Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2025; 5(4):1134-1138

Received: 15-06-2025
Accepted: 25-07-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Lumbar Arthroplasty in Degenerative Disc Disease: A Systematic Review of Diagnostic Criteria, Surgical Techniques, Postoperative Management, and Functional Outcomes

[1] João Gabriel Ventura Bariani, [2] Káren Araújo Rodrigues, [3] Joyce Matias Da Silva, [4] Jailson Barros Silveira, [5] Victoria Alves Melo, [6] Matheus Santos Machado, [7] Mário Augusto Silva Pereira, [8] Eduardo Menezes De Lima Filho, [9] Guilherme Luciano Rocha De Oliveira Gomes, [10] Vinícius Vieira Dos Reis

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10] Department of Orthopedics and Traumatology, HUGO – Hospital de Urgências de Goiânia, Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2025.5.4.4733
Corresponding Author: **João Gabriel Ventura Bariani**

Abstract

Introduction: Lumbar degenerative disc disease (DDD) is a major cause of chronic low back pain and functional limitation among adults. While spinal fusion has been the traditional surgical approach for advanced DDD, lumbar arthroplasty including total disc replacement (TDR) and facet joint replacement has emerged as a motion-preserving alternative aimed at restoring segmental mobility and reducing adjacent segment degeneration.

Objective: This systematic review aims to evaluate the current evidence on the diagnostic criteria, surgical management, postoperative care, and functional outcomes associated with lumbar arthroplasty procedures in patients with symptomatic DDD.

Methods: The review followed PRISMA guidelines. A structured search was conducted in PubMed, Scopus, Embase, and Web of Science to identify studies published between January 2000 and July 2025. Inclusion criteria comprised randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and systematic reviews involving adult patients undergoing TDR, facet arthroplasty, or hybrid procedures. Two independent reviewers conducted data extraction and quality appraisal using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool and Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. Data were synthesized narratively due to heterogeneity among studies.

Results: Thirty-seven high-quality studies were included. Diagnostic confirmation relied on clinical and radiological indicators such as axial low back pain, Modic changes, disc height loss, and MRI or CT findings. Surgical interventions using prostheses like ProDisc-L, Charité, and TOPS demonstrated efficacy in maintaining motion, reducing pain (VAS), and improving functional indices (ODI). Postoperative strategies prioritized early mobilization, physiotherapy, and radiographic monitoring. Complication rates were comparable or lower than fusion, and outcomes were favorable up to 10 years postoperatively.

Conclusion: Lumbar arthroplasty is a safe and effective surgical option for selected patients with DDD. When guided by appropriate diagnostic protocols and applied within evidence-based indications, motion-preserving surgery offers significant improvements in pain, function, and quality of life. Future longitudinal studies and refinement of patient selection criteria are essential to optimize long-term success.

Keywords: Intervertebral Disc Displacement, Arthroplasty, Replacement, Lumbar Vertebrae, Postoperative Care, Range of Motion, Articular

1. Introduction

Lumbar degenerative disc disease (DDD) remains a leading cause of chronic low back pain and disability in the working-age population, with considerable socioeconomic and quality-of-life implications worldwide. This condition is characterized by structural deterioration of the intervertebral disc, often associated with biochemical degeneration, annular fissures, disc space narrowing, and loss of segmental motion control. Clinically, patients may present with axial pain, reduced functional capacity, and varying degrees of radiculopathy, frequently unresponsive to conservative therapy after several months [1-3].

Historically, lumbar fusion has been the mainstay of surgical management in cases of symptomatic DDD refractory to

non-operative treatment. Although effective in stabilizing pathological motion segments and alleviating symptoms, fusion is intrinsically associated with loss of mobility and has been implicated in the development of adjacent segment degeneration (ASD) over time. This phenomenon, in which biomechanical stress is redistributed to adjacent non-fused segments, can lead to accelerated degeneration and may necessitate further surgical intervention [4, 5].

In response to the limitations of fusion, lumbar arthroplasty techniques have been developed to preserve spinal motion and restore physiological segmental biomechanics. Total disc replacement (TDR), in particular, emerged as a motion-preserving alternative aimed at maintaining disc height, restoring kinematic function, and potentially minimizing ASD. Devices such as the ProDisc-L, Charité, and activL disc prostheses have demonstrated promising outcomes in terms of pain reduction, functional improvement, and radiographic stability in both short- and long-term follow-ups [6–8]. Unlike fusion, which aims to eliminate motion at a pathological segment, TDR attempts to replicate the natural movement of the spine through artificial intervertebral devices that allow controlled flexion-extension, lateral bending, and axial rotation [1, 6].

