



**An Update of a Clinical Practice Guideline for the  
Management of Patients with Acute Spinal Cord Injury:  
Recommendations on the Role and Timing of Decompressive  
Surgery**

Journal:	<i>Global Spine Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue- Knowledge Forum SCI Guidelines
Keywords:	spinal cord injury, decompression, trauma
Abstract:	<p>Study Design Clinical practice guideline development</p> <p>Objectives Acute spinal cord injury (SCI) can result in devastating motor, sensory and autonomic impairment, loss of independence and reduced quality of life. Preclinical evidence suggests that early decompression of the spinal cord may help to limit secondary injury, reduce damage to the neural tissue and improve functional outcomes. Emerging evidence indicates that "early" surgical decompression completed within 24 hours of injury also improves neurological recovery in patients with acute SCI. The objective of this clinical practice guideline (CPG) is to update the 2017 recommendations on the timing of surgical decompression and to evaluate the evidence with respect to ultra-early surgery (in particular, but not limited to &lt;12 hrs after acute SCI).</p> <p>Methods A multidisciplinary, international, guideline development group (GDG) was formed that consisted of spine surgeons, neurologists, critical care specialists, emergency medicine doctors, physical medicine and rehabilitation professionals and individuals living with SCI. A systematic review was conducted based on accepted methodological standards to evaluate the impact of early (within 24 hours of acute SCI) or ultra-early (in particular, but not limited to within 12 hours of acute SCI) surgery on neurologic recovery, functional outcomes, administrative outcomes, safety and cost-effectiveness. The GRADE approach was used to rate the overall strength of evidence across studies for each primary outcome. Using the "evidence-to-recommendation" framework, recommendations were then developed that considered the balance of benefits and harms, financial impact, patient values, acceptability and feasibility. The guideline was internally appraised using the...</p>

## Abstract

### Study Design

Clinical practice guideline development

### Objectives

Acute spinal cord injury (SCI) can result in devastating motor, sensory and autonomic impairment, loss of independence and reduced quality of life. Preclinical evidence suggests that early decompression of the spinal cord may help to limit secondary injury, reduce damage to the neural tissue and improve functional outcomes. Emerging evidence indicates that “early” surgical decompression completed within 24 hours of injury also improves neurological recovery in patients with acute SCI. The objective of this clinical practice guideline (CPG) is to update the 2017 recommendations on the timing of surgical decompression and to evaluate the evidence with respect to ultra-early surgery (in particular, but not limited to <12 hrs after acute SCI).

### Methods

A multidisciplinary, international, guideline development group (GDG) was formed that consisted of spine surgeons, neurologists, critical care specialists, emergency medicine doctors, physical medicine and rehabilitation professionals and individuals living with SCI. A systematic review was conducted based on accepted methodological standards to evaluate the impact of early (within 24 hours of acute SCI) or ultra-early (in particular, but not limited to within 12 hours of acute SCI) surgery on neurologic recovery, functional outcomes, administrative outcomes, safety and cost-effectiveness. The GRADE approach was used to rate the overall strength of evidence across studies for each primary outcome. Using the “evidence-to-recommendation” framework, recommendations were then developed that considered the balance of benefits and harms, financial impact, patient values, acceptability and feasibility. The guideline was internally appraised using the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation (AGREE) II tool.

### Results

The GDG recommended that early surgery ( $\leq 24$  hours after injury) be offered as the preferred option for adult patients with acute SCI regardless of level. This recommendation was based on moderate evidence that suggested that patients were two times more likely to recover by  $\geq 2$  ASIA Impairment Score (AIS) grades at 6- (RR: 2.76, 95% CI 1.60 to 4.98) and 12-months (RR: 1.95, 95% CI 1.26 to 3.18) if they were decompressed within 24 hours compared to after 24 hours. Furthermore, patients undergoing early surgery improved by an additional 4.50 (95% 1.70 to 7.29) points on the ASIA Motor Score compared to

1  
2  
3 patients undergoing surgery after 24 hours post-injury. The GDG also agreed that a recommendation for  
4 ultra-early surgery could not be made on the basis of the current evidence because of the small sample  
5 sizes, variable definitions of what constituted ultra-early in the literature and the inconsistency of the  
6 evidence.  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **Conclusions**

12 It is recommended that patients with an acute SCI, regardless of level, undergo surgery within 24 hrs after  
13 injury when medically feasible. Future research is required to determine the differential effectiveness of  
14 early surgery in different subpopulations and the impact of ultra-early surgery on neurological recovery.  
15 Moreover, further work is required to define what constitutes effective spinal cord decompression and to  
16 individualize care. It is also recognized that a concerted international effort will be required to translate  
17 these recommendations into policy.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Summary of Recommendations

**Population Description:** Adult patients with acute SCI

**Key Question 1:** Should we recommend early decompressive surgery ( $\leq 24$  hours after injury) for adult patients with acute spinal cord injury regardless of injury severity and neurological level?

**Recommendation:** We recommend that early surgery be offered as an option for adult patients with acute SCI regardless of level.

**Quality of Evidence:** Moderate

**Strength of Recommendation:** Strong

**Population:** Adult patients with acute SCI

**Key Question 2:** Should we recommend ultra-early decompressive surgery for adult patients with acute SCI regardless of injury severity and neurological level?

**Statement:** A recommendation for ultra-early surgery could not be made on the basis of the current evidence because of the small sample sizes, variable definitions of what constituted ultra-early and the inconsistency of the evidence.

## Introduction

Traumatic spinal cord injury (SCI) can result in devastating motor, sensory and autonomic impairment, loss of independence and reduced quality of life[1]. The acute and long-term management of SCI requires substantial health care resources and can impose significant financial burden on patients, families and communities[2]. The treatment of SCI has evolved over time due to the emergence of several preclinical and clinical studies on injury mechanisms, disease pathophysiology, the role of surgical intervention and novel neuroprotective strategies.

Primary injury refers to the initial mechanical forces applied to the spinal cord by vertebral fractures, disc debris or disruption of the supporting ligaments[3,4]. Within minutes to hours of injury, significant pathophysiological changes occur that can damage the ascending and descending neural pathways and induce spinal shock[5,6]. These changes include vasospasm, ischemia, disruption of the blood-spinal cord barrier, ion imbalance and accumulation of neurotransmitters[5]. Secondary injury begins within minutes of the initial trauma and may cause progressive spinal cord damage for weeks to

1  
2  
3 months through demyelination, Wallerian degeneration, and formation of a glial scar[4]. Preclinical  
4 evidence suggests that early decompression of the spinal cord may help to limit this secondary injury,  
5 reduce damage to the neural tissue and improve functional outcomes[7-9]. This concept of timely surgical  
6 intervention has also been investigated by a number of clinical trials and cohort studies, allowing for the  
7 development of an evidence-based clinical practice guideline (CPG) in 2017[10].  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 This 2017 CPG provided recommendations for the timing of surgical intervention in patients with  
13 SCI, using 24 hours as the threshold between early and late decompression[10]. Based on a systematic  
14 review of the literature and a guideline development framework, a weak recommendation was formulated  
15 to suggest early surgery be offered as an option for adult SCI patients regardless of injury level[10,11].  
16 Since the publication of this CPG, several studies have emerged that assess the impact of early versus late  
17 surgical decompression on neurologic recovery, functional outcomes and quality of life[12-21]. Given  
18 the availability of new evidence, it is advised that the CPG from 2017 be updated as the results of recent  
19 studies may change the strength of previous recommendations and impact clinical decision-making.  
20 Furthermore, as care pathways for patients with SCI become more streamlined, it may be possible to  
21 intervene even earlier, especially if beneficial. It is therefore the endeavor of this CPG to explore different  
22 time cut-offs (e.g. <4, <8 or <12 hours) in order to establish the ideal timing of surgical intervention in  
23 terms of impact on outcome, cost-effectiveness and feasibility.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 The overarching aim of this CPG is to standardize care, improve outcomes and reduce morbidity and  
34 mortality in patients with SCI by creating recommendations on the timing of surgical intervention. The  
35 specific aims of this CPG are to address the following two questions:  
36  
37  
38  
39

- 40 1. Should we recommend early decompressive surgery ( $\leq 24$  hours after injury) for adult patients with  
41 acute spinal cord injury regardless of injury severity and neurological level?
- 42 2. Should we recommend very early decompressive surgery for adult patients with acute spinal cord  
43 injury regardless of injury severity and neurological level?  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **Methods**

48  
49  
50 The development of this CPG was sponsored by AO Spine and Praxis Spinal Cord Institute. A  
51 multidisciplinary guideline development group (GDG) was established that consisted of neurosurgeons,  
52 orthopedic surgeons, neurologists, critical care specialists, emergency medicine doctors, first responders,  
53 physical medicine and rehabilitation professionals and individuals living with SCI. Each member of the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

GDG was required to disclose both financial and intellectual conflicts of interest. Methodologists at Aggregate Analytics Inc. were responsible for providing the expertise for both the systematic review of the literature and the development of the CPG. The protocol for this CPG was formulated using the Conference on Guideline Standardization (COGS) framework and the Checklist for Reporting the Updating Process (CheckUp) and is published in a separate article in this focus issue[22,23].

