IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 16, Issue 12 Ver. XIII (Dec. 2017), PP 67-72
www.iosrjournals.org

A Cross Sectional Study To Correlate Low Back Pain With Sacral Parameters in Patients With Low Back Pain

*Dr. Gopal Chandra Mondal[1] , *Dr. Anupam Baske[2]
1. Associate Professor, Anatomy, N.R.S. M.C.H., Kolkata
2. Assistant Professor, Anatomy, B. S. M. C. ,Bankura
**Corresponding author: Dr. Anupam Baske*

Date of Submission: 19-12-2017 Date of acceptance: 23-12-2017

I. Introduction

Sacrum is formed by fusion of five sacral vertebrae and forms the caudal end of the vertebral column. The vertebral canal of Sacrum (Sacral canal) runs throughout the greater part of the bone. The opening present at the caudal end of sacral canal is known as sacral hiatus. It is located inferior to the fourth (or third) fused sacral spines at the lower end of median sacral crest.[1,2] The Sacral hiatus contains lower sacral and coccygeal nerve roots, filum terminale externa and fibro-fatty tissue.[3] The fifth sacral spinal nerves and coccygeal nerve emerge through the sacral hiatus close to the medial side of the sacral cornua. The sacral hiatus is covered only by skin, a subcutaneous fatty layer and the sacro-coccygeal membrane[4,5]**.** The shape of the sacral hiatus shows many variations. Sometimes lamina of more than one sacral vertebra or laminae of all sacral vertebrae remain non fused. In these conditions a wide gap is formed in that region. Hence the surface area for muscular attachment is decreased which may lead to pain sensation at the back region.[6, 7]

A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted among the patients with history of low back pain attending the Department of Radiology in atertiary care hospital of West Bengal with the following objectives:

1. To find out the position of sacral hiatus in radiograph
2. To measure the length and transverse diameter of sacral hiatus by Radiology
3. To elicit correlation of low back pain with sacral parameters in patients presenting with history of low back pain

II. Materials And Methods

Data collected from 100 patients were analysed. Out of that 50 had the history of chronic low back pain i.e. study group. For the sake of descriptive comparison (on the basis of 1:1) a group of 50 another age and sex matched patients was considered in the study i.e. comparison group.

All patients above 20 years age group attending the Radiology OPD with the digital radiograph of the antero-posterior view of lumbo-sacral spine, with history of low back pain, have been approached for this study. Proved cases with advanced malignanacy were excluded.After taking proper permission from the authorities of the respective departments, data were collected in the department of radiology, from the report of the digital X-ray of LS spine (AP view) of the patients with history of low back pain. Visits were made in the department of radiology twice a week (once in the Monday and once in Wednesday; if anyone is holiday or could not been attended for the departmental other academic assignment, then the visit has been made in the next possible day) in the six months time. All patients matching the inclusion and exclusion criteria have been incorporated in the study. Following parameters were studied:Vertebral level of apex of sacral hiatus , b)Vertebral level of base of sacral hiatus c) Diameter (mm) of sacral hiatus (in between two sacral cornua) d) Length (mm) of sacral hiatus (From the apex upto the mid-point of base) e) Demographic parameters: Age (in years), gender.

III. Results And Analysis

The study revealed that majorty i.e. 38% of the study subjects belonged in the age group of 31-40 years.

Group	**Male**	**Female**	**Chi-square, df, p**	
	No. (%)	**No. (%)**		
Study	23 (46.0)	27(54.0)	X2=0.000	
Comparison	23(46.0)	27(54.0)		
Total	46 (46.0)	54 (54.0)	---------	

Table-2: Distribution of study subjects as per gender in two groups (N=100) X2= Chi Square: df=Degree of Freedom: p= p-value

Overall female participant were slightly more than the male but in both the groups they were in comparable number and the difference was found to be statistically insignificant.

Table-3: Distribution of study subjects as per gender in different age groups (N=100)

Age (yrs) group	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Chi-square, df,p**
	No. (%)	**No. (%)**	**No. (%)**	
≤30	12(37.5)	20 (62.5)	32 (100)	X2=3.530
31-40	16(42.1)	22(57.9)	38(100)	Df=2
>40	18(60.0)	12(40.0)	30(100)	
Total	46(46.0)	54(54.0)	100(100)	----------
X2= Chi Square: df=Degree of Freedom: P= p-value				

Table-4: Distribution of participants as per the anatomical position of apex of sacral hiatus across gender (N=100)

Gender	**Anatomical level of apex**		**Chi-square, df,**
	Lower level of S4	At 5 th sacral vertebra	
	vertebra & above	**No. (%)**	
	No. (%)		
Male	40(86.96)	06 (13.04)	X2=0.088,
Female	48(88.89)	06(11.11)	df= 1
Total	88(88.0)	12(12.0)	----------
	X2= Chi Square df=Degree of Freedom P= p-value		

Majority (88.0 percent) of the patients was found to have the apex of their sacral hiatus at the level of fourth sacral vertebrae or slightly above it. So far as the anatomical position of the apex of the sacral hiatus is concerned, no significant difference between the genders could be found out.

