medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Research topics and trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis: a bibliometric study with machine-learning based text mining

Guoxin Fan, MD [1,2,†], Jiaqi Qin, BE [3,†], Yufeng Li[4,†], Sheng Yang, MD[5,6], Longfei Huang, MD [7], Huaqing Liu, MESc [3], Shisheng He[5,6,*], MD, Xiang Liao, MD [1,2,*]

[1] Department of Pain Medicine, Huazhong University of Science and Technology Union Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, 518060, China.

[2] Guangdong Key Laboratory for Biomedical Measurements and Ultrasound Imaging, School of Biomedical Engineering, Shenzhen University Health Science Center, Shenzhen 518060, China.

[3] Artificial Intelligence Innovation Center, Research Institute of Tsinghua, Pearl River Delta, Guangzhou, 510735, China.

[4] Department of Orthopedics, The Eighth Affiliated Hospital Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, 518033, China.

[5] Department of Orthopedics, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China

[6] Spinal Pain Research Institute, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China.

[7] Department of Orthopedics, Nanchang Hongdu Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 1399 Diezihu Road, Donghu District, Nanchang, 330006, China

[†] these three authors equally contribute to the work.

* Corresponding authors:

Shisheng He; Email addresses: tjhss7418@tongji.edu.cn

Mailing address: Department of Orthopedics, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

Xiang Liao; Email addresses: digitalxiang@163.com

Mailing address: Department of Pain Medicine, Huazhong University of Science and Technology Union Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, China

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives: The study aimed to conduct a bibliometric analysis of publications concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis, as well as explore its research topics and trends with machine-learning based text mining.

Methods: The data were extracted from the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) database and analyzed in Rstudio1.3.1. Annual publication production and the top 20 productive authors over time were presented. Additionally, top 20 productive journals and top 20 impact journals were compared by spine-subspecialty or not. Similarly, top 20 productive countries/regions and top 20 impact countries/regions were compared by developed countries/regions or not. The collaborative relationship among countries and the research trends in the past decade were presented by R package "Bibliometrix". Latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) analysis was conducted to classify main topics of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

Results: Up to 2021, a total number of 4990 articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis were finally included for analysis. Spine-subspecialty journals were found to be dominant in productivity and impact of the field, and SPINE, EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL and JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE were the top 3 productive and the top 3 impact journals in this field. USA, China and Japan have contributed to over half of the publication productivity, but European countries seemed to publish more influential articles. It seemed that developed countries/regions tended to produce more articles as well as high influential articles, and international collaborations focused on USA, Europe and eastern Asia. Publications concerning emerging surgical technique was the major topic, followed by radiographic measurement and epidemiology for this field. Cortical bone trajectory, oblique lumbar interbody fusion, oblique lateral lumbar interbody fusion, lateral lumbar interbody fusion, degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, adjacent segment disease, spinal canal stenosis, minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion and percutaneous pedicle screw were the recent hotspots over the past 5 years.

Conclusions: The study successfully summarized the productivity and impact of different countries/regions and journals, which should benefit the journal selection and pursuit of international collaboration for researcher who were interested in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis. Additionally, the current study may encourage more researchers in the field and somewhat inform their research direction in the future.

Keywords: Bibliometrics, Lumbar Spondylolisthesis, Machine Learning, Latent Dirichlet allocation, Text Minging

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction:

Lumbar spondylolisthesis, especially in the elderly, is one of the most common causes of low back pain(1). Lumbar spondylolisthesis is defined as a slip of one vertebra over the other beneath, causing instability of the segment and compression of the cauda equina(2). The incidence of lumbar spondylolisthesis is 4-6% in the general population(3), which typically occurs in the occurs at the fourth and fifth lumbar vertebrae(4). In the United States, approximately 11.5% of the population suffers from this disease(5). Based on its etiology, lumbar spondylolisthesis can be divided into isthmic or degenerative spondylolisthesis. The former could be post-traumatic fractures in the pars interarticularis or congenital defects, while the latter is a result of disorders of the disc space or degenerative arthritis(6). Currently, the risk factors for spondylolisthesis are considered to be older age, female gender, larger body mass index and sagittal facet orientation(7).

According to the current agreement, the treatment of lumbar spondylolisthesis essentially incorporates conservative treatment or surgical treatment. The nonsurgical treatment options may include physical therapy, exercise, epidural steroid injections for pain, and medications. If conservative therapy fails, a surgical intervention was usually recommended(8). Surgical options include either decompression alone or decompression with fixation and fusion, with the essential objectives of neural decompression and stability reconstructions as well as restoration of sagittal alignment(9). Recently, minimally invasive spine surgery has been widely adopted in surgical management of lumbar spondylolisthesis(10-12). Therefore, probing and summarizing the research topics or trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis may benefit potential doctors and researchers who were interested in this field.

