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ABSTRACT

Total disc replacement (TDR) was clinically introduced as an alternative to spinal fusion to relieve back pain, maintain mobility of the spine and eliminate the adverse side effects of fusion. More recently, gamma-inert-sterilized ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) TDR cores were introduced to replace historical gamma-air-sterilized cores in an effort to reduce UHMWPE wear debris and inflammation. In this study, both implant and periprosthetic tissue retrievals from patients with gamma-inert-sterilized TDRs were evaluated for in vivo performance and biological responses, respectively. As pain was the primary revision reason for all patients, the contributions of implant-related damage and tissue responses to the development of pain were also a focus of this investigation.

After analyzing implants and tissues for 11 TDR patients, detectable UHMWPE wear debris was identified with corresponding macrophage infiltration in six patients with associated implant damage. Neither damage nor TDR bearing design, fixed vs mobile, influenced the amount, size and shape characteristics of wear particles. However, comparisons to a retrieval study of historical devices indicated that the number of UHMWPE particles generated from gamma-inert-sterilized devices were decreased by 99% (p=0.003) and were 50% rounder (p=0.003), confirming the improved wear resistance of the newer devices. Accordingly, periprosthetic tissue reactions were also substantially reduced.

Prospective immunohistochemical investigations for these devices showed, for the first time, that UHMWPE wear-debris induced tissue reactions in the human
lumbar spine can be linked to inflammation. First, inflammatory factors were elevated in TDR periprosthetic tissues (n=30) when compared to disc degenerative disease (DDD) patient tissues (n=3) from primary surgery and disc tissues (n=4) from normal autopsy patients with no history of lower back pain. The mean percent area of production for vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) (p=0.04), interleukin-1beta (IL-1β), (p=0.01) and substance P (p=0.01) were significantly higher in TDR tissues when compared to tissues obtained from DDD patients. Although platelet derived growth factor-bb (PDGFbb) p=0.14), tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNFα) (p=0.06) and nerve growth factor (NGF) (p=0.19) were also increased in the TDR patient tissues, these increases were not significant. Compared to normal disc tissues, the mean percent area for all six factors was statistically increased in TDR tissues (at least p<0.05). Interestingly, no statistical differences were observed between DDD and normal disc tissues. Next, our studies showed that TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, NGF and substance P strongly correlated with the number of wear particles and also the number of macrophages for the TDR patient group (at least p<0.05 for all). Finally, the pro-inflammatory/pain factors, TNFα and IL-1β, and the vascularization factors, VEGF and PDGFbb, significantly correlated with the presence of the neural innervation and hypersensitization agents, NGF and substance P (p<0.01 for all).

These findings suggest not only the presence of inflammatory reactions, but the presence of factors that can directly and indirectly contribute to the pain sensitivity.

In addition to wear-debris and subsequent inflammation, increased vascularization was another key histomorphological change observed in the TDR tissues that may be involved in the pathogenesis of particle disease. In brief, the
ingrowth of blood vessels may be providing a conduit for nociceptive innervation. Studying vascularity in revision tissues showed the total number of blood vessels was significantly associated with TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, PDGFbb, NGF and substance P (at least p<0.05 for all), suggesting an interrelation between vascular changes and inflammatory-mediated responses. Furthermore, analysis at the local level revealed the innervation/pain factors, NGF and substance P, were predominantly localized to vascular channels, suggestive of nerve ingrowth and potential neural-maladaptive plasticity at periprosthetic sites. Lastly, comparing blood vessel number with factor expression and macrophage number in individual images obtained from tissue sections with low and high vascularity suggested a temporal link between TNFα, macrophages and angiogenesis. Taken together, elucidating the pathogenesis of inflammatory particle disease will provide information needed to identify potential therapeutic targets and treatment strategies to mitigate pain.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction & Background

1.1 Low Back Pain & Surgical Fusion

Low back pain is reported to be the leading cause of disability worldwide according to the 2010 Global Burden of Disease Study [48]. It is also the leading cause of activity limitation and work absence, resulting in a heavy economic burden on individuals, communities and governments [2, 74]. Degenerative disc disease (DDD) is one pathology known to result in chronic back pain due to the biomechanical instability caused by loss of disc height, disc dehydration and/or annular tears [18, 24, 82]. When conservative treatments such as pain medications and physical therapy fail, discectomy or surgical fusion are implemented to mitigate pain for patients with DDD. The number of spinal fusions performed each year is continually increasing [14], with an estimated 380,000 thoracolumbar fusions performed in 2013 according to the 2013 Spinal Surgery Update by the Millennium Research Group. However, the clinical success rate of lumbar fusion is variable ranging from 16-95%, as long-term results are poor due to increased risk of complications [7, 18, 80]. One noteworthy and common complication is adjacent segment disease (ASD) [23, 54]. ASD is the associated degeneration of adjacent intervertebral discs (IVDs) due to abnormal loading and increased mobility of IVDs.
above or below the fused degenerated disc. Definitive treatment for this complication is a topic of continuing research, but disc replacement has been regarded as a potential solution [87].

1.2 Total Disc Replacement: An Alternative Treatment for DDD?

Following the encouraging short term results of Fernstrom implantation of a steel ball in place of an IVD in the 1960s [15], total disc replacement (TDR) was conceived as an alternative to spinal fusion and its resulting complications. TDR involves the removal of a damaged or degenerating IVD and replacement with an artificial device. In theory, implantation of a mobile and potentially shock-absorbing component to replace a degenerating disc will not only restore disc height and alleviate pain, but also preserve spinal segmental motion and transmit/absorb load between vertebral bodies. In contrast to fusion, this preservation of mobility has been speculated to prevent ASD since excess strain at adjacent vertebral levels is theoretically diminished [18, 46]. In addition, other complications that may arise from fusion such as the morbidity associated with bone graft harvest, stiffening of the lumbar spine, sagittal balance misalignment, and nonunion are all avoided with disc arthroplasty [33, 47, 62].

Several studies have demonstrated clinical success of disc arthroplasty in comparison to fusion for short and mid-term results [46, 82, 93]. Despite this evidence, fusion is still regarded as the “gold standard” for surgical treatment of DDD, and only 24,579 cervical and lumbar disc replacements were performed in 2013 (Millennium Research Group). Roughly 10 years have passed since TDRs were
approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use in the US, but the excitement surrounding TDR technology has been tempered due to limited long-term data, which is needed to convince insurance companies to cover the increased cost of this surgery. Thus, it is crucial to pinpoint any long-term pitfalls of motion preservation surgery and understand successful features as well as failure modes of both contemporary and emerging designs of artificial discs to further improve the technology.

1.3 The Historical CHARITÉ Disc Design & Early Retrieval Studies of Wear Debris

While Fernstrom's steel spheres and many early artificial disc designs receded from clinical use soon after their introduction, the CHARITÉ artificial disc design has been used extensively since its development in the 1980s, with few changes to design and biomaterials over the past 2 decades [34]. The SB CHARITÉ III was the third iteration of the original device that became commercialized in 1987 by Waldemar Link GmbH & Co. The lumbar TDR (L-TDR) design adapted biomaterials and design principles based on successful total joint replacement (TJR) designs. The original L-TDR incorporated two cobalt-chromium (CoCr) metallic endplates that were fixed to the superior/inferior vertebrae, and articulated against a mobile polymer core made of ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene (UHMWPE), which was gamma-air-sterilized. The design features were iconic for “historical” metal-on-polyethylene (MOP) L-TDRs. The clinical performance of this
disc design was reported to result in good to excellent clinical outcomes based on the alleviation pain and preservation of motion (Figure 1-1) [13, 39, 46, 66].

![Figure 1-1. (A) Anterioposterior and (B) lateral radiographs of a successfully implanted CHARITÉ TDR in the lumbosacral spine.](image)

While MOP designs have proven to be relatively successful in TJR, UHMWPE prosthetic wear debris generation is a clinically relevant complication that can ultimately result in osteolysis and aseptic loosening [28, 29]. Wear debris generation and osteolysis were initially thought to be negligible in anterior column of the lumbar spine due to the decreased sliding distance in MOP TDRs compared to total hip and total knee arthroplasty [40, 41]. However, retrieval studies of original/historical TDRs with gamma-air-sterilized UHMWPE cores demonstrated wear of the UHMWPE core, along with three cases of osteolysis in the lumbar spine [37, 78, 85]. Additionally, both submicron (0.05-2.0 µm) and large UHMWPE wear particles (≥ 2.05 µm) were present in periprosthetic tissues from historical TDRs, and these particles were associated with a chronic innate inflammatory response [57, 58]. TDR wear particles had a size range that was similar to that observed in revision tissues from total knee replacements (TKRs), however the majority were smaller than 6 µm as seen in revision tissues from total
hip replacements (THRs) [57]. Furthermore, the extent of impingement of the implant positively correlated with increased submicron wear debris and biological/inflammatory activity of these particles [4]. Collectively, these studies and others have established the clinically relevant complication of UHMWPE core wear for the historical TDRs [36, 38, 56, 83, 84], which served as an impetus for improving TDR bearing surface materials and designs.

1.4 The Modern TDR: ProDisc-L & the new CHARITÉ

The growing field of artificial disc replacement includes a broad range of designs and a heterogeneous assortment of biomaterials, but the most commonly employed L-TDRs have relied on developing better MOP devices [86]. Modern MOP devices, such as the ProDisc-L and CHARITÉ (re-modeled in 2004), incorporate conventional polyethylene cores which are fabricated with gamma-inert-sterilized UHMWPE GUR 1020 resin, designed to improve oxidation resistance and thus enhance the wear performance of the cores. While both devices were approved by the FDA and in clinical use for several years, the CHARITÉ was discontinued in 2011 as their manufacturer, Synthes, was acquired by the ProDisc-L developer, DePuy. Today, the ProDisc-L remains as the only lumbar TDR in the present US market, however there is an extensive clinical history database for both devices as tens of thousands of people have received these devices.
The biomaterials used in the fabrication of the ProDisc-L prosthesis are quite similar to the CHARITÉ, specifically a conventional UHMWPE core and two CoCr endplates, plasma-coated on the outside with titanium. However, unlike the mobile-bearing CHARITÉ, the core of ProDisc-L is fixed via a locking mechanism into the inferior endplate, thus allowing relative motion only between the core and the superior endplate (Figure 1.2) [34]. To the author’s knowledge, no studies have evaluated implant wear or periprosthetic tissue reactions for contemporary MOP L-TDRs. Additionally, it remains unclear whether TDR design will influence the generation of UHMWPE particles and the associated chronic inflammatory response.

1.5 TDR Revision, Complications & Pain

TDR revision surgery can be a dangerous procedure due to the difficulty that is involved in retrieving the prosthesis that is adhered or in close proximity to great vessels and nerve plexus [82]. Nevertheless, revision cases are growing as TDRs are becoming more widely used. While TDR technology provides an alternative treatment approach to fusion, new operative techniques unfortunately mean new complications. However, many complications arising from TDRs that require
revision surgery result from iatrogenic causes such as inappropriate indications, poor implantation technique and malpositioning of the implant [5]. Implant subsidence into the vertebral body is a common problem that could potentially result from inadequate determination of preoperative bone quality as TDR contraindications include osteophenic/osteoporotic bones [26]. Other complications of poor implantation that result in revision surgeries include device migration, extrusion, or dislodgement that may ultimately result in spinal cord compression, causing nerve irritation or vascular impedance. A malpositioned prosthesis can cause foraminal narrowing and compromise the dorsal root ganglion or nerve root, thereby resulting in radiculopathy and excruciating pain. Adding to these complications, positional changes of the implant in vivo can also lead to wear debris generation from unintended contact between device components.

Pain is the primary reason for TDR revision, but iatrogenic damage is not always the cause. Periprosthetic wear debris generation in artificial disc replacement has recently emerged as a clinically relevant complication that may lead to a painful inflammatory response similar to what has been observed for some TJRs [20, 22]. Studies suggest there may be a functional link between the innate immune response, and neurological changes that ultimately result in the generation of peripheral pain [75, 94]. Specifically, activated macrophages have been reported to contribute to experimental pain states by releasing factors such as tumor necrosis factor-α (TNFα), interleukin-1β (IL-1β), IL-8, nerve growth factor (NGF), nitric oxide (NO) and prostanoids [43, 64, 76]. However, the role of wear-debris-induced inflammation and subsequent mediation of pain post-spinal arthroplasty remains
unknown. Thus, investigating wear debris and the resulting biological responses will be invaluable in understanding some of the underlying mechanisms of pain, which can then be targeted to preserve or extend the life-time of the implant.

1.6 What We Know About Lumbar Pain from the Degenerative Disc

Much of what is known about the pathological states that can contribute to the mediation of pain in the lumbar spine is derived from the large body of research comparing the normal disc to degenerative states. The normal intervertebral disc is comprised of three regions that are morphologically distinct: the inner gelatinous nucleus pulposus (NP), the outer annulus fibrosis (AF) and cartilaginous endplates. While the adult human NP is completely avascular and aneural, a relatively low number of small blood vessels and nerve fibers are found in the very outer regions of the AF and endplates [11, 63, 67, 92]. The capillaries present in these regions provide nutrients to cells within the disc through diffusion-facilitated fluid transport that occurs from normal movements. During movement compressive loading causes water in the NP to extrude metabolic waste products from cells towards the blood vessels and the osmotic potential of the nucleus draws back nutrients into the inner disc. However, the distance between NP cells and the nearest blood vessel can be as much as 8 mm, resulting in a nutrient- and oxygen- poor environment [30, 81]; this hostile environment is reflected in significantly lower cell densities and metabolic activities than other cartilaginous tissues. The small existing body of NP cells regulate homeostatic turnover of the extracellular matrix and any imbalance in the
Degradative/synthetic processes can contribute to loss of tissue integrity and degenerative conditions.

Disc degeneration is characterized by not only the overall breakdown of the extracellular matrix, but also changes in resident cell number, phenotype and behavior. These changes can contribute to inflammatory-mediated discogenic pain (inflammatory changes in the disc that influence the nervous system by stimulation of nociceptors in the AF) and/or pain caused by the physical biomechanical instability of the spine leading to disc herniation and impingement of nerve roots [8, 21, 91]. The loss of proteoglycans and overall breakdown of matrix is reflected in the poor reparative capacity of the disc. The breakdown of the matrix surrounding the cells ultimately results in inflammation, the replacement of NP with disorganized scar and granulated tissue [55]. The reparative effort of AF cells in response to matrix degeneration and tears/fissures also causes inflammation, scarring and promotes neovascularization [16, 17]. This process has been associated with an infiltration of inflammatory cells, as resident macrophages are not present [6, 17]. Koike and colleagues have found correlations that suggest progressive degeneration is accompanied by angiogenesis and that newly formed vessels play an important role as a passage for macrophages to enter the disc space [31]. Interestingly, an immunohistochemical study on human autopsy degenerative discs also showed the presence of CD68-positive (pan-macrophage marker) cells in the NP, and suggested these cells were transformed resident cells rather than invading monocytes [50]. While more substantiative evidence is necessary to determine whether the degenerative pathology enables a microenvironment
conducive to transdifferentiation of resident NP cells towards a macrophage-like phenotype, the presence of transformed cells or infiltrated inflammatory cells both have the potential to mediate pain.

Inflammatory cells in the degenerated disc and AF secrete proinflammatory cytokines such as TNFα and IL-1β that can directly and/or indirectly mediate pain sensitization [21, 53, 89, 91]. Both cytokines can directly exert algesic effects by binding to pain-associated receptors on the synapses of sensory neurons (which then respond by sending signals to the brain, initiating the perception of pain) [75, 94]. These cytokines also have the potential to induce neural ingrowth into the disc and mediate hypersensitization by upregulating the expression of factors like NGF and substance P, both of which are also found to be upregulated or increased in the outer AF of degenerated disc [1, 21, 60]. Furthermore, TNFα and IL-1β have been shown to induce blood vessel ingrowth by stimulating the release of factors like vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) [6, 79]. Activated fibroblasts and macrophages in close proximity to existing blood vessels can coordinate signals with endothelial cells (ECs) and other stromal cells to stimulate angiogenesis [10, 27].

Angiogenesis is a crucial component in the pain-associated pathogeneses of disc degeneration and herniation. An immunohistochemical study of 50 herniated discs showed 88% and 78% immunopositivity for the angiogenic growth factors, VEGF and platelet-derived growth factor (PDGFbb), respectively; both factors were predominantly observed in tissue capillaries, but also present in disc cells and
fibroblasts [77]. The presence of these factors in degenerated and herniated discs has been associated with neovascularization of the poorly vascular AF and avascular NP [6, 12]. This is a very noteworthy morphological change for two reasons. First, the newly formed blood vessels branch out to form a network of smaller vessels that provide a venue for monocyte infiltration into the disc tissue via post-capillary venules; this process can then induce further inflammation and vascularization in the disc space [31, 51]. Second, vascularization also contributes to pathological innervation into the disc space: blood vessels extend through the AF towards the degenerating NP and this process can be accompanied by ingrowing nerve fibers [16, 17]. On the basis that these nerve fibers originate from the dorsal root ganglia, they are nociceptive [3, 9, 19, 52]. Importantly, these nerve fibers can also become hypersensitized due the inflammatory conditions in the degenerated disc, thereby contributing to discogenic pain [19]. Gruber and colleagues (2012) proposed nerve ingrowth into the inner AF of degenerative discs encounter a proinflammatory cytokine-rich milieu that promotes hyperalgesia and exacerbates pain [21]. To complicate an already complex phenomenon in the degenerating disc, both ECs and nerve cells, in addition to inflammatory cells, produce proinflammatory cytokines, vascularization factors, neurotrophins or neuropeptides [51, 65, 70, 75, 91]. Taken together, inflammation and the vascularization/innervation process work in synergy to mediate discogenic pain. Although it is still not clear which comes first, both processes involve potential targets for therapeutic intervention to mitigate pain.
TDR is a surgical procedure that involves the removal of the degenerated disc in its entirety to alleviate back pain. Thus, in theory, the majority of the pathological disc is discarded, with the exception of outer-most portions of the AF. However, since the AF can be involved in the pathogenesis of discogenic pain, it raises the interesting question of how pain is developing in patients revised for TDRs. This present body of research aims to not only evaluate the wear performance of TDRs in patients that were originally indicated for DDD, but also study any overlaps in pain-associated pathologies, since the primary reason for TDR revision surgery is pain.

1.7 Overview of Thesis & Specific Aims

This thesis presents extensive work reviewing artificial disc implant designs and biomaterials, followed by studying TDR retrievals, wear debris generation from these devices and the biological responses to the debris. The field of artificial disc replacement includes a broad range of designs as well as heterogeneous assortment of biomaterials for lumbar and cervical regions of the spine. Chapter 2 provides a systematic review evaluating the design and material factors that are associated with differences in clinical wear performance of lumbar and cervical TDRs. The rest of the thesis details experimental research evaluating the wear performance and biocompatibility of lumbar TDRs comprised specifically of the 2-piece, metal-on-polyethylene (MOP) design. Chapter 3 describes the retrieval analyses of contemporary MOP lumbar device components and periprosthetic tissue responses (see Aim 1 below). Chapter 4 investigates the immune responses to polyethylene wear particles and the involvement of inflammatory factors known to play both a
direct and indirect role in inflammatory-mediated pain (see Aim II below). Chapter 5 evaluates the relationship between inflammation, vascularization and innervation in the periprosthetic lumbar spine to elucidate the wear-debris-induced pathogenesis based on localized tissue/cellular responses (see Aim III below). Chapter 6 provides more information on the biological responses that led to the rare case of osteolysis noted in two TDR revision patients. Lastly, Chapter 7 summarizes the findings from the above body of research, along with implications of this work and future directions.

1.7.1 Aim I: Retrieval Analyses of Contemporary MOP L-TDR Device Components & Periprosthetic Tissue Responses

Modern L-TDR designs incorporate gamma-inert-sterilized or conventional ultra-high-molecular-weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) cores to improve wear resistance, minimize wear debris generation and reduce the risk of revision surgery [35]. Whether this contemporary material or the type of TDR design (mobile vs fixed) will influence UHMWPE wear debris and the subsequent tissue reactions in the spine remain unanswered questions. The hypothesis was that conventional UHMWPE cores used in contemporary TDR designs will decrease wear damage and periprosthetic tissue reactions compared to historical designs. The goals were to determine whether: (1) periprosthetic UHMWPE wear debris and biological tissue responses are present in tissues from revised contemporary MOP L-TDRs; (2) there is an influence of bearing design (i.e. fully mobile vs. fixed designs) on wear particle
number, size and shape; and (3) wear particles characteristics from contemporary MOP L-TDRs differ from historical MOP L-TDRs and conventional THR.

### 1.7.2 Aim II: Investigate the Immune Response to UHMWPE Wear Particles and the Involvement of Inflammatory Factors known to Play Both a Direct and Indirect Role in Inflammatory-mediated Pain

Pain is the primary reason for revision of artificial discs. However, whether pain is mediated or exacerbated as a biological consequence of wear debris remains unclear. Hip and knee arthroplasty and *in vitro* studies have revealed that UHMWPE wear debris stimulate resident and recruited macrophages to secrete a number of inflammatory cytokines, chemokines, reactive oxygen species and reactive nitrogen species [25, 32, 44, 45, 59, 61, 68, 69, 71, 73, 88]. These factors are predominantly associated with the induction of bone resorption in TJAs, which can lead to the development of osteolysis and implant loosening [73]. However, their presence, quantity and role in the clinical failure of contemporary TDR designs have not been determined, where pain rather than osteolysis is the central reason for revision. Interestingly many of the aforementioned biological factors produced in response to wear debris in TJR have also been implicated in nociceptive pain mediation [90, 94]. Based on preliminary data from TDR wear debris and tissue analyses performed in Aim I, it was hypothesized that biological reactions to wear debris in the spine are unique, in that the production and interplay between key inflammatory mediators may be contributing to abnormal or enhanced pain sensitization. To test this hypothesis and better understand the biological responses in TDR patient tissues
with and without detectable wear debris, the second specific aim of this study was to analyze periprosthetic tissues from revised artificial discs using immunohistochemistry to quantify the levels of select inflammatory factors that are known to play both direct and indirect roles in the mediation of pain.

