

Study	HO prevalence (%)	Mean age	Male (%)	Single-level CTDR (%)	C5C6 (%)	C6C7 (%)	Mean operation time (minute)	Mean hospitalization (day)
Coric et al., 2018 ¹	62.4	43.7	37.5	100	61.0	27.2	80.2	2.1
Gao et al., 2018 ²	16.7	45.4	62.5	0	50.0	15.4	/	/
Pointillart et al., 2018 ³	54.5	46.2	55.6	77.8	50.0	40.9	/	/
Zhou et al., 2018 ⁴	50.0	43.0	49.2	77.0	67.1	12.9	/	/
Zeng et al., 2018 ⁵	46.7	43.8	42.2	100	51.1	40.0	/	/
Miao et al., 2018 ⁶	65.6	41.3	48.1	70.9	47.1	16.7	/	/
Zarkadis et al., 2017 ⁷	0	40.0	83.3	0	50.0	41.7	/	/
Mehren et al., 2017 ⁸	90.0	44.8	51.1	57.4	40.0	41.4	/	/
Wu_a et al., 2017 ⁹	4.0	44.8	48.0	0	36.0	12.0	106.4	/
Ozbek et al., 2017 ¹⁰	21.8	43.6	40.0	77.0	36.1	34.7	/	/
Chang et al., 2017 ¹¹	87.5	45.6	42.0	100	72.0	4.0	/	/
Wu_b et al., 2017 ¹²	7.4	48.1	59.3	0	/	/	132.2	/

Heo et al., 2017 ¹³	29.2	50.7	37.5	100	68.8	16.7	/	/
Lanman et al., 2017 ¹⁴	/	47.1	44.0	0	/	/	/	/
Tian et al., 2017 ¹⁵	2.7	45.0	67.9	71.4	59.5	13.5	/	/
Hisey et al., 2016 ¹⁶	/	43.2	47.6	100	/	/	90.0	2.1
Meisel et al., 2016 ¹⁷	/	43.0	41.0	100	54.0	38.0	78.0	/
Sirikci et al., 2016 ¹⁸	4.6	39.5	52.5	64.4	48.8	26.7	/	/
Kim et al., 2016 ¹⁹	69.6	45.0	87.0	100	65.2	8.7	/	/
Sundseth et al., 2016 ²⁰	100	44.2	45.9	100	59.5	40.5	/	/
Wagner et al., 2016 ²¹	13.8	41.7	76.1	62.8	/	/	/	/
Lei et al., 2016 ²²	51.4	42.6	48.4	87.1	32.3	35.5	/	/
Gornet et al., 2016 ²³	15.7	44.5	46.1	100	52.5	38.6	89.4	1.0
Chang et al., 2016 ²⁴	62.5	45.6	53.4	100	69.3	4.5	/	/
Shichang et al., 2016 ²⁵	28.2	46.3	43.5	100	44.7	7.1	58.1	8.4
Hou et al., 2016 ²⁶	0	46.3	58.8	100	54.9	27.5	95.0	9.3

Zhao et al., 2016 ²⁷	69.0	44.8	57.6	75.8	61.9	14.3	/	/
Qizhi et al., 2016 ²⁸	0	46.8	64.3	0	28.6	21.4	98.6	/
Thomas et al., 2016 ²⁹	2.5	45.5	18.2	66.7	/	/	/	/
Fransen et al., 2016 ³⁰	53.2	/	/	60.6	43.1	38.2	/	/
Shi et al., 2016 ³¹	13.3	46.5	40.0	100	41.7	16.7	79.2	/
Radcliff et al., 2016 ³²	41.7	45.3	50.2	0	/	/	/	/
Kim et al., 2015 ³³	18.9	45.4	64.9	100	64.9	16.2	/	/
Lee et al., 2015 ³⁴	78.6	47.1	85.7	100	35.7	42.9	/	/
Zhang et al., 2015 ³⁵	34.0	42.7	50.9	100	/	/	/	/
Skeppholm et al., 2015 ³⁶	/	46.6	42.9	64.3	35.7	21.4	/	/
Janssen et al., 2015 ³⁷	/	42.1	46.6	100	/	/	/	/
Hur et al., 2015 ³⁸	16.7	/	/	0	/	/	/	/
Phillips et al., 2015 ³⁹	/	45.3	51.8	100	50.0	34.9	100.8	1.2
Zhang a et al., 2014 ⁴⁰	18.8	/	/	89.7	51.6	0	126.6	/

