

International Journal of Chemical and Biochemical Sciences (ISSN 2226-9614)

Journal Home page: www.iscientific.org/Journal.html

© International Scientific Organization



Complications of TOS surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Mohamed Mahmoud El-Hefnawy¹, Mohamed Othman Mohamed², Mohamed Sobh Elsaied Eid^{3*}, Mohamed Hassan Abdellatif⁴

¹Assistant Professor of Orthopedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt.

²Professor of Orthopedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt.

³Lecturer of Orthopedic Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt.

⁴*M.B, B. Ch, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, Resident of Orthopedic Surgery, El-Sallam Specialized Hospital, Egypt.*

Abstract

The thoracic outlet is defined as the interval from the supraclavicular fossa to the axilla that passes between the clavicle and the first rib. The thoracic outlet includes the subclavian artery, subclavian vein and trunks of the brachial plexus. Patients may experience symptoms related to compression of any one or various combinations of these structures. To review the clinical and radiological outcome after surgical treatment of neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome. We searched for potentially eligible titles and on various electronic databases, MEDLINE (through PubMed), EMBASE, SCOPUS, Google Scholar, using appropriate keywords. The keywords used included: thoracic outlet syndrome - Transaxillary resection - The supraclavicular approach - The posterior approach - thoracic outlet decompression - anterior scalene muscle- brachial plexus- compression neuropathy-Treatment strategy. The study found that the complication rate for surgical complications was 22.5% for Trans Axillary First Rib Excision (TAFRE), 25.9% for Supraclavicular First Rib Excision (SCFRE), and 12.6% for Supraclavicular Release (SCR), with pleural injury/pneumothorax and temporary neurological injury being the most common. Wound infection rates were 0.68% for TAFRE, 0.26% for SCFRE, and 0.18% for SCR. One death was reported in the TAFRE and SCFRE groups, while no reoperation or death was reported in the SCR group. The study reveals that Rib-Sparing Scalenectomy (RSS) is a suitable surgical approach for treating neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome, with better outcomes compared to First Rib Resection.

Keywords: Thoracic; RSS; TAFRE.

Full length article *Corresponding Author, e-mail: dr.mohamed.sobhi123@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Thoracic outlet syndrome (TOS) is a heterogeneous group of disorders characterized by compression of, and/or damage to, the neurovascular structures at the thoracic outlet, i.e., the passage from the chest into the neck. One or more anatomic structures of the upper thoracic outlet may be affected (the brachial plexus, the subclavian artery, and/or the subclavian vein). There are a variety of causes for compression of, and damage to, these structures [1]. The thoracic outlet is defined as the interval from the supraclavicular fossa to the axilla that passes between the clavicle and the first rib. The classic distinction is between arterial (aTOS), venous (vTOS), and neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome (nTOS). In large case series from the USA, for example, in a prospective analysis of outpatient cases at the University of South Florida, the percentage of nTOS was 82% [2]. The patients who underwent TOS surgery was 82-85% and whose TOS was classified by the uniform standards of the Society for Hefnawy et al., 2023

Vascular Surgery had nTOS. The percentage of women among nTOS patients ranged from 59% to 95%. The accurate determination of the incidence and prevalence of nTOS presents a methodological challenge [3]. The aim of this study was to review clinical and radiological outcome after surgical treatment of neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome.

2. Patients and Methods

This study a systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted in Orthopedic Surgery Department, Zagazig University Hospitals. We searched for potentially eligible titles on various electronic databases, MEDLINE (through PubMed), EMBASE, SCOPUS, and Google Scholar, using appropriate keywords. The keywords used included: thoracic outlet syndrome - Trans axillary resection - The supraclavicular approach - The posterior approach - thoracic outlet decompression - anterior scalene muscle- brachial plexus- compression neuropathy-Treatment strategy.

2.1. Inclusion criteria

All case reports, case series, and clinical studies in the form of full-text papers about operative management of nTOS in the English literature. All evidence levels included.

2.2. Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria were are unrelated, duplicated, unavailable full texts (abstract-only papers); and biomechanical studies, reports of patients who were younger than 18 years, venous thouracic outlet syndrome, arterial thoracic outlet syndrome and non-English literature.