1.7.3 Aim III: Evaluate the Relationship between Inflammation, Vascularization and Innervation in the Periprosthetic Lumbar Spine to Elucidate the Wear-Debris-Induced Pathogenesis based on Localized Tissue/Cellular Responses

As a part of Aim II, we reported an association for the angiogenic factor, VEGF with the neutrophin, NGF and the neuropeptide, Substance P. Associations for these factors have been previously reported, specifically at the sites of neovascularization, where infiltrating vessels are thought to physically provide a route for nerves to form and grow [6, 17, 42, 49]. Interestingly, inflammation and the production of the proinflammatory cytokines TNFα and IL-1β were also associated with these neovascular changes. Taken together, these findings raise an important question: what is the significance of increased vascularization in TDR patient tissues and could the number of vessels independently serve as a pathogenic indicator and therapeutic target for pain-associated ‘particle disease’ in these individuals? To answer this question, macrophage, inflammatory factor and blood vessel and nerve cell contributions to the adverse reactions in TDR tissues needed to be systematically evaluated. We hypothesized that while inflammation is the driving force, increased vascularization may be a key histomorphological change
leading to nociception. Therefore, the final and prospective specific aim was to elucidate the wear-debris-induced inflammatory pathogenesis in TDR tissues based on vascular density and NGF and substance P production at the localized level.
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CHAPTER 2

A Systematic Review of Design & Biomaterial Factors Affecting the Clinical Wear Performance of Total Disc Replacements†

2.1 Abstract

Total disc replacement was clinically introduced to reduce pain and preserve segmental motion of the lumbar and cervical spine. Previous case studies have reported implant wear and adverse local tissue reactions around artificial prostheses, but it is unclear how design and biomaterials affect clinical outcomes. In this study, we asked which design and material factors are associated with differences in clinical wear performance (implant wear and periprosthetic tissue response) of (1) lumbar and (2) cervical total disc replacements?

To research the literature for publications related to TDR implant wear and periprosthetic tissue response, we performed a systematic review using an advanced search in MEDLINE and Scopus electronic databases. Of the 340 references identified, 33 were retrieved for full-text evaluation, from which 16 papers met the inclusion criteria, which were semi-quantitative analysis of wear and adverse local tissue reactions along with a description of the implanted device. The 16 papers included 12 on lumbar disc replacement and five on cervical disc replacement; one of the included studies reported on both lumbar and cervical disc replacement. An additional three papers were found by searching bibliographies of

the original articles, bringing the total to 19 papers (14 lumbar and 7 cervical studies). There were seven case reports, three case series, two case-control studies, and seven analytical studies. The Methodological Index for Non-randomized Studies (MINORS) Scale was used to score case series and case-control studies, which yielded mean scores of 10.3 of 16 and 17.5 of 24, respectively. In general, the case series (3) and case-control (2) studies were of good quality. In lumbar regions, metal-on-polymer devices with mobile-bearing designs consistently generated small and large polymeric wear debris, triggering periprosthetic tissue activation of macrophages and the formation of giant cells, respectively. In the cervical regions, metal-on-polymer devices with fixed-bearing designs had similar outcomes. Information on lumbar fixed-bearing devices and cervical mobile-bearing devices was limited. All metal-on-metal constructs, of both lumbar and cervical constructs, tended to generate small metallic wear debris, which typically triggered an adaptive immune response of predominantly activated lymphocytes. There were no retrieval studies on one-piece prostheses.

This review provides evidence that design and biomaterials affect the type of wear and inflammation. However, clinical study design, follow-up, and analytical techniques differ among investigations, preventing us from drawing firm conclusions about the relationship between implant design and wear performance for both cervical and lumbar total disc replacement.

2.2 Introduction
Total disc replacement (TDR) was clinically introduced as an alternative to fusion to reduce pain and preserve segmental motion of the cervical and lumbar spine. TDR designs currently on the market may be classified as either fixed- or mobile-bearing analogous to total knee replacements. Of these designs, the most widely used in the market today include metallic endplates, which are fixed to the adjacent vertebral bodies and one or more articulations that involve either metal-on-polymer or metal-on-metal bearing surfaces. The most commonly used lumbar disc replacements have relied on either cobalt-chromium (CoCr) alloy endplates articulating with a polymer core of ultrahigh-molecular-weight polyethylene (hereafter polyethylene) or metal-on-metal (MoM) bearings fabricated from CoCr alloys. In the cervical spine, a broader range of biomaterials have been used, including polyethylene, CoCr alloys, stainless steel, titanium (Ti) alloys, polyurethanes, polyetheretherketone, and Ti alloy-ceramic composites. In addition to the fixed- and mobile-bearing designs, a third “one-piece” classification of artificial disc design, in which an elastomeric polymer disc is fixed to metallic endplates, is currently undergoing clinical investigation. Thus, the field of artificial disc replacement includes a broad range of designs as well as heterogeneous assortment of biomaterials for lumbar (Table 2-1) and cervical regions of the spine (Table 2-2).

Although the early developers of disc arthroplasty argued that the release of wear debris would not be a clinically relevant issue [1], case studies have emerged in the literature over the past decade that illustrate the potential for not only wear debris-induced osteolysis with metal-on-polymer (MoP) TDRs, but also adverse local tissue reactions for MoM TDRs [2]. Compared with THAs and TKAs, little is known about the clinical damage modes for TDRs because the surgery to remove a
malfunctioning artificial disc can be challenging, or even life-threatening, especially for the lumbar spine [3]. There has been one systematic review of complications in cervical disc arthroplasty [4] and previous (nonsystematic) surveys of retrieved total disc replacements [5, 6], but the authors are not aware of a previous systematic approach to examine the effects of design and material selection on wear, corrosion, and tissue response of revised TDRs. Because the biomechanical requirements for TDRs differ for the cervical and lumbar spine and are reflected in both the TDR design and material selection, studies on TDRs for each region of the spine should be considered separately.

We therefore performed a systematic review to evaluate which design and material factors are associated with differences in clinical wear performance (implant wear and periprosthetic tissue response) of (1) lumbar and (2) cervical total disc replacements.

### 2.3 Search Strategy & Criteria

This systematic review used guidelines from the Cochrane handbook during the development of the study protocol and report [7]. To address the research questions posed in this review, studies were identified by searching the MEDLINE and Scopus electronic databases. An advanced search was performed in MEDLINE through PubMed by querying spine and arthroplasty MeSH terms along with title, abstract, and text word fields in the database. The following precise syntax was used for the search: ((((corrosion[tw] OR wear[tw] OR deform*[tw] OR degra*[tw] OR fracture[tw]) OR (((adverse[tw] AND effects[tw])))) AND (((((spin
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Table 2-1. Summary of contemporary lumbar total disc replacements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Biomaterials</th>
<th>Bearing design</th>
<th>IDE trial status (<a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a>)</th>
<th>Current regulatory status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>DePuy Synthes Spine, Raynham, MA</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>FDA-approved but withdrawn from US/OUS market after DePuy Synthes merger, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>DePuy Synthes Spine, West Chester, PA</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activ-L</td>
<td>Aesculap AG, Tuttingen, Germany</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Active; not recruiting</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobidisc</td>
<td>LDR Spine, Troyes, France</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>Medtronic, Memphis, TN</td>
<td>MOM</td>
<td>CoCr-CoCr</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinflex</td>
<td>Spinal Motion Inc, Mountainview, CA</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-CoCr</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexicore</td>
<td>Stryker Spine, Allendale, NJ</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-CoCr</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baguera L</td>
<td>Spineart, Geneva, Switzerland</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Diamonlith-coated Ti-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAdisc-L</td>
<td>Ranier Technology, Cambridge, UK</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>1-piece polyurethane</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>AxioMed, Garfield, OH</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>Ti plates and elastomer core</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDisc</td>
<td>Integra Spine, Vista, CA</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>Ti plates and elastomer core</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physio-L</td>
<td>Nexgen Spine, Whippany, NJ</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>Ti plates and elastomer core</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Kinetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ti plates and polyurethane-UHMWPE fiber core</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDE = Investigational Device Exemption; MoP = metal-on-polyethylene; 1P = one-piece; CoCr = cobalt-chromium; Ti = titanium; OUS = outside United States; NA = not available.
Table 2-2. Summary of contemporary cervical total disc replacements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Biomaterials</th>
<th>Bearing design</th>
<th>IDE trial status</th>
<th>Current regulatory status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige ST</td>
<td>Medtronic, Memphis, TN</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Stainless steel-stainless steel</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>FDA-approved, available US/OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Medtronic, Memphis, TN</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Ti-PCU</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>FDA-approved, available US/OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prodisc-C</td>
<td>DePuy Synthes Spine, West Chester, PA</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>FDA-approved, available US/OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCM</td>
<td>Nu Vasive, San Diego, CA</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>FDA-approved, available US/OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobi-C</td>
<td>LDR Spine, Troyes, France</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>FDA-approved, available US/OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE-C</td>
<td>Globus Medical, Audubon, PA</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Active; not recruiting</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activ C</td>
<td>Aesculap AG, Tuttlingen, Germany</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>CoCr-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kineflex/C</td>
<td>Spinal Motion Inc, Mountainview, CA</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>CoCr-CoCr</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CerviCore</td>
<td>Stryker Spine, Allendale, NJ</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>CoCr-CoCr</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCOVER</td>
<td>DePuy Synthes Spine, Allendale, NJ</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Ti-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baguera C</td>
<td>Spineart, Geneva, Switzerland</td>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Diamolith-coated Ti-UHMWPE</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige LP</td>
<td>Medtronic, Memphis, TN</td>
<td>CoC</td>
<td>Ti-ceramic composite</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Active; not recruiting</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUNEC</td>
<td>Pioneer Surgical Technology, Marquette, MI</td>
<td>PoP</td>
<td>PEEK-PEEK</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>AxioMed, Garfield, OH</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>Ti plates and polymer core</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeoDisc</td>
<td>Nu Vasive, San Diego, CA</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>Silicone elastomer and textile</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADisc-C</td>
<td>Ranier Technology, Cambridge, UK</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>1-piece polyurethane</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discocerv</td>
<td>Alphatec Spine Inc, Carlsbad, CA</td>
<td>CoC</td>
<td>Ceramic-ceramic</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTIA</td>
<td>Amedica, Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>CoC</td>
<td>Ceramic-ceramic (silicon nitride)</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Not registered</td>
<td>Available OUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CerPass</td>
<td>Nu Vasive, San Diego, CA</td>
<td>CoM</td>
<td>Ceramic-ceramic</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6-C</td>
<td>Spinal Kinetics, Sunnyvale, CA</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>Ti plates &amp; PCU-UHMWPE fiber core</td>
<td>One-piece</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDE = Investigational Device Exemption; MoM = metal-on-metal; MoP = metal-on-polymer; CoC = ceramic-on-ceramic; PoP = polymer-on-polymer; 1P = one-piece; CoM = ceramic-on-metal; Ti = titanium; PCU = poly(carbonate urethane); CoCr = cobalt-chromium; PEEK = polyether ether ketone; OUS = outside United States; NA = not available.
The search was streamlined to specifically identify reports of wear, corrosion, and periprosthetic tissue response after spinal arthroplasty. Terms in the latter portion of the code were chosen based on the brand names of motion preservation devices currently in active use or under investigation. Lastly, the search code excluded papers centrally themed around finite element analysis, biomechanical modeling, or strict clinical outcomes. PubMed filters further restricted results to human studies and reports published in English. Using the aforementioned criteria, 160 articles were obtained from MEDLINE published between January 1, 2001, and April 30, 2014. The same search strategy and filters were used for the Scopus database, yielding 180 articles, many of which overlapped the search results from MEDLINE. The following precise syntax was
used in Scopus: (((TITLE-ABS-KEY(corrosion) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(wear) OR
TITLE-ABS-KEY(deform*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(degra*) OR TITLE-ABS-
KEY(fracture))) OR (((TITLE-ABS-KEY(adverse) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(effects)))))
AND (((TITLE-ABS-KEY(spine) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(spinal) OR TITLE-ABS-
KEY(disc) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(disk))) AND (((TITLE-ABS-KEY(artificial) AND
TITLE-ABS-KEY(prosthe*))))) OR (((TITLE-ABS-KEY(disc) AND TITLE-ABS-
KEY(arthroplast*) OR (TITLE-ABS-KEY(disc) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(implant)) OR
(TITLE-ABS-KEY(disc) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(replace*)) OR (TITLE-ABS-KEY(disc)
AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(prosthe*)))))) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(fusion)) OR (TITLE-ABS-
KEY(stabilization)))))) AND ((TITLE-ABS-KEY(peek) OR TITLE-ABS-
KEY(polyethylene) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(polycarbonate urethane) OR TITLE-ABS-
KEY(cobalt chromium) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(prodisc) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(freedom)
OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(charite) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(maverick) OR TITLE-ABS-
KEY(kineflex) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(activ) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(mobidisc) OR TITLE-
ABS-KEY(flexicore) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(xi) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(bryan) OR TITLE-
ABS-KEY(prestige) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(cadisc) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(nubac) OR
TITLE-ABS-KEY(secure) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(discover) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(nunec)
OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(pcm) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(dynesys)))))) AND NOT (TITLE-
ABS-KEY(finite element) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(biomechanical analysis) OR TITLE-
ABS-KEY(biomech*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(model) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(mri) OR
TITLE-ABS-KEY(clinical outcome*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(ossification))) AND
(PUBYEAR > 1999 AND PUBYEAR < 2015) AND (LIMIT-TO(LANGUAGE,"English")).
Of the 340 papers obtained using the search strategies, duplicates were removed and studies were then screened and assessed for eligibility to be included in the systematic review (Figure 2-1). Screening of titles and abstracts revealed 55 articles with potential relevance for this review. Next, in vitro studies and review articles were excluded, narrowing the number of eligible papers for inclusion to 33. An additional three studies were located by searching bibliographies of key articles and identifying full-text articles by hand search. Further full-text assessment for eligibility led to the exclusion of papers without any semiquantitative analyses of wear, corrosion, osteolysis, or adverse local tissue reactions; this left 19 articles meeting the inclusion criteria, of which 14 were lumbar and seven were cervical TDR studies (with one overlapping study). The majority of clinical research was low-level evidence [8] and included a total of seven Level V case reports, three Level IV case series, and two Level III case-control studies. Case series and case-control studies, in general, were good-quality studies with mean scores of 10.3 of 16.0 and 17.5 of 24.0, respectively, on the Methodological Index for Non-randomized Studies (MINORS) Scale [9]. The main limitations to these studies included the lack of unbiased assessments, sufficiently long follow-up implantation times, and prospective calculations of study size. We did not grade study quality for the seven analytical reports because a suitable tool for this purpose is not available.

Each study was reviewed in detail by three authors (SYV, MJS, SMK). Data were extracted using a standardized form, which included study design, number of patients, patient demographic information, implant type, design, biomaterials, and
Figure 2-1. A flow diagram demonstrates the systematic review protocol.

outcome measures for device damage, wear, corrosion, metal ion levels, histology, and osteolysis. Some overlapping studies involving the same patients were included if the authors reported on larger patient pools in prospective retrieval studies or if authors evaluated varying durations of follow-up in clinical metal-ion investigations.

For the systematic review, we summarized the authors’ assessments of the removed artificial disc wear, corrosion, and/or periprosthetic tissue responses. We then classified these damage factors as absent or present in the patient cohorts to evaluate the impact of implant design and biomaterials on wear and corrosion performance. Given the methodological and analytical heterogeneity (ie, between-
study variation) between the studies included in this systematic review, the retrospective nature of the clinical series, and the absence of control groups in many of the studies, we were unable to combine data across studies to perform a quantitative meta-analysis. Instead we sought to examine each study to obtain the desired information concerning clinical performance outcomes based on implant design, wear performance, and local tissue reactions in light of each study's strengths and limitations.

2.4 Results

2.4.1 Lumbar Total Disc Replacement

In MoP studies, the mobile-bearing designs, CHARITÉ (Depuy Synthes Spine, Raynham, MA, USA), Activ-L (Aesculap AG, Tuttlingen, Germany), and Mobidisc (LDR Spine, Troyes, France), demonstrated evidence of polyethylene surface damage, polyethylene wear debris, and innate periprosthetic inflammation; fixed-bearing ProDisc-L (DePuy Synthes Spine, West Chester, PA, USA) devices evidenced a high frequency of endplate impingement and metal wear debris (Table 2-3). A total of 49 mobile-bearing MoP retrievals with gamma-air-sterilized polyethylene were evaluated in two studies (48 from one report and one from a case study) [10, 11]. Impingement, typically between the polyethylene core and the metallic endplate, was observed in 34 of 49 (69%) of the retrievals in those two studies. Two separate studies analyzed periprosthetic tissues from 22 of the 48 retrievals and reported polyethylene wear and inflammation in 16 of 22 (73%) patients [12]. A direct association was observed for severe or moderate impingement, wear debris,
and inflammation for 11 of the 34 impinged devices [13]. Despite the high incidence of polyethylene wear, osteolysis was only reported in one of 48 (2.1%) implants [10]. For mobile-bearing designs with conventional or gamma-inert-sterilized cores, a single report on three retrievals found wear particle generation was two orders less when compared to gamma-air-sterilized cores [14]. Nevertheless, impingement, wear debris, and innate inflammation were observed in all three retrievals. For fixed-bearing designs, one study reported burnishing in 11 of 19 (58%) and another reported the same wear mechanism in one of one retrieval [15, 16]. In a separate case report for a prosthesis removed as a result of migration, the presence of metallic debris was observed on the polyethylene core [17].

In MoM studies, both mobile-bearing Kineflex (Spinal Motion Inc, Mountainview, CA, USA) and fixed-bearing Maverick (Medtronic, Memphis, TN, USA) devices generated metallic debris accompanied by a mixed innate and adaptive immune response. Based on a case report of two mobile-bearing retrievals, implant damage in one was negligible and unreported in the second; however, tissues from both devices contained metallic debris [18]. Similarly, fixed-bearing implant analysis of tissues from two separate case studies [18, 19] reported metallic debris. Furthermore, all tissue retrievals showed mixed inflammation. Two independent studies looking at systemic metal ions found elevated serum Co and Cr ion levels postoperatively between 0.25 and 49.4 years [20, 21].

2.4.2 Cervical Total Disc Replacement
In MoP studies, there were no reports on mobile-bearing designs; the fixed-bearing designs, ProDisc-C (DePuy Synthes Spine, West Chester, PA, USA) and Bryan Cervical Disc (Medtronic, Memphis, TN, USA), showed a high frequency of endplate impingement with polymeric wear debris and mixed inflammation (Table 2-4). As observed in lumbar fixed-bearing designs, burnishing was consistent with metallic endplate impingement in 24 of 30 (80%) retrievals [22]. A separate case report noted one rare incidence of osteolysis [23]. In another study, impingement was observed in nine of 30 (30%) retrievals [5]. Tissues obtained from 15 of these 30 devices showed polymeric debris. Similarly, a separate case study reported polymeric debris [24]. Metallic debris was infrequent to negligible in all but one of the cases [25]. An innate immune response was predominant in all tissues, although a few isolated regions of lymphocytic infiltration were noted [5]. In MoM studies, impingement was observed in one case study of a mobile-bearing Kineflex/C (Spinal Motion Inc, Mountainview, CA, USA) device; fixed-bearing Prestige Cervical Disc (Medtronic, Memphis, TN, USA) devices evidenced impingement, metallic debris, and mixed inflammation.

A case study on one mobile-bearing device reported no evidence of metal particles in tissues, but visual evidence of metallosis within the joint tissue was pronounced [18]. In devices with fixed-bearing designs, impingement was evident in 11 of 16 (68.8%) retrievals, typically in anterior regions [5]. In addition, screw hole fretting and fretting adjacent to bone screws were detected. Metallosis was observed in all 15 (100%) patients with tissue retrievals and metallic debris within the tissue was noted, but in both cases its distribution was not uniform and was
described as focal. A separate study with an unreported bearing design also reported the presence of metallic debris in tissue retrievals [26]. Mixed inflammation was observed in all tissues for both mobile- and fixed-bearing designs.

### 2.5 Discussion

Although benefits of treating degenerative disc conditions with TDR include preservation of motion and limiting stress at adjacent vertebra, potential complications associated with wear debris remain a concern. The aim of this study was to systematically review reports of wear, corrosion, and subsequent biological responses for lumbar and cervical TDR. Additionally, we sought to determine whether design and material issues were associated with the wear and corrosion behavior of these motion-preserving spinal devices. After analyzing reports from 14 lumbar and seven cervical studies (in 19 papers), we found that wear-associated complications may be specific to the biomaterial used for TDR in both regions of the spine. Specifically, MoP devices typically produced polymeric wear debris, which was usually accompanied by an innate inflammatory response. On the other hand, MoM constructs tended to generate small metallic wear debris and metal ions, which activated an adaptive immune mechanism leading to adverse local tissue reactions in some patients.

