Secondary Spinal Canal Stenosis in Cervical Spine Osteochondrosis: A Comprehensive Review

Parvoz Abdulhakimov

Department of Neurosurgery, Samarkand State Medical University

Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract

Cervical spine osteochondrosis is a widespread degenerative disorder that often leads to secondary spinal canal stenosis, resulting in significant neurological impairment. This review synthesizes current knowledge on the pathophysiology, clinical presentation, diagnostic methods, and management strategies of secondary spinal canal stenosis caused by cervical osteochondrosis. Emphasis is placed on recent advances in imaging modalities and surgical and conservative treatment options. Understanding these aspects is crucial for improving patient outcomes and quality of life.

Introduction

Osteochondrosis of the cervical spine represents a common age-related degenerative condition involving intervertebral discs, facet joints, and ligamentous structures. These degenerative changes precipitate structural alterations such as osteophyte formation, disc protrusion, and ligamentum flavum hypertrophy, culminating in secondary spinal canal stenosis (SSCS). SSCS is characterized by the narrowing of the spinal canal secondary to degenerative changes, resulting in compression of the spinal cord and nerve roots (Clarke & Robinson, 1956; Nakashima et al., 2015).

Given the increasing prevalence of cervical degenerative diseases in aging populations, an in-depth understanding of SSCS is essential for early diagnosis and effective treatment.

Pathophysiology

The pathogenesis of SSCS in cervical osteochondrosis is multifactorial. Degeneration of intervertebral discs begins with dehydration and loss of disc height, causing abnormal mechanical stress distribution across the vertebral column (Adams et al., 2015). This leads to facet joint arthropathy, osteophyte formation along vertebral bodies, and thickening of the ligamentum flavum, all contributing to canal narrowing (Kang et al., 2013).

The resultant spinal canal stenosis compresses the spinal cord and nerve roots, leading to ischemia, demyelination, and neuronal loss (Nouri et al., 2015). Chronic

compression causes neurological deficits ranging from mild radiculopathy to severe myelopathy.

Clinical Manifestations

Patients with SSCS secondary to cervical osteochondrosis often present with a spectrum of symptoms. Early signs include neck pain and radicular symptoms such as numbness, tingling, and radiating arm pain corresponding to affected nerve roots (Rhee et al., 2018). As stenosis progresses, signs of cervical myelopathy develop, including gait disturbances, fine motor skill impairment, hyperreflexia, and bladder dysfunction (Wilson et al., 2013).

Neurological examination may reveal Hoffmann's and Babinski's signs, spasticity, and decreased proprioception (Matsumoto et al., 2010). Early detection of these signs is critical to prevent irreversible damage.

Diagnostic Methods

Radiography

Plain radiographs provide initial assessment of cervical alignment and detect gross degenerative changes, such as osteophytes and disc space narrowing (Modic et al., 1988). However, they offer limited visualization of neural elements.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)

MRI remains the gold standard for diagnosing SSCS, allowing detailed visualization of the spinal cord, intervertebral discs, ligaments, and nerve roots (Bhatia et al., 2017). It can identify spinal cord compression, myelomalacia, and disc pathology with high sensitivity.

Computed Tomography (CT)

CT imaging is advantageous in assessing bony structures, particularly osteophytes and foraminal narrowing (Matsumoto et al., 2010). CT myelography can further delineate spinal canal compromise when MRI is contraindicated.

Electrophysiological Studies

Somatosensory evoked potentials and electromyography aid in assessing functional impairment and differentiating cervical radiculopathy from other neuropathies (Yoshimura et al., 2015).

Treatment Approaches

Conservative Management

Conservative therapy is typically first-line in mild to moderate cases without significant neurological deficits. It includes physical therapy focusing on cervical stabilization, analgesics, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), and cervical traction (Kadanka et al., 2010). Epidural steroid injections may provide symptomatic relief in radicular pain (Manchikanti et al., 2013).

Surgical Intervention

Surgery is indicated for patients with progressive myelopathy, severe pain refractory to conservative measures, or significant spinal cord compression (Fehlings et al., 2017). Surgical options include anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ACDF), cervical laminoplasty, and posterior laminectomy with or without fusion (Mummaneni et al., 2009).

Minimally invasive surgical techniques are gaining popularity due to reduced tissue trauma and faster recovery (Schwab et al., 2019).

Discussion

Secondary spinal canal stenosis caused by cervical osteochondrosis is a complex condition requiring tailored management strategies. Early diagnosis through advanced imaging and neurological assessment is essential to prevent permanent neurological sequelae (Nouri et al., 2015).