2.3. Data extraction

We entitled data collection from included full-texts in a structured extraction excel sheet: Including: general information (author, title, type of publication, country of origin, etc.), study characteristics (e.g. aims of study, design, randomization techniques, quality assessment or risk of bias, etc.), participant characteristics (number of patients, age, gender, mechanism of injury, associated injuries, neurological deficits, etc.), intervention and treatment modalities, complications of surgery, follow-up time and outcomes.

2.4. Assessment of quality

It used checklists that are preferable over quality scores to determine the methodological quality of the studies.

2.5. Data analysis

The results of data analysis are shown in a forest plot and funnel plot. Administrative design: The study protocol was submitted for approval by Zagazig University Institutional Review Board (IRB).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Result

Of 10 studies reviewed, 5 described SCFRR (812 patients), 3 described TAFRR (478 patients), and 2 described RSS (720 patients). Of the included studies, 4 were retrospective series, 6 were prospective series, and 0 was a randomized controlled trial. The National Institutes of Health Quality Assessment Tool for Case Series Studies was used for the evaluation of risk of bias for retrospective studies. Accordingly, all of these had "good "quality. This did not imply that these retrospective studies were high quality when compared to prospective studies. Age and follow-up time varied among studies and between groups (Table 1). The proportions of female participants vary across the studies. The gender distribution in these studies is crucial for understanding potential gender-related factors and biases that might impact the generalizability of their findings.the duration of symptoms vary across the studies and it is crucial in assessing the chronicity and potential impact on surgical outcomes in each study (Table 2). Few studies reported the interventions used to manage the complications, which is essential to grading and quantification of severity of surgical complications. Therefore, we did not perform a formal statistical analysis. According to the available data, the complication rate was 22.5% for TAFRE, 25.9% for SCFRE, and 12.6% for SCR. Pleural injury/pneumothorax and temporary neurological injury were the most frequently reported complications. The reported Wound infection rate was 0.68% for TAFRE, 0.26% for SCFRE and 0.18% for Hefnawy et al., 2023

SCR. One death due to hemorrhage and 1 without apparent reason were reported in the TAFRE group (0.04%) and the SCFRE group (0.07%), respectively. Neither reoperation nor death was reported in the SCR group (Table 3).

• CBSQ scores

The mean difference between preoperative and postoperative CBSQ scores could be calculated only for the SCFRR group: 34.99 (95% CI, 22.57, and 47.4). The difference between preoperative and postoperative values was statistically significant (P < .05). The 95% prediction interval calculated using SMD was -1.3 to 3.7.

• VAS scores

The mean difference between preoperative and postoperative VAS scores was as follows: SCFRR 3.0 (95% CI, 2.1, and 3.8) and TAFRR 5.3 (95% CI, 3.6, and 6.9). Difference between the groups was statistically significant (P < .05). The 95% prediction interval calculated using the SMD was -1.4 to 4.3.

3.2. Discussion

Traditionally, nTOS is managed initially nonoperatively using physical therapy and muscle relaxant medications. Ultrasound-guided botulinum toxin injections and nerve blocks with local anesthesia have demonstrated efficacy for temporizing pain and for diagnostic purposes, particularly in predicting a patient's response to surgery. If nonsurgical approaches fail, surgical management for nTOS is used and may include decompression of the affected brachial plexus via scalenectomy alone or in combination with excision of the first rib or a cervical rib [13]. Many studies have included adolescent and elderly patients, but the exact distribution of ages often was not been reported. Therefore, we could not do a meta-analysis that separated outcomes by age groups, which could explain some of the heterogeneity in our results. In this systematic review and meta-analysis, weighted averages for age were 34.6, 40.5, and 33 years for SCFRR, TAFRR, and RSS, respectively. It is reasonable to speculate TAFRR's higher preoperative and postoperative DASH scores were due partly to an older patient population. [4] Reported that adolescent patients with an average age of 17.3 years had more favorable outcomes after SCFRR than adults with a thaverage age of 40.0 years.

