

## Physical Characteristics of Polyaxial-Headed Pedicle Screws and Biomechanical Comparison of Load With Their Failure

Guy R. Fogel, MD, Charles A. Reitman, MD, Weiqiang Liu, PhD, and Stephen I. Esses, MD

**Study Design.** Pedicle screw strength or load to failure was biomechanically evaluated, and the geometric characteristics of pedicle screw instrumentation systems were compared.

**Objectives.** To compare the features of pedicle screw systems, and to demonstrate the failure point of the polyaxial pedicle screw head.

**Summary of Background Data.** Many pedicle screw instrumentation systems are currently available to the spine surgeon. Each system has its unique characteristics. It is important for the surgeon to understand the differences in these pedicle screw systems. Pedicle screw load to failure has not been subjected to a comparison study.

**Methods.** The physical characteristics of each pedicle screw instrumentation system were determined. Features of rods, instruments, and pedicle screws were cataloged. Biomechanical testing of the pedicle screw construct was performed to determine the site and force of the load to failure. Nine pedicle screw systems were evaluated. Testing was performed with a pneumatic testing system under load control. Three polyaxial screws were used for each test at a load rate of 100 N/second. The load failure value was the force at which the pedicle screw or polyaxial head-screw interface initially deflected.

**Results.** Biomechanical testing demonstrated in all instances that the polyaxial head coupling to the screw was the first failure point. Although there have been subtle design differences in the instruments over time, the features of the pedicle screw instrument sets have become remarkably similar.

**Conclusions.** Biomechanical pedicle screw load-to-failure data demonstrated that the polyaxial head coupling to the screw is the first to fail and may be a protective feature of the pedicle screw, preventing pedicle screw breakage. Knowing the physical characteristics of the available pedicle screw instrumentation systems may allow the choice of pedicle screw best suited for a given clinical situation. [Key words: biomechanics, equipment design, pedicle screws, spinal fusion/instrumentation, surgery] *Spine* 2003;28:470-473

Polyaxial heads have made the pedicle screw more versatile, particularly improving ease of connecting rod application.

From the \*Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas.

Acknowledgment date: June 5, 2002. First revision date: July 26, 2002. Acceptance date: July 30, 2002.

Device status/drug statement: The device(s)/drug(s) is/are FDA approved or approved by a corresponding national agency for this indication.

Conflict of interest: No funds were received in support of this work. No benefits in any form have been or will be received from a commercial party related directly or indirectly to the subject of this manuscript. Address reprint requests to Stephen I. Esses, MD, Brodsky Chair of Spinal Surgery, Baylor College of Medicine, 6560 Fannin St., Suite 1900, Houston Texas 77030. E-mail: sesses@mysurgeon.com.

Clinically, the senior author has observed that the incidence of broken pedicle screws has diminished over the past several years coincidentally with the usage of polyaxial screws. A hypothesis was developed to explain the decreased breakage of pedicle screws. It may be that there is a subtle loosening or failure of the polyaxial head that removes some of the stress from the pedicle screw. By decreasing the stiffness in the coupling of the polyaxial head to the pedicle screw, the bending stresses on the pedicle screw would be lessened. A MEDLINE search showed no biomechanical evidence in the English spine literature regarding the testing of polyaxial screws. In addition, polyaxial-headed pedicle screw load-to-failure testing has not been subjected to a comparison study.

### ■ Methods

Nine pedicle screw systems were evaluated: the Silhouette (Sulzer Spine-Tech, Minneapolis, MN), Blackstone (Blackstone Medical, Springfield, MA), Click-X (Synthes, Paoli, PA), Xia (Stryker-Howmedica, Warsaw, IN), M8 (Sofamor-Danek, Memphis, TN), Miami-MOSS, Monarch, and Magnum (Depuy-AcroMed, Cleveland, OH), and the SD-90 (Surgical Dynamics, Memphis, TN). Not all of the commercially available pedicle screws were available for testing. The screw lengths were standardized at 45 mm, and the diameters varied from 6 to 7.5 mm.

Each tested screw was mounted perpendicularly on the appropriate rod provided by the vendor at the manufacturer's recommended torque settings. The distal half of the screw body was potted in the shape of a ceramic cylinder to enhance contact with the MTS machine. Testing was performed with a materials testing system (Model 1321; Instron, Canton, MA) (Figure 1). The MTS force was applied at a point 30 mm from the rod perpendicular to the long axis of the screw. The MTS compressed the screw at a load rate of 100 N/second until failure occurred. The load failure value was the force at which the pedicle screw initially deflected or uncoupled from the polyaxial head.

### ■ Results

The geometry of the coupling between the screw and head shows a conforming hemispherical interface that allows for polyaxial motion of the head on the screw. The fixation of the polyaxial head to the rod is with an internal screw, external nut, or both, pushing the rod into the slot of the head. The Silhouette has an external nut securing the rod into the head of the screw, whereas the Miami MOSS and the Magnum have an inner screw head and an external nut both securing the rod into the screw head. The other five systems have an internal screw device securing the rod to the pedicle screw head. To gain




Figure 1. Setup of the Instron MTS. The pedicle screw is encased in a ceramic cylinder, and the rod construct is held in a large chuck in a vise. The screw then is compressed at a load rate of 100 N/second until failure occurs.

final fixation, all the screws and nuts require torque to specified levels except the Surgical Dynamics SD-90. The SD-90 has a helical wedge that requires only a 90° turn of the inner screw to gain the final fixation. The Monarch also has a dovetail top with a center screw that locks the head to the rod.

