ICEOS Toronto Canada November 19, 2010

The Recognition of Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome



RM Campbell Jr. MD Division of Orthopaedics The Center for Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

#### CHOP Center for Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome Core Multi-Disciplinary Staff

#### Orthopaedics

#### Pulmonary

#### General Surgery







Robert Campbell MD



Oscar Mayer MD Radiology Howard Panitch MD



#### Michael Nance MD

D Thane Blinman MD



Todd Kilbaugh MD



Monica Epelman MD







Janice Gray

Kathleen Mikulski

### Disclosures

- Grant Support
  - NORD
  - FDA Office of Orphan Product Development
- Royalties
  - Synthes Spine Co.
- Volunteer Advisor Spine-Form Co.
- Medical Advisory Committee member National Organization of Rare Disorders (NORD)
- Advocate for inventors/companies trying to develop safe and effective devices for children



#### Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome

Growth

#### The Inability of the <sup>¬</sup>

-Campbell, Smith, et al. J Bone Joint Surg, Mar, 2003 J Bone Joint Surg, Aug, 2004







99%





#### Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome



### **Normal Respiration**

- Effortless at-rest breathing, able to respond to challenge activity without stress, ie, running
- Normal diaphragm excursion and rib cage expansion



# Normal Respiration?















AIS







#### Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome Mild, moderate or severe?

- Progressive? Getting worse without growth?
- So bad that respiratory insufficiency develops
  - Occult- clinically "seems" fine, but elevated respiratory rate, decreased play, other compensation mechanisms
  - -Frank- cannot compensate, needs O2, CPAP, ventilator



# Normal Thoracic Growth Potential

- Thoracic spine is normal height
- Thorax has normal volume
- Thorax has normal symmetry
- And all of the above continues to be appropriate for age



# Normal Growth Potential?



# Growth Potential of the Thorax

- Height:
   Thoracic spinal growth
  - 0-5 yrs: 1.4cm/yr,
  - 5-10 yrs: 0.6 cm/yr
  - 10-15 yrs 1.2 cm/yr

#### -Dimeglio - Clinical Chest Circumference





### **Growth Potential Problems**

Thoracic Spinal height 60% normal

Fused rib cage will grow poorly



# Volume Depletion Deformities of the Thorax







#### III a III b

-Campbell Smith, JBJS, supp, 2007

R Camp

Fusing scoliosis early may contribute to shortening of the thoracic spine and decreased thoracic/lung volume

• 28 pts

Low FVC more prevalent in proximal spine fusions

Thoracic spinal height FVC < 50%</li>
 < 18 cm.</li>
 63% pts
 18 to 22 cm
 25% pts
 0% pts





- Karol et al., JBJS, 2008

### Spondylo-Thoracic Dysplasia





thoracic spinal height 24.2% nl VC 27% nl

Ramirez, et al. JBJS, 2008



### Karol / Johnston 22 cm Rule ?

#### Pros:

 Could be used to calculate tolerable growth deficiency of thoracic spinal height from viewpoint of VC

Cons:

 Does not consider rib cage deficiencies, ie VATER, hypoplastic thorax/ Jeune's type chest



#### Early Fusion: A Critical Pulmonary Threshold?

-Fusing a spine before age 10 years may shorten a thoracic spine below the 22 cm threshold height
-Fusing a spine already shortened by congenital deformity may make matters even worse





(Courtesy, Behrooz Akbarnia)

### The original VEPTR concept

- Acutely reconstruct the malformed thorax, ie, opening wedge thoracostomy
- Add VEPTRs, as needed, to hold the thoracic reconstruction in place
- Expand VEPTRs to accommodate patient growth and maintain thoracic volume and symmetry



# VEPTR Opening Wedge Thoracostomy











# Congenital Scoliosis and rib fusion



CTIS OH

#### Percutaneous VEPTR without opening wedge thoracostomy -John Smith, MD, Utah





Instrumentation drives correction, rather than stabilizing the reconstruction





#### RIB BASED spine distraction instrumentation



#### SPINE BASED spine distraction instrumentation







#### Depends on your goals



# The original goal of VEPTR surgery

 To obtain the largest, most symmetrical, most functional thorax possible by skeletal maturity