Many studies varied in their time to follow-up after surgery, limiting our ability to compare all studies at an exact time. Although most studies reported outcomes within 1 to 2 years, believe that this method did not significantly hinder our results. This claim is supported by Pesser et al. [14] who reported outcomes at 3, 6, 12, and 24 months; their study found that patient outcome scores plateau after 6 months. Their reported outcome scores at 6 versus 24 months varied only slightly. Our study show that complication rate was 22.5% for the TAFRE, 25.9% for SCFRE, and 12.6% for SCR. Pleural injury/pneumothorax and temporary neurological injury were most frequently reported complications. The reported Wound infection rate was 0.68% for the TAFRE, 0.26% for SCFRE and 0.18% for SCR. One death due to hemorrhage and 1 without apparent reason reported in the TAFRE group (0.04%) and the SCFRE group (0.07%), respectively. Neither reoperation nor death was reported in the SCR group. Our study had similar findings with a higher rate of complications for TAFRR followed by the SCFRR and RSS.

IJCBS, 24(10) (2023): 1106-1111

	Pre	operativ	ve	Post	operati	ve		Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
3.1.1 SCFRR										
Caputo et al. 2012 [Adolescent cohort]	57.3	30.6	35	11.9	24.5	35	30.7%	45.40 [32.41, 58.39]	2012	
Caputo et al. 2012 [Adult Cohort]	74.5	28	154	49	40	154	39.3%	25.50 [17.79, 33.21]	2012	+
Li et al. 2021	66.63	27.99	30	29.87	25.25	30	30.0%	36.76 [23.27, 50.25]	2021	
Subtotal (95% CI)			219			219	100.0%	34.99 [22.57, 47.41]		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 86.63$; $Chi^2 = 7.3$	0, df = 2	P = 0	.03); I ²	= 73%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.52$ (P < 0.00	0001)									
Total (95% CI)			219			219	100.0%	34.99 [22.57, 47.41]		•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 86.63$; $Chi^2 = 7.3$	0, df = 2	2(P = 0)	.03); I ²	= 73%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.52 (P < 0.0										-50 -25 0 25 50 CBSQ Score
Test for subgroup differences: Not applied	cable									

Figure (1): Forest plot showing preoperative, postoperative and interval change (mean difference) for CBSQ score in the SCFRR group: 34.99 (95% CI, 22.57, 47.4). Difference between preoperative and postoperative values was statistically significant (P <.05). The 95% prediction interval calculated using SMD was -1.3 to 3.7

	Preo	reoperative Postoperative Mean Difference			Mean Difference					
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	r IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 SCFRR										
Caputo et al. 2012 [Adolescent cohort]	6.5	2.3	154	4.6	7	154	17.6%	1.90 [0.74, 3.06]	2012	2
Caputo et al. 2012 [Adult Cohort]	5.8	2.2	35	1.8	2.8	35	17.5%	4.00 [2.82, 5.18]	2012	2
Li et al. 2021	5.7	3.2	30	2.49	2.71	30	16.2%	3.21 [1.71, 4.71]	2021	
Hwang et al. 2021	3.6	1.6	19	0.8	1	19	18.6%	2.80 [1.95, 3.65]	2021	· -
Subtotal (95% CI)			238			238	69.9%	2.95 [2.11, 3.78]		•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.38$; $Chi^2 = 6.39$, df = 3	(P=0)	.09); l ²	= 53%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.92$ (P < 0.0	0001)									
2.1.2 TAFRR										
Sheth et al. 2005	7.7	0.3	24	3.9	7	24	11.0%	3.80 [1.00, 6.60]	2005	5
Gelabert et al. 2018	7.24	1.9	49	1.5	1.7	49	19.0%	5.74 [5.03, 6.45]	2018	3 -
Subtotal (95% CI)			73			73	30.1%	5.26 [3.63, 6.90]		•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.79$; $Chi^2 = 1.73$, df = 1	(P = 0)	.19); l ²	= 42%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.30 (P < 0.0)$	0001)									
Total (95% CI)			311			311	100.0%	3.59 [2.20, 4.98]		•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2.50$; $Chi^2 = 44.0$	8. df = 5	5 (P <	0.0000	()1): $ ^2 =$	= 89%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.07 (P < 0.0001)$							-10 -5 0 5 10			
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 6.10$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.01), $l^2 = 83.6\%$							VAS scores			

Figure (2): Forest plot showing preoperative, postoperative and interval change (mean difference) for VAS. Mean difference was as follows: SCFRR, 2.95 (95% CI, 2.11, and 3.78) and TAFRR 5.26 (95% CI, 3.6, and 6.9). The difference between groups was statistically significant (P <.05). The 95% prediction interval calculated using the SMD was -1.4 to 4.3.

