

# Accepted Manuscript

Title: The safety, efficacy and cost-effectiveness of intraoperative cell-salvage in metastatic spine tumour surgery

Author: Mahmoud Elmalky, Naveed Yasin, Ricardo Rodrigues-Pinto, John Stephenson, Craig Carroll, Glyn Smurthwaite, Rajat Verma, Saeed Mohammad, Irfan Siddique



PII: S1529-9430(17)30091-8  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2017.03.004>  
Reference: SPINEE 57258

To appear in: *The Spine Journal*

Received date: 30-6-2016  
Revised date: 9-2-2017  
Accepted date: 15-3-2017

Please cite this article as: Mahmoud Elmalky, Naveed Yasin, Ricardo Rodrigues-Pinto, John Stephenson, Craig Carroll, Glyn Smurthwaite, Rajat Verma, Saeed Mohammad, Irfan Siddique, The safety, efficacy and cost-effectiveness of intraoperative cell-salvage in metastatic spine tumour surgery, *The Spine Journal* (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2017.03.004>.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **Title:** The safety, efficacy and cost-effectiveness of intraoperative cell-salvage in metastatic spine  
2 tumour surgery

3 **Authors:** Mahmoud Elmalky<sup>1,4</sup>, MD (Tr & Orth); Naveed Yasin<sup>1</sup>, FRCS (Tr & Orth); Ricardo Rodrigues-  
4 Pinto<sup>1,2</sup>, MD, PhD; John Stephenson<sup>3</sup>, PhD CMath MIMA FRSS; Craig Carroll<sup>1</sup>, FRCA; Glyn  
5 Smurthwaite<sup>1</sup>, FRCA; Rajat Verma<sup>1</sup>, FRCS (Tr & Orth); Saeed Mohammad<sup>1</sup>, FRCS (Tr & Orth); Irfan  
6 Siddique<sup>1</sup>, FRCS (Tr & Orth)

7 **Institutions:**

8 1) Department of Spinal Surgery  
9 Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
10 Stott Lane, Lancashire, M6 8HD  
11 United Kingdom

12  
13 2) Department of Orthopaedics  
14 Centro Hospitalar do Porto – Hospital de Santo António  
15 Largo Prof. Abel Salazar  
16 4099-001 Porto  
17 Portugal

18  
19 3) School of Human and Health Sciences  
20 University of Huddersfield, Queensgate  
21 Huddersfield HD1 3DH  
22 United Kingdom

23  
24 4) Department of Orthopaedics  
25 Menoufia University,  
26 Shibin Al Kawm  
27 Egypt

28  
29 **Corresponding author:**

30 Mr. Mahmoud Elmalky  
31 Department of Spinal Surgery  
32 Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
33 Stott Lane, Lancashire, M6 8HD  
34 United Kingdom  
35 [mah\\_elmalky@yahoo.com](mailto:mah_elmalky@yahoo.com)  
36 Tel: 00447450277337

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 **ABSTRACT**

43 **Background context:** Metastatic spine tumour surgery (MSTS) is associated with substantial blood  
44 loss therefore leading to high morbidity and mortality. While intraoperative cell salvage with  
45 leucocyte depletion filter (IOCS-LDF) has been studied as an effective mean of reducing blood loss  
46 in other surgical settings, including the spine, no study has yet analysed the efficacy of re-infusion of

1 salvaged blood in reducing the need for allogenic blood transfusion in patients who have had surgery  
2 for MSTs.

3 **Purpose:** To analyse the efficacy, safety and cost effectiveness of using IOCS-LDF in MSTs.

4 **Study design/ Setting:** Retrospective controlled study

5 **Patient sample:** 176 patients undergoing MSTs

6 **Methods:** All patients undergoing MSTs at a single centre between February 2010 and December  
7 2014 were included in the study. The primary outcome measure was the use of autologous blood  
8 transfusion. Secondary outcome measures included hospital stay, survival time, complications and  
9 procedural costs. The key predictor variable was whether or not IOCS-LDF was utilised during  
10 surgery. Logistic and linear regression analyses were conducted by controlling variables such as  
11 tumour type, number of diseased vertebrae, approach, number and site of stabilised segments,  
12 operation time, pre-operative anaemia, ASA grade, age, gender and BMI. No funding was obtained  
13 and there are no conflicts of interest to be declared.