Bibliometric analysis is a powerful tool to depict the research activities of a certain field in details(13). For example, bibliometrics analysis can quantify the contribution of a research field (including different countries, institutions, journals, or authors), and to identify the research trends or topics in a particular field(14). Nowadays, bibliometric analysis has been widely adopted in summarizing medical fields, like emerging techniques(15-17) and common disease(18-20). In spine field, bibliometric studies about cervical myelopathy(21), spinal stenosis(22), spinal cord injury(23), scoliosis(24) are thriving. However, no bibliometric study concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis was available. Meanwhile, latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) is a popular machine learning algorithm that has been accepted as a bibliometric tool to obtain research topics for a specific field(25-27). Thus, the purpose of this work is to explore the research topics and trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis via bibliometric analysis.

Methods:

Data Acquisition

Relevant literatures were collected from the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) database. The search terms are “spondylolisthesis”. The time interval was set to 1975 to 2021. Only articles were included, and no language restrictions were applied. To avoid bias incurred by frequent database renewal, all literature retrieval and data downloads were completed in a single day, Jan 18, 2022. Considering that data were directly downloaded from the data set, ethical approval was not required. WoSCC data of full record and references (including titles, countries of origin,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

institutions, journals, authors, etc.) were extracted in bib format and then imported into the Rstudio1.3.1. for bibliometric analysis.

Quantitative analysis

Annual publication production and the top 20 productive authors over time were presented. Additionally, top 20 productive journals and top 20 impact journals were compared by spine-subspecialty or not. Similarly, top 20 productive countries/regions and top 20 impact countries/regions were compared by developed countries/regions or not. The productivity of journals and countries/regions was measured by the total number of publications, whereas the impact of journals and countries/regions was assessed by H-index or average article citations (15). H-index was characterized as the extent that an entity has published at least h papers that have been each cited at least h times (28). All the data were analyzed by Rstudio1.3.1 and R package "Bibliometrix" was used to conduct quantitative analysis of different entity's contributions.

Research topics and trends

LDA can create a vocabulary of terms and then classify the included publications into different topics(18). We used the package "lda" in R language to conduct LDA analysis of included abstracts. The collaborative relationship among countries and the research trend in the past decade were presented by R package "Bibliometrix".

Results

General information

Up to 2021, a total number of 4990 articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis were finally included for analysis. Average citations per documents reached 24.43, and average citations per year per documents reached 1.829. A total of 623 sources were identified while most sources were academic journals, as only a few articles were book chapters. Annual published articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis kept rising over time (**Figure 1**), and the publications of the latest 10 years contributed to 56.9% (2841/4990) productivity of this field. Similarly, almost all the top 20 productive authors published most of their articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis in years between 2010 and 2020.

Quantitative analysis

The top 20 productive journals and the top 20 impact journals publishing articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis were listed in **Table 1**. Articles in the top 20 journals (2789) were equal to 55.89% of all 4990 article publications. "SPINE" was the most productive journal (750 articles) and the most influential journal (H-index: 102) in the field. Similarly, "EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL" was the second productive (361 articles) and the second influential journal (H-index: 49), while "JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE" was the third productive (255 articles) and the third influential journal (H-index: 47). Most articles (1952/2789) were published by spine-subspecialty journals among the top 20 productive journals, even though only 9 spine-subspecialty journals were in the top 20 productive lists. The top 3 influential journals all belonged to spine-subspecialty journals, although only one third of the top 20 influential journals

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were spine-subspecialty journals (7/20).

The top 20 productive and top 20 impact countries/regions publishing articles concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis were listed in **Table 2**. Articles in the top 20 countries/regions (4468) were equal to 89.54% of all 4990 article publications. USA was the most productive country (1570 articles) in this field, followed by China (536 articles) and Japan (531 articles). It was noted that Taiwan, as one of the most developed regions in China, accounted for nearly 20% of China's productive contributions. However, only three non-developed countries were in the top 20 productive list, while developed countries/regions published 86.01% (3843/4468) articles among the top 20 productive lists. As we ranked the top impact countries/regions by average article citations, USA only ranked top 7 and Japan ranked top 16, while China was even not in the top 20 influential list. Among this list, only one country belonged to non-developed economic entity.

Collaborations among countries/regions and institutions in lumbar spondylolisthesis field were presented in **Figure 2**. Countries or region connected with red lines indicated there were some collaborations among them and the thickness of the red line was proportional to the number of collaborations. It seemed that USA was the hub country of publications, because there are lots of red lines radiated from USA to European countries, China, Korea, Japan and even Australia. Although India, Brazil, China, Japan and some middle eastern countries were also productive, there were little collaborations among them. As for institution collaboration, University of California-San Francisco was the most active institution in this field. It seemed that most active institutions in collaborations were from USA, followed by South Korea, and Canada. Although China was one of the most productive country, only two intuitions from Taiwan Province were recognized as the most active institutions in collaborations.

