Fracture-dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra
A NEW CLASSIFICATION
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We have studied fracture-dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra in seven patients and reviewed 50 previously reported cases. Based on this information, we have classified the injury into five types: type 1, unilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation with or without facet fracture; type 2, bilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation with or without facet fracture; type 3, unilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation and contralateral lumbosacral facet fracture; type 4, dislocation of the body of L5 with bilateral fracture of the pars interarticularis; and type 5, dislocation of the body of L5 with fracture of the body and/or pedicle, with or without injury of the lamina and/or facet.

Conservative treatment of fracture-dislocation of L5 is generally not effective because the lesion is fundamentally unstable. Planning of the operation should be made on the basis of the various types of injury.
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Fracture-dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra is relatively rare; its treatment presents challenging problems. About 70 cases have been reported in the literature, but there is as yet no rational classification of the disorder. Our aim is to describe the types of injury, the operative methods used, and the outcome of seven new cases and 50 published cases for which there is sufficient documentation. Based on this analysis, a new classification of the disorder is proposed.

Patients and Methods

This series. Between 1976 and 1997 seven men had surgery for fracture-dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra. Their mean age at operation was 22.6 years (16 to 28) with a mean period of follow-up of four years (2 to 6.75). The cause of injury was high-energy trauma in every case.

There was a unilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation and contralateral lumbosacral facet fracture in three (cases 2, 3, 7), dislocation of the body of L5 with fracture of the vertebral body, lamina, and the L4/L5 facet in two (cases 4 and 5), bilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation in one (case 1), and acute spondylolytic spondylolisthesis in one (case 6).

Before treatment, all patients complained of severe low back pain. Six had radicular symptoms and two bowel and bladder dysfunction (Table I). Six of the patients were referred to our hospital after long-term conservative treatment over a mean of seven months (5 weeks to 20 months).

Three patients had posterior decompression and posterolateral fusion using pedicle screws, followed by anterior interbody fusion at the L5/S1 level (cases 1, 3 and 7). One had posterior decompression and posterolateral fusion using pedicle screws from L3 to S1, followed by anterior interbody fusion at the L4/L5 level (case 4). One patient was treated by posterior decompression and posterolateral fusion using pedicle screws, without anterior interbody fusion (case 2). A posterior wire reduction device was used to reduce the subluxation followed by anterior interbody fusion in our two earlier patients (cases 5, 6), in one without posterior decompression.

Reviewed cases. We reviewed 50 cases of fracture-dislocation of L5 reported in detail in the literature. We excluded dislocation of L5 with sacral fracture, and lumbosacral facet fractures which were not associated with dislocation of L5. A summary is shown in Table I.

Results

Operative outcome of the present series. Low back pain disappeared after operation in four patients and improved in three. Radicular symptoms were improved in all six patients with preoperative neurological defects. Bowel and
bladder dysfunction disappeared in one and was improved in another.

Radiographs at follow-up showed improvement of the subluxations at L5 in five patients and none in two. The mean slip at L5 was 37.4% before operation and 19.4% at the latest follow-up. Bony union was achieved in five patients; two (cases 2 and 4) remained ununited. In these the pedicle screws had broken at the level showing no anterior interbody fusion.

**Types of injury.** Based on our seven patients and the 50 reported cases, we classified fracture-dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra into five types (Fig. 1):

- **Type 1.** Unilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation with or without facet fracture was recognised in 19 cases (none from our series). In this type, the contralateral facet remains intact.
- **Type 2.** Bilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation with or without facet fracture was seen in 16 cases (one from our series).
- **Type 3.** Unilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation and contralateral lumbosacral facet fracture was present in seven cases (three from our series).
- **Type 4.** Dislocation of the body of L5 with bilateral fracture of the pars interarticularis (acute spondylolytic spondyloolisthesis) was found in ten (one from our series).
- **Type 5.** Dislocation of the body of L5 with fracture of the body and/or pedicle was observed in five (two from our series), either with or without injury of the lamina and/or facet.

Of our seven cases and the 50 reported, 39 (68.4%) showed neurological involvement (Table I). These included eight of the 19 in type 1, 14 of the 16 in type 2, five of the seven in type 3, eight of the ten in type 4, and four of the five in type 5.

**Illustrative case reports**

**Case 1.** A 25-year-old man was crushed in a flexed position between an elevator and a ceiling. He complained of severe pain in the low back and right thigh with bowel and bladder dysfunction. Radiographs revealed forward dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra on the sacrum (Fig. 2a) and fractures of the right transverse processes of L1, L4, and L5. Myelography showed total block at the L5/S1 level. Three-
Diagrams showing the five types of L5 fracture-dislocation: a) type 1, b) type 2, c) type 3, d) type 4, and e) type 5.