### Goals of most VEPTR/GR Users

A. Correct the Cobb angle, with the spine continuing to grow
B. Minimize complications









### **Clinical Evidence**

Growing rods: Small clinical series, 1982-present, heterogeneous populations • VEPTR: Small clinical series, 2004-present, heterogeneous populations Both "appear" to function about the same for goals a and b



# Expanding the Growth Sparing Instrumentation Goals

a. Correct the Cobb angle with the spine continuing to grow
b. Minimize complications
c. Minimize cost and morbidity



## SHILLA



CTIS ()H

#### Pros:

- One Operation corrects deformity
- Then instrumentation "guides growth"
- Three (8?) point fixation

#### Cons:

- Additional operations for complications
- Unknown loss of thoracic spine growth because of central fusion/anchor points
- Long term complication rate unknown

### **Growing Rods and VEPTR** Self expansion capability? Pros:

- Distraction by physician/parents without surgery
  - Less cost
  - Less morbidity
- Cons:
- Long term cost?
- "Point of diminishing returns" ?
- Will it work long term?



# Adding Health Centered Goals

a. Correct the Cobb angle with the spine continuing to grow
b. Minimize complications
c. Minimize cost and morbidity
d. Improved Operative Long Term Health over Natural History











infantile, juvenile and adolescent scoliosis, and expected deaths.

- Pulmonary
  - Higher risk of respiratory failure curves >110°
- Cardiac
  - Higher risk cor pulmonale, severe curves
- Appearance/Self Image
  - Probably worse
- "QOL" questionnaire data
  - Worse scores with Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome
    - Vitale,et al.



#### Long Term Health: Operative History of EOS



Mortality

- Growing Rods: Unknown
- VEPTR: Higher mortality hypoplastic cohort
- SHILLA: Unknown



#### Pulmonary

- Growing Rods:
  - Unknown
- VEPTR:
  - Decreased % nI VC, Fused ribs scoliosis patients operated > 2 yrs age
  - Stable% nl VC post op?
- SHILLA:
  - Unknown



Cardiac Growing Rods: – Unknown • VEPTR: – Unknown • SHILLA: -Unknown



Appearance/Self Image

- Growing Rods:
  - Unknown
- VEPTR:
  - FDA data
- SHILLA:
  - Unknown



"QOL" questionnaire data Growing Rods: – Unknown • VEPTR: -FDA data • SHILLA: -Unknown



#### Quality of Life Instruments for Scoliosis



#### CTIS 🕑 H

- SRS 22
- SRS 22r
- SRS 23
- Walter Reed Visual Assessment Scale
- SRS 24
- SRS 36
- Spinal Appearance Questionnaire
- Turkish , Spanish, Italian
   Version SRS 22
- Child Health Questionnaire-CF87

Would it make sense to go back to the original goals of VEPTR surgery?

 To obtain the largest, most symmetrical, most functional thorax possible by skeletal maturity





# Use biology



CTIS OH

#### Lung Histology: Animal model (Mehta, Olson, Snyder) **Disease Control** Normal Control VEPTR Treated



**200x** 

#### 200x

**200x** 



**400x** 

# Measuring Thoracic Performance





### **CT scan Lung Volumes**

#### • (Johnston, et al.)





### Emans, et al. Spine, 2005

#### Lung volume by CT: Pre-op:

279 cm3 First Post-op Last Follow-up:

394 ± 289 cm3 736 ± 462 cm3

 $369 \pm$ 

Lung on side of VEPTR increased: 219% ± 306% (range, 13%–1,160%)

Lung not on side of the VEPTR increased: 147% ± 176% (range, 24%–731%)

The ratio of right to left lung volume compared with a normal value of 0.85 improved by 13%



Figure 5. Preoperative (A) and postoperative (B) individual threedimensional lung reconstructions for measurement of lung vol-



#### Helps us understand the 3-D deformity







# Pulmonary Function Testing







# Thoracic Performance drives PFTs





20 % VC



#### Individual Engine Oil Pressure

/-JET

QANTAS ACTIVATION CONSISTENT





/-JET



### The Future













Dynamic Lung MRI and Spine Deformity

Chu, WCW, et al. -SRS 2005 Kotani, T. et al. *Spine*, 2004.





#### Dynamic Lung MRI (Campbell, et al.)









Pre-op



Post op

My Goal: Recognize, measure, and effectively treat Thoracic Insufficiency Syndrome

 Do what it takes to have the largest, most symmetrical, most functional thorax by skeletal maturity



We need Courage







# Thank You