As of the time of this writing, for the one lumbar and five cervical disc artificial disc designs that have been approved by the FDA, only one is a MoM cervical device fabricated from stainless steel (Table 2). MoM prostheses have been under heavy scrutiny by researchers/regulators given the high-profile concern of
previous recall and warnings of THA devices with Co-based alloy MoM bearings [27]. Metallosis and subsequent soft tissue reactions and pseudotumors have been reported in patients with CoCr MoM articulations, in which some cases showed aseptic lymphocyte-dominated vasculitis-associated lesion response associated with normal implant wear rates [2, 18]. Metal hypersensitivity is also an issue with CoCr designs [26], although the relationship between delayed hypersensitivity and metallic debris remains unclear. Adverse host responses may also be triggered by metal tribochemical reactions in vivo, but to our knowledge, there have been no direct and standardized measurements of implant corrosion in TDRs. Although fretting and corrosion products were observed in some cervical MoM TDRs [5, 24], the extent of corrosive removal of metal in these devices remains unclear. Serum assays after lumbar TDR have revealed an elevation in Co and Cr ions, thereby inferring corrosion, but it was later concluded that these levels were similar to those observed for successful MoM THAs [20, 21, 28]. Despite these biomaterial issues, using MoM designs has its benefits, for example, these devices are theoretically designed to achieve lower volumetric wear (mainly as a result of lower friction) in comparison to traditional MoP designs, which potentially would reduce local inflammation and osteolysis. Also, it is worth noting that adverse local tissue reactions have been reported with all implant designs; thus, the small number of case reports for MoM studies exhibit important risks/complications of the technology. Further long-term follow-up studies are necessary to better understand the impact of such designs/materials on long-term wear rates.
### Table 2-3. Summary of findings from 14 published studies of retrieved implants, tissues, & fluids from lumbar total disc replacements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Bearing design</th>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Mean implantation time (years)</th>
<th>Impingement</th>
<th>Periprosthetic debris</th>
<th>Inflammation</th>
<th>Osteolysis</th>
<th>Systemic metal ions measured (# of patients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>David, 2005 [9]</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Stieber and Donald, 2006 [37]</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>van Ooij et al, 2007 [40]</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Kurtz et al, 2009 [21]</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>34/48*</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Choma et al, 2009 [5]</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Punt et al, 2012 [34]</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>0/22</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>Francois et al, 2007 [12]</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>Zeh et al, 2009 [42]*</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Kineflex</td>
<td>Guyer et al, 2011 [17]</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>Guyer et al, 2011 [17]</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>Kurtz et al, 2012 [24]</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>Gornet et al, 2013 [16]*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This cohort includes retrievals from study performed by van Ooij et al [40]; †these are metal ion clinical studies, not retrieval studies; MoP = metal-on-polyethylene; MoM = metal-on-metal; NR = not reported; Y = yes; N = no; NA = not applicable.
Table 2-4. Summary of findings from eight published studies of retrieved implants and tissues from cervical total disc replacements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Bearing design</th>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Mean implantation time (years)</th>
<th>Impingement</th>
<th>Periprosthetic debris</th>
<th>Inflammation</th>
<th>Osteolysis</th>
<th>Polymeric</th>
<th>Metallic</th>
<th>Innate</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Anderson et al, 2004 [1]</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>ProDisc-C</td>
<td>Turowski and Glof, 2011 [38]</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>ProDisc-C</td>
<td>Lebl et al, 2012 [27]</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24/30</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>Anderson et al, 2004 [1]</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Kineflex/C</td>
<td>Cavanaugh et al, 2009 [4]</td>
<td>~0.6</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Kineflex/C</td>
<td>Guyer et al, 2011 [17]</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MoP = metal-on-polyethylene; MoM = metal-on-metal; NR = not reported; Y = yes; N = no; NA = not applicable.
Unlike MoM devices, the central concern with the use of MoP devices is the generation of polymeric wear debris from bearing surfaces and the subsequent innate inflammatory response. Recent studies on MoP TDRs have revealed that tissue responses resulting from wear-related damage are indeed comparable to responses seen in total joint arthroplasties (TJAs) [12]. However, for THAs, polyethylene wear activates an innate inflammatory response that is associated with osteolysis and aseptic loosening, which is a fundamental cause of clinical failure [29, 30]. Vertebral osteolysis, on the other hand, appears to be a rare phenomenon in the spine and has only been reported in one patient with lumbar mobile-bearing TDR and one patient with cervical fixed-bearing TDR in the retrieval studies [23, 31] included in this review. Explanations for the relatively low frequency of osteolysis may include the low ranges of motion in the anterior column of the lumbar spine and an absence of resident macrophages and synovium compared with the hip and knee [1]. Furthermore, the reduced particle concentration/number, degree of inflammation and/or cytokine levels may be too low to directly cause osteolysis [14]. Reduced cytokine levels and/or local cellular responses to these factors is of particular interest since similar cytokines which include tumor necrosis factor-α, interleukin-1, and interleukin-6 are released by macrophages and giant cells in both tissue types; however, osteoclastogenesis is observed in THAs and neuroinflammatory pain in TDRs [32, 33]. For these reasons, the presence of wear remains a critical concern in the spine.

This review consisted primarily of papers reporting on wear performance of MoP retrievals with fixed- or mobile-bearing designs; collectively, these reports
indicated that wear damage mechanisms may be linked to the bearing design. Mobile-bearing retrievals tended to have characteristic multidirectional scratches with adhesive/abrasive wear mechanisms at the dome (much like THAs) and microadhesive/microabrasive wear mechanisms at the rim (much like TKAs) [34]. Although several fixed-bearing retrievals also had signs of scratches in the dome regions, a large percentage had characteristic metallic and endplate burnishing typically in the posterior region associated with impingement [15]. Also, fatigue-related rim damage and radial crack formation were only reported in gamma-air-sterilized cores of historical mobile-bearing retrievals, attributable to oxidative degradation [10, 11]. This was not evident in gamma-inert sterilized fixed-bearing designs and it is possible that the fixture of the core in designs may contribute to these wear mechanisms. The increased mobility and abnormalities in ROMs in mobile-bearing designs can influence the number and type of wear debris generation. Although flexion/extension ROM was restored to physiological ranges by both designs [35-37], mobile-bearing devices provide higher degrees of freedom (i.e., CHARITÉ; 5 DOF) compared with fixed bearings (i.e., ProDisc-L; 3 DOF). The long-term consequences of the differing kinematics on wear debris generation and subsequent inflammation remain unclear.

For the papers identified by the systematic search, there were no studies of wear for one-piece spine retrievals, thereby highlighting a need for research on nonball- and-socket type designs to evaluate their effectiveness and resistance to wear/corrosion. Ball-and-socket articulating bearings were originally modeled from total joint arthroplasties, which raises the question whether they replicate the
biomechanics of the intervertebral disc. Ball-and-socket designs are typically rigid in the axial direction and are not designed to resist moments in bending or rotation forces like the natural and deformable spinal disc, which may lead to altered ROM, segmental lordosis, or overloading of facet joints [38-41]. One-piece designs typically incorporate compliant elastomer biomaterials to mimic the physiological six degrees of freedom [42, 43]. Although the first one-piece model, known as the Acroflex (DePuy-AcroMed, Inc., Raynham, MA) discs, was abandoned as a result of failure of elastic rubber [44], newer designs have developed to improve the technology, including solving the issue of bonding elastic components to titanium endplates. Long-term follow-up studies are required to better understand the wear performance for these devices.

In summary, current TDRs have been developed using total joint arthroplasty models and thus comparable biomaterial issues have been observed. MoP devices raise a concern for the production of polymeric wear debris that initiates innate inflammation. MoM devices present the risk of generating small metallic debris, metal ion release, adaptive host responses, metal hypersensitive reactions, and pseudotumor formation. Increases in systemic metal ion levels have also been detected, raising the likelihood of responses in other tissues. Design factors such as mobile- and fixed-bearing or one-piece constructs may also influence wear performance of TDRs, but more research is necessary to better understand which models truly mimic the natural motions of the spine while minimizing wear. Additional analytical studies with standardized cohort and case-control based observations would augment the existing body of literature and facilitate a more
formal quantitative assessment of TDR material and design. In addition, future studies need to address how design and wear of the various biomaterials impact neuroinflammation in the spine, considering pain is the primary reason for revision of both lumbar and cervical TDRs.

2.6 Study Limitations

Limitations of this review included the number limited number of studies and the mixed quality of the research, of which only a small number of case-control studies scored well on the MINORS quality scale. Furthermore, in the application of our inclusion and exclusion criteria, studies that did not report at least semiquantitative measures of wear were excluded, thus potentially eliminating studies with some important clinical information and patient outcomes in response to the use of certain implant designs/biomaterials. It is also important to note that all the studies that were included involved cases in which the primary revision reason was pain rather than an association with wear, and tissue evaluations of wear debris and inflammatory responses were limited. Nevertheless, these criteria were necessary to report common endpoints and measurable findings that could be summarized and evaluated. Finally, variability in the reporting of wear and related damage mechanisms made it difficult to synthesize results as did the inclusion of data from case reports, which lack a representative comparison group. Standardized test methods for retrieval analysis of TDRs have only recently been developed [5]; thus, older studies included in this review typically relied on visual characterization of wear.
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CHAPTER 3

Retrieval Analyses of Contemporary Lumbar TDRs & Periprosthetic Tissue Responses†

3.1 Abstract

Lumbar total disc replacement (L-TDR) is a procedure used to relieve lower back pain and maintain mobility. Contemporary metal-on-polyethylene (MoP) L-TDRs were developed to address wear performance concerns about historical designs, but wear debris generation and periprosthetic tissue reactions for these newer implants have not been determined. The purpose of this study was to determine (1) whether periprosthetic ultrahigh-molecular-weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) wear debris and biological responses were present in tissues from revised contemporary MoP L-TDRs that contain conventional cores fabricated from γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE; (2) how fixed- versus mobile-bearing design affected UHMWPE wear particle number, shape, and size; and (3) how these wear particle characteristics compare with historical MoP L-TDRs that contain cores fabricated from γ-air-sterilized UHMWPE. We evaluated implant retrievals and periprosthetic tissues from 11 patients who received eight fixed-bearing ProDisc-L and four mobile-bearing CHARITÉ contemporary L-TDRs with a mean implantation time of 4.1 and 2.7 years, respectively. Implants were first examined for wear and surface damage. Histologic analysis of tissues was then performed to assess biological responses and polarized light microscopy was used to quantify number and size of wear particles.

†The content of this chapter was published in the journal of Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research: Veruva SY, Lanman TH, Isaza JE, MacDonald DW, Kurtz SM, Steinbeck MJ. UHMWPE Wear Debris and Tissue Reactions Are Reduced for Contemporary Designs of Lumbar Total Disc Replacements. Clinical orthopaedics and related research. 2015;473:987-998.
size/shape characteristics of UHMWPE wear particles. Comparisons were made to previously reported particle data for historical L-TDRs. All fixed-bearing (100%) and two of four mobile-bearing (50%) implant component retrievals indicated wear damage. Five of seven (71%) fixed-bearing and one of four mobile-bearing L-TDR patient tissues contained at least 4 particles/mm² wear with associated macrophage infiltration. Tissues with wear debris were highly vascularized, whereas those without debris were more necrotic. Given the samples available, the tissue around mobile-bearing L-TDR was observed to contain 87% more, 11% rounder, and 11% less-elongated wear debris compared to tissues around fixed-bearing devices; however, there were no significant differences. Compared to historical L-TDRs, UHMWPE particle number and circularity for contemporary L-TDRs were 99% less (p = 0.003) and 50% rounder (p = 0.003). In this study, short-term results suggest there was no significant influence of fixed- or mobile-bearing design on wear particle characteristics of contemporary L-TDRs, but conventional UHMWPE has notably improved the wear resistance of these devices compared to historical UHMWPE.

3.2 Introduction

Lumbar total disc replacement (L-TDR) is an established alternative to spinal fusion for degenerative disc disease and its associated lower back and leg pain. With the goal to preserve natural segmental motion in the spine, commonly used implant designs incorporate cobalt-chromium (CoCr) metallic endplates, which are fixed to the adjacent vertebral bodies, articulating against a polymer core made of ultrahigh-
molecular-weight polyethylene (UHMWPE). As a result of the decreased sliding distance in metal-on-polyethylene (MoP) L-TDRs compared with THA and TKA, wear and osteolysis of L-TDRs were originally thought to be negligible in the anterior column of the lumbar spine [24, 25]. However, studies of historical L-TDRs with γ-air-sterilized UHMWPE cores have demonstrated wear of the UHMWPE core along with rare cases of osteolysis in the lumbar spine [21, 44]. Additionally, both submicron (0.05-2 µm) and large UHMWPE wear particles (≥ 2 µm) were present in periprosthetic tissues from historical TDRs [33, 34]. The presence of wear debris was associated with an innate inflammatory response and in one case contributed to osteolysis. The particle shapes were comparable to those observed in revision tissues from THA and generally round to oval in morphology, whereas the TKA particles were more needle-shaped [33]. The mean particle numbers were similar and ranged from 0 to 1002 particles/mm² [33]. Additionally, the extent of impingement of the implant positively correlated with increased submicron wear debris and thus, biological activity of the particles [5]. Collectively, these studies and others have established the clinically relevant complication of UHMWPE core wear for historical L-TDRs [20, 22, 32, 42, 43] and served as an impetus for improving bearing surface materials and designs.

Contemporary L-TDR designs incorporate γ-inert-sterilized (conventional) UHMWPE cores and air-impermeable packaging to improve oxidation resistance and thus enhance the wear performance of the cores [19, 45]. The ProDisc-L (DePuy Synthes Spine, West Chester, PA, USA) and CHARITÉ (originally Waldemar Link, Hamburg, Germany, later fabricated by DePuy Spine, Raynham, MA, USA, and
currently discontinued) are two established contemporary designs. The biomaterials used in the fabrication of the ProDisc-L prosthesis are quite similar to the CHARITÉ as they both consist of two CoCr alloy endplates articulating against a conventional UHMWPE core component. Although the materials used in these L-TDRs are similar, there are differences in the design of these implants. Unlike the mobile-bearing design of the CHARITÉ, the core of ProDisc-L is fixed through a locking mechanism into the inferior endplate, thus allowing relative motion only between the core and the superior endplate [18]. Other contemporary L-TDRs designs currently in clinical use are the Mobidisc (LDR Spine, Troyes, France) and Activ-L (Aesculap AG, Tuttlingen, Germany), which use similar biomaterials in fabrication but differ specifically from the CHARITÉ in the amount of constraint presented by the bearing. To our knowledge, only one case report has evaluated retrievals of Mobidisc and Activ-L from two patients [2], and there is still limited understanding of implant wear or periprosthetic tissue reactions for contemporary MoP L-TDRs. Additionally, it remains unclear whether the L-TDR design will influence the generation of UHMWPE particles and their associated biologic response.

In this study, we analyzed retrievals of two contemporary designs of fixed-bearing and mobile-bearing L-TDRs to evaluate γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE performance in vivo and to compare design differences. We asked: (1) are periprosthetic UHMWPE wear debris and associated biological responses present in tissues from revised contemporary MoP L-TDRs that contain cores fabricated from γ-inert sterilized UHMWPE; (2) what is the influence of bearing design (i.e., fully
mobile versus fixed designs) on wear particle number, size, and shape; and (3) how do the detectable wear UHMWPE particles from contemporary MoP L-TDRs compare with historical MoP L-TDRs that contain cores fabricated from γ-air-sterilized UHMWPE?

3.3 Materials & Methods

3.3.1 Tissue Collection & Patient Clinical Information

Figure 3-1. Tissues are harvested from annular regions during L-TDR revision surgery.

Spine tissues from regions adjacent to the implanted device were obtained at the time of revision surgery (Figure 3-1). Tissues, along with their respective devices, were collected as part of a public, multicenter retrieval research program initiated in 2004 [17, 22]. Contemporary TDRs were classified as modern device designs incorporating components made of γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE GUR 1020 resin; this
study investigated tissue retrievals from around two contemporary lumbar designs: the fixed-bearing ProDisc-L and mobile-bearing CHARITÉ. The fixed-bearing L-TDR cohort included seven patients and eight implants (implantation time, 1-6 years; mean, 4.1 years), whereas the mobile-bearing cohort included four patients and four implants (implantation time, 2-3 years; mean, 2.7 years). All were primarily revised for persistent back and/or leg pain and, for two of the patients, osteolysis was observed (Table 3-1). Implant subsidence or migration was a complication noted in three patients with fixed-bearing and one patient with mobile-bearing L-TDRs (Figure 3-2). Primary surgical tissues were obtained from other L-TDR patients and served as controls. Quantitative findings on particle number and were compared to our previous findings for 16 patient tissue responses from revised historical TDRs, SB CHARITÉ III, in which the core was either γ-air-sterilized UHMWPE GUR 412 resin or γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE GUR 1020 resin with polymer barrier packing that allowed exposure to air [32].

Figure 3-2. Sagittal CT scan illustrating implant subsidence at the L4 level on the right side of the vertebra from a fixed-bearing L-TDR patient (BHSP023).
Table 3-1. Clinical information of MoP L-TDR retrievals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient ID</th>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Bearing design</th>
<th>Patient sex</th>
<th>Age at implantation (years)</th>
<th>Primary diagnosis</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Year of index surgery</th>
<th>Year of removal surgery</th>
<th>Implantation time (years)</th>
<th>Revision reason(s)</th>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>Osteolysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 022</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Herniated disc; lumbar pain/ radiculopathy</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Right L4-L5 arthropathy; facet pain; progressive degeneration; radiculopathy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 023</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Herniated disc; lumbar pain/ radiculopathy</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Increasing pain in the back, lower back and left quad</td>
<td>Subsidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025a</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Disc degeneration; discogenic back pain</td>
<td>L4-L5; L5-S1</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Severe pain</td>
<td>Posterior migration; compressing nerve roots</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025b</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Disc degeneration; discogenic back pain</td>
<td>L4-L5; L5-S1</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Severe pain</td>
<td>Posterior migration; compressing nerve roots</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 026</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Herniated disc w/degeneration; back pain</td>
<td>L5-S1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Persistent pain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 027</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Herniated disc w/degeneration; back pain</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Lumbar pain; radiculopathy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 0032</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>L5-S1</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Severe lower back pain; L4-L5 disc injury; radiculopathy</td>
<td>Subsidence; upper level degeneration</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDL 004</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Unremitting lower back pain</td>
<td>L5-S1</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Pain; ventral encroachment into spinal canal</td>
<td>Partial dissociation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 003</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Disc degeneration</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Discogenic pain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 004</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Disc degeneration</td>
<td>L5-S1</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Discogenic pain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 006</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Disc degeneration</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Painful instrumentation</td>
<td>Subsidence; scarring in disc space</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 007</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Painful retained hardware</td>
<td>L5-S1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>Periprosthetic scarring</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MoP = metal-on-polyethylene; L-TDR = lumbar total disc replacement; N/A = not available
3.3.2 Implant Retrieval Analysis

All implants were cleaned with 10% bleach and examined under a stereomicroscope equipped with a digital camera (Leica DFC490, Wetzlar, Germany) to assess surface damage and gross fracture. All components were inspected to identify surface damage mechanisms (plastic deformation, scratching, burnishing, pitting, and embedded debris). Select implant components with macroscopic surface damage were further analyzed using scanning electron microscopy (SEM; Supra 50 VP, Zeiss Peabody, Massachusetts) to identify specific wearing patterns and distinguish any iatrogenic damage introduced by the surgeon during the retrieval process. Lastly, Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) was utilized to detect and identify any abnormal surface deposits on implant components, whereas x-ray fluorescence (XRF) was used to conduct elemental analysis on the interior of the metallic endplates to ensure they met the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) weight standards.

