk factor for increased complications, resource use, and costs after cervical fusion. Spine J 2018;18: 1989-98.
- 28. Martin JL, Charboneau R, Barke RA, et al. Chronic morphine treatment inhibits LPS-induced angiogenesis: implications in wound healing. Cell Immunol 2010;265:139-45.
- 29. Martin JL, Koodie L, Krishnan AG, et al. Chronic morphine administration delays wound healing by inhibiting immune cell recruitment to the wound site. Am J Pathol 2010;176: 786-99.
- 30. Rook JM, Hasan W, McCarson KE. Morphine-induced early delays in wound closure: involvement of sensory neuropeptides and modification of neurokinin receptor expression.

Biochem Pharmacol 2009;77:1747-55.

- 31. Elsamadicy AA, Adogwa O, Lydon E, et al. Depression as an independent predictor of postoperative delirium in spine deformity patients undergoing elective spine surgery. J Neurosurg Spine 2017;27:209-14.
- 32. Phan K, Moran D, Kostowski T, et al. Relationship between depression and clinical outcome following anterior cervical discectomy and fusion. J Spine Surg 2017;3:133-40.
- 33. Elsamadicy AA, Adogwa O, Cheng J, et al. Pretreatment of depression before cervical spine surgery improves patients' perception of postoperative health status: a retrospective, single institutional experience. World Neurosurg 2016;87: 214-9.
- 34. Gruskay JA, Fu M, Basques BA, et al. Factors affecting length of stay and complications after elective anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: a study of 2164 patients from the American College of Surgeons National Surgical Quality Improvement Project Database (ACS NSQIP). Clin Spine Surg 2016;29:E34-42.
- 35. Phan K, Kim JS, Lee N, et al. Impact of insulin dependence on perioperative outcomes following anterior cervical discectomy and fusion. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2017;42:456-64.
- 36. Worley N, Buza J, Jalai CM, et al. Diabetes as an independent predictor for extended length of hospital stay and increased adverse post-operative events in patients treated surgically for cervical spondylotic myelopathy. Int J Spine Surg 2017;11:10.
- 37. Bekelis K, Desai A, Bakhoum SF, et al. A predictive model of complications after spine surgery: the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (NSQIP) 2005-2010. Spine J 2014;14:1247-55.
- Buerba RA, Fu MC, Grauer JN. Anterior and posterior cervical fusion in patients with high body mass index are not associated with greater complications. Spine J 2014;14:1643-53.
- 39. Epstein NE. More risks and complications for elective spine surgery in morbidly obese patients. Surg Neurol Int 2017;8:66.
- 40. Pesenti S, Pannu T, Andres-Bergos J, et al. What are the risk factors for surgical site infection after spinal fusion? A metaanalysis. Eur Spine J 2018;27:2469-80.

Complication	Independent ambulation	Impaired ambulation	p-value
Anemia	5 (3.7)	2 (3.3)	> 0.99
UTI	0 (0)	5 (8.2)	0.004*
Arrhythmia	2 (1.5)	2 (3.3)	0.78
DVT	1 (0.7)	2 (3.3)	0.47
PE	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	0.68
Pneumonia	2 (1.5)	0 (0)	0.85
CVA	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	0.68
Cardiac arrest	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	0.68
Death	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	0.68

Supplementary Table 1. Medical complications associated with impaired ambulation

Values are presented as number (%).

UTI, urinary tract infection; DVT, deep vein thrombosis; PE, pulmonary embolism; CVA, cerebrovascular accident. *p < 0.05.

Supplementary Table 2. Medical and overall complications associated with estimated blood loss

Complication	\leq 500 mL	>500 mL	p-value
Anemia	3 (1.8)	4 (14.3)	0.006*
UTI	4 (2.4)	1 (3.6)	>0.99
Arrhythmia	3 (1.8)	1 (3.6)	>0.99
DVT	1 (0.6)	2 (7.1)	0.07
PE	1 (0.6)	0 (0)	>0.99
Pneumonia	2 (1.2)	0 (0)	>0.99
Sepsis	1 (0.6)	0 (0)	>0.99
CVA	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	0.31
Cardiac arrest	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	0.31
Death	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	0.31
Surgical site infection	7 (4.2)	0 (0)	0.58
Dysphagia	2 (1.2)	3 (10.7)	0.02
Vocal paralysis	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	0.31
New neurologic deficit	10 (6.0)	6 (21.4)	0.02*
Durotomy	10 (6.0)	1 (3.6)	0.95
Seroma	4 (2.4)	0 (0)	0.92
Pain control difficulty	4 (2.4)	0 (0)	0.92
Implant malposition	1 (0.6)	2 (7.1)	0.07
Revision within 30 days	1 (0.6)	2 (7.1)	0.07

Values are presented as number (%).

UTI, urinary tract infection; DVT, deep vein thrombosis; PE, pulmonary embolism; CVA, cerebrovascular accident. *p < 0.05.

Supplementary Table 3. Surgical complications associated with operative time

Complication	>240 min	\leq 240 min	p-value
Surgical site infection	4 (3.0)	3 (4.9)	0.06
Dysphagia	2 (1.5)	3 (4.9)	0.01*
Vocal paralysis	0 (0)	1 (1.6)	> 0.99
New neurologic deficit	9 (6.7)	7 (11.5)	0.28
Durotomy	9 (6.7)	2 (3.3)	0.42
Seroma	4 (3.0)	0 (0)	0.34
Pain control difficulty	4 (3.0)	0 (0)	0.34
Implant malposition	1 (0.7)	2 (3.3)	0.07
Revision within 30 days	1 (0.7)	2 (3.3)	0.07

Values are presented as number (%).

*p<0.05.

Supplementary Table 4. Surgical and overall complications associated with preoperative narcotic use

Complication	No	Yes	p-value
Anemia	4 (4.2)	3 (3.0)	0.92
UTI	1 (1.1)	4 (4.0)	0.41
Arrhythmia	3 (3.2)	1 (1.0)	0.56
DVT	2 (2.1)	1 (1.0)	0.95
PE	1 (1.1)	0 (0)	0.97
Pneumonia	1 (1.1)	1 (1.0)	>0.99
Sepsis	1 (1.1)	0 (0)	0.97
CVA	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	>0.99
Cardiac arrest	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	>0.99
Death	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	>0.99
Surgical site infection	2 (2.1)	5 (5.0)	0.50
Dysphagia	2 (2.1)	3 (3.0)	>0.99
Vocal paralysis	1 (1.1)	0 (0)	0.97
New neurologic deficit	8 (8.4)	8 (7.9)	>0.99
Durotomy	3 (3.2)	8 (7.9)	0.26
Seroma	4 (4.2)	0 (0)	0.05
Pain control difficulty	1 (1.1)	3 (3.0)	0.66
Implant malposition	1 (1.1)	2 (2.0)	>0.99
Revision within 30 days	1 (1.1)	2 (2.0)	> 0.99

Values are presented as number (%).

UTI, urinary tract infection; DVT, deep vein thrombosis; PE, pulmonary embolism; CVA, cerebrovascular accident.

*p<0.05.