Despite the increasing adoption of TDR, clinical practice remains heterogeneous regarding patient selection, surgical indications, and outcome measures. Additionally, recent advances in motion-preserving spinal surgery have introduced posterior-based technologies, including facet joint arthroplasty and hybrid procedures combining disc replacement with posterior dynamic stabilization. These innovations have further expanded the indications for arthroplasty and generated new questions regarding long-term effectiveness, complication profiles, and optimal surgical strategies [5, 7].

Given the rapid evolution of implant designs, surgical techniques, and biomechanical paradigms in lumbar arthroplasty, a comprehensive review of the available literature is warranted. This systematic review seeks to integrate current evidence regarding diagnostic criteria, surgical approaches, postoperative management, and functional outcomes of lumbar disc and facet arthroplasty in adult patients with degenerative spinal disease.

2. Methodology

This systematic review was developed based on the guidelines proposed by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA), ensuring methodological rigor, transparency, and reproducibility. The objective was to gather, evaluate, and synthesize scientific evidence related to lumbar spine arthroplasty, particularly total disc replacement (TDR), facet joint replacement, and hybrid motion-preserving strategies, in the context of degenerative disc disease (DDD).

The first stage involved the formulation of a focused research question, structured according to the PICOS framework (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, Study design). The population included adult patients diagnosed with symptomatic lumbar DDD; the interventions were lumbar TDR or facet arthroplasty; comparisons, where applicable, involved spinal fusion or conservative treatment; outcomes included clinical, functional, and radiographic results; and eligible study designs were randomized controlled trials (RCTs), prospective or retrospective cohort studies, and systematic reviews.

The second stage was the literature search, which involved a comprehensive and systematic query of four electronic databases: PubMed (MEDLINE), Embase, Scopus, and Web of Science. The search included studies published between January 2000 and July 2025 to ensure both historical and current data were captured. A combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms was used to maximize sensitivity. Search strings included terms such as “lumbar disc replacement,” “lumbar arthroplasty,” “degenerative disc disease,” “facet replacement,” “motion preservation,” and “total disc prosthesis.” Boolean operators ("AND," "OR") structured the search logic to retrieve all relevant records. To increase coverage, reference lists of included studies were also screened manually for additional articles not identified through database queries.

In the third stage, all retrieved records were exported to a reference management tool, and duplicates were removed. Two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts based on pre-established inclusion and exclusion criteria. Eligible studies were then reviewed in full text. Inclusion criteria were: (1) studies involving adult patients (≥18 years) with confirmed lumbar DDD; (2) interventions involving lumbar TDR, facet arthroplasty, or combined/hybrid surgical strategies; (3) studies reporting at least one clinical or radiological outcome (e.g., pain, function, ROM, complications); and (4) studies designed as RCTs, controlled clinical trials, cohort studies, case-control studies, or systematic reviews. Exclusion criteria included: (1) case series with fewer than 10 patients; (2) biomechanical or in vitro studies without clinical follow-up; (3) studies limited to cervical or thoracic spine; (4) editorials, letters, conference abstracts without full data; and (5) non-peer-reviewed publications.

Once eligible studies were selected, the fourth stage consisted of data extraction. A standardized extraction form was used to collect relevant information from each study, including: authorship, publication year, country, study design, sample size, patient demographics, type of intervention and prosthesis, comparison groups (if applicable), duration of follow-up, outcome measures (e.g., Oswestry Disability Index [ODI], Visual Analog Scale [VAS], range of motion [ROM]), reported complications, and conclusions. This systematic extraction ensured uniformity in the data collected across all included studies.

In the fifth stage, the risk of bias and methodological quality of the included studies were assessed. For randomized controlled trials, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was applied, evaluating domains such as random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, incomplete outcome data, and selective reporting. For non-randomized observational studies, the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was employed, which assesses selection of participants, comparability between groups, and adequacy of outcome assessment. Discrepancies in scoring were resolved through consensus between the two reviewers or adjudicated by a third reviewer.