Research topics and trends

After removing articles without abstracts, a total of 4581 articles were finally included for LDA analysis. We found three major topics in this field, and named them as "Topic 1: surgery", "Topic 2: radiology" and "Topic 3: epidemiology" (**Figure 3**). The publication proportion of these three topics were 37.2%, 34.3% and 28.5%, respectively. Additionally, we presented how the productivity of these three topics evolved over time. It seemed that one third of publications were concerned about the radiographic measurement of lumbar spondylolisthesis (Topic 2: radiology), and it kept as the most productive topic for two decades (1990 to 2010). After 2010, publications concerning all kinds of surgical management (Topic 1: surgery) became the dominant topic, and publications concerning prevalence, risk factors, quality of life and conservative treatment of lumbar spondylolisthesis (Topic 3: epidemiology) joined as another mainstream topic after 2015.

Using term frequency, we obtained the research trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis over the past one decade (**Figure 4**). Cortical bone trajectory (CBT), oblique lumbar interbody fusion (OLIF), oblique lateral lumbar interbody fusion (OLLIF), lateral lumbar interbody fusion (LLIF), degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, adjacent segment disease (ASD), spinal canal stenosis, minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion (MIS-TLIF) and percutaneous pedicle screw were the recent hotspots over the past 5 years.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

Text mining and bibliometric analysis have been adopted widely in depicting a certain academic field in details. The current study quantified different entities' academic contributions to lumbar spondylolisthesis, as well as provided an in-depth and visualized analysis of its topics and trends. To the best of our knowledge, this was the first bibliometric analysis of lumbar spondylolisthesis, which might help researchers gain a basic understanding, develop areas of focus and pursue further practice in this field.

Academic contributions of one field could be quantified by publication productivity and citation activity. The current study mainly quantified the contributions of different journals and countries in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis. It seemed that SPINE, EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL and JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE were the prior journals for researchers to follow or submit their own works, as these three journals were the top 3 productive and the top 3 impact journals in this field. Additionally, other spine-subspecialty journals like SPINE JOURNAL could be the second-line options, as spine-subspecialty journals were found to be dominant in productivity and impact of the field. For country/region contributions, USA, China and Japan have contributed to over half of the publication productivity. However, European countries seemed to publish more influential articles, as their average article citations were much higher. It seemed that developed countries/regions tended to produce more articles as well as high influential articles, as there were only a few non-developed countries/regions among the top 20 productive and the top 20 influential lists. Additionally, researchers may need to focus on USA, Europe and eastern Asia, if they need collaborations in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

Natural language processing (NLP) is a popular research field where human language could be decoded by machine learning, which has been adopted to analyze academic publications recently(29). LDA is one of the most widely used machine learning algorithms in NLP(18, 25, 26), as it is scalable, computationally fast and close to what the human mind assigns while decoding text words. In the study, publications of Topic 2 remained as the dominant topic from 1990 to 2010, when all kinds of radiographic equipment spread over the world gradually. We assumed that the widespread of radiographic equipment enabled researchers to pay more attention to lumbar instability and thus identify key parameters of sagittal balance. These publications (Topic 2) did improve the knowledge of lumbar spondylolisthesis like classification(30) or sagittal balance(31), which was of great significance of guiding the management of lumbar spondylolisthesis(32-34). Publications of Topic 1 kept as the most productive topic after 2010, which could be explained by the emerging minimally invasive surgical technique and the lack of agreement on the best surgical approaches(35), as well as the controversy of the addition of fusion to decompression(36). Publications of Topic 3 gradually became the mainstream topic after 2015, which indicated the importance of systematic management of lumbar spondylolisthesis. As most spondylolisthesis patients were asymptomatic and only a few patients seeking treatment will have surgery, doctors from different subspecialties might hold different viewpoints about best options of nonoperative treatments, as well as their dosage and progression of physical therapy procedures(6). Failed conservative treatment would lead to more than double medical costs than those in the successfully treated cohort(37).

While major topics with historical perspective quickly informed potential researchers about the macroscopic picture of one academic field and how it evolved, recent hotspots might guide the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

future researches. The current study identified CBT, OLIF, OLLIF, LLIF, MIS-TLIF, percutaneous pedicle screw, degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal canal stenosis and ASD were the research hotspots over the past 5 years. Interestingly, most of these hotspots (the first six) belong to minimally invasive surgical techniques, and all of them were derivatives of internal fixation or fusion technique instead of decompression. It was not a surprise as decompression technique has developed for decades, but internal fixation and fusion technique could be easily modified with different approaches and novel devices. Unlike the novel concept of the first six hotspots, spine physicians or surgeons might not be unfamiliar with degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal canal stenosis and ASD. Degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis became a hotspot instead of isthmic spondylolisthesis might be explained by growing aging population and higher prevalence of lumbar degeneration. Lumbar spondylolisthesis often accompanied by spinal canal stenosis and ASD is a common complication of spinal fusion, which indicated continuous attentions have been paid to these traditional problems.