Fay et al., 2014 ⁴¹	41.9	50.6	60.8	62.4	54.1	12.2	213.2	/
Suchomel et al., 2014 ⁴²	/	42.9	40.0	100	53.7	37.1	/	/
Zhang_b et al., 2014 ⁴³	32.7	44.8	45.5	100	29.1	21.8	84.5	/
Ding et al., 2014 ⁴⁴	7.7	50.6	61.5	0	/	/	153.1	10.3
Qi et al., 2014 ⁴⁵	27.9	43.1	54.4	76.8	33.6	7.2	/	/
Malham et al., 2014 ⁴⁶	36.4	40.3	54.2	79.2	48.3	41.4	/	/
Zhao et al., 2013 ⁴⁷	65.4	44.0	61.5	100	61.5	11.5	/	/
Li et al., 2013 ⁴⁸	18.2	46.4	49.1	100	61.8	10.9	/	/
Zhang et al., 2013 ⁴⁹	26.1	46.5	65.0	85.0	52.2	0	134.5	/
Park et al., 2013 ⁵⁰	94.1	45.0	49.3	78.7	44.7	36.5	/	/
Chen et al., 2013 ⁵¹	16.1	45.0	58.1	100	90.3	0	/	/
Pimenta et al., 2013 ⁵²	7.7	46.2	32.3	44.9	69.6	50.6	/	/
Jin et al., 2013 ⁵³	64.2	46.0	72.8	74.7	50.5	24.2	/	/
Cho et al., 2013 ⁵⁴	/	41.7	78.1	84.4	64.7	17.6	/	/
Choi et al., 2012 ⁵⁵	38.8	48.8	54.7	50.9	46.3	32.5	/	/
Tu et al., 2012 ⁵⁶	56.1	46.7	68.0	57.3	56.1	11.2	/	/

Sun et al., 2012 ⁵⁷	42.3	44.0	53.8	100	76.9	3.8	/	/
Chung et al., 2012 ⁵⁸	68.4	50.1	63.2	100	47.4	47.4	/	/
GUeRIN et al., 2012 ⁵⁹	27.7	41.2	45.1	77.5	/	/	75.0	/
Wu et al., 2012 ⁶⁰	37.5	45.5	60.0	100	67.5	5.0	/	/
Lee et al., 2012 ⁶¹	64.3	44.4	75.0	67.9	50.0	10.7	/	/
Zhang et al., 2012 ⁶²	12.5	44.8	58.3	100	43.3	13.3	92.4	3.3
Barrey et al., 2012 ⁶³	18.8	42.3	43.8	100	75.0	21.9	65.6	5.1
Cho et al., 2012 ⁶⁴	46.5	46.3	55.0	86.0	51.2	25.6	/	/
US FDA IDE trial (P100003) 2012	74.2	42.7	53.3	100	51.3	39.2	91.7	1.1
Wang et al., 2011 ⁶⁵	0	46.5	65.0	85.0	52.2	0	134.5	/
Peng et al., 2011 ⁶⁶	/	43.9	47.5	62.5	55.9	15.3	/	/
Huppert et al., 2011 ⁶⁷	62.0	44.9	39.8	75.8	44.7	39.9	97.9	3.5
Ren et al., 2011 ⁶⁸	/	46.0	57.8	86.7	53.3	11.1	/	/
Tu et al., 2011 ⁶⁹	48.1	46.6	58.3	55.6	61.5	9.6	/	/

