

1 **Comparing Continuous versus Intermittent-Threshold Drainage Strategies for Spinal**  
2 **Perfusion Pressure Optimization in Patients with Acute Traumatic Spinal Cord Injuries**

3  
4 Raj Swaroop Lavadi,<sup>1</sup> Regan Shanahan,<sup>1</sup> David Kojo Hamilton,<sup>1</sup> Thomas James Buell,<sup>1</sup> Nitin  
5 Agarwal,<sup>1,2</sup> Ava Puccio,<sup>1</sup> David Okwudi Okonkwo,<sup>1</sup> Daryl Pinion Fields II<sup>1</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh,  
8 PA, USA

9  
10 <sup>2</sup>Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA,  
11 USA

12  
13 **Funding Statement**

14 This research received funding from the Chuck Noll Foundation for Brain Injury Research.

15  
16 **Competing Interests Statement**

17 Dr. Agarwal has received royalties from Thieme Medical Publishers and Springer International  
18 Publishing.

19  
20 **Data Sharing**

21 All data pertaining to this research article are included within the manuscript as written.

22  
23 **Corresponding Author**

24 Daryl Pinion Fields II, M.D., Ph.D.  
25 Resident Physician, Neurological Surgery  
26 University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine  
27 Department of Neurological Surgery  
28 200 Lothrop Street, Suite B-400  
29 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213  
30 P: 412-647-6777  
31 E: [fieldsdp@upmc.edu](mailto:fieldsdp@upmc.edu)

32  
33 Key Words: Lumbar drain, CSF drainage, Spinal cord perfusion pressure, Spinal cord injury,  
34 Vasopressor, Mean arterial pressure

35 Abstract Word Count: 242

36 Text Word Count: 1255

37 Tables/Figures: 4

38 References: 12

39  
40 **Author Contributions**

41 RSL: data curation, writing – review & editing, visualization; RS: writing – review and editing;  
42 DKH: writing – review and editing; TJB: writing – review and editing; NA: writing – review and  
43 editing; AP: writing – review and editing; DOO: writing – review and editing; DPF:  
44 conceptualization, methodology, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and  
45 editing, supervision, funding acquisition.

46

47 **RUNNING TITLE:** CSF Drainage Strategies in Patients with Spinal Cord Injuries  
48

49 **ABSTRACT:**

50 **Study Design:** A cross-sectional study.

51 **Objective:** The primary objective of this study is to compare the efficacy of continuous versus  
52 threshold drainage strategies for maintaining spinal cord perfusion pressure (SCPP) in patients  
53 with new traumatic spinal cord injuries (SCI).

54 **Setting:** Level 1 trauma center.

55 **Methods:** A retrospective study of 19 patients with traumatic SCIs. SCPP was optimized at the  
56 discretion of the managing clinician using either vasopressors to increase mean arterial pressure  
57 or cerebral spinal fluid (CSF) drainage to decrease intrathecal pressure. Six patients were  
58 managed with continuous drainage (CSF drained at regular intervals regardless of SCPP) and 13  
59 had CSF drained only when SCPP fell below 65mmHg (i.e. threshold drainage). Intrathecal  
60 pressure, SCPP, mean arterial pressure, and vasopressor utilization were compared using  
61 univariate T-test statistical analysis.

62 **Results:** The cohort included over 1500 time points from 19 patients. While there was no  
63 difference in rates of sub-optimal SCPP ( $< 65\text{mmHg}$ ;  $p = 0.257$ ), patients managed with  
64 threshold drainage were more likely to exhibit critically-low SCPP ( $< 50\text{ mmHg}$ ;  $p = 0.003$ )  
65 despite also having lower average intrathecal pressures ( $p < 0.001$ ). There were no differences in  
66 average SCPP, MAP, or vasopressor utilization between the two groups ( $p > 0.05$ ).

67 **Conclusions:** Acute SCI patients managed with continuous CSF drainage were less likely to  
68 exhibit critically-low SCPPs, previously shown to be associated with worse clinical recovery. A  
69 larger, prospective cohort is needed to validate the impact of CSF drainage strategies on long-  
70 term SCI outcomes.

71

## 72 INTRODUCTION

73 There are over 17,000 new spinal cord injuries in the United States each year [1]. Management  
74 of traumatic spinal cord injury includes surgery to decompress neural elements and stabilized the  
75 spine, followed by medical management to minimize secondary insults; including spinal cord  
76 hypo-perfusion related cord ischemia [2].