14 **Results:** Data included 63 cases (IOCS-LDF) and 113 controls (non IOCS-LDF). IOCS-LDF  
15 utilisation was substantively and significantly associated with a lower likelihood of allogenic blood  
16 transfusion (OR=0.407,  $p=0.03$ ). IOCS-LDF was cost neutral ( $p=0.88$ ). Average hospital stay was  
17 3.76 days shorter amongst IOCS-LDF patients ( $p=0.03$ ). Patient survival and complication rates were  
18 comparable in both groups.

19 **Conclusions:** We have demonstrated that the use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs reduces the need for post-  
20 operative allogenic blood transfusion whilst maintaining satisfactory post-operative haemoglobin.

21 We recommend routine use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs for its safety, efficacy and potential cost benefit.

22

23 **Keywords:** "intraoperative cell salvage", "intraoperative blood salvage autotransfusion", "autologous  
24 transfusion", "autotransfusion", "malignant tumour", "tumour surgery", "cell saver", "blood loss in  
25 spinal metastatic surgeries, and "leucocyte depletion filter"

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2

3 Metastatic spine tumour surgery (MSTS) aims to decompress neural structures, preserve cord  
4 function, stabilise the spine and confirm diagnosis prior to further oncological treatment. Whilst  
5 recent advances in perioperative care, spinal instrumentation and surgical techniques have led to  
6 improved clinical outcomes in MSTS, the peri-operative and postoperative risks remain high.[1, 2]  
7 Surgical treatment of MSTS is often associated with substantial blood loss and need for autologous  
8 blood transfusion, both of which contribute to high morbidity and potential mortality associated with  
9 these surgeries. In a meta-analysis published in 2013, Chen et al[3] found a mean blood loss of 2180ml  
10 in spinal tumour surgeries with a possibility of catastrophic blood loss of more than 5000ml in 12% of  
11 patients.[3]

12 A number of peri- and intra-operative strategies exist to reduce the risk of blood loss. Their aim is to  
13 minimize the need for allogeneic blood product transfusion, decrease total blood loss, and reduce cost.  
14 [4] Additionally, they maintain high/adequate post-operative haemoglobin which potentially benefits  
15 patient recovery and could affect postoperative complication rates.[5]

16 Intraoperative cell salvage (IOCS) involves the collection of shed surgical blood, filtration, and  
17 reinfusion to the patient and reduces the need of allogeneic blood transfusion.[6] It has been  
18 demonstrated to be a viable option for reduction or avoidance of allogeneic blood product during  
19 many oncologic surgeries and may be a lifesaving option for patients who refuse allogeneic blood  
20 products.[7]

21 The use of IOCS has been investigated in other oncological surgeries. In gynaecology, hepatic,  
22 urological and cardiothoracic setting it has been demonstrated as being safe and efficacious in  
23 reducing allogeneic blood transfusion.[6-8]

24 Although IOCS provides benefits, it carries some risks. In paediatric patients transient haematuria,  
25 concern for reinfusion of heparinized blood leading to altered haemostasis and alteration in electrolyte  
26 balance have been reported. Furthermore, IOCS is potentially costly, and requires additional  
27 personnel intraoperatively.[7]

1 In oncological surgeries, efficacy of using the leucocyte depletion filter (LDF) to remove malignant  
2 cells from intra-operative cell salvage blood has been studied in vitro and in vivo and reported as a  
3 potentially safe.[9] Previous studies have also evaluated the effectiveness of using IOCS with LDF to  
4 eliminate tumour cells from salvaged blood in spinal tumour surgeries[10, 11]. However no large  
5 scale comparative studies have been published to evaluate the efficacy in reducing the need for  
6 autologous blood transfusion or cost effectiveness in spinal tumour surgery.[12]

7 In a systematic review published in 2014, Kumar et al suggested that the evidence base [10, 11] in  
8 other oncological surgeries would support the use of IOCS in MSTs but recognised the lack of  
9 evidence in this particular patient group.[12]

10 The aim of this study was to evaluate the safety, efficacy and cost effectiveness of IOCS in MSTs.

11

## 12 **METHODS**

13

14 Data was retrospectively obtained from studying all patients undergoing MSTs at a single tertiary  
15 referral centre between February 2010 and December 2014. Case notes and electronic inpatient  
16 hospital records were reviewed. All disease related, patient related, surgery related and post-operative  
17 charts were reviewed to complete the data.