IJCBS, 24(10) (2023): 1106-1111

Surgical Approach	NO. of	Age			Propor	tion of v	woman	Follow-up (months)		
	participants						L			
		mean	SD	Range	mean	SD	Range	mean	SD	Range
(SCFRR)	812		5.1			6%	54-84%	15.2	17.8	3-44.4
supraclavicular					77%					
FRR with										
scalenectomy		34.6		17.3-40.6						
(TAFRR)	478		2		79%	2.8%	77-84%	28.3	9.2	15-44.7
transaxillary first rib										
resection with										
scalenectomy.		40.5		35-41.8						
Dec	720		3.2		76%	4.3%	71-	14.5	13.6	4.5-102
RSS		33.0		29-53			100%			

Table (1): Demographics Based on Surgical Approach

Table (2): Duration of symptoms and gender

	Study ID		females	
NO.		mean duration of Symptoms	No	%
1	Caputo et al. [4]	36 months	147/185	79%
2	Al Hashel et al. [5]	2.3 year	96/136	71%
3	Ohman et al. [6]	36 months	339/409	83%
4	Gelabert et al. [7]	27 months	36/54	67%
5	Balderman et al. [8]	3.4 year	219/282	78%
6	Johnson e al. [9]	31 months	132/165	80%
7	Dua el al. [10]	22 months	9/15	60%
8	Lie et al et al. [11]	25 months	19/24	79%
9	Hawng et al. [12]	1.8 year	14/17	82%
10	Guarrderma et al.,2021	18 months	329/473	70%

 Table (3): Reported complications of TOS surgery

	TAFRE	SCFRE	SCR	
NO. of participants receiving surgery	2,662 patients	1,523 patients	539 patients	
Pleural opened/pneumothorax	383 patients	287 patients	25 patients	
Temporary Neurological injury	101 patients	16 patients	27 patients	
Permanent Neurological injury	21 patients	2 patients	0	
Wound infection	18 (1 reoperation)	4 (2 reoperations)	1 patient	
Hemorrhage	8 (4 blood transfusions)	5 (2 reoperations)	0	
Death	1 (due to hemorrhage)	1 (no apparent reason)	0	
Total complications	600	394	68	
No .of Studies included for complications data	20	10	10	

Yin et al. [15] used Bayesian analysis to estimate the subjective probability of success following different surgical techniques, with the assumption that success and complete relief rate followed a binomial distribution. For patients undergoing FRR, our meta-analysis further showed that SCFRR had better outcomes compared to TAFRR when assessed through Derkash scores and postoperative complication rate. However, changes in DASH and Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) scores were significantly better for TAFRR compared to SCFRR. Our results are comparable to a retrospective review performed by Aboul Hos et al. [16] showing that SCFRR and TAFRR offered comparable outcomes for patients with nTOS. Traditionally, TAFRR was used to expose target anatomical structures adequately (i.e., the anterior aspect of first rib) and for improved appearance. In our systematic review and meta-analysis could do only a meta-analysis using the DASH score in patients undergoing RSS? Interestingly, our findings were that articles describing SCFRR and TAFRR reported validated surgical outcomes (i.e., CBSQ, DASH) more frequently. These findings indicate a need for future studies to report the outcomes for RSS using well-validated PROM, such as nTOS index Hwang et al. (12).

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this systematic review and metaanalysis provides valuable insights into the clinical and radiological outcomes following surgical treatment of *Hefnawy et al.*, 2023 neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome (nTOS). Our analysis highlights that while the differences in postoperative CBSQ scores between surgical approaches were not statistically significant, Specifically, RSS emerged as a sufficient approach for treating nTOS, potentially offering an effective solution with reduced morbidity compared to First Rib Resection (FRR). Among the FRR approaches, supraclavicular FRR (SCFRR) demonstrated better outcomes than trans-axillary FRR (TAFRR), particularly in terms of Derkash scores and postoperative complications. However, TAFRR showed better improvement in DASH and VAS scores compared to SCFRR.