Case 1. Figure 2a – Lateral radiograph of the lumbosacral spine four months after injury, showing forward dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra on the sacrum. Figure 2b – Posterior view of a three-dimensional CT reconstruction of the lumbosacral junction showing bilateral lumbosacral facet interlocking. Fractures of the facet were not evident.
dimensional CT reconstruction showed bilateral lumbo-
sacral facet interlocking (Fig. 2b) without fracture of the
facet. The patient was referred to our hospital 24 weeks
after the injury, which was judged to be type 2, and had
posterior decompression and posterolateral fusion using
pedicle screws, followed by anterior interbody fusion five
weeks later. A severely disrupted L5/S1 disc was revealed
during surgery and removed. The pain in the low back and
right thigh disappeared after operation, but the bowel and
bladder dysfunction had not recovered four years later.

Case 2. Figure 3a – Lateral radiograph of the lumbosacral spine at the time of injury showing forward dislocation of the
fifth lumbar vertebra on the sacrum. Figure 3b – Posterior view of a three-dimensional CT reconstruction showing
interlocking of the left lumbosacral facet and fracture of the right superior sacral facet. Figure 3c – Lateral radiograph of
the lumbosacral spine on the day of surgery. Figure 3d – Lateral radiograph 6.75 years after surgery, showing the narrowed
L5/S1 disc space and breakage of the screws inserted into the pedicles of S1.
Case 2. A 22-year-old man complained of severe pain in the low back after jumping from a train. Radiographs showed forward dislocation of the fifth lumbar vertebra on the sacrum (Fig. 3a) and fractures of all the left lumbar transverse processes. Myelography revealed a dural injury. Three-dimensional CT reconstruction showed interlocking of the left lumbosacral facet and a fracture of the right superior sacral facet which was judged to be type 3 (Fig. 3b). Five weeks after the injury, posterior decompression and posterolateral fusion were carried out using pedicle screws (Fig. 3c). After 6.75 years, a lateral radiograph showed a narrowed L5/S1 disc space and breakage of the screws in the pedicles of S1 (Fig. 3d). Lateral radiographs in flexion and extension showed instability at the L5/S1 disc space. He still has mild pain in the low back.

Discussion

Wiltse and Rothman classified lumbar and lumbosacral spondylolisthesis into six types. Their post-traumatic spondylolisthesis (type IV) was described as resulting from traumatic fracture of parts of the supporting bone other than the pars. They suggested that the slip would gradually occur over a period of weeks or longer, although it has since been reported that such late displacement is fairly rare. In our seven case studies, the slip occurred immediately at the time of severe injury, as had happened in most of the cases reviewed in the literature. Therefore the term ‘L5 fracture-dislocation’ seems to be more appropriate than ‘traumatic spondylolisthesis.’

Injury pattern. There are various patterns of injury affecting the fifth lumbar vertebra. Analysis of our seven cases revealed four types, and review of the 50 reported cases revealed a fifth category.

The direction of dislocation was anterior in S1 of the 57 fracture-dislocations of L5, anterolateral in one, lateral in one, and posterior in four (including case 4 from our series).

Fractures of the transverse processes of L5 were seen in 31 of the 57 patients, fracture of the spinous process of L5 in eight, and of the sacral promontory in ten.

In type 1, only eight of the 19 patients presented with neurological abnormality whereas 31 of the 38 other cases showed neurological damage. Present results indicated that type 1 was less severe than types 2, 3, 4 or 5 in terms of neurological involvement.

Treatment. Irrespective of the type of injury, fracture-dislocation of L5 is a three-column injury. The cause is always a high-energy injury, resulting in severe spinal and ligamentous damage. As Hilibrand et al described, children may be managed by immobilisation in a cast, but conservative treatment is not effective in adolescents or adults because of severe instability. The pedicle screw system is useful for posterior reduction and fusion. With the high frequency of fractures of the transverse processes of L5 (31 of the 57 patients) and the necessity for extensive posterior decompression (23 of the 57), posterolateral or posterior fusion alone may be insufficient to stabilise the lumbosacral junction. This is shown in our cases 2 and 4 and has been reported in the literature.12,14,20,22,23,32

In a unilateral lumbosacral facet-dislocation (type 1), posterior instrumentation and fusion alone may be sufficient. Since the L5/S1 disc is disrupted, interbody fusion is required in types 2 and 3. Taking into consideration the trauma of major surgical invasion, posterior lumbar interbody fusion via a single approach may be preferable to the combined procedure. In our experience, posterior lumbar interbody fusion is a fairly difficult operation in fracture-dislocation of L5.

Although acute spondylolytic spondylolisthesis (type 4) seems radiologically similar to the standard isthmic spondylolisthesis, the former is always accompanied by disruption of the anterior and/or posterior ligamentous structures, resulting in much greater instability than in isthmic spondylolisthesis. We therefore believe that a combination of the anterior and posterior procedures is called for in such cases.

In type 5 (our case 4), the pedicle screw system is not effective for posterior reduction and fusion since it cannot be secured in the fractured body or pedicle of L5. Multi-level posterolateral or posterior fusion, using pedicle screws and interbody fusions of both L4 to L5 and L5 to S1, may be necessary in type 5.

Conservative treatment of fracture-dislocation of L5 is ineffective due to significant instability. Although the total number of cases in our own and the reviewed series is small, we propose a classification system in order to clarify the principles of the pathology and to enable operative treatment to be designed more efficiently and reliably. No benefits in any form have been received or will be received from a commercial party related directly or indirectly to the subject of this article.
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