Finally, in the sixth stage, the results were synthesized and interpreted. Due to the heterogeneity in study designs, patient populations, surgical techniques, follow-up periods, and outcome reporting, a narrative synthesis approach was adopted rather than meta-analysis. Studies were grouped and analyzed according to four thematic categories: (1) diagnostic criteria and patient selection for lumbar

arthroplasty; (2) surgical procedures and implant designs; (3) postoperative management and rehabilitation protocols; and (4) clinical, functional, and radiographic outcomes. Patterns of convergence and divergence among the findings were identified, and the strength of evidence supporting each category was evaluated qualitatively based on the quality and consistency of the included studies.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Diagnostic Considerations

Lumbar spine arthroplasty is indicated primarily in patients with symptomatic lumbar degenerative disc disease (DDD) who have not responded to comprehensive conservative management for a minimum of six months. Clinical features typically include persistent axial low back pain, which may or may not radiate, and is often exacerbated by lumbar flexion, prolonged sitting, or static postures [1–3].

Radiological assessment is crucial for accurate diagnosis and patient selection. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) remains the gold standard for identifying disc desiccation, Modic changes, annular tears, and nerve root compression. It also provides essential information regarding the condition of the adjacent vertebral endplates and facet joints [2–4]. Dynamic flexion-extension radiographs help evaluate segmental instability, while upright standing radiographs allow assessment of sagittal alignment [3, 4].

The presence of instability beyond grade I spondylolisthesis, significant facet arthropathy, severe central canal stenosis, or deformity may constitute contraindications to arthroplasty [5–7]. In these cases, alternative surgical approaches such as fusion or hybrid procedures may be considered more appropriate. CT scans provide additional insights into bony anatomy, particularly facet joint morphology and osteophyte formation [6, 8].

Although controversial, discography may be employed in selected cases to confirm the symptomatic level, especially when imaging findings are equivocal or multiple degenerative levels are present [8]. However, due to its invasiveness and risk of exacerbating symptoms, discography should be reserved for carefully selected cases and interpreted in conjunction with clinical and radiological data.

Precise diagnosis and rigorous selection criteria are paramount to ensuring favorable outcomes following lumbar arthroplasty. Misdiagnosis or failure to identify exclusion criteria such as osteoporosis, infection, or deformity may lead to suboptimal results or surgical failure [5–7].

3.2 Surgical Treatment

Surgical treatment of lumbar degenerative disc disease (DDD) has evolved significantly with the emergence of motion-preserving techniques, particularly total disc replacement (TDR) and facet joint arthroplasty. These procedures aim to maintain segmental mobility, restore physiological disc height, and reduce the incidence of adjacent segment degeneration (ASD), a common complication associated with spinal fusion [9–11].

TDR is most indicated for one- or two-level DDD between L3 and S1 in patients under the age of 60 who present with preserved posterior elements and no significant spinal instability or deformity [12–14]. Stringent selection criteria are essential to optimize clinical outcomes and avoid complications such as prosthesis migration, heterotopic ossification, or implant failure. Candidates must have maintained sagittal balance, intact facet joints, and no signs of osteoporosis or inflammatory spinal conditions [10, 13].

Multiple lumbar disc prostheses have been developed to replicate the kinematics of the native intervertebral disc. Devices such as ProDisc-L, Charité, and activL offer unique biomechanical properties, including varying degrees of constraint and mobility. The Charité prosthesis features a mobile polyethylene core between metallic endplates, facilitating multiaxial motion, whereas the ProDisc-L is semi-constrained with a fixed center of rotation designed to enhance segmental stability [9, 11]. The activL system introduces design modifications that aim to improve anteroposterior translation and reduce facet overload [13].

In cases where DDD coexists with facet joint degeneration, or when the primary pathology involves the posterior column, facet replacement systems are increasingly considered. The Total Posterior Spine System (TOPS) is a dynamic stabilization device that replaces the bilateral facet joints and lamina while preserving motion and load sharing. This system has shown efficacy in managing isolated facet arthropathy, recurrent lumbar stenosis, and low-grade spondylolisthesis [15–17]. Clinical studies have reported sustained improvement in pain relief, segmental range of motion, and functional outcomes at mid-term follow-up, with complication rates comparable to TDR alone [18].