Table-5: Distribution of participants as per the anatomical position of apex of sacral hiatus between groups (N=100)

Groups	**Level of anatomical position of sacral apex**		
	Level of S4 vertebra & above	**At S5 vertebra**	**Chi-square,**
	No. (%)	**No. (%)**	**df, p**
Study	47(43.48)	03 (75.0)	X2=3.409
Comparison	41(56.52)	09(25.0)	Df= 1
			P=0.065
Total	88(100)	12(100)	----------
	X2= Chi Square df=Degree of Freedom p= p-value		

Though in a higher proportion of patients of comparison group the sacral apex was found to lie at the level of S4 vertebra significant.

Table-6: Distribution of participants according to the anatomical position of the base of sacral hiatus across gender (N=100)

	Gender			**Fisher exact test, p**
Anatomical level of base	**Male**		**Female**	**(two tailed)**
	No. (%)		**No. (%)**	
At level of S4 vertebra & above	04(8.0)		02(4.0)	P=0.4095
At level of S5 vertebra	42(92.0)		52(96.0)	
Total	46(100)		54(100)	---------

Analysis of data reflected that 94.0 percent of study subject was found to have the base of the sacral hiatus at the level of 5th sacral vertebrae. The anatomical position of the base of the sacrum was found to have no statistically significant difference between the genders **[p=0.4095 in 2 tailed Fisher exact test]**

Table-7: Distribution of participants as per the anatomical position of base of sacral hiatus between two groups (N=100)

Groups	**Level of anatomical position of sacral base**		
			Fisher exact
	At level of S4 vertebra &	**At level of S5**	
	above	**vertebra**	**test, p (two**
	No. (%)	**No. (%)**	**tailed)**
Study	03(6.0)	47 (94.0)	
			1.000
Comparison	03(6.0)	47(94.0)	
Total	06(6.0)	94(94.0)	----------

In respect of the anatomical position of base of the sacral hiatus two groups were perfectly comparable.

Table-8: Distribution of participants accordin

		Gender		
Length of sacral hiatus	**Male**		**Female**	**Chi-square,**
(mm)	**[No. (%)]**		**[No. (%)]**	**df,p**
≤15	20(28.0)		28(36.0)	X2=1.062
				df=3
16-20	18(40.0)		17(44.0)	
				P=0.786
21-25	07(28.0)		07(12.0)	
>25	01(4.0)		02(8.0)	
Total	46(100)		54(100)	----------
X2= Chi Square df=Degree of Freedom p= p-value				

g to the length of their sacral hiatus across the gender (N=100)

The length of the sacral hiatus was estimated in the present study and the overall value was 16.33±4.15 mm with range of 11-27 mm. According to the length of the sacral hiatus the participants were divided in to different categories. The majority (44.0 percent) of thestudy subjects was found to have sacral hiatus in the range of 16-20 mm length. In thisregard no statistically significant difference could be observed in the distribution betweenthe genders.

Table-09: Distribution of participants according to the category of length of sacral hiatus across two groups (N=100)

		Group		
Length of sacral hiatus	**Study**		**Comparison**	**Chi-square,**
(mm)	**[No. (%)]**		**[No. (%)]**	**df,p**
≤15	17(34.0)		31(62.0)	X2=10.369
16-20	20(40.0)		15(30.0)	Df=3
				P=0.016
21-25	10(20.0)		04(8.0)	
>25	03(6.0)		0	
Total	50(100)		50(100)	----------
X2= Chi Square df= Degree of Freedom P= p-value				

The table shows that significantly higher proportion of study subjects in the comparison group belonged in the group having length of sacral hiatus 15 mm or less.

Table-10: Distribution of participants as per their age groups and category of length of sacral hiatus (N=100)

		Age groups			
Length of sacral hiatus (mm)	**≤30 y No. (%)**	**31-40 yrs No. (%)**	**40 yrs No. (%)**	**Chi-square, df, p**	
≤15	17(53.13)	17(44.74)	14 (46.67)	X2=2.072,	
16-20	11(34.38)	13(34.21)	11(36.67)	Df=6,	
21-25	04(12.50)	06(15.79)	04(13.33)	**P=0.913**	
>25	0	02(5.26)	01(3.33)		
Total	32(100)	38(100)	30 (100)	----------	
	X2= Chi Square df= Degree of Freedom p= p-value				

Length of the sacral hiatus had no significant variation across the age categories. The length of the sacral hiatus was also found not to vary across the age groups.