18 Logistic and linear regression analyses were conducted, considering whether or not an allogenic blood  
19 transfusion was given and post-operative haemoglobin levels as primary outcome measures.

20 Secondary outcome measures included length of stay, post-operative survival time, complications and  
21 procedural costs. The key predictor variable was whether or not IOCS-LDF was utilised during the  
22 surgical procedure.

23 A number of procedural-related, health-related and demographic variables were also initially  
24 considered as controlling variables for the primary analyses. Procedural-related variables were: type  
25 of tumour (categorised as thyroid/renal or non-thyroid/renal); number of vertebrae (affected spinal  
26 levels in the operative field); anatomical region (cervical, cervicothoracic, thoracic, thoracolumbar or  
27 lumbar); approach (posterior, anterior or combined); number of stabilised spinal levels and operation  
28 time. Health-related variables were: pre-operative anaemia and ASA (American Society of

1 Anaesthesiologists) grade.[13] Demographic variables were: age; gender and body mass index  
2 (BMI).

3 Data was summarised descriptively. Exploratory procedures were undertaken to assess data  
4 distributions, extent of missing data and possible collinearity.

5 Logistic regression analyses were conducted using the allogenic blood transfusion outcome measure.

6 A sequential modelling strategy was utilised with the key predictor variable of IOCS-LDF utilisation  
7 included at the highest level of the model hierarchy. All procedural-related variables were then fitted  
8 at the second stage of the hierarchy. Health-related variables, ASA grade and anaemia status were  
9 fitted at the third level of the hierarchy. Demographic variables of age, gender and BMI were fitted at  
10 the fourth (lowest) level of the hierarchy. For hierarchical levels 2-4, stepwise routines were utilised  
11 to derive an optimum selection of variables within the level. Final model adequacy was assessed  
12 using Nagelkerke's pseudo-R<sup>2</sup> statistic, and the percentage of cases correctly classified by the model  
13 was evaluated.

14 Linear regression analyses were conducted on the data using the post-operative haemoglobin level  
15 outcome measure utilising the same sequential modelling strategy as for the sequential logistic  
16 regression modelling. Cross-validation and diagnostic procedures were conducted on both of the final  
17 logistic and linear regression models.

18 Secondary outcomes were assessed using descriptive and univariable methods. Association between  
19 IOCS-LDF group and patient survival was assessed using the  $\chi^2$  test for association. Associations  
20 between IOCS-LDF group, length of hospital stay and total procedural costs were assessed using  
21 independent samples t-test.

22 Cost calculation was performed analysing the combined cost of use of IOCS-LDF equipment and cost  
23 of allogenic blood.

24

25

## 26 **RESULTS**

27

1 Analysis was conducted on 176 patients, from an original dataset of 178 patients. Two patients were  
2 not assigned to an IOCS-LDF group and were excluded from the analysis. Less than 0.5% of the  
3 remaining data in total was missing, and imputation methods were not used.

4 Data comprised 63 cases (use of IOCS-LDF) (35.8% of valid cases) and 113 controls (no use of IOCS-  
5 LDF) (64.2% of valid cases). Dataset included 106 males (60.2%) and 70 females (39.8%); with a  
6 mean age of 63.2 years (SD 12.6 years) (Table 1).

7 Exploratory analyses indicated evidence for collinearity effects between certain variables  
8 necessitating the removal of variables corresponding to number of affected vertebrae and anatomical  
9 region from subsequent analyses.