Du et al., 2011 ⁷⁰	0	47.9	56.0	96.0	/	/	132.6	/
Cardoso et al., 2011 ⁷¹	0	50.0	58.1	0	60.0	6.7	/	/
Kowalczyk et al., 2011 ⁷²	3.3	44.4	50.0	100	55.0	33.3	/	/
Zhao et al., 2010 ⁷³	33.3	43.8	50.0	90.9	75.0	4.2	/	/
Walraevens et al., 2010 ⁷⁴	38.5	42.8	42.7	100	/	/	/	/
Lee et al., 2010 ⁷⁵	27.1	44.0	56.3	100	56.3	29.2	/	/
Reyes-Sanchez et al., 2010 ⁷⁶	0	44.5	8.0	48.0	47.4	23.7	/	/
Suchomel et al., 2010 ⁷⁷	88.3	45.3	50.0	81.5	58.5	29.2	82.0	3.7
Ryu et al., 2010 ⁷⁸	52.8	46.6	58.3	100	47.2	30.6	/	/
Cardoso et al., 2010 ⁷⁹	0	45.0	100	0	36.4	31.8	/	/
Barbagallo et al., 2010 ⁸⁰	42.2	40.9	60.0	63.3	51.1	28.9	/	/
Cheng et al., 2009 ⁸¹	0	45.0	51.6	0	/	/	/	/
Yang et al., 2009 ⁸²	0	45.4	66.7	100	37.5	12.5	140.0	/
Bhadra et al., 2009 ⁸³	13.3	34.0	60.0	100	60.0	33.3	105.0	2.0

US FDA IDE trial (P060023) 2009	/	44.4	45.5	100	57.9	36.0	132.0	1.1
Heidecke et al., 2008 ⁸⁴	28.8	46.7	40.7	90.7	55.9	13.6	/	/
Kim et al., 2008 ⁸⁵	0	/	63.8	83.0	47.3	36.4	/	/
Park et al., 2008 ⁸⁶	0	45.0	52.4	100	61.9	28.6	167.0	5.6
Amit et al., 2007 ⁸⁷	0	51.0	59.1	100	/	/	120.0	/
Pimenta et al., 2007 ⁸⁸	0.4	46.0	40.0	50.7	44.2	28.6	113.5	1.1
Mehren et al., 2006 ⁸⁹	66.2	/	/	63.0	46.8	37.7	/	/
Pickett et al., 2006 ⁹⁰	2.7	/	16.2	/	43.8	32.3	/	/
Leung et al., 2006 ⁹¹	17.8	45.0	43.3	/	/	/	/	/
Pimenta et al., 2004 ⁹²	/	45.0	39.6	52.8	33.7	21.8	/	/

HO, heterotopic ossification; CTDR, cervical total disc replacement.

Reference

1. Coric D, Guyer RD, Nunley PD, et al. Prospective, randomized multicenter study of cervical arthroplasty versus anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: 5-year results with a metal-on-metal artificial disc. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2018;1-10.
2. Gao X, Yang Y, Liu H, et al. Cervical disc arthroplasty with Prestige-LP for the treatment of contiguous 2-level cervical degenerative disc disease: 5-year follow-up results. *Medicine*. 2018;97(4).
3. Pointillart V, Castelain J-E, Coudert P, Cawley DT, Gille O, Vital J-M. Outcomes of the Bryan cervical disc replacement: fifteen year follow-up. *International orthopaedics*. 2018;42(4):851-857.
4. Zhou F, Ju KL, Zhao Y, et al. Progressive Bone Formation After Cervical Disc Replacement. *Spine*. 2018;43(3):E163-E170.
5. Zeng J, Liu H, Wang B, et al. Clinical and radiographic comparison of cervical disc arthroplasty with Prestige-LP Disc and anterior cervical fusion: A minimum 6-year follow-up study. *Clinical neurology and neurosurgery*. 2018;164:97-102.
6. Miao J, Shen Y, Li C, et al. Cervical Artificial Disc Replacement With Discover Prosthesis Does Not Reduce the Midterm Risk of Heterotopic Ossification: Results of a Cohort Study. *Clinical spine surgery*. 2018;31(3):E204-E208.
7. Zarkadis NJ, Cleveland AW, Kusnezov NA, Dunn JC, Caram PM, Herzog JP. Outcomes Following Multilevel Cervical Disc Arthroplasty in the Young Active Population. *Military medicine*. 2017;182(3-4):e1790-e1794.
8. Mehren C, Heider F, Siepe CJ, et al. Clinical and radiological outcome at 10 years of follow-up after total cervical disc replacement. *European Spine Journal*. 2017;26(9):2441-2449.
9. Wu T, Wang B, Ding C, et al. Artificial cervical disc replacement with the Prestige-LP prosthesis for the treatment of non-contiguous 2-level cervical degenerative disc disease: a minimum 24-month follow-up. *Clinical neurology and neurosurgery*. 2017;152:57-62.
10. Ozbek Z, Ozkara E, Arslantaş A. Implant Migration in Cervical Disk Arthroplasty. *World neurosurgery*. 2017;97:390-397.
11. Chang H-K, Chang C-C, Tu T-H, et al. Can segmental mobility be increased by cervical arthroplasty? *Neurosurgical focus*. 2017;42(2):E3.
12. Wu T-k, Wang B-y, Cheng D, et al. Clinical and radiographic features of hybrid surgery for the treatment of skip-level cervical degenerative disc disease: A minimum 24-month follow-up. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*. 2017;40:102-108.
13. Heo DH, Lee DC, Oh JY, Park CK. Bone loss of vertebral bodies at the operative segment after cervical arthroplasty: a potential complication? *Neurosurgical focus*. 2017;42(2):E7.
14. Lanman TH, Burkus JK, Dryer RG, Gornet MF, McConnell J, Hodges SD. Long-term clinical and radiographic outcomes of the Prestige LP artificial cervical disc replacement at 2 levels: results from a prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2017;27(1):7-19.