A systematic review was conducted based on accepted methodological standards to address the following key questions:

1. What is the evidence for the effectiveness of early decompression ( $\leq 24$  hours) compared with late decompression ( $>24$  hours) or conservative therapy based on clinically important change in neurological status? What is the effectiveness of ultra-early decompression compared with other “early” time frames up to 24 hours (for example, but not limited to  $< 12$  hours vs  $\geq 12$  hours but  $<24$  hours)?
2. Does timing of decompression influence other functional outcomes or administrative outcomes?
3. What is the safety profile of early decompression compared with late decompression?
4. Does early decompression have differential efficacy or safety in specific subgroups of patients?
5. What is the cost-effectiveness of early decompression compared with late decompression?

The approach outlined by the Grading of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group was used to rate the overall strength of evidence across studies for each primary outcome[24]. The results of the systematic review and the evidence tables were presented to the GDG. The GRADE “evidence-to-recommendation” framework was used to support the guideline development process and ensure that each recommendation considered other factors, including benefits and harms, resource use, impact on health inequities, acceptability and feasibility[25-27]. The last step in the framework was to balance the desirable and undesirable consequences and determine the strength of each recommendation. The Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation (AGREE) II was used to internally appraise the CPG[28]. Finally, this document was distributed to a multidisciplinary group of clinicians as well as prominent societies in spine surgery for external review. A complete summary of the methods used to create this CPG are provided in a separate article in this focus issue entitled “An Overview of the Methodology Used to Develop Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Acute and Intraoperative Spinal Cord Injury.”

### **Clinical Recommendations**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 *Part 1. Timing of Decompressive Surgery ( $\leq 24$  hours After Injury) in Adult Patients with Acute Spinal*  
6 *Cord Injury*  
7

8  
9 **Population Description:** Adult patients with acute SCI.

10  
11 **Key Question 1:** Should we recommend early decompressive surgery ( $\leq 24$  hours after injury) for adult  
12 patients with acute spinal cord injury regardless of injury severity and neurological level?  
13

14 **Recommendation:** We recommend that early surgery be offered as an option for adult patients with acute  
15 SCI regardless of level.  
16

17 **Quality of Evidence:** Moderate  
18

19 **Strength of Recommendation:** Strong  
20  
21

22 Evidence Summary  
23  
24

25 A systematic review of the literature was conducted in order to summarize and appraise the available  
26 evidence on the effectiveness and safety of early ( $\leq 24$  hours post-injury) surgical decompression  
27 compared to late ( $>24$  hours post-injury) surgical decompression after acute SCI.  
28  
29

30  
31 *Evidence Related to Benefits*  
32  
33

34  
35 Nine studies reported on change in ASIA Impairment Scale (AIS) at 6- or 12-months following  
36 injury[13,15,16,19-21,29-31]. Of these, five studies compared the rate of improvement by  $\geq 2$  AIS  
37 grades at 6-months between patients undergoing early versus late surgery [20,21,29,30,32]. Based on  
38 pooled estimates, patients were 2.76 (95% CI 1.60 to 4.98) times more likely to recover by  $\geq 2$  AIS grades  
39 if they were decompressed within 24 hours compared to after 24 hours. Four studies evaluated the impact  
40 of timing of surgery on improving by  $\geq 2$  AIS grades at 12-months[13,15,16,19]. Similarly, patients were  
41 approximately two (95% CI 1.26 to 3.18,) times more likely to exhibit a  $\geq 2$  grade improvement on the  
42 AIS at 12-months if treated within 24 hours compared to after 24 hours. The overall strength of evidence  
43 for these outcomes ( $\geq 2$  grade improvement in AIS at 6- and 12-months) was moderate.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Five studies explored the change in ASIA motor score (AMS) between individuals operated on early  
52 versus late[12,14,16,31,32]. The results from the two studies that reported on AMS at 6-months could  
53 not be pooled due to substantial clinical heterogeneity and limited reporting of data[31,32]. A single  
54 study identified that patients undergoing early ( $<24$  hours post-injury) surgery for acute central cord  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 syndrome gained an additional 7.47 points on the AMS compared to those treated late[31]. A second  
4 study demonstrated that early surgery confers a 13-point improvement in AMS in individuals with  
5 cervical, thoracic or lumbosacral SCI[32]. Based on the results of these two studies, there is very low  
6 evidence that early surgery improves AMS in the short term. The remaining three studies explored change  
7 in AMS at >6-12 months and were evaluated in a meta-analysis[14,16,31]. Based on pooled estimates,  
8 patients undergoing early surgery improved by an additional 4.50 (95% 1.70 to 7.29) points on the AMS  
9 compared to patients treated late. The overall strength of evidence was moderate for this outcome. In  
10 summary, the evidence is very low that early surgery impacts AMS in the short term (<6 months) but  
11 moderate that it results in motor improvement in the longer term (>6-12 months).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 A single prospective observational study evaluated the impact of early decompression on Functional  
20 Independence Measure (FIM) motor and total scores [31]. Based on the results, patients undergoing early  
21 surgery for acute central cord syndrome were more likely to exhibit improvements in Functional  
22 Independence Measure (FIM) total scores (MD 7.79, 95% CI 0.09 to 15.49, p=0.0474) than those treated  
23 late[31]. However, the overall level of evidence for this outcome was rated as very low due to serious  
24 imprecision in the estimate of effect.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 *Evidence Related to Harms*