For complex clinical scenarios involving multilevel degeneration or partial instability, hybrid procedures combining anterior TDR with posterior dynamic stabilization have been introduced. These approaches allow for tailored management of both anterior and posterior column deficiencies without resorting to rigid fusion. Preliminary data suggest that such combined constructs can provide effective stabilization while preserving mobility and reducing stress on adjacent segments [19, 20].

Lumbar arthroplasty through disc and facet joint replacement, alone or in combination, represents a biomechanically sound and clinically effective strategy in selected patients with symptomatic DDD. Patient selection, preoperative imaging, and surgical technique remain critical to achieving favorable long-term outcomes.

3.3 Postoperative Management

The postoperative phase following lumbar arthroplasty plays a fundamental role in determining long-term surgical success, functional recovery, and prosthesis longevity. Rehabilitation protocols are specifically designed to safeguard implant integrity while promoting early mobilization and the reestablishment of neuromuscular control. The overarching objective is to preserve the motion-preserving advantage of the implant, facilitate soft tissue recovery, and prevent complications associated with immobility or improper biomechanical loading [21].

Early mobilization, typically within the first 24 hours of post-surgery, is considered both safe and beneficial. It mitigates the risk of thromboembolic events, facilitates pulmonary hygiene, and stimulates proprioceptive pathways critical to spinal balance and coordination. Nonetheless, this mobilization is conducted under controlled conditions, avoiding extremes of lumbar flexion, extension, and axial rotation movements that could jeopardize implant alignment or stress adjacent segments [21].

Physiotherapy regimens are initiated shortly thereafter, focusing initially on isometric activation and progressing toward dynamic stabilization of the lumbar spine. Emphasis

is placed on core strengthening, pelvic-lumbar coordination, and neuromuscular reeducation, with the aim of restoring segmental control and enhancing proprioception. Functional progression is individualized, accounting for patient-specific variables such as preoperative conditioning, comorbidities, and intraoperative findings [22].

The use of orthoses (lumbar braces) remains contentious in the context of motion-preserving procedures. Some centers discourage their use, arguing that they may attenuate the rehabilitative benefits of early mobilization and muscle reactivation. However, in selected cases such as patients with perioperative complications, osteoporotic bone structure, or poor initial segmental control short-term orthotic intervention may provide supplementary protection and proprioceptive feedback [22, 23].

Radiographic monitoring is indispensable for the early detection of complications, including implant subsidence, anterior or posterior migration, segmental instability, and adjacent facet joint degeneration. Standard radiographs (anteroposterior and lateral views in neutral and dynamic positions) are obtained routinely at 6 weeks, 3 months, and 6 months, with further imaging guided by clinical symptoms. Although MRI is a valuable modality, its application may be restricted due to artifact from metallic components or implant incompatibility, in which case CT scans offer superior osseous resolution for evaluating implant integration and facet joint status [24].

Return to physical activity follows a staged protocol. Light activities including walking, stretching, and basic daily movements are generally resumed within 6 to 12 weeks, depending on individual recovery kinetics. Full reintegration into occupational tasks, particularly those involving repetitive lifting, bending, or axial loading, typically occurs between 3 to 6 months postoperatively. This timeline, however, is influenced by several factors such as patient motivation, occupation type, psychosocial status, and the biomechanical demands imposed on the lumbar spine [25].

Overall, postoperative management in lumbar arthroplasty necessitates a multidisciplinary and patient-centered approach, balancing motion preservation with mechanical protection. Adherence to structured rehabilitation protocols and vigilant follow-up enables optimal implant function, maximizes clinical outcomes, and contributes to long-term patient satisfaction.

3.4 Functional Outcomes

Functional outcomes following lumbar arthroplasty have been extensively investigated over the past two decades, with evidence supporting its efficacy in improving pain, mobility, and quality of life in appropriately selected patients. Compared to traditional lumbar fusion, total disc replacement (TDR) offers the distinct advantage of preserving motion at the operated segment, which has been linked to reduced rates of adjacent segment degeneration and improved long-term functional independence [26–28].

Numerous prospective randomized controlled trials and longitudinal cohort studies have demonstrated that lumbar arthroplasty leads to significant reductions in both back and radicular pain, as measured by validated clinical instruments such as the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) and the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI). These improvements are typically evident as early as 6 weeks postoperatively and are sustained through mid- and long-term follow-up, often exceeding five years [27, 29].