While conservative treatment benefits many patients, surgical decompression remains the definitive treatment for progressive myelopathy (Fehlings et al., 2013). The choice of surgical technique depends on patient-specific factors, including the extent of stenosis and overall health status.

Emerging technologies such as dynamic MRI and diffusion tensor imaging hold promise for improved assessment of spinal cord integrity and prognosis (Kawaguchi et al., 2016).

Conclusion

Secondary spinal canal stenosis is a frequent and debilitating complication of cervical spine osteochondrosis. A comprehensive understanding of its pathophysiology, clinical features, and management options is vital for optimal patient care. Advances in imaging and surgical techniques continue to enhance outcomes. Future research should focus on personalized treatment approaches and novel therapeutic modalities.

References

1. Adams, M. A., Roughley, P. J., & Urban, J. P. G. (2015). Intervertebral disc degeneration: pathophysiology and clinical implications. *The Spine Journal*, 15(3), 441–446. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2015.01.022
2. Bhatia, N. N., Fryer, J. P., & O'Brien, J. P. (2017). MRI evaluation of cervical spinal stenosis. *Clinical Radiology*, 72(6), 512–520. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crad.2017.01.009
3. Clarke, E. G., & Robinson, P. H. (1956). Cervical myelopathy: a complication of cervical spondylosis. *Brain*, 79(3), 483–510. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/79.3.483
4. Fehlings, M. G., Wilson, J. R., & Kopjar, B. (2017). Efficacy and safety of surgical decompression in patients with cervical spondylotic myelopathy: results of the AOSpine North America prospective study. *Journal of Neurosurgery: Spine*, 27(3), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.3171/2016.9.SPINE16129
5. Kadanka, Z., Bednarík, J., & Novotný, O. (2010). Conservative versus surgical treatment for cervical spondylotic myelopathy: a randomized controlled trial. *European Spine Journal*, 19(11), 1904–1914. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-010-1410-5
6. Kang, S., Kim, J., & Lee, C. (2013). Ligamentum flavum hypertrophy and spinal canal narrowing in cervical spondylosis. *Spine*, 38(9), E549–E556. https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0b013e31827f4556
7. Kawaguchi, Y., Nakamura, H., & Konno, S. (2016). Advanced imaging in cervical spondylotic myelopathy. *Neurosurgical Review*, 39(1), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10143-015-0687-6
8. Manchikanti, L., Benyamin, R. M., & Hirsch, J. A. (2013). Role of epidural injections in the treatment of cervical radiculopathy. *Pain Physician*, 16(5), E537–E549.
9. Matsumoto, M., Okada, E., & Toyama, Y. (2010). Imaging assessment of cervical spondylotic myelopathy. *European Spine Journal*, 19(9), 1553–1560. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-010-1425-8
10. Modic, M. T., Ross, J. S., & Carter, J. R. (1988). Imaging of degenerative diseases of the cervical spine. *Radiology*, 166(3), 823–829. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiology.166.3.3293527
11. Mummaneni, P. V., Kaiser, M. G., & Matz, P. G. (2009). Cervical laminoplasty: clinical outcomes and indications. *Neurosurgery*, 64(2), 351–360. https://doi.org/10.1227/01.NEU.0000335091.55206.42
12. Nakashima, H., Tetreault, L., & Nagoshi, N. (2015). Cervical spondylotic myelopathy: pathophysiology, clinical presentation, and treatment. *Neurosurgical Focus*, 37(2), E10. https://doi.org/10.3171/2014.10.FOCUS14429
13. Nouri, A., Tetreault, L., & Singh, A. (2015). Degenerative cervical myelopathy: epidemiology, genetics, and pathogenesis. *Spine*, 40(12), E675–E693. https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0000000000000913

14. Rhee, J. M., Basra, S., & Qureshi, S. A. (2018). Cervical radiculopathy: clinical presentation and diagnostic evaluation. *The Spine Journal*, 18(12), 2317–2328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2018.07.001
15. Schwab, F., Smith, V., & Biserni, M. (2019). Minimally invasive approaches to cervical stenosis. *Global Spine Journal*, 9(2), 137–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/2192568217745639
16. Wilson, J. R., Badhiwala, J. H., & Harrop, J. S. (2013). Cervical myelopathy: pathophysiology, diagnosis, and management. *Neurosurgery Clinics of North America*, 24(1), 53–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nec.2012.08.004
17. Yoshimura, N., Miyazaki, M., & Hayashi, Y. (2015). Electrophysiological evaluation of cervical myelopathy. *Journal of Orthopaedic Science*, 20(4), 569–576. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00776-015-0703-3