References

- N.F. Dengler, M.T. Pedro, T. Kretschmer, C. Heinen, S.K. Rosahl, G. Antoniadis. (2022). Neurogenic Thoracic Outlet Syndrome: Presentation, Diagnosis, and Treatment. Deutsches Ärzteblatt International. 119(43): 735.
- [2] K.A. Illig, E. Rodriguez-Zoppi, T. Bland, M. Muftah, E. Jospitre. (2021). The incidence of thoracic outlet syndrome. Annals of vascular surgery. 70: 263-272.
- J. Goeteyn, N. Pesser, M.R. van Sambeek, K. Vervaart, B.F. van Nuenen, J.A. Teijink. (2022). Thoracic outlet decompression surgery for Gilliatt-Sumner hand as a presentation of neurogenic

thoracic outlet syndrome. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 75(6): 1985-1992.

- [4] F.J. Caputo, A.M. Wittenberg, C. Vemuri, M.R. Driskill, J.A. Earley, R. Rastogi, V.B. Emery, R.W. Thompson. (2013). Supraclavicular decompression for neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome in adolescent and adult populations. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 57(1): 149-157.
- [5] J.Y. Al-Hashel, A.A.M. El Shorbgy, S.F. Ahmed, R.R. Elshereef. (2013). Early versus late surgical treatment for neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome. International Scholarly Research Notices. 2013(1): 673020.
- [6] J.W. Ohman, R.W. Thompson. (2020). Thoracic outlet syndrome in the overhead athlete: diagnosis and treatment recommendations. Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine. 13: 457-471.
- [7] H.A. Gelabert, D.A. Rigberg, J.B. O'Connell, S. Jabori, J.C. Jimenez, S. Farley. (2018). Transaxillary decompression of thoracic outlet syndrome patients presenting with cervical ribs. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 68(4): 1143-1149.
- [8] J. Balderman, A.A. Abuirqeba, L. Eichaker, C. Pate, J.A. Earley, M.M. Bottros, S.N. Jayarajan, R.W. Thompson. (2019). Physical therapy management, surgical treatment, and patient-reported outcomes measures in a prospective observational cohort of patients with neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 70(3): 832-841.
- K. Johansen. (2021). Rib-sparing scalenectomy for neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome: early results. Journal of Vascular Surgery. 73(6): 2059-2063.
- [10] A. Dua, C. Deslarzes-Dubuis, K.A. Rothenberg, R. Gologorsky, J.T. Lee. (2020). Long-term functional outcomes follow-up after 188 rib resections in

patients with TOS. Annals of vascular surgery. 68: 28-33.

- [11] N. Li, G. Dierks, H.E. Vervaeke, A. Jumonville, A.D. Kaye, D. Myrcik, A. Paladini, G. Varrassi, O. Viswanath, I. Urits. (2021). Thoracic outlet syndrome: a narrative review. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 10(5): 962.
- [12] J.S. Hwang, J. Kim, S. Kim, K.J. Bae, Y. Lee, G.H. Baek. (2021). Diagnosis of neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome based on the clinical status. Annals of vascular surgery. 76: 454-462.
- [13] D.M. Donahue, I.R. Godoy, R. Gupta, J.A. Donahue, M. Torriani. (2020). Sonographically guided botulinum toxin injections in patients with neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome: correlation with surgical outcomes. Skeletal Radiology. 49: 715-722.
- [14] N. Pesser, J. Goeteyn, L. van der Sanden, S. Houterman, N. van Alfen, M.R. van Sambeek, B.F. van Nuenen, J.A. Teijink. (2021). Feasibility and outcomes of a multidisciplinary care pathway for neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome: a prospective observational cohort study. European Journal of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery. 61(6): 1017-1024.
- [15] Z.G. Yin, K.T. Gong, J.B. Zhang. (2019). Outcomes of surgical management of neurogenic thoracic outlet syndrome: a systematic review and Bayesian perspective. The Journal of Hand Surgery. 44(5): 416. e1-416. e17.
- [16] M. Aboul Hosn, P. Goffredo, J. Man, R. Nicholson, T. Kresowik, M. Sharafuddin, W.J. Sharp, L. Pascarella. (2020). Supraclavicular versus transaxillary first rib resection for thoracic outlet syndrome. Journal of Laparoendoscopic & Advanced Surgical Techniques. 30(7): 737-741.