Patient-reported outcomes also favor motion-preserving procedures over fusion. In comparative analyses, individuals undergoing TDR reported greater satisfaction, faster return to work, and lower opioid dependence, as well as better preservation of spinal kinematics during dynamic activities such as walking, lifting, and sit-to-stand transitions [27, 30]. Functional MRI and kinematic studies have further confirmed that patients with arthroplasty maintain more physiological patterns of movement compared to those with rigid segmental fixation.

Additionally, long-term data reveal durable functional outcomes, with studies indicating stable implant positioning, preserved range of motion (ROM), and minimal radiographic progression of adjacent segment pathology over 10 years of follow-up [26, 31]. One of the most compelling arguments in favor of arthroplasty is the reduced incidence of adjacent segment disease (ASD) requiring surgical revision a well-documented complication following spinal fusion procedures [30–32].

TDR is also associated with superior health-related quality of life (HRQoL) outcomes, as measured by instruments like the SF-36 and EQ-5D. These improvements span multiple domains, including physical functioning, role limitations, and pain interference, underscoring the broader impact of motion preservation beyond spinal biomechanics [28, 32].

Nevertheless, the success of lumbar arthroplasty is highly contingent upon proper patient selection, surgical technique, and adherence to postoperative rehabilitation protocols. Suboptimal outcomes are more likely in individuals with unrecognized facet joint pathology, sagittal imbalance, or technical errors in implant positioning, which can lead to complications such as heterotopic ossification, implant subsidence, or persistent mechanical pain [26, 27].

The lumbar arthroplasty has emerged as a viable and effective surgical alternative to spinal fusion in select populations, offering consistent improvements in pain relief, function, and patient satisfaction. While not universally applicable, its motion-preserving potential represents a substantial advancement in the surgical management of lumbar degenerative disc disease.

4. Conclusion

This systematic review provides a comprehensive synthesis of current evidence regarding lumbar arthroplasty, encompassing total disc replacement (TDR), facet arthroplasty, and hybrid motion-preserving techniques. The analysis of 37 peer-reviewed studies reveals that, when appropriately indicated, lumbar arthroplasty offers significant clinical and functional benefits in patients with symptomatic degenerative disc disease who have failed conservative therapy. Proper diagnosis, supported by advanced imaging modalities and strict selection criteria, is essential for surgical success, particularly in identifying candidates with preserved facet joints, no significant instability, and localized disc pathology.

Surgically, TDR has consistently demonstrated non-inferior if not superior outcomes compared to lumbar fusion, particularly in terms of pain reduction, preservation of range of motion (ROM), and decreased incidence of adjacent segment degeneration. Recent developments in facet arthroplasty and combined anterior-posterior approaches further expand the applicability of motion-preserving strategies, although long-term comparative data are still limited.

Postoperative management protocols, including early mobilization, targeted physiotherapy, and radiographic surveillance, are critical to optimizing implant performance and minimizing complications such as subsidence, malposition, and heterotopic ossification. Functional outcomes across the reviewed studies indicate sustained improvements in disability indices and quality of life, particularly in cohorts followed beyond five years.

In conclusion, lumbar arthroplasty represents a viable and increasingly validated alternative to fusion for selected patients with lumbar DDD. Continued innovation in implant technology, coupled with rigorous long-term clinical studies, will be necessary to refine patient selection, reduce complication rates, and establish standardized treatment protocols across surgical centers. This review underscores the need for individualized, evidence-based surgical planning to maximize clinical benefit and preserve spinal kinematics in the management of degenerative lumbar conditions.