15. Tian W, Yan K, Han X, Yu J, Jin P, Han X. Comparison of the Clinical and Radiographic Results Between Cervical Artificial Disk Replacement and Anterior Cervical Fusion: A 6-Year Prospective Nonrandomized Comparative Study. *Clinical spine surgery*. 2017;30(5):E578-E586.
16. Hisey MS, Zigler JE, Jackson R, et al. Prospective, randomized comparison of one-level Mobi-C cervical total disc replacement vs. anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: results at 5-year follow-up. *International journal of spine surgery*. 2016;10.
17. Meisel H-J, Jurák L, Antinheimo J, et al. Four-year results of a prospective single-arm study on 200 semi-constrained total cervical disc prostheses: clinical and radiographic outcome. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2016;25(5):556-565.
18. Sirikci M, Karaca S, Enercan M, et al. Radiologic and Clinical Outcome of the Operated and Adjacent Segments Following Prodisc-C Cervical Arthroplasty After a Minimum 24-month Follow-up: A Single Surgeon-center Experience. *Neurosurgery Quarterly*. 2016;26(3):234-239.
19. Kim KS, Heo DH. Do postoperative biomechanical changes induce heterotopic ossification after cervical arthroplasty?: A 5-year follow-up study. *Clinical spine surgery*. 2016;29(6):E309-E313.
20. Sundseth J, Jacobsen EA, Kolstad F, et al. Heterotopic ossification and clinical outcome in nonconstrained cervical arthroplasty 2 years after surgery: the Norwegian Cervical Arthroplasty Trial (NORCAT). *European Spine Journal*. 2016;25(7):2271-2278.
21. Wagner SC, Formby PM, Kang DG, et al. Persistent axial neck pain after cervical disc arthroplasty: a radiographic analysis. *The Spine Journal*. 2016;16(7):851-856.
22. Lei T, Liu Y, Wang H, et al. Clinical and radiological analysis of Bryan cervical disc arthroplasty: eight-year follow-up results compared with anterior cervical discectomy and fusion. *International orthopaedics*. 2016;40(6):1197-1203.
23. Gornet MF, Burkus JK, Shaffrey ME, Nian H, Harrell Jr FE. Cervical disc arthroplasty with prestige LP disc versus anterior cervical discectomy and fusion: seven-year outcomes. *International journal of spine surgery*. 2016;10.
24. Chang P-Y, Chang H-K, Wu J-C, et al. Differences between C3–4 and other subaxial levels of cervical disc arthroplasty: more heterotopic ossification at the 5-year follow-up. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2016;24(5):752-759.
25. Shichang L, Yueming S, Limin L, et al. Clinical and radiologic comparison of dynamic cervical implant arthroplasty and cervical total disc replacement for single-level cervical degenerative disc disease. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*. 2016;27:102-109.
26. Hou Y, Nie L, Pan X, et al. Effectiveness and safety of Mobi-C for treatment of single-level cervical disc spondylosis: a randomised control trial with a minimum of five years of follow-up. *Bone Joint J*. 2016;98(6):829-833.
27. Zhao Y, Zhang Y, Sun Y, Pan S, Zhou F, Liu Z. Application of cervical arthroplasty with Bryan cervical disc: 10-year follow-up results in China. *Spine*. 2016;41(2):111-115.
28. Qizhi S, Lei S, Peijia L, et al. A comparison of zero-profile devices and artificial cervical disks in patients with 2 noncontiguous levels of cervical spondylosis. *Clinical spine surgery*. 2016;29(2):E61-E66.