32  
33  
34 Several studies discussed rates of complications between patients treated surgically within 24 hours of  
35 injury and those decompressed after 24 hours [13,15,16,20,21,29,30,33]. Based on the results of the  
36 systematic review, there were no statistically significant differences in critical harm outcomes between  
37 early and late surgery groups. Furthermore, rates of the majority of reported complications tended to be  
38 higher in the late surgery group, including mortality, decubitus ulcers, cardiopulmonary events and need  
39 for tracheostomy[15,16,20,29,30,33]. In contrast, the frequency of neurological deterioration and sepsis  
40 secondary to systemic infection tended to be higher in the early surgery groups[13,29,30]. Unfortunately,  
41 the majority of studies were underpowered to detect a difference in rates of complications based on timing  
42 of surgery.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Based on a single study and moderate evidence, there was no difference in the rate of major complications  
51 between early (24.2%) and late surgery (30.5%, RR 0.79, 95% CI 0.55 to 1.14)[29]. Two randomized  
52 controlled trials and four observational studies evaluated mortality rates in patients treated early versus  
53 late[16,20,29,30,33]. Mortality was uncommon and did not significantly differ between groups: 2.6% in  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 the early group and 3.6% in the late group (RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.29 to 1.50). Although results across  
4 studies were consistent, the overall quality of evidence was rated as low due to moderate risk of bias and  
5 imprecision. Three studies examined differences in rates of fixation or construct failure and one study  
6 assessed differences in rates of screw revision or pull-out according to timing of surgery[16,20,29]. Based  
7 on low evidence, there were no differences in rates of surgical-device related complications between  
8 patients decompressed early compared to those treated late (fixation or construct failure: 1.5% vs 1.4%,  
9 RR 1.21, 95% CI 0.21 to 5.87; revision of lateral screws or screw pull-out: 8.1% vs 8.3%, RR 0.97, 95%  
10 CI 0.21 to 4.51). Based on low evidence, there were no differences in the frequency of sepsis between  
11 patients treated early (1.7%) compared to late (0.8%, RR 1.96, 95% CI 0.50 to 7.60)[15,29]. Four studies  
12 assessed the rate of decubitus or pressure ulcers based on timing of surgery and concluded that patients  
13 treated early had fewer decubitus or pressure ulcers than those treated late (3.8% vs. 6.9%, RR 0.81, 95%  
14 CI 0.46 to 1.37)[15,16,20,33]. However, this difference did not reach statistical significance and the  
15 overall rating of the evidence was low due to moderate risk of bias. Three studies reported no difference  
16 in the rate of neurological deterioration following early (4.7%) versus late (0.7%) surgery in patients with  
17 cervical SCI (RR 3.51, 95% CI 0.73 to 17.23)[13,29,30]. The overall rating of the evidence for this  
18 outcome was very low. Finally, based on the results of single studies and low evidence, there were fewer  
19 cardiopulmonary complications (17.6% vs. 25.9%, RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.44 to 1.04) and tracheostomies  
20 (45% vs. 55%, RR 0.82, 95% CI 0.54 to 1.25) in the early surgery group compared to the late surgery  
21 group; however, this difference did not reach statistical significance[20,29].  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 Rationale for Recommendation

36  
37  
38 The outcomes ranked as critical for decision-making were improvement of AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades, AMS, and  
39 FIM as well as any major complications, mortality, surgical device related complications, sepsis  
40 secondary to systemic infection, pressure ulcers, neurological deterioration, cardiopulmonary events and  
41 need for tracheostomy. It was also decided that the proposed recommendation would not distinguish  
42 between patients with complete and incomplete injuries or specify the level of injury. The reason behind  
43 this decision was based on the results of the meta-analysis that assessed whether injury severity or level  
44 modified the effects of timing of surgery with respect to improvement by  $\geq 2$  grades on the AIS. Based on  
45 the results, the risk ratio estimates in both the complete and incomplete injury groups suggested benefit of  
46 early decompression. Furthermore, the confidence intervals for the estimates of effect overlapped and the  
47 test for interaction was not significant. Based on these results, it can be concluded that injury severity  
48 does not modify the treatment effect of early surgery in patients with SCI. Unfortunately, data were  
49 insufficient to hypothesize whether the level of SCI alters the effect of early surgery. However, given the  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 similarity of point estimates and overlapping confidence intervals when comparing the impact of early  
4 surgery on outcomes across injury levels, there is likely no modification of treatment effect. Furthermore,  
5 the risk ratios suggest potential benefit of early surgery across all levels of SCI.  
6  
7

8  
9 An important first step in the guideline development process was to identify the minimum clinically  
10 important difference (MCID) for each critical outcome. The MCID refers to the smallest change in a  
11 score that a patient would perceive as beneficial or meaningful[34,35]. It is postulated that neurological  
12 improvement is only meaningful to a patient living with SCI if it translates to functional benefits and  
13 enhancement in quality of life. Furthermore, the MCIDs for neurological recovery and functional  
14 outcomes are likely dependent on the level and severity of SCI. The International Standards for  
15 Neurological Classification of SCI Patients (ISNCSCI) is the preferred tool to assess the severity and  
16 level of SCI and quantify motor and sensory dysfunction[36-38]. It is an ordinal scale that is not linear,  
17 meaning that a one-grade change carries different value depending on patient characteristics[39]. Using  
18 distribution-based methods, the MCID for the upper extremity motor score (UEMS), lower extremity  
19 motor score (LEMS) and total motor score (TMS) was computed as 2.72, 3.66 and 4.48, respectively in a  
20 population of acute or subacute traumatic or nontraumatic SCI[40]. For individuals with cervical SCI, the  
21 MCID for the UEMS ranged from 1.9 for AIS D patients to 2.91 for ASIA A patients[40]. Similarly, the  
22 MCID of the LEMS was lower in patients with AIS D injuries (1.5) compared to individuals with more  
23 severe AIS grades (2.45 AIS C, 2.35 AIS B). Finally, the MCID of the TMS was 2.22 in AIS D, 4.16 in  
24 AIS C, 3.23 in AIS B and 2.91 in AIS A patients[40]. In other studies, the minimum detectable change of  
25 the UEMS was estimated to be two or three[41,42], with six points being the average spontaneous  
26 improvement seen in acute cervical sensorimotor complete injuries[39]. Despite extensive efforts to  
27 define the MCID for UEMS, LEMS, and TMS in SCI patients, it remains a clinical challenge because the  
28 myotomal distribution of improvement may be more important than the absolute change in the motor  
29 score. For example, trace flicker (score of 1) in two myotomes on each side of the body is not as  
30 clinically meaningful to a patient as obtaining a 4-point improvement across two myotomes in a single  
31 extremity. In a study by Scivoletto et al (2013), the effect-size based estimate for a substantial change was  
32 also calculated[40]. Based on their results, a 7.45-point change was considered substantial for UEMS, 8.4  
33 for LEMS and 10.65 for TMS. These results were presented to the GDG who were asked to vote on the  
34 MCID for AMS using either clinical expertise or personal experiences. Forty-five percent of participants  
35 voted that any change in AMS was meaningful for individuals living with SCI, while 18% stated 2 points,  
36 5% selected 3 points, 23% agreed 4 points and 9% chose 5 points as the likely MCID. While there was a  
37 lack of consensus, it is important to note that the majority of the GDG (91%) agreed that an improvement  
38 in AMS of four points (and sometimes less than this) is likely to be clinically meaningful for patients with  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 SCI. While this method for defining what constituted a “clinically meaningful change” may not be  
4 grounded in a formal statistical analysis of empirical evidence, it did incorporate the opinions of a diverse  
5 set of stakeholders, including individuals living with SCI.  
6  
7

8  
9 A two-grade improvement in the AIS was considered a critical outcome for decision-making, while a one  
10 grade improvement was deemed important but not critical. The GDG agreed that a two-grade  
11 improvement is likely to be clinically meaningful in the majority of patients. While a one grade  
12 improvement may still lead to some functional improvements in select patients[43], it does not reliably  
13 translate to improved functional status, reduced disability or enhanced quality of life. For example, a  
14 change in AIS from A to B will likely not significantly impact overall function, nor would improving  
15 from ASIA B to C if the only gain is a trace flicker of movement in the lower extremities. In patients with  
16 ASIA C or D injuries, however, a one grade change in AIS may translate to significant improvements in  
17 function. Given the variable clinical significance of a one grade change in AIS, the GDG agreed that a  
18 two-grade improvement should be the main outcome driving the clinical recommendation.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 As highlighted above, the overall quality of evidence for these critical outcomes was rated as “moderate,”  
27 “low” or “very low.” The GDG agreed that the main outcomes driving the recommendation on timing of  
28 surgery are improvement in AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades and improvement in AMS. In contrast, the GDG  
29 acknowledged that outcomes related to harm should not drive the recommendation as early surgery does  
30 not increase the risk of major complications or mortality, and because the majority of studies comparing  
31 early and late surgery were underpowered to detect any difference in rates of adverse events. The GDG  
32 also agreed that neurological outcomes at  $>6$  to 12 months are more relevant than at  $<6$ -month follow-up  
33 as patients often continue to demonstrate improvement up to and sometimes after a year following injury.  
34 Based on these discussions, 95% of the GDG voted that the overall certainty of evidence was moderate.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The GDG agreed that there was either probably no (65%) or no (30%) important uncertainty or variability  
43 with respect to how much key stakeholders value the main outcomes. Based on professional opinion, it is  
44 likely that clinicians and patients would similarly value the outcomes related to neurological and  
45 functional improvement and serious adverse events. While these outcomes would also be valued by  
46 payers, this stakeholder group would also value length of stay, resource use and cost-effectiveness.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 The anticipated desirable effects of early surgical decompression include clinically meaningful  
53 improvements in AIS and AMS. Based on moderate evidence, patients were approximately two times  
54 more likely to improve by  $\geq 2$  AIS grades at 6 months (RR 2.76, 95% CI 1.60 to 4.98) or 12 months  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (1.95, 95% CI 1.26 to 3.18) if they were decompressed within 24 hours of injury compared to after 24  
4 hours. An effect size greater than 2 is considered large. In addition, moderate evidence suggested that  
5 early surgery resulted in a 4.50 (95% CI 1.70 to 7.29) point improvement in AMS at > 6 to 12 months.  
6  
7