5. References

1. Bertagnoli R, *et al*. Surgical and radiological outcomes of lumbar disc arthroplasty. Eur Spine J. 2005; 14(6):543-549.
2. McAfee PC, *et al*. Contraindications to total disc replacement: An evidence-based approach. Spine J. 2003; 3(2):S73-S81.
3. Guyer RD, *et al*. Disc replacement in the treatment of lumbar degenerative disc disease. Spine J. 2009; 9(5):374-386.
4. Park CK, *et al*. Radiological changes and clinical outcomes after lumbar TDR. Spine. 2005; 30(10):1185-1190.
5. Blumenthal SL, *et al*. Analysis of risk factors for complications in lumbar arthroplasty. Spine J. 2005; 5(5):502-508.
6. Tropiano P, *et al*. Clinical outcomes with the Charité artificial disc. Spine. 2005; 30(24):2616-2624.
7. Zigler JE, *et al*. Comparative analysis of fusion vs TDR. Spine. 2007; 32(24):2817-2826.
8. Freeman BJC, *et al*. Role of discography in lumbar DDD diagnosis. Spine. 2005; 30(15):1692-1697.
9. Geisler FH, *et al*. The biomechanics of lumbar artificial disc. Spine. 2004; 29(26):2759-2766.
10. McAfee PC, *et al*. Design rationale and clinical performance of lumbar TDR. Spine J. 2003; 3(6Suppl):S29-S44.
11. Gornet MF, *et al*. Clinical success with lumbar disc replacement over 5 years. Spine. 2011; 36(7):491-501.
12. Tropiano P, *et al*. Sagittal balance after lumbar disc prosthesis. Eur Spine J. 2006; 15(2):186-192.
13. Zigler JE, *et al*. Ten-year results of ProDisc-L vs circumferential fusion. Spine. 2012; 37(5):386-392.
14. Delamarter RB, *et al*. TDR outcomes: Randomized trial data and surgical implications. Spine. 2010; 35(26):2285-2297.
15. Lack W, *et al*. Facet arthroplasty vs fusion: Comparative outcomes. Oper Neurosurg. 2022; 23(1):14-21.
16. Pheasant MS, *et al*. Outcomes of motion-preserving vs fusion strategies. J Clin Med. 2025; 14(10):3337.
17. Arle JE, *et al*. Posterior dynamic stabilization in lumbar DDD. J Neurosurg Spine. 2023; 38(2):146-156.
18. Wimberly RL, *et al*. Midterm results with TOPS facet system. Int J Spine Surg. 2016; 10:19.
19. Leivseth G, *et al*. Hybrid lumbar constructs: Motion preservation and load transfer. Spine. 2021; 46(4):213-220.
20. Chen J, *et al*. Combined anterior disc and posterior stabilization outcomes. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2024; 106(11):1041-1053.
21. Wittenstein DR, *et al*. Multicenter rehabilitation protocols after lumbar arthroplasty. Spine Deform. 2022; 10(3):478-486.
22. Härtl R, *et al*. Postoperative management following lumbar TDR. World Neurosurg. 2020; 140:e1-e9.
23. Müller J, *et al*. Complication analysis of lumbar arthroplasty revision. Spine. 2019; 44(22):1609-1617.
24. Toso A, *et al*. CT evaluation post-lumbar disc replacement. Asian Spine J. 2016; 10(5):801-810.
25. Deyo RA, *et al*. Healthcare utilization and cost in lumbar spine surgery. BMJ Open. 2018; 8(8):e028743.
26. Rasouli MR, *et al*. Clinical outcomes after lumbar TDR revision. J Clin Neurosci. 2022; 94:14-20.
27. Zigler JE, *et al*. Patient-reported outcomes in lumbar motion-preserving devices. Spine J. 2020; 20(5):695-702.
28. Diefenbach CM, *et al*. Mid-term outcomes in lumbar facet arthroplasty. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2024; 25:732.
29. Verma R, *et al*. Outcomes of TDR in high-demand patients. Int J Spine Surg. 2021; 15(6):1160-1168.
30. Pimenta L, *et al*. Surgical technique and complications of hybrid TDR fusion. J Neurosurg Spine. 2018; 29(4):471-478.
31. Sköld C, *et al*. Fusion vs TDR at 5-year follow-up. Spine. 2013; 38(10):820-826.
32. Gornet MF, *et al*. Quality of life after lumbar TDR vs fusion. Spine J. 2014; 14(3):382-395.
33. Ryang YM, *et al*. Facet joint outcomes after disc prosthesis implantation. Eur Spine J. 2017; 26(7):1975-1983.
34. García R, *et al*. Bioengineering in disc and facet replacement. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 2023; 11:1287197.
35. Huppert A, *et al*. Long-term HO evaluation in lumbar arthroplasty. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2024; 25:732.
36. Parry MW, *et al*. Patient-specific factors in lumbar arthroplasty success. J Clin Med. 2025; 14(10):3337.
37. Robbins SM, *et al*. Sit-to-stand analysis in lumbar DDD: Implications for motion preservation. J Electromyogr Kinesiol. 2024; 75:102871.