10

#### 11 *Analysis of need for allogenic blood transfusion outcome*

12 Using the stepwise modelling strategy within each level of a sequential logistic regression procedure,  
13 the Level-2 variable corresponding to approach and stabilised levels entered the model at the 2<sup>nd</sup> step,  
14 following the forced entry of the key predictor variable of IOCS-LDF at step 1. No other variables  
15 were included in the model at this step. Both Level-3 variables (ASA grade and preoperative anaemia)  
16 were included in the model at the 3<sup>rd</sup> step. None of the Level-4 variables (demographic variables)  
17 were included in the model at the 4<sup>th</sup> step. Hence, the final model included the variables IOCS-LDF,  
18 approach, number of stabilised levels, ASA grade and preoperative anaemia (Table 2).

19 IOCS-LDF was found to be substantively and significantly associated with this outcome, as were  
20 number of stabilised levels, anaemia status and ASA grade. Approach was substantively associated  
21 with the need for allogenic blood transfusion but did not achieve statistical significance at the 5%  
22 level.

23 Controlling for other variables, the odds of a patient receiving an allogenic blood transfusion were  
24 59% higher in cases where IOCS-LDF was not utilised than when it was utilised. A higher probability  
25 of allogenic blood transfusion was found in patients whose procedures involved anterior, rather than  
26 posterior approach (not statistically significant), greater extents of spinal fixation, higher ASA grades  
27 (indicating worse morbidity) and preoperative anaemia.

1 Nagelkerke's pseudo- $R^2$  statistic for the parsimonious model was 0.276, indicating that the model is a  
2 good fit to the data. The model correctly classified 73.4% of cases in the sample. A model derived  
3 from a training set comprising 80% of cases correctly classified 70.0% of cases in a validation set  
4 comprising the remaining 20% of the sample; indicating good predictive capability. Studentised  
5 residuals and Cook's distances were within expectations for all cases, indicating that no data point  
6 exerts excessive influence on the model.

7

### 8 Analysis of post-operative haemoglobin outcome

9 Using the stepwise modelling strategy within each level of a sequential regression procedure, the  
10 Level-2 variable corresponding to stabilised levels entered the model at the second step, following the  
11 forced entry of the key predictor variable of IOCS-LDF at step 1. The Level-3 variable corresponding  
12 to anaemia entered the model at the 3<sup>rd</sup> step. The Level-4 demographic variable gender was included  
13 in the model at the 4<sup>th</sup> step. Hence the final model included the variables IOCS-LDF, stabilised levels,  
14 anaemia and gender (Table 3).

15 While the controlling variables corresponding to number of stabilised levels, anaemia and gender  
16 were found to be significantly associated with the outcome, the IOCS-LDF variable did not achieve  
17 statistical significance at the 5% level, or appear to show any substantive importance. Higher post-  
18 operative haemoglobin levels were found in patients whose procedures involved lesser extents of  
19 spinal fixation, in those without anaemia and in males. Controlling for other variables, an increase of  
20 one stabilised level was associated with a decreased post-operative haemoglobin count of 1.55 units;  
21 pre-operatively anaemic patients had 6.9 units post-operative haemoglobin count less than non-  
22 anaemic patients; and male patients had 8.7 units post-operative haemoglobin count greater than  
23 female.

24 The adjusted (Wherry)  $R^2$  value for the final model was 0.111. Stein's adjusted  $R^2$  statistic for the  
25 final model was 0.0863; indicating an adequately performing model with good cross validity  
26 predictive power. Studentised residuals and Cook's distances were within expectations for all cases,  
27 indicating that no data point exerts excessive influence on the model. No evidence for violation of



1 regression assumptions was detected during residual analysis procedures: residuals were found to be  
2 normally distributed and homogeneity of variance was achieved.

3

#### 4 Analyses of secondary outcomes

5 The association between patient survival and IOCS-LDF was not significant using a  $\chi^2$  test for  
6 association ( $\chi^2_{(1)}=0.245$ ;  $p=0.620$ ). Length of stay was 3.76 days shorter on average amongst those  
7 for whom IOCS-LDF was utilised (15.9 days) than amongst those for whom IOCS-LDF was not  
8 utilised (19.1 days). This difference was statistically significant using an independent samples t-test  
9 ( $p=0.028$ ). A 95% confidence interval for the difference was given by (0.34, 6.01).