29. Thomas S, Willems K, Van den Daelen L, Linden P, Ciocci M-C, Bocher P. The M6-C cervical disk prosthesis: first clinical experience in 33 patients. *Clinical spine surgery*. 2016;29(4):E182-E187.
30. Fransen P, Hansen-Algenstaedt N, Chatzistiriou A, et al. Radiographic outcome and adjacent segment evaluation two years after cervical disc replacement with the Baguera® C prosthesis as treatment of degenerative cervical disc disease. *J Spine*. 2016;5(2):1-7.
31. Shi S, Zheng S, Li X-F, Yang L-L, Liu Z-D, Yuan W. Comparison of 2 Zero-Profile implants in the treatment of single-level cervical spondylotic myelopathy: a preliminary clinical study of cervical disc arthroplasty versus fusion. *PloS one*. 2016;11(7):e0159761.
32. Radcliff K, Coric D, Albert T. Five-year clinical results of cervical total disc replacement compared with anterior discectomy and fusion for treatment of 2-level symptomatic degenerative disc disease: a prospective, randomized, controlled, multicenter investigational device exemption clinical trial. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2016;25(2):213-224.
33. Kim SH, Chung YS, Ropper AE, et al. Bone loss of the superior adjacent vertebral body immediately posterior to the anterior flange of Bryan cervical disc. *European Spine Journal*. 2015;24(12):2872-2879.
34. Lee SE, Jahng T-A, Kim HJ. Correlation between cervical lordosis and adjacent segment pathology after anterior cervical spinal surgery. *European Spine Journal*. 2015;24(12):2899-2909.
35. Zhang Z, Jiao L, Zhu W, Du Y, Zhang W. Comparison of Bryan versus ProDisc-C total disc replacement as treatment for single-level cervical symptomatic degenerative disk disease. *Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery*. 2015;135(3):305-311.
36. Skeppholm M, Svedmark P, Noz ME, Maguire Jr GQ, Olivecrona H, Olerud C. Evaluation of mobility and stability in the Discover artificial disc: an in vivo motion study using high-accuracy 3D CT data. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2015;23(3):383-389.
37. Janssen ME, Zigler JE, Spivak JM, Delamarter RB, Darden BV, Kopjar B. ProDisc-C total disc replacement versus anterior cervical discectomy and fusion for single-level symptomatic cervical disc disease: seven-year follow-up of the prospective randomized US Food and Drug Administration Investigational Device Exemption Study. *JBJS*. 2015;97(21):1738-1747.
38. Hur J-W, Ryu K-S, Kim J-S, Seong J-h. Multilevel Fusion versus Hybrid Surgery in Three-Level Cervical Disc Disease: Retrospective Matched Analysis of Clinical and Radiologic Results in Minimum Two-Year Follow-Up. *The Spine Journal*. 2015;15(10):S236-S237.
39. Phillips FM, Geisler FH, Gilder KM, Reah C, Howell KM, McAfee PC. Long-term outcomes of the US FDA IDE prospective, randomized controlled clinical trial comparing PCM cervical disc arthroplasty with anterior cervical discectomy and fusion. *Spine*. 2015;40(10):674-683.
40. Zhang Z, Zhu W, Zhu L, Du Y. Midterm outcomes of total cervical total disc replacement with Bryan prosthesis. *European Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery & Traumatology*. 2014;24(1):275-281.
41. Fay L-Y, Huang W-C, Wu J-C, et al. Arthroplasty for cervical spondylotic myelopathy: similar results to patients with only radiculopathy at 3 years' follow-up. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2014;21(3):400-410.