77  
78 The hemodynamic management of spinal cord injury is evolving to include a focus on spinal  
79 cord perfusion pressure (SCPP) defined as the difference between mean arterial pressure and  
80 intrathecal pressure (ITP) [3]. Previous work has linked SCPP < 50mmHg with worse outcomes,  
81 [4] while SCPP > 65mmHg in the early post injury phase has been associated with improved  
82 neurologic recovery. Patients with SCPP < 65mmHg may either receive vasopressors to drive up  
83 their mean arterial pressure (MAP) or have cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) removed through a lumbar  
84 intrathecal drain. There is no consensus as to which method is more effective but a recent study  
85 highlights the difficulty in maintaining high MAPs in SCI patients with autonomic volatility [5].

86  
87 CSF drainage can be achieved via two distinct strategies; 1) threshold drainage involves CSF  
88 removal only when SCPP drops < 65mmHg, and 2) continuous drainage involves removing 5 –  
89 10mL of CSF at regular one-hour intervals regardless of SCPP. We compared the impact of  
90 threshold versus continuous CSF drainage on spinal cord perfusion pressure in a single-center  
91 cohort of acute spinal cord injury patients.

92

## 93 METHODS

### 94 Experimental Protocol

95 All procedures, including lumbar drain placement, CSF drainage, and collection of relevant  
96 clinical data from electronic medical records were approved by the University of Pittsburgh  
97 Institutional Review Board (STUDY19070184), with necessary consent provided by the patients.  
98 Patients presenting to a single level 1 trauma center between 2018–2022 with cervical or thoracic  
99 traumatic spinal cord injury severity grade A–C as evaluated by the ASIA impairment scale  
100 (AIS) were eligible for inclusion [6]. All patients underwent spinal stabilization surgery with a  
101 lumbar drain placed either intraoperatively or postoperatively in the intensive care unit. All  
102 patients were managed at the discretion of the lead clinician for a targeted SCPP > 65mmHg. ITP  
103 was monitored using a lumbar intrathecal catheter and MAP was measured using an arterial line.  
104 Systemic oxygenation was monitored using surface pulse oximetry. SCPP was calculated as  
105 MAP minus intrathecal pressure [7]. Patients managed with continuous drainage had 5-10mL of  
106 CSF removed from the intrathecal catheter every hour, regardless of SCPP. Alternatively,  
107 patients managed with threshold drainage had CSF withdrawn only when SCPP dropped <  
108 65mmHg. In patients with low MAP (< 60mmHg), a vasopressor (most commonly  
109 norepinephrine) was utilized to increase MAP and, thereby, SCPP. Choice of vasopressor and the  
110 decision to use vasopressor versus CSF drainage was left to the discretion of the managing  
111 clinician. All vasopressors were converted to equivalent norepinephrine dosages as follows; 1:10  
112 norepinephrine:phenylephrine [8].

113

## 114 **Demographics**

115 The two groups demonstrated similar gender and age distributions ( $p > 0.05$ ). Information on  
116 spinal cord injury location, clinical course of neurological function, and patient demographics  
117 can be found in **Table 1**.

118

## 119 **Statistics**

120 Normality was assessed with Shapiro-Wilks test. ITP, SCPP, MAP, and vasopressor utilization  
121 were compared using univariate T-test statistical analysis; SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC). Differences were  
122 considered significant if p value < 0.05.

123

## 124 **RESULTS**

### 125 *SCPP*

126 Threshold drainage and continuous drainage groups demonstrated similar average SCPP (p =  
127 0.935), average MAP (p = 0.112), and average systemic oxygenation (p = 0.94). Threshold  
128 drainage patients exhibited significantly lower average ITP (p < 0.001; **Table 2**). There was no  
129 difference in percentage of time spent below optimal SCPP (< 65mmHg; p = 0.257). Threshold  
130 drainage patients were more likely to exhibit critically low SCPPs (< 50mmHg; p = 0.003;  
131 **Figure 1**) when compared to continuous drainage patients. There was no difference in  
132 vasopressor use between the two groups (p = 0.76; **Figure 2**).

133

### 134 *Patient Outcomes*

135 Of the 19 patients included in this study, 15 had documented neurological exams at least one-  
136 month after the index injury (six continuous patients and nine threshold patients; **Table 1**). Of  
137 the six continuous patients, four demonstrated at least a single grade improvement in their AIS  
138 exam, one demonstrated a subacute decline (< 72 hours after injury), and one remained an AIS A  
139 at least three-month after injury. Of the 9 patients managed with threshold drainage, three  
140 demonstrated at least a single grade improvement in their AIS exam, one worsened from AIS B

141 to AIS A, while the other five patients remained stable with persistent AIS A exams. No patient  
142 incurred a complication related to lumbar drain placement, use, or removal.