Since most hotspots belonged to publications of Topic 1 (surgery), it was necessary to depict these surgical hotspots in details. CBT, as a caudal-to-rostral and medial-to-lateral pedicle screw insertion method, has merits of great fixation and pull-out strength even in osteoporosis patients due to its trajectory goes through cortical bone(38). Thus, CBT became popular in all kinds of spinal fusion including lumbar spondylolisthesis(39-41). Percutaneous pedicle screw is another widespread fixation technique with traditional trajectory, but its merits of minimally invasiveness popularized its utility in OLIF, OLLIF, LLIF and MIS-TLIF etc. OLIF takes an anterior retroperitoneal approach surgery through a small incision(42). Within the retroperitoneal space, surgeons will drag the psoas muscle backward, expose the intervertebral space between the psoas muscle and the abdominal aorta, and then perform decompression plus fusion, which is usually followed by posterior fixation of percutaneous pedicle screw. OLLIF is another minimally invasive fusion surgery described by AbbasiH in details in 2015(43). OLLIF uses the classic YESS endoscopy trajectory technology to establish a working channel, and then enters the intervertebral disc through Kambin's triangle to complete discectomy and intervertebral fusion under full-endoscopy(44). LLIF or extreme lateral interbody fusion (XLIF) is another minimally invasive surgery by bluntly separate the psoas muscle to the lateral side of the intervertebral space(45, 46). It should be noted that muscle separation may damage the lumbar plexus, so intraoperative neuromonitoring is required for LLIF/XLIF. MIS-TLIF takes a small paramedial incision, and the ipsilateral articular process will be excised to expose the intervertebral foraminal window, through which decompression and fusion are performed(47). It is reported that MIS-TLIF has become one of the most widespread fusion surgeries(48).

The current study may have some limitations. First, we only analyzed articles from the WoSCC database, so publications not indexed in the WoSCC database were not considered and citation counts might be underestimated. Second, the study mainly analyzed some useful information (e.g. abstracts, titles, etc.) of the included publications instead of reviewing full texts. Last but may not least, as the WoSCC database kept updating and records of 2022 were not complete, we only analyzed the data by 2021, which might not reflect the most recent trends of 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusions

The study successfully summarized the productivity and impact of different countries/regions and journals, which should benefit the journal selection and pursuit of international collaboration for researcher who were interested in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis. Publications concerning emerging surgical technique was the major topic, followed by radiographic measurement and epidemiology for this field. CBT, OLIF, OLLIF, LLIF, MIS-TLIF, percutaneous pedicle screw, degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal canal stenosis and ASD were the research hotspots of lumbar spondylolisthesis over the past 5 years. With macroscopic plus detailed analysis of publications concerning lumbar spondylolisthesis, the current study may encourage more researchers in the field and somewhat inform their research direction in the future.

References:

1. Bydon M, Alvi MA, Goyal A. Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: Definition, Natural History, Conservative Management, and Surgical Treatment. Neurosurg Clin N Am. 2019;30(3):299-304.

2. Fan G, Zhang H, Guan X, Gu G, Wu X, Hu A, et al. Patient-reported and radiographic outcomes of minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative spondylolisthesis with or without reduction: A comparative study. J Clin Neurosci. 2016;33:111-8.

3. Standaert CJ, Herring SA. Spondylolysis: a critical review. Br J Sports Med. 2000;34(6):415-22.

4. Zhang S, Ye C, Lai Q, Yu X, Liu X, Nie T, et al. Double-level lumbar spondylolysis and spondylolisthesis: A retrospective study. J Orthop Surg Res. 2018;13(1):55.

5. Kalichman L, Kim DH, Li L, Guermazi A, Berkin V, Hunter DJ. Spondylolysis and spondylolisthesis: prevalence and association with low back pain in the adult community-based population. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2009;34(2):199-205.

6. Vanti C, Ferrari S, Guccione AA, Pillastrini P. Lumbar spondylolisthesis: STATE of the art on assessment and conservative treatment. Archives of physiotherapy. 2021;11(1):19.

7. Ferrero E, Guigui P. Current trends in the management of degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis. EFORT Open Rev. 2018;3(5):192-9.

8. Faldini C, Pagkrati S, Acri F, Miscione MT, Francesconi D, Giannini S. Surgical treatment of symptomatic degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis by decompression and instrumented fusion: J Orthop Traumatol. 2007 Sep;8(3):128-33. doi: 10.1007/s10195-007-0079-7. Epub 2007 Sep 17.