3.3.3 Tissue Preparation and Histological Analysis

Tissues collected from revision and primary surgeries were fixed in either formalin or Universal Molecular Fixative (UMFIX; Sakura Finetek USA, Inc, Torrance, CA, USA). One to two 4-mm punches from each tissue, considering variations in color, texture, and size of specimen, were embedded in paraffin blocks, and 6-µm serial sections were mounted onto ProbeOnPlus (Fischer Scientific Co, Pittsburgh, PA, USA) slides. Slides were dewaxed, rehydrated, and stained with hematoxylin,
and eosin (H&E) (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) to visualize the nucleic acids, extracellular matrix and other proteins in the tissue sections. The alcian blue stain (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA) was also used in conjunction with H/E to detect cartilaginous regions. Subsequently, Wright-Giemsa (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA) and Prussian blue (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA) stains were used for further in-depth histological evaluation when inflammation was present to facilitate the differentiation of leukocytes and identify hemosiderin deposits, respectively. Transmitted and polarized light images were captured using an Olympus BX50 microscope (Olympus, Melville, NY, USA) equipped with a stepper motor-controlled stage, an elliptically polarized light imaging system, and a Jenoptik ProgRes Speed XT Core5 camera (Jenoptik, Jena, Germany). A 36-image (200X magnification) composite, that spanned the entire tissue section, was created for each section under transmitted light to grade tissue reactions by at least two individuals (SYV, MJS) using a scoring system scaled from 0 to 3 (Table 3-2). The scoring criteria were based on the Oxford method that is presently used for grading total joint arthroplasty tissues for macrophage and lymphocyte inflammation, aseptic lymphocyte-dominated vasculitis associated lesion (ALVAL), and necrosis [8, 31], but modified to exclude ALVAL responses to metal wear debris and include hemosiderin deposition and vascularization, which are more predominant in spine tissue. This criteria allowed us to make semi-quantitative comparisons to previous research using similar grading scales for periprosthetic inflammatory responses.
Table 3-2. Modified Oxford scoring criteria for grading biological responses in periprosthetic tissues of L-TDRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Necrosis</th>
<th>Hemosiderin</th>
<th>Innate Inflammation</th>
<th>Vascularization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tissue Percent Area</td>
<td>Tissue Percent Area</td>
<td>Number of Cells</td>
<td>Tissue Percent Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>Scattered or Isolated</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4 Wear Particle Characterization

For UHMWPE particle analysis, a 36-image (200X magnification) composite was created from each tissue section under polarized light that corresponded to the transmitted light tissue composites. Our polarized light microscopy enabled us to detect particles as small as 0.34 μm. In each individual image, UHMWPE wear particle number, size, and shape were determined by first using a customized image threshold operation programmed in MATLAB® (MathWorks Inc, Natick, MA, USA) followed by counting/measuring particles using NIH ImageJ (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA) (Figure 3-3). In brief, polarized light images were split into three eight-bit channels (red, green, and blue). Signal from blue channels were converted into masks based on a threshold value relative to the average signal intensity of each image. All images were visually reviewed to ensure that false-
positive signals from birefringent collagen or dust did not contribute to particle counts. The resulting particle number was then converted to number/mm² area of tissue using a measured conversion factor of 3.887 µm/pixel. Initial validation of this technique was performed using an environmental scanning electron microscope (ESEM) to study histomorphologic changes and wear debris in periprosthetic tissues of THAs [3]. Particle size and shape were characterized by calculating the equivalent circular diameter (ECD) (Equation 3-1), aspect ratio (Equation 3-2) and perimeter-based-circularity (Equation 3-3); the use of these measurements for particle analysis was validated in an earlier study by Baxter et al [4] and compared to ASTM guidelines for particle characterization [1].

\[ ECD = \sqrt{4 \times A(p)/\pi} \]

Equation 3-1. Equivalent circular diameter (ECD) (µm), where \( A(p) \) is the area of the particle, represents the diameter of a circle that occupies the same two dimensional surface area as the particle. ECD provides a standardized measure of particle size [30].
Equation 3-2. Aspect ratio (AR) (unitless), where \( L(p) \) is the particle length and \( W(p) \) is the particle breadth, represents the proportional relationship between length and breadth. AR provides a standardized measure to classify the general form of particles (e.g. equant, acicular or fibrous) [30].

\[
AR = \frac{L(p)}{W(p)}
\]

Equation 3-3. Circularity (C) (unitless), where \( A(p) \) is the area of the particle and \( P \) is the perimeter, represents the degree (from 0 to 1) to which the particle is similar to a circle based on the smoothness of the perimeter. C provides a measure for both particle form and roughness [30].

\[
C = \frac{4 \pi A(p)}{P^2}
\]

3.3.5 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used for evaluating wear debris-induced tissue responses, which were semi-quantitatively compared based on histology/tissue scores. When quantifying UHMWPE particle numbers, the total number of particles in all tissue sections for each patient was normalized to total tissue sectional area, minimizing the effect of region-specific heterogeneity of particle distribution (Figure 3-4). Size and shape measurements of particles were averaged for each patient when detectable wear debris was present. To statistically compare UHMWPE particle number, ECD, perimeter, circularity, and aspect ratio between the two different bearing designs, the Mann-Whitney U-test was employed using IBM SPSS Statistics V22 software package (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA). Significance was based on \( p < 0.05 \). Because we were unable to detect statistical differences in particle measurements between the two bearing designs, fixed- and mobile-bearing patients were combined into a single contemporary L-TDR cohort before comparing it with the historical L-TDR cohort. To compare these two groups,
the Mann-Whitney U-test was used to test differences in UHMWPE particle number, circularity, and aspect ratio. Particle size measurements of ECD (mean, 2.71μm ± 4.29) and perimeter (mean, 11.07μm ± 27.54) were not statistically analyzed because particles larger than 2 μm were not evaluated in the historical L-TDR cohort.

Figure 3-4. Patient tissues with detectable wear debris had a heterogeneous distribution of particles as illustrated by significant debris in the lateral tissue from patient BHSP027 (left, 200X), but no debris in other regions of same tissue (right).

3.4 Results

3.4.1 Device Retrieval Analysis for Contemporary L-TDRs

The eight fixed-bearing L-TDRs (implantation time, 1-6 years; mean, 4.1 years) exhibited minor to moderate signs of implant damage after discounting iatrogenic markings that were induced inadvertently by the surgeon. All eight cores from the seven patients (100%) showed evidence of burnishing and mild abrasive scratching on the bearing surfaces (Figure 3-5). In addition, impingement was noted in two of eight implants (25%) from two different patients with malpositioning, and the respective components evidenced plastic deformation (Figure 3-5). Microscopic scratches of fan-shaped pattern were found on the interior of these metallic plates.
and a glossy appearance on the polyethylene core, respectively. SEM images of the impinged regions showed a polished appearance in comparison to the as-manufactured texture seen in non-impinged regions of the metallic plate (Figure 3-6). The unidirectional and circumferential wear patterns seen on the endplates suggest the wear may have occurred during axial rotation and/or lateral bending of
the articulating surfaces. Lastly, all fixed-bearing retrievals showed no indications of fatigue wear or fracture of the polyethylene core. No abnormal surface deposits were observed by SEM/EDS analysis. XRF scans showed the metallic surface-constituents on the interior of the endplates consistently matched CoCr ratios seen in ASTM F-75 cobalt alloy standards, and the exterior of plates consisted of weight compositions seen in commercially pure titanium.

The four mobile-bearing L-TDRs (implantation time, 2-3 years; mean, 2.7 years) exhibited minor signs of implant damage after discounting iatrogenic markings. Two of four mobile bearing cores showed signs of burnishing, pitting and mild scratching (Figure 3-7). Minor unidirectional scratches were present on the endplates from all patients. There were no obvious signs of impingement on the metallic endplates. Analysis using SEM and EDS revealed no abnormal surface deposits on the metallic endplates. As expected, XRF scans consistently detected cobalt-chromium ratios matching ASTM F-75 cobalt alloy weight-standards in the interior of the endplates.

Figure 3-6. Representative fixed-bearing retrieval with impinged regions on both endplates (black arrows). SEM images showed the impinged region on the metallic plate (lower right) had a smooth surface compared to the unimpinged region (upper right).
Two of four patients with mobile-bearing UHMWPE cores showed evidence of burnishing, pitting (green arrow). Minor unidirectional scratches were noted on endplates from all patients (red arrow).

3.4.2 UHMWPE Wear Debris from Contemporary L-TDRs & Biological Tissue Responses

Periprosthetic UHMWPE wear debris with corresponding macrophage infiltration was observed in five of seven patients with a fixed-bearing L-TDR and one of four patients with a mobile-bearing L-TDR. Generally, detectable wear debris was associated with low to moderate biological tissue responses as compared to tissues (controls) from L-TDR patients undergoing primary surgery (Figure 3-8). For the fixed-bearing L-TDR revisions, tissues from three of seven (43%) patients
Figure 3-8. Transmitted light images (left) and polarized microscopy (middle) of tissue sections revealed the presence of UHMWPE wear and corresponding macrophage infiltration; particles were characterized using a MATLAB threshold (right).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient ID</th>
<th>Implant bearing design</th>
<th>Tissue samples with wear debris</th>
<th>UHMWPE wear debris (particles/mm²)</th>
<th>Metal wear debris</th>
<th>Inflammation (macrophages)</th>
<th>Type of inflammatory cells</th>
<th>Necrosis</th>
<th>Hemosiderin</th>
<th>Vascularization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 022</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Macrophages</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 023</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Predominantly macrophages with lymphocytes and plasma cells</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025a</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Predominantly macrophages with lymphocytes and plasma cells</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025b</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Predominantly macrophages with lymphocytes and plasma cells</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 027</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Macrophages</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 0032</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Predominantly macrophages with lymphocytes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDL 004</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 003</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>107.33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Macrophages</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflammation, necrosis, hemosiderin, and vascularization scores on a 0-3 scale.
Figure 3-9. Wright Giemsa and Prussian blue stains were used to identify inflammatory cells and hemosiderin deposits, respectively. Both fixed-bearing (left) and mobile-bearing (middle) tissues showed inflammatory infiltrates, but hemosiderin deposits were also found in fixed-bearing cohorts. There was no inflammation or hemosiderin present in control tissue (right) obtained from primary surgery (Original magnification x 400; inset, x 1000).
contained at least 15 UHMWPE particles/mm² with an associated macrophage infiltration score > 1.5 (Table 3-3). Tissues from the two other patients (29%) contained < 5 UHMWPE particles/mm² and a variable macrophage infiltration (0.5 and 2). Tissues with UHMWPE wear debris from patients BHSP 023 and BHSP 025, who had their implants revised for malpositioning and device impingement, also had some isolated regions containing metal wear debris, lymphocytes, plasma cells, and hemosiderin that occupied > 10% of the total tissue area (Figure 3-9). Another tissue with UHMWPE wear debris from patient BHSP 0032 also contained metal particles and lymphocytes but no hemosiderin deposits. Patient PDL 004 had one tissue sample with an isolated area containing 21 UHMWPE particles/mm² but no detectable inflammation. For the mobile-bearing L-TDR cohort, tissue that contained detectable UHMWPE wear debris (> 0.34 μm) was found in only one of four patients. None of the tissues associated with the mobile-bearing devices contained metallic debris, and none of the implants exhibited rim impingement. A tissue sample from patient BRSP 003 contained 107 UHMWPE wear particles/mm² and it had a high macrophage infiltration score (3.0). For the fixed-bearing cohort, tissues with wear debris were consistently more vascularized with mean scores as high as 3 (range, 0-3), whereas necrotic/acellular regions were scarce (Figure 3-10). In contrast, the majority of tissue samples around the devices that did not contain detectable wear debris had low vascularity and more prominent regions of necrosis (mean necrosis score, 2) (Table 3-4). Tissues around mobile-bearing devices, with or without detectable wear, were moderately vascularized with isolated necrotic regions.
Representative fixed-bearing L-TDR tissue images showed increased vascularization (top left) in tissues with wear debris and regions of necrosis (bottom left) in tissues without wear debris. Mobile-bearing L-TDR tissues had lower vascularization (top right) in tissues with wear debris and a mix of moderate vascularization and isolated necrosis (bottom right) in tissues without wear debris (Original magnification, x 400).

3.4.3 Wear Particle Number, Size & Shape for Contemporary L-TDRs

In general, L-TDRs patient tissues collectively had limited wear debris and the majority were small (< 10 µm) with low aspect ratio and high circularity (Figures 3-11, 3-12, 3-13). For the mobile-bearing L-TDR patient tissue with UHMWPE wear debris, particle number was increased by 87% compared to fixed-bearing patient tissues, and the particles were 11% rounder and 11% less elongated (Table 3-5), but, with the number of samples available, these differences were not significant. Qualitative observations revealed the area percentage or amount of...
Table 3-4. Histologic evaluation & mean scores of retrieved tissues without wear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient ID</th>
<th>Implant bearing design</th>
<th>Tissue samples without wear debris</th>
<th>Necrosis</th>
<th>Hemosiderin</th>
<th>Vascularization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 022</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 023</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025a</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025b</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 026</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 027</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDL 004</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 003</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 004</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 006</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 007</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Necrosis, hemosiderin, and vascularization scores on a 0-3 scale.

tissue occupied by particles from the mobile-bearing device was more extensive than the particles from fixed-bearing devices with the exception of tissues from patient BHSP 022, which contained large (> 10 µm) particles (highest ECD and perimeter values). Nonetheless, the overall distribution of particle sizes was similar for both cohorts. The majority of the particles were between 1 and 10 µm (75% and 83% for the fixed- bearing and mobile-bearing L-TDR cohorts, respectively). Submicron particles (< 1 µm) represented 20% of the particles from fixed-bearing devices and 16% from the mobile-bearing device. Large particles (> 10 µm) were rarely observed and represented less than 2% of the particles in both cohorts.
Figure 3-12. Equivalent circular diameter size distribution for wear particles in fixed- and mobile-bearing L-TDR tissues

Figure 3-13. Aspect ratio distribution for wear particles in fixed- and mobile-bearing L-TDR tissues

Figure 3-14. Circularity distribution for wear particles in fixed- and mobile-bearing L-TDR tissues
Table 3-5. UHMWPE particle number and characteristics from tissues with wear debris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient ID</th>
<th>Implant bearing design</th>
<th>Tissue samples with wear debris</th>
<th>&lt; 0.1-1µm particles/ mm²</th>
<th>1-10 µm particles/ mm²</th>
<th>&gt; 10 µm particles/ mm²</th>
<th>All sizes (particles/ mm²)</th>
<th>Percent area of particles*</th>
<th>Equivalent circular diameter (µm)</th>
<th>Perimeter (µm)</th>
<th>Circularity</th>
<th>Aspect ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 022</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>6.64 ± 10.78</td>
<td>28.05 ± 47.09</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.20</td>
<td>1.76 ± 0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 023</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>2.68 ± 5.63</td>
<td>13.43 ± 39.45</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.25</td>
<td>2.02 ± 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025a</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>2.90 ± 3.12</td>
<td>11.95 ± 19.13</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.19</td>
<td>1.93 ± 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025b</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>2.60 ± 2.71</td>
<td>10.31 ± 15.69</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.18</td>
<td>1.85 ± 0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 027</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>2.86 ± 5.24</td>
<td>11.82 ± 38.18</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.18</td>
<td>1.90 ± 0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 0032</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>3.78 ± 4.65</td>
<td>8.43 ± 11.45</td>
<td>0.77 ± 0.20</td>
<td>1.87 ± 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDL 004</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>2.28 ± 2.40</td>
<td>8.44 ± 11.43</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.17</td>
<td>1.56 ± 0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 003</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>89.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>107.33</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>2.23 ± 2.85</td>
<td>8.16 ± 14.11</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.14</td>
<td>1.70 ± 0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent area of particles is the ratio of the total area of all particles to the total area of tissue; † mean ± SD.

Table 3-6. Comparing UHMWPE particle number and characteristics in patients with wear debris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Fixed-Bearing L-TDR</th>
<th>Mobile-Bearing L-TDR</th>
<th>Contemporary L-TDR (Fixed and Mobile)</th>
<th>Historical Mobile-Bearing L-TDR* (Punt et al., 2011) [30]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHMWPE core</td>
<td>γ-inert-sterilized</td>
<td>γ-inert-sterilized</td>
<td>γ-inert-sterilized</td>
<td>γ-air-sterilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with wear debris (number)</td>
<td>6 of 7</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>7 of 11</td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle number** (particles/g x 10⁷; mean ± SD)</td>
<td>1.16 ± 3.09</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>2.14 ± 2.90†</td>
<td>162.10 ± 27.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circularity (mean ± SD)</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.19†</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio (mean ± SD)</td>
<td>1.88 ± 0.76</td>
<td>1.70 ± 0.53</td>
<td>1.84 ± 0.71</td>
<td>2.00 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Particle measurements were generated using ESEM and a cutoff of 2 µm so size characteristics were not comparable; **Measurements from contemporary L-TDR cohorts were converted from particles/mm² for comparison purposes; L-TDR = lumbar total disc replacement; SD = standard deviation; N/A = not available; ESEM = environmental scanning electron microscope. †Significant differences between combined contemporary L-TDRs and historical L-TDRs (p < 0.01)
3.4.4 Comparison of Wear Particle Characteristics to MoP Historical L-TDRs

Compared to five historical L-TDR patients identified in a previous study [32], UHMWPE particle number and circularity in the seven contemporary L-TDR patient tissues were significantly different, but aspect ratio was not (Table 3-6). Specifically, the number of particles per gram of tissue was 99% less (p = 0.003) and their shape was 50% rounder (p = 0.003) in contemporary L-TDR cohorts, which included both fixed- and mobile-bearing designs. Qualitative observations of particle size revealed that tissues from contemporary L-TDR patients contained more submicron and small (< 10 µm) wear debris and less associated inflammation in comparison to the historical L-TDR cohort.

3.5 Discussion

L-TDR was developed as an alternative to spinal fusion for the treatment of degenerative disc disease in the lumbar spine, and is a device that preserves or restores segmental function and motion. However, historical generations of L-TDR devices with γ-air-sterilized UHMWPE cores raised concerns regarding wear debris generation and subsequent immunological responses that may adversely affect clinical outcomes. Today, modern L-TDR designs incorporate purely γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE cores to improve wear resistance and minimize wear debris generation in an effort to reduce the risk of revision surgery. The aims of this study were to evaluate wear debris and biological responses in tissues from revised contemporary MoP L-TDRs and determine the influence of bearing design on wear particle number, size, and shape. Furthermore, we wanted to know how UHMWPE
wear particle densities and characteristics compared with previous historical MoP L-TDRs. After analyzing retrieved tissues around eight fixed- and four mobile-bearing L-TDRs from 11 patients revised primarily for pain, we found measurable UHMWPE wear debris with corresponding macrophage infiltration in five patients that had fixed-bearing L-TDRs and one patient that had a mobile-bearing L-TDR. The frequency, amount, and shape of wear debris suggested the bearing design of contemporary devices did not influence wear particle characteristics. Furthermore, particle comparisons with a retrieval study of historical devices suggested that γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE has improved wear resistance and as a result reduced wear-induced periprosthetic tissue reactions.

Not all periprosthetic tissue from the two contemporary MoP L-TDRs examined in this study contained detectable UHMWPE wear debris (> 0.34 μm); this was true for tissues from all patients and different tissues from the same patient. However, those tissues that contained UHMWPE wear debris generally had an associated macrophage inflammation. This type of co-localization of wear debris and macrophages is an established phenomenon in total joint arthroplasty and more recently noted in historical L-TDRs [34]. One noteworthy difference observed for the contemporary L-TDRs was a decrease in particles > 10 um and as a result; unlike historical L-TDRs, giant cells were not observed in these tissues. Periprosthetic UHMWPE particles from both contemporary L-TDR cohorts resulted primarily in a macrophage response, except for three patients with metallic wear debris from fixed-bearing devices where an associated lymphocytic response was observed. These patient tissues also had higher macrophage infiltration scores. The presence
of metallic debris may be attributed to the unintended wear mechanism of impingement between the metallic endplates arising from malpositioning and/or subsidence, which was noted in more than 50% of contemporary fixed-bearing device retrievals in a separate retrieval study [23]. Interestingly, considerable amounts of hemosiderin were present in many of these tissues, indicative of phagocytosis of erythrocytes and degradation of hemoglobin by macrophages [16, 39]. The exact contribution of hemosiderin to revision remains unclear; however, a previous study has associated the deposition with the accumulation of activated macrophages that are positive for osteoclastic cell markers [28]. Although the amount of UHMWPE wear debris in the spine may not be severe enough to directly contribute to osteolysis [21], vertebral osteolysis was noted as a clinical complication in two patients with fixed-bearing L-TDRs, both of whom had tissues containing hemosiderin. The effect of hemosiderin in these tissues on UHMWPE wear-induced inflammation requires further investigation. Other biological tissue responses noted around the fixed-bearing devices included increased vascularization in tissues with wear and necrosis in tissues without wear. In contrast, tissues around mobile-bearing L-TDRs, with and without detectable wear debris, had low to moderate vascularization and necrosis. The presence of these reactions in both cohorts is noteworthy because these reactions have been implicated in the development of pain. Specifically, increased vascularization and sensory nerve growth are closely linked processes [6, 27]; and tissue necrosis or cell death results in the release of proinflammatory cytokines and other factors that initiate persistent pain by directly activating nociceptive sensory neurons [7, 47].
Both reactions can lead to maladaptive plasticity and neural disease states, which raises the question whether these tissue responses contributed to neuropathic pain in both fixed- and mobile-bearing L-TDR patients.

While the observations and data did not explain why wear debris in patients lead to vascularization in some tissues and necrosis in others, we believe the amount of wear debris and the stage of inflammation contributed to pathological modes observed at fixation. It is important to note that nanometre-sized wear debris may still be present in tissues that were indicated for no debris due to our detection limitations (>0.34 µm) [36]; and also that particles can be cleared by the lymphatic system when the tissue matrix degenerates [10]. Furthermore, apparition of the inflammatory modes of vascularization and necrosis can depend on the nature and extent of the injury (e.g. wear-debris amount and length of exposure), along with the locale and cell types present in the region [41]. For example, tissue sections that were excised from deeper discal regions with severe wear-induced hypoxic conditions may reflect inflammation that led to ischemic necrosis; contrarily, inflammation and wear-induced hypoxia in outer layers of the disc with access to ingrowing blood vessels may lead to vascularization and more inflammation [14, 38, 41]. Nonetheless, with enough time, it is thought that all wear-induced tissue responses eventually lead to necrosis as inflammatory cells are unable to digest or enzymatically degrade UHMWPE wear particles [40].