143

## 144 **DISCUSSION**

145 Within this cohort of 19 spinal cord injury patients, patients managed with continuous drainage  
146 were less likely to exhibit critically low SCPP (< 50mmHg). This data highlights the need for  
147 further work to refine strategies for secondary insult prevention in spinal cord injury patients.

148

149 SCPP represents the pressure difference from mean arterial pressure and intrathecal pressure [7]  
150 and is used as a surrogate marker of spinal tissue oxygen delivery. In patients with traumatic  
151 spinal cord injuries, critically low SCPPs are associated with worse six-month clinical outcomes.  
152 While a causative link has not been confirmed, we theorize that acute hypoperfusion increases  
153 the rate of spinal cord infarct that undermines recovery potential. [9] While patients managed  
154 with threshold and continuous drainage strategies demonstrate similar average SCPP, and a  
155 similar propensity for sub-optimal (< 65mmHg) perfusion pressures, only threshold drainage  
156 patients demonstrated critically low SCPPs. The significance of transient (< 1h) spinal  
157 hypoperfusion (suboptimal or critical hypoperfusion) is not well-studied and represents a gap in  
158 our understanding of secondary insult prevention. Future animal models and human studies must  
159 explore spinal tissue tolerance to critical hypoperfusion, and responsiveness to corrective  
160 measures.

161

162 Prognostic tools that utilize magnetic resonance imaging suggest injury site edema results in  
163 worse clinical outcomes [10], likely secondary to local perfusion deficits that result in tissue

164 ischemic injury [11]. The present study does not address cord edema or local tissue perfusion  
165 deficits but we can speculate that maintaining appropriate SCPP may indirectly limit local  
166 edema-associated ischemic injury. An analogous example would be measures to prevent  
167 systemic hypotension in acute stroke patients; global measures to increase perfusion indirectly  
168 enhance local perfusion. Interestingly, continuous drainage did not result in a lower intrathecal  
169 pressure. This paradoxical observation is beyond the scope of this particular study but warrants  
170 further investigation into the link between CSF drainage and intrathecal pressure in spinal cord  
171 injury patients.

172

### 173 **Limitations**

174 The small sample size limits our capacity to assess the impact of CSF drainage strategy on  
175 neurological outcomes. The small sample size also limits analysis of cervical versus thoracic  
176 spinal cord injury as well as injury pattern (fracture/dislocation, central cord syndrome, etc.).

177

178 While this study assumes SCPP is representative of spinal cord oxygen delivery, we did not  
179 directly test spinal or CSF oxygenation. Placement of an intraspinal oxygen monitor or non-  
180 invasive tissue oxygen detector may provide better insight into tissue oxygenation but these tools  
181 are not commonly available for clinical use. A similar debate exists in traumatic brain injury.  
182 The ongoing Brain Oxygen Optimization in Severe Traumatic Brain Injury Phase-3 (BOOST-3)  
183 trial utilizes intracranial-intraparenchymal monitors to guide oxygenation strategies for severe  
184 traumatic brain injury patients [12]. The results of the BOOST-3 study will inform us if tissue  
185 oxygenation probes are superior to pressure monitors in evaluating oxygen delivery changes, an  
186 important consideration for ongoing spinal cord injury trials.



187

188 **CONCLUSION**

189 Continuous CSF drainage in traumatic spinal cord injury patients was associated with fewer  
190 incidences of critically-low spinal cord perfusion pressure (SCPP < 50mmHg) when compared to  
191 threshold CSF drainage. These observations suggest the need for a larger prospective study that  
192 explores the long-term clinical impact of alternative CSF drainage strategies in traumatic spinal  
193 cord injury.