9. Fan G, Gu G, Zhu Y, Guan X, Hu A, Wu X, et al. Minimally Invasive Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion for Isthmic Spondylolisthesis: In Situ Versus Reduction. World Neurosurg. 2016;90:580-7.e1.

10. Kwon JW, Park Y, Lee BH, Yoon SR, Ha JW, Kim H, et al. Ten-Year Outcomes of Minimally Invasive Versus Open Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion in Patients With Single-Level Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2022.

11. Chang M, Wang L, Yuan S, Tian Y, Zhao Y, Liu X. Percutaneous Endoscopic Robot-Assisted Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion (PE RA-TLIF) for Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Technical Note and Two Years Clinical Results. Pain physician. 2022;25(1):E73-e86.

12. Haddas R, Lieberman I, Block A, Derman P. The Effect of Surgical Decompression and Fusion on Functional Balance in Patients With Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. Spine (Phila Pa 1976).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2020;45(14):E878-e84.

13. Da W, Tao Z, Meng Y, Wen K, Zhou S, Yang K, et al. A 10-year bibliometric analysis of osteosarcoma and cure from 2010 to 2019. BMC Cancer. 2021;21(1):115.

14. Tao L, Zhou S, Tao Z, Wen K, Da W, Meng Y, et al. The publication trends and hot spots of scoliosis research from 2009 to 2018: a 10-year bibliometric analysis. Ann Transl Med. 2020;8(6):365.

15. Ding H, Wu C, Liao N, Zhan Q, Sun W, Huang Y, et al. Radiomics in Oncology: A 10-Year Bibliometric Analysis. Frontiers in oncology. 2021;11:689802.

16. Wang Q, Yang KL, Zhang Z, Wang Z, Li C, Li L, et al. Characterization of Global Research Trends and Prospects on Single-Cell Sequencing Technology: Bibliometric Analysis. Journal of medical Internet research. 2021;23(8):e25789.

17. Shi J, Gao Y, Ming L, Yang K, Sun Y, Chen J, et al. A bibliometric analysis of global research output on network meta-analysis. BMC medical informatics and decision making. 2021;21(1):144.

18. Zhang Z, Wang Z, Huang Y. A Bibliometric Analysis of 8,276 Publications During the Past 25 Years on Cholangiocarcinoma by Machine Learning. Frontiers in oncology. 2021;11:687904.

19. Lin H, Wang X, Huang M, Li Z, Shen Z, Feng J, et al. Research hotspots and trends of bone defects based on Web of Science: a bibliometric analysis. Journal of orthopaedic surgery and research. 2020;15(1):463.

20. Guo Y, Xu ZY, Cai MT, Gong WX, Shen CH. Epilepsy With Suicide: A Bibliometrics Study and Visualization Analysis via CiteSpace. Frontiers in neurology. 2021;12:823474.

21. Yin M, Xu C, Ma J, Ye J, Mo W. A Bibliometric Analysis and Visualization of Current Research Trends in the Treatment of Cervical Spondylotic Myelopathy. Global spine journal. 2021;11(6):988-98.

22. Yin M, Wang H, Sun Y, Xu C, Ye J, Ma J, et al. Global Trends of Researches on Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: A Bibliometric and Visualization Study. Clinical spine surgery. 2022;35(1):E259-e66.

23. Li Y, Wei B, Zhong Y, Feng H, Wu H. A bibliometric analysis of global research on spinal cord injury: 1999-2019. Spinal cord. 2021.

24. Zhao T, Li Y, Dai Z, Zhang J, Zhang L, Shao H, et al. Bibliometric Analysis of the Scientific Literature on Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis. World neurosurgery. 2021;151:e265-e77.

25. Wang K, Feng C, Li M, Pei Q, Tan F. A bibliometric analysis of 23,492 publications on rectal cancer by machine learning: basic medical research is needed. Therapeutic Advances in Gastroenterology. 2020;13:175628482093459.

26. Stout NL, Alfano CM, Belter CW, Nitkin R, Cernic H A, Siegel KL, et al. A Bibliometric Analysis of the Landscape of Cancer Rehabilitation Research (1992–2016). JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute. 2018.

27. Zhang Z, Yao L, Wang W, Jiang B, Xia F, Li X. A Bibliometric Analysis of 34,692 Publications on Thyroid Cancer by Machine Learning: How Much Has Been Done in the Past Three Decades? Frontiers in oncology. 2021;11:673733.

28. Garfield E. The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. Jama. 2006;295(1):90-3.

29. Chen X, Xie H, Fu LW, Liu Z, Xu J, Hao T. A bibliometric analysis of natural language processing in medical research. Bmc Medical Informatics & Decision Making. 2018;18(1):14.