The Silhouette had the lowest mean failure load of 213 N, whereas the Magnum was the highest at 486 N. The full results from load-to-failure testing of the pedicle screws are shown in Table 1. Figure 2 shows that the statistical differences ranged from a *P* of 0.13 to a *P* of 0.0009. The statistical power was limited in some cases by the small sample size.

## Discussion

Pedicle screw systems have undergone continual modifications over the past several years. As recently as 1 to 2 years ago, there were substantial differences in the design features of these sets. However, the systems have evolved to match the strengths of each other such that there currently are very few differences between instrument sets (Table 2). There have been design changes in the screws

themselves. The crosslink systems have been updated, and there currently is a wide selection of screw diameters, lengths, and sizes of cross-links. Two of the systems do offer more than one rod diameter.

The results from the load-to-failure testing of the polyaxial pedicle screws demonstrates that the weakest point of the construct is the head-to-screw coupling (Table 1 and Figure 2). This failure of the polyaxial head may be a protective factor for the pedicle screw shaft, preventing early breakage.

The polyaxial head has three tasks: 1) to secure the rod to the head, 2) to prevent the head from deforming in diameter, and 3) to secure the polyaxial head to the pedicle screw. The outside nut, pin-nut, helical or dovetail wedges, and thicker walled polyaxial head are designed to prevent the head from deforming. The inner screw locks the rod in the head and the head to the screw. The helical wedge actually can do all three tasks with one locking device. All pedicle screw heads have some method to stabilize the diameter of the head and a method to hold the rod in the head. The single outside nut-locking mechanism was statistically weaker than any other design.

Biomechanical tests of pedicle screw constructs have demonstrated the fundamental importance of the bone implant interface, bone density, and screw pullout strength.<sup>4,5,7,9,11,12,15,16</sup> The essential need for fit and fill of the screw in the isthmus of the pedicle has been proved.<sup>7,15</sup> The direct relation between pullout strength and insertional torque has been well demonstrated,<sup>5,6</sup> and the fundamental improvement in pullout strength obtained by cross-linking has been documented.<sup>14</sup> The stabilizing influence of using converging screws has been shown.<sup>1</sup> The major diameter of a pedicle screw has been shown to control pullout strength.<sup>2,3</sup> Bicortical purchase increased pullout strength fundamentally both in individual vertebrae and in the sacrum. However, bicortical

Table 1. Load to Failure of Polyaxial Head of Pedicle Screw

Screw System	Mean (N)	SD	Screw Diameter (mm)
Silhouette	213.21	25.71	6.5
BMI	268.88	38.06	6.5
Moss Miami	280.02	13.31	6
M8	340.57	31.18	6.5
Click'X	349.54	42.53	7
SD90	357.99	25.44	6.75
Xia	397.72	25.5	7.5
Monarch	447.67	28.38	7
Magnum	486.24	24.05	7

SD = standard deviation.



## References

1. Barber JW, Boden SD, Ganey T, et al. Biomechanical study of lumbar pedicle screws: Does convergence affect axial pullout strength? *J Spinal Disord* 1998; 11:215-20.
2. Daftari TK, Horton WC, Hutton WC. Correlations between screw hole preparation, torque of insertion, and pullout strength for spinal screws. *J Spinal Disord* 1994;7:139-45.
3. Hirano T, Hasegawa K, Takahashi HE, et al. Structural characteristics of the pedicle and its role in screw stability. *Spine* 1997;22:2504-9, discussion 10.
4. Kostuik JP, Munting E, Valdevit A. Biomechanical analysis of screw load sharing in pedicle fixation of the lumbar spine. *J Spinal Disord* 1994;7:394-401.
5. Liljenqvist U, Hackenberg L, Link T, et al. Pullout strength of pedicle screws *versus* pedicle and laminar hooks in the thoracic spine. *Acta Orthop Belg* 2001;67:157-63.
6. Lill CA, Schlegel U, Wahl D, et al. Comparison of the *in vitro* holding strengths of conical and cylindrical pedicle screws in a fully inserted setting and backed out 180 degrees. *J Spinal Disord* 2000;13:259-66.
7. Lim TH, Eck JC, An HS, et al. Biomechanics of transfixation in pedicle screw instrumentation. *Spine* 1996;21:2224-9.
8. Lu WW, Zhu Q, Holmes AD, et al. Loosening of sacral screw fixation under *in vitro* fatigue loading. *J Orthop Res* 2000;18:808-14.
9. McCormack T, Karakovic E, Gaines RW. The load sharing classification of spine fractures. *Spine* 1994;19:1741-4.
10. Mirkovic S, Abitbol JJ, Steinman J, et al. Anatomic consideration for sacral screw placement. *Spine* 1991;16:S289-94.
11. Oktenoglu BT, Ferrara LA, Andalkar N, et al. Effects of hole preparation on screw pullout resistance and insertional torque: A biomechanical study. *J Neurosurg* 2001;94:91-6.
12. Ono A, Brown MD, Latta LL, et al. Triangulated pedicle screw construct technique and pullout strength of conical and cylindrical screws. *J Spinal Disord* 2001;14:323-9.
13. Robertson PA, Plank LD. Pedicle screw placement at the sacrum: Anatomical characterization and limitations at S1. *J Spinal Disord* 1999;12:227-33.
14. Suzuki T, Abe E, Okuyama K, et al. Improving the pullout strength of pedicle screws by screw coupling. *J Spinal Disord* 2001;14:399-403.
15. Tencer AF, Hampton D, Eddy S. Biomechanical properties of threaded inserts for lumbar interbody spinal fusion. *Spine* 1995;20:2408-14.
16. Vaccaro AR, Garfin SR. Pedicle screw fixation in the lumbar spine. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 1995;3:263-74.