UHMWPE wear debris in tissues around fixed-bearing devices qualitatively appeared smaller, less concentrated, and less round than debris in tissues around
the one mobile-bearing retrieval; however, no statistical difference was observed. Austen et al. recently reported a case study of two patients revised for a different set of fixed- and mobile-bearing contemporary L-TDRs, and observed larger UHMWPE particles in tissues from the patient with the mobile-bearing design [2]. Interestingly, retrieval studies of TKA also found comparable findings in which larger UHMWPE particles were found in tissues surrounding failed mobile-bearing TKRs than in tissues around failed fixed-bearing TKRs [11, 29]. Design-dependent differences in loading and wear mechanisms may explain observed qualitative differences of wear particles between designs. All fixed-bearing retrievals in our study showed signs of scratching on UHMWPE dome regions, and the tissues with metal wear corresponded with implant components that had metallic and endplate burnishing as a result of impingement attributable to malposition and/or subsidence. The mobile-bearing patient tissue retrieval with UHMWPE wear corresponded to an implant core that had burnishing, pitting, and unidirectional scratching. The overall density of UHMWPE particles was relatively low in tissues from both cohorts, but the majority were 1 to 10 µm, which falls within a size range that activates macrophages [9]. Lastly, the higher number and rounder particles observed in the mobile-bearing patient tissue may be influenced by the increased mobility of the core. The mobile-bearing implant design has 5 degrees of freedom (DOF) and its instant axes of rotation (IAR) more consistently matches the geometrical center of the UHMWPE core, whereas the fixed-bearing design has only 3 DOF and the IAR is not always as centered [37]. The differing kinematics of bearing design likely contribute to the different wear mechanisms that generate distinct particle amounts and morphology.
However, further research and larger sample sizes are necessary to determine whether design-dependent differences significantly influence particle size and shape differences.

UHMWPE particles from the contemporary L-TDR cohorts were less numerous and rounder in comparison to the historical L-TDR group, suggesting that modern L-TDR designs have improved wear properties. A separate study investigating particles > 2 µm in historical L-TDR cohorts reported a mean of 231 particles/mm² [33], which was roughly 10-fold higher than the amount of similar-sized particles from contemporary TDRs (mean, 22 particles/mm²). This comparison paralleled findings from a case report, which noted that the mean number of UHMWPE particles was two orders of magnitude lower in a different set of revised contemporary L-TDRs [2]. Our study also showed that mean particle circularity (roundness) was noticeably higher in the contemporary L-TDR cohort (mean, 0.8 versus mean, 0.4), but aspect ratios were within the same range as those of historical L-TDR particles [32]. Interestingly, UHMWPE particles from conventional THAs fabricated with γ-inert-sterilized UHMWPE acetabular liners have been reported to have shapes similar to the contemporary L-TDR group [4, 12, 13, 15, 26]. Multiple studies have reported that particles with more rounded morphologies trigger less robust macrophage activation compared with fibrillar-shaped particles [13, 35, 46]. Thus, with the samples available in this study, both the decreased number and increased roundness of the particles suggest that wearing of contemporary L-TDRs will result in a reduced inflammatory response.
In summary, the amount of wear debris and subsequent tissue responses were greatly reduced in tissues from contemporary L-TDRs when compared to historical L-TDRs. We showed that periprosthetic tissues from both fixed- and mobile-bearing L-TDR patients contained UHMWPE particles within size ranges known to elicit a macrophage response. Because artificial discs are intended to last the lifetime of the patient, further retrieval studies are still necessary to elucidate the long-term role of UHMWPE wear and its association, if any, to the clinical performance of lumbar disc arthroplasty.

3.6 Study Limitations

As any retrieval study, a few important limitations need to be noted. First, although the primary revision reason for all patients was pain, implant malpositioning and impingement were reported in three of six fixed-bearing and none of the mobile-bearing L-TDR patients. This complication may serve as a confounding variable when comparing the two designs. However, this discrepancy between the two cohorts may be viewed with a little skepticism given that the issue of impingement is not an uncommon finding for L-TDRs; it was previously reported for mobile-bearing L-TDR retrievals as well and contributed to wear debris generation and the immune responses [5]. Second, we were only able to investigate short-term revisions within 5 years of implantation, and of these retrievals, the implantation times varied between the fixed- and mobile-bearing cohorts. The times ranged from 1 to 6 years (mean, 4.1 years) for the fixed-bearing cohort and 2 to 3 years (mean, 2.7 years) for the mobile-bearing cohort, although both cohorts were
short-term revisions. Third, the cohort sizes were small and wear particle characteristics of mobile-bearing devices were extrapolated from particles that were observed in only one of four patients who had wear debris. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, there are no published retrieval studies for contemporary MoP L-TDRs. Lastly, comparisons of particle number and characteristics are provided for historical MoP L-TDRs; however, the previous study used ESEM and excluded wear particles larger than 2 µm, whereas in this study, we used polarized light microscopy and were able to detect particles as small as 0.34 µm. Although polarized light microscopy has been used in other related studies to investigate UHWMPE particles of particular sizes [33, 34], the different approaches make it difficult to make direct comparisons.
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CHAPTER 4

Periprosthetic Immune Response to UHMWPE Wear Particles and Inflammatory Factor Production in the Lumbar Spine

4.1 Abstract

The pathophysiology and mechanisms driving the generation of unintended pain after TDR are poorly understood. It has been suggested that pain may be the result of UHMWPE wear debris and the resulting periprosthetic inflammation. We therefore asked whether inflammation could be linked to wear debris generation and the production of inflammatory factors that might contribute to abnormal or enhanced pain sensitization. Tissues were evaluated for three patient groups: periprosthetic tissue samples (n=30) obtained at revision of contemporary metal-on-UHMWPE TDRs from 11 patients (implantation time 1.2-6.0 year, average 3.3 year); painful degenerative disc disease (DDD) tissue samples (n=3) obtained from patients exhibiting pain at the time of initial TDR surgery; and normal disc tissue samples (n=4) obtained at autopsy from patients with no clinical history of back surgery. The wear particle number and size/shape characteristics were determined in tissue sections from TDR patients and immunohistochemistry was performed to identify CD68+ macrophages and the production of tumor necrosis factor-α (TNFα), interleukin-1β (IL-1β), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), platelet-derived growth factor-bβ (PDGFbb), nerve growth factor (NGF) and substance P, inflammatory factors known to play both a direct and indirect role in inflammatory-
mediated pain sensitization. Clinical and implant factors did not show any correlation with the expression of these factors. However, the amounts of TNFα IL-1β, VEGF, NGF and substance P strongly correlated with the number of wear particles and also the number of CD68+ macrophages for the TDR patient group. Furthermore, the cytokines, TNFα and IL-1β, and the vascularization factors, VEGF and PDGFβb, correlated with the presence of the neural innervation and hypersensitization agents, NGF and substance P, suggesting inflammation can contribute to pain sensitization.

4.2 Introduction

The pathophysiology of low back pain remains poorly understood [25], and even less is known about mechanism(s) involved in the generation of unintended pain after metal-on-UHMWPE total disc replacement (TDR). The normal human lumbar disc consists of an avascular/aneural nucleous pulposus, and a surrounding annulus fibrosis that is poorly vascularized and innervated [22]. Painful disc degeneration has been associated with an infiltration of inflammatory cells, as resident macrophages are not present, and responses leading to innervation by sensory nerve fibers, which follow the path of ingrowing blood vessels into disc tissue [6, 11]. This process is mediated by both activated fibroblasts and inflammatory cell infiltrates that release biological factors that may ultimately lead to pain sensitization. In a previous study, we reported an increase in inflammation and vascularization in TDR revision tissues [37]. Thus, it was hypothesized that biological reactions to UHMWPE wear debris in the lumbar spine result in the
production and interplay between key inflammatory mediators that contribute to the abnormal or enhanced pain sensitization in TDR patients.

Studies have suggested that there is a functional link between the immune response and neurological changes that ultimately result in the generation of peripheral pain. Specifically, activated macrophages, derived from circulating monocytes, have been reported to contribute to experimental pain states by releasing pro-inflammatory cytokines such as TNFα and IL-1β [23, 30, 34]. In addition, these cells can secrete the angiogenic factors, VEGF and PDGFbb, and the neurotrophic factor and neuropeptide, NGF and substance P. Investigations on painful degenerative discs have identified a significant increase in the production of these factors in both the nucleus pulposus and annulus fibrosis [19, 38].

It is important to note that TNFα and IL-1β are not only potent stimulators of pro-inflammatory reactions in the disc space, but both have the potential to induce neural ingrowths into the disc and mediate hypersensitization by upregulating the expression of factors like NGF and substance P [2]. In addition, TNFα and IL-1β can directly stimulate pain by acting on nociceptors, sensory neurons that respond by sending signals to the brain that initiate the perception of pain [33, 42]. Furthermore, TNFα and IL-1β have been shown to induce angiogenesis by stimulating the release of factors like VEGF, PDGFbb and fibroblast growth factor (FGF) [6, 35]. While the underlying mechanisms of vascular ingrowth remain unclear, VEGF can promote blood vessel expansion into the disc space and
subsequently enhance innervation as the growing vessels provide a conduit for ingrowing neurons [26]. Thus, it is feasible that all of these cytokines play a role in the peripheral mediation of the unintended neuropathic pain experienced in some patients after disc replacement. Identifying their presence in the context of wear-debris-induced inflammatory reactions of the lumbar spine could provide valuable insights into the mechanisms that contribute to the unintended pain in some TDR patients.

In this study, we evaluated periprosthetic tissues collected at the time of TDR revision surgery using immunohistochemistry (IHC) to quantify the levels of select inflammatory factors that are known to play a major role in inflammation, vascularization and inflammatory-mediated pain/innervation, and investigate their associations with wear debris and macrophages. The inclusion criteria for the factors focused on identifying secretory proteins that are known to be involved in both direct and indirect mediation of pain, and included TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, PDGF-bb, NGF and substance P. Understanding the inflammatory responses and factors present in TDR periprosthetic tissues with and without detectable UHMWPE wear debris will enable us to discover mechanistic pathways that may link wear particles to pain sensitization. It will also provide information needed to identify therapeutic targets and treatment strategies to mitigate chronic pain after TDR.

4.3 Materials & Methods

4.3.1 Tissue Collection & Patient Information
Tissues were evaluated from three patient groups: periprosthetic tissue samples (n = 30) from TDR patients (see Chapter 3.3.1 and Table 3-1), tissues samples obtained from patients with disc degenerative disease (n = 3) exhibiting pain at the time of initial TDR surgery, and intervertebral disc (IVD) tissue samples (n = 2) obtained at autopsy from normal patients with no clinical history of back surgery or lower back pain. Periprosthetic revision and initial TDR surgical tissues were collected as part of a public, multi-center retrieval research program initiated in 2004 [16, 17]. Normal IVD tissues samples were obtained from the Cooperative Human Tissue Network (CHTN) of the National Cancer Institute (NCI), the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD (http://faculty.virginia.edu/chtntma/home.html). Additional IVD tissue samples were obtained from the Life Legacy Foundation (Tucson, AZ). Visual analog scale (VAS) pain scores and other demographic data was collected when available (Table 4-1).

4.3.2 Tissue Preparation

Tissues collected from revision surgeries, primary surgeries for treatment of DDD and autopsy were fixed in either formalin or Universal Molecular Fixative (UMFIX; Sakura Finetek USA, Inc, Torrance, CA, USA). One to two 4-mm punches from each tissue, considering variations in color, texture, and size of specimen, were embedded in paraffin blocks, and 6-µm serial sections were mounted onto ProbeOnPlus (Fischer Scientific Co, Pittsburgh, PA, USA) slides.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient ID</th>
<th>Tissue Type</th>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Bearing design</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Implantation Time (years)</th>
<th>VAS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 022</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 023</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025a</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025b</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 026</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 027</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 0032</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDL 004</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>ProDisc-L</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 003</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 004</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 006</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 007</td>
<td>Periprosthetic</td>
<td>CHARITÉ</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP Pri 002</td>
<td>DDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP Pri 003</td>
<td>DDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP Pri 004</td>
<td>DDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHTN 38422T</td>
<td>IVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHTN 55035T</td>
<td>IVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLF I</td>
<td>IVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLF II</td>
<td>IVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Wear Particle Analysis

For UHMWPE particle analysis, hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) stained tissue sections were evaluated for wear debris (see Chapter 3.3.4). In brief, a 36-image (200X magnification) composite was created from each tissue section under polarized light that corresponded to the transmitted light tissue composites. In each individual image, UHMWPE wear particle number, size, and shape were determined by first using a customized image threshold operation programmed in MATLAB® (MathWorks Inc, Natick, MA, USA) followed by counting/measuring particles using NIH ImageJ (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA). Equivalent circular diameter (ECD), aspect ratio and circularity measurements were calculated to determine particle size and shape (as described in Chapter 3.3.4).

4.3.4 Immunohistochemistry

Immunohistochemistry was performed on prepared slides to evaluate the expression of six secretory factors and a pan-macrophage marker: pro-inflammatory cytokines, TNFα (Rabbit IgG, Novus Biologicals, NBP1-19532) and IL-1β (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, AB2105); vascularization factors, VEGF (Rabbit IgG, SantaCruz, sc-507) and PDGFβb (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, ); pain-related factors, NGF (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, AB6199) substance P (Rabbit IgG, EMD Millipore, AB1566); and macrophage marker, CD68 (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, AB125157). Optimal conditions for the inflammatory and pain-related antibodies were determined using periprosthetic tissues of total hip replacement patients that had severe pain and wear debris;
mouse kidney tissues for the vascularization factors; and human tonsil tissue for the macrophage marker. The antibody concentrations were: TNFα 1:100, IL-1β 1:400, VEGF 1:100, PDGFβb 1:100, NGF 1:500, substance P 1:500 and CD68 1:100. Slides with tissues originally fixated in formalin, as opposed to UMFIX (Sakura Finetek, Torrance, CA), were first treated with an antigen retrieval solution (Vector Labs). All slides were incubated in 0.5% Triton in PBS to enhance permeability, 3% H₂O₂ in methanol to block endogenous peroxidases, and to block non-specific background in 4% BSA, 0.1% Tween 20 in PBS. Lastly, slides were incubated at 4 °C overnight with the primary antibodies. For antibody visualization, samples were incubated with pan-specific secondary antibody, followed by horseradish peroxidase (Santa Cruz Biotech) and DAB solution (Vector Labs), and then counterstained with 50% hematoxylin.

In an attempt to identify macrophage phenotype subsets, M1, M2a and M2c cells, the monoclonal antibodies CCR7 (Rat IgG, Origene, TA320232), CD206 (Mouse IgG, Abcam, AB8919) and CD163 (Rabbit IgG, Labome, MBS302586) were employed. However, these antibodies failed to recognize their intended targets in the TDR revision tissues despite multiple trials with both immunofluorescent and chromogen-based staining techniques. We believe the detection was not possible because these proteins are minimally expressed or not present in TDR tissues.

4.3.5 Imaging & Analysis

Each stained tissue section was imaged (200X objective) using an Olympus BX50 microscope (Olympus, Melville, NY, USA) equipped with a stepper motor-controlled stage. DAB expression was determined by first employing a customized
image threshold operation programmed in MATLAB® (MathWorks Inc, Natick, MA), followed by measuring area via NIH ImageJ (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD). In brief, the red, green and blue channels for the 24-bit bright field DAB-labelled images were normalized by the sum of the three channels. Pixel values for 8-bit images were calculated using a published formula that allows for maximal separation of DAB-stained pixels from the background tissue: 

$$255 \times \text{blue} / (\text{red} + \text{green} + \text{blue})$$

(Figure 5-1) [8]. See Appendix 1B for MATLAB script.

![Figure 4-1. Representative image of a tissue with DAB deposition after immunohistochemistry (left) followed by thresholding for DAB-stained pixels in MATLAB (right).](image)

CD68+ macrophages were quantified in each image (200x) of the stained tissue sections with the aid of Image-Pro Plus 6.0 (Media Cybernetics, Silver Spring, MD, USA). A customized macro was generated to count DAB-stained cells. A quantitative value of the inflammatory response was then presented as the number of positive cells (DAB) was normalized to total area. In brief, images were split into three eight-bit channels (red, green, and blue). Signal from blue channels were converted into masks based on a threshold value relative to the average signal
intensity of each image. Next, count/size operations were employed along with water-shed split commands in order to maximize accuracy of counts. See Appendix 3-1 for macro.

4.3.6 Statistical Analysis

The normality of the data was determined using Shapiro-Wilk test (IBM SPSS Statistics V22 software package, IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA). To statistically compare immunohistochemical levels between different patient groups, the Mann-Whitney U-test was employed. Significance was based on $P < 0.05$. Correlations for wear debris, inflammatory cells and the six immunohistological markers were determined using Spearman Rho correlation test for non-parametric data. Significance was based on $P < 0.05$.

4.4 Results

4.4.1 Mean Inflammatory Factor Expression in Patient Tissues

The levels of six inflammatory-associated secretory factors, TNFα, IL-1ß, VEGF, PDGF-bb, NGF and substance P, were evaluated in TDR revision tissues and compared to levels in DDD patient tissue samples retrieved at the time of initial TDR surgery, as well as IVD tissue samples from autopsy patients with no history of back surgery or lower back pain (Figure 4-2). Percent area of expression for each factor was determined based on the amount of DAB (pixels per total tissue area (mm²) in each section.
Figure 4-2. Mean expression of inflammatory factors in tissues for TDR, DDD and normal IVD patients. *p<0.05

Figure 4-3. Mean expression of inflammatory factors in TDR tissues with (n=14) and without (n=16) wear debris, DDD and normal patient tissues. *p<0.05
We found that the mean percent area of expression for IL-1β ($p = 0.01$), VEGF ($p = 0.04$), and substance P ($p = 0.01$) were significantly higher in TDR tissues when compared to tissues obtained from DDD patients. TNFα ($p = 0.06$) and NGF ($p = 0.19$) were also increased in the TDR patient tissues. When compared to normal, IVD, tissues, the mean percent area for all six factors, TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, PDGFbb, NGF and substance P, were statistically increased in TDR tissues ($p < 0.05$). Interestingly, no statistical differences were observed between DDD and normal IVD tissues.

To further evaluate differences in the tissue cohorts, TDR tissues were separated into sections that had detectable (> 0.34 µm) UHMWPE wear particles (n = 14) and sections that did not (n = 16). The expression of all of the factors, except PDGFbb, was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) in TDR tissues with UHMWPE wear particles (Figure 4-3). Overall, TDR patient tissues with detectable wear debris had the highest expression of each factor compared to the DDD and IVD patient cohort tissues.

4.4.2 Mean Inflammatory Factor Expression in Tissues from TDR Patients and Associations with Patient Clinical and Implant Factors

As patient, clinical and implant factors may contribute to the overall biological response, associations with the inflammatory secreted factors were investigated. Five male revision patients did not express any significant differences in mean percent area of expression for the six inflammatory factors when compared to the four female patients (Figure 4-4A). Next, implant complications of malpositioning, subsidence, dissociation and/or migration were noted in five revision patients, but there was no relationship with the factors when compared to the seven other TDR patients with no reported complications (Figure 4-4B). Based on short-term
Figure 4-4. Gender (A) and implant complications (B) showed no significant association with inflammatory factors.

Figure 4-5. Implantation time showed no significant association with inflammatory factors.

To mid-term TDR revision patients, ranging from 1.3 years to 6.0 years of implantation, increasing implantation times also failed to correlate with the percent area expression of these factors (Figure 4-5). Similarly, other available clinical and implant information on patient demographics such as age and implant design (fixed-
versus mobile-bearing cores) did not show any association with the expression of these factors (not shown).

### 4.4.3 Correlations between the Amount of Wear Debris and Inflammatory Factors in TDR Tissues

![Figure 4-6. Representative tissue sections with wear debris (left, polarized light) and TNFα immunostaining (right). The blue arrows indicate wear particles and the red arrow a macrophage surrounded by TNFα expressing fibroblasts.](image)

To determine whether UHMWPE wear particle accumulation affected the six inflammatory factors, particle number per tissue section was compared to the amount of each factor. In general, tissues that contained wear debris also showed substantially increased amounts of the inflammatory factors (Figure 4-6). The quantity of wear debris showed a significant and moderately positive correlation to the percent area of both TNFα and IL-1β ($p < 0.001, \rho = 0.63; P = 0.015, \rho = 0.50$; Figure 4-7). Both factors were expressed at substantially lower levels when no particles were present, with the exception of highly necrotic tissues (statistical outliers). Comparisons to VEGF and PDGFbb expression revealed the amount of wear debris showed a significant and moderately positive correlation with VEGF ($p = 0.003, \rho = 0.56$), but not PDGFbb
Figure 4-7. UHMWPE wear debris correlated with TNFα & IL-1β

Figure 4-8. UHMWPE wear debris correlated with VEGF.
Figure 4-9. UHMWPE wear debris correlated with NGF and SP.

(Figure 4-8). Nonetheless, both factors were expressed at lower levels when no particles were present in the tissues. Lastly, comparisons to NGF and substance P expression showed the amount of wear debris had a significant and positive correlation with both factors, respectively ($p = 0.012, \rho = 0.46; p < 0.001, \rho = 0.59$; Figure 4-9).