30. Martikos K, Greggi T, Faldini C. High grade isthmic spondylolisthesis; can reduction always re-align the unbalanced pelvis? BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2019;20(1):499.

31. Zhang GZ, Deng YJ, He XG, Ren EH, Wu ZL, Yang FG, et al. Different Types of Double-Level Degenerative Lumber Spondylolisthesis: What Is Different in the Sagittal Plane? World neurosurgery. 2021;150:e127-e34.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

32. Wang S, Zhou Q, Xu L, Wang M, Qiu Y, Zhu Z, et al. Impact of lumbar fusion on sitting spinopelvic balance: Multisegmental versus monosegmental. Clinical neurology and neurosurgery. 2021;209:106905.

33. Shao X, Liu H, Wu J, Qian Z, Qu R, Liu T. A retrospective comparative study of postoperative sagittal balance in isthmic L5-S1 spondylolisthesis using single segment or two-segment pedicle screw fixation. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2022;23(1):145.

34. Pan W, Zhao JL, Xu J, Zhang M, Fang T, Yan J, et al. Lumbar alignment and patient-reported outcomes after single-level transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis with and without local coronal imbalance. Journal of neurosurgery Spine. 2020:1-7.

35. Akkawi I, Zmerly H. Degenerative Spondylolisthesis: A Narrative Review. Acta bio-medica : Atenei Parmensis. 2022;92(6):e2021313.

36. Austevoll IM, Hermansen E, Fagerland MW, Storheim K, Brox JI, Solberg T, et al. Decompression with or without Fusion in Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis. The New England journal of medicine. 2021;385(6):526-38.

37. Davison MA, Lilly DT, Moreno J, Bagley C, Adogwa O. A comparison of successful versus failed nonoperative treatment approaches in patients with degenerative conditions of the lumbar spine. Journal of clinical neuroscience : official journal of the Neurosurgical Society of Australasia. 2021;86:71-8.

38. Tschugg A, Kavakebi P, Hartmann S, Lener S, Wipplinger C, Löscher WN, et al. Clinical and radiological effect of medialized cortical bone trajectory for lumbar pedicle screw fixation in patients with degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial (mPACT). Trials. 2018;19(1):129.

39. Chang MC, Choo YJ, Lee GW. Pedicle screws versus cortical screws in posterior lumbar interbody fusion surgery for degenerative spondylolisthesis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Spine Journal. 2021;21(7):1126-34.

40. Sakaura H, Miwa T, Yamashita T, Kuroda Y, Ohwada T. Posterior lumbar interbody fusion with cortical bone trajectory screw fixation versus posterior lumbar interbody fusion using traditional pedicle screw fixation for degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis: a comparative study. Journal of neurosurgery Spine. 2016;25(5):591-5.

41. Ding H, Hai Y, Liu Y, Guan L, Pan A, Zhang X, et al. Cortical Trajectory Fixation Versus Traditional Pedicle-Screw Fixation in the Treatment of Lumbar Degenerative Patients with Osteoporosis: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial. Clinical interventions in aging. 2022;17:175-84.

42. Du X, She Y, Ou Y, Zhu Y, Luo W, Jiang D. Oblique Lateral Interbody Fusion versus Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion in Degenerative Lumbar Spondylolisthesis: A Single-Center Retrospective Comparative Study. BioMed research international. 2021;2021:6693446.

43. Abbasi H, Abbasi A. Oblique Lateral Lumbar Interbody Fusion (OLLIF): Technical Notes and Early Results of a Single Surgeon Comparative Study. Cureus. 2015;7(10):e351.

44. Li ZZ, Wang JC, Cao Z, Zhao HL, Lewandrowski KU, Yeung A. Full-Endoscopic Oblique Lateral Lumbar Interbody Fusion: A Technical Note With 1-Year Follow-Up. International journal of spine surgery. 2021;15(3):504-13.

45. Li J, Sun Y, Guo L, Zhang F, Ding W, Zhang W. Efficacy and safety of a modified lateral lumbar interbody fusion in L4-5 lumbar degenerative diseases compared with traditional XLIF and OLIF: a retrospective cohort study of 156 cases. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2022;23(1):217.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

46. Limthongkul W, Chantharakomen R, Tanasansomboon T, Yingsakmongkol W, Yoong-Leong Oh J, Kotheeranurak V, et al. Comparison of Unremoved Intervertebral Disc Location Between 2 Lateral Lumbar Interbody Fusion (LLIF) Techniques. World neurosurgery. 2022.

47. Liu JB, Wu JL, Zuo R, Li CQ, Zhang C, Zhou Y. Does MIS-TLIF or TLIF result in better pedicle screw placement accuracy and clinical outcomes with navigation guidance? BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2022;23(1):153.