8  
9 Ninety percent of the GDG agreed that the anticipated desirable effects of early surgical decompression  
10 were either moderate (48%) or large (43%). Participants who voted “moderate” commented that while a  
11 two-point improvement in AIS and a 4.5 improvement in AMS are likely clinically meaningful, the  
12 MCID of these outcome tools have not been rigorously assessed in a traumatic SCI population.  
13  
14 Furthermore, the GDG acknowledged that neurological recovery on the AIS and AMS may inconsistently  
15 translate to functional benefit and often depends on the myotomal distribution of improvements (as  
16 described above) or whether changes are appreciated in the upper or lower extremities. In contrast,  
17 participants who selected “large” emphasized that any improvement in neurological function has the  
18 potential to significantly impact the quality of life of an individual living with SCI.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 The anticipated undesirable effects of early surgical decompression include any major complication,  
26 mortality, surgical device related complications, sepsis secondary to systemic infection, pressure ulcer,  
27 neurological deterioration, cardiopulmonary dysfunction and need for tracheostomy. Based on very low to  
28 moderate evidence, there was no difference in the rate of complications between patients treated  
29 surgically within 24 hours and those treated after 24 hours. However, most studies were underpowered to  
30 detect a difference in rates of complications based on timing of surgery. Furthermore, it is often difficult  
31 to distinguish complications associated with the underlying SCI from those related to surgery. Fifty-five  
32 percent of the GDG voted that the undesirable effects of early surgery were likely trivial and 45% agreed  
33 they were small. The anticipated undesirable effects were considered trivial not because these  
34 complications are trivial but because there are no additional risks following early compared to late  
35 surgical intervention. The GDG unanimously agreed that the balance between the desirable and  
36 undesirable effects favor early surgical decompression given the potential neurological benefit without an  
37 increased risk of complications.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 The financial burden of SCI is significant due to costs associated with acute and chronic medical care, in  
48 addition to costs related to loss of productivity. Individuals with SCI have a higher rate of  
49 rehospitalizations, visits to primary care physicians and home services compared to a matched cohort of  
50 individuals without SCI[44,45]. Based on a systematic review of the literature, the mean cost of SCI  
51 management in the first year was \$119,870 in Canada and between \$300,880 and \$634,400 in the United  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 States[46]. Furthermore, based on a study by Krueger et al (2013), lifetime expenses range from  
4 \$2,105,811 to \$3,026,028 CAD for individuals with incomplete and complete tetraplegia, respectively[2].  
5  
6

7  
8 Although the financial burden of SCI is well known, there was limited data on whether costs differ based  
9 on timing of surgical intervention. A study by Mac-Thiong et al (2012) compared the cost of acute  
10 management between individuals receiving early versus late surgery for SCI[47]. Based on their results,  
11 the hospitalization costs were  $\$20,525 \pm 13,791$  in the <24-hour surgery group and  $\$25,036 \pm 17,886$  in  
12 the  $\geq 24$ -hour surgery group. There were, however, significant baseline differences confounding these  
13 results: patients treated within 24 hours of injury were younger, more likely to have a lower AIS and more  
14 likely to have sustained a thoracolumbar neurological injury[47]. A cost utility analysis was conducted by  
15 Furlan et al (2016) to compare the cost-effectiveness of early ( $\leq 24$  hours) versus late ( $> 24$  hours) surgery  
16 in patients with acute traumatic cervical SCI[48]. In patients with motor complete SCI, early  
17 decompression cost  $\$524,483.81$  USD/QALY whereas late surgery cost  $\$544,851.71$  USD/QALY.  
18 Furthermore, the potential savings of early surgery was estimated to be  $\$58,368,024$  USD/QALY.  
19 However, using a Monte-Carlo simulation, early decompression was more cost-effective 26.3% of the  
20 time but less cost-effective 23.4% of the time. These results indicate that no strategy was clearly dominant  
21 in motor complete SCI. In a group of patients with motor incomplete SCI, early decompression cost  
22  $\$83,009.19$  USD/QALY, whereas late decompression cost  $\$81,233.10$  USD/QALY. Early surgery was  
23 deemed to be more cost-effective than late surgery with the potential to save  $\$536,217.33$  USD/QALY in  
24 individuals with motor incomplete SCI. Using Monte-Carlo simulation, early decompression was more  
25 cost-effective in 32.6% but less cost-effective in 18.2% of patients with motor incomplete SCI. Again,  
26 these findings indicate that no strategy is clearly dominant. This study concluded that early  
27 decompression is more cost-effective than late decompression in patients with complete and incomplete  
28 SCI even if there was clearly no dominant strategy[48]. The level of evidence was not graded for these  
29 results.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Length of stay was also considered when assessing overall cost and resource requirement. Six studies  
45 were identified that compared hospital length of stay between patients treated early versus late for acute  
46 SCI [32,49] [50] [15,20,21]. In a meta-analysis, pooled estimates across five studies indicated that  
47 patients undergoing early surgery had a shorter length of stay than those treated late (mean difference -  
48 3.52, 95% CI -4.08 to -2.95) [15,20,21,32,50]. The overall level of evidence for this outcome was low.  
49 While a shorter length of stay can drastically reduce costs, this difference likely reflects only minor  
50 savings when considering the financial burden of SCI. However, institutions often use length of stay as a  
51 metric of performance[51]. Furthermore, a shorter time spent in the hospital reduces the risk of hospital-  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 acquired complications (e.g. infection, delirium, falls, pressure ulcers and respiratory complications)  
4 which can further prolong length of stay, increase cost and impact outcomes. Fifty-eight percent of the  
5 GDG agreed the costs and savings associated with early surgical decompression are negligible given that  
6 the resource requirements are similar for early and late surgery. Sixteen percent either selected large  
7 (11%) or moderate (5%) savings with early surgical decompression as the neurological improvements  
8 associated with early surgery may result in significant lifelong savings. An additional 16% of the group  
9 selected moderate costs associated with early surgery, 5% stated the resource requirements vary and 5%  
10 voted that they did not know given the absence of strong literature.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 The GDG agreed that the certainty of evidence related to resource requirements was very low (64%) or  
18 low (18%). They voted that cost-effectiveness probably favors (64%) or favors (27%) early surgical  
19 decompression given that the resource requirement is likely similar between early versus late surgery and  
20 because early surgery is associated with improved neurological outcomes and a shorter length of stay.  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 The votes varied with respect to the impact of a recommendation of early surgery on health inequities:  
26 38% uncertain, 48% probably reduced, 5% reduced and 10% don't know. If it is assumed that  
27 standardized pathways are implemented in order to ensure direct transfer from the site of injury to a  
28 trauma center capable of urgently performing surgical decompression, the GDG agreed that health  
29 inequities would probably be reduced. If policy makers funded initiatives to ensure patients with  
30 traumatic SCI are triaged appropriately and have better access to early surgical intervention, then there  
31 would be less disparity across socioeconomic groups and geographic regions.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 The GDG agreed that a recommendation for early surgery would be acceptable to key stakeholders  
39 (probably yes: 45%, yes 50%) due to the potential improvement in AIS and AMS with no added risks.  
40 The GDG acknowledged that patients with devastating injuries may value small neurological  
41 improvements as these may translate to clinically meaningful changes in functional status and quality of  
42 life. Furthermore, a recommendation for early surgery would likely be acceptable to payers due to no  
43 added costs and the potential for significant long-term savings. The GDG also agreed that a  
44 recommendation for early surgery would probably be feasible to implement (probably yes 63%, yes: 26%,  
45 varies: 11%) but that this would depend on the clinical setting, geographic region and local guidelines.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Considering these factors, 95% of the GDG voted that the desirable consequences clearly outweigh the  
53 undesirable consequences in most settings. This consensus led to the formation of a strong  
54 recommendation for early decompression in patients with traumatic SCI (100%).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5 The final wording that a recommendation be made for surgical decompression within 24 hours post-injury  
6 was subjected to a final vote of all the GDG members and consensus was achieved for its approval  
7 (>90%). There was one ‘dissenting’ concern raised in the final voting that the recommendation should  
8 be stronger given the quality of the evidence.  
9  
10

