



**Format:** Abstract

**See 1 citation found by title matching your search:**

[Spine \(Phila Pa 1976\)](#). 2020 Mar 19. doi: 10.1097/BRS.0000000000003506. [Epub ahead of print]

## **AIS Bracing Success is Influenced by Time in Brace: Comparative Effectiveness Analysis of BraIST and ISICO Cohorts.**

[Dolan LA](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Donzelli S](#)<sup>2</sup>, [Zaina F](#)<sup>2</sup>, [Weinstein SL](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Negrini S](#)<sup>2,3,4</sup>.

### **Author information**

#### **Abstract**

**STUDY DESIGN: Comparative effectiveness** study **OBJECTIVE.:** To evaluate factors leading to higher percentage of **brace** failures in a cohort of North American patients with **AIS** relative to their peers in Italy.

**SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND DATA:** Studies of **bracing** in USA have shown worse outcomes than studies from European centers, possibly due to sample characteristics or treatment approaches.

**METHODS:** Sample: Braced patients, age 10-15, Risser < 3, Cobb 20-40°, observed to Cobb ≥40° and/or ≥Risser 4 selected from prospective databases. Comparators: **Bracing per BraIST** (TLSO) and **ISICO** protocol (SPoRT braces with or without SEAS exercises). Baseline characteristics (sex, age, BMI, Risser, Cobb, curve type) and average hrs of **brace** wear/day. Differences in programs (e.g. SEAS, type of **brace**, weaning protocol) were captured by a variable named "SITE."

**OUTCOME:** Treatment failure (Cobb≥40 before Risser 4).

**STATISTICS:** Comparison of baseline characteristics, analyses of risk factors, treatment components and outcomes within and between **cohorts** using logistic regression.

**RESULTS:** 157 **BraIST** and 81 **ISICO** subjects were included. **Cohorts** were similar at baseline but differed significantly in terms of average hrs of **brace** wear: 18.31 in the **ISICO** vs. 11.76 in the **BraIST** cohort. 12% of the **ISICO** and 39% of the **BraIST** cohort had failed treatment. Age, Risser, Cobb and a thoracic apex predicted failure in both groups. SITE was related to failure (OR =0.19), indicating lower odds of failure with **ISICO** vs **BraIST** approach. With both SITE and wear **time** in the model, SITE loose significance. In the final model, the adjusted odds of failure were higher in boys (OR=3.34), and those with lowest BMI (OR=9.83); the odds increased with the Cobb angle (OR=1.23), and decreased with age (OR=0.41) and hours of wear (OR=0.86).

**CONCLUSION:**

Treatment at the **ISICO** resulted in a lower failure rate, primarily explained by longer average hours of **brace** wear.

**LEVEL OF EVIDENCE: 3.**

PMID: 32205704 DOI: [10.1097/BRS.0000000000003506](https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0000000000003506)

---

**LinkOut - more resources**