4.4.4 Correlations between Wear Debris Characteristics and Inflammatory Factors in TDR Tissues

To determine whether UHMWPE wear particle size and shape affected the six inflammatory factors, mean measurements for particle ECD, aspect ratio and circularity, in each tissue section with detectable wear debris, were compared to inflammatory factor expression. Mean values for the wear particle size and shape showed no significant correlation with any of the factors, with the exception of mean particle aspect ratio to the percent area of TNFα ($p < 0.001, \rho = 0.71$, Figures 4-10 A-C).
Figure 4-10. Particle ECD means did not correlate with any factor expression (A). Particle aspect ratio means correlated with TNFα (B). Particle circularity means did not correlate with any factor expression (C).
4.4.5 Correlations between Wear Debris, Inflammatory Factors and the Number of Macrophages

![Image: Representative tissue sections with wear debris (left) and CD68+ macrophages (right). The blue arrows indicate wear particles and the red arrows macrophage.](image)

To investigate the presence and influence of macrophages during the immune response to wear particles in TDR tissues, the number of CD68+ cells in each tissue section was compared to particle accumulation and inflammatory factor amounts in serial sections. The majority of sections that contained wear particles also showed localized macrophage infiltration (Figure 4-11). The number of CD68+ cells showed an expected significant and strong positive correlation to the number of detectable wear particles (Figure 4-12). In addition, the number of CD68+ cells had a significant and strong positive correlation to the amount of TNFα and IL-1β in these tissues ($p < 0.001, \rho = 0.85; p = 0.001, \rho = 0.69$; Figure 4-13). The number of CD68+ cells also showed a significant and strong positive correlation to VEGF ($p = 0.001, \rho = 0.71$), however there was a poor relationship with PDGFbb ($p = 0.090, \rho = 0.40$) (Figure 4-14). Lastly, the number of CD68+ cells showed a significant and positive correlation to NGF and substance P ($p = 0.003, \rho = 0.63; p = 0.002, \rho = 0.65$; Figure 4-15).
Figure 4-12. UHMWPE wear debris strongly correlated with CD68+ macrophages.

Figure 4-13. CD68+ cells correlated with TNFα and IL-1β.
Figure 4-14. CD68+ cells correlated with VEGF, but not PDGFbb.

Figure 4-15. CD68+ cells correlated with NGF and substance P.
4.4.6 Correlations of NGF and Substance P with Other Factors

![Correlation Images]

**Figure 4-16.** Representative inflamed tissue samples from serial sections immunostained for NGF and substance P (left) that matched proportionally with inflammatory and vascularization factors (right). The red arrows indicate a macrophage positive for the respective immunostain.

The amounts of the inflammatory, neural innervation agents and pain mediators, NGF and substance P, were identified in TDR tissues and their associations with pro-inflammatory and vascularization factors were determined (Figure 4-16). Both NGF and substance P showed statistically significant correlations with the amounts of TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF and PDGFbb ($p < 0.01$ for all; Figure 4-17). NGF had a strongly positive relationship with the TNFα and IL-1β ($\rho = 0.77$; $\rho = 0.79$), while substance P had a strongly positive relationship with the vascularization factor, VEGF ($\rho = 0.77$).
4.5 Discussion

To better understand the pathophysiology and mechanisms of unintended pain after TDR, we investigated whether inflammation could be linked to wear debris generation and the production of inflammatory factors that could contribute to abnormal or enhanced pain sensitization. Inflammatory factors that promote inflammation, vascularization, pain and innervation were all elevated in TDR periprosthetic tissues when compared to tissues from DDD patients and IVD tissues from normal autopsy patients with no history of lower back pain. While no association was found between these factors and patient clinical/implant factors, TNFα IL-1β, VEGF, NGF and substance P correlated with the number of wear particles and also the number of CD68+ macrophages in the TDR tissue sections. Furthermore, the pro-inflammatory cytokines, TNFα and IL-1β, and the vascularization factors, VEGF and PDGFbb, correlated with the neural innervation and hypersensitization agents, NGF and substance P suggesting not only the
presence of inflammatory reactions but also the presence of factors that can directly and indirectly contribute to pain at periprosthetic sites.

Although the inflammatory pain factors showed no associations with any patient demographic information, clinical indications or implant factors, these findings may be an artifact of low sample size and power of study. Both gender and implant complications were expected to show at least some association with the inflammatory pain factors. In regards to gender differences in pain perception, recent studies clearly suggest men and women differ in both pain perception and how they respond [1, 13]. In the context of low back pain, women present with symptoms more frequently, undergo spine surgery more commonly [1], and report higher levels of back pain than men [7, 18]. However, this was not evident in our study cohort, which was again limited by sample size and also the availability of VAS scores. Limited sample size may have also contributed to the non-associations with implant factors such as malpositioning that can not only lead to severe wear debris generation [5], but can also physically impinge upon neighboring nerve roots [41]. Both of these outcomes can lead to the development of pain. Unfortunately, malpositioning is often unreported by the surgeon [12], which may explain why patients with implant complications had similar inflammatory pain factor production compared to patients not indicated for any complication. Nonetheless, it is also possible the non-associations of the inflammatory factors with patient and clinical factors simply adds weight to the associations we observed for TDR tissue biological responses and wear debris.
While TDR tissues do not contain resident macrophages and are initially poorly vascularized, the generation of wear debris increased the infiltration of CD68+ macrophages. Past studies on hips and knees have suggested these changes are initiated by wear debris activation of fibroblasts. Tunyogi-Csapo and colleagues (2007) found that fibroblasts in periprosthetic tissues from joint replacements secrete pro-inflammatory cytokines in response to particulate wear as well as the angiogenic factors, VEGF and fibroblast growth factor [35]. Moreover, the production of pro-inflammatory factor-recruitment of peripheral blood monocytes and the production of angiogenic factors lead to extensive vascularization of periprosthetic hip tissue [14, 35]. While we hypothesized a similar upregulation of angiogenic factors, only VEGF was significantly increased and associated with the number of wear particles. Although increases in PDGFβbb were observed when particle number was high. Based on the high ratio of VEGF to PDGFβbb we believe the pro-inflammatory M1 macrophage responses predominate rather than M2 macrophage response [29, 32].

It is well accepted from joint arthroplasty studies that UHMWPE particles can activate cells, including fibroblasts, to secrete TNFα, which can induce subsequent IL-1β secretion, and together these factors can synergistically contribute to the recruitment and polarization of macrophages towards the M1 phenotype [21, 29]. Accordingly, our previous work showed an increased infiltration of macrophages in TDR tissues containing wear particles [37]. In support of these findings, the current study showed increased expression of both TNFα and IL-1β, which correlated with the number of wear particles and inflammatory cells. Particle size and shape have
been previously reported to influence biological reactions as well [37], however only the aspect ratio of the particles in our study showed a significant relationship with TNFα. This may however be due to our limited range (> 0.34 µm) of particle size detection capabilities.

While the current study is the first to identify vascularization and neurological factors in TDR periprosthetic tissues, a number of DDD studies have reported the presence of pro-inflammatory factors, blood vessel ingrowth and nerve ingrowth into layers of the disc, which are thought to result in chronic lower back pain [6, 11, 24, 27]. Specifically, NGF-expressing blood vessels have been detected and co-localized to sensory nerve fibers in the annulus fibrosis and even deeper into the nucleus pulposus of the spinal disc [11]. These nerve fibers are known to produce neurotransmitters, including substance P, involved in pain transmission [4]. Activated macrophages can further exacerbate the condition by signaling the release of more neurotrophins and neuropeptides by neighboring macrophages and neurons [2]. Purmessur et al. (2008) have shown in vitro that TNFα stimulation of normal cells from the IVD increases the production of substance P, whereas IL-1β stimulation increases NGF [28]. Altogether, the current findings, combined with previous research, suggest a possible signaling cascade starting with fibroblast activation, macrophage infiltration, increased vascularization and innervation/nociception (pain response to inflammation and tissue damage).

The importance of NGF and substance P production in periprosthetic tissues is 2-fold. First, NGF is a known mediator of sensory and nociceptive nerve function and substance P is a sensory pain-associated neuropeptide released at synapses;
thus, both contribute to hyperalgesia (increased sensitivity to pain) [3, 20, 40]. Second, NGF can contribute to nerve ingrowth [2, 9, 15], and without it, all sensory neurons will undergo apoptosis [10]; substance P is also involved in nerve ingrowth and is predominantly secreted at sensory nerve endings during innervation [39]. Both factors work in synergy and may be directly involved in mediating innervation and pain in the lower back [31, 36]. Taken together, the association with wear-debris induced inflammation elucidates key mechanisms that may be involved in the development of pain in TDR patients.
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CHAPTER 5

Investigations into the Pathogenesis of Inflammatory Particle Disease in the Lumbar Spine based on Localized Changes in Vascularization & Innervation

5.1 Abstract

The mechanisms involved in the generation of unintended pain after metal-on-UHMWPE total disc replacement (TDR) remain poorly understood. While wear-debris and subsequent inflammation have been established in this dissertation as the biological response to UHMWPE wear particles, increased vascularization is another key histomorphological change that may provide the link to pathological innervation and ultimately pain sensitization. Our hypothesis was that ingrowth of blood vessels may provide a conduit for nociceptive innervation. Thus, the aim of this study was to explore the contributions of a neurovascular component in wear-debris-triggered tissue responses. We evaluated the expression of six inflammatory factors in tissue sections from eleven TDR patients and their association with tissue vascularity using immunohistochemistry. To assess the production of these factors by cells other than macrophages or fibroblasts, we masked blood vessels/nerves in individual images of tissue sections with wear-debris and varying degrees of vascularity for five TDR patients. Macrophages were also quantified to assess their relationship with angiogenesis. Our results showed the total number of blood vessels strongly correlated with the levels of TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, PDGFbb, NGF and substance P,
confirming that vascular changes and inflammatory-mediated responses are interrelated. Furthermore, the innervation/pain factors, NGF and substance P, were predominantly localized to vascular channels, strongly suggesting increased innervation of these tissues. Lastly, comparing blood vessel number with factor production and macrophage number in images from tissue sections with low and high vascularity suggested that a temporal link exists between increased inflammatory factors, macrophages and angiogenesis.

5.2 Introduction

Angiogenesis is the growth of new blood vessels from existing vasculature that can play a critical role in development [6], but may also be involved in pathological conditions of wear-debris-induced inflammation (i.e. particle disease) after total disc replacement (TDR) [28]. While the term “particle disease“ was originally coined to describe the failure of local tissue homeostatic mechanisms for total hip replacements (THRs), wear particles in both the hip and spine may also indirectly lead to the induction of angiogenesis and other tissue functional changes [9, 28]. These changes are a consequence of wear particle-induced release of inflammatory factors by resident fibroblasts and recruited macrophages. In addition, these “activated” cells also proliferate and the increased cellular activity/metabolism results in higher oxygen consumption in the local tissue. In turn, this process induces hypoxic or oxygen-deficient microenvironments [26]. Subsequently, fibroblasts, macrophages and other hypoxic cells (even neurons) in the tissues secrete factors such as vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) to promote an increase in vascularization in an
attempt to alleviate hypoxia [13, 18]. Although the annulus fibrosis of the spinal disc regions is poorly vascularized [19], activated fibroblasts and macrophages in close proximity to existing blood vessels can coordinate signals with endothelial cells (ECs) and other stromal cells to stimulate angiogenesis [6, 12]. Specifically, activated macrophages, given their ability to play a trophic role in pathological angiogenesis and anastomosis [20, 23], can induce blood vessel ingrowth, which can consequently result in the infiltration of more monocytes. Thus, increased vascularization can ultimately lead to enhanced inflammation and more VEGF production, thereby creating a viscous cycle.

In addition to increasing oxygenation, angiogenesis can lead to increased innervation of the tissue by nociceptive nerve fibers. It is well established and has been published in anatomy textbooks for decades that peripheral nerves track alongside blood vessels. During development of the sympathetic nervous system, neural crest stem cells migrate to positions adjacent to the aorta and extend axons in close proximity to the peripheral vasculature [5]. Similarly, degenerative disc disease stimulates sympathetic nerve fibers to follow the trajectories of ingrowing blood vessels into the relatively avascular and aneural disc [5, 8]. Studies have shown that ECs from infiltrating vessels can secrete neurotrophins such as nerve growth factor (NGF), whereas peripheral sensory nerves can secrete VEGF, creating a complex, but coordinated pattern of growth between large blood vessels (typically arteries and veins that connect the vascular network and provide a capillary source for nutrient and oxygen exchange) and nerve fibers [8, 18]. In degenerative disc studies involving painful discogenic pain, these infiltrating nerve fibers are positive for proteins like
substance P, indicative of nerves originating from the dorsal root ganglion; and thus, these fibers are nociceptive [2, 4, 10, 21].

While there is already a dearth of knowledge on the mechanisms underlying vascular and nerve ingrowth into painful intervertebral discs, there are no reports regarding the contributions of a neurovascular component in the pathogenesis of inflammatory particle disease after TDR. We hypothesized that wear-debris-induced inflammatory mediators and cells noted in our previous retrieval studies of TDR tissues (see Chapter 4), may be intimately linked to vascularization and innervation. To investigate this link, we focused on localized relationships between inflammatory factors, CD68+ macrophages, vascularization and innervation factors in these periprosthetic spine tissues. We evaluated whether: (1) the total number of large blood vessels present in tissue sections from revised TDRs were associated with the inflammatory factors, TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, PDGFbb, NGF and substance P in the respective sections; (2) the innervation and pain factors, NGF and substance P, were localized to large blood vessels and surrounding nerve fibers; (3) the localization of large blood vessels, inflammatory factors and macrophages suggested temporal differences in tissue sections with varying levels of vascularity.

5.3 Materials & Methods

5.3.1 Tissue Selection & Patient Information

All periprosthetic revision and initial TDR surgical tissues were collected as part of a public, multi-center retrieval research program initiated in 2004 [15, 16]. For the initial analysis studying associations between the vasculature and
inflammatory factors in the periprosthetic spine, 30 periprosthetic tissue samples were evaluated from 11 TDR patients (see Chapter 3.3.1 and Table 3-1). For the investigations focused on the localization of blood vessels, inflammatory factors and macrophages, five representative tissue sections were chosen from five TDR patients (Table 5-1). The inclusion criteria for this selection process were: (1) the presence of wear debris to specifically study wear-induced tissue responses; (2) the presence of at least 10 blood vessels per section to match baseline levels of vascularization noted in intervertebral disc tissue controls; and (3) a range of low to high vascularity based on the Oxford scoring system (see Chapter 3.3.2 and Table 3-3) to study temporal differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-1. Tissue Selection and Clinical Information for TDR Patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHSP 0032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRSP 003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values based on modified Oxford scoring system developed in Chapter 4.

5.3.2 Tissue Preparation & Immunohistochemistry

Tissues collected from revision surgeries were fixed in either formalin or Universal Molecular Fixative (UMFIX; Sakura Finetek USA, Inc, Torrance, CA, USA). One to two 4-mm punches from each tissue, considering variations in color, texture, and size of
specimen, were embedded in paraffin blocks, and 6-µm serial sections were mounted onto ProbeOnPlus (Fischer Scientific Co, Pittsburgh, PA, USA) slides. Immunohistochemistry was performed on prepared slides to evaluate the expression of six secretory factors and a pan-macrophage marker: pro-inflammatory cytokines, TNFα (Rabbit IgG, Novus Biologicals, NBP1-19532) and IL-1β (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, AB2105); vascularization factors, VEGF (Rabbit IgG, SantaCruz, sc-507) and PDGFbb (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, ); pain-related factors, NGF (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, AB6199) substance P (Rabbit IgG, EMD Millipore, AB1566); and macrophage marker, CD68 (Rabbit IgG, Abcam, AB125157). Optimal conditions for the inflammatory and pain-related antibodies were determined using periprosthetic tissues of total hip replacement patients that had severe pain and wear debris; mouse kidney tissues for the vascularization factors; and human tonsil tissue for the macrophage marker. The antibody concentrations were: TNFα 1:100, IL-1β 1:400, VEGF 1:100, PDGFbb 1:100, NGF 1:500, substance P 1:500 and CD68 1:100. Slides with tissues originally fixated in formalin, as opposed to UMFIX (Sakura Finetek, Torrance, CA), were first treated with an antigen retrieval solution (Vector Labs). All slides were incubated in 0.5% Triton in PBS to enhance permeability, 3% H2O2 in methanol to block endogenous peroxidases, and to block non-specific background in 4% BSA, 0.1% Tween 20 in PBS. Lastly, slides were incubated at 4 °C overnight with the primary antibodies. For antibody visualization, samples were incubated with pan-specific secondary antibody, followed by horseradish peroxidase (Santa Cruz Biotech) and DAB solution (Vector Labs), and then counterstained with 50% hematoxylin.

5.3.3 Imaging & Analysis
Each stained tissue section was imaged (200X objective) using an Olympus BX50 microscope (Olympus, Melville, NY, USA) equipped with a stepper motor-controlled stage. DAB expression was determined by first employing a customized image threshold operation programmed in MATLAB® (MathWorks Inc, Natick, MA), followed by measuring area via NIH ImageJ (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD). In brief, the red, green and blue channels for the 24-bit bright field DAB-labelled images were normalized by the sum of the three channels. Pixel values for 8-bit images were calculated using a published formula that allows for maximal separation of DAB-stained pixels from the background tissue: \[
255 \times \text{blue} / (\text{red} + \text{green} + \text{blue})
\] [3].

CD68+ macrophages were quantified in each image (200x) of the stained tissue sections with the aid of Image-Pro Plus 6.0 (Media Cybernetics, Silver Spring, MD, USA). A customized macro was generated to threshold and count DAB-stained cells, in which the algorithm allowed the non-stop analysis of up to 50 consecutive images. In brief, images were split into three eight-bit channels (red, green, and blue). Signal from blue channels were converted into masks based on a threshold value relative to the average signal intensity of each image. Next, count/size operations were employed along with water-shed split commands in order to maximize accuracy of counts. See Appendix 1-3 for macro.

Lastly, automation for the quantification of blood vessels was not possible through conventional thresholding and edge-detection. Large blood vessels were quantified through manual counts conducted by at least two individuals. For localization analysis, the tunics of blood vessels were manually traced in each image,
creating regions of interest that could be masked. Note that the tunics are not visible at 200X magnification for smaller vessels such as capillaries, postcapillary venules or arterioles. However, the focus of the analysis was to determine the number of large vessels (i.e. arteries and veins) that theoretically provide a conduit for in-growing nerve fibers [8, 18]. All analysis was performed in a blinded fashion.

5.3.4 Statistical Analysis

The normality of the data was determined using Shapiro-Wilk test (IBM SPSS Statistics V22 software package, IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA). To statistically compare immunohistochemical levels between different patient groups, the Mann-Whitney U-test was employed. Significance was based on p < 0.05. Correlations for blood vessels, inflammatory factors and inflammatory cells were determined using Spearman Rho correlation test for non-parametric data. Significance was based on p < 0.05.

5.4 Results

5.4.1 Correlations between the Total Number of Blood Vessels and Inflammatory-mediated Pain Factors in TDR Tissues

To determine whether inflammatory-mediated pain factors correlated with tissue vascularity, the number of blood vessels in each tissue section was compared to factor expression for eleven TDR patients. The number of blood vessels, showed an expectedly significant and strongly positive correlation to the percent area of VEGF (p < 0.001, ρ = 0.70), but only a significant and weakly positive correlation to PDGFβ (p = 0.022, ρ = 0.46) (Figure 5-1). In the majority of cases, PDGFβ was only expressed
in high amounts when the tissue sections were highly vascularized (>45 blood vessels). For
the pro-inflammatory cytokines, the number of blood vessels also showed a significant
and strongly positive correlation to the percent area of TNFα ($p = 0.001$, $\rho = 0.70$),
and a significant and moderately positive correlation to IL-1β ($p = 0.002$, $\rho = 0.57$) (Figure
5-2). However, high TNFα levels were predominantly observed only when the tissue
sections were highly vascularized (>45 blood vessels). Lastly, comparisons to the
innervating/pain factors revealed the number of blood vessels also showed a significant
and strongly positive correlation to the percent area of NGF ($p < 0.001$, $\rho = 0.70$), and
a significant and moderately positive correlation to substance P ($p = 0.003$, $\rho = 0.57$)

![Figure 5-1. Blood vessel number correlated with VEGF and PDGFbb.](image)
Figure 5-2. Blood vessel number correlated with TNFα and IL-1β.

Figure 5-3. Blood vessel number correlated with NGF and substance P.
(Figure 5-3). While both factors showed a correlative relationship with blood vessel number, variations in expression levels were noted in both tissues sections with moderate and high vascularity.

5.4.2 Co-localization of Factors with Blood Vessels

![Figure 5-4. Representative images of TDR tissues immunostained for PDGFbb (left), NGF (middle) and substance P (right) illustrating co-localization of all three factors to blood vessels (black arrows).](image)

Five vascularized tissue sections with wear debris from five TDR patients were selected to determine whether the inflammatory factors and particularly, innervation factors were co-localized to ingrown blood vessels in the periprosthetic spine tissues; each DAB-stained image was individually analyzed at 200X magnification and factor expression was averaged for each of the selected tissues. All six factors, VEGF, PDGFbb, TNFα, IL-1β, NGF and substance P, were expressed in some blood vessels to a certain degree (Figure 5-4), however only three factors appeared to be specifically localized to blood vessels.

Masking blood vessels in images from the five tissue sections showed a decrease in amounts for all six factors at varying levels. Quantifying the percentage decrease of the factors when blood vessels were masked showed that PDGFbb and the innervation/pain factors NGF and substance P were reduced by more than 25%,
inferring that they were largely localized to blood vessels, and being produced by ECs, vascular smooth muscle cells and/or peripheral nerves (Figure 5-5). Furthermore, NGF was significantly higher in blood vessels compared to TNFα \((p = 0.016)\), and PDGFbb was significantly higher in blood vessels compared to VEGF, TNFα, IL-1β and substance P, respectively \((p = 0.008; P = 0.008; p = 0.016; p = 0.016)\).