## 11 12 *Part 2. Ultra-Early Decompressive Surgery in Adult Patients with Acute Spinal Cord Injury*

13  
14  
15  
16 **Population:** Adult patients with acute SCI

17 **Key Question 2:** Should we recommend ultra-early decompressive surgery for adult patients with acute  
18 SCI regardless of injury severity and neurological level?  
19

20 **Statement:** A recommendation for ultra-early surgery could not be made on the basis of the current  
21 evidence because of the small sample sizes, variable definitions of what constituted ultra-early and the  
22 inconsistency of the evidence.  
23  
24

### 25 26 Evidence Summary

27  
28  
29  
30 A systematic review of the literature was conducted in order to summarize and appraise the available  
31 evidence on the effectiveness and safety of ultra-early surgical intervention.  
32  
33

### 34 35 *Evidence Related to Benefits*

36  
37  
38 Four studies explored the impact of ultra-early surgery on neurological outcomes using the following  
39 cutoffs: (i)  $\leq 4$  versus 4 to 24 hours; (ii)  $<5$  versus 5 to 24 hours; (iii)  $<8$  versus 8 to 24 hours; and (iv)  
40  $<12$  versus 12 to 24 hours[13,18,52,53]. Using an 8-hour threshold, patients treated ultra-early were 4.55  
41 (95% CI 1.13 to 18.29) times more likely to improve by  $\geq 2$  grades on the AIS at 6-months than those  
42 treated early (8 to 24 hours)[53]. In contrast, a single study failed to detect a difference in the rate of  
43 improvement by  $\geq 2$  AIS grades at 6 months between patients treated within 4 hours of injury and those  
44 decompressed between 4 and 24 hours (RR 0.50, 95% CI 0.16 to 1.50)[52]. Given the limited evidence, it  
45 was not possible to make firm conclusions on the effectiveness of ultra-early surgery ( $<4$  or  $<8$  hours) in  
46 improving AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades at 6 months. The overall level of evidence for this outcome was very low.  
47  
48 Two studies explored whether ultra-early surgery was associated with a  $\geq 2$  grade improvement on AIS at  
49 12-months[13,18]. Using a 5-hour threshold, patients treated ultra-early were less likely to improve by  $\geq 2$   
50 grades on AIS than those treated early (5 to 24 hours) (RR 0.24, 95%CI 0.07 to 0.85)[18]. Using a 12-  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 hour threshold, there was no difference in the likelihood of achieving  $\geq 2$  AIS grades at 12-months between  
4 the ultra-early (<12 hours) and early (12 to 24 hours) groups (RR 1.09, 95% CI 0.39 to 3.04)[13]. Given  
5 the results of these two studies, it was not possible to make definitive conclusions on the effectiveness of  
6 ultra-early surgery (<5 or <12 hours) in improving AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades by 12 months. The overall level of  
7 evidence for this outcome was also very low.  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 A single study compared the median improvement in AMS at 6-months between patients treated ultra-  
13 early (<8 hours) and those treated early (8 to 24 hours)[53]. Based on their results, the median  
14 improvement in AMS was 38.5 (95% CI 10.0 to 61.0) in the ultra-early group and 15.0 (95% CI 9.9 to  
15 34.0) in the early surgery group.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 Since the completion of the systematic review, an additional study was published investigating outcomes  
21 of decompression surgery performed  $\leq 12$  hours after SCI versus  $>12$  hours [54]. This study found a trend  
22 in favor of ultra-early decompression ( $\leq 12$  hours) for LEMS change at 12 months, however, several  
23 methodological limitations render the results of this study challenging to interpret. Specifically, there  
24 were significant imbalances in early and late surgical groups, particularly the baseline ASIA score, the  
25 study was underpowered, and there was a lack of reporting of clinically relevant outcome measures  
26 including upper extremity motor scores for cervical SCI cases. It is therefore unlikely that results from  
27 this study would have changed the conclusions or recommendations.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 *Evidence Related to Harms*

37  
38

39 Two prospective cohort studies evaluated mortality rates in patients treated ultra-early (<4 hours or <8  
40 hours) versus early (4 or 8 to 24 hours)[52,53]. In the study that evaluated a 4-hour cut-off, the mortality  
41 rate was 0 in both the ultra-early and early surgical groups[52]. In the second study, mortality was also  
42 infrequent and did not differ between groups: 2/26 in the ultra-early (<8 hours) and 1/22 in the early (8 to  
43 24 hours, RR 1.69, 95% CI 0.16 to 17.44)[53]. The overall level of evidence was low. A single study  
44 evaluated rates of neurological deterioration in patients undergoing surgery within 12 hours of injury  
45 compared to 12 to 24 hours[13]. Only three patients experienced neurological deterioration in a cohort of  
46 57: two in the ultra-early and one in the early group. There was no significant difference in the frequency  
47 of neurological deterioration based on the timing of surgical decompression (RR 1.56, 95% CI 0.15 to  
48 16.27). The overall level of evidence was very low.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Rationale for Recommendation

The outcomes ranked as critical for decision making were improvement of AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades and AMS as well as any major complication, including mortality and neurological deterioration. As highlighted above, the overall quality of evidence for these critical outcomes was rated as very low. Similar to part 1, the GDG agreed that the main outcomes driving the recommendation for ultra-early surgery are improvement in AIS grade  $\geq 2$  and improvement in AMS at  $>6$  to 12 months. The GDG acknowledged that there is inconsistency with respect to the impact of ultra-early surgery on these critical outcomes depending on what time threshold was evaluated. Based on these discussions, the GDG voted that the overall certainty of the evidence was either very low (87%) or low (13%).

Similar to part 1, the GDG agreed that there was probably no (44%) or no (31%) important uncertainty or variability with respect to how much key stakeholders value the main outcomes.

The anticipated desirable effects of ultra-early surgical decompression include improvement of AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades and improvement of AMS. Based on very low evidence, it was not possible to make firm conclusions on the effectiveness of ultra-early surgery ( $<4$ ,  $<5$ ,  $<8$ ,  $<12$ ) in improving AIS by  $\geq 2$  grades at 6- or 12-months[13,18,52,53]. Given the limitations in the literature, 75% of the GDG stated that they did not know how substantial the desirable anticipated effects were for ultra-early surgery.

The anticipated undesirable effects of ultra-early surgery include mortality and neurological deterioration. Based on very low evidence, there were no differences in rates of mortality or neurological deterioration between patients treated ultra-early ( $<4$ ,  $<8$  or  $<12$  hours) compared to early (4, 8 or 12 to 24 hours)[13,52,53]. Unfortunately, the majority of studies were underpowered to detect a difference in complications based on timing of surgery. Fifty-three percent of the GDG voted that the undesirable effects of very early surgery were likely trivial, 20% agreed they were small and 27% stated they did not know. Given the desirable effects of ultra-early surgery were unknown and the undesirable effects were either trivial or small, the GDG agreed that the balance between the desirable and undesirable effects was unknown.

