Prognostic Factors for Recovery in Spinal Cord Injury After Open Descending and Thoracoabdominal Aortic Aneurysm Repair

### Akiko Tanaka, Y Ikeno, L Ribe, A Mills, R Afifi, H Sandhu, C Miller, H Safi, and Anthony L. Estrera

Department of Cardiothoracic and Vascular Surgery McGovern Medical School at UTHealth Houston, Texas / USA

Department of Cardiothoracic & Vascular Surgery



# Objective

Spinal cord injury (SCI) after descending thoracic and thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm (DTAA/TAAA) repair triggers poor prognosis.

Special protocol to treat SCIs are used in our institution. We retrospectively reviewed what are the predictors for recovery from SCI.



Sandhu H. Semin Thoracic Surg 29:451–459

# **Modified COPS Protocol to Treat SCI**



Sandhu H. Semin Thoracic Surg 29:451–459

## 2004-Current



SCI=paraplegia+paraparesis

### 1125 DTAA/TAAA repairs

• 65.0±12.2 years old



28 immediate

82 delayed

## **How Many Recovered from SCI?**



Functional recovery: ambulatory at discharge or an increase in modified Tarlov score of 2 or more.

	Recovered M=58	No Recover N=52	P-value
Age	64.8±12.4	65.2±12.2	0.804
Female	19 (33%)	16 (31%)	0.823
Heritable Aortic Dz	12 (21%)	18 (35%)	0.102
CKD Stage 1 Stage 2 Stage 3a Stage 3b Stage 4 Stage 5	20 (35%) 14 (25%) 11 (19%) 3 (5%) 9 (16%) 0 (0%)	13 (25%) 16 (31%) 7 (13%) 9 (17%) 4 (8%) 3 (6%)	0.279 0.436 0.436 0.064 0.204 0.102
DTAAA Extent I Extent II Extent III Extent IV Extent V	12 (21%) 10 (17%) 16 (28%) 13 (22%) 7 (12%) 0 (0%)	5 (10%) 8 (15%) 13 (25%) 16 (31%) 5 (10%) 5(5%)	0.109 0.793 0.759 0.321 0.680 0.016
COPD	37 (64%)	24 (46%)	0.063
HTN	55 (95%)	50 (96%)	1.000
CAD	23 (40%)	17 (33%)	0.449

	Recovered M=58	No Recover N=52	P-value
Emergent	4 (7%)	13 (25%)	0.016
MEP loss	35 (60%)	39 (75%)	0.102
SSEP loss	17 (29%)	42 (81%)	<0.001
Intraop hypotension	O (O%)	11 (21%)	<0.001
Immediate SCI	5 (9%)	23 (44%)	<0.001
Delayed SCI	53 (91%)	29 (56%)	<0.001

## **Predictors for Recovery**

Variables	Recover y (%)	Odds Ratio	Confidence	P-value
(number present in SCI)		Recovery vs. Permanent	Intervals	
Female (N=35)	19 (54%)	1.096	0.490-2.451	0.823
Connective tissue disorder (N=30)	12 (40%)	0.493	0.210-1.158	0.102
Aortic dissection (N=51)	27 (53%)	1.018	0.480-2.153	0.967
Emergent repair (N=17)	4 (24%)	0.222	0.067-0.733	0.016
Extent V repair (N=5)	O (O%)			0.021
Intraop CSFD use (N=103)	54 (52%)	0.827	0.176-3.879	1.000
MEP loss (N=74)	35 (47%)	0.507	0.224-1.151	0.102
SSEP loss (N=59)	22 (4%)	0.099	0.041-0.241	<0.001
Immediate SCI (N=28)	5 (18%)	0.119	0.041-0.346	<0.001

# Why TAAA Extent V?





Possible statistical error due to very low incidence of SCI in this group

(lowest in all DTAA/TAAA repair in our experience)

## Why Emergent Repair?

- Hypotension
- ICA reattachment
- CSFD

## **MEP vs. SSEP Loss**



### MEP loss:

Gray matter-"penumbra" no infarction yet

### **SSEP loss**:

Gray matter – "penlucida" beginning of infarct White matter – "penumbra"

#### SSEP loss = advanced ischemia

# Conclusions

- Nearly half of the patients who developed SCI after DTAA/TAAA had functional recovery
- Emergent repair, SSEP loss, TAAA extent V, and immediate SCI had less likelihood of recovery from SCI.

# **Thank You!**



Department of Cardiothoracic & Vascular Surgery



O I UTH\_CVSurgery info.ctvs@uth.tmc.edu https://med.uth.edu/cvs/