Table-11: Distribution of participants as per the length of sacral hiatus between the gender (N=100)

Gender	**Length of sacral hiatus (mm)**	
	mean±sd	**'Unpaired**
Male [n1=46]	17.10±3.82	Unpaired t =1.746,
Female[n2=54]	15.66±4.33	Df=98,
		P= 0.084
Total	16.33±4.15	----------
According to the length	of the sacral hiatus	the patients in two genders were

Table-12: Distribution of participants as per the category of diameter of sacral hiatus and gender (N=100)

Diameter of sacral hiatus (mm)	**Gender**		**Chi-square, df , p**	
	Male [No. (%)]	**Female [No. (%)]**		
≤10	33(71.74)	46(85.19)	X2=2.833,	
11-15	12(26.09)	07(12.96)	Df=2,	
>15	01(2.17)	01(1.85)	**P=0.243**	
Total	46(100)	54(100)	----------	

X2= Chi Square df= Degree of Freedom P= p-value

Overall diameter of sacral hiatus was estimated to be 9.27±2.43 mm. According to the diameter of the sacral hiatus three groups were created. It was revealed in the above table that no variation among categories created based on the diameter of the sacral hiatus could be explored across the genders. It was also noted that majority (79.0 percent) of the patients had the diameter of sacral hiatus in the range of 10 mm or less.

Table-13: Distribution of participants as per their age groups and category of diameter of sacral hiatus (N=100)

Diameter of sacral hiatus	**Age groups**			**Chi-square, df, p**	
	≤30 y	**31-40 yrs**	**40 yrs**		
≤10	26(81.25)	28(73.68)	25(83.34)	X2=2.157,	
11-15	06(18.75)	09(23.68)	04(13.33)	Df= 4,	
>15	0	01(2.63)	01(3.33	P=0.707	

			)		
Total	32(100)	38(100)	30 (100)	----------	

X2= Chi Square df= Degree of Freedom P= p-value

Majority i.e.79 percent of the participants had sacral hiatus of diameter of 10 mm or less. However, higher age group was shown to have higher proportion of individual with hiatus with diameter of 10mm or less.No variation in the distribution of participants among the diameter categories was revealed between the age groups.

Table-14: Distribution of participants as per the diameter of sacral hiatus between genders (N=100)

Gender	**Diameter of sacral hiatus (mm)**		
	Mean ± sd	**'Unpaired**	
Male	9.50±2.59	Unpaired t =0.845,	
		Df=98,	
Female	9.09±2.29		
		P=**0.400**	
Total	9.34±2.58	----------	

The above table 15 shows that there was no statistically significant difference between the genders in respect of the diameter of the sacral hiatus.

Table-15: Distribution of participants as per their length of sacral hiatus between the groups (N=100)

Group	**Length of sacral hiatus (mm)**		
	Mean ± sd	**'Unpaire**	
Study	17.54±4.25	Unpaired t =3.049,	
		Df=98,	
Comparison	15.11±3.69		
		P=0.003	
Total	16.33±4.15	----------	

The above table 16 shows that the study group had higher length of sacral hiatus andthe difference was found to be statistically significant.

Table-16: Distribution of participants as per the diameter of sacral hiatus across groups (N=100**)**

Group	**Diameter of sacral hiatus (mm)**		
	mean±sd	**'Unpaire**	
Study	10.27±2.66	Unpaired t =3.826,	
		Df=98,	
Comparison	8.41±2.16		
		P=0.000	
Total	9.34±2.58	----------	

The above table 17 shows that the study group had higher diameter of sacral hiatus and the difference was found to be statistically significant.