Although the management of SCI requires substantial resources, there were no studies that compared costs between patients treated ultra-early and early. The GDG, however, agreed that the resources required for ultra-early surgery were likely similar to the resources required for early surgery. Length of hospital stay was also considered when evaluating overall cost and resource requirement of ultra-early

1  
2  
3 surgery. A single study by Jug et al (2015) determined that patients undergoing ultra-early (<8 hours)  
4 surgery had a shorter length of hospital stay ( $38.8 \pm 24.0$  days) than patients treated early (8 to 24 hours)  
5 ( $48.8 \pm 40.3$  days); however, this difference was not statistically significant (MD 10.0, 95% CI -30.31 to  
6 10.31 days)[53]. Sixty-nine percent of the GDG agreed that the costs and savings associated with ultra-  
7 early surgery were negligible given that the resource requirements are likely similar for ultra-early and  
8 early surgery. An additional 23% of participants stated they did not know given the absence of strong  
9 literature. Ninety-two percent of the GDG voted that there were no studies that compared the resource  
10 requirements between ultra-early and early surgical decompression. Similarly, the cost-effectiveness of  
11 ultra-early compared to early surgery was largely unknown given the unknown neurological benefit  
12 associated with ultra-early surgery and the uncertainty surrounding the resource requirement. Sixty-  
13 percent of the GDG stated that they did not know the cost-effectiveness of ultra-early surgery while 40%  
14 voted that it does not favor either the intervention or the comparison.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Fifty-four percent of the GDG stated that they did not know the impact of a recommendation of ultra-  
25 early surgery on health inequities and 15% noted that they were uncertain. Furthermore, the GDG was  
26 uncertain whether a recommendation for ultra-early surgery would be acceptable to clinicians and patients  
27 with traumatic SCI due to unclear neurological benefit (uncertain: 62%, don't know: 15%). Furthermore,  
28 it was uncertain whether payers would accept a recommendation of ultra-early surgery due to unclear  
29 costs and unknown potential for long-term savings. Finally, recommendations for some, if not all, of the  
30 time thresholds would be difficult to implement into clinical practice. In a study by Wilson et al (2016),  
31 the mean time from injury to arrival at a definitive care center was  $8.1 \pm 25.5$  hours, while the mean time  
32 to surgery was  $49.4 \pm 65.0$  hours[55]. Moreover, only 34.2% reached the operating room within 12 hours.  
33 As such, pathways of care for SCI would need to be further streamlined in order to successfully  
34 implement a recommendation for ultra-early surgery. In addition, some patients require hemodynamic  
35 stabilization prior to undergoing surgery, creating further barriers to adopting a recommendation of ultra-  
36 early surgery. The voting with respect to the feasibility of ultra-early surgery was therefore split: 21% no,  
37 21% probably no, 50% uncertain and 7% varies.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Considering these factors, 100% of the GDG voted that the balance between the desirable and undesirable  
48 consequences was closely balanced or uncertain. As a result of this uncertainty, the GDG agreed that a  
49 recommendation for very early surgery could not be made at this time.  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 The final wording that a recommendation for ultra-early surgical decompression could not be made with  
55 the current body of evidence was subjected to a final vote of all the GDG members and consensus was  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 achieved for its approval (>80%). Those who dissented either believed that the evidence did support the  
4 benefit of ultra-early decompression, or had concerns about whether ultra-early decompression was  
5 feasible to achieve or practical.  
6  
7

### 8 9 Evidence Gaps and Future Recommendations

10  
11  
12 Through the development of these CPGs, we identified several important knowledge gaps and areas of  
13 future research:  
14  
15

- 16  
17 1. *The impact of surgical timing across different SCI phenotypes, specifically central cord syndrome*  
18 *(CCS)*. Little of the current evidence base on timing of surgery for SCI has specifically focused on the  
19 unique entity of CCS. Based on current evidence for other injury patterns and the few studies  
20 examining timing of surgery for CCS, it is reasonable to extrapolate that a similar benefit of early  
21 surgery is afforded in this patient population. However, as CCS is the most common pattern of  
22 incomplete SCI, with an increasing incidence particularly among the growing elderly population,  
23 further research on the impact of surgical timing on neurological recovery in these patients is  
24 required. It is recognized that since the completion of the systematic reviews and guidelines process,  
25 at least two high quality studies on the timing of surgery for CCS and incomplete cervical SCI have  
26 been published[56,57]. Future efforts will need to address this new knowledge to update the current  
27 guidelines.  
28
- 29 2. *The influence of SCI severity or level of injury on the treatment effect of early surgery*. While there  
30 are several studies that incorporate patients with various levels and severities of SCI, estimates have  
31 typically been pooled and thus conclusions cannot be made in specific patient subgroups. Future  
32 studies should be designed to determine the impact of timing of surgical decompression on  
33 neurological outcomes in different patient subgroups in order to better establish personalized  
34 treatment approaches and correctly triage patients.  
35
- 36 3. *The influence of ultra-early surgery on patient related outcome measures*. While there are a number  
37 of studies that have attempted to determine the impact of surgery performed earlier than 24 hours, the  
38 lack of consistent time frames in the literature has significantly hindered pooling of the evidence.  
39 Establishing consistent timing thresholds to be used in future studies is critical in order to definitively  
40 determine whether ultra-early surgery provides additional benefits to patients. Careful consideration  
41 must be made in future studies to the timing of the neurological examination during this ultra-early  
42 period. This indeed is an important limitation in the interpretation of neurologic benefit after ultra-  
43 early surgery. Patients undergoing ultra-early surgery must be neurologically assessed very early  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 after their injury, when they still may be in spinal shock and when their examination is inherently less  
4 reliable at predicting outcome. And so, a person deemed “AIS A” when examined 2 hours post-injury  
5 who then has an immediate surgical decompression at 4 hours post-injury is not necessarily  
6 comparable to a person deemed “AIS A” when examined 14 hours post-injury who then has surgery  
7 at 20 hours post-injury. Accounting for this will be important in future studies that try to establish the  
8 true neurologic benefit of ultra-early surgery. Furthermore, studies investigating barriers to early  
9 surgical intervention and strategies to address them, particularly in under-resourced settings, are  
10 critical in ensuring adherence to established CPGs.

- 11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 4. *Establishment of what constitutes a clinically meaningful improvement on the outcome measures used*  
17 *to evaluate neurological and functional status.* The development and incorporation of new metrics to  
18 assess functional improvement in future studies will aid in establishing clearer benchmarks for  
19 clinically meaningful improvements.  
20  
21  
22 5. *The cost-effectiveness of early versus late surgery.* Since publication of the last set of guidelines in  
23 2017, there has been only one additional study investigating the cost-effectiveness of early surgery.  
24 Nevertheless, there remains a paucity of evidence in this area which necessitates further research.  
25  
26  
27 6. *The issue of what constitutes an effective decompression is an area of evolving interest.* The role of  
28 duroplasty, extent of spinal column decompression (e.g. number of levels of laminectomy), surgical  
29 approach and the use of intraoperative ultrasound to validate the effectiveness of decompressive  
30 surgery are areas of ongoing investigation that will require high quality prospective comparative  
31 effectiveness studies to move the field forward.  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 Implementation Considerations

37  
38  
39 Dissemination of this guideline will be accomplished at multiple levels in order to ensure effective  
40 implementation into clinical practice:

- 41  
42  
43 • Presentation at international spine surgery, critical care, neurology, and anesthesiology  
44 conferences.  
45  
46 • Scientific and educational courses.  
47  
48 • Online webinar that engage a broad audience in an interactive format.  
49  
50 • Publication of a focus issue in the Global Spine Journal.  
51  
52 • Submission to the National Guideline Clearinghouse.  
53

### 54 Internal Appraisal and External Review

1  
2  
3 The leader of the GDG and a methodologist from Aggregate Analytics completed an internal appraisal of  
4 the final guideline using the AGREE II checklist. A multidisciplinary group of stakeholders were invited  
5 to externally review this guideline document prior to publication. This guideline was also reviewed by  
6 several professional societies (see Appendix). The methods paper published elsewhere in this focus issue  
7 summarizes additional details of these processes and highlights the conflicts of interest of both internal  
8 and external reviews.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 Plans for Updating