48. Phani Kiran S, Sudhir G. Minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion - A narrative review on the present status. Journal of clinical orthopaedics and trauma. 2021;22:101592.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analysed during this study are either included in this published article or its supplementary information fles.

Competing interests

Authors declare that there is no confict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Funding

Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (2019A1515111171) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (82102640) were received in support of this work. The funders had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, writing of this report and in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Authors' contributions

G.F. contributed to writing and data interpreting; J.Q. contributed to data analysis; Y.L. and S.Y. contributed to drafting and data extraction; H.L. and L.H. contributed to data analysis and critical revisions; X.L. and S.H. contributed to study design and administration support.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Authors' information

[1] Department of Pain Medicine, Huazhong University of Science and Technology Union Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, 518060, China.

[2] Guangdong Key Laboratory for Biomedical Measurements and Ultrasound Imaging, School of Biomedical Engineering, Shenzhen University Health Science Center, Shenzhen 518060, China.

[3] Artificial Intelligence Innovation Center, Research Institute of Tsinghua, Pearl River Delta, Guangzhou, 510735, China.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[4] Department of Orthopedics, The Eighth Affiliated Hospital Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen, 518033, China.

[5] Department of Orthopedics, Shanghai Tenth People's Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China

[6] Spinal Pain Research Institute, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, 200072, China.

[7] Department of Orthopedics, Nanchang Hongdu Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 1399 Diezihu Road, Donghu District, Nanchang, 330006, China

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Figure captions

Figure1. Annual publication production and the top 20 authors over time.

Figure2. Collaborations in lumbar spondylolisthesis field. A: collaborations among countries/regions; B: collaborations among institutions.

Figure 3. Research topics of lumbar spondylolisthesis over the past 3 decades. A: topic 1- surgery; B: topic 2- radiology; C:Topic 3: epidemiology; D: publication productivity of the three topics over the past three decades.

Figure 4. Research trends of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Top 20 productive and top 20 impact journals in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

Ranking	Journals ranked by articles	Articles	Spine-subspecialty	Journals ranked by h_index	h_index	Spine-subspectialty	Total Citations
1	SPINE	750	yes	SPINE	102	yes	42029
2	EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL	361	yes	EUROPEAN SPINE JOURNAL	49	yes	10390
3	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY -SPINE	255	yes	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY-SPINE	47	yes	6836
4	SPINE JOURNAL	205	yes	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-AMERICAN VOLUME	41	no	7068
5	WORLD NEUROSURGERY	178	no	SPINE JOURNAL	39	yes	4903
6	JOURNAL OF SPINAL DISORDERS \& TECHNIQUES	149	yes	JOURNAL OF SPINAL DISORDERS \& TECHNIQUES	37	yes	4741
7	CLINICAL ORTHOPAEDICS AND RELATED RESEARCH	103	no	CLINICAL ORTHOPAEDICS AND RELATED RESEARCH	30	no	2732
8	CLINICAL SPINE SURGERY	79	yes	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY	27	no	2849
9	BMC MUSCULOSKELETAL DISORDERS	77	no	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-BRITISH VOLUME	27	no	2487
10	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-AMERICAN VOLUME	75	no	NEUROSURGERY	27	no	2332
11	NEUROSURGERY	74	no	NEUROSURGICAL FOCUS	26	no	1715
12	NEUROSURGICAL FOCUS	73	no	JOURNAL OF SPINAL DISORDERS	25	yes	2294
13	JOURNAL OF	57	yes	WORLD	19	no	1453

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	SPINAL DISORDERS			NEUROSURGERY			
14	JOURNAL OF CLINICAL NEUROSCIENCE	55	no	JOURNAL OF PEDIATRIC ORTHOPAEDICS	19	no	1019
15	JOURNAL OF BONE AND JOINT SURGERY-BRITISH VOLUME	53	no	INTERNATIONAL ORTHOPAEDICS	14	no	834
16	ZEITSCHRIFT FUR ORTHOPADIE UND IHRE GRENZGEBIETE	53	no	AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SPORTS MEDICINE	14	no	806
17	GLOBAL SPINE JOURNAL	49	yes	BMC MUSCULOSKELETAL DISORDERS	14	no	672
18	JOURNAL OF KOREAN NEUROSURGICAL SOCIETY	49	no	ARCHIVES OF ORTHOPAEDIC AND TRAUMA SURGERY	14	no	547
19	ASIAN SPINE JOURNAL	47	yes	CLINICAL SPINE SURGERY	14	yes	540
20	JOURNAL OF NEUROSURGERY	47	no	JOURNAL OF CLINICAL NEUROSCIENCE	13	no	603

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.25.22275576; this version posted May 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Top 20 productive and impact countries/regions in the field of lumbar spondylolisthesis.