42. Suchomel P, Jurák L, Antinheimo J, et al. Does sagittal position of the CTDR-related centre of rotation influence functional outcome? Prospective 2-year follow-up analysis. *European Spine Journal*. 2014;23(5):1124-1134.
43. Zhang H-X, Shao Y-D, Chen Y, et al. A prospective, randomised, controlled multicentre study comparing cervical disc replacement with anterior cervical decompression and fusion. *International orthopaedics*. 2014;38(12):2533-2541.
44. Ding F, Jia Z, Wu Y, Li C, He Q, Ruan D. Fusion-nonfusion hybrid construct versus anterior cervical hybrid decompression and fusion: a comparative study for 3-level cervical degenerative disc diseases. *Spine*. 2014;39(23):1934-1942.
45. Qi M, Chen H, Cao P, Tian Y, Yuan W. Incidence and risk factors analysis of heterotopic ossification after cervical disc replacement. *Chinese medical journal*. 2014;127(22):3871-3875.
46. Malham GM, Parker RM, Ellis NJ, Chan PG, Varma D. Cervical artificial disc replacement with ProDisc-C: clinical and radiographic outcomes with long-term follow-up. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*. 2014;21(6):949-953.
47. Zhao Y, Sun Y, Zhou F, Liu Z. Cervical disc arthroplasty with ProDisc-C artificial disc: 5-year radiographic follow-up results. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2013;126(20):3809-3811.
48. Li J, Liang L, Ye X-f, Qi M, Chen H-j, Yuan W. Cervical arthroplasty with Discover prosthesis: clinical outcomes and analysis of factors that may influence postoperative range of motion. *European Spine Journal*. 2013;22(10):2303-2309.
49. Zhang Z, Gu B, Zhu W, Wang Q, Zhang W. Clinical and radiographic results of Bryan cervical total disc replacement: 4-year outcomes in a prospective study. *Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery*. 2013;133(8):1061-1066.
50. Park JH, Rhim SC, Roh SW. Mid-term follow-up of clinical and radiologic outcomes in cervical total disk replacement (Mobi-C): incidence of heterotopic ossification and risk factors. *Clinical Spine Surgery*. 2013;26(3):141-145.
51. Chen F, Yang J, Ni B, Guo Q, Lu X, Xie N. Clinical and radiological follow-up of single-level Prestige LP cervical disc replacement. *Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery*. 2013;133(4):473-480.
52. Pimenta L, Oliveira L, Coutinho E, Marchi L. Bone formation in cervical total disk replacement (CTDR) up to the 6-year follow-up: Experience from 272 levels. *Neurosurgery Quarterly*. 2013;23(1):1-6.
53. Jin YJ, Park SB, Kim MJ, Kim K-J, Kim H-J. An analysis of heterotopic ossification in cervical disc arthroplasty: a novel morphologic classification of an ossified mass. *The Spine Journal*. 2013;13(4):408-420.
54. Cho Y-H, Kim K-S, Kwon Y-M. Heterotopic ossification after cervical arthroplasty with ProDisc-C: time course radiographic follow-up over 3 years. *Korean Journal of Spine*. 2013;10(1):19.
55. Choi D, Petrik V, Fox S, Parkinson J, Timothy J, Gullan R. Motion preservation and clinical outcome of porous coated motion cervical disk arthroplasty. *Neurosurgery*. 2012;71(1):30-37.

