



Received: 18-12-2024  
Accepted: 28-01-2025

## International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

### Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: An Update on the Epidemiology, Diagnosis and Operative Complication

<sup>1</sup>Md. Mahabub Alam, <sup>2</sup>Tajuddin Molla, <sup>3</sup>Md. Shahidul Islam Akon, <sup>4</sup>Md. Shah Alam, <sup>5</sup>Syed Ariful Islam

<sup>1</sup> Medical Officer, Department of Orthopaedic and Traumatology, Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor (c.c), Department of Orthopaedic and Traumatology, Dhaka National Medical College, Bangladesh

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Orthopaedic and Traumatology, Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh

<sup>4</sup> Professor, Department of Orthopaedic and Traumatology, Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh

<sup>5</sup> Medical Officer, Department of Orthopaedic and Traumatology, Chittagong Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2025.5.1.3735>

Corresponding Author: **Md. Mahabub Alam**

#### Abstract

##### Background

Lumbar spinal canal stenosis is one of the most important causes of Low Back Pain & it is the frequent cause of disability. When conservative treatments fail, surgery is the only way to treat this patients & different surgical procedure are there. Posterior decompression by Laminotomy, Laminectomy, Foraminotomy is common operation for spinal canal stenosis in our country.

##### Objective

The aim of this study was to assess the epidemiology, clinical feature, diagnosis and operative complication of the lumbar spinal stenosis patients.

##### Methods

This Prospective Interventional Study study was carried out among 28 patients attending at the department of Orthopaedic Surgery at Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh Spine & Orthopaedic Hospital (BSOH), Al-Manar Hospital Ltd, Dhaka for the treatment of lumbar spinal canal stenosis within the defined period from January 2022 to December 2022. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of DMCH. Purposive sampling was done according to availability of the patients. Statistical analyses of the results were obtained

by using window based computer software devised with Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS-20.1).

##### Results

Mean age of the patients was 51.32±8.29 years and the ranges were 40-70 years where maximum belonged to 40-49 years of age (42.86%). Greater part of the patients was female 60.71% with a female: Male ratio 1.6 :1. Maximum patients were Housewife 57.14% and manual worker 32.14%. All of the study patients had low back pain and 85.71% had leg pain. 92.86% patients had Neurogenic claudication. Motor weakness in lower extremities were seen in 22 patients (78.57%) & Sensory changes were seen in 21 patients (75.00%). Most commonly involved intervertebral disc level was L4/L5 (39.29%) & less in L2/3, 3/4 (3.57%). operative complications were seen in 2 patients (7.14%) where in 2 patients (7.14%) developed superficial wound infection post-operatively.

##### Conclusion

Lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) is a common spinal disorder in the older population. All of the study patients had low back pain. Most commonly involved intervertebral disc level was L4/L5. Operative complications were seen in only 2 patients.

**Keywords:** Lumbar Spinal Stenosis, Epidemiology, Clinical Feature

#### Introduction

Approximately 75% to 80% of the adult population may experience low back pain (LBP) at least once in their lifetime <sup>[1]</sup>. The common musculoskeletal condition which affects adult population today is Low back pain (LBP). Chronic LBP (CLBP) is a syndrome in which there is pain in lower back region, which lasts minimum 12 weeks. Degenerative lumbar spine disorders comprise the major proportion of etiology of chronic low back pain in adult population, which often leads to serious disability to carry out daily routine activities. These conditions are often managed initially using conservative treatment like NSAIDs,

rest, muscle strengthening exercises, lumbosacral brace [2]. The management options for patients with degenerative lumbar disease have evolved over the decades with variable results of the different options published globally [3].

## Materials & Method

This Prospective Interventional Study study was carried out among 28 patients attending at the department of Orthopaedic Surgery at Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh Spine & Orthopaedic Hospital (BSOH), Al-Manar Hospital Ltd, Dhaka for the treatment of lumbar spinal canal stenosis within the defined period from January 2022 to December 2022. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of DMCH. Purposive sampling was done according to availability of the patients. The collected data were entered into the computer and analyzed by using SPSS (version 20.1) to assess the epidemiology, clinical feature, diagnosis and treatment of the lumbar spinal stenosis patients.

## Results

Mean age of the patients was  $51.32 \pm 8.29$  years and the ranges were 40-70 years where maximum belonged to 40-49 years of age (42.86%) (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Distribution of the study patients (n=28)

| Age (years) | Number | percentage |
|-------------|--------|------------|
| 40-49       | 12     | 42.86%     |
| 50-59       | 9      | 32.14%     |
| ≥60         | 7      | 25%        |
| Total       | 28     | 100%       |

Greater part of the patients was female 60.71% with a female: Male ratio 1.6 :1. (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Gender distribution of the study population (n=28)

| Gender | Number | percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Female | 17     | 60.71%     |
| Male   | 11     | 39.29%     |
| Total  | 28     | 100%       |

Maximum patients were Housewife 57.14% and manual worker 32.14% (Table 3).

**Table 3:** Occupation of the study population (n=28)

| Occupation       | Number | percentage |
|------------------|--------|------------|
| Manual worker    | 9      | 32.14%     |
| Housewife        | 16     | 57.14%     |
| Sedentary worker | 3      | 10.72%     |
| Total            | 28     | 100%       |

All of the study patients had low back pain and 85.71% had leg pain. 92.86% patients had Neurogenic claudication. Motor weakness in lower extremities were seen in 22 patients (78.57%) & Sensory changes were seen in 21 patients (75.00%) (Table 4).