194

## 195 REFERENCES

- 196 1. Bennett J, J MD, Emmady PD. Spinal Cord Injuries. *StatPearls*. 2023.
- 197 2. Alizadeh A, Dyck SM, Karimi-Abdolrezaee S. Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury: An Overview  
198 of Pathophysiology, Models and Acute Injury Mechanisms. *Front Neurol*. 2019;10:282.  
199 doi:10.3389/fneur.2019.00282
- 200 3. [clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03911492](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03911492)
- 201 4. Squair JW, Belanger LM, Tsang A, et al. Spinal cord perfusion pressure predicts  
202 neurologic recovery in acute spinal cord injury. *Neurology*. Oct 17 2017;89(16):1660-1667.  
203 doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000004519
- 204 5. Gee CM, Kwon BK. Significance of spinal cord perfusion pressure following spinal cord  
205 injury: A systematic scoping review. *J Clin Orthop Trauma*. Nov 2022;34:102024.  
206 doi:10.1016/j.jcot.2022.102024
- 207 6. Roberts TT, Leonard GR, Cepela DJ. Classifications In Brief: American Spinal Injury  
208 Association (ASIA) Impairment Scale. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. May 2017;475(5):1499-1504.  
209 doi:10.1007/s11999-016-5133-4
- 210 7. Chen S, Smielewski P, Czosnyka M, Papadopoulos MC, Saadoun S. Continuous  
211 Monitoring and Visualization of Optimum Spinal Cord Perfusion Pressure in Patients with Acute  
212 Cord Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. Nov 1 2017;34(21):2941-2949. doi:10.1089/neu.2017.4982
- 213 8. Abril MK, Khanna AK, Kroll S, McNamara C, Handisides D, Busse LW. Regional differences  
214 in the treatment of refractory vasodilatory shock using Angiotensin II in High Output Shock  
215 (ATHOS-3) data. *J Crit Care*. Apr 2019;50:188-194. doi:10.1016/j.jcrc.2018.12.007
- 216 9. Evaniew N, Mazlouman SJ, Belley-Cote EP, Jacobs WB, Kwon BK. Interventions to  
217 Optimize Spinal Cord Perfusion in Patients with Acute Traumatic Spinal Cord Injuries: A  
218 Systematic Review. *J Neurotrauma*. May 1 2020;37(9):1127-1139. doi:10.1089/neu.2019.6844
- 219 10. Bozzo A, Marcoux J, Radhakrishna M, Pelletier J, Goulet B. The role of magnetic  
220 resonance imaging in the management of acute spinal cord injury. *J Neurotrauma*. Aug  
221 2011;28(8):1401-11. doi:10.1089/neu.2009.1236
- 222 11. Perim RR, Gonzalez-Rothi EJ, Mitchell GS. Cervical spinal injury compromises caudal  
223 spinal tissue oxygenation and undermines acute intermittent hypoxia-induced phrenic long-  
224 term facilitation. *Exp Neurol*. Aug 2021;342:113726. doi:10.1016/j.expneurol.2021.113726
- 225 12. Bernard F, Barsan W, Diaz-Arrastia R, Merck LH, Yeatts S, Shutter LA. Brain Oxygen  
226 Optimization in Severe Traumatic Brain Injury (BOOST-3): a multicentre, randomised, blinded-  
227 endpoint, comparative effectiveness study of brain tissue oxygen and intracranial pressure  
228 monitoring versus intracranial pressure alone. *BMJ Open*. Mar 10 2022;12(3):e060188.  
229 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060188

230

231

232

233

234 **TABLE AND FIGURE LEGENDS**

235 **Table 1. Patient demographics and injury characteristics.** Patients 1-6 were managed with  
236 continuous drainage and patients 7-19 were managed with threshold drainage. The color gradient  
237 represents the transition in AIS scores over time (darker color indicates greater severity). There  
238 was no significant difference in patient age between the two groups ( $p = 0.31$ ). AIS, ASIA  
239 (American Spinal Injury Association) Impairment Scale.

240

241 **Table 2. Average subacute pressure and systemic oxygenation.** The ‘N’ value represents the  
242 number of individual data points collected for each variable. The groups were considered  
243 significantly different if  $p < 0.05$  \*.

244

245 **Figure 1. Frequency of suboptimal and critically low spinal cord perfusion pressure. A)**  
246 Comparing percentage of time spent in suboptimal spinal cord perfusion pressure ( $< 65$  mmHg;  $p$   
247  $= 0.257$ ). **B)** Comparing percentage of time spent in critically low spinal cord perfusion pressure  
248 ( $< 50$  mmHg;  $p = 0.003$ ). Graphs demonstrate groups averages with error bars representing  
249 standard error of mean. The groups were considered significantly different if  $p < 0.05$ .