56. Tu T-H, Wu J-C, Huang W-C, Wu C-L, Ko C-C, Cheng H. The effects of carpentry on heterotopic ossification and mobility in cervical arthroplasty: determination by computed tomography with a minimum 2-year follow-up. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2012;16(6):601-609.
57. Sun Y, Zhao Y, Pan S, Zhou F, Chen Z, Liu Z. Comparison of adjacent segment degeneration five years after single level cervical fusion and cervical arthroplasty: a retrospective controlled study. *Chinese medical journal*. 2012;125(22):3939-3941.
58. Chung S-B, Muradov JM, Lee S-H, Eoh W, Kim E-S. Uncovertebral hypertrophy is a significant risk factor for the occurrence of heterotopic ossification after cervical disc replacement: survivorship analysis of Bryan disc for single-level cervical arthroplasty. *Acta neurochirurgica*. 2012;154(6):1017-1022.
59. GUÉRIN P, Obeid I, Bourghli A, et al. Heterotopic ossification after cervical disc replacement: clinical significance and radiographic analysis. A prospective study. *Acta Orthopædica Belgica*. 2012;78(1):80.
60. Wu J-C, Huang W-C, Tu T-H, et al. Differences between soft-disc herniation and spondylosis in cervical arthroplasty: CT-documented heterotopic ossification with minimum 2 years of follow-up. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2012;16(2):163-171.
61. Lee SE, Chung CK, Jahng TA. Early development and progression of heterotopic ossification in cervical total disc replacement. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2012;16(1):31-36.
62. Zhang X, Zhang X, Chen C, et al. Randomized, controlled, multicenter, clinical trial comparing BRYAN cervical disc arthroplasty with anterior cervical decompression and fusion in China. *Spine*. 2012;37(6):433-438.
63. Barrey C, Champain S, Campana S, Ramadan A, Perrin G, Skalli W. Sagittal alignment and kinematics at instrumented and adjacent levels after total disc replacement in the cervical spine. *European Spine Journal*. 2012;21(8):1648-1659.
64. Cho H-J, Shin M-H, Huh J-W, Ryu K-S, Park C-K. Heterotopic ossification following cervical total disc replacement: iatrogenic or constitutional? *Korean Journal of Spine*. 2012;9(3):209.
65. Wang Q, Cheng H, Mao Z, Qi X, Zhang M, Chen Y. Clinical and radiographic results after treatment of cervical degenerative disc disease with the bryan disc prosthesis: a prospective study with 2-year follow-up. *Acta Orthopædica Belgica*. 2011;77(6):809.
66. Peng CWB, Yue WM, Basit A, et al. Intermediate results of the prestige LP cervical disc replacement: clinical and radiological analysis with minimum two-year follow-up. *Spine*. 2011;36(2):E105-E111.
67. Huppert J, Beaurain J, Steib J, et al. Comparison between single-and multi-level patients: clinical and radiological outcomes 2 years after cervical disc replacement. *European Spine Journal*. 2011;20(9):1417-1426.
68. Ren X, Wang W, Chu T, Wang J, Li C, Jiang T. The intermediate clinical outcome and its limitations of Bryan cervical arthroplasty for treatment of cervical disc herniation. *Clinical Spine Surgery*. 2011;24(4):221-229.
69. Tu T-H, Wu J-C, Huang W-C, et al. Heterotopic ossification after cervical total disc replacement: determination by CT and effects on clinical outcomes. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2011;14(4):457-465.