![Percentage Decrease of Factors after Blood Vessel Masking](image)

**Figure 5-5. Percentage decrease of all six factors in periprosthetic tissues when blood vessels were masked.**

### 5.4.3 Correlations for Blood Vessel Number with Inflammatory-mediated Pain Factor Expression and Macrophages in Tissues with Varying Levels of Vascularity

To assess how vasculature is related to local production of these factors, representative tissue sections (selected for wear debris and varying levels of vascu-
Figure 5-6. Blood vessel number and factor amounts per image in (A) low and (B) highly vascularized patient tissues.

larity) from five TDR patients were chosen in which blood vessels and inflammatory-mediated pain factors were quantified in individual images (at 200X magnification). These results were then separated based on low and highly vascularized tissue sections (Figure 5-6A & B). In less vascularized tissue sections, the number of blood vessels weakly correlated with only TNFα ($p = 0.007; \rho = 0.33$) and substance P ($p = 0.039, \rho = 0.27$). In highly vascularized tissue sections, the number of blood vessels correlated significantly with decreasing strength to TNFα ($p < 0.001, \rho = 0.58$), PDGFbb ($p < 0.001, \rho = 0.55$) and VEGF ($p = 0.004, \rho = 0.35$). Contrary to results from less vascularized tissue sections, substance P, although not statistically significant,
showed a negative association ($p = 0.115$, $\rho = -0.24$). NGF and IL-1β showed no significant correlation in either case, but maintained a weakly positive association in both low and highly vascular tissues. A larger sample size may be necessary to identify the production of NGF and IL-1β by ECs, vascular smooth muscle cells and/or peripheral nerves. Nonetheless, taken together, this data suggests a differential expression of factors depending on vascularity.

**Figure 5-7.** Blood vessel number and macrophage number per image in low (A) and highly vascularized (B) patient tissues.

To determine how vessel number is related to the local presence of macrophages, blood vessel and CD68+ macrophage number were quantified in individual images (at 200X magnification) and then collectively compared for low and highly vascularized tissue sections (Figure 5-7A & B). In less vascularized tissue sections, the number of blood vessels correlated significantly, but very weakly, to the number of CD68+ macrophages ($p = 0.001$, $\rho = 0.55$). In contrast, in highly
vascularized tissue sections, the number of blood vessels correlated significantly and very strongly to the number of CD68+ macrophages ($p < 0.001, \rho = 0.92$).

Although no significant correlations were originally found for implantation time (see Chapter 4), the mean implantation time for the low and high vascularity groups was 3.25 years and 4.3 years, respectively.

### 5.5 Discussion

Wear-debris and subsequent inflammation have been established in TDR revision tissues (see Chapters 4 & 5). In this study, increased vascularization has been identified as a consistent histomorphological change in response to wear debris. As such, the ingrowth of blood vessels may be providing a conduit for nociceptive innervation. Thus the aim of this study was to explore the contributions of a neurovascular component in wear-debris-mediated tissue responses. By determining the production of six inflammatory-mediated pain factors in tissue sections for all eleven patients making up the original TDR cohort, we found the total number of blood vessels was significantly associated with TNF$\alpha$, IL-1$\beta$, VEGF, PDGF$\beta$, NGF and substance P, confirming that vascular changes and inflammatory-mediated responses are interrelated. Based on individual images of tissue sections with wear-debris from five TDR patients (a new approach), we found that in addition to PDGF$\beta$, the innervation/pain factors, NGF and substance P, were predominantly localized to vascular channels. Lastly, correlations for blood vessel number with factor expression and macrophage number in images from tissue sections with low and high vascularity revealed a temporal link between TNF$\alpha$, macrophages and angiogenesis.
The significant localization of NGF and substance P with vascular channels supported our hypothesis that innervation is intertwined with the trajectories of ingrowing blood vessels. Although this study does not provide evidence for the presence of actual nerves or pain, it is well established that these factors are involved in nerve ingrowth and predominantly secreted at sensory nerve endings resulting in nonciception or pain [1, 7, 14, 29]. Furthermore, both factors work in synergy and may be directly involved in mediating innervation and pain of the lower back [24, 27]. Taken together, the association of NGF and substance P with wear-debris induced inflammation and vascularization elucidates key mechanisms that may be involved in the development of pain in TDR patients.

Tissue sections with low and high vascularity (and noted for the presence of wear debris) were selected with the idea that the latter group contains more in-grown blood vessels and thus, systematic analysis of individual images in the two sets may provide insight into the temporal component of particle-induced pathogenesis. Substance P was the only factor that showed a strong association to low, but not highly vascular tissues, suggesting that it may be one of the initiating factors for the coordinated in-growth of blood vessels and nerves. Whereas, TNFα, VEGF and PDGFbb showed stronger associations with blood vessel number in highly vascular tissue sections, suggesting they may be playing a more prominent role during relatively late stages of particle-induced tissue response.

Interestingly, TNFα showed a progressive correlation to low and high vascularity, suggesting that even though this factor is not co-localized to blood
vessels, it may be playing an essential role in regulating angiogenetic progression. Although the role of TNFα in angiogenesis is the subject of some controversy, the duration of TNFα signaling can differentially regulate EC cell responses [25]. For example, in vitro studies have shown the initial secretion of TNFα can block signaling of VEGF receptor-2 and delay the VEGF-driven angiogenic response by inhibiting EC cell proliferation and migration [11, 22]. On the other hand, depending on the duration of TNFα signaling, it can also prime EC cells for sprouting by inducing tip cell phenotype via macrophage nuclear factor-κB (NF-κB) activation [25]. Since macrophages are a major source of TNFα, and their numbers also increased in highly vascularized tissues this strengthens a synergistic association of inflammation and TNFα with angiogenesis. Supporting this synergistic hypothesis, animal studies in mice and chicks indicate inflammatory factors like TNFα are essential for macrophage-induced angiogenesis [17]. Furthermore, a reduced number of macrophages can result in a significant delay in the onset of the angiogenic switch, suggesting inflammatory factors, which includes all six factors in this study, may be required for increased vascularization of periprosthetic TDR tissues. In conclusion, while the current results reveal some temporal differences and potential stages in wear-debris-induced vascularization, more research with a larger sample size is necessary to better understand the systematic progression of particle disease.

5.6 References


CHAPTER 6

Rare and Abnormal Biological Complications of Osteolysis after Total Disc Replacement: A Case Series†

6.1 Abstract

While this dissertation has focused on elucidating the clinical relevance of wear debris in the spine with an emphasis on pain, which is the primary reason for revision, osteolysis is a rare complication that should not be entirely discounted. Although few such complications have been reported for lumbar total disc replacement (TDR) and hybrid TDR fixations, our retrieval center identified and evaluated retrieved implants and periprosthetic tissue reactions for two cases of osteolysis following disc arthroplasty with ProDisc-L prostheses. Implants were examined for wear and surface damage, and tissues for inflammation, polyethylene wear debris by polarized light microscopy and metal debris by energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy. Despite initial good surgical outcomes, osteolytic cysts were noted in both patients at vertebrae adjacent to the implants. For the hybrid TDR case, heterotopic ossification and tissue necrosis due to wear-induced inflammation were observed. In contrast, the non-hybrid implant showed signs of abrasion and impingement, and inflammation was observed in tissue regions with metal and polyethylene wear debris. In both cases, wear debris and inflammation may have contributed to osteolysis. Surgeons using ProDisc prostheses should be aware of these rare complications.

†The content of this chapter was published in the journal of Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research: Veruva SY, Lanman TH, Hanzlik JA, Kurtz SM and Steinbeck MJ. Rare complications of osteolysis and periprosthetic tissue reactions after hybrid and non-hybrid total disc replacement. *Eur Spine J.* 2015 May;24 Suppl 4:S494-501.
6.2 Introduction

Total disc replacement (TDR) is an established alternative to lumbar fusion for the treatment of back and leg pain that is associated with degenerative disc disease (DDD). In cases of 2-level DDD, hybrid fixation is a new approach that involves combining the advantages of TDR with spinal fusion at the adjacent (typically inferior) level. This approach preserves motion at one level and maintains stiffness in the lower segment to prevent adjacent segment degeneration. Aunoble and colleagues have shown that the clinical outcomes for patients that received hybrid surgery may be superior to 2-level TDRs or fusion in certain cases as there was a mean reduction of 24.9 in the owestry disability index (ODI) and a 64.6% improvement in the visual analog scale (VAS)[2]. Nevertheless, this does not mean every patient will benefit from hybrid fixation; for instance, the condition of the facet joints also serves as a central factor when determining the type of construct that is appropriate for a particular patient.

Although the majority of patients attain clinically significant pain reduction after 1-level TDR or hybrid fixation, foreign-body response to wear debris and rare instances of osteolysis have been noted for other devices. Historical generations of polyethylene-core devices such as the Charité Disc [originally Waldemar Link, Hamburg, Germany, later fabricated by DePuy Spine, Raynham, MA and currently discontinued] prostheses have shown evidence of polyethylene wear debris in periprosthetic tissues, accompanied by histological changes, the presence of histiocytes and multinuclear giant cells [9, 18]. Polyethylene wear particles are released from the implant as a consequence of abrasive and adhesive wear.
mechanisms and are then ingested by resident macrophages initiating a chronic immune response that can lead to osteolysis[4]. Evidence of lumbar periprosthetic osteolysis appeared in 1 of 21 implant revisions from 18 patients who received a Charité Disc in our previously reported study, but little is known about osteolysis around ProDisc-L implants [9].

Interestingly, the one osteolysis case reported in our previous study occurred in a patient that underwent hybrid fixation. This raises the question of whether the combination of TDR and fusion may create a loading and kinematic environment conducive to potential osteolysis. Another potential factor that may contribute to osteolysis in the spine is the use of bone morphogenic protein (BMP) during fusion. McKay et al. noted that resorption rates around the implant increase with the use of BMP-2, presumably due to BMP-induced enhancement of osteoclast activity, which results in vertebral osteolysis [6, 14].

The purpose of this study was to report two unusual cases of osteolysis with a ProDisc-L lumbar disc replacement—one in which the patient underwent TDR at the level superior to BMP-induced interbody fusion at L5-L6 and another who had similar osteolytic lesions after 1-level TDR without any exposure to BMP-2. Both patients underwent TDR with ProDisc-L [Synthes, West Chester, PA] prosthesis, which consists of an ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene (UHMWPE) core and two metallic endplates made of a cobalt-chromium (CoCr) alloy and plasma-coated on the outside with titanium, similar to the Charité [10]. However, unlike the Charité, the UHMWPE core of ProDisc-L is locked into the inferior endplate, thus allowing relative motion only between the UHMWPE core and the superior endplate. To our
knowledge, there have been no previous reports on complications associated with osteolysis with the use of ProDisc-L.

6.3 Materials & Methods

6.3.1 Patients and Clinical Information

Two patients who suffered from lumbar disc herniation and radiculopathy underwent surgery. One patient required multi-level treatment and opted for hybrid fixation with ProDisc-L TDR and fusion, while the other received 1-level ProDisc-L TDR. Both TDRs were extracted during revision surgery and periprosthetic tissue specimens selected from regions adjacent to the implant were obtained. Retrievals, operative notes and radiographs were de-identified and collected in accordance with an IRB-approved protocol.

6.3.2 Implant Retrieval Analysis

The two sets of retrieved components were cleaned in 10 % bleach and examined under a stereomicroscope equipped with a digital camera (Leica DFC490) to assess for surface damage and gross fracture. All components were inspected to identify surface damage mechanisms (plastic deformation, scratching, burnishing, pitting, and embedded debris). Damaged regions of the implants were analyzed using scanning electron microscopy (SEM; Supra 50 VP, Zeiss Peabody, MA, USA), energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) and x-ray fluorescence (XRF).

6.3.3 Tissue Preparation and Histological Analysis
Tissues collected from revision surgeries were fixed in Universal Tissue Fixative (Sakura Finetek USA, Inc., Torrance, CA, USA), and decalcified based on the presence of heterotopic ossification determined by microCT (μCT 80, Scanco Medical, Bru¨ttisellen, Switzerland). One to two 4-mm punches from each tissue, considering variations in color, texture, and size of specimen, were embedded in paraffin blocks for 6-lm serial sectioning and staining with Alcian blue (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA, USA), hematoxylin, and eosin (H&E) (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). Entire tissue sections were imaged under transmitted light microscopy using a Motic BA300POL microscope (Motic, Richmond, British Columbia, Canada), equipped with an elliptically polarized light imaging system and ProgRes SpeedXT core 5 (Jenoptik, Jena, Germany) microscope camera. Inflammatory cells were confirmed using the Wright-Giemsa stain (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA, USA). Tissues with notable chronic inflammation were examined using environmental scanning electron microscopy (ESEM; XL-30 ESEM-FEG, FEI Company, Hillsboro, OR, USA) with backscatter and were analyzed with EDS.

6.4 Case 1

A 40-year-old male suffering from discogenic collapse with lower back pain and radiculopathy at L5-S1 underwent anterior discectomy at L5-S1 and interbody arthrodesis with 17x24mm titanium-threaded fusion cages filled with BMP-2. The cages were inserted on each side of the vertebrae. A few months later, a posteriorly displaced cage, along with osteophyte formation and foraminal stenosis, required the
Figure 6-1. Sagittal (A) and axial (B) CT scans from case 1 illustrating discogenic herniation and osteolytic cysts at inferior L4 and superior L5. The axial scan also shows that there may be facet osteophytes and nerve root compression at the foramen.

Patient to undergo revision of the cage. Segmental pedicle screws were used to stabilize the cage on the right side; 6.5mm Xia (Stryker Spine, Allendale, NJ) pedicle screws were inserted at L5 and S1. Once the cages were locked, posterior interbody arthrodesis was then implemented at L5-S1 with the use of BMP-2 in two small sponges placed between each cage. One year later, with continued back pain and disc herniation at L4-L5, the patient opted for hybrid fixation and underwent anterior interbody placement of 12mm-large and 6-degree ProDisc-L (Synthes, West Chester, PA) prosthesis at L4-L5. The following year, the patient had removal of pedicle screw instrumentation at L5-S1 and there was solid fusion at the level. It may be important to note that the patient also required mass resection of osteophytes, other bony spurs and scar tissue.

Three years after fusion, persistent pain was experienced by the patient and severe arthropathy and degeneration was noted at right L4-L5. As the patient refused
to undergo disc removal and anterior fusion, posterior fusion was undertaken; 6.5mm screws were inserted and a PEEK rod was implemented at L4-L5, followed by posterolateral arthrodesis using local bone autograft, BMP-2, and DBX Demineralized Bone Matrix Allograft (Musculoskeletal Transplant Foundation, Edison, NJ). However, computed tomographic (CT) scans in the following year revealed osteolytic cysts at L4-L5 (Figure 6-1). The patient now consented to artificial disc removal. The PEEK rod stabilization system (2 PEEK rods and 4 pedicle screws) was removed and sent for retrieval analysis, along with the explanted artificial disc. Preoperative work up and intraoperative cultures ruled out infection. Tissue samples adjacent to the disc were also removed for histological analysis. After explantation of disc, the patient underwent spinal fusion with vertebral corpectomy. The area was filled and sealed with allograft bone and BMP-2. In the same year, pedicle screws were placed with rods for stabilization and posterior lateral arthrodesis was conducted with more local bone autograft and BMP-2. An overview of clinical information is provided in Table 6-1.

**Table 6-1. Clinical information for the hybrid case 1 & non-hybrid case 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implant</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at Implantation</th>
<th>Age at Revision</th>
<th>Primary Diagnosis</th>
<th>Revision Reason</th>
<th>Previous Surgeries</th>
<th>Implantation Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lumbar disc herniation, radiculopathy</td>
<td>Pain, osteolysis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Lumbar disc herniation, radiculopathy</td>
<td>Pain, subsidence, osteolysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.1 Device Retrieval Analysis

**Figure 6-2. Retrieved ProDisc-L TDR, 5 years after insertion.** The device was damaged during explantation. While it is unclear as to whether the polyethylene core was damaged in-vivo, there is no evidence of wear mechanisms on the end-plates.

The ProDisc-L prosthesis was retrieved five years after implantation. The polyethylene core was damaged during explantation, particularly the dome of the core (Figure 6-2). Due to iatrogenic damage, we could not determine if the rims of the polyethylene core experienced impingement with the superior endplate. While the backside surface also experienced iatrogenic damage, there was evidence of burnishing and scratching that occurred in vivo. There were no obvious signs of impingement on the metallic endplates, and the abrasive scratches were not patterned in any physiological manner, suggesting they were formed by surgical tools during device removal. Analysis using environmental scanning electron microscopy (ESEM) (XL-30 ESEM-FEG, FEI Company, Hillsboro, Oregon) and energy X-ray dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) revealed no abnormal surface deposits on the metallic endplates. As expected, x-ray fluorescence (XRF) scans consistently detected cobalt-
chromium ratios matching ASTM F-75 cobalt alloy weight-standards in the interior of the endplates, and the exterior plasma-coated elements consisted of alloy compositions seen in commercially pure titanium.

6.4.2 Tissue Analysis

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 6-3.** Bony tissue from case 1 stained with H&E (100X) showed necrotic bone with empty osteocyte lacunae (arrow) and necrotic marrow.

Periprosthetic tissues from this patient were obtained from two unclassified regions around the implant. Two tissue samples from one region were identified to be fibrocartilage, the other two samples from the second region were mature trabecular bone. One isolated region in the fibrocartilage tissue contained hemosiderin deposits and macrophages; consistent with an innate response to hemorrhage prior to explantation. There was no evidence of metal wear debris in any
tissues and only minor polyethylene debris was detected in isolated regions of the trabecular bone at a mean density of 1.13 particles/mm². In bony tissue samples, the fatty marrow in the intertrabecular spaces contained only a small number of viable cells; isolated regions of these samples consisted of necrotic bone marrow along with necrotic bone with empty osteocyte lacunae (Figure 6-3). An overview of tissue morphology is provided in Table 6-2.

6.5 Case 2

Figure 6-4. Sagittal (A) and axial (B) CT scans from case 2 showing L4 subsidence on the right side of the vertebra and one large osteolytic cyst in L5. Smaller osteolytic formations are also evident at superior L5.

A 56-year old male with a herniated disc and radiculopathy at L4-L5 underwent anterior TDR with a 10mm-large and 6-degree ProDisc-L. Three years after, subsidence of disc was noted at L4 on the right side, along with the formation of osteolytic cysts in CT scans at L5 that appear similar to the lesions seen in case 1 (Figure 6-4). Progressive back pain led to removal of ProDisc-L, followed by placement of 22mm PEEK interbody graft filled with BMP-2 for interbody fusion at
Table 6-2. An overview of tissue morphology for the two cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implant</th>
<th>Tissue Location</th>
<th>Degeneration</th>
<th>Bone/Cartilage</th>
<th>Hemosiderin</th>
<th>Innate/Adaptive Inflammation</th>
<th>PE Wear Debris (particles/mm²)</th>
<th>Metal Wear Debris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Region 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Region 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Lateral Annulus I</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No/Isolated</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Annulus II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Isolated/Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Lateral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>Moderate; Isolated</td>
<td>Moderate/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Spur I</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Isolated</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Spur II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior Lateral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Moderate/Yes</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior End Plate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Cyst</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Isolated/No</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Severe/Yes</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Cyst</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Isolated/No</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Severe/Yes</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Cyst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Severe/Yes</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intradiscal</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Isolated/Isolated</td>
<td>Moderate; Isolated</td>
<td>Severe/Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Intradiscal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Moderate/Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior Intradiscal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>Mild; Isolated</td>
<td>Moderate/Yes</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior Intradiscal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No/No</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exact tissue region of extraction is unknown.
L4-L5. Preoperative workup and intraoperative cultures were negative for infection.

6.5.1 Device Retrieval Analysis

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 6-5. Retrieved ProDisc-L TDR, 3 years after insertion. Note the signs of impingement on both endplates (arrows). The impinged region on the metallic plate (lower right) has a smooth surface compared to the unimpinged region (upper right).**

The ProDisc-L prosthesis was retrieved three years after implantation. There was clear evidence of chronic impingement between the endplates and burnishing at the core’s edge; microscopic scratches of fan-shaped pattern were found on the interior of the metallic plates and a glossy appearance on the polyethylene core, respectively (Figure 6-5). SEM images of the impinged regions showed a polished appearance in comparison to the as-manufactured texture seen in non-impinged regions of the metallic plate. The unidirectional and circumferential wear patterns seen on the endplates suggest the wear may have occurred during axial rotation and/or lateral bending of the articulating surfaces. The impingement was most likely due to implant subsidence which was observed by the surgeon during surgery. The
dome of the core also had evidence of multi-directional scratches and burnishing. There were no indications of fatigue wear or fracture of the polyethylene core. No abnormal surface deposits were observed by SEM/EDS analysis. XRF scans showed the metallic surface-constituents on the interior of the endplates consistently matched CoCr ratios seen in ASTM F-75 cobalt alloy standards, and the exterior of plates consisted of weight compositions seen in commercially pure titanium.