250

251 **Figure 2. Average vasopressor use.** There was no significant difference in vasopressor  
252 utilization between the two groups ( $p = 0.76$ ). Graphs demonstrate groups averages with error  
253 bars representing standard error of mean. The groups were considered significantly different if  $p$   
254  $< 0.05$ .

255

256

257

258

259 **Table 1. Patient demographics and injury characteristics.** Patients 1-6 were managed with  
 260 continuous drainage and patients 7-19 were managed with threshold drainage. The color gradient  
 261 represents the transition in AIS scores over time (darker color indicates greater severity). There  
 262 was no significant difference in patient age between the two groups ( $p = 0.31$ ). AIS, ASIA  
 263 (American Spinal Injury Association) Impairment Scale.

Patient	Age Range (years)	Gender	Injury Site	Initial AIS	24h AIS	72h AIS	1-month AIS	3-month AIS
1	35-39	F	T9	T9 AIS A	T9 AIS A	T6 AIS A	T6 AIS B	
2	20-24	M	T5	T5 AIS A	T5 AIS A	T3 AIS A	T3 AIS C	
3	60-64	F	C5	C4 AIS C	C4 AIS C	C4 AIS D	C4 AIS D	
4	50-54	M	C4	C5 AIS B	C5 AIS B	C5 AIS B		C3 AIS D
5	20-24	M	T3	T3 AIS A	T3 AIS A	T3 AIS A	T2 AIS A	T3 AIS A
6	75-79	M	C6	C6 AIS C	C5 AIS A	C5 AIS A	C5 AIS A	

7	30-34	F	C7	C5 AIS B	C5 AIS B	C7 AIS A	C8 AIS A	
8	65-69	F	C4	C4 AIS A	C4 AIS A	C3 AIS A	C4 AIS A	
9	20-24	M	T12	T12 AIS A	T11 AIS A	T11 AIS A		
10	50-54	M	C6	C5 AIS A	C5 AIS A	C4 AIS A	C6 AIS A	C7 AIS A
11	75-79	M	C4	C4 AIS D	C4 AIS D	C4 AIS D		
12	20-24	F	C7	C6 AIS A	C5 AIS A		C2 AIS A	
13	45-49	M	C5	C5 AIS C		C7 AIS C	C7 AIS D	
14	75-79	M	C5	C5 AIS B	C5 AIS B	C4 AIS C	C5 AIS C	
15	80-84	F	C5	C5 AIS A	C5 AIS A	C5 AIS A		
16	30-34	M	T4	T4 AIS A	T3 AIS A	T3 AIS A	T4 AIS A	
17	30-34	M	C4	C4 AIS A	C4 AIS A	C4 AIS A	C4 AIS A	
18	70-74	F	C6	C6 AIS B	C6 AIS B	C6 AIS C	C6 AIS C	C6 AIS D
19	30-34	M	C6	C7 AIS C	C7 AIS C	C6 AIS C		

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271 **Table 2. Average subacute pressure and systemic oxygenation.** The ‘N’ value represents the  
 272 number of individual data points collected for each variable. The groups were considered  
 273 significantly different if  $p < 0.05$  \*.

	N		Threshold [mean (SD)]	Continuous [mean (SD)]	p-value
	Threshold	Continuous			
<b>Spinal cord perfusion pressure</b>	1088	480	73.38 (12.56)	73.43 (9.95)	0.94
<b>Intrathecal pressure</b>	1088	480	14.60 (6.29)	16.23 (8.37)	<b>*2.14 E-05</b>
<b>Mean arterial pressure</b>	1088	480	87.90 (12.77)	88.97 (10.82)	0.11
<b>% oxygen saturation (systemic)</b>	919	401	97.14 (5.76)	97.17 (7.75)	0.94

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287 **Figure 1. Frequency of suboptimal and critically low spinal cord perfusion pressure. A)**


288 Comparing percentage of time spent in suboptimal spinal cord perfusion pressure (< 65 mmHg; p

289 = 0.257). **B)** Comparing percentage of time spent in critically low spinal cord perfusion pressure

290 (< 50 mmHg; p = 0.003). Graphs demonstrate groups averages with error bars representing

291 standard error of mean. The groups were considered significantly different if p < 0.05.

292



293

294

295

296

297

298


299

300

301

302

303 **Figure 2. Average vasopressor use.** There was no significant difference in vasopressor  
304 utilization between the two groups ( $p = 0.76$ ). Graphs demonstrate groups averages with error  
305 bars representing standard error of mean. The groups were considered significantly different if  $p$   
306  $< 0.05$ .



307