10 IOCS-LDF costs £128.41 per case. The cost of the allogenic blood is £135.7 for a red blood cell unit,  
11 £215.03 for a platelets unit and £29.11 for a unit of fresh frozen plasma. The total procedural cost for  
12 patients for whom cell salvage was utilised and for whom IOCS-LDF was not utilised was not  
13 significantly different using an independent samples t-test ( $p=0.875$ ).

14 No difference in the peri and post-operative complications was found between the two groups.

15

16

## 17 **DISCUSSION**

18

19 Blood loss in MSTs is a major complication due to the tumour nature or altered spinal vascular  
20 anatomy (dilated epidural veins, hypervascularity and neovascularisation). Controlling blood loss is  
21 difficult. To date, very little evidence exists to support the use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs. [14-16]

22 Blood loss can affect patient recovery, delay wound healing and increase the risk of wound infection,  
23 ultimately delaying further oncological (radio or chemotherapy) treatment, increasing hospital stay  
24 and adding to healthcare costs.[17]

25 The evaluation of the efficacy of blood conservation techniques in MSTs is compounded by many  
26 factors that can influence blood loss. These include type of primary tumour (non vascular/vascular),  
27 number of affected segments, number of operated levels, operative time and approach. Additionally,  
28 health related factors such as pre-operative anaemic status of the patients, ASA grading and BMI are

1 also variables that can potentially influence blood loss. This is, to our knowledge, the first study to  
2 comprehensively consider and control for these confounding factors in evaluating the use of IOCS-  
3 LDF in MSTs.

4 All of these factors have been previously demonstrated as potentially affecting blood loss; Zhenget  
5 al[18] reported the factors affecting blood loss and blood transfusion in patients having segmental  
6 spinal surgeries as number of levels fused, age, and low preoperative haemoglobin. Many studies  
7 have validated the role of BMI and ASA grade as factors which affect intraoperative blood loss.

8 Therefore, in analysing the benefits of intraoperative cell salvage we have controlled for these  
9 potentially confounding factors in order to accurately establish the efficacy of IOCS-LDF in reducing  
10 the need for allogenic blood transfusion[19-23].

11 The choice of surgical approach is dependent upon the source of compression (anterior or posterior),  
12 patient comorbidity, associated deformity, surgeon's experience and spinal instability. Cases with 3-  
13 column spinal disease, compression, deformity (kyphosis) and instability can require combined,  
14 anterior and posterior, decompression and stabilisation. These procedures are associated with  
15 significantly greater morbidity and blood loss, therefore have been controlled for in the analyses.[24-  
16 26]

17 To our knowledge, to date, no studies have analysed the cost-effectiveness of IOCS-LDF in MSTs.  
18 However, in liver transplant and hepatocellular carcinoma it has been found to be cost-effective.[27,  
19 28]. Ubeeetal [29] concluded that the cost benefits of IOCS make this technique economically  
20 efficient, clinically effective and an attractive alternative to other methods of transfusion for open  
21 radical prostatectomy surgery.[29] Our results show that using IOCS-LDF is potentially cost neutral.

22 The total procedural cost for patients for whom IOCS-LDF was utilised and for whom IOCS-LDF  
23 was not utilised was found to be not significantly different. However our study did not include the  
24 additional staff cost that can be associated with use of IOCS-LDF.

25 The short hospital stay is an important focus of modern hospital management with associated  
26 reduction in cost and improvements in the quality of health care. Our results show that using IOCS is  
27 consistent with a reduced hospital stay. Whilst this difference was observed and significant, it is  
28 likely that unmeasured factors, rather than the utilisation of IOCS-LDF, have contributed to this

1 finding (for example, patients' neurological status). In our study no association was found between  
2 patient survival and IOCS-LDF.

3 Whilst our data was analysed retrospectively, missing data was minimal and with the substantial  
4 number of patients and an analysis that controls for the majority of the known and measurable  
5 confounding factors that can influence blood loss in this type of surgery, our findings would suggest  
6 that the routine use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs has clear benefits for both patients and healthcare  
7 providers.

8 The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) published guidelines endorsing the use  
9 of IOCS-LDF for radical prostatectomy and cystectomy.[30] We would advise, based on our  
10 findings, the routine use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs.