6.5.2 Tissue Analysis

![Figure 6-6. Histology of inner-cyst tissue with H/E stain showing mixed inflammation throughout. Inset A shows presence of macrophage-ingested metallic debris (H/E, 400X). Inset B shows presence of lymphocytes in the tissue (Wright-Giemsa, 400X).](image)

The periprosthetic tissues in this patient showed several abnormalities such as progressive degeneration, varied inflammation levels, and metal and polyethylene wear debris (Table 6-2). While degeneration was observed in tissues from various regions, inflammation was predominantly in the intradiscal and cyst tissue; there
Figure 6-7. Titanium alloy and cobalt-chrome particles (arrows) were confirmed by use of backscatter scanning electron microscopy with elemental dispersive spectroscopy. Analysis of a region of interest (square) evidenced cobalt as the most abundant metal visualized by scanning electron microscopy. Wt = weight; At = atomic weight

were no signs of inflammation in tissues from the lateral annulus, left lateral, lateral spur, superior end plate and anterior intradiscal regions. Cyst tissue from L5 regions showed signs of both innate and adaptive immune response; macrophage ingested metal-wear-debris was present throughout the tissue and isolated areas of lymphocytes were also present (Figure 6-6). Cyst and intradiscal tissues also contained hemosiderin deposits (not shown), suggesting a prior hemorrhage that may have contributed to or exacerbated the chronic inflammation. To confirm metallic wear debris, tissues with notable inflammation were examined by ESEM using backscatter and were analyzed with EDS. The particles from cyst and intradiscal tissues were predominantly cobalt and chromium, however titanium was also detected (Figure 6-7). Polyethylene wear debris was present in relatively low numbers in all cyst, posterior-intradiscal, anterior-intradiscal and posterior-lateral
tissues. The mean polyethylene particles in these tissues was 2.08 particles/mm². These particles varied from oval to amorphous in shape and were localized to regions of chronic inflammation (Figure 6-8).

Figure 6-8. An H/E stained region of left-cyst tissue was stained with Wright-Giemsa (A, 1000X) and observed under polarized light (B, 1000X), showing evidence of mixed inflammation and polyethylene particles, respectively.

6.6 Discussion

This study reported two unusual cases of osteolysis in TDR patients with a ProDisc-L. The first patient suffered from multi-level DDD and opted for hybrid fixation, while the second had a 1-level TDR. Both patients developed osteolytic lesions in vertebrae adjacent to the prostheses. Infection was ruled out in both cases.
Retrieval and histological analysis of the hybrid case showed minor amounts of wear, however tissue responses included fibrocartilage generation, heterotopic ossification, and necrosis due to inflammation. The second case showed signs of endplate impingement and adverse local tissue reactions (ALTRs) in intradiscal and cystic tissues. In this second, impingement case, the amount of polyethylene wear debris was relatively low, but there was CoCr wear debris and associated inflammation. In both cases, inflammatory tissue responses may have contributed to the osteolytic lesions.

One difference between the hybrid and non-hybrid case was the use of BMP-2. The hybrid patient was exposed to BMP-2 on five occasions, in comparison to the patient that had a 1-level TDR who received none. Although osteolysis was a late observation after BMP-2 application, the hybrid patient only sought medical attention due to pain. A number of tissue responses to BMP-2 have been noted after spine surgery including heterotopic ossification observed in the hybrid patient’s retrieved tissue [1, 7, 12]. Although previously believed to be asymptomatic, heterotopic ossification can lead to delayed neural compression and pain [7]. Furthermore, recent studies reported increased resorption rates with the use of BMP-2 around implants, raising the question whether BMP-2 contributes to osteolysis in regions adjacent to the fused segment [6, 14]. Authors have reported asymptomatic osteolysis after interbody fusion and attributed bone loss to endplate violation during disc space preparation and/or to overdosing of BMP-2 [11, 13, 17]. Whether BMP-2 has a dose-
responsive effect on the activation of osteolytic pathways remains unclear, since an optimal BMP-2 dose for fusions is still not agreed upon.

Osteolysis, along with tissue reactions involving mixed immune responses have been previously reported in a CHARITÉ by Kurtz et al. [9], but these devices consisted of polyethylene cores that were gamma-air-sterilized. ProDisc devices utilize conventional gamma-inert-sterilized polyethylene that has been previously reported in total joint replacements to significantly lower oxidation, wear debris generation and inflammation [5, 8]. ProDisc TDRs have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and only a limited number of complications have been documented with the use of either ProDisc-L or ProDisc-C. While hybrid fixation with ProDisc-L and fusion remains under clinical evaluation, there have been no previous reports of osteolysis with the use of ProDisc-L. However, with use of ProDisc-C for cervical TDR, one exceptional case of progressive osteolysis was reported and attributed to a possible immune-mediated metal sensitivity reaction [16].

In contrast to the minimal immune reaction in the hybrid case, there were substantial ALTRs in the intradiscal and cyst tissue of the non-hybrid case. Wear debris-induced inflammation is known to mediate osteolysis; thus, impingement and subsequent pro-inflammatory processes may explain the clinical symptoms and radiographic progression seen in the non-hybrid case [15]. All samples of cyst tissue showed signs of chronic inflammation and lymphocytic infiltration which were similar to ALTRs to metal ions from implant corrosion of metal-on-metal total hip
replacements (THRs) [3]. These findings suggest that ALTRs from THRs share some characteristics with the cyst tissue from the non-hybrid case.

The present study reported two rare osteolysis cases following implantation of the Prodisc-L. In one case, wear-debris induced inflammation; in the second case, inflammation induced heterotopic ossification. As surgeons incorporate ProDisc technology into their clinical practice, the rare complication of osteolysis and its occurrence should be taken into account when defining contraindications for spinal arthroplasty.

6.7 References


CHAPTER 7

Conclusions & Future Directions

7.1 Conclusions

This research was conducted to evaluate the present efficacy of TDR technology by performing retrieval analyses of revised implants and periprosthetic tissues. Much of what is known about conventional or gamma-inert-sterilized metal-on-UHMWPE TDRs was originally derived from in vitro simulations. However, given the extensive complexity of the musculoskeletal system, there is no in vitro testing, simulation or analytical modeling that can truly and fully predict the performance of these implants. Furthermore, in vivo testing of spinal implants in animal models to assess the interactions of the living tissue environment provide limited and subjective information on implant performance, tissue-implant interface and biocompatibility due to varied anatomy, healing rates and biomechanical environments. For this reason, it is hard to overstate the importance of implant retrieval analyses of implants and tissues, as they provide unique and crucial insights of in situ performance, along with vital information on mechanisms of both failure and success.

Implants and their corresponding tissue retrievals from eleven patients revised for TDRs were extensively studied and documented in this body of work. Despite the small sample size, this is presently the only research (to the author's knowledge) on contemporary TDR implant and corresponding tissue retrievals. This
study has uncovered several unknown issues related to UHMWPE wear generation and subsequent biological responses in the lumbar spine. Specifically, this dissertation addressed the following broad questions: (1) Are wear particles and associated biological reactions present in tissues from patients revised for painful gamma-inert sterilized TDRs and how do design and/or biomaterials of these newer TDRs compare to each other and previous devices? (2) Are UHMWPE wear debris and particle-induced inflammation linked to implant and/or clinical factors and are both associated with the production of inflammatory factors that can potentially contribute to the development of pain in TDR patients? (3) Is there a relationship between inflammation, vascularization and innervation in the periprosthetic lumbar spine and how do these wear-debris-induced morphological changes contribute to the pathogenesis of particle disease?

To answer the first question, fixed- and mobile-bearing implant retrievals and their corresponding tissues were evaluated. Not only was this investigation itself novel, but this was the first study to identify and quantify wear debris and corresponding biological reactions in periprosthetic tissues from contemporary gamma-inert-sterilized TDRs. UHMWPE wear particles were characterized and the number, size and shape were found to affect tissue inflammatory responses. Interestingly, no association was shown between wear debris generation and the TDR designs when comparing fixed- versus mobile-bearing devices. Overall, the current generation of contemporary TDRs were found to result in reduced wear debris generation and inflammatory reactions compared to historical or gamma-air-sterilized TDRs.
Investigating the immune response to UHMWPE wear particles by evaluating immunohistochemical markers of inflammatory pain resulted in some intriguing and unexpected results. First, given that malpositioning was a concern in a couple of revision patients, implant complications such as impingement and clinical factors such as implantation time were expected to affect the extent of biological responses; however, there was no indication of this based on correlation studies with the inflammatory pain factors. Interestingly, all six inflammatory factors were expressed to a greater extent in TDR patient tissues compared to IVD tissues from patients with no history of back pain. Factors were also more highly expressed in TDR patient tissues compared to DDD patients (with non-implant related pain). Further investigation revealed the interesting finding that separating TDR tissues with and without wear debris provided distinct differences in inflammatory factor expressions. Based on this finding, TDR patient tissues were pooled and wear particle number was found to be correlated with TNFα, IL-1β, VEGF, NGF and Substance P, but not PDGFβb. Given that macrophages have the potential to secrete all of the above factors, their numbers were quantified and also found to be correlated with the expression of these five factors. Taken together, this report was the first to show that UHMWPE wear debris and subsequent inflammation in the periprosthetic spine may lead to the production of factors that are directly associated with inflammatory pain and nociception.

These results led us to identify the potential missing links that can connect wear-debris induced inflammation to pain: vascularization and innervation. Building on the hypothesis that in-growing blood vessels are providing a conduit for
nerve fibers, it was found that all of the aforementioned inflammatory pain factors correlated with increasing numbers of blood vessels. Additionally, the innervating factors NGF and SP (which are primarily be secreted by neurons) were localized to the vascular channels. Lastly, comparing blood vessel number with factor expression and macrophage number in images from tissue sections with low and high vascularity suggested the possibility of a temporal link between increased inflammatory factors, macrophages and angiogenesis. Even though this study does not provide evidence for the presence of actual nerves or pain in the discal regions, unveiling and linking wear-induced inflammation and innervation factors with associated morphological changes of increased vascularization provides an important insight in the pathology that may directly contribute to pain sensitization.

The data generated from this study provide crucial insight into the spectrum of neuroimmunological responses to UHMWPE wear debris, and help to identify biological pathways associated with pain that can be targeted to potentially prevent the need for TDR revision surgery. It is worth noting that the TDR hardware from all of the patients in this study were relatively uncompromised from a mechanical standpoint, and thus, finding ways to either minimize wear-debris generation even further and/or inhibiting wear-induced inflammatory cascades will be invaluable to the field of total disc arthroplasty to improve clinical outcomes.

7.2 Implications & Future Directions

7.2.1 Therapeutic Strategies for Treatment
A better understanding of the pathogenesis of inflammatory particle disease in the spine, provided the TDR hardware remains mechanically uncompromised, allows the potential to develop novel therapeutic strategies to inhibit and/or mitigate pain sensitization. The importance of alleviating wear-debris associated pain in TDR patients is to improve the overall longevity of TDR implants and avoid complex and high-risk revision surgical procedures. Based on the findings embodied in this dissertation, these strategies include: (1) modulation of macrophage phenotype; (2) local inhibition of TNFα; and (3) local inhibition of VEGF.

Macrophages, like other immune cells, have various phenotypes or polarization states. As such, macrophages are involved in not only innate inflammation and adaptive immunity, but also tissue repair/regeneration. Thus, modulation of the macrophage polarization state could provide a target for therapeutic intervention of particle-disease-induced pain. In our study, the significant amounts of TNFα and IL-1β, in conjunction with a high ratio of VEGF to PDGBbb in TDR periprosthetic tissues, suggested that M1 macrophage pro-inflammatory responses predominated over anti-inflammatory/healing responses driven by M2 macrophages (see Chapter 4). A number of joint replacement studies have also reported similar findings suggesting an M1 rather than an M2 response in periprosthetic tissues [1, 3, 5-7, 14, 16, 20, 21]. Furthermore, preliminary in vitro and in vivo prospective investigations on the modulation of macrophage polarization from an M1 to an M2 response have reported favorable outcomes. Specifically, the addition of interleukin-4 (IL-4) to cultured human peripheral blood monocytes, which had been activated by wear particles, promoted macrophage
polarization from M1 to M2 and reduced the production of pro-inflammatory factors TNFα, IL-1β and interleukin-6 (IL-6) [4, 15]. In a separate 
in vitro study, the addition of IL-4 to cultured monocytes reduced TNF-α production as the macrophage phenotype was sequentially converted from a neutral M0 phenotype to M1 and then to an M2 phenotype [10], suggesting IL-4 treatment is effective on infiltrating or activated macrophages rather than modulating resident macrophages that are neutral [13]. Consistent with 
in vitro findings, recent in vivo studies using rodent models to investigate particle-induced inflammation and osteolysis also showed IL-4 treatment suppressed TNFα production and attenuated bone resorption [11, 17].

While more research is certainly necessary (especially in the spine) to clearly understand macrophage polarization in regards to implant wear debris, early IL-4 studies provide evidence that it may be possible to suppress or attenuate wear-debris-induced inflammation and thus down-stream responses that lead to pain.

While the above studies showed that modulating macrophage polarization also suppresses TNFα production, this potent pro-inflammatory cytokine can serve as an attractive therapeutic target by itself in the spine. In our study, TNFα production in TDR periprosthetic tissues was integrally associated with wear-induced inflammatory pain, as it was strongly correlated with the number of wear particles, CD68+ macrophages, blood vessels and the presence of the neural innervation and hypersensitization agents, NGF and substance P (see Chapter 4 & 5). Furthermore, TNFα showed a progressive correlation with low and high vascularity, suggesting that it may be playing an essential role in regulating the angiogenetic progression/innervation that can contribute to pain sensitization. Hence, TNFα
inhibitors or blockers may be effective in inhibiting or suppressing wear-induced inflammatory reactions that lead to pain. A number of TNFα blockers have already been cleared by the FDA and deemed effective for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis (RA), a disease characterized by inflammation and pain. Some of the commonly used drugs that block TNFα binding to its receptor include infliximab, etanercept and adalimumab, all of which have been shown to successfully reduce inflammation in randomized double-blind placebo-controlled studies [2, 8, 18, 19]. More recently, these inhibitors have been used to decrease inflammation in a number of autoimmune diseases besides RA [12]. Given the relatively low and infrequent side effects of these drugs (compared to other immunosuppressive and cytotoxic agents) [12], future research investigating their therapeutic potential in the periprosthetic spine may be warranted.

Although inflammation is the driving force of wear-induced adverse reactions, this body of work showed vascularization is arguably the most important link that is specific to the pain-associated pathogenesis of particle disease in the lumbar spine; and thus can serve as a relatively new avenue of research for therapeutic intervention. In this regard, the angiogenic factor VEGF, like TNFα, was strongly correlated with the number of wear particles, CD68+ macrophages, blood vessels and with the presence of the neural innervation and hypersensitization agents, NGF and substance P (see Chapter 4 & 5). Furthermore, VEGF was not only produced by inflammatory cells including fibroblasts and macrophages, but it was also produced by endothelial cells. Hence, it can be hypothesized that VEGF inhibitors would reduce blood vessel ingrowth and presumably innervation in
periprosthetic spine tissues. Although FDA-approved VEGF inhibitors like bevacizumab have been well-established to inhibit angiogenesis in ovarian cancer [9], there is a dearth of knowledge on their use in the context of inflammatory-mediated pain, and therefore warrants future attention.

### 7.2.2 Cervical Total Disc Replacement

The systematic review presented in *Chapter 2* showcased current cervical retrieval studies of metal-on-polymer TDRs with fixed-bearing designs reporting similar outcomes of wear debris generation and tissue responses to lumbar TDRs. However, this was only based on five studies with very limited sample sizes and study designs; there still exists a scarcity of data to clearly understand implant wear debris generation and biological responses that are specific to the cervical spine. Interestingly, as of the time of this writing, only one lumbar, but five cervical disc artificial disc designs have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). This raises the question of whether artificial disc replacements fare better in cervical regions. Cervical segments and discs are anatomically smaller and biomechanically experience less stresses and movements than lumbar regions [22]. Whereas, the vertebral bodies of the lumbar spine are much larger and transversely wider in order to withstand and transmit discal loads that are substantially greater than the cervical regions. For this reason, it can be hypothesized that the clinical wear performance of cervical TDRs may possibly be superior to lumbar devices. Considering that chronic neck pain can be just as debilitating as lower back pain,
extrapolating both the pitfalls and successes of lumbar TDR technology to the cervical regions could prove very valuable.
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Appendix

1. Relevant MATLAB Scripts

1-1. Polarized Light Input File

%polyprocess.m

%% Automated Selection of DAB-labeled Tissue
% By SYV

%script to segment polyethylene from background
%read the fully polarized and brightfield images
iorig = imread('filename.jpg');
ibf = imread('filename.jpg');

%part1: polarized particle masking
%select the 'blue' channel
p1 = iorig(:,:,3);

%threshold the blue channel
%note: the .2 is image dependent, seems to work ok. Range is from 0 to 1
pth = im2bw(p1,1.0);

%remove 'small objects' that are camera noise
%NOTE, 'nthresh' is camera/imaging dependent!
%When you correctly perform Black/White References, this value can be set
to 0.
nthresh = 00;
apth = bwareaopen(pth,nthresh);

%build new RGB image for displaying only poly particles
for i=1:3, nap(:,:,i) = uint8(apth).*iorig(:,:,i);end

%display poly segmented image
%here is your chance to change nthresh accordingly
%imshow(nap); inactivate this line to get rid of the first image

%count poly pixels (area of poly)
inap = rgb2gray(nap);
ppix = sum(sum(apth));

%part2: brightfield masking
gibf = rgb2gray(ibf);

%threshold, note: must select value, 0.75 seems to work
% the ~ inverts the image to make tissue white
gibfth = ~im2bw(gibf,.8);

% count 'tissue' pixels
tpix = sum(sum(gibfth));

% easy to compute poly vs. tissue region ratio and display result
ratiopoly = ppix / tpix;

% display poly and tissue maps
% figure, imshow(apth*29 + gibfth*61,colorcube);

[L,num] = bwlabel(apth,8);
pnum = num;

% Enable these two command lines if you want to look at original polarized light an brightfield.
% figure, imshow(L);
% figure, imshow(iorig);

imwrite(L, 'filename.jpg');
imwrite(apth*29 + gibfth*61,colorcube, 'filename.jpg');

subplot(2,2,1), subimage(iorig)
subplot(2,2,2), subimage(L)
% subplot(2,2,3), subimage(ibf)
% subplot(2,2,4), subimage(apth*29 + gibfth*61,colorcube)

1-2. DAB Quantification Input File

% DAB.m

%% Automated Selection of DAB-labeled Tissue
% By SYV

close all

%% Load in images and process
files = dir('filename.jpg');
for k = 1:(numel(files))
    OrigImg=imread(files(k).name);
    % Splitting the image into R, G, and B matrices
    R=OrigImg(:,:,1); % The first page is red
    G=OrigImg(:,:,2); % The second page is green
    B=OrigImg(:,:,3); % The third page is blue
    BN=(255*((B)./(0.9*(R+G+B)))); % Normalizing (see Ref. Brey et al., 2003); Use 80-90% RGB if tissue is over-stained; Use 90-99% B if tissue is under-stained, but stay consistent between stains
    %BNinv=sum(255-BN,3); % Inverted image to highlight DAB-labeling
%Save processed image
imwrite(BN,[ 'filename.jpg' files(k).name]);
end

%% To view a processed image

%ProcImg = imread('filename.jpg');
figure,hold on
imshow(ProcImg);
hold off

2. Relevant ImageJ Macros

2-1. Macro for Area Analysis of Transmitted Light Images

run("8-bit");

run("Set Scale...", "distance=3.887 known=1 pixel=1 unit=µm");

setThreshold(100, 200);

//run("Threshold...");

run("Measure");

2-2. Macro for Particle Analysis of Processed Polarized Light Images

//Run only on 20X Polarized Light Images post-Matlab.
run("8-bit");

//run("Threshold...");
setAutoThreshold("Default");
//run("Threshold...");
run("Convert to Mask");
//The following commands set the appropriate scales of pixels/µm. The default distance=3.887 for 20X images. Then a second threshold is performed to prepare for the particle analysis.

run("Set Scale...", "distance=3.887 known=1 pixel=1 unit=µm");
//run("Threshold...");
setAutoThreshold("Default dark");

run("Set Measurements...", "area centroid standard perimeter fit shape area_fraction display redirect=None decimal=3");

//To use the right analysis, remove the "//" from the beginning of the “run” command.

//Line for All Particles (ECD)
run("Analyze Particles...", "size=0.2298-Infinity circularity=0.00-1.00 show=Outlines display exclude summarize");

//Line for particles less than 1 µm (ECD)
//run("Analyze Particles...", "size=0.2298-0.785 circularity=0.00-1.00 show=Outlines display exclude summarize");

//Line for particles less between 1 and 10 µm (ECD)
//run("Analyze Particles...", "size=0.785-78.53 circularity=0.00-1.00 show=Outlines display exclude summarize");

//Line for particles greater than 10 µm (ECD)
//run("Analyze Particles...", "size=78.53-Infinity circularity=0.00-1.00 show=Outlines display exclude summarize");

III. Relevant Image-Pro Plus Macro

3-1. Macro for Automated CD68+ DAB-Stained Cells

Sub macrophage()
Dim x As Integer

Dim DocId As Integer

For x = 1 To 50

    ret = IpDocGet(GETACTDOC, 0, DocId)

    ret = IpCmChannelExtract(CM_RGB, CM_RGB, 2)

    ret = IpBlbShow(1)

    ret = IpSegSetRange(0, 0, 100)

    ret = IpSegPreview(CURRENT_C_T)

    ret = IpBlbEnableMeas(BLBM_ROUNDNESS, 1)

    ret = IpBlbSetFilterRange(BLBM_ROUNDNESS, 0.1, 7.0)

    ret = IpBlbSetFilterRange(BLBM_AREA, 50.0, 200000.0)

    ret = IpBlbCount()

    ret = IpBlbUpdate(0)

    ret = IpBlbSplitObjects(1)

    ret = IpDcShow(1)

    ret = IpDcShow(3)

    ret = IpDcSelect("Image", "Name", 0)

    ret = IpDcSelect("Count_Size", "Count", 0)
ret = IpDcShow(1)

ret = IpDcSet(DC.AUTO, 0)

ret = IpDcUpdate(DC.FETCH)

ret = IpDocClose()

ret = IpDocCloseEx(DocId)

Next x

End Sub