15  
16  
17 This guideline will be reviewed by AO Spine, Praxis Spinal Cord Institute and members of the leadership  
18 group at three to five years following publication. The guideline will be updated at this time, or earlier, if  
19 there are changes in (i) the evidence related to benefits and harms, (ii) outcomes deemed critical for  
20 decision-making; (iii) knowledge related to resource requirements and cost-effectiveness; and (iv)  
21 available interventions and resources.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

1. Witiw CD, Fehlings MG. Acute Spinal Cord Injury. *J Spinal Disord Tech* 2015; 28: 202-210 DOI: 10.1097/BSD.0000000000000287
2. Krueger H, Noonan VK, Trenaman LM et al. The economic burden of traumatic spinal cord injury in Canada. *Chronic Dis Inj Can* 2013; 33: 113-122
3. Alizadeh A, Dyck SM, Karimi-Abdolrezaee S. Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury: An Overview of Pathophysiology, Models and Acute Injury Mechanisms. *Front Neurol* 2019; 10: 282 DOI: 10.3389/fneur.2019.00282
4. Dumont RJ, Okonkwo DO, Verma S et al. Acute spinal cord injury, part I: pathophysiologic mechanisms. *Clin Neuropharmacol* 2001; 24: 254-264 DOI: 10.1097/00002826-200109000-00002
5. Wilson J, Fehlings M. Emerging Approaches to the surgical management of acute traumatic Spinal Cord Injury. *Neurotherapeutics* 2011; 8: 197-194
6. Ahuja CS, Nori S, Tetreault L et al. Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury-Repair and Regeneration. *Neurosurgery* 2017; 80: S9-S22 DOI: 10.1093/neuros/nyw080
7. Guha A, Tator C, Endrenyi L. Decompression of the spinal cord improves recovery after acute experimental spinal cord compression injury. *Paraplegia* 1987; 25: 324-339
8. Dimar J, Glassman S, Raque G et al. The influence of spinal canal narrowing and timing of decompression on neurologic recovery after spinal cord contusion in a rat model. *Spine* 1999; 24: 1623-1633
9. Fehlings MG, Perrin RG. The timing of surgical intervention in the treatment of spinal cord injury: a systematic review of recent clinical evidence. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2006; 31: S28-35; discussion S36 DOI: 10.1097/01.brs.0000217973.11402.7f
10. Fehlings MG, Tetreault LA, Wilson JR et al. A Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Patients With Acute Spinal Cord Injury and Central Cord Syndrome: Recommendations on the Timing ( $\leq 24$  Hours Versus  $>24$  Hours) of Decompressive Surgery. *Global Spine J* 2017; 7: 195S-202S DOI: 10.1177/2192568217706367
11. Wilson JR, Tetreault LA, Kwon BK et al. Timing of Decompression in Patients With Acute Spinal Cord Injury: A Systematic Review. *Global Spine J* 2017; 7: 95S-115S DOI: 10.1177/2192568217701716
12. Badhiwala JH, Wilson JR, Witiw CD et al. The influence of timing of surgical decompression for acute spinal cord injury: a pooled analysis of individual patient data. *Lancet Neurol* 2021; 20: 117-126 DOI: 10.1016/s1474-4422(20)30406-3
13. Aarabi B, Akhtar-Danesh N, Chryssikos T et al. Efficacy of Ultra-Early ( $< 12$  h), Early (12-24 h), and Late ( $>24$ -138.5 h) Surgery with Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Confirmed Decompression in American Spinal Injury Association Impairment Scale Grades A, B, and C Cervical Spinal Cord Injury. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 2020; 37: 448-457 DOI: 10.1089/neu.2019.6606
14. Aarabi B, Akhtar-Danesh N, Simard JM et al. Efficacy of early ( $\leq 24$  Hours), Late (25-72 Hours), and Delayed ( $>72$  Hours) surgery with magnetic resonance imaging-confirmed decompression in american spinal injury association impairment scale grades C and D acute traumatic central cord syndrome caused by spinal stenosis. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 2021; 38: 2073-2083 DOI: 10.1089/neu.2021.0040
15. Du JP, Fan Y, Liu JJ et al. Decompression for Traumatic Thoracic/Thoracolumbar Incomplete Spinal Cord Injury: Application of AO Spine Injury Classification System to Identify the Timing of Operation. *World Neurosurgery* 2018; 116: e867-e873 DOI: 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.05.118
16. Haghnegahdar A, Behjat R, Saadat S et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Early versus Late Surgical Decompression for Thoracic and Thoracolumbar Spinal Cord Injury in 73 Patients. *Neurotrauma Rep* 2020; 1: 78-87 DOI: 10.1089/neur.2020.0027
17. Lee S, Kim C, Ha JK et al. Comparison of Early Surgical Treatment With Conservative Treatment of Incomplete Cervical Spinal Cord Injury Without Major Fracture or Dislocation in