Ranking	Country/region ranked by Article productions	Article productions	Developed	Country/region ranked by average article citations	Total Citations	Average Article Citations	Developed
1	USA	1570	yes	SWEDEN	3591	47.25	yes
2	CHINA	536	no	UNITED KINGDOM	7742	45.54	yes
3	JAPAN	531	yes	LUXEMBOURG	42	42.00	yes
4	KOREA	297	yes	AUSTRALIA	2297	40.30	yes
5	GERMANY	239	yes	DENMARK	1849	39.34	yes
6	FRANCE	190	yes	PHILIPPINES	35	35.00	no
7	UNITED KINGDOM	170	yes	USA	52829	33.65	yes
8	CANADA	140	yes	HONG KONG	30	30.00	yes
9	ITALY	116	yes	FINLAND	1820	26.76	yes
10	TURKEY	109	no	CANADA	3713	26.52	yes
11	TAIWAN	105	yes	NEW ZEALAND	340	26.15	yes
12	SWITZERLAND	96	yes	NETHERLANDS	1360	23.45	yes
13	INDIA	85	no	HUNGARY	187	23.38	yes
14	SWEDEN	76	yes	ISRAEL	946	22.52	yes
15	FINLAND	68	yes	SWITZERLAND	2099	21.86	yes
16	NETHERLANDS	58	yes	JAPAN	11336	21.35	yes
17	AUSTRALIA	57	yes	BELGIUM	401	21.11	yes
18	DENMARK	47	yes	SPAIN	856	20.88	yes
19	ISRAEL	42	yes	FRANCE	3936	20.72	yes
20	SPAIN	41	yes	ITALY	2310	19.91	yes


Annual Scientific Production
Articles
300
200
100
0
1975 1977 1979 1981 1983 1985 1987 1989 1991 1993 1995 1997 1999 2001 2003 2005 2007 2009 2011 2013 2015 2017 2019 2021
Year
A


Top-Authors' Production over the Time
Author
LEE SH
GLASSMAN SD
SAIRYO K
BYDON M
PARK P
VACCARO AR
LABELLE H
LURIE JD
OHTORI S
WANG JC
SAKAI T
LIU H
MUMMANENI PV
CARREON LY
LEE JH
TAKAHASHI K
WEINSTEIN JN
KIM JS
MCGIRT MJ
ORITA S
1988 1990 1992 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 2012 2014 2016 2018 2020
Year
N.Articles
5
10
TC per Year
0
20
40
60
B


A
yonsei univ
seoul natl univ
hallym univ
seoul natl univ hosp
catholic univ korea
spine ctr
wooridul spine hosp
emory univ
barrow neurol inst
univ calif los angeles
washington univ
yale univ
chang gung univ
case western reserve univ
hosp special surg
dartmouth med sch
natl yang ming univ
harvard med sch
univ washington
univ minnesota
rush univ
harvard univ
univ virginia
thomas jefferson univ
johns hopkins univ
univ utah
univ toronto
univ michigan
univ louisville
duke univ
univ calif san francisco
vanderbilt univ
univ pittsburgh
univ montreal
univ british columb
norton leatherman spine ctr
m (corresponding author)
mayo clin
univ miami
B


Topic 1
plf
posterolateral
bone
plif
asd
complications
average
interbody
cage
instrumentation
postoperative
fixation
approach
decompression
stabilization
pedicle
reduction
odi
screws
A
Topic 2
pars
spondylolysis
instability
mri
vertebral
imaging
facet
motion
joint
slip
degrees
angle
lordosis
sagittal
type
pelvic
radiographs
parameters
sacral
lumbosacral
B
Topic 3
care
costs
life
quality
health
disorders
physical
general
prevalence
therapy
regression
nonoperative
risk
diagnosis
factors
management
chronic
reoperation
primary
ratio
C
factor(Topic)
1
2
3
150
100
50
0
Quantity
1990
2000
2010
2020
Year
D


Trend Topics
Term
cortical bone trajectory
oblique lumbar interbody
lateral lumbar interbody
oblique lateral interbody
degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis
lateral interbody fusion
adjacent segment disease
spinal canal stenosis
minimally invasive transforaminal
invasive transforaminal lumbar
lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis
lumbar spine surgery
percutaneous pedicle screw
lumbar interbody fusion
transforaminal lumbar interbody
degenerative lumbar spine
spinal fusion surgery
interbody fusion versus
lumbar spinal stenosis
posterior lumbar interbody
adjacent segment degeneration
pedicle screw fixation
minimum _year follow_up
lumbar spine fusion
degenerative disc disease
pedicle screw placement
magnetic resonance imaging
recombinant human bone
bone morphogenetic protein_
anterior lumbar interbody
lumbar spinal fusion
degenerative lumbar spinal
patient outcomes research
outcomes research trial
posterolateral lumbar fusion
2002
2004
2006
2008
2010
2012
2014
2016
2018
2020
Year
Term frequency
200
400
600