11

## 12 **CONCLUSION**

13

14 In summary we have demonstrated that the use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs reduces the need for post-  
15 operative allogenic blood transfusion whilst maintaining satisfactory post-operative haemoglobin. The  
16 use of IOCS-LDF may be cost-effective depending on the personnel set-up. We would recommend  
17 routine use of IOCS-LDF in MSTs for its safety and efficacy.

18

19

20

1 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

2

3 The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest related to this work.

4 RR-P was a recipient of a PhD grant from Programme for Advanced Medical Education, sponsored

5 by Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Fundação Champalimaud, Ministério da Saúde, Fundação para a

6 Ciência e Tecnologia and Apifarma, Portugal (between 2010 and 2014) and has undertaken a

7 Fellowship supported by the International Group for the Advancement of Spinal Sciences in 2014, all

8 outside the scope of the submitted work.

Accepted Manuscript

1 **REFERENCES**

2

- 3 1. Patchell RA, Tibbs PA, Regine WF, et al. Direct decompressive surgical resection in the  
4 treatment of spinal cord compression caused by metastatic cancer: a randomised trial. *Lancet*.  
5 2005;366(9486):643-8.
- 6 2. Klimo P, Jr., Kestle JR, Schmidt MH. Treatment of metastatic spinal epidural disease: a review  
7 of the literature. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2003;15(5):E1.
- 8 3. Chen Y, Tai BC, Nayak D, et al. Blood loss in spinal tumour surgery and surgery for metastatic  
9 spinal disease: a meta-analysis. *Bone Joint J*. 2013;95-B(5):683-8.
- 10 4. Carey PA, Schoenfeld AJ, Cordill RD, Tompkins BJ, Caskey PM. A comparison of cell salvage  
11 strategies in posterior spinal fusion for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. *J Spinal Disord Tech*.  
12 2015;28(1):1-4.
- 13 5. Tse EY, Cheung WY, Ng KF, Luk KD. Reducing perioperative blood loss and allogeneic blood  
14 transfusion in patients undergoing major spine surgery. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2011;93(13):1268-77.
- 15 6. Waters JH, Yazer M, Chen YF, Kloke J. Blood salvage and cancer surgery: a meta-analysis of  
16 available studies. *Transfusion*. 2012;52(10):2167-73.
- 17 7. Trudeau JD, Waters T, Chipperfield K. Should intraoperative cell-salvaged blood be used in  
18 patients with suspected or known malignancy? *Can J Anaesth*. 2012;59(11):1058-70.
- 19 8. Hansen E, Bechmann V, Altmeppen J. Intraoperative blood salvage in cancer surgery: safe  
20 and effective? *Transfus Apher Sci*. 2002;27(2):153-7.
- 21 9. Catling S, Williams S, Freitas O, Rees M, Davies C, Hopkins L. Use of a leucocyte filter to  
22 remove tumour cells from intra-operative cell salvage blood. *Anaesthesia*. 2008;63(12):1332-8.
- 23 10. Kumar N, Ahmed Q, Lee VK, Zaw AS, Goy R, Wong HK. Are we ready for the use of  
24 intraoperative salvaged blood in metastatic spine tumour surgery? *Eur Spine J*. 2015.
- 25 11. Kumar N, Zaw AS, Khoo BL, et al. Intraoperative cell salvage in metastatic spine tumour  
26 surgery reduces potential for reinfusion of viable cancer cells. *Eur Spine J*. 2016.
- 27 12. Kumar N, Chen Y, Zaw AS, et al. Use of intraoperative cell-salvage for autologous blood  
28 transfusions in metastatic spine tumour surgery: a systematic review. *Lancet Oncol*. 2014;15(1):e33-  
29 41.
- 30 13. Owens WD. American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Status Classification System in  
31 not a risk classification system. *Anesthesiology*. 2001;94(2):378.
- 32 14. Bilsky MH, Fraser JF. Complication avoidance in vertebral column spine tumors. *Neurosurg*  
33 *Clin N Am*. 2006;17(3):317-29, vii.
- 34 15. Manke C, Bretschneider T, Lenhart M, et al. Spinal metastases from renal cell carcinoma:  
35 effect of preoperative particle embolization on intraoperative blood loss. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*.  
36 2001;22(5):997-1003.
- 37 16. Smit JW, Vielvoye GJ, Goslings BM. Embolization for vertebral metastases of follicular  
38 thyroid carcinoma. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2000;85(3):989-94.
- 39 17. Carless PA, Henry DA, Moxey AJ, O'Connell D, Brown T, Fergusson DA. Cell salvage for  
40 minimising perioperative allogeneic blood transfusion. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*.  
41 2010;(4):CD001888.
- 42 18. Zheng F, Cammisa FP, Jr., Sandhu HS, Girardi FP, Khan SN. Factors predicting hospital stay,  
43 operative time, blood loss, and transfusion in patients undergoing revision posterior lumbar spine  
44 decompression, fusion, and segmental instrumentation. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2002;27(8):818-24.
- 45 19. Han IH, Son DW, Nam KH, Choi BK, Song GS. The effect of body mass index on intra-  
46 abdominal pressure and blood loss in lumbar spine surgery. *J Korean Neurosurg Soc*. 2012;51(2):81-  
47 5.
- 48 20. Jiang J, Teng Y, Fan Z, Khan S, Xia Y. Does obesity affect the surgical outcome and  
49 complication rates of spinal surgery? A meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2014;472(3):968-75.