IV. Discussion

Low back pain is a common feature in modern day life. We have taken radiograph of known cases of low back pain, measured the sacral hiatus and compared them with the comparison group to assess whether the morphology of sacral hiatus is responsible for low back pain or not. The sacral hiatus is an important bony landmark. Clinicians sometimes experience difficulties in determining the hiatus of sacrum by palpating it clinically. It is therefore important to describe the anatomical variations of the location of sacral hiatus to guide the clinical procedure e.g. caudal epidural block. Variations in dorsum of the sacrum may have some association with clinical conditions like low back pain.Long back Brailsford JF [6] proposed that the variation in the development of the sacral hiatus can cause decrease area for the attachment of extensor muscle at back causing painful conditions. In spina-bifida the laminae of all the sacral vertbrae fail to fuse at back leading open sacral canal i.e. a midline gap. In spina-bifida occulta the posterior element of upper sacral vertebrae fail to fuse. Mehmet S et al and Kumar V e al [7,8] also mentioned that these kinds of anatomical variations would lead to painful condition of the back and some clinical procedural failures. Variants of sacral hiatus (SH) may be considered as the lower pole of the spectrum of failure in fusion of laminae of sacral vertebrae with spina-bifida as its highest grade which is established to be due to folic acid deficiency during pregnancy. Malarvani T et al [9] also supported this hypothesis that this developmental variations of the dorsum of the sacral bone leads to the decreased surface area for the attachment of extensor muscles of the back and so even a mild stress to these

muscles would make it strain more and result in painful conditions of the back. So, studying the area of sacral hiatus i.e. level of its apex; its length, breadth and diameter is a pertinent issue. Knowledge of higher area of sacral hiatus as one of the causes of low back pain can be utilized for prevention of this chronic disabling condition. In the present study the percentages among male and female low back pain patients having their apex of sacrum at S4 level were revealed to be 91.30 percent and 96.29 percent, respectively and these were higher than what were observed by Kumar et al.[8]. Contrary to the observations made by Mohamed S M et al [10] the present study revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean sacral hiatal length across the gender. Analysis in the present study reflected that the length of sacral hiatus was higher among the patients suffering from low back pain than their counterpart. This difference was found to be statistically robust.

V. Conclusion

The dorsal surface of the sacral bone is the area where many of the extensor muscles of the back get attached. Weakness in the origin or insertion of any muscle leads to its frequent strains which in turn may culminate into one of the causes of low back pain in the long run. The present study revealed higher proportion of low back pain patients showing sacral apex at higher level at S4. This group of study subjects had significantly longer sacral hiatus with higher diameter i.e. larger deficient dorsum of sacra. As proposed earlier by few investigator this finding led to conclude that the low back pain patients might have higher deficiency in back of their sacrum, resulting poor attachment of the extensor group of muscles of the back, leading in turn to the development of muscular strain and thereby in the long run the patients were suffering from low back pain. The results of the present study couldn't be compared with similar other study. This was due to the lack of comparable study done on the living subjects suffering from low back pain. So, to get the hypothesis i.e. deficiency on the dorsal surface of the sacrum is higher among the low back pain patients in whom it is one of the causes of the disease firmly established a larger study involving the living patients suffering from low back pain can be conducted along with a suitable matched control/comparison group in different settings.

References

[1]. Standering S gray's anatomy: the anatomical basis of clinical practice, 39th edn. Elsevier,Churchill Livingstone, Edinburg, 2005:749-754. Gray H.: PeterAnatomyLwilliam,Gray' practice; Skeletal system, 38th edition. Churchill Livingston.2008.
[2]. Ernest JF. Anatomy of the Human Skeleton; J and A Churchill Ltd, London 1914; 37-42
[3]. Gray's Anatomy, 35th edition, Orient Longman 1973; P: 242-244
[4]. Phalgunan V, Baskaran S. Morphological analysis of sacral hiatus and its clinical significance: The Health Agenda 2013;1(1).
[5]. Brailsford JF. Deformities of lumbosacral region of spine. Br J Surg 1929; 16: 562—627.
[6]. Mehmet S, Johongir MM, Ali D. Evaluation of Congenital Lumbosacral Malformations and Neurological Findings in Patients with Low Back Pain, Turkish Neurosurgery, 2009; 19(2): 145-8.
[7]. Kumar V, Vinay KV, Remya K, Kumar A, Shishir K. High sacral hiatus with non fusion of lamina of first sacral vertebrae: a case report. NUJHS, 2012; 2(4):60-2.
[8]. Malarvani T, Ganesh E, Nirmala P. Study of sacral hiatus in dry human sacra in Nepal, Parsa region.Int J Anat Res 2015, Vol 3(1):848-55.
[9]. Mohamed S M,Omayma M M, Hoda H A El R, Hosam M. A. Morphometric study of sacral hiatus in adult human Egyptian sacra: Their significance in caudal epidural anesthesia**.** Saudi J Anaesth. 2012; 6(4): 350–7.

*Dr. Gopal Chandra Mondal. "A Cross Sectional Study To Correlate Low Back Pain With Sacral Parameters in Patients With Low Back Pain." IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS) , vol. 16, no. 12, 2017, pp. 67–72.