**Table 4:** Clinical manifestations of the study population (n=28)

| Clinical manifestations* | Frequency (n) | percentage |
|--------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Low back pain            | 28            | 100        |
| Leg pain                 | 24            | 85.71      |
| Neurogenic claudication  | 26            | 92.86      |
| Motor weakness           | 22            | 78.57      |
| Sensory disturbances     | 21            | 75.00      |

Most commonly involved intervertebral disc level was L4/L5 (39.29%) & less in L2/3, 3/4 (3.57%) (Table 5).

**Table 5:** Level of intervertebral disc space involvement of the study population (n= 28)

| Disc space        | Frequency (n) | percentage |
|-------------------|---------------|------------|
| L3/4,4/5,5/S1     | 7             | 25         |
| L4/5, L5/S1       | 2             | 7.14       |
| L3/4              | 1             | 3.57       |
| L4/5              | 11            | 39.29      |
| L5/S1             | 5             | 17.86      |
| L2/3,3/4,4/5,5/S1 | 1             | 3.57       |
| Total             | 28            | 100        |

Operative complications were seen in 2 patients (7.14%) wherein 2 patients (7.14%) developed superficial wound infection post-operatively. (Table 6)

**Table 6:** Operative complications of the study population (n=28)

| Operative complications     | Frequency (n) | percentage |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Superficial wound infection | 2             | 7.14       |
| Damage to the dura          | 0             | 0          |
| Nerve root injury           | 0             | 0          |
| Total                       | 2             | 7.14       |

## Discussion

In our study mean age of the patients was  $51.32 \pm 8.29$  years and the range were 40-70 where maximum belonged to 40-49 years of age (42.86%). Similar result was found by Murthy & Reddy (2016) where maximum patients were in the age group of 41-50 years (36.7%) followed by 51-60 years (33.3%) [4]. In our study greater part of the patients were female 60.71% with a female: Male ratio 1.6 :1. Murthy & Reddy (2016) found male 46.7% and female 53.3% which is almost similar to our study [4]. In our study maximum patients were Housewife 57.14% and manual worker 32.14%. Hossain *et al.* (2021) in their study found 65% patients were housewife & 20% patients were sedentary worker and 15% patients were manual worker [5]. Almost similar result was found by Aziz & Aziz 2022 [6].

Regarding clinical manifestation, all of the study patients had low back pain and 85.71% had leg pain. 92.86% patients had Neurogenic claudication. Motor weakness in lower extremities were seen in 22 patients (78.57%) & Sensory changes were seen in 21 patients (75.00%). Almost similar findings were observed by Hossain *et al.* (2021) where 100% patient had LBP, 85% had radiculopathy and 70% patient had both sensory & motor involvement [5].

In our study, 60.72% patients had only a single level involvement while 39.28% patients had multi-level involvement. Murthy & Reddy 2016 found nearly similar result where single level involvement was 80% & multilevel was 20% [4]. Hossain *et al.* 2021 in their study found 3 patient of desiccated disc and 17 patients of degenerated spondylolisthesis. Among desiccated disc, 1 patient at L3/L4, 1 patient at L4/L5 and 1 patient at L5/S1. Among spondylolisthesis 10 patient at L4/L5 and 7 patients at L5/S1 [6]. In our study we also found 12 patients spondylolisthesis at L4/L5 and 7 patients at L5/S1 which almost similar. Operative complications were seen in 2 patients (7.14%) where in 2 patients (7.14%) developed superficial wound infection post-operatively. Okuda *et al.* (2006) in their study found only 1 (0.4%) patient developed superficial wound infection [7].

## Conclusion

Lumbar spinal stenosis (LSS) is a common spinal disorder in the older population. All of the study patients had low back pain. Most commonly involved intervertebral disc level was L4/L5. Operative complications were seen in only 2 patients.

## Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the entire staff of department of Orthopaedic Surgery at Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh Spine & Orthopaedic Hospital (BSOH), Al-Manar Hospital Ltd, during the study period.

## Conflict of Interest

Authors declare no conflict of Interest.

## References

1. Meng B, Bunch J, Burton D, Wang J. Lumbar interbody fusion: Recent advances in surgical techniques and bone healing strategies, *European Spine Journal*, 2020. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-020-06596-0>.
2. Saini R, Jain M, Sharma A, Yadav AK. Outcome of posterior lumbar interbody fusion using cage, combined with posterior instrumentation. *International Journal of Orthopaedics*. 2020; 6(1):611-615.
3. Ndubuisi CA, *et al.* Outcome of posterior lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative lumbar spine spondylolisthesis in a neurosurgical centre in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Medicine*. 2021; 30(3):288.
4. Murthy H, Reddy TV. Short term clinical and functional outcome after posterior lumbar inter body fusion in cases of lumbar canal stenosis by using RODI score assessment. *Indian Journal of Orthopaedics Surgery*. 2016; 2(3):280-284.
5. Hossain MA, Uddin MJ, Rahman MT, Islam MK, Faisal MA. Evaluation of Treatment of Degenerative Disc Disease by Posterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion with Cage and Bone Graft, *IOSR-JDMS*. 2021; 20:51-60.
6. Aziz AMA, Aziz AIA. Short-term functional evaluation of posterior lumbar interbody fusion done for degenerative spondylolisthesis at L4–L5 level. *Journal of Orthopedics, Traumatology and Rehabilitation*. 2020; 12(1):17.
7. Okuda S, Miyauchi A, Oda T, Haku T, Yamamoto T, Iwasaki M. Surgical complications of posterior lumbar interbody fusion with total facetectomy in 251 patients. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2006; 4(4):304-309.