- 1  
2  
3 Patients With Pre-existing Cervical Spinal Stenosis. *Clin Spine Surg* 2021; 34: E141-e146 DOI:  
4 10.1097/bsd.0000000000001065
- 5 18. Mattiassich G, Gollwitzer M, Gaderer F et al. Functional Outcomes in Individuals Undergoing  
6 Very Early (< 5 h) and Early (5-24 h) Surgical Decompression in Traumatic Cervical Spinal Cord  
7 Injury: Analysis of Neurological Improvement from the Austrian Spinal Cord Injury Study.  
8 *Journal of Neurotrauma* 2017; 34: 3362-3371 DOI: 10.1089/neu.2017.5132
- 9 19. Qadir I, Riew KD, Alam SR et al. Timing of Surgery in Thoracolumbar Spine Injury: Impact on  
10 Neurological Outcome. *Global Spine Journal* 2020; 10: 826-831 DOI:  
11 10.1177/2192568219876258
- 12 20. Sewell MD, Vachhani K, Alrawi A et al. Results of Early and Late Surgical Decompression and  
13 Stabilization for Acute Traumatic Cervical Spinal Cord Injury in Patients with Concomitant Chest  
14 Injuries. *World Neurosurg* 2018; 118: e161-e165 DOI: 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.06.146
- 15 21. Ter Wengel PV, de Gendt EEA, Martin E et al. Impact of Surgical Timing on Motor Level  
16 Lowering in Motor Complete Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury Patients. *J Neurotrauma* 2022: DOI:  
17 10.1089/neu.2021.0428
- 18 22. Shiffman RN, Shekelle P, Overhage JM et al. Standardized reporting of clinical practice  
19 guidelines: a proposal from the Conference on Guideline Standardization. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;  
20 139: 493-498 DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-139-6-200309160-00013
- 21 23. Vernooij RW, Alonso-Coello P, Brouwers M et al. Reporting Items for Updated Clinical  
22 Guidelines: Checklist for the Reporting of Updated Guidelines (CheckUp). *PLoS Med* 2017; 14:  
23 e1002207 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002207
- 24 24. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schunemann HJ et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of  
25 evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011; 64: 401-406
- 26 25. Li SA, Alexander PE, Reljic T et al. Evidence to Decision framework provides a structured  
27 "roadmap" for making GRADE guidelines recommendations. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2018; 104: 103-  
28 112 DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.09.007
- 29 26. Alonso-Coello P, Oxman AD, Moberg J et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks:  
30 a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 2: Clinical  
31 practice guidelines. *BMJ* 2016; 353: i2089 DOI: 10.1136/bmj.i2089
- 32 27. Alonso-Coello P, Schunemann HJ, Moberg J et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD)  
33 frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices.  
34 1: Introduction. *BMJ* 2016; 353: i2016 DOI: 10.1136/bmj.i2016
- 35 28. Brouwers MC, Kho ME, Browman GP et al. Development of the AGREE II, part 2: assessment  
36 of validity of items and tools to support application. *CMAJ* 2010; 182: E472-478 DOI:  
37 10.1503/cmaj.091716
- 38 29. Fehlings MG, Vaccaro A, Wilson JR et al. Early versus delayed decompression for traumatic  
39 cervical spinal cord injury: results of the Surgical Timing in Acute Spinal Cord Injury Study  
40 (STASCIS). *PLoS One* 2012; 7: e32037 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0032037
- 41 30. Umerani MS, Abbas A, Sharif S. Clinical Outcome in Patients with Early versus Delayed  
42 Decompression in Cervical Spine Trauma. *Asian spine journal* 2014; 8: 427-434 DOI:  
43 10.4184/asj.2014.8.4.427
- 44 31. Lenehan B, Fisher CG, Vaccaro A et al. The urgency of surgical decompression in acute central  
45 cord injuries with spondylosis and without instability. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2010; 35: S180-186  
46 DOI: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181f32a44
- 47 32. Wilson JR, Singh A, Craven C et al. Early versus late surgery for traumatic spinal cord injury: the  
48 results of a prospective Canadian cohort study. *Spinal Cord* 2012; 50: 840-843 DOI:  
49 10.1038/sc.2012.59
- 50 33. Bourassa-Moreau É, Mac-Thiong JM, Ehrmann Feldman D et al. Complications in acute phase  
51 hospitalization of traumatic spinal cord injury: does surgical timing matter? *J Trauma Acute Care*  
52 *Surg* 2013; 74: 849-854 DOI: 10.1097/TA.0b013e31827e1381
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 34. Copay AG, Subach BR, Glassman SD et al. Understanding the minimum clinically important  
4 difference: a review of concepts and methods. *Spine J* 2007; 7: 541-546 DOI:  
5 10.1016/j.spinee.2007.01.008  
6 35. Jaeschke R, Singer J, Guyatt GH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal  
7 clinically important difference. *Control Clin Trials* 1989; 10: 407-415 DOI: 10.1016/0197-  
8 2456(89)90005-6  
9 36. Kirshblum S, Waring W, 3rd. Updates for the International Standards for Neurological  
10 Classification of Spinal Cord Injury. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am* 2014; 25: 505-517, vii DOI:  
11 10.1016/j.pmr.2014.04.001  
12 37. Kirshblum SC, Burns SP, Biering-Sorensen F et al. International standards for neurological  
13 classification of spinal cord injury (revised 2011). *J Spinal Cord Med* 2011; 34: 535-546 DOI:  
14 10.1179/204577211X13207446293695  
15 38. Rupp R, Biering-Sorensen F, Burns SP et al. International Standards for Neurological  
16 Classification of Spinal Cord Injury: Revised 2019. *Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil* 2021; 27: 1-22  
17 DOI: 10.46292/sci2702-1  
18 39. Wu X, Liu J, Tanadini LG et al. Challenges for defining minimal clinically important difference  
19 (MCID) after spinal cord injury. *Spinal Cord* 2015; 53: 84-91 DOI: 10.1038/sc.2014.232  
20 40. Scivoletto G, Tamburella F, Laurenza L et al. Distribution-based estimates of clinically  
21 significant changes in the International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord  
22 Injury motor and sensory scores. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2013; 49: 373-384  
23 41. Marino RJ, Jones L, Kirshblum S et al. Reliability and repeatability of the motor and sensory  
24 examination of the international standards for neurological classification of spinal cord injury. *J*  
25 *Spinal Cord Med* 2008; 31: 166-170 DOI: 10.1080/10790268.2008.11760707  
26 42. Kramer JL, Lammertse DP, Schubert M et al. Relationship between motor recovery and  
27 independence after sensorimotor-complete cervical spinal cord injury. *Neurorehabil Neural*  
28 *Repair* 2012; 26: 1064-1071 DOI: 10.1177/1545968312447306  
29 43. Kirshblum S, Botticello A, Lammertse DP et al. The impact of sacral sensory sparing in motor  
30 complete spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2011; 92: 376-383 DOI:  
31 10.1016/j.apmr.2010.07.242  
32 44. Skelton F, Hoffman JM, Reyes M et al. Examining health-care utilization in the first year  
33 following spinal cord injury. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2015; 38: 690-695 DOI:  
34 10.1179/2045772314Y.0000000269  
35 45. Dryden DM, Saunders LD, Rowe BH et al. Utilization of health services following spinal cord  
36 injury: a 6-year follow-up study. *Spinal Cord* 2004; 42: 513-525 DOI: 10.1038/sj.sc.3101629  
37 46. Malekzadeh H, Golpayegani M, Ghodsi Z et al. Direct Cost of Illness for Spinal Cord Injury: A  
38 Systematic Review. *Global Spine J* 2022; 12: 1267-1281 DOI: 10.1177/21925682211031190  
39 47. Mac-Thiong JM, Feldman DE, Thompson C et al. Does timing of surgery affect hospitalization  
40 costs and length of stay for acute care following a traumatic spinal cord injury? *J Neurotrauma*  
41 2012; 29: 2816-2822 DOI: 10.1089/neu.2012.2503  
42 48. Furlan JC, Craven BC, Massicotte EM et al. Early Versus Delayed Surgical Decompression of  
43 Spinal Cord after Traumatic Cervical Spinal Cord Injury: A Cost-Utility Analysis. *World*  
44 *Neurosurg* 2016; 88: 166-174 DOI: 10.1016/j.wneu.2015.12.072  
45 49. Dvorak MF, Noonan VK, Fallah N et al. The influence of time from injury to surgery on motor  
46 recovery and length of hospital stay in acute traumatic spinal cord injury: an observational  
47 Canadian cohort study. *J Neurotrauma* 2015; 32: 645-654 DOI: 10.1089/neu.2014.3632  
48 50. Rahimi-Movaghar V, Niakan A, Haghnegahdar A et al. Early versus late surgical decompression  
49 for traumatic thoracic/thoracolumbar (T1-L1) spinal cord injured patients. Primary results of a  
50 randomized controlled trial at one year follow-up. *Neurosciences (Riyadh)* 2014; 19: 183-191  
51 51. Brasel KJ, Lim HJ, Nirula R et al. Length of stay: an appropriate quality measure? *Arch Surg*  
52 2007; 142: 461-465; discussion 465-466 DOI: 10.1001/archsurg.142.5.461  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 52. Biglari B, Child C, Yildirim TM et al. Does surgical treatment within 4 hours after trauma have  
4 an influence on neurological remission in patients with acute spinal cord injury? *Ther Clin Risk*  
5 *Manag* 2016; 12: 1339-1346 DOI: 10.2147/term.S108856  
6  
7 53. Jug M, Kejžar N, Vesel M et al. Neurological Recovery after Traumatic Cervical Spinal Cord  
8 Injury Is Superior if Surgical Decompression and Instrumented Fusion Are Performed within 8  
9 Hours versus 8 to 24 Hours after Injury: A Single Center Experience. *J Neurotrauma* 2015; 32:  
10 1385-1392  
11  
12 54. Hosman AJF, Barbagallo G, van Middendorp JJ. Neurological recovery after early versus delayed  
13 surgical decompression for acute traumatic spinal cord injury. *Bone Joint J* 2023; 105-b: 400-411  
14 DOI: 10.1302/0301-620x.105b4.Bjj-2022-0947.R2  
15  
16 55. Wilson JR, Voth J, Singh A et al. Defining the Pathway to Definitive Care and Surgical  
17 Decompression after Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury: Results of a Canadian Population-Based  
18 Cohort Study. *J Neurotrauma* 2016; 33: 963-971 DOI: 10.1089/neu.2015.4258  
19  
20 56. Badhiwala JH, Wilson JR, Harrop JS et al. Early vs Late Surgical Decompression for Central  
21 Cord Syndrome. *JAMA Surg* 2022: DOI: 10.1001/jamasurg.2022.4454  
22  
23 57. investigators O, Chikuda H, Koyama Y et al. Effect of Early vs Delayed Surgical Treatment on  
24 Motor Recovery in Incomplete Cervical Spinal Cord Injury With Preexisting Cervical Stenosis: A  
25 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; 4: e2133604 DOI:  
26 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.33604  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60