- 1 21. Daabiss M. American Society of Anaesthesiologists physical status classification. Indian J  
2 Anaesth. 2011;55(2):111-5.
- 3 22. Grosflam JM, Wright EA, Cleary PD, Katz JN. Predictors of blood loss during total hip  
4 replacement surgery. Arthritis Care Res. 1995;8(3):167-73.
- 5 23. Wolters U, Wolf T, Stutzer H, Schroder T. ASA classification and perioperative variables as  
6 predictors of postoperative outcome. Br J Anaesth. 1996;77(2):217-22.
- 7 24. Fourney DR, Abi-Said D, Rhines LD, et al. Simultaneous anterior-posterior approach to the  
8 thoracic and lumbar spine for the radical resection of tumors followed by reconstruction and  
9 stabilization. J Neurosurg. 2001;94(2 Suppl):232-44.
- 10 25. Kamat A, Gilkes C, Barua NU, Patel NR. Single-stage posterior transpedicular approach for  
11 circumferential epidural decompression and three-column stabilization using a titanium cage for  
12 upper thoracic spine neoplastic disease: a case series and technical note. Br J Neurosurg.  
13 2008;22(1):92-8.
- 14 26. Lu DC, Lau D, Lee JG, Chou D. The transpedicular approach compared with the anterior  
15 approach: an analysis of 80 thoracolumbar corpectomies. J Neurosurg Spine. 2010;12(6):583-91.
- 16 27. Phillips SD, Maguire D, Deshpande R, et al. A prospective study investigating the cost  
17 effectiveness of intraoperative blood salvage during liver transplantation. Transplantation.  
18 2006;81(4):536-40.
- 19 28. Liang TB, Li DL, Liang L, et al. Intraoperative blood salvage during liver transplantation in  
20 patients with hepatocellular carcinoma: efficiency of leukocyte depletion filters in the removal of  
21 tumor cells. Transplantation. 2008;85(6):863-9.
- 22 29. Ubee S, Kumar M, Athmanathan N, Singh G, Vesey S. Intraoperative red blood cell salvage  
23 and autologous transfusion during open radical retropubic prostatectomy: a cost-benefit analysis.  
24 Ann R Coll Surg Engl. 2011;93(2):157-61.
- 25 30. NICE. Intraoperative red blood cell salvage during radical prostatectomy or radical  
26 cystectomy. NICE interventional procedure guidance <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG258> 2008.

