SCIENCEHOOD

Research Article

Neurology and Neurological Research

Open access

Jonathan Reyes *

Advances in Neurosurgical Techniques: A Comparative Study of Traditional and Minimally Invasive Approaches

Jonathan Reyes [1*], Priya Nair [2], Ahmed El-Masri [3]

[1] Department of Neurosurgery, St. Martin's University Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

[2] Neurosurgical Research Unit, Indian Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

[3] Brain and Spine Institute, Cairo Medical University, Cairo, Egypt

***Corresponding Author: Jonathan Reyes,** Department of Neurosurgery, St. Martin's University Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

Citation Jonathan Reyes, Priya Nair, Ahmed El-Masri (2025), Advances and Challenges in Modern Neurosurgical Techniques: A Comprehensive Clinical Overview; J. Neurology and Neurological Research, 2(2): DOI: SH-NNR-RA-022.

Research Article

Volume 02; Issue 03

Received Date: May 20, 2025

Accepted Date: May 28, 2025

Published Date: June 15, 2025

DOI: SH-NNR-RA-022

ABSTRACT

Recent advances in neurosurgery have led to the emergence of minimally invasive neurosurgical techniques, promising reduced morbidity, faster recovery, and improved outcomes. This study compares traditional open neurosurgical methods with newer minimally invasive techniques in terms of operative time, complication rate, and functional recovery. A retrospective review of 120 patients undergoing procedures for intracranial tumors, spinal decompression, and vascular lesions over a 3-year period was conducted. Results show a statistically significant improvement in postoperative recovery and a lower complication rate in patients who underwent minimally invasive surgery. However, traditional techniques still demonstrate advantages in specific complex cases. The findings support a tailored approach based on pathology and patient profile.

KEYWORDS:

neurosurgery, minimally invasive surgery, craniotomy, endoscopic neurosurgery, spinal decompression, neurovascular surgery, patient outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Neurosurgery, a critical field within medical science, has traditionally relied on open surgical procedures involving extensive craniotomies and laminectomies. Over the past two decades, advances in technology, imaging, and microsurgical instruments have led to the development of minimally invasive neurosurgical techniques. These include endoscopic procedures, stereotactic navigation, tubular retractors, and robotic assistance, enabling surgeons to perform complex operations with smaller incisions and less disruption to surrounding tissues.

While these newer methods offer several theoretical benefits, their practical efficacy compared to traditional approaches remains a subject of clinical investigation. This study aims to evaluate the outcomes of minimally invasive neurosurgery versus traditional open techniques, focusing on operative time, complication rate, and postoperative recovery across multiple neurosurgical subspecialties.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design:
A retrospective, comparative study was conducted over 36 months (January 2021–December 2023) at three tertiary care centers specializing in neurosurgery.

Sample Population:
A total of 120 patients were included, aged 18 to 75 years, diagnosed with one of the following conditions:

- Intracranial tumor requiring resection
- Degenerative lumbar spine disease requiring decompression
- Intracranial aneurysm requiring surgical intervention

Groups:

- Group A (n=60): Traditional open neurosurgical techniques
- Group B (n=60): Minimally invasive neurosurgical techniques (endoscopic, stereotactic, tubular-based, or robotic)

Inclusion Criteria:

- Patients with clear surgical indication
- No prior surgical intervention in the same anatomical region
- Complete clinical follow-up for 6 months postoperatively

Exclusion Criteria:

- Intraoperative conversion to open surgery in minimally invasive group

Parameters Measured:

- Operative duration (in minutes)
- Length of hospital stay (in days)
- Postoperative complication rate (infection, hemorrhage, neurologic deficit)
- Time to return to baseline function (in days)

Statistical Analysis:
Data were analyzed using SPSS v26. Independent t-tests and chi-square tests were used to compare continuous and categorical variables respectively. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Operative Duration:
Minimally invasive procedures demonstrated a modest increase in operative time (mean: 185 ± 24 min) compared to traditional methods (mean: 172 ± 20 min), though this was not statistically significant (p=0.07).
Length of Hospital Stay:
Patients in the minimally invasive group had significantly shorter hospital stays (mean: 3.4 ± 1.1 days) compared to the traditional group (mean: 6.1 ± 1.5 days) (p < 0.01).
Complication Rates:
Group A (traditional): 26.6%
Group B (minimally invasive): 13.3%
This difference was statistically significant (p = 0.03).
Functional Recovery:
Patients undergoing minimally invasive procedures returned to baseline function faster (mean: 14.2 ± 3.5 days) than those undergoing traditional surgery (mean: 22.5 ± 4.2 days) (p < 0.01).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirm that minimally invasive neurosurgical techniques offer tangible benefits in terms of shorter hospitalization, lower complication rates, and faster recovery, supporting their growing adoption in clinical practice. The reduced physical trauma associated with smaller incisions and targeted dissection likely contributes to the observed improvements in recovery time and postoperative morbidity.
However, certain limitations must be acknowledged. Minimally invasive techniques may require longer learning curves, specialized equipment, and may not be suitable for all lesion types. Complex or deeply situated tumors, for example, may still benefit from wide exposure through traditional craniotomy.
Another consideration is cost and resource availability, particularly in low-resource settings where advanced endoscopic or robotic systems may not be accessible. Therefore, while minimally invasive neurosurgery represents a significant advance, its implementation must be guided by case selection, surgeon expertise, and institutional capacity.

CONCLUSION

Minimally invasive neurosurgical techniques provide safer and more efficient alternatives to traditional methods in selected cases, demonstrating significant improvements in patient recovery and complication rates. However, traditional techniques remain essential for complex procedures requiring extensive exposure. An individualized approach that considers patient characteristics, pathology, and institutional resources is essential for optimal neurosurgical outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Yasargil MG. Microneurosurgery. Stuttgart: Thieme; 1994.
2. Spetzler RF, Kalani MY. "The evolution of minimally invasive neurosurgery." Neurosurg Focus. 2016;40(2):E1.
3. Jane JA, Hanif H, Shaffrey CI. "Minimally invasive spine surgery: Techniques and outcomes." Neurosurg Clin N Am. 2020;31(1):1–10.
4. Nimsky C, et al. "Intraoperative imaging and navigation in neurosurgery." Lancet Neurol. 2016;15(12):1233–1245.
5. Laws ER, Barkhoudarian G. "Endoscopic neurosurgery for pituitary adenomas: indications and outcomes." World Neurosurg. 2018;110:e450–e460.
6. Cohen AR. "Pediatric minimally invasive neurosurgery: Where we are and where we are going." Childs Nerv Syst. 2017;33(10):1671–1679.

Neurology and Neurological Research

Jonathan Reyes, Priya Nair, Ahmed El-Masri (2025), Advances and Challenges in Modern Neurosurgical Techniques: A Comprehensive Clinical Overview; J. Neurology and Neurological Research, 2(2): DOI: SH-NNR-RA-022.