



TITLE: SYMBIS for Neurosurgery and Spine Application: Clinical and Cost-Effectiveness

DATE: 04 December 2014

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the evidence for the clinical effectiveness of SYMBIS for spine application?
2. What is the evidence for the cost-effectiveness of SYMBIS for spine application?
3. What is the evidence for the clinical effectiveness of SYMBIS for neurosurgery?
4. What is the evidence for the cost-effectiveness of SYMBIS for neurosurgery?

KEY FINDINGS

One non-randomized study regarding the clinical effectiveness of SYMBIS for neurosurgery was identified.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2014, Issue 12), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2009 and December 1 2014. Internet links were provided, where available.

SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. **This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only.** It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners' own terms and conditions.

Table 1: Selection Criteria

Population	Q1,2: Adult patients requiring surgery for spine disease (e.g., degenerative disc diseases, spinal infections, spinal tumours, spinal trauma) that involves pedicle screw placement Q3,4: Adult patients with brain tumours, radiation necrosis, intractable epilepsy, brain vascular malformations, or spinal cord tumours
Intervention	Q1,2: Pedicle screw placement using SYMBIS (previously NeuroArm) (IMRIS Inc.) for spine application Q3,4: SYMBIS (IMRIS Inc.) for neurosurgery
Comparator	Q1,2: Freehand screw placement, minimally invasive surgery with percutaneous screw placement, fluoroscopy guided screw placement, or no comparator Q3,4: Microsurgery often with intra-operative MR imaging; or no comparator
Outcomes	Q1: Benefits (e.g. shorter operating times when coupled to other technologies such as laser ablation, decrease in revision surgery rates, decreased complications); Harms Q3: Benefits (e.g., improved safety due to precision and accuracy of the device, shorter operating times; Harms Q2,4: Cost effectiveness
Study Designs	Health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and economic evaluations.

One non-randomized study regarding the clinical effectiveness of SYMBIS for neurosurgery was identified. No relevant health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials or economic evaluations, and no evidence regarding the clinical effectiveness of SYMBIS for spine application or cost-effectiveness was identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Health Technology Assessments

No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials

No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies

1. Sutherland GR, Lama S, Gan LS, Wolfsberger S, Zareinia K. Merging machines with microsurgery: clinical experience with neuroarm. J Neurosurg. 2013 Mar;118(3):521-9.
[PubMed: PM23240694](#)

Economic Evaluations

No literature identified.

PREPARED BY:

Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health

Tel: 1-866-898-8439

www.cadth.ca

APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses – Robotic Technology Unspecified

2. Marcus HJ, Cundy TP, Nandi D, Yang GZ, Darzi A. Robot-assisted and fluoroscopy-guided pedicle screw placement: a systematic review. *Eur Spine J* [Internet]. 2014 Feb [cited 2014 Dec 4];23(2):291-7. Available from:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3906467>
[PubMed: PM23801017](#)

Non-Randomized Studies

Alternate Procedures

3. Motkoski JW, Yang FW, Lwu SH, Sutherland GR. Toward robot-assisted neurosurgical lasers. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2013 Apr;60(4):892-8.
[PubMed: PM23047855](#)

Unclear Clinical Outcomes

4. Lang MJ, Greer AD, Sutherland GR. Intra-operative robotics: Neuroarm. *Acta Neurochir Suppl*. 2011;109:231-6.
[PubMed: PM20960348](#)

Case Studies

5. Pandya S, Motkoski JW, Serrano-Almeida C, Greer AD, Latour I, Sutherland GR. Advancing neurosurgery with image-guided robotics. *J Neurosurg*. 2009 Dec;111(6):1141-9.
[PubMed: PM19374495](#)

Review Articles

6. Sutherland GR, Wolfsberger S, Lama S, Zarei-nia K. The evolution of neuroarm. *Neurosurgery*. 2013 Jan;72 Suppl 1:27-32.
[PubMed: PM23254809](#)
7. Mattei TA, Rodriguez AH, Sambhara D, Mendel E. Current state-of-the-art and future perspectives of robotic technology in neurosurgery. *Neurosurg Rev*. 2014 Jul;37(3):357-66.
[PubMed: PM24729137](#)