27

28

29

30

1 **Table 1: descriptive summary of cohort**

Variable	Cases (n=63)	Controls (n=113)	All patients (n=176)
<b>Gender</b>			
Males (frequency (valid %))	45 (71.4%)	61 (54.0%)	106 (60.2%)
Females (frequency (valid %))	18 (28.6%)	52 (46.0%)	70 (39.8%)
<b>Age (mean (SD))</b>	63.6 (13.8)	64.1 (11.5)	63.6 (12.6)
<b>BMI (mean (SD))</b>	25.9 (4.55)	25.7 (4.58)	25.8 (4.54)
<b>Number of affected vertebrae (median (range))</b>	1 (1-7)	1 (1-4)	1 (1-7)
<b>Number of stabilised levels (median (range))</b>	4 (2-12)	4 (0-11)	4 (0-12)
<b>Operation time (hours) (mean (SD))</b>	4.64 (1.66)	4.04 (1.54)	4.26 (1.62)
<b>ASA score (median (range))</b>	3 (1-5)	3 (1-5)	3 (1-5)
<b>Length of stay in days (mean (SD))</b>	15.9 (7.38)	19.1 (9.96)	17.9 (9.19)
<b>Type of tumour</b>			
Non-thyroid/renal (frequency (valid %))	53 (86.9%)	105 (93.8%)	158 (91.3%)
Thyroid/renal (frequency (valid %))	8 (13.1%)	7 (6.2%)	15 (8.7%)
<b>Approach</b>			
Posterior only (frequency (valid %))	51 (81.0%)	96 (85.0%)	147 (83.5%)
Anterior/both (frequency (valid %))	12 (19.0%)	17 (15.0%)	29 (16.5%)
<b>Level code</b>			
Cervical (frequency (valid %))	3 (4.8%)	11 (9.7%)	14 (8.0%)
Cervicothoracic (frequency (valid %))	7 (11.1%)	9 (8.0%)	16 (9.1%)
Thoracic (frequency (valid %))	28 (44.4%)	52 (46.0%)	80 (45.5%)
Thoracolumbar (frequency (valid %))	16 (25.4%)	35 (31.0%)	51 (29.0%)
Lumbar (frequency (valid %))	9 (14.3%)	5 (5.3%)	15 (8.5%)
<b>Preoperative anaemia</b>			
No anaemia (frequency (valid %))	29 (46.0%)	58 (51.3%)	87 (49.4%)
Anaemia (frequency (valid %))	34 (53.0%)	55 (48.7%)	89 (50.6%)
<b>Surgical complications</b>			
No complications (frequency (valid %))	59 (95.2%)	107 (99.1%)	166 (97.6%)
Complications (frequency (valid %))	3 (4.8%)	1 (0.9%)	4 (2.4%)
<b>Patient survival</b>			
Death recorded (frequency (valid %))	26 (41.3%)	51 (45.1%)	77 (43.8%)
No death recorded (frequency (valid %))	37 (58.7%)	62 (54.9%)	99 (56.2%)
<b>Procedural cost (mean (SD))</b>	GBP351.78 (GBP207.21)	GBP338.42 (GBP314.85)	GBP340.77 (GBP286.67)

2

1 **Table 2: Parameter coefficients, confidence intervals and p-values of all variables included in final model**  
 2 **(blood transfusion outcome measure)**

Variable	Parameter estimate	Odds ratio (OR)	95% confidence interval for OR	P-value
IOCS-LDF	-0.898	0.407	(0.180, 0.920)	0.031
Approach <sup>1</sup>	0.923	2.516	(0.866, 7.304)	0.090
Number of stabilised levels	0.408	1.503	(1.221, 1.852)	<0.001
Anaemia status <sup>2</sup>	1.042	2.836	(1.337, 6.016)	0.007
ASA grade	0.806	2.239	(1.244, 4.031)	0.007

3 <sup>1</sup>Reference category=posterior approach

4 <sup>2</sup>Reference category=no anaemia

5

6

7

8 **Table 3: Parameter coefficients, confidence intervals and p-values of all variables included in final model**  
 9 **(post-operative haemoglobin outcome measure)**

Variable	Unstandardised coefficient	95% confidence interval	P-value
IOCS-LDF	-1.568	(-6.708, 3.572)	0.548
stabilised levels	-1.553	(-2.778, -0.328)	0.013
Anaemia <sup>1</sup>	-6.892	(-11.81, -1.97)	0.006
Gender <sup>2</sup>	-8.692	(-13.77, -3.61)	0.001

10 <sup>1</sup>Reference category=no anaemia

11 <sup>2</sup>Reference category=male

12

13

14