70. Du J, Li M, Liu H, Meng H, He Q, Luo Z. Early follow-up outcomes after treatment of degenerative disc disease with the discover cervical disc prosthesis. *The Spine Journal*. 2011;11(4):281-289.
71. Cardoso MJ, Mendelsohn A, Rosner MK. Cervical hybrid arthroplasty with 2 unique fusion techniques. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2011;15(1):48-54.
72. Kowalczyk I, Lazaro BC, Fink M, Rabin D, Duggal N. Analysis of in vivo kinematics of 3 different cervical devices: Bryan disc, ProDisc-C, and Prestige LP disc. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2011;15(6):630-635.
73. Zhao Y-b, Sun Y, Chen Z-q, Liu Z-j. Application of cervical arthroplasty with Bryan cervical disc: long-term X-ray and magnetic resonance imaging follow-up results. *Chinese Medical Journal (English Edition)*. 2010;123(21):2999.
74. Walraevens J, Demaerel P, Suetens P, et al. Longitudinal prospective long-term radiographic follow-up after treatment of single-level cervical disk disease with the Bryan Cervical Disc. *Neurosurgery*. 2010;67(3):679-687.
75. Lee J-H, Jung T-G, Kim H-S, Jang J-S, Lee S-H. Analysis of the incidence and clinical effect of the heterotopic ossification in a single-level cervical artificial disc replacement. *The Spine Journal*. 2010;10(8):676-682.
76. Reyes-Sanchez A, Miramontes V, Olivarez LMR, Aquirre AA, Quiroz AO, Zarate-Kalfopulos B. Initial clinical experience with a next-generation artificial disc for the treatment of symptomatic degenerative cervical radiculopathy. *SAS journal*. 2010;4(1):9-15.
77. Suchomel P, Jurák L, Beneš V, Brabec R, Bradáč O, Elgawhary S. Clinical results and development of heterotopic ossification in total cervical disc replacement during a 4-year follow-up. *European Spine Journal*. 2010;19(2):307-315.
78. Ryu K-S, Park C-K, Jun S-C, Huh H-Y. Radiological changes of the operated and adjacent segments following cervical arthroplasty after a minimum 24-month follow-up: comparison between the Bryan and Prodisc-C devices. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2010;13(3):299-307.
79. Cardoso MJ, Rosner MK. Multilevel cervical arthroplasty with artificial disc replacement. *Neurosurgical focus*. 2010;28(5):E19.
80. Barbagallo GM, Corbino LA, Olindo G, Albanese V. Heterotopic ossification in cervical disc arthroplasty: is it clinically relevant? *Evidence-based spine-care journal*. 2010;1(1):15.
81. Cheng L, Nie L, Zhang L, Hou Y. Fusion versus Bryan Cervical Disc in two-level cervical disc disease: a prospective, randomised study. *International orthopaedics*. 2009;33(5):1347.
82. Yang YC, Nie L, Cheng L, Hou Y. Clinical and radiographic reports following cervical arthroplasty: a 24-month follow-up. *International orthopaedics*. 2009;33(4):1037-1042.
83. Bhadra AK, Raman A, Casey AT, Crawford R. Single-level cervical radiculopathy: clinical outcome and cost-effectiveness of four techniques of anterior cervical discectomy and fusion and disc arthroplasty. *European Spine Journal*. 2009;18(2):232-237.
84. Heidecke V, Burkert W, Brucke M, Rainov N. Intervertebral disc replacement for cervical degenerative disease—clinical results and functional outcome at two years in patients implanted with the Bryan® cervical disc prosthesis. *Acta neurochirurgica*. 2008;150(5):453.

85. Kim SW, Shin JH, Arbatin JJ, Park MS, Chung YK, McAfee PC. Effects of a cervical disc prosthesis on maintaining sagittal alignment of the functional spinal unit and overall sagittal balance of the cervical spine. *European Spine Journal*. 2008;17(1):20-29.
86. Park JH, Roh KH, Cho JY, Ra YS, Rhim SC, Noh SW. Comparative analysis of cervical arthroplasty using Mobi-C® and anterior cervical discectomy and fusion using the solis®-cage. *Journal of Korean Neurosurgical Society*. 2008;44(4):217.
87. Amit A, Dorward N. Bryan cervical disc prosthesis: 12-month clinical outcome. *British journal of neurosurgery*. 2007;21(5):478-484.
88. Pimenta L, McAfee PC, Cappuccino A, Cunningham BW, Diaz R, Coutinho E. Superiority of multilevel cervical arthroplasty outcomes versus single-level outcomes: 229 consecutive PCM prostheses. *Spine*. 2007;32(12):1337-1344.
89. Mehren C, Suchomel P, Grochulla F, et al. Heterotopic ossification in total cervical artificial disc replacement. *Spine*. 2006;31(24):2802-2806.
90. Pickett GE, Sekhon LH, Sears WR, Duggal N. Complications with cervical arthroplasty. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*. 2006;4(2):98-105.
91. Leung C, Casey AT, Goffin J, et al. Clinical significance of heterotopic ossification in cervical disc replacement: a prospective multicenter clinical trial. *Neurosurgery*. 2005;57(4):759-763.
92. Pimenta L, McAfee PC, Cappuccino A, Bellera FP, Link HD. Clinical experience with the new artificial cervical PCM (Cervitech) disc. *The Spine Journal*. 2004;4(6):S315-S321.